



LARAEC Executive Board

Minutes- Board Meeting

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

9:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Van De Kamp Innovation Center
2930 Fletcher Drive, LA 90065

Executive Board Members in		Point Person Team Members		Staff	
Emilio Urioste, Burbank USD	X	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 9:20 A.M. Justin Gorence led the pledge of allegiance.</p>	Justin Gorence
	<p>1.2 Approval of the Agenda</p> <p>a. Ms. Montes moved to approve the agenda, Mr. Frank seconded. The board voted unanimously to approve the agenda.</p>	Mr. Urioste
2 Public Comment	There were no public comment cards.	
3 Information/ Discussion Items	<p>3.1 State Audit Response</p> <p>a. Presentation by Mr. Asturias</p> <p>i. Mr. Asturias reviewed a presentation that outlined the timeline and activities thus far in responding to the State Audit of Montebello.</p> <p>ii. During the presentation, Mr. Stark commented that he thinks it is important to draw the distinction that the board’s response in its initial objection to what the state proposed was regarding the idea that other districts would be held responsible for overseeing MUSD.</p> <p>b. Board Member Discussion</p> <p>i. Mr. Stark said that, with regard to the funding formula, there has been extensive discussion and workshops, and LAUSD proposed a formula on January 18th, 2019 for discussion. And the components of what they proposed were that the districts were already presenting most of the components to the state individually. According to the timeline, they need to respond fairly quickly, and Mr. Stark asked what is going to change between now and the next few months? They are already reporting a lot of these</p>	Mr. Asturias

elements to the state, are they saying they don't believe their own numbers, that they need new numbers? What information is the board going to need to actually engage in this work and get some kind of decision made, since the state is kind of breathing down their neck.

- ii. Mr. Urioste recalled at the time that they looked at this that there were maybe 4 or 5 different options presented. So he thinks that's the critical piece, going back and looking at those options, and he knows there were questions about them, and that would be the critical step. Mr. Urioste asked, on the slide into the future, where Mr. Asturias says that the funding formula takes effect in the 2022 school year, is he talking the 2021/2022 academic year, and Mr. Asturias confirmed that that was correct.
- iii. Mr. Frank introduced himself, and said that the last time he was involved with this current process was when they figured out the funding portion. He said he has some catching up to do. The original split was based on maintenance of effort, and since that time the only real change in the allocations is based on MUSD voluntarily giving money back at a certain point. And then they have the Vasquez and Company audit, and even though if they ask for until December 31, is that just the policy and procedure review, or the final release of the audit report? Mr. Asturias clarified that the final policies and procedures were what was due December 31. Mr. Asturias clarified that they have a completed audit by Eide Bailly which will be released on November 15th.
- iv. Ms. Montes asked about the last slide, about not wanting to hamper anyone's progress as they move forward. Mr. Asturias clarified that the implementation of a new funding formula should not happen immediately to allow for districts to react and plan appropriately.
 1. Ms. Jacquez added that she appreciated the visual, and the drawn-out timeline. She remembers when Dr. Miller mentioned that they have to remember social justice and serving the needs of their students. Given the timeframe, referring to Mr. Stark's question of what will change moving forward, they may have to have special meetings on the weekends to talk about it. They all know that it will affect the smaller districts, but they have to move forward in order to best serve all of their stakeholders, even if it does get messy.

- v. Mr. Urioste thanked Mr. Asturias and the LARAEC staff for putting together the timeline and presentation. He agrees that their first point of order is to adopt bylaws that regulate how they operate. They do not have them right now, and they need to put them in place. Mr. Asturias and he attended a conference in Sacramento, and Mr. Asturias was on a panel about governance, and each panel member's organization had bylaws. Mr. Urioste thought that once they have bylaws, then they can move into an orderly discussion on funding distribution. He thinks that they should proceed with a presentation of the report from Eides Bailly, combined with reports from the different systems of LAUSD and LACCD. He emphasized that what they are reporting needs to be as clean as possible.
- vi. Ms. Montes said that it seems that there are concerns about some of the numbers inside the system, and thinks the point of engaging Vasquez and Co. were to make sure they are entering things accurately into whatever system the district uses. If the input is consistent, the output will be consistent. Ms. Montes added that they need to be careful to not characterize all of their data as inaccurate.
- vii. Mr. Asturias added that on November 8 there would be a special meeting to discuss bylaws.
- viii. Mr. Stark asked if there was a consensus that the board was in agreement on the timeline presented. He wanted to make sure they have an agreement moving forward. Mr. Asturias said that if they wanted to make a motion, they would have to wait until after they've heard from the public. Mr. Stark said he did not want a formal vote, but just wanted agreement to make sure they were all on the same path moving forward. The board members expressed agreement on the timeline.

