



LARAEC Executive Board

Minutes- Regular Meeting

Friday, May 17, 2019

1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

East Los Angeles Skills Center
3921 Selig Place, LA 90031

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

1 Call to Order	1.1 Pledge of Allegiance	Michelle Stiehl
	1.2 Approval of the Agenda Dr. Miller moved to approve the agenda, Ms. Jacquez seconded. The board voted unanimously to approve the agenda.	Dr. Miller
	1.3 Approval of the Minutes a. Regular Board Meeting, April 2019 I. Mr. Urioste moved to approve the draft minutes from the April board meeting, Mr. Stark seconded. The board voted unanimously to approve the April minutes.	Mr. Urioste
2 Public Comment	There was no public comment.	
3 Program Updates	3.1 Budget a. Upcoming CAEP and Data Accountability Deadlines and Updates I. Revised FY20 Allocations: a. Ms. Ocampo explained that the governor’s May revision included a decrease of \$1M in CAEP funding due to a change in COLA, which was reduced from 3.46% to 3.26%. b. Due to the COLA reduction, the CAEP State Office will adjust the allocation amount by consortium in NOVA, and each member must reverify the adjusted amount on the FY20 CFAD. The LARAEC office has not received additional information yet, and the state office will be conducting informational webinars. c. Ms. Ocampo presented the estimated revised FY 2020 allocations. II. Due Date reminders: a. Ms. Ocampo explained that on June 3, the D&A Expenditure Report up to Q3 (June 1, 2016 to March 31, 2019) is due. Also, final budget revision and work	Grace Ocampo

plan revisions are due to LARAEC (and due to state by June 17, 2019).

b. She added that June 30 will be when D&A activities end. July 17 is when the final D&A expense report will be due to LARAEC (due to the state on Jul 31). On August 12, D&A will close out and the Practice with Promise report will be due to LARAEC (due to state on Aug 26, 2019)

i. Ms. Montes asked what the Practice With Promise Report was, and Ms. Ocampo replied that they have seen no template from the state regarding it.

ii. Ms. Montes asked if "Practice With Promise was just a report name, and Mr. Asturias said that that has all they have been told, and he believes the state wants to know best practices that were funded through the D&A mechanism.

c. Ms. Ocampo added that the Q3 Progress and Expense report is due in NOVA June 1, with an executed copy submitted to LARAEC. June 30 will be the end of Q4 and the due date for the Q3 Progress and Expense Report to be certified by the consortium.

III. FY 2019 INstructional Hours and Expenses by Program Area:

a. Ms. Ocampo explained that estimates due to LARAEC by August 16 (and are due in NOVA on September 1)

b. Actuals are due to LARAEC by December 6, and due in NOVA on December 31.

IV. FY2020 CAEP Funds

a. Ms. Ocampo explained that they must certify their new 3-year plan in NOVA by June 7, and their annual plan is due in NOVA by August 15.

b. The Member Program Year budget and work plan is due to LARAEC by September 20 (Due in NOVA on September 30).

V. Mr. Urioste asked when they must recertify their revised FY20 allocations, and Ms. Ocampo said the state hasn't presented any information at this time.

VI. Mr. Urioste said that he was concerned that they are just taking this and that there is no response from us as a consortium to whomever that would be, saying that they have already made commitments or had started to make commitments to cut back. He believes someone needs to hear that this is quite an impact on adult education for this consortium.

a. Dr. Miller said he believes that the COLA is set by the US federal department of commerce, for the whole country. So the state budgets set the COLA according to those guidelines. So this is adjusting every

