



**LARAEC Executive Board**

**Minutes- Special Meeting - Workshop**

Friday, November 2, 2018

12:00 – 4:00 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	Yanira Chavez, BUSD		Lanzi Asturias, Project Director	x
Veronica Montes, Culver City USD	x	Elvis Carias, CCUSD	x	Michele Stiehl, Advisor	x
Dr. Robert Miller, LACCD	x	Dr. Adrienne Ann Mullen, LACCD	x	Justin Gorence, Advisor	x
Joseph Stark, Los Angeles USD	x	Men Le, LAUSD	x	Grace Ocampo, Budget Analyst	x
Alice Jacquez, Montebello USD	x	Philip Tenorio, MUSD	x	Vacant, Secretary	

	<b>Agenda Item</b>
<b>1</b> Call to Order	
<b>2</b> Public Comment	
<b>3.</b> Workshops Items	<p><b>Consortia Governance Research Presentation (Michele Stiehl and Justin Gorence)</b></p> <p>A. Mr. Asturias introduced Ms Stiehl and Mr. Gorence. Mr. Gorence introduced their presentation, saying that in preparation they had looked through about 250 websites, and over 85 minutes and agendas. They had talked to a lot of people, and their outcome in their presentation is three-fold: one, to help with the context of the information, help locate the information better, and give some broad takeaways.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Gorence wanted to share something with them right out of the gate that they consistently heard when talking to project directors of different consortia: they typically said in the middle of talking about their governing structure, it sounds so much better just talking about it than it felt when they were actually doing it. Each of them would say that their consortium is the most challenging, for a variety of reasons. Ms. Stiehl added that 4 consortia claimed they were the biggest.</li> <li>2. Ms. Stiehl explained that they worked with the guiding document approved at last meeting. They looked at everyone’s CFADs, everyone’s original regional comprehensive plan, as well as more recent documents, organizational charts, governance documents, websites, and social media. They looked at EdJoin to look up position responsibilities. They also looked at Launchboard, but that was limited to data from 2016/2017.</li> <li>3. Ms. Stiehl then explained that they came up with questions for consortia members, and emailed consortia members the questions with a request for a phone interview.</li> </ol> <p>B. Mr. Gorence explained that they looked for commonalities. He displayed an overview of these commonalities and directed attendees to more detailed info regarding that in their packet.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. He explained that typically, it’s a two-tiered or three-tiered structure. Usually there was some sort of steering committee (names varied by consortium), and in the three-tier structure there was usually an in-between team or entity, an advisory group (names varied by consortium) and then a working group of some</li> </ol>

kind. The two-tier group was more direct, with the executive steering committee working directly with that working group. Both worked with staff as well.

