



LARAEC Executive Board

Minutes- Regular Board Meeting

Wednesday, October 18, 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	Men Le, Project Director	X
Veronica Montes, Culver City USD	X	Daniel Gomez, CCUSD	X	Dr. Michele Stiehl, Advisor	X
Dr. James Lancaster, LACCD	X	Dr. Adrienne Ann Mullen, LACCD	X	Justin Gorence, Advisor	X
Renny Neyra, Los Angeles USD	X	Francisco Narciso, LAUSD	X	Kitty Phan, Budget Analyst	X
Dr. Angel Gallardo, Montebello USD	X	Sherry Jimenez, MUSD	X	Teresa Plaza, Secretary	

1 Call to Order	<p>a. Ms. Montes called the meeting to order at 9:06 AM with quorum.</p>	Ms. Montes
	<p>1.1 Pledge of Allegiance</p> <p>a. Ms. Benedetta led the Pledge of Allegiance.</p> <p>b. Mr. Gorence and Ms. Montes explained how public comment works.</p> <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. Mr. Noguera motioned to approve the agenda and Dr. Gallardo seconded.</p> <p>b. The board voted unanimously to approve the agenda.</p> <p>1.4 Items for future agendas – The Board President will request items for future board meetings</p> <p>a. There were no requests for items for future board meetings.</p> <p>1.5 Approval of the Minutes: Regular Board Meeting: September 20, 2023</p> <p>a. Dr. Gallardo motioned to approve the minutes from the Regular Board Meeting on September 20, 2023. Mr. Noguera seconded.</p> <p>b. The board voted unanimously to approve the minutes.</p>	Ms. Montes

<p style="text-align: center;">2 Public Comment</p>	<p>a. There was no public comment electronically submitted or at the teleconferencing locations.</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 went over upcoming CAEP due dates for budgets and workplans, student data in TopsPro, the employment and earning follow-up study, and program area reports.</p> <p>b. Dr. Gallardo asked if one of the reports was one they already submitted in NOVA for their hours for last year, and Ms. Phan confirmed. Dr. Gallardo thought it seemed like they are doing it differently this year.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">i. Ms. Phan explained that last year they also had the SMA, and then the state would move the SMA, so they only do the actuals this year.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">ii. Dr. Gallardo said he would call Ms. Phan for clarification, because he believes that what they put in the report on NOVA is the actuals and not an estimate. He asked if they just copy it from NOVA, have the superintendent or CBO sign it and then submit it back.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">iii. Ms. Phan clarified the numbers that should be reported and the submission process.</p>	<p>Ms. Phan</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">4 Information and Staff Reports</p>	<p>4.1 Update on cancellation of the LARAEC Conference previously scheduled for October 14, 2023</p> <p>a. Ms. Le gave a recap of the events leading up to the item, noting that the board agreed to cancel the conference in solidarity with LAUSD which had passed a resolution in solidarity with striking hotel workers to not cross their picket line.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">i. Last time they were anticipating having to take a penalty of \$47,000 for food and AV services because of the late cancellation, but because of their relationship with the Sheraton they have agreed to roll over the money to next year's conference without penalty.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">ii. The Sheraton is still working with their labor partners to come to a resolution, after which LARAEC will be able to draft a new contract with them. They are tentatively scheduling the conference for October 12th of next year.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">iii. She noted that the coincidence of their most recent canceled conference being scheduled on the 14th, and that their last canceled in-person conference was also scheduled on the 14th (of March).</p> <p>4.2 LARAEC upcoming events and activities. A brief overview of the action planning teams, lunch with LARAEC, and other consortium activities.</p> <p>a. Mr. Gorence summarized upcoming LARAEC activities.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">i. He introduced Lunches with LARAEC, intended to provide on the spot professional development strategies, ideas, and best practices by engaging subject matter experts from across the</p>	<p>Ms. Le Dr. Stiehl Mr. Gorence</p>