	<p>unrestricted and categorical fund for education state-wide, not just Adult Ed.</p> <p>b. Mr. Urioste added that the state should have made an adjustment to the date they had to certify their numbers. Ms. Montes added that the May revision is not even the final budget, which does not come out until June, so they may be potentially recertifying again.</p> <p>VII. Mr. Asturias said that he thinks part of it is for the districts to know and have a figure to plan with, and that the state always makes a point to indicate when the COLA numbers are not the final numbers. The deadlines they have is so the CFAD is in place, otherwise the state cannot distribute funding to them on July 1.</p>	
<p>4 Informational Items</p>	<p>I.1 Information Items</p> <p>a. Discuss scheduled board meeting for June 21, 2019</p> <p>I. Mr. Asturias explained that in the board’s packet, the LARAEC office team has included a list of possible dates to meet, and that per their conversation last time, they indicated they would tentatively not be having a meeting on June 21.</p> <p>II. Ms. Montes said that unless there was some deadline that they needed to meet, that they would not need to meet in June, and they would just need to adjust the schedule they had approved the year before.</p> <p>III. Mr. Urioste moved to cancel the July 21 board meeting, and Ms. Jacquez seconded. Mr. Urioste, Mr. Stark, Ms. Montes, and Ms. Jacquez voted aye. Dr. Miller was absent. Motion passed with 4 aye votes.</p> <p>IV. Ms. Montes asked Ms. Ocampo to confirm that there was nothing the board needed to approve coming up with financials, just data/copy they needed to enter, and Ms. Ocampo confirmed.</p> <p>b. Discuss STEP Pilot Direction and Next Steps</p> <p>I. Mr. Asturias explained that they thought it would be prudent to get vendors to let them know what they’ve done so far and how it can be used, and also to inform LARAEC’s next steps with what the board would like regarding the STEP program.</p> <p>II. Garth Neil introduced himself as a representative of the vendor behind CommunityPro and the STEP pilot program. He thanked the board, saying it has been a pleasure to work with them, Mr. Asturias, and the whole LARAEC team.</p> <p>a. Mr. Neil gave a quick review of project: its timeline started in Jan 2017 with visionary discussion, they spent last fall and early this year in developing it, getting specs right and coding. Earlier this year, they went into preliminary implementation phase. On March 22, they trained 26 pilot testers. Many people got trained, but many did not engage with the system.</p>	

- b. He explained that one of the first things they did was make sure all of the data is flowing, and that they were bringing it in on a nightly basis from ASAP and TopsPro Enterprise, and it was clear that LACCD was going through a new student data program. They will not be able to devote time and resources to this project as a result. When that word got out, others indicated they may be pulling out of it while waiting for a directive from LARAEC about how to move forward.
- c. They currently have about 77,000 records in they system, and also have data from students who attended two or more schools, and where they have been dual-enrolled.
- d. He added that they worked very carefully with the leadership of each school to create the community catalog and bundles; the community catalog tells students exactly where they are, and if a school can't provide a class that they want, it's an effective and quick referral to an outside school. And this is also used for catalog bundles. The way the program works is if you are referred into a program about English, the bundle is ESL 1,2,3,4, and a CASAS assessment will be used to refer students to the right level, then an assessment is done based on how long it will take a student to be English proficient.
- e. He explained that the current summary screen was their first shot at it, and they think it is sparse and can be improved, and they want more feedback from users. They have shown this to consortia in Northern California and the Bay Area, and they are very excited and grateful for LARAEC for putting the idea together. He said they will be back with more mockups of system pages when the time is right, probably in the next couple of weeks.
- f. Mr. Neil summarized that schools have been working isolated from each other from an IT standpoint. What CommunityPro brings is collaboration and connectedness, better planning within each school, co/dual-enrollment visibility, and improved transitions to post-sec. Matriculation from adult school to community college is often such a chasm, but this helps capture data from reliable sources.
- g. Mr. Neil said that, regarding where to go from here, if they still want to use the pilot, they will need to regain commitment to the pilot, and his company is happy to retrain users if necessary. Second, they need to adjust and develop better summary screens, and improve dual-enrollment display and subsequent functionality. They would also ideally bring on LACCD to see co/dual enrollments, transitions, degrees.
- h. Also, they would highly recommend to expand the pilot to include LARAEC's community partners. They have seen that you can do it strictly in-school, but where the true power comes from is engaging workplace community partners and state/federal/community agencies/entities.

