



LARAEC Executive Board

Minutes- Board Meeting

Wednesday, June 17, 2020

10:00 AM – 1:00 PM

Via Zoom

Executive Board Members in		Point Person Team Members		Staff	
Emilio Urioste, Burbank USD	X	VACANT, BUSD		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 10:03 AM.</p>	Mr. Frank
	<p>1.2 Adjustments to the Agenda</p> <p>a. Mr. Stark requested that items 5.1, 5.2, and item 8 be reordered to items as 3.1, 3.2, and 4 respectively. The reason being is that he has a hard stop at 1:00 PM and may need to drop off early. Mr. Urioste made changes on the agenda to reorder those items.</p> <p>b. There were no other adjustments.</p>	Mr. Urioste
	<p>1.3 Approval of the Agenda</p> <p>a. Mr. Stark motioned to approve the agenda, and Ms. Montes seconded.</p> <p>b. The boarded voted unanimously to approve the agenda.</p>	
	<p>1.4 Items for Future Agendas</p> <p>a. Mr. Frank referred to the minutes from last meeting, saying that he had requested for future agendas that they have a discussion on some of the new grant opportunities for adult education on the state level. He had also suggested that the board members discuss best practices during the COVID-19 pandemic. He suggested the same recommendations as last time.</p>	
	<p>1.5 Approval of the Minutes</p> <p>a. Regular Board Meeting: May 20, 2020</p> <p>i. Ms. Montes moved to approve the minutes, and Mr. Frank seconded.</p> <p>ii. Mr. Urioste suggested the following changes: referring to page 8 of 70 of the board packet, on number 3, towards the bottom of number 3, saying “aid” should be stricken in “hold aid a”. In addition, on page 10 of 70, they left off the “e” of his last name on D, number 1.</p> <p>iii. The board voted unanimously to approve the minutes. MUSD was absent for the vote.</p>	
2	No public comment at this time.	

Public Comment		
<p data-bbox="139 174 280 275">3 Yearly Plan Update</p>	<p data-bbox="337 174 1279 268">Mr. Asturias asked if he could briefly give the Yearly Plan Update prior to the newly ordered recognition items 3.1 and 3.2. Mr. Urioste said that he could.</p> <p data-bbox="337 306 1266 436">Mr. Asturias explained that they have made some progress even with schools in the consortium shut down. Some activities have restarted or continued recently, working with the APTs to bridge with the new Yearly Plan due in August.</p> <p data-bbox="337 474 669 506">3.1 Service Recognition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="386 510 1239 573">a. Mr. Asturias explained that there are a few LARAEC members transitioning into new roles, and one retiring. <li data-bbox="386 577 1305 669">b. Mr. Urioste is transitioning out of the role of LARAEC Board President, and incoming LARAEC Board President Mr. Stark spoke in recognition of Mr. Urioste’s service. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="467 674 1305 905">i. Mr. Stark expressed gratitude for his leadership and service as board president, saying he’s had the pleasure of working with Mr. Urioste for years now, both as a colleague and a mentoring supervisor. He has been a valued thought-partner as well. He thanked Mr. Urioste for his steady and focused leadership, and for his passion and vitality around the work of providing access and equity for adult learners. <li data-bbox="467 909 1305 1171">ii. Mr. Frank asked if there was opportunity for other comments, and noted that while only serving on the board in this permutation for the last year, he didn’t realize they had not really figured out the bylaws piece and the funding formula. So he thanked Mr. Urioste for his steady hand in leading LARAEC’s work, included complicated bylaws and funding work. He also complimented Mr. Urioste on work that he witnessed firsthand at Burbank USD. <li data-bbox="467 1176 1305 1306">iii. Ms. Montes thanked Mr. Urioste for his leadership this year, and as a board member in general. She hopes he enjoys his summer, and thanked him for everything he’s provided for this board. <li data-bbox="467 1310 1305 1904">iv. Mr. Urioste said he is very happy that Mr. Stark will be taking the mantle of president with a breadth of experience and knowledge in adult education. He noted that Mr. Stark has both the experience from a large district, but also experience in a small district, Burbank. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="581 1480 1305 1610">1. He would like to leave today the fact that this consortium is just learning what its potential years, and hopes in the coming years they will grow and exercise its potential. <li data-bbox="581 1614 1305 1904">2. Good work can be done with the tremendous, unique resources of each member district. He thinks there were three major pieces he’s proud that they were able to complete: one was the three-year plan; one was the development of the governance structure, which is a critical piece that can be utilized by other consortia; and the final piece was the funding distribution. It was good that they could all come together and develop that. 	<p data-bbox="1352 174 1500 205">Mr. Asturias</p>