	<p>consortium and outside it. He also previewed upcoming topics for this season.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dr. Stiehl also noted that Mr. Gorence did a great job taking all the presenters from their canceled in-person conference and reaching out to them; many have booked speaking spots in Lunches with LARAEC. ii. Mr. Gorence also noted that the Action Planning Teams would be reengaging in November using a facilitator like they did last year. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They will be engaged throughout the year culminating in their APT Summit with the board where they will present their work and recommendations for next year. They are also engaged in the 3-year planning cycle. iii. He also shouted out the LARAEC newsletter as a really great way to check in and get a snapshot of what activities are coming up for the consortium, as well as great features on research, resources, and more. iv. Ms. Montes requested having a link to the LARAEC website on every agenda. 	
<p style="text-align: center;">5 Public Comment</p>	<p>There was no public comment at this time either virtually or in-person at the teleconferencing locations.</p>	<p>Mr. Gorence</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">6 Discussion and Action Items</p>	<p>6.1 Discussion of the ELL Healthcare Pathways grant, including recap of the timeline and process for completing the grant work plan, presentations by member districts, presentation of possible funding models, and next steps.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Dr. Stiehl gave a quick recap of where LARAEC is in terms of their timeline for a Pathways grant which was presented at the last board meeting and approved. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. She noted that they had asked member districts to put together proposals for what they would do with the grant money, and a presentation for the board to flesh those proposals out. ii. During the next two board meetings, they want to determine grant money allocation and have final proposals written. Today will inform a conversation about how they will allocate the money, and LARAEC staff will also give the board sample funding allocation scenarios they've worked on in conjunction with the Point Persons Team. 	<p>Mr. Gorence</p>

1. She noted that the State has been really clear that the allocations of the grant to each district is up to the LARAEC board.

iii. After the special meeting on October 27th, they will have a quick turnaround for the Point Persons and staff to write and get their whole work plan together. Their final grant proposals are due in NOVA on November 6th.

1. Ms. Montes thanked the board for their flexibility with their schedules in order to have the special meeting.

2. Dr. Stiehl noted that the special meeting is still an open public meeting and will have public comment.

b. Mr. Gorence then broke down the funding that LARAEC is eligible for in year 1 of the ELL Pathways Grant, about 4.8 million dollars.

i. He noted that the State has not given out guidelines yet on what year 2 and 3 funding will look like.

ii. Dr. Stiehl noted that year 1 will technically take them through to September 2025, so the money they are discussing the allocation of today will need to be spent by then, not the end of this year.

c. Mr. Gorence then introduced the pathways presentations from the LARAEC districts, going over the format and having space for clarifying questions from the board.

d. Mr. Noguera introduced himself and Burbank Adult School's Assistant Principal Elvis Carias.

i. Mr. Carias introduced Burbank's Vision and Mission, noting that everything they do stems from it and that they are very community-minded and focus on making an impact on their students and beyond into the community. A lot of their health occupational programs offered are to address those same community needs.

ii. He noted that Burbank also offers their programs at a much lower cost than other nearby community colleges.

iii. He shared data from various government studies that the healthcare field is the second highest-emplying industry and that healthcare companies like Kaiser, Providence, and Cedars Sinai are in the top 10

companies in terms of job posting, highlighting Burbank's need for healthcare professionals.

- iv. Mr. Carias then showed a summary of what Burbank offers in terms of health occupation programs. He wanted to focus on 3 pathways of the grant: CNA and LVN and Pharmacy Tech. They chose not to focus on certain pathways because of lack of enrollment or lack of ELL students.
- v. He explained that they chose those pathways because they are above the living wage and provide an occupational licensure certification which are outcomes that can be easily reported to CAEP. Also, CNA and LVN are in-house pathways.
 - 1. He also noted that some of these programs are expensive, so the grant can help keep costs down and provide for supportive services.
- vi. Mr. Carias then displayed employment projections for growth in different healthcare occupations, and explained how it affects their program offerings based on demand.
- vii. He noted the number of health clinics in Burbank alone, as well as a hospital that also has demand for healthcare occupations. Burbank would like to expand its CNA classes and pharmacy classes, and expand the LVN location.
- viii. Mr. Carias then introduced Burbank's "Big Picture" goals for year one, including the infrastructure goals and equipment goals.
- ix. Mr. Noguera then introduced the proposed budgets for their Pharmacy Tech, CNA, and LVN pathways, noting that they might change by November 1st as enrollment increases. The final proposed total was for \$220,000 in grant money.
- x. Dr. Gallardo asked whether Burbank's proposal might change because the details would change, or they might learn there is more cost to it, and Mr. Noguera thought it was a combination of both, but more so the latter.
- xi. Dr. Gallardo recommended to LARAEC staff that since this is a health field project, since all of us are going to be looking for directors of CNA and Health to help them move this through the state, that maybe all of LARAEC