2. Ms. Stiehl looked at where consortia fell within those tier structure system, and some were still unknown because they hadn't responded. Mr. Stark asked if there was a correlation between size and structure, and Ms. Stiehl said it depended on a variety of factors. For example, it depended on the strength of the working groups, with stronger groups working directly with the executive groups. She then went over where consortia fell into the tier structure (including LARAEC). Dr. Miller congratulated them on a stellar piece of work, and suggested every consortium would want to see this information. Mr. Urioste suggested they go to CASAS Irvine, because there's a hunger for this kind of info.
  - a. Ms. Stiehl added that program directors really wanted to talk to other program directors in each consortium, and wanted to share their information, successes, trials and tribulations, etc.
- C. Ms. Stiehl then moved on to consortium staffing, which she said was a difficult thing to figure out in terms of how they're counted over various structures. She explains breaking it down into consortia-based staff members, site-based staff, and the odd other staff members.
  1. She then went into some of the workgroups employed by them, and unique traits of each. She then went into explaining a chart/spreadsheet of the total enrollment versus staffing, adding that many times the community college funding is a taken-off-the-top dollar amount like it is at LARAEC, which is reflected in the spreadsheets with how it affects staffing/enrollment.
  2. Mr. Urioste said that when looking at the documents, San Diego stuck out to him. Mr. Stark asked if the 55,000 students under enrollment were being served with AEP funds, or if this was just their enrollment. Dr. Mullen explained that their adult school is a separate campus, and that the number was just for-credit enrollment. Mr. Stark said that before they share this research broadly, they need to be clear about what they're talking about.
  3. Dr. Miller added that non-credit is paid at a much lower rate than credit under the new funding formula, which is a problem with San Diego. So there's something odd about 55,000 students. Dr. Mullen added that it's age-driven: anything above 19 years old goes to San Diego Adult. Ms. Montes asked if they were an anomaly, and Dr. Mullen said not really, that there were a few anomalies.
  4. Mr. Stark said that in San Diego, they're only looking at roughly 4 million AEP funds for students, and wanted to make sure that they're comparing apples to apples. Dr. Mullen emphasized that there and elsewhere Adult Ed is run specifically by the Community College so that's not all of their funding money. Ms. Stiehl clarified that only in North Orange County and Glendale are all students in the community college. Dr. Miller added that "Total Funding" should really be "Total AEP Funding" just for clarity, especially so people don't make assumptions based on inaccuracies. Board members suggested removing it, with Ms. Stiehl clarifying that they'd only included it because it was requested. Dr. Mullen added that it's a huge conversation at the state level about per-student, and that it's generally tough to slice out data.
  5. Mr. Stark said that before they assign a dollar amount to each student, they should be careful about what they publish. Mr. Urioste suggested K12's and districts such as Glendale where the adult school is run entirely by the college. Dr. Miller said that the dollar amounts on this chart from a fiscal view lead to more questions and uncertainty. Mr. Stark emphasized that he still appreciated the work put into the research, but that they still need to be careful about publishing stuff like this without context. In a future version of this, they might not want to have that column in there.

6. Mr. Urioste asked if when they talked to people, they knew that for example Glendale was run entirely by the community college, and Ms. Stiehl and Mr. Gorence said they did not really have that conversation and stuck with their approved questions. Mr. Urioste asked which were run by colleges, and Dr. Mullen clarified the question was more specifically which were run by the colleges before AB86. Ms. Stiehl went through the colleges, explaining that sometimes it was hard to really say who was running adult ed in its entirety. Dr. Mullen clarified what the “owners” of adult ed had to do in terms of acquiring new partners after AB86.

D. Ms. Stiehl then introduced a chart with info from AEP fact sheets that broke down enrollment and student demographics by age, poverty, etc. She added that they had been directed to find consortia that were demographically similar, and so they wanted something about urban/suburban, and picked two metrics: no high school diploma or equivalency, and limited English, so we went looking for ones that were similar to LARAEC in those respects. Conclusion: there is no consortium that’s REALLY demographically similar to LARAEC.

E. Next, Ms. Stiehl explained that they were interesting extra groups. One of them was really great because it addressed their own questions about how to include their labor partners. San Jose created a work group with members from all of their bargaining units, then have two people from that group that actually sit on the board as ex officio board members, non-voting.

1. Mr. Stark asked if there was one member representing all classified groups, one representing certificated groups, and how they choose. Ms. Stiehl explained that one was K-12, one was College, and they found a lot of that kind of balancing done throughout the groups. Some also included community partners on the board. Many also included workgroup influence, with consistent agendized presentations from workgroups. There were super-region meetings, some of them regular. In San Diego, one consortium runs it each year.

2. The notion also came up of sub-region meetings, due to geographic isolation or dramatic demographic differences. She thought they were interesting ways of including more stakeholders and teachers.

F. Mr. Gorence explained that they also looked at the nuances of staffing information. Typically for a consortium office, there’s some kind of program manager, usually has administrative support. There’s usually some sort of data or coordinator person, with a shared concern among consortia of making sure data was being collected correctly and properly.

1. Typically there is also a transition specialist for students going from K-12 to Community College, for example. The large districts tended to have a lot of support services, and they needed to buck up the smaller ones around, which they were willing to do.