3. Ms. Jacquez apologized for technical difficulties, and thanked Mr. Urioste for being such a great leader and for leading by example.
- c. Mr. Asturias recognized the service of Mr. Larry Frank, noting that this is Mr. Frank's last scheduled LARAEC meeting, as he is retiring. They have appreciated Mr. Frank's positivity, cheerfulness, dedication, and passion for serving the students of LARAEC.
 - i. Dr. Mullen said that it has been her honor to work with Mr. Frank, thanked him, and said that his work as a community advocate, in city governance, and as an educational administrator all came together to allow them to push their agenda forward. He has continued to be an advocate for students, especially for non-credit students, and he has always been a voice in the background that has been a champion for adult ed and their students. She thinks he was the perfect person to sit in this seat for LACCD and he'll have hard shoes to fill.
 - ii. Mr. Stark said that he wished Mr. Frank could stay longer with the board. He had the pleasure of working with Mr. Frank during the AB86 planning period, and said that Mr. Frank has a gifted mind as a consummate systems thinker. He thanked Mr. Frank for pushing colleagues to be bold and look for opportunities, and looks forward to other opportunities to work with him and learn from him. Mr. Frank returned the warm feelings.
 - iii. Mr. Urioste said that they have a very divisive political climate today, but what he's always been impressed with and found that Mr. Frank mentored him about, was how he conducted himself at meetings, and how they could disagree, but always keep professional. He remembers Mr. Frank during challenging AB86 discussions, and remembers drawing strength from him on how he represented himself and his organization, and the tone he put forward.
 - iv. Ms. Montes thanked Mr. Frank for everything he brought to LARAEC from the very beginning. She remembers the wealth and breadth of experience Mr. Frank brought, and the way he brought forward messages from a place of passion in a way that people can hear. She thought that he was the voice of reason from the community college district then, and was so excited to have him back. She knew that they could tackle difficult conversations with him.
 - v. Ms. Jacquez said that he was a leader who was absolutely respected, and looks forward to whatever pathway he's moving to next.
 - vi. Mr. Frank thanked the board members and described his background working with LAUSD and the City and County to build the Workforce Systems Collaborative. And in 2012 they saw the money becoming flexible for adult ed, which was frightening. He noted that the board members represent the districts that kept their commitments to adult education, and commended those districts.
 1. He noted that in 2012 they did a report about the future of adult education and how to serve the needs of their students; in 2013-2014 when they started the work of adult education and LARAEC, the consultant they used Gayla was from money that Trade Tech

	<p>had left on their contract. became a steadfast believer in the work of LARAEC.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. So he is back for this year as an administrator, but he spent this last 7th year at the district helping to try to put together a division of workforce and resource development at the district office. 3. He noted that his son just graduated from UC Santa Cruz, the same time that Mr. Frank is “graduating”. He will still have to work part-time but he wants to work parttime, and will be taking a position at the UCLA labor center. It’s work he loves, and they are doing a big DREAM summer coming up. 4. He will be returning to things that are deep personal passion projects for him. He believes ust as other districts believe that they are stronger together. He doesn’t believe they’ve tapped the full potential of their strength, and it would be a profound thing for them to put forward a face to the world concentrating on reentry, since a lot of it is in terms of the work they already do. 5. Finally, on the next board agenda, there will be an item appointing the Vice Chancellor of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness Dr. Ryan Cornner as the next board member representing LACCD. He is a value-driven leader; Dr. Mullen was given the opportunity to step up, but felt she could make her biggest contribution as a point person. Mr. Frank thinks Dr. Cornner will be an amazing voice and a collaborative leader, and added that he is the person who pulled together the LA College Promise with LAUSD. <p>3.2 LARAEC Board presidency transition to Mr. Joseph Stark effective July 1, 2020</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mr. Asturias officially welcomed Mr. Stark as the next LARAEC board president. He will officially first preside as president on July 15, 2020. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Mr. Frank commented that one of his biggest sadnesses is not being able to work with Mr. Stark as president. He has great confidence in Mr. Stark, and noted that this is an important opportunity for the organization that is biggest out of all of the districts to lead by unifying the rest of the districts, and one of the ways would be by finding a way forward using new grant opportunities. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Stark thanked Mr. Frank and is going to see what LARAEC can do about getting him as a consultant because of his expertise and brilliance as a systems thinker, and the value he can bring as a thought partner moving forward. 	
<p>4 Budget Report and Updates/Consent Agenda</p>	<p>4 Consent Agenda</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. BUSD Capital Outlay Request <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Mr. Urioste explained the nature of the capital outlay expenditure for the installation of 6 security cameras, already approved by the board. They realized that they missed a critical area in the main hallway. 	