3.2 LARAEC Funding Formula Development

- a. Mr. Asturias explained that as it pertains to 3.2, the issue is, as noted on the timeline, the timeline is appropriate and realistic to meet the requirement from the state audit.
 - i. Mr. Stark said that Ms. Montes makes a great point about LARAEC possibly being caught in a cyclical mode debating which numbers they will report. His concern with some of the auditing data and feedback is that he hopes they are not holding themselves to a standard higher than the state or federal government are holding LARAEC to. He emphasized that everyone, including the government, knows that they will never get a 100% match between the data that comes from their SIS and the data they put into TE. They probably need to bring in an expert to inform the board on what a reasonable data variance is. That will determine how

	<p>or if they move forward on a funding formula. He said that it boils down to each of the districts saying whether or not they stand behind their data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Mr. Frank wanted to say for the record that he is comfortable with the timeline, and believes that they have an obligation to figure out an equitable funding model. c. Mr. Urioste agreed substantially with the comments Mr. Stark made, and added that they have a responsibility to review and respond to the Eide Bailly report, and address their recommendations, which he thought were valid. He emphasized that he did not think that LARAEC's data was invalid, but that they have an obligation to look at their report and respond to it. After that, they can move ahead, and he added that that item will be on the agenda for November 15th. Mr. Asturias added that the auditor and their partner will be present at the meeting to answer board questions. d. Mr. Asturias clarified that the meeting was still on agenda item 3.2, and with 3.2 they were trying to get a board consensus that the funding formula was something that needed to be addressed, and based on the board's comments, there is a consensus. 	
	<p>3.3 Timeline and Consortium Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Consortium impact of issues in agenda items 3.1 and 3.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Mr. Asturias said that all of the issues raised in previous agenda items impact the consortium. He thinks for everyone involved, they need to know where their programs stand in order to provide the most collaborative and innovative possible experience for their students. b. Board Member Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Ms. Montes asked to clarify the agenda items, and then asked what the next step was to develop a new LARAEC funding formula. a. Mr. Asturias clarified that the only thing being asked of the board today involved agreeing on the timeline of implementing or developing a new funding formula between December and March so they can tell the state by October 25th that during this interval, they will be creating a funding formula that will go into effect on July 1st, 2020, but that will go into effect in 2020, 2021, and 2022. II. Mr. Stark added that these are highly charged discussions, and reminded the board that when LARAEC was formed and first discussed four years ago, they were not under the Brown Act, so there were a lot of closed-door discussions. He said that things were different now, and that they should be different, and said that there should not be any deliberations about funding formulas in any meeting that is not an open meeting with the ability for public comment. III. Ms. Montes asked to clarify if the development of a new funding formula would take place between December 2019 	

and March 2020, and would be implemented not in the 2021 school year, but the 2021/2022 school year.

