



LARAEC Executive Board

Minutes- Regular Board Meeting

Wednesday, June 28, 2023

9:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Via Zoom

Executive Board Members in		Point Person Team Members		Staff	
Juan Noguera, Burbank USD	X	Yanira Chavez, BUSD	X	TBD, Project Director	
Veronica Montes, Culver City USD	X	Lynda Farnsworth, CCUSD	X	Dr. Michele Stiehl, Advisor	X
Dr. Katrina VanderWoude, LACCD	X	Dr. Adrienne Ann Mullen, LACCD	X	Justin Gorence, Advisor	X
Renny Neyra, Los Angeles USD	X	Men Le, LAUSD	X	Kitty Phan, Budget Analyst	X
Dr. Angel Gallardo, Montebello USD	X	Benedetta Kennedy, MUSD		Teresa Plaza, Secretary	X

1 Call to Order	<p>1.1 Pledge of Allegiance</p> <p>a. Dr. Gallardo called the meeting to order at 9:03 AM.</p> <p>b. Mr. Gorence led the meeting in the Pledge of Allegiance.</p>	Dr. Gallardo
	<p>1.2 Adjustments to the agenda – The Board President will announce any requests for adjustments to the meeting agenda</p> <p>a. There were no requests to adjust the agenda.</p> <p>1.3 Approval of the agenda</p> <p>a. Ms. Montes motioned to approve the agenda and Mr. Noguera seconded.</p> <p>b. The board members from Burbank, Culver City, Los Angeles, and Montebello voted to approve the agenda. Dr. VanderWoude was present on the zoom call, but did not vote on this motion because of audio issues.</p> <p>1.4 Items for future agendas</p> <p>a. There were no items for future agendas.</p> <p>1.5 Approval of the Minutes: Special Board Meeting: June 7, 2023</p> <p>a. Ms. Montes moved to approve the minutes for the June 7 Special Board Meeting and Dr. Gallardo seconded.</p> <p>b. The board members from Burbank, Culver City, Los Angeles, and Montebello voted to approve the agenda. Dr. VanderWoude was present on the zoom call, but did not vote on this motion because of audio issues.</p>	Dr. Gallardo

<p style="text-align: center;">2 Public Comment</p>	<p>Mr. Gorence said there was no public comment at this time over chat or Zoom. He asked the district representatives if there was any in-person public comment and there was not.</p>	<p>Dr. Gallardo</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3 Budget Report and Updates</p>	<p>3.1 CAEP Due Dates and Reminders</p> <p>a. Ms. Phan reminded the board of deadlines for certification of the 2023 Q3 Member and Expense Report and the entry of Member-district student data in TOPSPro.</p>	<p>Mr. Gorence Dr. Stiehl Ms. Phan</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">4 Information/Discussion Items</p>	<p>4.1 Preliminary Staff and APT Survey Data</p> <p>a. Mr. Gorence and Dr. Stiehl gave background on LARAEC's yearly Action Planning Team surveys and the responses to the current survey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. They explained that they had a response from 391 district staff members, and that the survey covered multiple areas, including their participation in LARAEC activities, what their concerns are and what support they need, what professional growth they would like to accomplish this year, and any new ideas they would love the consortium to implement. ii. 76% said that they participated in LARAEC activities (including the website, conferences, and Lunch With LARAEC) and over 75% said that the activities were useful or somewhat useful to their work. Mr. Gorence explained the breakdown of which LARAEC activities were most popular. <p>b. Mr. Gorence and Dr. Stiehl then explained the most important priorities and concerns for staff as revealed by the survey; he noted that many were extremely similar to priorities/concerns pre-pandemic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. They then went over the support most wanted by staff, noting that a majority preferred online professional development. ii. They explained the ideas staff would like to implement in the consortium (the survey specified in this question that necessary funding and opportunity were assumed). iii. They also went over LARAEC staff recommendations for member districts based on the survey, including expanding current programs, expanding counseling support, clarifying and streamlining transitions, and new programs to implement. <p>c. Ms. Montes asked for more information about the 25% percent who did not say LARAEC's activities were useful or somewhat useful to their work.</p>	<p>Dr. Stiehl Mr. Gorence</p>

- i. Dr. Stiehl explained that “not useful” was on one end of their metric, followed by “neutral”, “somewhat useful”, and “useful”.
- ii. Ms. Montes thought it would be useful to see the data for the “neutral” and “not useful” responders and what PD they requested/recommended.