together can hire someone to help aid them, and to pay attention to the cost of finding that person who can help them through.

- e. Mr. Gorence introduced Dr. Maribel Galan and Daniel Gomez from CCUSD.
 - i. Dr. Galan introduced herself as an interim consultant with CCUSD, along with Mr. Gomez their academic coordinator.
 - ii. Dr. Galan introduced projected growth for the Medical Billing and Coding, Medical Assistant, EMT, and Pharmacy Technician healthcare occupations, noting that the field as a whole will grow by anywhere from 7 percent to 23 percent in the next 5 years. The grant would be a big help to be able to build these opportunities for students, especially since they have students with degrees from different countries, or that were in the healthcare field.
 - iii. Mr. Gomez introduced projected enrollment for each of the 4 different courses they are looking to pursue, which may be exceeded because of high demand.
 - iv. Dr. Galan noted that as they are developing partnerships with labor partners and letters of support for them, they have developed draft requirements and goals for the students in each area which will continue to be developed as they develop their staff.
 - v. She also outlined goals for marketing and recruiting ESL students, ASC, and ABE students who may be interested in these new pathways. So they will market to existing students and outside the school to other local schools and high schools. They also want a combination of in-person and online support and tutoring for students.
 - vi. Mr. Gomez outlined their big three marketing and outreach strategies: focus internally on their English language learners, recruit directly from throughout their district such as at PTA meetings and from their high school, and thirdly to focus externally on the community through newspaper, social media, and other marketing techniques.
 - vii. Dr. Galan elaborated more on the co-teaching component involving an ESL teacher collaborating with a CTE or other healthcare teacher to support students

with challenging language or basic skills that might need extra support.

- viii. Mr. Gomez then talked about the lengthy list of potential partners that CCUSD has compiled, all of which are close commutes within the school's area. They are looking to secure additional letters of support from other potential partners.
 - ix. Dr. Galan then talked about the proposed allocation of \$511,400, noting that it was not modest, but that the proposed costs are important since they do not currently have pathways at CCUSD for their ESL courses. So it will take resources to offer these new programs, including funding for new staff, new space, and external professional development support.
 - x. The board had no clarifying questions.
- f. Mr. Gorence introduced Dr. Adrienne Ann Mullen from LACCD.
- i. Dr. Mullen introduced herself as the District Dean for Adult Education at LACCD, working across their 9 colleges.
 - ii. She displayed a slide showing the geographic footprint of LACCD which covers over 850 square miles, broken down by 3 regions: Valley, City, and Seaside. This is important to understand as they build their pathways to make sure they have equity of programs across regions.
 - iii. She also explained LACCD's Vision 2030, looking to close the gap in educated working age adults in California by having 70% of all working age adults earn a college credential certificate or degree postsecondary by 2030. That's 2.7 million for Los Angeles. Currently, LACCD has 5,000 ELL learners within their non-credit pathways.
 - iv. They also survey their students frequently to help provide supports for success; their students will travel within a 7-mile radius of home or work. So they make sure their partners are balanced geographically.
 - v. She thanked their faculty, staff, and administrators for coming together to create this ELL vision across LACCD as well as Dr. Stiehl and Mr. Gorence for their help with a template for the presentation.
 - vi. Dr. Mullen described a 4-pronged approach LACCD took for their proposal, looking at the ELL Bridge Program to

Allied Health Careers, what pathways they could create new, what existing pathways they could expand, and what current programs or grants LACCD has that they can leverage on behalf of these pathways.