2. Mr. Stark asked if there was a common definition that emerged regarding “transition specialist”, because that sounds like an advisor or counselor. Ms. Stiehl compared it to their pathway advisors, and pointed to the job description for the “transition specialist” in their packet. Mr. Stark said he was glad that that role was an important part of adult education now across the board.

3. Dr. Miller asked if any of these were “success coaches”, or paraprofessionals that actually just work to get people through the system (not counselors, not academic, unclassified hourly). Ms. Stiehl said from what they’ve reported, it’s usually certificated and a counselor.

G. Ms. Stiehl added that where they saw the most people getting on board and moving things was when administrators were actively participating. Administrator engagement in a district of our size was a challenge.

H. For workgroups, everyone had a lot of different combinations. What happened: a lot of people created workgroups aligned with program areas.

1. Eventually, they took a path similar to LARAEC in examining what they want to actually be working on. ESL is a common one to continue, but other groups have been phased out and instead started looking at three-year plan related issues, leading to more heterogeneous groups.
2. Some consortia have just identified priority projects, so their groups are project-based.
3. At the Capital Group, they had a similar issue: what do they do with these program areas? They decided they liked the conversation happening in the ASE and ABE groups, and the sharing was valuable, even if they did not have a specific project to work on. At Capital, they've switched project-based groups into these kind of networking groups that are more professional development targeted.
4. At one consortium, they identified that the same couple of people were involved with every work group, so they ended up combining all of the work groups into one big work group.

I. Mr. Gorence said that in terms of conferences, they only identified LARAEC and Mt. Sac as doing conferences, but they would sometimes to a local CCAD conference, or call it a "Local PD Day". At Mt. Sac, their outcomes were very focused and very specific in terms of speakers and specific PD's and presentations.

1. Ms. Stiehl added that they do two conferences, one in the spring, one in the fall, and that the fall one which they attended was a call to action, where the one in spring is where Mt. Sac's workgroups share accomplishments for the year and best practices.
2. She added that they consistently heard from consortium members and staff that most of their time is spent building relationships within the districts and consortium.

J. Mr. Gorence and Ms. Stiehl then explained that they had then compiled reports on the districts/consortiums/individuals they had spoken to. Some of the consortia do one vote, one institution, others do weighted votes, and some do consensus voting. They included more narrative versions of their data on staffing and governing practices. Lastly, they included notable things that their interviewees said: points of views on issues, etc. They had asked them about funding formulas, and they put their responses in the packet.

1. She directed the board to Lake Tahoe's report, which was unique among the consortium. They've done incredible, specific branding by renaming themselves "Advance" or "Advanzar" and engaging with the local tourism community. Dr. Mullen added that they are a JPA.
2. Mr. Stark commended them on outstanding work. He commented that whether they like it or not, this is now a public document and wanted to remind people of that. People need to understand that now this is out in the world and a lot of people will have questions, so he will need to be prepared to respond. He mentions it because he thinks that they want to think carefully about how we're allocating our resources in terms of staff time and product. Moving forward, they want to be clear about what they're sending staff out to do, and it's not quite clear to him what they're trying to accomplish by gathering this information.
  - a. Dr. Miller agreed and wanted to know what the staff recommends we do based on the research done and best practices they might have identified. Ms. Stiehl thought that they need to figure out how to do teacher engagement in a way that hits the whole consortia, and out of the research, she thought they were missing half of the consortia by having an equal vote when LA is very large. They need to figure a way to get administrators engaged in the conversation, and there's not a lot of representation from the school sites. One thing she saw from this was by including staff and administrators and labor partners in the meetings,

you're getting people involved in the work. Dr. Miller said she talked about student engagement, which is what he's interested in.