- ii. Mr. Asturias explained that it is the only action item they have on the agenda today. No board members wanted to remove the item for discussion.

CCUSD: Aye
LAUSD: Aye
LACCD: Yes
MUSD: Aye
BUSD: Aye

Consent agenda is passed.

4.1 Upcoming CAEP due dates, updates and reminders

- a. Ms. Ocampo summarized the upcoming CAEP due dates as explained in the board packet.

4.2 FY 2020 2021 Consortium Fiscal Administration Declaration (CFAD) Based on the May Revise

- a. Ms. Ocampo explained that they have submitted their CFAD based on the May budget revision. They have also received their CAEP Fund Certification memo from the CAEP office.
- b. Basically, the letter indicates their FY 2021 CFAD has been approved. The state anticipates delays in the apportionment for next year. They are estimating the funds will be released later in the fall.
- c. The state also indicated that CAEP funds are apportionment, and are not subject to flexibilities. They can only be used in the seven CAEP program areas, and must have a consortium-approved regional AE plan. Consortiums must follow this plan or risk reductions in funding.

4.3 FY 2019 20 Progress & Expense Preliminary report

- a. Ms. Ocampo explained and summarized their Q3 Progress and Expense report, with a breakdown of their budget. They have submitted a budget transfer adjustment to the state to transfer across different object categories, along with budget adjustment rationales.
- b. Ms. Ocampo also summarized LARAEC's total spending and corrective action plans by district. LARAEC has met their Q3 target overall for the quarter, but there were some districts that did not meet their individual targets because of the COVID situation.
- c. Ms. Ocampo also summarized the activities of each district as aligned with the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

4.4 FY 2019 20 Quarterly Capital Outlay Overview

- a. Ms. Ocampo summarized the state's Capital Outlay Policy from the CAEP state office. She then summarized LARAEC's reported Capital Outlay expenditures and budgets.

- b. She then explained that as of next year, they would like to request the following:
- i. Member districts must submit their capital outlay requests in advance for consortium board approval.
 - ii. At the beginning of each year, member districts must confirm with the LARAEC office the amount of capital outlay budget to be carried over. The carry-over can only be used for projects that have been approved by the board. Any new capital outlay project/expenditures have to be submitted for board approval.
 - iii. The capital outlay budget should be equal to the beginning balance or carry-over plus the approved amount for the current fiscal year.
 - iv. They would also want to do quarterly updates for the board about Capital Outlay so that the board can have proper oversight. She asked if the board would prefer to have those updates quarterly or every six months, or if they had any suggestions.
- c. Ms. Montes asked if they were reporting the expenditures twice a year. Ms. Ocampo explained that they don't give details on expenditures by member districts, and that they wanted to check if they wanted it presented on a quarterly basis or every six months.
- i. Ms. Montes said that the issue she has seen with Capital Outlay is that someone can propose an expenditure, but because of the timing, it can take forever to get things done. So she's okay with every six months because sometimes it takes a long time for things to hit or be completed.
 - ii. Mr. Uriote said that BUSD's example today is not a good example of that, because this was a new expenditure. But what Ms. Montes said earlier is true in that they may have had a capital outlay expenditure approved, but given how it is then dispersed it may not hit all at one time. He could also support the quarterly or the six months, because then each individual member district could show how much has been expended or how much has been carried over.
 - iii. Ms. Montes said that she can see the value of the quarterly reports so they can see things as they progress.
 - iv. Mr. Frank wanted to take a moment for the purpose of trust amongst the districts. He noted that one page showed a capital outlay of \$213,000 not approved by the board. So he wanted to give a little bit of quick background on that as a way of trust-building amongst LARAEC districts.

1. Mr. Frank explained that they have a different system in the Community College District: items that they classify as low value assets which is anything over \$250 up to \$5000, so of that \$213,000, only one item was officially capital outlay. And they are working with the LARAEC office to figure out how to make sure the LACCD systems mesh well with the rest of the systems.
 2. He is providing this background to make sure they know that LACCD is very committed to the LARAEC process of capital outlays going forward. The LARAEC office is very clear about the different pieces of the puzzle, and he is comfortable with six months.
- v. Mr. Stark said he was comfortable with six months, and asked if there was some way they can leverage existing processes and timelines that they are already working with, particularly around budget development, which usually happens in January, February, March. He thinks it's in everyone's interests to be transparent about things when they get into the large-value expenditures.