1. In terms of creating new pathways, she displayed data on potential cost, wages, and noted that some pathways are established in some regions but not others. She also went over projected enrollment and job openings per year for each potential pathway.
2. She also went over existing pathways throughout LACCD that they can expand in alignment with the ELL focus, including cost breakdowns, potential earnings, potential enrollment, and annual job openings.
3. Dr. Mullen then broke down the different resources they bring as a district and what they would want to use the grant money to leverage towards, including district coordination, instructional support, and field supervision.
 - a. The grant would also allow them to pay for licensure and national exam fees which is often a barrier of completion for students.
 - b. The grant would also help support bus transportation for students, as well as employment prep with resumes and interviewing, a textbook lending library, and social supports to make sure students' basic needs are being met (housing and food insecurity).
4. Dr. Mullen then broke down ELL support and acceleration strategies, such as creating scaffolded lessons, using IET models, bridge classes, co- and dual-enrollment, work-based learning, exam prep.
 - a. They are also going to be reaching out to their students who are already in the system and create opportunities for them to join those pathways. They will also create a community partnership model and pipelines from non-credit to credit programs.

vii. Dr. Mullen then summarized their proposed budget as \$1,912,593.

viii. The board had no clarifying questions.

g. Mr. Gorence introduced Dr. Francisco Narciso and specialist Alma Arellano from LAUSD DACE.

i. Dr. Narciso the board for the opportunity. He noted the frame they are going into this with is equity through transitions and articulations with different member districts, and partnerships with already existing businesses that could help LAUSD students get skills and jobs.

1. He noted they are also taking a long-term vision of this grant since it will pay out over 3 years.

ii. He then looked at the first pathway proposal for Nursing Assistant.

1. They want to utilize their 3 existing NA classes and convert them to IET classes so they can support ELLs as they go into them. They also want to create a new class, and work to develop transitions into community colleges and collaborate with the other consortium districts.

iii. The next pathway, Personal Care Aid, has been used by a lot of ELLs successfully as a pathway into the Allied Health field, so they are going to add onto it with 2 new classes and a reviewed and revised curriculum with the IET model. They will also look into articulation with community colleges.

iv. Ms. Arellano then explained a proposed Foundations to Health Careers courses, which the district does not offer. It would be like a medical terminology course to provide a strong groundwork for students to understand the healthcare environment, and it creates a pathway for ELLs to transition more seamlessly.

1. It will also serve all healthcare training courses by covering a range of essential topics and help with ELL's ability to communicate, work collaboratively, and adapt to the needs of patient care.

2. The funding would also allow them to develop supports and resources in collaboration with their ESL department.

v. She introduced a proposed Phlebotomy training program, which DACE currently does not offer.

1. This would bolster existing healthcare training pathways by providing specialized skills and increasing students' value in the workplace. The funding would help with developing the curriculum to comply with regulatory requirements, industry standards, and enabling graduates to meet certification requirements for practice.

2. They would also like to develop a state of the art hands-on skills lab.

3. They have already executed an MOS with existing partners to expand their partnership to include phlebotomy.

vi. Ms. Arellano added that they would like to hire an Allied Health Programs Director, as required by regulatory bodies for certain health occupation programs for oversight.

vii. Dr. Narciso explained that they would also like to create a position for Outreach, Bridge, and Transitions for the purpose of helping transition students through existing articulations and building partnerships with different member districts.

viii. They would also like to develop an IET Allied Health Language Learning Center with 5 locations where students can come and get extra support

ix. Ms. Arellano then explained that they would like to collaborate with the ESL faculty and subject matter experts to develop instructional materials, content, and resources to support ELLs in the Medical Assistant pathway. None of the 5 MA classes are in IET format currently.

1. They would also like to develop a state of the art skills lab for their MA classes with bilingual materials and support.