- b. Ms. Stiehl added that there is a whole bunch of stuff that needs to happen besides just getting bodies in the door. Mr. Asturias summarized also that there is no magic bullet: there are a lot of good practices which they can emulate, but it seems like every consortium is a little world of their own with their own approaches to issues. Ms. Stiehl said that one of the things that was really inspiring was Bob Harper from San Jose, when he was talking with people who were thinking of being on the workgroup, he emphasized that they need to take more action and not just have conversations about it.
3. Mr. Urioste called their report like a Reader's Digest study guide for WASC practices, and he would like them to come back to them with practices, based on what they had learned about how unique our consortium is, that they should bring to it. Mr. Gorence added that the sub-regional approach was such a unique thing that he took away as an approach to geographic issues. LARAEC is so dense, but in his experience, nobody knows their population better than the people at the school site. Also the idea of transition specialists: everybody's got another job, and the idea that there are people whose sole job is creating a conduit between two entities, is a fantastic idea.
4. Ms. Montes thinks a challenge is that they've been stuck in action for a long time. In terms of the field, she feels there have been some missing pieces; the bottom line about AB86 and AB104 is to serve the adult students in the consortia from a collaborative perspective. It's easy for her to just say they should do things, but she will not be implementing them and doing the work. Neither are the Point People. It would be easier if the people at the site who would be actually implementing this stuff were present for the conversation at the meetings and in the workgroups.
5. Mr. Stark liked that they were now talking about actions that need to happen. He liked that Ms. Stiehl pointed out that they didn't have a lot of stakeholder involvement at meetings, so as a result a lot learn about information secondhand. They need to focus on why more people aren't here and engaged. Before they leave today, he thinks the recommendation staff has put forward is that they want to do more research; he'd like to know how much more, how much time, what other pieces they're looking for, and then what they are going to do about it.
  - a. Mr. Asturias concurred, and thought it was good to know that others are having similar problems to LARAEC but at different scales. Dr. Miller agreed with Mr. Stark, but does not in this sense: he does not care who shows up at these meetings, but would much prefer putting resources into things that mean something to them. Coming to listen to some bureaucrats speaking isn't going to directly do them any good. They need to take this to the people wherever they are, and as far as the amount of research, he gets worried that they are dealing with the five members of the board. He would rather see them put a lot more into them.

- A. Ms. Montes segued into talking about the Roles and Responsibilities of the various LARAEC team members: Ms. Stiehl added that they would love to go out and make more connections with other consortia. Ms. Montes asked what are the things that have been getting in the way of getting to the field, to workgroups, getting PD. Mr. Asturias also thanked Mr. Gorence and Ms. Stiehl, and Mr. Carias suggested creating a chart of the roles and responsibilities for each group.
1. Ms. Montes said she realized that she probably should have asked for LARAEC staff to bring job descriptions for the Project Manager, LARAEC staff, but also for the board members, because their role has morphed over time. Mr. Urioste suggested that the morphing that has occurred is due in large part to the Brown Act limiting the roles of Board Members.
  2. She added that the Advisor position's job description was to assist in ensuring compliance with adult ed block grant, monitors compliance, monitors budgets. Mr. Carias suggested that rather than going off what's strictly written, they should get descriptions from the advisors themselves about what they feel their role is.
  3. Mr. Stark said that they have not stated what the problem they're trying to solve is, they are just throwing up ideas. Ms. Montes reiterated that she wanted to know what has gotten in the way of them restarting their workgroups. Mr. Stark suggested in terms of a framework engagement of faculty as an issue. So when we talk about getting in the way, getting in the way of what? So if the frame is about how they can create the best plan to help as many students as possible, I don't know that asking what's in the way gets to the root of the problem. Are they talking about putting in new systems to address the problem, are they saying that our current efforts aren't working?
  4. Dr. Miller suggested that it could be teachers telling them what's interfering with their ability to accomplish their goals, or it could be sending the LARAEC staff and the PPT away with the report and having them come up with things they need to do and come back to the board. He thinks that that doesn't need to happen right at this meeting, but that it needs to be brought up at a future meeting.
    - a. Mr. Urioste agreed, and said that he thought their needed to be time to process the report. He is a little confused in the question: are they talking about the SME's, of what's keeping them from operating and keeping functional? Dr. Miller added that they are functional and operational, but they may need resources or to put more time into different things. Is this a discussion on not getting our return on investment in the staff, or about where we're allocating our resources?
    - b. Ms. Montes clarified: is there a challenge with the structure of Project Manager, Point Persons, etc., and getting stuff done. Are there no issues between groups or confusion between them? She added that recently in communicating with the Point Person Team and LARAEC staff, there was a disagreement about what the board says during their open meetings in terms of direction. She wants to know if they are able to resolve those differences of opinion so that they are not stuck. Mr. Urioste thought that that issue had been resolved by her and Mr. Asturias communicating to be clear to what staff is directed to do.
    - c. Dr. Mullen thought part of the charge today was looking at whether their consortium was the most effective in its current structure. She thought one of the questions asked at the open meetings was whether they have the right staffing in place to be effective. She doesn't know if they've answered that question. Saying just "are we effective" is a very loaded question to ask in this setting.

