



LARAEC Executive Board

Minutes- Regular Meeting

Friday, September 20, 2019

1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

Burbank Adult School
3811 W Allan Ave, Burbank, CA 91505

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

1 Call to Order	<p>1.1 Pledge of Allegiance</p> <p>Mr. Urioste called the meeting to order at 1:35 PM. The pledge of allegiance was led by a Burbank USD student.</p>	
	<p>1.2 Adjustments to the Agenda</p> <p>Mr. Asturias said that one of their presenters for Vasquez and company is running late, so they request to move his presentation later on the agenda (5.2). Mr. Urioste suggested placing 5.2 after Board Member Comments, and Mr. Asturias agreed. The rest of the board agreed as well.</p> <p>Mr. Urioste requested pulling item 7.1 and tabling it for a future board workshop (tabling the action, not the discussion). The board agreed. 7.1 was pulled from the agenda and will be placed on a future agenda, possibly a board workshop. .</p>	Mr. Urioste
	<p>1.3 Approval of the Agenda</p> <p>Mr. Stark moved to approve the agenda as amended, Ms. Vasquez seconded. The board voted unanimously to approve the agenda as amended.</p>	
	<p>1.4 Items for Future Agendas</p> <p>There were no items for future agendas.</p>	
	<p>1.5 Approval of the Minutes</p> <p>a. Executive Board Meeting, August 16, 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Mr. Stark moved to approve the minutes from the August 16, 2019 board meeting. Ms. Montes seconded. II. There was no discussion. The board voted unanimously to approve the minutes. 	Mr. Urioste
	<p>1.6 Recognition of Service Provided by Ms. Veronica Montes, Former Board President</p> <p>Mr. Urioste introduced Ms. Montes as a very experienced and refreshing person who speaks from her heart. She served as the board president for over a year, which is not an easy task with LARAEC being the largest</p>	

	<p>consortium in the state of California. Mr. Urioste said he is very proud of her and the leadership she has and will continue to provide to the board.</p> <p>Ms. Vasquez thanked Ms. Montes for taking her under her wing and being welcoming and approachable.</p> <p>Mr. Stark echoed the others' comments, and added that he appreciated Ms. Montes' passion for adult ed and always having her heart in the right place.</p>	
<p>2 Public Comment</p>	<p>Philip Tenorio from MUSD withdrew his public comment due to amendments to the meeting's agenda.</p> <p>Dr. Adrienne Ann Mullen from LACCD commented that she did not believe there was ample time to review the bylaws being proposed before voting on them in the meeting. She was also concerned about the lack of movement on the Action Planning Teams/Subject Matter Expert groups. They have discussed about it at the Point Person Team meetings, and she hopes that they can question whether having things on hold while governance is resolved is the right path. It's already essentially October, and they need to start moving items forward.</p> <p>Larry Frank from LACCD introduced himself, saying that he was president at the Trade Tech college for 6 years. This is his second full week as vice chancellor of workforce and research development for LACCD, and he will have responsibility for technical education, adult ed deans, and working with partner foundations. He also wanted to announce that he will be taking over from Dr. Miller as the representative of LACCD on the LARAEC board, adding that Dr. Miller has spent a ton of time working his way through the Tournament of Roses, and he has received card number 1 from them, so he will be retiring and touring as an ambassador for them around the world. Mr. Frank needs board approval before taking on the responsibilities of being an LACCD representative to LARAEC. The item will be on the October 2 agenda for his organization's board.</p>	
<p>3 Annual Plan Update</p>	<p>3.1 Annual Plan Update</p> <p>a. Mr. Asturias said that they have met with the PPT to discuss the 1-year implementation, and they have created a number of models that were presented to the LARAEC board at the previous meeting. They have gotten as far as they could get without the governance roles and responsibilities and the bylaws. It was his recommendation to the PPT to halt activities until they had the roles, responsibilities, or the bylaws adopted so that then as they implement the one-year plan they do it purposefully and they don't have to go back and redo work. As Dr. Mullen indicated, the PPT is concerned about the delayed implementation as they feel they will not have enough time for outcomes. Similarly the LARAEC office is concerned, the activities listed as beginning in year 1 represent about 70% of the work in the 3-year plan. And of course, they would like to start the process of implementation as quickly as possibly as well.</p>	<p>Mr. Asturias</p>