- x. Lastly, they would allocate funding for CPR and First Aid training applicable to support all allied health programs (and as required by the division in preparation for externship training and the workforce).
 - xi. Dr. Narciso closed by reiterating that they have to work together as a consortium to be successful and to facilitate those equity pathways. He also reiterated the need to think in the long term in terms of this grant.
 - xii. Dr. Gallardo asked if the phlebotomy program would also include internships, since it is part of the experience students would need to get a job. He hopes moving forward as LARAEC that they find ways to help their students be ready for their jobs.
- h. Mr. Gorence introduced Principal Jose Ornelas from MUSD.
- i. Mr. Ornelas thanked the LARAEC board and consortium for their help thus far and thanked them in advance for the help that they will be seeking throughout the rollout of their pathways. He also thanked Ms. Jimenez for helping put this presentation together, as well as Judy McFadden for her input on the process so far and Ms. Arellano and Dr. Narciso for meeting with MUSD and letting them pick their brains.
 - ii. Mr. Ornelas presented their proposed funding allocation for their grant and read their mission statement.
 1. They propose to allocate \$23,200 for marketing and outreach, \$34,079 to expand their existing CNA and Personal Care Aide programs, \$36,000 to restart their Medical Assistant and Pharmacy Tech programs, and \$157,816 to create a brand-new phlebotomy program.
 2. Mr. Ornelas broke down their proposal for marketing and outreach, including physical supplies, social media, and community events.
 3. He then explained the proposed expansion of their CNA and PCA programs, including support for ESL students and increasing enrollment and seats.
 4. Then he went over the proposed restart of their MA and PT programs, which fizzled a little during

the pandemic but would expand opportunities for the community.

5. Their proposed Phlebotomy program would be an entirely new program for Montebello Community Adult School and they have begun meeting with people including LARAEC partners to work on next steps for adding this pathway. A bulk of the funding would be for classroom conversion as well as curriculum development and resources.

iii. Dr. Gallardo commented that they might reconsider and come back with a revised version of this allocation at another point in time.

i. Mr. Noguera respectfully requested that they reverse the order of who starts first in the future because Burbank always starts first; he noted that he respected his 8 minutes, but no one else did. However, he is grateful for the learning opportunity the presentations gave.

i. He also asked as a point of clarification whether their proposed budgets that they need to revise by November 1st are for the first year or the three years, because that will affect what they will consider for the funding.

1. Dr. Stiehl clarified that this work plan is for the 4.8 million dollars for only year 1. There will be more money allocated in years 2 and 3, but they don't know how much will be allocated to LAREC then. They are also not going to get the funds until December. She also noted that going forward she can't imagine a scenario where LARAEC will not get the majority of the grant funding as well because of their need and population.

2. She also noted that the State is really looking for reporting on metrics so they will want to focus on that moving forward.

j. Dr. Gallardo concurred 100% with Mr. Noguera and that they need to look at how they are going to help their different communities and collaborate moving forward with all of their resources and expertise. He also thought they would need to keep in mind revising it for the future.

- k. Ms. Montes noted that they are hearing proposals, and that CCUSD shot for the moon with theirs; however, she is crystal clear this is just year one funding, so they will come back with their team and have a realistic plan in place.
- l. Ms. Montes then explained they would be looking at potential allocation and funding scenarios. Mr. Gorence thanked the presenters for putting together their presentations.
 - i. Dr. Stiehl then displayed a spreadsheet from the board packet talking about 4 possible ELL Pathway Grant funding scenarios generated from working with the Point Persons Team. She noted that the board can read the percentages and more detailed pros and cons with their team.
 - 1. She noted that this is not the be-all, end-all and that the Board can choose to divide the money or allocate the money.
 - ii. The first scenario would be utilizing their current allocation to figure out what percentage of the entire pot each district gets; she explained how the percentages would change based on LARAEC office activities and newly proposed programs.
 - iii. The second scenario is called Base Plus, based on considerations from the Chancellor's office about the minimum amount needed to build a pathway and applied to the Pathways grant. It looks at the number of school sites and each gets a base of \$150,000 per school. There would be a remainder and that remainder can be divided.
 - iv. The third scenario is enrollment-based, on their current 2022-2023 numbers since their current allocation looks at 2018-2019 enrollment which has changed a lot since COVID. They also looked at CTE headcount since looking at all student enrollment includes students who aren't on medical pathways. Also, CCUSD currently doesn't have a CTE program, which skews that scenario.
 - v. The last model is the Pathway Funding Model, which took all of the proposals sent by the member districts and looks into funding for specific pathways per district.
 - 1. Dr. Stiehl noted that if every proposal from each district got their wish, they calculated they would need 7 million dollars, while the grant