4.2 Discussion of process to hire a new LARAEC Project Director and follow-up information requested, including items related to Education Code & Title 5, contracts, minimum requirements, and human resources processes.

- a. Dr. Gallardo summarized the decisions and direction that had been decided at the June 7 special meeting.
- b. He then reviewed Title 5 and its requirements and qualifications for an education administrator. He also noted that as it relates to the Ed Code, the Ed Code requires you to have a preliminary credential, a clear credential, or that a candidate is eligible for a certificate of eligibility.
 - i. Dr. Gallardo noted that at the previous meeting Ms. Neyra had indicated a difference in classification from one position to another, and Ms. Neyra clarified that the difference was between “leadership” positions and “administrative” positions. She noticed that a “coordinator” position is a higher level supervisor position and has to have administrative experience.
 - ii. Ms. Neyra added that she had reached out to get a concrete description of the position in writing, and was told that as practice for many years there was nothing in writing other than the job postings.
- c. Dr. VanderWoude unmuted at 9:26 AM and explained that she had been having issues with her microphone. She added that she had examined the job postings for different LAUSD positions, and noted that some only ask for “leadership experience” instead of administrative experience.
 - i. Ms. Neyra had previously discussed that coordinator positions require administrative experience because those individuals will be supervising other administrators/leaders.
- d. Dr. Gallardo said he would be in favor of shifting the title and requirements of the position towards one that required leadership experience, with the potential of gaining administrative experience in the role with LARAEC. This would also require shifting the salary.
 - i. Ms. Neyra noted that if they want to change it, they can, but it is still based on salary, and changing it will force the position to go through the freeze committee, which will take months.
 - ii. She added that since the project director will be a consortium employee, they will not report to her, and that there may be vacations or days being taken off by prospective candidates that may not align with the schedule of necessary activities over the summer. She believes that LARAEC staff needs to have someone to report to immediately, and said she is uncomfortable with them not having an immediate report. She asked who is supervising the LARAEC employees now.

- iii. Ms. Neyra also noted that if they do shift the title and salary down of the position, that they will not get the same caliber of people applying because the salary will be less. She also clarified that if they change the position, that will trickle down to all of their subordinates and those positions will also have to be adjusted. It will still be an administrative position, but she noted that there are different levels of coordinator and it will be at a lower level if they change it.
- e. Dr. VanderWoude noted that she has been raising her hand via Zoom and asked if they are still raising hands to speak. She noted that they seem to keep interrupting each other, and says that she wants to hear from all of the other board members as well.
 - i. She asked what positions would need to be downgraded if the Project Director position is downgraded, and what administrators report into the Director. She mentioned hearing that some staff aren't showing up, perhaps because there is no supervision, but emphasized that Dr. Stiehl and Mr. Gorence are always showing up and on point. She also wanted to know more about the downgrading of the position.
 - ii. Ms. Neyra reiterated that if the position is downgraded it will then have to go through the freeze committee at LAUSD which will take a while, and that downgrading it will make the position essentially a lateral move for people with experience as directors and administrators.
 - iii. She also noted that if LARAEC decides to move somewhere else, she will have to keep the person on at LAUSD and have to find a position for them at the same salary. She also noted that she never said that Dr. Stiehl and Mr. Gorence were not doing a great job, but added that they do not have a supervisor to report into.
 - 1. Ms. Neyra noted that she had to give special approval for the hours that the LARAEC staff are working for their consortium duties over the summer. She reiterated her concern over the lack of oversight of the LARAEC staff.
- f. Dr. Gallardo thought that Ms. Neyra's explanation raised new questions, and noted that the LARAEC staff she mentioned have to be very on task. He thought that this time was not the right time to critique work schedules and reporting. He also expressed being upset at what he perceived as the critique of excellent employees in the LARAEC office, noting that they should be talking about their options for downgrading or not downgrading the director position.
 - i. Ms. Neyra clarified that she was not intending to speak about or critique LARAEC staff, she merely wanted to point out that they do not have a supervisor currently.
 - ii. Dr. Gallardo thought that they need to hear from the rest of the board and that they have tended to deviate into areas of discussion that they should not deviate to.
- g. Dr. VanderWoude noted that they can always refer to the recording for accuracy of board member statements and added her own displeasure about talking about employees on topics that should be