4.5 FY 2020-2021 LARAEC Office Budget

- a. Ms. Ocampo explained that it was requested at the last board meeting that they present the FY 2021 budget for the LARAEC Office. She summarized the projected total revenue for LARAEC, the total projected expenditures, the FY 2021 allocation, and their estimated balance.
- i. Mr. Urioste asked if this was included in the packet, and Mr. Asturias confirmed that it is in the packet as part of the slides.
 - ii. Mr. Frank asked if she was able to give a verbal presentation as to how they've been able to make adjustments with the challenge of the 10% cut. Mr. Asturias said they could: in the past 3 years, since they were incepted, the office was fortunately receiving more funding than it was spending, so as a result of that, they had a carryover of \$288,000. As of next year, their income was reduced from \$913,000 to \$803,000. So how they propose to mitigate that deficit is to use some of the carryover that they had. If that is implemented, then they would still have \$113,000 carryover for the following year for FY 21/22. Their suggestion is to use that for continuing operations of the office. They may have some possible audits they may need to do in the future. To make a long answer short, they are mitigating some of the shortcomings in revenue for next year with the carryover balance they have been carrying.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Mr. Frank asked if part of the carryover is a result of not being able to do the annual conference. Mr. Asturias said that that was part of the calculation, but it is an estimated amount at this point. They estimate there was a savings of about \$80,000 from the conference. iv. Ms. Jacquez asked about the item aying the consortium will send an informational email to the CAEP office to inform them of the proposed expenditures. She asked if it would not be of the expenditures, because they already approved it, and if it was something that just LARAEC is doing. Mr. Asturias clarified that it is a requirement CAEP has of all consortia. They do not want the money to carry over for every consortia, but they want to be informed of Capital Outlay approvals. v. Ms. Jacquez asked if it would behoove them to change “proposed expenditures” to “approved expenditures”. Mr. Asturias clarified that it was language they received from the CAEP office. But in essence, they are not really looking at specific expenditures, rather the approval of Capital Outlay items. 	
<p style="text-align: center;">7 Information/Dis cussion Items</p>	<p>7.1 Presentation of the LARAEC Innovation Awards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ms. Stiehl screenshared a powerpoint presenting the LARAEC Innovation Awards, looking back on 2019 and to the present 2020 awards via socially distant Zoom conferencing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Mr. Gorence introduced the awards, explaining the background of the cancellation of the LARAEC conference in March. Ms. Stiehl explained that the innovation awards were introduced last year for the first time to spotlight teams or individuals of teachers and administrators and staff that go above and beyond to try out new innovations and expand services for their students and the community. The awards were designed to acknowledge these individuals and teams as well as provide a platform for sharing best practices throughout the consortium and throughout the state. ii. Ms. Stiehl acknowledged that there are many more people doing incredible work in the field, and they can’t acknowledge them all but they can salute a few. Mr. Gorence added that Zoom presents limitations compared to the scale of the conference, but there are ways over Zoom that people can show their excitement. iii. Ms. Stiehl summarized attendees’ options for reacting using react buttons, the chat buttons, “clapping”, or dancing over video. 	<p>Ms. Stiehl Mr. Gorence</p>

- b. Mr. Gorence thanked the Innovation Award Committee: Fred Rivas, BUSD, Kelly Scott, CCUSD, Miranda Chavez, CCUSD, Imelda Perez, LACCD, Sharon Dalmage, LACCD, and Alejandra Salcedo, LAUSD and explained the selection and scoring process. Ms. Stiehl also thanked the administrators and co-workers of their nominees for filling out the nomination paperwork.
- i. Ms. Stiehl explained that nominees would be honored by a virtual “Honorable Mentions” kiosk on the website similar to the in-person one that would be used at the conference.
 - ii. Mr. Gorence highlighted the Honorable Mentions and congratulated them.
- c. Mr. Gorence introduced the Award Recipient portion, and he and Ms. Stiehl presented the awards:
- i. From Burbank Adult School: “Visual Effects - Reel People”, Jimmy Lifton
 - ii. From LACCD District West: “College to Career (C2C) Program”, Danielle Sheppard, Brianne Bunch, Yesenia Garcia, Ebony Hallman, Angel Key, Amy Gonzalez
 - iii. From Culver City Adult School, “ESL Cocktail Party”, Bradley Wheeler
 - iv. From LAUSD, East LA Occupational Center, “Building Bridge at Puente Learning Center”, Ana Herrera
 - v. From LAUSD, Eastside Learning Center, “Student Empowerment Conference”, Myra Arredondo Vanessa Sanchez, Julie Singer, Beatriz Ochoa, Bertha Galvan, Ed Wu, Yetta Shavers
 - vi. From LACCD, Los Angeles City College, “Innovations in Community Connections”, Angel Amaro
 - vii. From LACCD, Los Angeles Southwest College, “Careers for a Cause”, Allison Upstill, Courtney Pierce, Kirsten Swiggum, Algenia Harding, Marian Ruane, Laura I. Perez
 - viii. From MUSD Ford Park Adult School and Montebello Adult School, “Census Enumerator Preparation Class (IET)”, Julie Lemus, Judy McFadden, Irma Navarro, Karla Ramirez
 - ix. From LAUSD North Valley Occupational Center, “TAA & I-Train Contract Management”, Patrick Wickham, Jonathan Schaeffer, John Alvarez, Refugio Rios.
 - x. From LAUSD West Valley Occupational Center, “Options Promise”, Monica Balbuena, Laura Chardiet, Steve Rosen, Brenda Vela, Sam Powers, Joshua David, and Martha Martinez