award is 4.8 million. So the idea of this model is where they can look and find 2.1 million dollars that maybe they can shave off.

- a. Are there certain pathways that make more sense to wait until year 2 or year 3 funding for?
- b. Are there certain pathways that are part of a large project where districts can focus on doing part of it for the first year, then wait for year 2 and year 3 funding?

2. She also noted that they looked at having people take another look and come back with how they might cut certain pathways down, and also came up with a mathematical way of getting to the 4.8 million grant amount by spreading the 2.1 million overage proportionally to each district.

- vi. Dr. Stiehl also emphasized that they are not the be-all, end-all in terms of models, and that they were to provide board members for tools to go back with their team and discuss in preparation for the special meeting.
- m. Ms. Montes thanked the LARAEC team for all the information and proposed models and the presenters for their proposals and presentation. She noted that they are not having an allocation discussion today, but they will discuss and finalize those allocations at their next meeting.
 - i. She suggested that at the special meeting they can start their discussion by having each board member share their preferences as to how to determine the allocation. Then if there is a consensus on a model or option, the districts can look at their proposals and see if there's something that can more realistically be part of year 2 or 3. If that plan works for the board members, she will work with the LARAEC staff and Point Persons to work out the agenda for the special meeting.
 - ii. Dr. Lancaster agreed as long as there is an opportunity to have some discussion prior to that happening, since he will have some thoughts as they bring that meeting together. He also asked if there was a possibility for the team and the staff to go through all of the proposals and pull out costs that could be aggregated together like marketing, branding, things like costs for convening industry and advisory groups, he would like to see that. Dr. Stiehl said they could bring that on the 27th.

iii. Dr. Gallardo concurred with Dr. Lancaster that they should look across the consortium at the commonalities and cost that should be the same for all the different entities. Aggregating it would help, especially based on the rich information the presentations today gave.

iv. Ms. Neyra thought it was a great idea, and it goes along with LAUSD's vision; as she mentioned at LARAEC's last board meeting, they need to strengthen their consortium and show the State that they are working smarter and for all their students. They also need to create systems that help multiply their funding because the State sees they are working in the best interest of all their member districts.

n. Ms. Montes requested a 4-minute break at 10:54 AM. The meeting reconvened at 10:58 AM.

6.2 Approve the revised LARAEC Member District Monitoring Procedures and review next steps in implementation and reengagement with the auditing firm.

a. Dr. Stiehl explained the background of the project described in 6.2, and the timeline approved at the last board meeting.

i. They have been working with LARAEC staff, Point Persons, fiscal specialists, and program people to work on their monitoring procedures and how they might amend them. The intent was to bring them to the meeting today as a final draft after 6 previous drafts.

ii. The intent is to approve this today to reengage with their auditing firm. They can then come back to the November meeting with some options, and they can discuss the cost for the consortium moving forward.

iii. She explained that they were trying to look at the line between auditing and monitoring, and to stay as cleanly in the monitoring zone as they can since districts have their own mechanisms in place for auditing expenditures.

b. Dr. Stiehl presented their new modern procedures aligned with their 3-year planning process; in years 1 and 3 they will do a limited-scope review, and then a full-scope review in year two.

i. She noted that the limited scope review is really an internal self-analysis. They have truncated some of the questionnaires that were in the original document so they focus on just monitoring. The forms are also simpler to fill out and can be filled out by a Point Person, board member, or one of their team members.