- d. Mr. Stark added that they hadn't defined "effective", or "meaningful". So they have to decide what work they're going to do, and then what the best structure is. But he does not want them to have a conversation that is some vague solution in search of a problem instead of identifying what they're trying to accomplish.
    - e. Dr. Miller submitted that they could look at it from the perspective of, if they could throw everything up in the air and start over again, knowing what they know now and having learned about what others do, what would they change?
  5. Mr. Stark added that they have to figure out who the stakeholders are, and whether what they decide to do is going to have any meaning for the end units of the process, the teachers and the students. And they will get answers from all over the board from their various stakeholders. That should be the focus of whatever their efforts are.
  6. Mr. Urioste said he would like some time to go through the report and do justice to all of this work, but his focus would be on what he is getting from the report that will help their faculty and students. Ms. Montes wants to know how they get meaningful faculty and student engagement as soon as possible. Mr. Stark asked if there is an assumption of whether their current structure is getting in the way.
    - a. Mr. Asturias interjected, saying that some of the questions are getting pointed, and as a result it's difficult since they have to work with each other on a daily basis. He suggested asking their point persons those questions, then come together again with answers. Or, they can have a guided, structured conversation with an outside firm or individual to get answers in that constructive way. Because of the nature of their groupings, it would make it difficult for, for example, Mr. Gorence to truly criticize him because he has to see him every day.
    - b. Mr. Urioste clarified that he has no animus for anybody; he is too busy trying to serve his students. He looks forward most of all to the PD that they can provide to their teachers; but they would need to go back to the core, their faculty. For example, ESL workgroup: what's working? What are they doing next? Otherwise, he does not want to spend the time discussing other issues. The key fundamental aspect is where are we with our workgroups, and what do we want to achieve with those.
  7. Dr. Mullen reminded the board that they approved a PD framework, and it is in play, with Point Persons reviewing programs for workshops for the Counseling Group and others. The work groups that they identified in that framework are in play, such as Regional Planning. They have talked about creating transition people, and to do that they wanted to produce strong articulation between adult schools and community colleges, and in conjunction with the Counseling workgroup.
    - a. Mr. Urioste thought that there was a need for them to discuss the articulation that occurs between the adult school counselors and the community college. Dr. Mullen added that they want to bring counselors to the table and build relationships.
    - b. Mr. Urioste agreed, and said that if counselors meet face to face, they can promote each other's programs to each other's students, and that articulation is not in place. The other part is the collaboration between the K-12 and the Community Colleges needs to be strengthened from the adult school into the CC.
  8. Mr. Stark thought they kept saying the way they wanted articulation to work, but there are different assumptions being made. He didn't know they had a common understanding of what they're talking about. For example, he has heard

that CTE is more of a feeder into community college. But then he's also heard there's a cross-referral. He thinks they're talking about a lot of stuff that's contradictory, and they will keep having circular conversations, and walk out without agreeing at a basic level what they're trying to achieve with articulation.