- i. Mr. Neil outlined the list of entities and agencies that his company has been having active conversations with in the LA basin.
- III. Ms. Montes said that they depend on consortia stuff at CCUSD to give their students additional options, considering how small CCUSD is, so they would be stuck without information for things in LAUSD or West LA. She also asked what the partnerships with the AJCC's look like inside of this CommunityPro program.
 - a. Mr. Neil explained that their staff is able to do the preliminary loading of the community catalog in only a few hours with LARAEC district staff, and explained that they have vetted and bundled all other districts but LA's, adding that they would love to work with the other 3 schools because they know there are ways to improve the project.
 - b. In addressing how the program works with the AJC's, they do the same thing loading up offerings and options from workforce systems and workboards around LA. And they work with them to better convey what they have to offer. With that set up, they can instantly refer them and follow up, as well as convey necessary information to students with a comprehensive printout to ensure a strong handoff. They want to decrease the time it takes to get new jobs for students with more comprehensive support.
 - c. Ms. Montes asked what sort of student data the AJC's see on their end. Mr. Neil explained that they will see is the Golden Record. What they get in that is the WIOA data and the Pearl data: who they are, where they live, contact info, and demographics. AJCs also see the equivalent of a super-transcript for all schools that provide CommunityPro data. It can tell you if they are enrolled, if they have earned a degree or certificate, plus their employment status through CalJobs. There's a lot of data there to use.
- IV. Mr. Urioste asked, since their AJC is the Verdugo Job Center, what their commitment will have to be, and whether they will have to purchase CommunityPro themselves.
 - a. Mr. Neil explained that in the past, when the consortium has purchased the product, then all their students have subscriptions. So when they refer any of their students out or when AJC's refer to them, it's all covered. They are negotiating to sign data sharing agreements with all of the districts, and with CalJobs, they sign a DSA and train them as well. So it's fairly straightforward, and a low-capped way for them to bring on. If they want to bring on Title 3 and Title 4 participants, they will pay more for them directly. He has not had a conversation with the Verdugo people yet, but now he know it's important.
- V. Mr. Urioste also added that he has not had good feedback from their counselors on CommunityPro. They say it is cumbersome to use, and don't like that they have to flip over

from one page to another to use it. He asked how they get to this point and not take in input from the end users to modify the product so that it is user-friendly.

- a. Mr. Neil said that they are looking for that exact feedback, and are wide-open and willing to sit down and talk with users, making any adjustments necessary. If it is not working in practice, that is the point of a pilot. He would have loved to have that feedback, but they have had zero.
- b. Ms. Jacquez added that MUSD counselors had the same feedback about using the system. She noticed this, and went to one of the trainings herself. She also thinks that CommunityPro needs to go into the service part of the industry: the EDD's, Workhorse, and AJC's to tap into to supplement the cost.

VI. Mr. Asturias wanted to provide background on the genesis of this system: at the beginning they were looking for a system to track our students. The Counseling Workgroup developed an ISP, and the consensus was that this should be an electronic thing so they can keep track of students internally. Then, discussion moved to how they keep track of where students go, where they came from, and if they're employed. Right now, they still using self-reporting from the TE system. And they have no way of tracking whether students are going to and what they're doing in college, unless they self-report. So that is what this system was intended to do.

- a. He explained that the process started for LARAEC four years ago; then there was an electronic system they were trying to do with a different vendor. Subsequent to that, they found CommunityPro to help address this issue.
- b. To go back to when counselors came in, they have been with them the whole way, and they developed a form to help create the system. In addition to that, they wanted to be able to see academic records and in the planning portion, they wanted to be able to tell students what class is best for them and what location is most convenient.
- c. Finally, Mr. Asturias added that the part where people come back and say they do not like certain portions of the system has not happened yet. That is what the pilot was supposed to do. They have talked to counselors, who have given a lot of input about how to modify the system, and they are now at the point where the system is built, but it is not being tested live as of yet, and that's the part that is missing at this point. If they were to test it, part of the testing process is the modification from users based on their suggestions. So all of those things are due to the pilot version not being concluded.

VII. Dr. Miller added that LACCD is playing out at least this round because they have their own SIS and are still working through it. He is not sure what they are deciding today, and if they are not deciding anything today, he thinks the three