- b. Mr. Stark summarized that so far he is hearing that the PPT feel there are some things they can move forward on sooner rather than later. He asked, as board members, if they need to weigh in on this or provide guidance to the LARAEC office.
- c. Montes said they need to identify what areas in the plan they need to move forward on, because she does not think they can do nothing between now and action on the bylaws. And the thing is, bylaws in and of themselves won't provide foolproof clarification.
- d. Mr. Asturias said they would be happy to start, and can start that discussion with the implementation of the workgroups. That is the element that would be most significant in terms of having a foundation to get the groups started. He added that this work was supposed to take place months ago, but the workshop was delayed, and that has had a domino effect over implementation. They would like clarity to proceed without having to restart or redo. Mr. Urioste asked if they have any pending deadlines regarding anything they need to submit to the state that would be jeopardized by delaying, and Mr. Asturias said that the only deadlines are self-imposed and those are the deliverables they need to have by the end of the year.
- e. Ms. Montes added that it would be helpful to have a one-sheet on the annual plan to see some of those things to identify some quick wins and quick things to do, and asked if there are any items that don't require the clarification of anything. Mr. Asturias said that they do have some activities that could take place that do not require clarity.
 - a. Ms. Stiehl said the main thing is, they are hung on the things that revolve around the workgroups and their structure. There's a lot of items that are in the plan that we've been able to go ahead on. They are just waiting on clarity around the workgroups to start them.
 - b. Mr. Stark recommended that in their discussion of bylaws, they get to discussion of workgroups as soon as possible.
- f. Ms. Jacques noted there was a comment from someone in the audience, and asked if they should address that. Mr. Urioste clarified that generally in board meetings, if the board has a question for staff, the staff then responds. That's why he suggested when they look at 7.1, they talk about a board workshop because that structure allows then for a flow of conversation. In a regular meeting such as this, the time for that would be during the public comment.
- g. Ms. Montes said that in practice during future updates, it would be good to know what activities they are moving on. Mr. Asturias said that they absolutely intend on going back to the previous format to let the board know what activities are progressing.

	<p>h. Ms. Jacquez added that MUSD wants to align itself so teachers can attend workgroups, so it would be nice to get a timeline of dates.</p>	
<p>4 Budget Report and Updates</p>	<p>I.1 Information Items</p> <p>a. 4.1 - Data and Accountability Practices with Promise</p> <p>I. Ms. Ocampo explained that last month they completed the D&A PwP closeout report. They submitted the same budget and expenditures as they reported at the last board meeting. Part of this reporting included mandatory submission of “Practice with Promise”. The state requested consortia submit best practices, and for LARAEC, they made two submissions: for LACCD, the Successful Practice for Large Community College Districts, and for LAUSD, development of the new Student Information System designed to support educational pathways including consulting.</p> <p>b. 4.2 - Upcoming CAEP Due Dates</p> <p>I. September 30 - Q4 Progress and Expense Report</p> <p>II. November 15 - a CBO executed copy of the Program Area Report (actuals) due to LARAEC</p> <p>III. November 29 - Program Area Report (Actuals) due in NOVA and certified by consortium</p> <p>IV. FY 2020 CAEP Funds: Program Year Budget and Work Plan</p> <p>V. September 30 - Member PY Budget and Work Plan due in NOVA</p> <p>VI. October 18 - CBO executed copy to LARAEC</p> <p>VII. October 30 - Consortium certified into NOVA</p> <p>VIII. November 29 - Q1 Progress and Expense Report in NOVA</p> <p>IX. December 9 CBO executed copy to LARAEC</p> <p>X. December 24 - Consortium certification in NOVA</p> <p>c. 4.3 - FY 2018-2019 Program Area Report Estimates</p> <p>I. Ms. Ocampo presented the instruction hour summary and expenditures, and noted that there were some irregularities, so they are planning on conducting a fiscal training next month to basically just go over the reporting requirements for the fiscal representatives for each district.</p> <p>II. Mr. Asturias added that the PPT is welcome to attend, or anyone districts feel would benefit from it. They want to just point irregularities out so that when they report actuals in November, they iron out any kinks there may have been with the original reporting, which is just an estimate. They want to make sure that when they make the report to the state which will be actuals, that they are tight as possible on that.</p> <p>d. 4.4 - CAEP Updates and Reminders</p>	<p>Grace Ocampo</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Ms. Ocampo noted that around the first week of September they received a revision on the adult ed fiscal management guide: CAEP reports such as CFAD, Quarterly progress and expense reports, budget and work plans, program area reports, capital outlay and corrective action plans must be reviewed, approved, and certified by consortium membership. They are prepared to share the new guidelines to the auditors helping us develop new fiscal procedures. a. Also, as districts are developing their FY2020 budget, regarding indirect costs, they should use the CDE/CCD approved indirect cost rate or 5%, whichever is lower. II. She then summarized the First In, First Out on all active funds, and quarterly spending targets, adding that failure to meet these targets requires submission of a corrective action plan in NOVA, and they should include the action steps that will be taken. III. She then summarized the closeout of 17-18 CAEP funds in NOVA, effective February 2020. e. 4.5 - FY 2018-2019 Q4 Progress and Expense Report I. For LARAEC, they have a total budget of 146 million, including carryover from FY2018 and the new allocation. They have spent about 125.6 million, or 86% of their budget. Carryover will be about \$20.5 million for FY 2020. Each member district has met their spending target for the quarter. II. She then summarized the budget for the LARAEC office and total carryover into 2020, \$301,776. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ms. Montes asked what in that 301,000 carryover was something that they budgeted for the year that didn't get spent. Ms. Ocampo explained that part of that came from the vacant secretary position, and also they have contracts with our previous webmaster. III. She ended by saying that the Fiscal Representative Professional Development will be tentatively scheduled for October 11, 2019 at the LARAEC office in LAUSD, with the LARAEC office staff conducting the training 	
<p style="text-align: center;">5 Information/ Discussion Items</p>	<p>5.1 Eide Bailly, LLP LARAEC Enrollment Count and Procedures Audit Progress Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Asturias informed the board that the enrollment count and procedures have been completed. A draft report has been issued and shared with all of the executive board so that they have an opportunity to review and provide some input, and also some responses if applicable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The LARAEC office will provide responses for some of the recommendations that have been made. They will add that to the report and share one more time for your input. Then after 	