- a. Ms. Montes clarified that their frustration comes from having had conversations about doing things for so long without actually doing them. The issue is how can we actually achieve it and get obstacles out of the way. Also, as a member of the board, she feels they support what the consortium is doing as opposed to their individual best interests. She wants to make sure the conversation around collaboration is two-ways, and that the referral is two ways. Unless they deal with elephants in the room and conflict where conflict exists, then the conflict doesn't go away.
  - b. Ms. Stiehl noticed, having been a SME and having talked with other consortia, it's not always about barriers, but sometimes about things they can add. For example, they don't have chairs for their workgroups while other consortia do; there's nobody to drive and direct work. Putting in clear outcomes for each groups as well, and a way to get that information out of that room. Then, how do they get representation for all of the schools in the workgroups?
9. Dr. Miller went back to something Mr. Gorence had said about getting smaller so they can get bigger. He likes the concept a lot, and suggested focusing on those who want to play first, and put less energy in those who aren't quite ready to play. At some point the board, but Mr. Stark and he in particular, are going to have a come to Jesus moment with those administrators if they're not making their goals. But for those who want to participate, that's where we should be putting our resources, where they will generate results.
10. Mr. Stark agrees, and thinks it brings up a good point about strategic planning, with any number of layers of planning. In their case, they have a LARAEC- and district-aligned strategic plan. It's an important thing to bring to the table because if they have things that they don't know or are contradictory or not lining up with the common work that they are defining, those are things they need to bring to the table as well. In some ways, there are things they are keeping close to the vest for whatever reason, but if they want to move the work forward, they are going to have to put some of their cards on the table.
11. Dr. Miller added that the state has invested billions of dollars in a strong workforce in adult education. At some point, they are going to want to see results. He does not want the day of reckoning to come where they look at the money they've invested in the consortium and say, "Hey, you really haven't done much." Dr. Mullen added that this was already happening to some extent, and Dr. Miller reiterated that they should be working with and investing in groups that actually want to work with them and do something.
- a. Ms. Jacquez added that unless the colleges are actually willing to interface with the workgroups, there's no point, relating anecdotes of creating numerous proposals through a workgroup, only to find none had been approved. She understood from Carrie Frobe that the SME group stopped because their articulations weren't getting to the right people.
  - b. Dr. Mullen corrected that it was actually two different things: one of the reasons was the SME groups had to have relevant and meaningful work to move it forward, meaning that they did not have a lot of deliverables for them to work on. The counseling group does not move the articulation in their district, that is moved by faculty to faculty through the dean. She cannot move 11 articulations through without any faculty conversations taking place. So they looked at creating adult schools to

college articulation, and they have 3-4 articulations that are moving much farther down than others.