	<p>districts involved can keep doing what they are doing, then get together and decide what they want to do.</p> <p>VIII. Ms. Montes thought that the whole idea was the referral piece, the ability to keep track of students. Mr. Neil mentioned something earlier about payment points, and Ms. Montes said that Ms. Jacquez suggested AJCC's pick up the cost of the subscriptions since they are sending the students. So, she asked what their potential return on investment is if LARAEC districts are picking up the cost.</p> <p>a. Mr. Neil summarized that organizations such as CalJobs can help students by helping them get a new job, retain a job that was at risk, or get a better job. He also added that they would love to have counselors come to them, if a couple or three take the lead in helping them improve CommunityPro, they would love that. And it is covered in the existing contract. They would rather deliver a product that LARAEC is really happy with.</p> <p>IX. Mr. Urioste said that BUSD is reluctant to use the system since it is cumbersome, and as a result, they are sticking with the paper ISP that they piloted. His concern is that they have he would hate to move forward with the new system if their counselors cannot utilize it, and that they need to be given the opportunity to submit problems with the product as it stands.</p> <p>X. Mr. Neil said that the board has his commitment that his company will come down to talk to their counselors to discuss with them what they would like to do. He thought that would be better than the larger meetings they have been having.</p> <p>XI. Mr. Urioste thanked Mr. Neil, and said that as a consortium, LAUSD has a proprietary system, and LACCD has its own. Dr. Miller added that LACCD would be willing to facilitate funding of this system on behalf of its colleagues. He explained that LACCD has a PeopleSoft/Oracle-based student planning system. They have a state MIS system they need to interface this, and they are not sure if this is compatible with that. They would not want to stand in the way of our K12 colleagues, but they do not know if CommunityPro will work out with their system.</p> <p>XII. Mr. Stark clarified that LAUSD has been through a lengthy process in identifying a new ISP system, and they are over their eyeballs in the implementation of a system of this size and scope. He clarified that it is not proprietary, but rather they went through the vendor Focus Software. They just need to get their hands on the tools of the system that are similar to CommunityPro's functions and figure out if they want to get involved in another third-party system.</p> <p>XIII. Mr. Neil add that LACCD would not have to use CommunityPro even if they decided to join on. Their intent is only to bring LACCD data on from Peoplesoft, to see who went on to enroll and whether they got a degree or not. Each</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>of these IT systems are great for running their school. CommunityPro is the one that bridges them and provides a common view.</p>	
<p>5 Board Member Reports</p>	<p>LAUSD:</p> <p>a. Mr. Stark announced that for measure EE, there is a special election on June 4, and summarized the measure and the funding it would provide. He encouraged those present to vote for measure EE.</p>	<p>Mr. Stark</p>
	<p>BUSD:</p> <p>a. Mr. Urioste announced that this afternoon they are having their staff celebration, where he will be barbecuing and their staff will be celebrating a good year. Also, their teachers will be working this summer to launch two IET programs they are very proud of, and also exploring a visual effects program for next year for students with disabilities with a post-production company in Burbank.</p>	<p>Mr Urioste</p>
	<p>LACCD:</p> <p>a. Dr. Miller summarized that things are going well in the LACCD right now. They continue to be challenged with enrollments, and the most transformational things in CC's these days are their new funding formula, guided pathways, and AB705, the doing away of remedial education. But that too will result in a downward slope of enrollment. That being said, their financial situation is quite strong. Their graduation from all 9 of their colleges is on June 4th and they are looking forward to that.</p>	<p>Dr. Miller</p>
	<p>MUSD:</p> <p>a. Ms. Jacquez announced that MUSD has been conducting professional learning with all of its staff. Just this week, they collaborated with LAUSD for FSI training, along with their pathways that help support our teachers. Their teachers are ready to keep on training, possibly without pay. They are also doing a lot of branding, with the slogan "Perserverence, Pride, and Promotion" on their documents. They also participated in the Discover MUSD event which had over 4,400 participants. They are working with local schools for service learning programs, and they did our CTE career fair in April. In May, the auditor visited. They are also working closely with communities with adults with disabilities. And Mr. Tenorio and Ms. Jacquez are continuing to work with the CIE (Competitive Integrated Employment) plan for special needs individuals to find work.</p>	<p>Ms. Jacquez</p>
	<p>CCUSD:</p> <p>a. Ms. Montes described how excited her team was from the PLC training, and how excited they are about the work they</p>	<p>Ms Montes</p>