that and the report is finalized, it will be made public, hopefully at the next regularly scheduled board meeting in November.

- b. Ms. Jacquez asked if they will be able to ask questions, and Mr. Asturias said they would.
2. Mr. Urioste said he had read the report, and in his personal opinion the recommendations are doable. He pointed out that they need clarification on the recommendation that LARAEC management look into a system review of all the systems generating reports. They need a definition about what they're actually recommending and what it means. LAUSD uses Focus Software, and 3 of the LARAEC districts use ASAP. LACCD has their own software system.
3. Mr. Stark emphasized that one of the overarching concerns related to the audit is making sure they respond appropriately to the state so the state takes them off their watchlist. He asked if they have a timeline for initiating a response that will be acceptable to the state. They had two responses they were working on, which was the rationale for bringing in a third party so they could tell the state that we've implemented things so they could respond either "You've got more work to do" or "You're good".
 - a. Mr. Asturias clarified that their response to the state and promise to develop a funding formula hinged on the audit of their student counts and the procedures those derive from. They feel some of the findings of the audit could be addressed with implementation of policies and procedures Vasquez et al are developing. This would clear only one item in the pending audit requirements from the state, and the one item that remains pending is the creation of the formula.
4. Ms. Jacquez asked if the state asked for more clarification, or LARAEC was just taking the initiative. Mr. Asturias explained that what the state does is after they audit, there is a 6-month and a 1-year review in which LARAEC are supposed to define what the plan was to address the findings. And then they have all that time to report that they completed what they said they would do to address those findings. The first anniversary for LARAEC was last November, and they are coming up on the second. The state is still waiting on LARAEC's action so they can be removed from the list of organizations they check in on on a regular basis.
 - a. Ms. Jacquez noted that in a previous board meeting, the board voted that if MUSD reports into the state as a result of their audit, all districts have to report, and that MUSD decided which items they would select for quarterly reporting. Mr. Asturias added that there was no follow-up since then, and no system suggested for having all of the districts report.
 - b. Ms. Montes asked if the items are ones that are part of their CAEP reports, which Mr. Asturias confirmed. She asked if the auditors have contacted them to say they are not in compliance, and Mr. Asturias said that during the anniversary, they informed LARAEC that they had not complied with the