- xi. From LAUSD Los Angeles Technology Center, “TSA Security Partnership”, Mark Lawrence, Carol Johnson, Sam Powers, Ana Martinez, Brenda Vela, rocelia Beard, Lane Bragg, Luz Granados, and Denise Becker
 - xii. From LAUSD Division of Adult and Career Education, “Census 2020 Campaign”, Laura Chardiet, Karla Galleguillos, Ed McBride, Vanessa Little, Jose Montalvo, Pierre Giammattei, Erica Rosario
- d. Mr. Gorence congratulated all of the Innovation Award winners for 2020, and encouraged all attendees to show their enthusiasm and appreciation for them. They know there is so much ability, support, and passion for what they do as adult educators in general. Ms. Stiehl added that they are looking forward to all of the innovation to come during this year and the award ceremony in 2021.

7.2 Eide Bailly, LLP LARAEC Enrollment Count and Procedures Final Audit Update

- a. Mr. Asturias explained that at the last board meeting it was requested for him to contact Eide Bailly to get additional information regarding the documentation of the findings listed on the final report.
 - i. Mr. Asturias explained that the reply indicated that the suggestions they made were included in the final report, and the more actionable items come from Management. They noted that they answered board questions during a presentation, and indicated that their engagement had come to an end, and would be happy to work with us in an additional engagement. Basically, they indicated that they are no longer working with LARAEC on this particular item, and that they have provided all of the info that they had to provide.
 - ii. Mr. Asturias said that as they evaluate this report, there are some questions he believes are still outstanding, so the LARAEC office will put together a summary report to board members in the next week or so. Then he will call them individually to answer any questions they may have in preparation for a summary presentation to make at the July board meeting. And hopefully that will lead to discussion and perhaps action items in the August meeting.
 - iii. Ms. Montes said that it seems there are no real questions, since they said they are done and will not be providing additional information.
 - iv. Mr. Stark asked if it would be appropriate at this point to ask LARAEC staff to provide insight in terms

of a possible recommendation one way or another. His question is where they go from here; they still have the state audit hanging over their heads, and this is a piece of resolving that once and for all. So he thinks it would be helpful getting perspective from the LARAEC office in terms of if they feel they got what they asked for, if there's anything they can take away and use to make decisions, or if they just throw it out because it didn't really do what they thought it was going to do.

1. Mr. Asturias said that they plan to do that, and go a step beyond to provide summary information for the board in advance. As they resume continuity on this item, they will be summarizing, providing additional context, and he will be reaching out to answer any questions that they may have offline in preparation for that. They will make it a point to be a little more focused in the management recommendations also included in the final report.
- b. Mr. Urioste said that what they got was basically a summary, but it will be interesting to see what the LARAEC Office comes up with. He thinks it would behoove them to have a discussion about some of the practices mentioned, including duplicated student counts, and about how they handle them in each individual member of the consortium. Meaning students that have more than one profile in their student information systems.
 - i. Mr. Asturias said that that was one of the findings, and Ms. Montes clarified that it was one of the items in the Management Recommendations in their report.
 - c. Mr. Frank said that he was not that impressed with Eide/Bailly's work; he was not sure to what extent they feel better about Vasquez and Company's work, but letting Eide Bailly go is the appropriate thing to happen in his opinion.
 - i. Mr. Urioste said that he would not want to entertain another contract with them. He would rather consult with Mount Sac, the nearest consortium in size with them, and see if they have a recommendation for a firm LARAEC could consult with.
 - ii. Ms. Jacquez agreed that they should look elsewhere.
 - iii. Mr. Stark said that the consensus seems to be that there's not a lot of value in what's been produced by Bailly, so he can't see engaging with them any further.