discussed in a closed session. She also added that they should be focusing on the main questions around the position.

- h. Dr. Gallardo agreed, saying the issue at hand was whether they want to keep the position as is or downgrade it with a change in salary to only requiring leadership experience.
 - i. He also noted the unique nature of LARAEC as an organization, so they might not get any applicants that have immediately applicable experience, but the position could offer a learning opportunity.
- i. Mr. Noguera noted that he is confident they will be able to find a good person for the position whether or not they downgrade it, but that money does play a factor in recruitment. He mentioned that especially in smaller districts like Burbank they have run into problems enticing staff because of their pay rate. He also reminded the board that their main job is to support the students.
- j. Ms. Montes apologized for any interruptions and said she will work on not interrupting and raising her hand in the future.
 - i. She referenced the job posting that had been sent out and was reviewed at the last board meeting which laid out experience necessary and preferred, the coding and classification of the position, etc. She asked if there were similar conditions written out for the theoretical downgraded position being discussed, noting that they were comparing two alternatives without one alternative in front of them.
 - ii. Dr. Gallardo directed the board's attention to a similar LAUSD job posting on their website for a K12 Language Arts Coordinator.
 - iii. He also added that although the board does lead LARAEC, the Director also guides the board and leads them in certain matters. He also believes that the Director position should be open to staff from all 5 member districts, noting that there seemed to be an assumption that the person would definitely be hired from LAUSD.
 - iv. Ms. Montes also asked that when they decide whether to downgrade the position or not the board be notified right away so they can notify their staff about the job. She noted that the previous posting was not able to be promoted because the posting was a surprise to the board.
 - v. Ms. Montes also requested that the posting be given to the CAEP office so it can be posted to people across the state.
- k. Ms. Neyra clarified that a 41G classification would not work for the Project Director position because they would need to work during the summer. She also reminded the board that if the position changed it would have to go through LAUSD's freeze committee.
- l. Dr. VanderWoude agreed that the posting should be sent throughout the member districts of LARAEC. She also noted that the position as posted was a 41G position, but the LARAEC coordinator is listed as a 42G position. She was not sure if this was a discrepancy.
 - i. Ms. Neyra clarified that the "administrative" position as it is now is a 42G, and that if they downgrade it to a "leadership" position, then it would become 41G.
 - ii. Dr. VanderWoude asked to clarify if the listing on the website supersedes the information in the post, and Ms. Neyra

clarified that the posting was incorrect and the position was a 42G one. Either way, it will have to be reposted.