	<p>are going to do separately and collaboratively. She is also thankful that PLC is part of their 3-year plan to see it continue. They have also started what they call their WestSide LARAEC group, and summarized the group's origins and its current makeup. Lastly, they have hired an Assistant Principal at CCUSD.</p>	
<p>6 Action Items</p>	<p>6.1 Approve proposed LARAEC Board Meeting Schedule for 2019 □ 2020 6.2 2019 □ 2022</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mr. Asturias explained that the LARAEC board had expressed an interest in meeting every other month starting with the next school year. LARAEC staff had included a schedule in their packet indicating suggested dates for meeting under this scheme. The first meeting in 2019/2020 fiscal year would be August 16, 2019. The next would be September 20. Even though we recognize that is not 2 months, there are some deadlines that need to be met. b. Ms. Montes noted that the annual plan is due August 15, and Mr. Asturias added that they have an agenda item for the annual plan. Since it is happening so close to the culmination of the three year plan, they can use the narrative from the current three-year plan for yearly plan. Since they are using the action plan, all items due within one year will become activities for yearly plan. Ms. Montes clarified that he was talking about using the three-year plan we're voting on today, and then pulling items out from that plan based on the first year and making that their annual plan. The board agreed to do this unanimously. c. Mr. Stark moved to adopt the schedule as presented by LARAEC staff. Mr. Urioste seconded. The board voted unanimously to approve the new LARAEC schedule. 	
	<p>6.2 2019 □ 2022 □ 3 □ Year Plan Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mr. Asturias explained that the draft 3-year plan was submitted to the board as part of the board packet. Dr. Miller recommended that Gayla Hartsough and her colleagues go over the executive summary so the public knows what they are up to. b. Ms. Hartsough summarized the adjustments made to the document, saying that the one they have is the required text for the state template. The executive summary talks about who LARAEC are, then how that connects to the CAEP programs, and then consortium plans. At the bottom of page 7 are the priority areas of building pathways and bridges, priority 2, student success support, and priority 3, professional developments. There are also two documents that are not necessary to approve today. 	

- c. Dr. Miller thought the two additional documents are very helpful, and personally speaking for LACCD, he thought the work of Ms. Hartsough and her team has been extraordinary.
- d. Mr. Asturias provided background on the process of revising the plan, and said that the document before them is for all intents and purposes the final iteration of that work.
- e. Ms. Montes said that she had notes; beginning on page 55, she asked if “fast tracks” was just a term. Ms. Hartsough confirmed that it was, and that the action planning team used it to refer to moving students through tracks as fast as possible.
 - i. Ms. Montes referred to page 57 in the 1.5 category, and how the goal is to provide educational services through improved pathways and transitions. She asked if that was just a general statement. Ms. Hartsough said that this is also why the workbook action team planning document is important. It’s consistent with the strategies, and focusing on the vulnerable population. So there is a much longer definition in their reference workbook.
 - ii. Ms. Montes referred to page 65: in looking at the APTs and workgroups, she sees an asterisk that says, “Will advise APTs, Conseling Collaborative, and SMEs”, and there’s no counseling workgroup there. There it talks about a counseling collaborative, and they would be remiss if they did not have a group that is that, and not just part of something else. Mr. Stark had a similar question, and thought that it was on an earlier draft.
 - iii. Ms. Hartsough explained that the counseling collaborative already exists. The other APT’s are new. Number 5 is sort of reconstituting the subject matter experts. There’s a need for the counseling collaborative to become more metric-driven. But they already had the Data and Accountability group. And they were thinking that every group needs to be more metric driven.
 - iv. Ms. Montes clarified that she is not talking just about the data, but rather the work that counselors do and the need for them to work collaboratively and the need for better metrics. She would like to see a Counseling Workgroup. Ms. Hartsough explained that the counseling collaborative still exists, and that they can add that to the table and the checkmarks, but her group saw that as just continuing. Mr. Asturias and Mr. Stark agreed that it would be a good addition and provide clarity.
 - v. Mr. Asturias asked if the board wanted the LARAEC staff or Ms. Hartsough’s staff to make the aforementioned changes. Ms. Montes asked LARAEC staff to make the changes since they would be inputting

the data. Ms. Hartsough said they can coordinate to make the changes; Mr. Asturias said, if it please the board, that LARAEC staff can make the changes to the plan, then provide Ms. Hartsough with a copy so she can change the other two documents.