- ii. The full scope review will be every 2nd year of the 3-year cycle, and they will take the same reports from the LSR and have an auditing firm come and validate those submissions for accuracy.
- iii. They are all following CAPE requirements and policies and procedures, and they have aligned it all with guidance they get from the CAEP office.
- iv. Dr. Stiehl noted that the last meeting on the subject they had, Carolyn Zachary from the California Department of Education visited, and was really complimentary about how LARAEC leads the way in a lot of activities, and was very excited to see how this particular item turns out, since it might be interesting to other consortium.
- v. Mr. Gorence added that it is important to note that even with the full scope review they were being mindful of how burdensome that was to member districts when they looked at focusing it and making it more intentional.
- c. Dr. Gallardo asked if this current document was a reflection of the new process, based on the experience LARAEC had this year and subsequent meetings with the PPT on common language and common expectations of reports.
 - i. Dr. Stiehl confirmed this, saying this document in the board packet was a reflection of all the conversations they had. Dr. Gallardo thought it would eventually save us a lot of time and effort and stress, and thanked the LARAEC staff.
 - ii. Dr. Stiehl added that the document delineates which reports the state is going to be sent by the LARAEC office and which ones they'll ask for from member districts.
- d. Dr. Gallardo moved to approve the October 11th version of the document. Mr. Noguera seconded.
- e. There was no discussion of the motion.
- f. The board voted unanimously to approve the October 11th document.

6.3 Discussion of proposed amended LARAEC bylaws, including hiring protocols for LARAEC staff, AB1491 updates related to budget carryover thresholds, teleconferencing practices, and other small updates. This is the first read through, discussion, and edits. Final approval will be in November.

- a. Dr. Stiehl gave background on the item, noting that it has been discussed on multiple different agendas and they have been moving discussion until all board members were together. She noted that in a previous meeting it was suggested and agreed upon they would do a first read of it today, then bring it back at

the November meeting for a potential approval. She also gave background for why the bylaws exist and how they guide the board in its operations.

- b. Dr. Stiehl explained that they had looked at 5 areas: conversations around hiring LARAEC staff, Meetings and Teleconferencing, website updates, budget bylaws updates recommended by the CAEP office, and their new monitoring procedures. She then shared a Word document of the bylaws with proposed changes.
 - i. Dr. Stiehl summarized the proposed changes for the hiring LARAEC staff section.
 1. Dr. Gallardo asked for clarification about the section on Project Director and certificated staff, where it says “all activities must comply with the Brown Act”. He felt like it was too broad. Dr. Stiehl clarified that the Brown Act does come into play with staffing if you’re having a conversation around positions in general; if you’re talking about a person and evaluating that person in their job, then those can be in a closed session.
 2. Ms. Neyra had a couple questions reading through it where it refers to collective bargaining agreements, district policies, and the education code. She ran it through their legal department and their comment was that they need to review it with their collective bargaining agreements, and see how they word that in regards to district policies. And there are things that are worded very vaguely.
 - a. Ms. Montes asked Ms. Neyra which sections she was referring to, and Ms. Neyra referred to section a.3, about classified staff. She thinks “adequate time” should be defined.
 - b. Ms. Montes thought her own interpretation of “adequate time” means it would comply with policies established for that within the member district. Ms. Neyra noted that LAUSD’s legal team said it needs to be more specific, and in terms of compliance, any hiring, dismissal, or movement must be in alignment with

that code and their collective bargaining agreements.