- m. Dr. Gallardo summarized the issue at hand and the topic so far. There was some confusion about what had been shared that listed the position as 41G. He added that in his mind the better thing to do would be to drop it to 41G with the 3,000 difference in salary, noting that none of their applicants are going to have specifically LARAEC administrative experience. He thought board members could acknowledge with thumbs-ups if he was on the right track related to board opinion.
 - i. Dr. VanderWoude asked to clarify if Dr. Gallardo was making a motion. Dr. Gallardo asked if it was possible to get a board consensus, noting that they have nothing actionable yet.
 - ii. Dr. Stiehl clarified that it is listed in the action items, so they could take action on it.
- n. Dr. Gallardo moved that they fly the Project Director role for LARAEC to 41G and with “leadership experience” instead of “administrative experience”. Ms. Montes seconded.
 - i. Ms. Montes asked if she could amend the motion, saying she would change it to 41G “at a basis” with the rest of the descriptors. Dr. Gallardo supported the amendment.
 - ii. Ms. Montes asked Dr. VanderWoude what the proper Brown Act language would be to phrase the amendment. Dr. VanderWoude suggested since the friendly amendment had been made, Dr. Gallardo could read the motion with the added amendment. Dr. Gallardo restated his motion and called for the vote.
- o. The board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

4.3 Discussion of timeline and actions related to hiring a new LARAEC project director

- a. Dr. Gallardo asked whether the position would definitely have to go through the freeze committee at LAUSD, and if that meant that there was a chance the position could be disapproved by the committee.
 - i. Ms. Neyra thought it unlikely it would be rejected, but that was still a possibility. She noted that the freeze committee was out of her hands, and that some positions she had sent to them had taken 6 months to get approved.
 - ii. Dr. Gallardo suggested he could talk to district leadership to get their help expediting the process and communicating how vital it is. Ms. Neyra said she could do the same, but noted that the crucial element is the freeze committee actually meeting to discuss the issue, since they do not meet that often.
 - iii. Dr. Gallardo thanked Ms. Neyra for the clarification and noted that despite going through some raucous times, the board always comes back to the center of supporting their students. He admired the board’s passion and thanked them for their expertise and help.
- b. Dr. VanderWoude asked whether specially funded program positions or CAEP-funded program positions still have to go through LAUSD’s freeze committee.

- i. Ms. Neyra clarified that it does not matter where the funding comes from, LAUSD positions still have to go through the committee. She had tried using that reasoning for another position and was told it still had to go through freeze.
- ii. She further clarified that positions that do not have a student interaction side to them, administrative ones, are the only ones that do not go through freeze.
- iii. Dr. VanderWoude sympathized with the difficulty of filling staff positions, and added that she does not want to have to wait 6 months for the process to finish. She thought because they have heard other processes are used at other districts, that they might want to consider other options to expedite filling the position.
- iv. Ms. Neyra said as soon as the meeting is over she can find out when the next freeze committee meeting is. Dr. VanderWoude thought that would be helpful to know if they needed to have a special meeting.
- v. Dr. Gallardo agreed that they should plan and think through alternatives and whether they might have to move the home of the LARAEC office. He does not think they are at that junction yet, but would request each board member talk with their own superintendent.
 - 1. He noted that they do have a meeting mid-July, but time is of the essence.
- c. Dr. Gallardo noted that having too many board members as part of the interview panel for the position would invoke the Brown Act, and suggested having 2 board members on the panel or 3 point persons.
 - i. He also recommended an option where they have 2 board members on the committee to select a finalist, then have a closed session of the LARAEC board to interview the finalist/finalists and make a final recommendation to LAUSD.
- d. Ms. Neyra updated the board that the freeze committee is meeting tomorrow; it is too late to turn in the forms, but she believes she can go directly to them and beg and they will still accept them. But it has to be completed ASAP; she added that the form was posted in the chat.
 - i. She is not sure who would assist in filling it out, but it would need to be done immediately.
 - ii. Dr. Gallardo suggested Ms. Montes. Ms. Neyra clarified that they must include an extensive justification attached to the form of why they're changing the position for the committee to even consider it. Dr. Gallardo suggested they create a google document so the board can collaborate on the justification after the meeting.
- e. Dr. VanderWoude clarified that the committee would have a definitive yay or nay vote tomorrow, and if they vote "nay" that means LARAEC will need to go to another plan and make adjustments.
 - i. Dr. Gallardo added that if the committee did vote nay, the LARAEC board would need to have a special board meeting since they would need to immediately start moving to fight it.