- a. Ms. Montes said that she was frustrated, because they had had workshops related to the funding formula last year, with a sense of urgency, and that that sense of urgency suddenly evaporated. She said that now they are going back to the same discussion with similar options, and are pushing it back another year.
- b. Mr. Stark agreed, and said that LAUSD felt the same way, which is why they put together proposals similar to what the LARAEC team had presented, in order to keep the discussion going.
 - i. He added that LAUSD has tremendous needs because of its size, but he thinks that the formula discussion should be in an open meeting, and that they have other needs that need to be brought forward to have a discussion about student equity. For example, counselors, library media professionals and Family Success Initiative classes for parents of students. LAUSD feels these are necessary, and that an authentic discussion is needed about the fact that these items cost money.
 - ii. Mr. Stark also added that they need to look at how much each district is rolling over into the next year, saying that LAUSD has programs planned that are ready to go, but just need the funding, and that LAUSD's current philosophy is that the current year's funding should serve the current year's students.
 - iii. He added that some districts have large funding carryovers, which they may be saving for a number of reasons, like capital projects. But Mr. Stark said that they are not having discussions about that issue, and to Ms. Montes' point, they have needs going on with their students right now. And the fact that so much money is carrying over is also hampering their ability to negotiate for more funding with the state. Mr. Stark said that he would like to put those issues on the table at the November 15 meeting for discussion.
- c. Mr. Urioste questioned why these issues and opinions weren't raised before. He added that the issue of bylaws is another thing that they've been kicking down the road and need to get resolved. LARAEC is the largest consortium in the state, and their situation is entirely different from the next-largest consortium, so they need to take care of these issues, or face the prospect of functioning in a state of dysfunction.
- d. Mr. Frank said that he could only comment on what his experience was four years ago when he was part of LARAEC's formation, and on what he had heard since then.

- i. He said that one of the intentions of building a consortium was that there was this trust from the governor's office that they were prioritizing adult populations. He said that he understands the urgency, and that there are populations not being served, but that he thinks that they are doing a measured process, and that he would like time to process the audit.
 - ii. He's not sure if there will be enough time to complete the entire process on November 8th, and thinks there is urgency, and they need to properly set up a process to avoid setting up long meetings with very little notice. He acknowledges that it is hard for board members to make meetings fit in their schedule, and that as much as it's frustrating to not nail down the funding allocation formula until next year, they are a large consortium, and they need to nail down their response to the audit, and then figure out their funding allocation formula and implement it.
- e. Mr. Frank said that he knows the Brown Act, and that it would normally allow non-decision-makers to interact, and for organizations to work together. He said that the Point Person Teams need to be able to discuss. Mr. Stark agreed, and said that that topic would be discussed with relation to the bylaws and with making sure that everyone stays within their roles in LARAEC.
- f. Ms. Jacquez asked, regarding the bylaws, if the Point Persons would be able to give input, and Mr. Urioste said that they would, since it was a workshop meeting.
- g. Mr. Frank asked if there had already been workshops about the funding formula, and Mr. Asturias said that there had been two if not three special meetings about funding formulas, and a workshop about roles and responsibilities in governance to define bylaws, and that the LARAEC office was tasked with developing bylaws.
 - i. Mr. Frank said that he would benefit from a workshop session on the development of a funding formula, but did not know whether the board would have the patience for another funding formula workshop.
 - ii. Mr. Stark said he would have no problem with Mr. Asturias and the LARAEC staff meeting with any board members who need to be updated on coming up with a new funding formula, and did not know if the entire board needed to be there.
 - 1. Mr. Asturias said that the PPT and the LARAEC office already had two meetings about that, and they did not feel that they had the authority to define a funding formula, or even to suggest one. He believes the issue is within the purview

of the board, and that they should get together to define it.

2. Mr. Stark said that he thought that Mr. Frank just wanted to be briefed on actions and events that have taken place related to the funding formula discussion, which Mr. Frank confirmed. Mr. Asturias said that the LARAEC office can do that.