- iv. Mr. Frank said to give the Point Persons a chance to engage in a conversation about that as well, if that could be agendaized. Mr. Asturias said that the PP's were instrumental in selecting the two auditing firms that they used, in conjunction with the LARAEC office. So they would be happy to do that again.
 - 1. Mr. Frank said that he thinks this is going to be passed his role in this organization when they have to figure this next piece out.

7.3 Vasquez and Company, LLP Development of Oversight Policies and Procedures Progress Report

- a. Mr. Asturias said that Vasquez has turned in their first draft of policies and procedures, and is currently under review. There is a proposed timeline for approving the policies and procedures for final approval by LARAEC board and implementation by December 2020, or the January 2021 board meeting. He explained that the main thrust of the timeline is for the districts to have enough time to vet and evaluate the procedures and policies proposed. They have some feedback coming from the LARAEC office already to Vasquez and Company. they will come up with a second draft, based on information from each district as well, and then that second draft will go out to Point Persons and the executive board for a final draft in November.
 - i. Mr. Stark recalled that there were two pieces they had to address with the state: coming up with a funding formula, and coming up with consortium policies and procedures. So assuming they approve and agree on this, does that essentially satisfy the state audit vis-a-vis LARAEC? Mr. Asturias said that yes, it was the original intent of this work stemming from the Montebello Audit items 31 and 32.
 - ii. Mr. Urioste asked if their governance policy does not also address that issue. Mr. Asturias replied that all of these steps are part of providing a comprehensive approach to the weaknesses that were pointed out by the state: having a structure and governance founded on bylaws makes for a much stronger case for how decision-making is done in LARAEC, and part of the process is also having policies and procedures and a funding formula that i based on enrollment.

7.4 Online Conference Update and Consortium Moderated Sessions Update

- a. Ms. Stiehl directed attendees to the board document, explaining that last time they discussed having a virtual conference, which was met with universal support.

- i. The LARAEC Office had a meeting with the Point Persons to work out specifics and come up with a detailed report and budget. They decided Friday, September 25th would be an ideal date as an early fall date that would still allow attendees to get their school year started.
- ii. There's also a number of other conferences going on that have switched over to virtual conferences in the fall, and they wanted to avoid those dates.
- iii. They are looking at a half-day conference of 4 to 6 hours in the afternoon, since it seemed to be the best time for everybody, and they will figure out the time based on the activities and how many sessions they want to get in, and what they figure out in terms of speakers.
- iv. They decided to go with a simpler platform using Zoom Webinar, using Sched, which is their current conference management software. They'll use standard zoom rooms for sessions and the LARAEC website.
- v. The Point Persons talked passionately about acknowledging collaboration between districts, consortia, and outside agencies. So they thought they might have collaboration awards as part of their next conference.
- vi. Since they have a short timeline, the Point Persons were agreeable to simplifying the award nomination and selection timeline and process, with districts nominating the award winners, and districts and Point Persons selecting between 8-12 winners.
- vii. They have also been talking about reaching out to 3-5 exhibitors that are specific towards having a virtual conference: vendors that deal with software or web-based solutions for schools who can "sponsor" the conference and help offset some of the costs, as well as sponsor the collaboration awards.
- viii. They will also reach out to presenters that they had from the last conference and see which ones still fit with what they're doing in the virtual conference, particularly with remote instruction.
- ix. They are going to distinguish them from other summits and conferences by focusing on teacher and school sites so they can go back and implement something right away with students.
- x. With plenary speakers, a virtual conference reduces costs and opens up the field more. They love the speaker they picked last time, many of the teachers and faculties have read his book, and the speaker George Curtis (?) is still very relevant now as a big

proponent of technology learning tools and blended learning. They were talking about reaching out to him since they gave him a deposit for the spring and seeing if he could do something for their virtual conference at a reduced cost.