- vi. Ms. Montes referred to page 67, and the phrase “Build an argument...” that discusses pursuing legislative remedies related to the dual-enrollment issue. Dr. Miller explained the current community college promise regarding high school graduates, and the desired outcome for the same promise to roll over into adult ed.
 - vii. Ms. Hartsough clarified that the APT was passionate about adult ed students in a program for high school equivalency getting the same reimbursement that high school students do entering community college. She added that there may be other options, and some districts have ways of working around it.
 - viii. Mr. Asturias added that part of the argument that the group was trying to make was, let’s explore what the dual credit/dual enrollment issues were and let’s explore how they can make that happen. It’s important for dual enrollment students to get credits for taking college classes while they’re taking classes at an adult school. The work group wanted to see how they can get to the bottom of the issue and figure how they can effect it. Ms. Hartsough added that it may require legislative change, or LARAEC subsidizing them.
- f. Dr. Miller said that the discussed item in the plan says to Establish, Identify, Expand, then Build an Argument for the issue. Ms. Hartsough suggested it could be changed to “Assess the pros and cons”, but it seems the big barrier was that it had been done in the past and they were unable to secure reimbursement. So the big barrier was figuring out the entire situation, and this to her is an example of what the legislators did no think of because they are not on the ground level. She asked the APT what are the ballpark figures of how many students they would be talking about, and it would be about 20,000 in the system. If a quarter of them want that first step before heading off to college, that’s a sizeable number.
- i. Mr. Asturias added that this item was discussed at length, and there were all kinds of previous requests and requirements, and he vividly recalls one of them was looking at other avenues where this can take place.
 - ii. Mr. Stark suggested that maybe for the moment, they can just agree to explore possibilities on dual enrollment and leave the possibilities a little open-ended, mark it, and then be more specific in one of the next annual plans.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Dr. Miller added that he thinks what he said was to change it to “explore opportunities for adult education dual-enrollment programs”. And this is tied to AB130, which is legislation for College Career Access Pathways, CCAP. Ms. Hartsough added that if they say “explore opportunities”, there was concern among the LACCDs that this would lead the public to expect it would be done tomorrow, and there is not the funding for it. Dr. Miller said that he thought that would be a given, exploring funding, and Ms. Hartsough said they will phrase it as “...explore legislative and funding-related opportunities for adult education dual-enrollment programs”. g. The board meeting recessed at 3:38 PM for a break. It was reconvened at 3:45 PM. h. Mr. Stark asked for clarification on page 70, strategy 2.4 A, and wanted to add language to clarify that they are not holding the D&A workgroup responsible for implementing the items listed. Ms. Hartsough suggested putting, “And submit to the board for approval” at the end of the item, and Mr. Stark agreed. i. Ms. Montes referred to page 71, item 3.5.b, and asked why the community college is not listed in there. Ms. Hartsough explained that most of the PD is with adult education USD’s. Ms. Montes asked, if they wanted to do PLC and LACCD would be available, what would be the issue? Ms. Hartsough explained that there would be no issue, but they do their own training, and there was a feeling that they need to have a master calendar sharing overlaps with LAUSD and LACCD. Mr. Asturias thought that the point being made is there’s no need to exclude an organization, and Dr. Miller suggested just putting “administrators”. Ms. Montes suggested putting “LARAEC board” instead of “LARAEC staff”. j. Mr. Stark thanked the APT’s, the faculty, teachers, administrators, and said that the new 3-year plan couldn’t have happened without their input, and felt they had more robust participation from faculty and administrators k. Dr. Miller moved to approved of the plan as is. Mr. Urioste seconded. The board voted unanimously to approve the draft 3-year plan as modified. l. Ms. Montes thanked Ms. Hartsough, KH consulting, LARAEC staff, and LARAEC point people for their hard work. 	
	<p>6.3 2019-20 Annual Plan concept approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Item 6.3 was approved as part of item 6.1. 	
<p>7 Consent Agenda</p>	<p>7.1 Approve Capital Outlay – LAUSD</p>	

	Mr. Urioste moved to approve the capital outlay, and Dr. Miller seconded. The board voted unanimously to approve the capital outlay.	
8	<p>Announcements The next meeting will be on August 16th, location TBD.</p> <p>Mr. Asturias suggested that they take up rotating meeting locations through the five districts again. Mr. Urioste said they would be happy to host in Burbank on August 16th. Ms. Montes requested the board to look at their calendars, and bring some dates in August for them to offer for meeting hosting.</p> <p>Mr. Asturias said that, now that the three-year plan is approved, the board had mentioned a desire to review roles and responsibilities, and that they might need a special meeting, so he is bringing it back to the board as an item that was crucial but had been put off to prioritize the 3-year plan.</p> <p>Ms. Montes requested it be part of the agenda for August 16. Dr. Miller asked if there was a need to do it before then, and Mr. Asturias explained that it would make it easier to begin implementing the plan. Ms. Montes suggested they bring it as an agenda item on August 16, and Mr. Asturias confirmed that it would not materially get in the way of things LARAEC staff needs to do before August 16 to do so.</p>	
Adjournment	Ms. Montes adjourned the meeting at 3:55 PM.	