12. Ms. Montes asked, to Dr. Miller's point, how they do find and play with the people who want to play. Dr. Miller, as an example, described facilitating communication between MUSD and East LA as a LARAEC function if both schools are ready. Dr. Mullen said there are definitely examples of deans working well with the principals and vice versa, and there are examples of that relationship being unhappy.
  13. Mr. Asturias explained that they had created statements of work for the Subject Matter Expert teams that had been vetted by the PPT and the Executive Team. So if it wasn't going to work at the very beginning it should have been noticed. But they were allowed to continue that process for two years, and it did not come to fruition. He implored them not to forget that at least 99% of the work that has been conducted has been vetted by both, so it's not as if it was happening by surprise. He thinks that at the same time they are having this discussion, they need to be real as to how this is all happening. The question is not going to the past, but how they proceed so they are able to have the outcomes that will benefit their students moving forward.
- B. Dr. Miller feels that they have been doing a great job, and it seems to him this meeting has taken a turn for the ugly and he is not sure why. He was unaware that they were in a bad place, and thinks they are making great progress, that the PPT has gelled and is making great progress, but that he senses a lot of defensiveness and is not sure why.
1. Mr. Stark said he thought that there had just been areas identified for improvement, and that people get passionate about that (which shows they care about getting it right). His suggestion would be to try to wrap it up and agree on these or others they want to add or take away, and note that they have areas based on discussion that they want to focus on that should be reflected in the work moving forward. But unless they're clear on what they want to do, it doesn't make sense to tinker with something.
  2. Ms. Montes clarified that the purpose of the workshop is to bring out more information, and reiterated Mr. Asturias' suggestion that Point Persons should have a conversation with their execs about any problems/suggestions they are encountering, and then asked whether they should have a conversation about changing the structure, perhaps at an open meeting.
  3. Dr. Miller wanted to be clear, at least from his perspective, he would expect staff based on input they got today to reflect on the conversation and the documents, and ask "how they can build a different mousetrap" that better serves the needs of the consortium.
  4. Mr. Stark liked that statement, and thought it set the stage for one delineation they could set down today: he does not feel qualified to micromanage the job that the PPT or LARAEC staff is doing, and looks to them to tell the board how it should be done, so the board can make it happen.
  5. Ms. Jacquez asked whether they were changing the vision of LARAEC or changing the workgroups, acknowledging that she had only been a board executive for two months and that she had participated in the SME groups and workgroups.
    - a. Mr. Stark thought they should have workgroups, and asked whether they should talk about governance. He thought they do have to delineate the different aspects of what they were talking about. If they need to revisit the formal governance structure, do they need to revisit it? Personally, he does not think they do.
    - b. Dr. Miller agrees as long as they can collectively work through

their consortium's issue. He also thinks their core philosophy is fine, it's just a matter of implementation. And if they are not providing member districts what they need, then that's an issue they need to address.

- C. Mr. Carias also wanted to advocate for Professional Learning Community professional development and offering it in relation to PD and faculty engagement. He believes they should find a way to offer it. Mr. Stark added that the PD they do should be tied to the metrics they know and around student achievement, so that would fit the definition of what a PLC is, and that becomes an incentive for a person to participate. Dr. Miller added that it should be whatever it takes to get students out the door with the goals they need to achieve, adding that that is now tied directly with their funding.
1. Mr. Asturias thinks that their students have been telling them that consistently, and want training to be able to work and hold down a living salary, and quickly. So they need to implement the mechanisms necessary to achieve the strategies laid out in their strategic plans. Dr. Miller added that he would like to make sure they have whatever tools they need to develop the metrics that will show they are accomplishing their goals, to be displayed to the board and the state.
  2. Mr. Stark said that the CASAS/TE system is probably going to be reporting that will show their results. If it isn't in the system, it essentially didn't happen in the eyes of the state. Ms. Montes agreed, because they have to be talking about what they have and what they can use, and not reasons for not achieving goals. TE is the AEBG/AEP reporting structure. Dr. Miller said they need to invest resources into PD that teaches faculty how to do that reporting.
- D. Mr. Urioste thought that the report was wonderful, and wanted to know where they were going from it: if they would have time to go through it and digest it and have another workshop follow-up. He does not see them as a dysfunctional consortium in terms of governance. But if people read it and have ideas otherwise, he wants to be able to share that.
1. Mr. Asturias understood that the request was for staff to develop a set of recommendations based on what has been done for the next regular meeting. By then they will have appropriate significant recommendations.
  2. Mr. Stark added that as executives, if something occurs to them, they should share it with their point people. They should have it all filtered by the point person team. Ms. Montes asked if that communication should be to the point person and to Mr. Asturias at the same time. Mr. Asturias added that sometimes that gets confused, so the question is, they always provide as much info as possible to the PPT.
  3. Dr. Mullen said that given the time constraints they had not had a chance to evaluate the most recent version of this report. Ms. Montes thought that if it was informational stuff and no action needed, they would not need to filter it through the PPT. For action items, staff can take all of the ideas and create a plan for it, then come back to the PPT, then it can come to the exec board. But if it is just information, she does not think it has to come through these filters.
  4. Mr. Urioste asked if the point persons had not seen it, and Mr. Asturias clarified that they had received a draft previously like the board, but had only received the final form today. He explained that the process would be for the staff to come with suggestions, then bring them to the PPT, then ones that were vetted and/or modified would be presented at the next open meeting.
  5. Ms. Montes asked if there's a recommendation that comes to her point person, Mr. Carias, is it possible that the point person might flat-out reject a recommendation. Mr. Asturias explained that that would lead to a bit of a conflict, and that given the work put into recommendations by the staff, the point person