3. Ms. Montes asked if there was a way to add somewhere through the document the suggestions about the alignment with the education code, collective bargaining agreements for the employer of record, etc. Dr. Gallardo thought that that same compliance with the ed code would be important with regards to classified positions and their possible termination. Ms. Montes added that staff has noted their comments and will look through the document to apply them.
4. The board consented to making those changes to the document.
 - ii. Dr. Stiehl summarized the changes made to the bylaws regarding teleconferencing, which adds in new language for teleconferencing, but also covers LARAEC if they decide to go back to in-person.
 - iii. Dr. Stiehl explained the changes made to the bylaws since their website has changed; they now refer to “the consortium website” instead of the exact URL.
 - iv. Dr. Stiehl noted that the changes to the Budget section were suggested by the CAEP Office. One clarified the Cost of Living Adjustments that the consortium districts receive. The next section related to the carryover, relating to AB1491 as discussed in the April meeting. Carryover is now being looked at in 2 different ways, one as a consortium.
 1. She explained the CAEP measures for if you don’t send your money adequately. She noted they can also create thresholds for member districts as a consortium, and that the board opted not to impose thresholds, but to revisit that every year. So they will come back to that when they do the CFAD. So in this section they are memorializing the decision to look at it annually, and the information they would need if they chose to impose member thresholds. The decisions made in the CFAD approval process are also indicated in NOVA.
 2. Dr. Gallardo wanted to make certain, as related to capital outlay, that part of what this thing is

saying is the board can then permit districts to complete that project so that funding is not cut off in the middle of it.

3. Dr. Stiehl clarified that LARAEC knows that they have a lot of carryover right now, which is an issue across the State of California because of COVID. Her opinion is that they will not be able to spend the 80% of their budget required by the end of this calendar year, and the ramifications of that will be a little red sticker placed by the CAEP office next to LARAEC, and they'll have to write a plan about how they'll spend more. So she does not feel like it will be a big deal that LARAEC will be flagged for it. But they can probably focus on how they can get their spending into that 80% by the following year so people can finish their capital projects and get all that money spend down in a reasonable way. So even if they decide to impose thresholds on member districts, they cannot do that until the next CFAD, sometime in May. And even then it will be the next year that implements the threshold.

4. Ms. Le added that in her experience, the state does not want to take LARAEC's money; they want them to spend it judiciously, and want to support them. They just want to make sure they are spending their money wisely and supporting their programs and students.

- v. Dr. Stiehl explained that the next section memorializes their new monitoring procedures and requirements.

- c. Dr. Stiehl noted that they will have this as an action item at their next regular board meeting, and there will still be time if they would like to make some edits. She summarized the edits staff would be making based on board member comments.

6.4 Approve BUSD Capital Outlay Expenditures.

- a. Dr. Gallardo moved to approve BUSD Capital Outlay Expenditures, and Dr. Lancaster seconded.
- b. The board voted unanimously to approve the expenditures.

6.5 Approve LAUSD capital outlay expenditures.

- a. Dr. Gallardo moved to approved LAUSD capital outlay expenditures, and Mr. Noguera seconded.

<p style="text-align: center;">7 Board Member Reports</p>	<p>b. The board voted unanimously to approve the expenditures.</p> <p>a. BUSD</p> <p>i. Mr. Noguera reported that the BUSD school district approved an 8 percent salary increase for everyone across the board. They also approved a 15% increase on top of that for adult ed teachers, and it was ratified with the raise taking place retroactive to July 1st. Teachers are happy and morale is very high, which will help in supporting the students as well.</p> <p>b. CCUSD</p> <p>i. No report.</p> <p>c. LACCD</p> <p>i. No report.</p> <p>d. LAUSD</p> <p>i. Ms. Neyra reported that in September, their teachers received a 21 percent pay increase retroactive to July 2022 and paid prep time, the only district to do so.</p> <p>e. MUSD</p> <p>i. No report.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">8 Announcements</p>	<p>8.1 Next Regular Board Meeting: November 15, 2023 Special Meeting: Friday, October 27th 12 – 2 PM</p> <p>Location(s): Teleconferencing locations and Zoom</p> <p>The board discussed meetings for the rest of the year, and Ms. Montes noted that they definitely needed to meet in November because of action items, but asked Ms. Le and the LARAEC team to look at December and see if there is anything they have to do then.</p>	<p>Ms. Montes</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">9 Adjourn</p>	<p>Ms. Montes adjourned the meeting at 11:41 AM.</p>	<p>Ms. Montes</p>