- ii. Ms. Neyra added that she was unaware the freeze meeting was tomorrow, and that they told her they don't even have meeting dates for the new fiscal year yet. So the decision will be tomorrow or in months.
- iii. Dr. Gallardo suggested that they all collaborate on a google doc for the justification so that it reflects experiences across LARAEC districts.
- f. Dr. Gallardo asked if they wanted to talk about the timing and composition of the interviews, or if they wanted to wait until freeze committee and then discuss at their next meeting. Ms. Neyra said that she is confident that the justification will be accepted and that they would just need to post the updated posting which could happen as soon as Friday.
 - i. Ms. Neyra also thought that there would not be a massive number of applicants. Ms. Montes added that she would like to talk about the actual reviewing of the applications since LAUSD does an initial elimination of people who don't meet the minimum eligibility.
 - ii. Ms. Montes requested that a member of the board assist with the review of applications that were deemed eligible before they are brought to the interview stage in case they get a large number of applicants.
- g. Dr. VanderWoude said she assumed that the board members would participating in deciding who to interview unless board members are another step in a final interview.
- h. Ms. Neyra asked how they can justify not interviewing everyone who is eligible for a position. Ms. Montes replied that that is common in any school district if they have more candidates than they can possibly need. At Culver City USD, she explained that they have a rubric for determining who to interview even if they have met the minimum qualifications.
 - i. Ms. Neyra was confused because she thought the justification for changing the position WAS to open it up to as many people as possible. She asked why they didn't leave the position as is if they wanted to parse down the number of applicants and deem a stricter rubric after the fact. She was not okay with that.
 - ii. Dr. VanderWoude noted that they are casting a wider net for the initial pool, but that it was rare for every applicant in a pool to be interviewed. Applicants can meet the minimums but that alone might not land an interview and certainly may not land the job. She was used to that process from the various other districts she's worked with.
 - iii. Dr. VanderWoude explained that a pool of finalists then comes from the pool created from the rubric, and then eventually a decision is made after a reference check.
 - iv. Ms. Neyra noted that it was a serious problem if they are going to create a separate rubric that mimics the job description they changed, and they're only tweaking it a little bit. She also doubted that they were going 50 applicants, since when they posted the first posting about the position they got 8 applicants. Now they're downgrading it and giving the position less money.

1. She also noted that unless it is a candidate that has serious issues, she believes making an additional rubric makes it seem a little shady on LARAEC's part, and she is not comfortable with it. She prefers to be transparent and equitable.
- v. Dr. Gallardo suggested they wait until they have the full perspective of the process and timeline, noting that what is being said is factual and legal in respect to HR.
 1. He noted that every HR office in California has a different process of deciding who's going to get interviewed, but thought discussing it now was moot until they have a feeling of what their next steps may have to be re: the freeze committee.
- vi. Dr. VanderWoude thought that the process is the process no matter who applies. To rebut the idea of the term "shady" previously used, she was more concerned about waiting to determine what they do until after they see who's in the applicant pool to narrow it down. She thinks they are more easily in a position of having to justify their actions if they decide the process after seeing who applies rather than deciding the process before and sticking to it.
- i. Dr. Gallardo clarified that he only meant that maybe they would have to narrow the pool down. He added that they need to focus on the the freeze committee first, then at the July meeting they can discuss this important aspect to the process. He also agreed with Dr. VanderWoude that in the several districts he's worked in, they have 2, 3, 4 screening phases.
 - i. He also agreed that they need to have a clear process, and Dr. VanderWoude thought they need to have a clear process before the position is posted. Ms. Montes agreed. He suggested Dr. VanderWoude elaborate on what she would think a clear process is.
 - ii. He then summarized the rough timeline for HR to screen, noting that they do not know exactly how long it will take. Dr. VanderWoude noted that the type of process would depend on whether they are moving to a finalist type of interview or not.
 - iii. Dr. VanderWoude summarized that HR after posting would first screen by minimum qualifications, and then that pool would move to whoever is going to be doing the interviewing as a group. Then, they would decide who would move to the final process to be considered as a finalist.
- j. Dr. Gallardo thought that as much as he wants 2 board members and 3 point persons in the interview process, he does think that the finalists should come and be interviewed by the LARAEC board.
 - i. Ms. Montes thought Dr. VanderWoude described a very clear and thorough process, and asked if she could send an email detailing the order of it. She agrees that figuring out the process before interviewing is important for equity and transparency. Dr. VanderWoude agreed to formulate an email.
- k. Ms. Neyra sent the board a link to a Google doc so they can collaborate on the forms for the freeze committee.