	<p>self-requirements, and that they would continue to be on the state's list.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Mr. Urioste asked if those CAEP reports provide figures for LARAEC, but also isolate the member districts; Mr. Asturias clarified that most of the reports they present as the LARAEC office are aggregated, even though it comes in individually through each district. Mr. Urioste noted that the spending target report presented previously was by district, and asked if they are not meeting what the auditors request by doing those kinds of reports. Mr. Asturias said that, not being an auditor, he would not be able to answer that properly. Mr. Montes said she would be curious to know of the four items they want MUSD to report on, which ones come out of NOVA separated by district. d. Mr. Asturias said that he could rehash what those four items are and tell them what the source of info would be if they are considering it. And then issue the quarterly report on behalf of each one of the districts. The issue is to highlight the numbers in a public meeting to take a look and assess if we are in compliance. Ms. Jacquez also noted that the state is not always correct, and they should be focused on that moving forward. She proposed they meet separately on the audit for the enrollment. e. Mr. Urioste said that he thinks there are things that we can report on every quarter, simple things such as our spending numbers. There are things they have access to in terms of numbers and data that he thinks they can package very quickly, put on the agenda, and show it here as testimony that they are in fact sharing their individual data and looking at it here in an open meeting. Mr. Asturias said that they can put together a report outline and then get the board's input for additional elements for them to review on a regular basis. f. Mr. Asturias summarized that within 2 weeks they will have a draft report for them to look at and provide input on. If they can have consensus on what is to be reported on a regular basis, they can start as early as November. g. Mr. Urioste said he would imagine critical pieces are spending targets, enrollment, and performance data in terms of high school diplomas, equivalencies, and CT certificates. 	
	<p>5.2 Vasquez and Company, LLP Development of Oversight Policies and Procedures Progress Report</p> <p>Deferred to after Item 6.</p> <p>Following item 6, presenters were still not present. Mr. Asturias gave an update. Basically, they have finished interviewing each of the districts, and they are in the process of writing the policies and procedures. Then they will give LARAEC a draft document to be shared with the executive team for input and additional commentary on it. They are expecting by the end of October is when they would have a draft, if not before.</p>	

5.3 LARAEC Bylaws Discussion

1. Mr. Asturias introduced Mr. Gorence and Ms. Stiehl for a presentation on the proposed bylaws document, made with the facilitation and assistance of the CAEP TAP office as well as stakeholders who participated and the PPT and Executive teams.
2. Mr. Gorence gave background on the development of the working draft based on the board workshop and the charted notes and minutes from it. They worked collaboratively with the TAP office, which provided verbal and written input. Their feedback covered format, content, additions, and revisions, given both written and over conference calls. The process was intensive and exhaustive to develop something they think would be worthy of this body, the largest consortium in California, and they want to be trendsetters in California.
3. Basis of Bylaws:
 - a. Ms. Stiehl explained that they read samples of bylaws from other consortia, school boards, etc., as well as Robert's rules of parliamentary procedure for formatting and recommendations. They also read all of their school districts' bylaws just to get a flavor for what LARAEC's members all have and what's uniform about their bylaws. Robert's Rules also has a chapter about creating bylaws: it doesn't necessarily provide a template, but rather says these are the kinds of things bylaws have, but that individual organizations need to modify them for what helps that organization work.
4. Compliance:
 - a. Ms. Stiehl explained that they looked at lots of organizations and city government institutions that provide their interpretation of the Brown Act. In the back of the document they have sources of where they read different interpretations of the Brown Act for guidance, plus the relevant references in Education Code and Government Code.
 - b. The content came primarily from the workshop and chart contents from 8/16/19. It also came from the workshop minutes, which had a lot of stuff written about the workshop that didn't end up in bullet points on the chart. They also put in current practice, things they didn't talk about but describe the way they operate now. The bylaws are a draft, and amendable, so they put a process for amendment as part of the bylaws. Then they took things from the three year and annual plan, LARAEC bylaw research, AB104, the Education Code, and Government Code, and wove them throughout.
5. Overview of Articles
 - a. Mr. Gorence explained that there are 4 primary areas of articles plus references. Articles 1-4 cover establishment of consortium and membership. Article 5 covers overview of structure. Articles 6-12 outline main bodies, duties, and meeting procedures. Articles 12-14 are about the operational budget, procedural authority, and amendment process.

b. Ms. Stiehl added that Articles 1-4 establishes them as a consortium and what we stand for. They come right out of 3 year plan and LARAEC governance document, plus the ed code for adult ed, and their current practice.