can augment the recommendation or offer their own recommendations on it, but it would be unfair to remove staff recommendations at the request of the PPT.

6. Ms. Montes then asked how they make sure that those ideas then come to everyone. Dr. Miller suggested that this was the reason for the variations in structure amongst consortium. If there is a difference of opinion among staff and point persons, he would suggest they both be included and then flagged so that they can be discussed.

### III. Next Meeting

- A. Ms. Montes said that she would not be at their next meeting on November 16, 2018, but would be here for the facilitative component with the 3-year plan after the meeting. Mr. Urioste clarified that it was a regular board meeting and not a workshop. The workshop would be from 4PM-6PM. Mr. Asturias explained that he would be working with Ms. Montes on the agenda, and would share it with Mr. Urioste so he could take Ms. Montes' place as chair.
- B. Ms. Montes added that the next workshop is scheduled for December 7, 2018 centered around funding formulas. It is scheduled at 12PM, but she asked if they could go 1PM-4PM instead since it seemed like it was difficult for some attendees to come to this workshop at 12PM, and she has Grandparents' Day. The board agreed to have the workshop start at 1:30PM and go to 4:30PM instead.
- C. Mr. Asturias wanted to let the board know that he is going on vacation from the 15th to the 27th of November.
- D. Mr. Stark asked what exactly was happening for the funding formula workshop December 7th. Mr. Asturias said that his understanding was for staff to get additional information from the world as to different examples of funding formulas, then come up with several useful options for them to look at. Dr. Miller suggested that Ms. Stiehl and Mr. Gorence spend time with Dr. Mullen, find out how the new student-centered funding formula works, and then perhaps the four of them should talk about where the funding formula is going in the next few years, and that would provide context.
  1. Mr. Asturias asked whether they should pull the whole funding table out from the report document. Mr. Urioste said that he thought they were only talking about the per pupil column. Mr. Asturias agreed to remove the per pupil column before they upload the document to the website. Mr. Stark explained that the other information about enrollment is public information. Mr. Asturias clarified that they had not yet posted the document to the website and they will proceed accordingly. He added that those who took part in interviews for the report requested a copy, and recommended they send copies to them.
  2. Mr. Urioste added that he was really impressed with Mr. Asturias, Ms. Stiehl, and Mr. Gorence's work, and wondered if it is possible to copyright the final version of the report as the consortium's work. He clarified that copyright was not the right word, rather, they wanted a statement that if anyone wanted to use or duplicate the report, they would need LARAEC permission. Mr. Asturias said he was not sure if it was possible or not, but added that a possibility was to simply post on their website first. Dr. Miller added that they do need to take credit for it with obvious language on the cover. He also recommended sending it to the state AEP office giving them permission to distribute the document as something they are making available to the field. That gives them credit, and generates goodwill.
  3. Mr. Stark asked if they had gotten permission from the various consortia to go that route, and Ms. Stiehl said they might want to check in with them and the interviewees on that, and make sure there is nothing that could be considered disparaging towards individuals or organizations. Mr. Asturias added that in the emails they sent to consortia they also copied the relevant organizations in the

state, so they are aware that LARAEC has done this research. He said they would check specifically with the individuals they interviewed to make sure they are okay with what they published.

**Adjournment**

A. Ms. Montes thanked everyone and said that she thought it was a good first workshop, and that they would learn a lot. Special Meeting Workshop adjourned at 02:43:33 in recording file.