4.4 Nomination and election of new LARAEC executive board officers for the 2023-24 school year including board president, 1st vice president, and 2nd vice president.

- a. Dr. Gallardo gave some background on the president selection process and succession. Dr. Stiehl elaborated that each year they will nominate and elect a second Vice President, and the first vice president will become the president, the second will become the first, and so on. However, they have also done it by nominating each role.
- b. Dr. VanderWoude nominated Ms. Montes as board President. Ms. Montes accepted. Dr. Gallardo seconded the nomination.
 - i. The board voted unanimously to approve Ms. Montes as President.
- c. Dr. Gallardo nominated Dr. VanderWoude as first Vice President. Dr. VanderWoude accepted. Ms. Montes seconded.
 - i. The board voted unanimously to approve Dr. VanderWoude as first Vice President.
- d. Ms. Montes nominated Mr. Noguera for second Vice President. Dr. Gallardo seconded, and Mr. Noguera accepted.
 - i. The board voted unanimously to approve Mr. Noguera as second Vice President.
- e. Dr. VanderWoude sent the bullet-pointed summary of the Project Director hiring process to the board, which she then read onto the record.
 - i. Ms. Neyra reminded the board that they must still follow the same process as LAUSD because it will be technically an LAUSD employee position. She explained that adding things onto the process in this way does not require putting it in writing. She also reminded the board that she must deal with the unions, and that it is a contractual thing.
 - ii. Dr. VanderWoude added that she understands, because at LACCD they deal with 6 unions and 3 meet and confer groups. She also asked who determines the questions for the interviews and the reason; she did not put that into the process because she considers that step standard procedure. She would like for their decisions about that and the process to be finished before the applicants are known to everyone.
 - iii. She also apologized for asking questions in the last meeting of Ms. Neyra that she had to go out and get answers for, saying that she for some reason thought Ms. Neyra had been with LAUSD for 10 or more years. Ms. Neyra confirmed she has been with the district for 6 months. However, she noted she has already gained a ton of experience.
 - iv. Dr. VanderWoude also clarified that in her outline of the process, any questions must be determined before those interviewers ever see applicants or their applications.
 1. Ms. Neyra noted that the committee will just meet at the time of interviewing. The committee is developed by those who are chosen to be on it, who then discuss what questions are going to be asked by who. The committee will have representatives from different departments.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Dr. VanderWoude elaborated that in her process, the number of applicants they see would be based on a rubric at a certain point, not determined by whoever is sitting in the room. They do not have to accept her process, but she is suggesting that they use a rubric to select interviewees after developing the questions, then if there will be a finalist round recommends the finalists to the board. At that point reference checks would have to happen before any offer were made. f. Dr. Gallardo asked Ms. Neyra to ask LAUSD HR to provide them information of what is feasible and to send them a document detailing their interview process. Ms. Neyra said she would pose the question, but if there is going to be a review of who's going to move forward to interview it's going to be just the board members. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Dr. VanderWoude guessed that LAUSD has an HR hiring guide that lays everything out. Some things may not be in writing but they've been practice and there's a difference between practice and policy. And she wants to make sure they're following policies. She also noted that typically the things in the HR guide are solid regardless of each of the contractual agreements. ii. She thought it would be helpful for someone from HR to answer some of these questions and email the board back, and that she would like to request an HR guide and any of the stipulations in those contracts. iii. She believes that conceivably they may get all applicants that meet the minimums, but they would never end up reviewing them all; she thinks somewhere in writing must attest to that and the filtering process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ms. Neyra said she could get the board the HR guide, but did note that in just the last 3 weeks HR has interviewed over a hundred applicants for certain positions, so it can be done. She is not saying they want to, but equity has to be taken into account. 2. Ms. Montes posted the hiring guide in the chat. 3. Ms. Neyra added that the interview panel is the same as a committee, and has to be for consistency. iv. Dr. VanderWoude asked for a formal document and any language that would tell the board definitively that an interview committee cannot do any level of selection of who they are going to interview. Ms. Neyra agreed to get that document and have it posted before they wrap the meeting up. g. Dr. Gallardo summarized that they have covered and accomplished a lot and thanked the board members. 	
<p style="text-align: center;">5 Board Member Reports</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. BUSD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Mr. Noguera reported that they are almost finished with summer school, which was 7 weeks this year and has 	<p style="text-align: center;">LARAEC Board members</p>