6. Executive Team, Articles V-VII.

a. These establish the decision-making body for LARAEC as the executive team. They outline the president's election, progression, and duties. For the executive team roles and responsibilities, they put in and codified current meeting practices, and incorporated ed code, gov code, the Brown Act, and Robert's Rules recommendations. Also, the language "also, unless otherwise determined by the board, this is the process" is in the document frequently. This gives the board flexibility to determine a process and timeline for electing officers. Also, it outlines what happens if they remove somebody from office.

7. Article 8 Project Director Staff

a. Mr. Gorence explained that they used board-approved job descriptions, a lot of workshop content plus minutes content, plus current practice.

8. Point Persons and Working Groups, Articles IX-XI.

a. Ms. Stiehl explained that one of the things they were trying to capture in this section was that the board was clear that however they deal with working groups and PPT, they should try to relate to them as staff. They don't want to have those meetings be agendized and rigid. They want to make sure these groups can operate without open meeting rules, but under the Brown Act.

b. They spent a lot of time working out legal things for how these things work; what the Brown Act says, and how they can be in compliance. This section required a lot of looking at, and one of the things they found is that there's a lot of stuff in here with regards to how they relate to the board. They want to be careful they don't have anything occur like a serial meeting. Since they don't want to have to have the PPT meetings as open meetings, there's lots of things around making sure staff aren't representing opinions of their board member together. As soon as board member opinions/deliberations are being stated by point persons, that is a violation of the Brown Act.

c. She explained that PPTs have to operate from their own expertise and own point of view and when they come together to work, they have to make sure they are working on things the board has already approved and is already according to the plan. Also, the board cannot have advisory committees. Under the Brown Act, there is no difference between an advisory committee and decision-making committee.

d. The way they couched it in here, in the Project Director's position, they will coordinate between the PPT and working groups. Mr. Asturias would be fulfilling the plan, which moves it

away from the PPT and work groups as being advisory to the board. That's why they see this section crafted the way it is so they make sure they have those things built in. There are lots of rules prohibiting things that are common throughout many bylaws to be in compliance with the Brown Act.

- e. All that said, they will see that those ideas are incorporated into the working groups and the PP structure. Members are operating under the coordination of the project director, and represent personal expertise and the perspective of their respective districts, and may not serve as an extension of their Executive Team member or the board as a whole.

9. Articles XII-XIV: Committees, Ad Hoc Committees, and Special Committees

- a. Ms. Stiehl explained that if an ad hoc committee is made up of less than a quorum number of board members, those aren't subject to the Brown Act. But as soon as they add staff or members of the public, that falls under the Brown Act and must be an agenda item for an open public meeting.
- b. This section also establishes the district of record for consortium staff and funding. They wrote it with the understanding of providing for if the board wanted to grow into anything, add people employed by other districts, etc. It also establishes basic parliamentary rules and guidance. They didn't lock us into a book, just wrote that they will follow basic parliamentary guidelines. It also establishes the process and procedures for making amendments. And there's a lot of places throughout the document that provide opportunities for boards to decide on issues.
- c. Mr. Gorence added that moving forward there are a number of options for having this discussion. They can go line by line, they can do it by section, or if they have specific questions of items they would particularly like to look at. Mr. Asturias added that the other option is to defer the entire discussion process to the next workshop/meeting.

10. Mr. Stark asked if they would want to look at articles IX-XI about the working groups: whether they want to wait to sort that out at the workshop that Mr. Urioste proposed or if they want to make a try at identifying some things they can give a blessing on so they can have the work groups start getting going. Mr. Urioste said he was fine with that, and Mr. Stark suggested they start with the Working Group article, article X.

11. Ms. Montes asked about page 16, which says that working groups do not have the ability to add or remove members, and all official members should be included in communication.

- a. Ms. Stiehl explained that in previous iterations of SME groups, they started off with members of the group, and if someone didn't show up to the group, that person would be eliminated from communications without them officially being removed by their district. Also, some people would show up saying they

were replacing people, so they wanted a more formalized way removing/communicating/adding people.