- xi. For the budget, they hashed out a simple budget, which Ms. Stiehl summarized. She noted if they have some exhibitors they can potentially offset costs. They'd still like it to look and feel like the actual conference. They'd like to also have some iPad studio equipment to use for clean video content. Since some schools are thinking of coming back in the fall, they're looking at producing advertising banners and posters as well. All told, it would be between \$11,000 and \$12,000, roughly.
- b. Mr. Frank loved the Collaboration Awards, and asked where the idea came from. Ms. Stiehl explained that after the Innovation Awards were selected, Dr. Mullen brought up that she wanted to focus on the collaboration between districts.
- c. Ms. Stiehl added that at the last board meeting, they talked about having moderated sessions done as soon as possible before this meeting.
 - i. They met with point persons and came up with a whole plan and schedule, they had booked some presenters, and then a lot of things changed between this meeting and last meeting, including civil unrest when they planned to have moderated sessions.
 - ii. It was felt that now and in the summer was not the best time to do them, and that people needed some off-time right now. So they decided to put them in the fall, and they thought it would be a great idea to have the moderated sessions come after the virtual conference so they use the virtual conference as a springboard. They are looking at Tuesday and Friday afternoons for an hour; they'll be subject-matter specific with a teacher showcase of some kind, then sharing open resource materials and having some discussion time for teachers and presenters.
 - iii. Ms. Jacquez asked, regarding UTLA members, if they have a set number of days that they can't meet, because theirs is Tuesdays and Fridays. Ms. Stiehl was not aware of that, but they can go back to the Point Persons and re discuss the dates with this new information.

a. Mr. Gorence directed board members to the board packets, saying that he wanted to shout out to all the APT members who were nominated or received an innovation award. He added that the board members may remember that at the May 20 meeting they talked about re engaging the APT's, and understanding the status of the teams, their viability, needs, and the works in process and work that may need to be done.

i. To that end, he and Ms. Stiehl put together a survey that included those items so they could begin a conversation with the co-chairs of those teams. That survey targeted those items the board found as a priority: work completed, work to be done, timeline for completion, and additional gaps in service. They added this item as they felt it was important to identify any additional work that the APT's identified to inform choices and information for the annual plan that's coming up.

ii. They also added an item for how the move to remote learning may have required a revision or change in any of the action items. They also created a fillable sign-in sheet to track participation during the PPT meeting so districts would be aware of who participated.

iii. Once they created the survey, they reached out to the co-chairs the week of May 25 to review the survey, and he and Ms. Stiehl were impressed with how quickly, professionally, and passionately the APT's got in touch with them.

iv. The report in front of the board currently was just meant to give an update and a background. Of note, as they got those surveys back, a couple things that they discussed was that the short turnaround time was so professional and quick. They feel it will be helpful to go back to the APT co-chairs and teams to refine their questions and target the information that they're looking for. They felt that in this short turnaround the APT's did a wonderful job of providing content, but they need to focus a bit more on certain items.

1. For example, they had asked about a timeline; some responses said that they needed more time, so they want to look at a timeline specifically to complete those activities. And they want to look more into those identified gaps to inform the content and structure of the annual plan.

2. Lastly, they were struck by the passion of the responses of the APT's that had to do with

their commitment to carrying on service even in a remote learning environment. Some of the questions didn't have a lot to do with that content, but a lot of the APT members wanted to share how the districts were engaging their students in a remote learning environment.

- b. Mr. Stark asked if they would consider, since it's nice to have flexibility around some of these groups, and there is scope of work and some well-defined parameters; they also have unique challenges that have cropped up, and it would be great if they could bring some problems of practice into these groups to leverage the expertise of some of these folks that may have figured certain things out. And LAUSD would love to work with the college or maybe other partners. For example, clinical externships. It might be helpful to leverage these groups around problems of practice coming up that are unique and maybe not part of the original scope of their duties, but would be really valuable given some of the challenges they are facing.
- c. Mr. Gorence said that they can certainly do that. He asked if it was the board's desire to take a look at how they might pragmatically reconfigure the action items for the APT's in order to target some of the items that Mr. Stark just mentioned.
 - i. Mr. Frank said he would vote yes on that.
 - ii. Ms. Montes said that for sure they have to be a consideration in what is happening and they may be a priority or they may be a consideration within that action item. So however it needs to be included in that conversation.
 - iii. Mr. Stark added that they should connect with the Point People around whether there are topics that have come up in their districts that have risen to the top of their list that weren't a priority just a few months ago. He does not want to take people off of their original scope of work, but as appropriate.
 - iv. Mr. Frank added that there are some technologies that it's becoming clear are very useful, both on the credit and non-credit side. He thinks it would be a rich conversation.
- d. Mr. Stark added that he thinks that would facilitate going deeper on a few issues that they have been trying to crack around articulation. And if they are leaning toward healthcare as a consortium, they can prioritize some of those articulations as part of it.
 - i. Mr. Frank added that his big issue is there are probably some grants out there right now related to reentry opportunities. He doesn't know if that could