- IV. Mr. Asturias directed the board to their packets, saying that they have a couple of corrections to the document they have with them, the proposed response to the state auditors.
 - a. On item 31, they have background information on the activities they've done this year to address those issues. They have had a request to add the following item to the response: on January 19, 2019, subsequent to the December 2019 special meeting workshop, LAUSD presented and discussed a funding formula proposal to the board, and no action was taken. It was determined that a special meeting was needed to discuss this matter further.
 - b. Mr. Asturias said that the request was made after they had already put the board packet together, and submitted it for the board's comment/review.
 - c. Mr. Urioste asked if copies could be made for the board members, since the request was awkward to read on the projected screen for the board members. Mr. Asturias said that they could, and Mr. Urioste asked for a five-minute recess to allow the LARAEC staff to copy it. The meeting recessed.
 - d. The meeting resumed at 10:46 AM.
 - e. Mr. Asturias said that they are looking at the second page of the document, the top item. Basically, that is a request from LAUSD for that item to be included as part of our response to the state auditors.
 - f. Mr. Urioste asked if the item was an extension of other bullet points or its own bullet point. Mr. Asturias clarified that it was an extension which indicates another activity that took place. Mr. Urioste suggested placing it above the January 2019 entry in terms of the timeline.
 - i. Mr. Frank said that there was a lack of clarity that could perhaps be cleared up in the bylaws. In general, he would feel at a disadvantage if the PPT were not allowed to discuss the funding formula. So he would say that there are no decisions being made there, but it would be a lost opportunity to disallow the PPT from having that conversation. Mr. Asturias said that he thinks the upcoming meeting dedicated to bylaws is a more appropriate forum for that discussion
 - ii. Mr. Urioste said he would reserve his comments until that bylaws meeting on November 8th. Ms. Jacquez asked if the point persons were scheduled to meet

before November 8th, and Mr. Asturias said they were. He clarified that they did not have bylaws currently, and that the main concern is whether LARAEC was following the Brown Act.

- iii. Mr. Frank said that he thinks Mr. Asturias clarified that the PPT can discuss bylaws at their next meeting, and they will have a further discussion at the bylaws meeting. Mr. Stark added that he thinks there needs to be a longer conversation, and wanted to make clear that he is not trying to muzzle the PPT, it's about putting guardrails and protections in place so the appropriate discussions are happening with the appropriate groups by identifying key roles and responsibilities. .
- g. Mr. Asturias said that the final item to be added to the timeline is a bullet point stating that the board will work from December to March to create and develop an allocation formula Mr. Urioste believed that is a pivotal part of the response, and that the state would at least see that there is a timeline showing that LARAEC is taking care of critical issues.
- h. Ms. Jacquez added that the bullet point referring to the LARAEC staff and PPT not having the requisite skills/knowledge to propose a funding formula should be removed. Mr. Urioste asked if the bullet point referred to what was discussed at the January meeting, and Mr. Asturias confirmed it. Mr. Urioste clarified that the item therefore could not be removed.
- i. Mr. Urioste said that any kind of response like this is not easy, and commended the LARAEC office and Mr. Asturias for putting together a thoughtful response.
- V. Mr. Asturias said that the next item was item 32, that they will receive a draft of the policies by the end of the year. That has been adjusted since the auditors of LARAEC requested a slight reprieve. If that meets with the board approval, that covers what was discussed in the presentation, including training. He added that the bullet point proposed to be added would be sent to the board for individual approval, and they will bring the completed document for the actual ratification by the board to the November 15th meeting.
- VI. Mr. Frank had to leave the meeting.
- VII. After Public Comment in agenda item 4, Mr. Asturias asked if the board would like to motion to use the drafted response and timeline as amended, and added that the final draft would go out to the board for review before sending it to the state.
 - a. Mr. Urioste said that he found it awkward to make a motion on the draft when there was still a major component to be added. Mr. Asturias clarified that they were asking for approval to