12. Mr. Stark asked, deferring to the board president, if there was a chance of even today giving preliminary approval on this section if they have agreement so it frees up the LARAEC office to start activating and working. Mr. Urioste said that he thinks that is a good idea.
13. Mr. Urioste pointed out page 16, point C, about the selection of members. He asked how viable it is that when they have organizations like LACCD and LAUSD that are much larger than MUSD, BUSD, and CCUSD, to limit them to four members? Mr. Gorence pointed out that the next statement on the page addresses that. Ms. Stiehl added that this section tries to balance those two ideas. They don't want to drown out a small district but also want large districts to have representation so they can move this thing. She added they are not attached to these numbers, it's whatever makes sense.
 - a. Ms. Montes addressed the same section, C.6., and asked if it's not that LARAEC staff approves the list. Ms. Stiehl clarified that they do not, they are merely notified. They do not automatically invite everyone who was participating last year. Mr. Asturias clarified that a lot of these things are to remove the arbitrariness of what has taken place in previous years.
 - b. Mr. Urioste suggested they just say that, because "recertify" sounds like something official. He thought they should just say "Provide an official list of working group representatives", and Mr. Asturias agreed.
14. Ms. Jacquez asked if they want to stick with one name, SMEs or APTs, and Ms. Stiehl clarified that they put "Working Groups" as the umbrella term, no matter what we call them, because there are different names of groups. In the plan they're referred to as SMEs, APTs, Counseling Collaborative, and the D&A Work Group. She said it was the board's discretion who participates in which groups on their behalf. They put it in the beginning that the definition of "working group" will include those different names. Ms. Montes asked why ad hoc its own thing, and Ms. Stiehl clarified that ad hoc has very special rules according to the Brown Act, it's its own thing.
15. Ms. Jacquez referred to letter B on number 5, pg 16, asking if that covers when their teachers would participate in something LARAEC might be having, as far as what happened before, and Mr. Asturias confirmed this, saying the prime example is the LARAEC conference (as an inter-district activity taking place on a yearly basis), as well as PLC's and PD taking place. Ms. Stiehl: added that they tried to write this to capture whatever might happen in future plans too.
16. Ms. Jacquez asked how they rolled out the other ones last year, SMEs and APTs, and Ms. Stiehl clarified that the APTs were after January, and were rolled out during writing of plan. Mr. Tenorio had a meeting with the ESL people, and the ASC group with the old people met as well. There wasn't a lot of meetings with other groups other

than Data and Counseling. And then, you get to item D, which was brought up in APT group and at Workshop, the notion of having chairs for the group to serve as a point person, and they listed general duties of those.

- a. Ms. Montes asked if B gave them flexibility for how they want to come up with co-chairs, which Ms. Stiehl confirmed. Ideally they want to have all districts represented, but for the Conference Group, it ended up being just her and Mr. Gorence. They also put in that they might have extra people added to the group that are not from each of the member districts, and they put that in there for including point people or staff or consultants, so it's covered and provides flexibility.
17. Ms. Montes asked what was the purpose of a temporary working group, and Ms. Stiehl explained that at the workshop, there was a conversation around what happens if something else comes up that they want to work on. So they created this notion of a temporary working group; there might not be one in their plan, but it gives them the ability to add one.
 18. Ms. Jacquez asked if they ever had training for their night staff incorporated, and if they should consider that, and Ms. Stiehl said it was a great idea, and they will put that in when they consider PD.
 19. Mr. Urioste said that speaking for Burbank, regarding item D about co-chairs for the workgroups, it is hard as a small district sometimes to get people to serve in these workgroups. So, having these items, is this going to intimidate people from participating in workgroups? Ms. Stiehl said that was a potential issue; what they were doing with these items is trying to plug some holes from the last iteration of it. Also, under item C, number 3, districts can put people on workgroups.
 - a. Mr. Urioste asked if those people would be trained on their responsibilities, and Mr. Asturias said absolutely, if they are approved then they would have to define some professional development for individuals that would be participating.
 - b. Ms. Stiehl added that in previous SME groups, some people naturally stepped up to play a co-chair roll, in others there were no clear leaders sometimes. So this builds in ones.
 20. Mr. Urioste asked where the roadblock started here, because the ESL workgroup didn't have this and did fantastic work. Mr. Asturias explained that what they did not have previously was oversight. He thinks what made a difference in the ESL workgroup is some of the members really did take ownership of the process to produce workgroup products. They were not as lucky with some of the other groups. And efforts to correct that came very late in the game, and too late for implementation to take place.
 21. Mr. Stark said that they may also want to consider having staff sitting in and providing support, and in some cases coaching and modeling. Because with a lot of folks it may not be second nature to facilitate and run these meetings, and it does take a certain skill set. Ms. Montes agreed, saying that they want all of the groups to be successful, willing to play, and feel empowered.