	<p>translate into the APTs, but that might be a better place for it to be than even at the board level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. Mr. Urioste said that he would like to see them complete some of the items on here, such as the universal form, and the other one that looks promising is the adults with disabilities, and the assessments. He'd like to get some of the things done here as well as some other tasks. He does not want to take on new things when some things are still pending. f. Mr. Gorence said that the information on the report is meant to be just an update and not comprehensive because they do need to go back. He feels like it will be more rewarding if they have a chance to go back and pick up some of that information. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. With counseling, they felt they were really near to completing that universal form that would be a comprehensive orientation. The challenge for LARAEC with a lot of this is for some districts, they are already in summer. So the challenge is about reengagement with personnel on summer break, and their availability. ii. He added that they might need guidance from the board on their member districts, and how that might work for them. iii. Regarding the Pathways APT, they were in process of completing the Pathway map, but they did indicate that summer has made it challenging for them to reengage. iv. For Workforce, they completed the list of available resources. The co-chairs felt very good about their positioning with those resources. They do feel that for some of the other work as a group the deadlines need to be pushed back, and expressed concern about work through summer. v. For Professional Development, they had compiled their survey, and they wanted to survey teachers, counselors, advisors, staff, and so on to get their fields' input on PD. But again, they were running out of time and needing to push that into the fall. vi. And as Mr. Urioste indicated with adults with disabilities, the co-chair was really positive with the work they'd done so far, but theirs is a heavy lift and they do need more time to do the things they need to do. 	
<p>8 Board Member Reports</p>	<p>LAUSD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mr. Stark ceded his time to Mr. Frank. 	<p>Mr. Stark</p>
	<p>BUSD:</p>	<p>Mr. Urioste</p>

	<p>a. No report.</p>	
	<p>LACCD:</p> <p>a. Mr. Frank said that LACCD is 100% online this summer, and they are almost all online in the fall at this point. The hard-to-convert classes and those they were unable to complete, mostly because of clinical or other requirements, those are going to be the first ones that are going to get back on their campuses. They are doing a short-form for applications to the community colleges for those that are in non-credit or adult education. The short-form process is going to be implemented this July and August. He thanked LARAEC for their gift of a flower arrangement, and for a memorable day and morning.</p>	<p>Mr. Frank</p>
	<p>MUSD:</p> <p>a. Ms. Jacquez said that they did accomplish their drive-through graduation celebration June 5th with adult staff, students, and board members, as well as their director. A lot of participants said it was the best it's ever been, very festive and intimate. They are also focusing on distance learning, trying to improve it for now and figure out what lies ahead in the fall. Currently they got emergency approval for a CNA course to continue with clinical skills. So those students are able to complete the hours for this month in the beginning of July. Other than that, they are on break as well for teachers and staff until July 6. Their summer program begins July 6th, and registration starts June 22 online.</p>	<p>Ms. Jacquez</p>
	<p>CCUSD:</p> <p>a. Ms. Montes said that Culver City adult school ended its year with a virtual graduation, and it was attended by their entire board and cabinet in addition to teachers and students. Sadly, it was the first adult school graduation she has missed since 1986. But they appreciated that Mr. Asturias was present and Ms. Stiehl helped with logistics, and he thanked them both. The school is on break right now with a skeleton staff in the office preparing for summer programs: five-week programs for ESL, ABE, and ASC classes throughout the day. She summarized the curriculums of the new ABE classes, and said they would offer High School Diploma and High Set programs. They are also piloting the remote CASAS testing through the summer. They are planning on starting the new school year in distance learning, with the potential for in-person offerings. Also, she'd like to announce that Ruth Morris who was hired this past year as Assistant Principal for Culver City Adult School will be taking over as the point person for CCUSD beginning this school year. Ms. Montes</p>	<p>Ms Montes</p>

	<p>thanked Elvis Carias for representing CCUSD for all these years and his commitment to making sure their little district didn't get lost. They are excited about going into the next year and really creating given everything that's happened with COVID. They are also going to be spending time on social justice issues, because they matter for their population.</p>	
<p>9 Public Comment</p>	<p>There was no public comment.</p>	
<p>10 Action Items</p>	<p>Action items covered in agenda item 4.</p>	
<p>11 Announcements</p>	<p>Announcements: Next meeting Wednesday, June 15 from 10:00 AM to 1:00 PM, to be held over Zoom videoconferencing.</p>	
<p>Adjourn</p>	<p>Mr. Urioste adjourned the meeting at 12:35 PM.</p>	