	<p>proceed and make the amendment, and to finalize this response.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Mr. Stark said that as he understands it, they have already given him the authority to move forward as LARAEC staff, and his understanding is that it would be brought back as a ratification item. Mr. Asturias confirmed this. c. Mr. Urioste said that he was looking forward to Mr. Asturias' email with the additional item, and said that Mr. Asturias is good to go. 	
<p>4 Public Comment</p>	<p>Point Person Dr. Adrienne Ann Mullen commented on agenda item 3, saying that may of her issues will be addressed at the meeting on the 8th, and hopes that in the future when they have responses, the PPT will be able to review them to make sure that their statements and practices are reflected correctly.</p> <p>Stakeholder Michelle Cohen from United Teachers of Los Angeles said that she is disappointed that Mr. Frank had to leave early, and said that she was a Subject Matter Expert who served on the bridges and pathways Action Planning Team. Today, she's having a sense of deja vu, and is here to talk from the perspective of labor. They need to build an adult ed system to pair their students with good jobs, and in order to do this, they need to settle this issue to secure a future with the state and insure stability. They will not be able to retain good adult ed teachers or recruit new, good adult ed teachers if they are not able to provide job security and benefits.</p> <p>Stakeholder Gina Paiz from the Slauson Occupational Center introduced herself as an academic advisor there. She said that their executive director Mr. Stark has always said that advisors and counselors change the trajectory of student lives, being the ones who actually sit down with the students, and that their district has taken a huge hit, over 70 hours of advisory counseling alone. When Ms. Montes was speaking about the numbers they put into the system, that's enrollment numbers, and her concern in writing a future formula is that if they don't have numbers right now, what will their data look like in the future when they turn in those numbers? They need advisor hours to sit with the students to enroll them in classes and to service the students.</p> <p>Stakeholder Rocelia Beard introduced herself as principal of the LAUSD Los Angeles Technology Center, and said that she is proud of the work LARAEC has done to date. They have all invested time and effort to produce deliverables that form the foundation of LARAEC. Her concern is that all of this work was done for naught if the consortium does not resolve the issues of a new funding formula and new policies and procedures. She is also concerned that if they do not get it right, there will be a cloud over them. They are therefore looking at the LARAEC board to complete the items by the deadlines in the timeline.</p> <p>Stakeholder Rosario Galvan from the LAUSD DACE office introduced herself, saying that he wanted to commend the board and their individual efforts, and said that as they hear words of frustration or messiness, they still turn to the board to figure everything out, and that they want to work with the board in collaboration. And he said that he and others can play an active role at LARAEC meetings to work to resolve the issues and bolster trust in the board.</p>	

	<p>Stakeholder Bernardine Gonzalez from the Slauson Occupational Center introduced herself and thanked the board for the opportunity to share concerns related to the timeline and the impact of the formula. She reiterated that in counseling services alone their school lost 70 hours a week of serving students. Also, they have suffered cuts to the CTE and ASL programs. To hear that the funding formula will not be implemented until 2021/2022, it means that every principal and teacher in the room will have to make up the money, and that it is stressful and unfair to have to do this time and time again when there may be funding available to help support their students and advisors that are trying to provide supportive services to students.</p>	
<p>5 Board Member Reports</p>	<p>LAUSD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mr. Stark thanked all the LAUSD staff who were at the meeting today, and acknowledged that there is a tremendous amount of activity happening at the school site and knows how hard it is for them to make time in their schedule. He also let people know that LAUSD will continue to push the conversation around funding, and will be open and transparent about what their needs are. They are not here to bully anyone, but will make sure that their students' and teachers' needs will be represented on the board. 	
	<p>BUSD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mr. Urioste said that BUSD was also in the middle of WASC proceedings for a visit in April by the same people visiting CCUSD. This Saturday, teachers will be discussing the development of action plans. They will be meeting with students over three Saturdays to engage them in that. On October 28th, academic block 3 starts for students seeking a high school diploma or high school equivalency. 	
	<p>LACCD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. No report. 	
	<p>MUSD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ms. Jacquez said that they have been conducting a lot of open houses and college readiness events. They have gone to city fairs and done a lot of outreach, in addition to gathering a consensus from their students as to what new classes they would like to open or what classes they would like to restructure. 	<p>Ms. Jacquez</p>
	<p>CCUSD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ms. Montes said that they are in the middle of WASC self-study for a visit in March or April 2020. It is one of the best ways for a school to look at itself internally, and said that CCUSD is committed to constantly reevaluating themselves, and either validating, tweaking, or scrapping programs and ideas. There will also be challenging conversations about the 	<p>Ms Montes</p>

	funding formula, but they can get through them in a respectful way.	
Announcements	Announcements: Next board workshop is Friday, November 8 at 1:30 PM at the Van De Kamp Innovation Center. The next regular board meeting is Friday, November 15th at 1:30 PM also at Van De Kamp Innovation Center.	
5 Adjourn	Mr. Urioste adjourned the meeting at 11:21 AM.	