	<p>22. Ms. Jacquez asked if the PPT was able to go over the document, and Mr. Asturias said that they received it when the board did.</p> <p>23. Mr. Stark added that he thinks the understanding is there will be a workshop coming up, so folks will have the opportunity to give a really thorough look. But getting back to what he mentioned earlier, if it's possible, if they are comfortable as a board saying, "We're cool with this as a working definition right now with the understanding that we reserve the right to revisit this, but in the meantime, we're okay saying this looks good as a start", he thinks they should do it and that way work can get going. Ms. Montes agreed. Mr. Urioste thought they need a statement of consensus as a board.</p> <p>24. Ms. Montes motioned that they operate in the interim under article 10 of the draft bylaws to forward activity in the implementation of the annual plan, including amendments discussed today, while waiting for the entire bylaws to be approved. Mr. Stark seconded.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. The board voted unanimously to approve the motion.</p> <p>25. Mr. Asturias confirmed that he could send a scheduling form to the board and PPT to get a sense of when works best for everyone to have a workshop about the bylaws.</p>	
6 Board Member Reports	<p>LAUSD:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. Mr. Stark commented on item 8.2 for the consent agenda, saying that the governor has a bold vision for expanding apprenticeship for state. Right now they are at about 92,000 apprentices for the state, and LAUSD has about 12,000 statewide. They would like to see the model be expanded to other new sectors as well. Having a regional asset in place through LARAEC would be a vehicle to establish a hub for apprenticeship throughout member districts, which could be an avenue for future funding. They are very excited about it, and getting letters of support from various elected officials. They recently got a letter from the assistant secretary of labor, who was very supportive of the idea.</p>	Mr. Stark
	<p>BUSD:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. Mr. Urioste announced that Burbank is in full WASC mode, and has the same WASC chair as CCUSD. The self study process is not easy, but it is easier at an adult school where the staff is very fluid. So they are using Saturdays to be able to hold their self-study meetings, and the next one will be September 28th.</p>	Mr Urioste
	<p>LACCD:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. Dr. Miller was absent; no comments from LACCD board member.</p>	Dr. Miller
	<p>MUSD:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. Ms. Jacquez wanted to say thanks to LAUSD; they recently had interviews for ESL teachers and counselors, and sent out an email to Mr. Stark, and right away staff sent a lot of great questions. Also thanks to LACCD, they have been working</p>	Ms. Jacquez

	<p>with their representatives of junior colleges and sending a lot of students their way. Phone calls are coming in, and we've trained all front facing staff to refer people to LARAEC site and give them specific numbers when requesting information about classes MUSD doesn't offer.</p>	
	<p>CCUSD:</p> <p>a. Ms. Montes announced that CCUSD is in WASC mode, with full self-study this year and new leadership in the district. That is a primary focus for this year.</p>	Ms Montes
7 Action Items	<p>7.1 Adopt LARAEC Bylaws</p> <p>a. Tabled for future board meeting/workshop.</p>	
8 Consent Agenda	<p>8.1 Approve NOVA System Operational Allocation Changes and MOU Amendment</p> <p>8.2 Approve LAUSD Letter Request in Support for the Richard N. Slawson Regional Apprenticeship Innovation and Training Center</p> <p>Mr. Urioste asked if any board member wants to pull 8.1 or 8.2 separately. Ms. Montes had a question about 8.1, but said it was not important enough to take it separately.</p> <p>Ms. Montes moved to accept 8.1 and 8.2 as presented. Mr. Stark seconded.</p> <p>The board voted unanimously to accept the consent agenda.</p>	
9	Announcements Next meeting Friday, November 15th, 2019 at LACCD's Van De Kamp Innovation Center.	
Adjournment	Mr. Urioste adjourned the meeting at 3:41 PM.	