	<p>been a great success. In the fall, they are planning to expand the ESL classes and increase the Saturday program. They are also planning to include IT classes and expand the healthcare program. They are also planning to hire staff to begin an LVN program in Spring 2024. They are also planning to have a professional development targeting customer service. They are also asking students that do not have devices at home to come to BUSD and connect to the online class.</p> <p>b. CCUSD</p> <p>i. Ms. Montes yielded to the next speaker to move on to writing the freeze committee justification sooner.</p> <p>c. LACCD</p> <p>i. Dr. VanderWoude thanked Dr. Gallardo for his leadership and the energy, time, and effort he’s put in.</p> <p>d. LAUSD</p> <p>i. Ms. Neyra reported that their students competed in the National Skills USA Conference in Atlanta last week and had 8 medal winners at that level. It was the highest Conference attended to date. They also have over 12,000 students enrolled in summer school, up 5% from last year. They are also expanding their LVN programs to more locations.</p> <p>e. MUSD</p> <p>i. Dr. Gallardo thanked the board. Ms. Montes noted that she oversees CCUSD’s health services team and is always looking for LVN, so now she knows where to go for advice.</p> <p>ii. Dr. Gallardo said he thought Burbank is going to be their hub of career and technical. He thinks next year will be great because they are going to connect more. He yielded his time as well.</p>	
<p>6 Public Comment</p>	<p>Mr. Gorence announced there was no virtual public comment. There was also no on-location public comment.</p>	<p>Mr. Gorence</p>
<p>7 Action Items</p>	<p>7.1 Approve 2023-24 Capital Outlay for LAUSD</p> <p>a. Ms. Montes motioned to approve the 2023-2024 Capital Outlay for LAUSD. Dr. Gallardo seconded. Dr. Gallardo summarized the purpose and amount of the Capital Outlay.</p> <p>b. Dr. Gallardo moved to board reports, but Mr. Gorence noted that they had not asked Ms. Neyra for her vote.</p> <p>c. The board voted unanimously to approve the 2023-2024 Capital Outlay for LAUSD.</p> <p>d. Dr. Gallardo then moved to board reports.</p> <p>7.2 Approve LARAEC Executive Board officers for 2023-24 school year to be effective July 1, 2023.</p> <p>a. Covered in a previous item.</p>	

	<p>7.3 Approve the process of hiring a new project director, establishing how the board will work with the district-of-record. a. Covered in a previous item.</p> <p>7.4 Approve timeline and actions related to the hiring of a new LARAEC project director a. Covered in a previous item.</p>	
<p>8 Announcements</p>	<p>Next Board Meeting: July 19, 2023</p> <p>Location(s): District teleconferencing locations and Zoom</p>	Dr. Gallardo
<p>9 Adjourn</p>	<p>Dr. Gallardo congratulated Ms. Montes on being approved as LARAEC Board President and adjourned the meeting at 11:14AM.</p>	Dr. Gallardo