



**LARAEC Executive Board**

**Minutes- Special Board Meeting**

Friday, October 27, 2023

12:00 PM – 2:00 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	

<b>1 Call to Order</b>	a. Ms. Montes called the meeting to order at 12:03 PM with quorum.	Ms. Montes
	<p><b>1.1 Pledge of Allegiance</b></p> <p>a. Mr. Gorence led the meeting in the Pledge of Allegiance.</p> <p>b. Ms. Montes explained the purpose of the special meeting and invited attendees to give public comment.</p> <p><b>1.2 Adjustments to the agenda – The Board President will announce any requests for adjustments to the meeting agenda</b></p> <p>a. There were no requests to adjust the agenda.</p> <p><b>1.3 Approval of the agenda</b></p> <p>a. Dr. Gallardo moved to approve the agenda and Ms. Neyra seconded.</p> <p>b. The board voted unanimously to approve the agenda.</p> <p><b>1.4 Items for future agendas – The Board President will request items for future board meetings</b></p> <p>a. There were no items for future agendas.</p>	Ms. Montes
<b>2 Public Comment</b>	a. There was no public comment electronically submitted or at the teleconferencing locations.	Mr. Gorence

**3  
Discussion and  
Action Items**

**3.1 Discussion and approval of the ELL Healthcare Pathways grant member-district allocations, including recap of the timeline and process for completing the grant work plan, and next steps.**

- a. Mr. Gorence gave background on the ELL Healthcare Pathways grant, as well as updating the board on where they are in the timeline for completing the grant work plan.
  - i. Dr. Stiehl explained that today’s discussion and action would be to finalize member-district allocations, which would give them 5 working days to finalize the work plan with LARAEC staff and the Point Persons Team.
  - ii. She noted that four options were presented by LARAEC staff at the previous meeting and could be found in spreadsheet form on the website, but added that those are not the only options. She then briefly summarized the four options: allocation based on their existing allocation percentages, one where each district gets a base amount and then additional allocation on top of that, one based off of enrollment, and one based on proposals for specific pathways.
  - iii. Dr. Stiehl also summarized the tasks that LARAEC staff had asked individual member districts to complete as preparation for today’s meeting, including looking over the allocation proposals, assessing their own proposals for items that could be part of Year 2 or Year 3 funding, and what parts of their proposals could best be adapted as a consortium-wide activity.
- b. Ms. Montes opened up the issue for discussion.
  - i. Dr. Lancaster asked if there was one document where the proposals are aggregated. Dr. Stiehl explained that each member district is summarized in their own one-sheet, and that they did not aggregate by occupational outcome. Dr. Lancaster clarified that he was interested in potential cost-saving, particularly on new program development.
    - 1. Dr. Lancaster also asked whether they investigated regional labor market information to see if they would be oversaturating certain occupational areas, which they had not.
    - 2. Dr. Gallardo also concurred that they should look into this item, noting that most member districts seem to be looking into starting similar programs, such as phlebotomy programs.
    - 3. Dr. Stiehl explained that their task was more looking at what curriculum development would be like if done more as a consortium. They also thought marketing could be done together as a consortium and what project management could be done together.
  - ii. Ms. Neyra added that in the previous meeting they talked about how LAUSD is frequently looked to by member districts who are starting programs because LAUSD has the staffing, resources, and expertise to develop new curriculums. One of the points of the consortium is to share that expertise and those resources.

1. She also noted that originally the consortium was developed to articulate to community colleges from member districts, and asked why they are not creating those articulation agreements if they have the programs. She thinks they are not leveraging those the way they should.
- iii. Ms. Montes asked regarding the consortium-wide strategies if any could be absorbed within current staff structures and the collaborative structures LARAEC currently has.
  1. She also noted, going back to Dr. Lancaster and Dr. Gallardo's statements, that the report does not have information on whether proposed programs are new or an expansion of existing programs.
  2. She reminded the board that given the time crunch, they would have to make some decisions with the best information they have, and that they are only in year 1, so more analysis or changes may be possible in Year 2.
- iv. Dr. Gallardo asked if Ms. Montes saying they do not have time to decide is because of the November deadline for submission and the requirements for it. He also asked if they would be able to modify it later, given they will most likely have to have a medical director position.
  1. He noted that Montebello is creating some new programs, expanding some, and would like to explore more in the future. He thinks even if they submit this budget they can still come back to adjust or modify it.
- c. Ms. Montes asked board members to let her know if they need time to confer with their district staff during the discussion, but reminded them that they have finite time in the meeting so she would like to keep discussion moving forward.
  - i. She reminded the board members that the ELL Pathways Grant is a 3-year program, and the current item is only about year 1. Also, whatever formula they decide on does not lock in that formula for all future funding.
  - ii. She assumes that every district is requesting funding in good faith that will be needed for programs in year 1.
- d. Dr. Gallardo reiterated his agreement with Dr. Lancaster, and said that while they may change the allocation in the future, he is inclined now to say that they should have the same percentage allocation for the grant funding for each district that they do now for normal LARAEC funding.
- e. Ms. Neyra said she would choose option 4, funding for specific pathways.
  - i. She explained that that option is specifically about need, not legacy allocation, and that's where the consortium can help the most in terms of prioritizing need.
- f. Dr. Lancaster also would choose option 4 and to structure that regionally so there can be shared resources and shared marketing like curriculum developers. He added that it would be easier to adjust the budget with that kind of global approach to the pathways.

- g. Mr. Noguera suggested the Base+ option with a slight modification, taking the averages of previous fiscal year allocations from 2020 to 2022/2023 and averaging them. He believes this will give a better picture of what the students and districts need and reflect their current enrollment situation.
  - i. He added that they can still modify the allocation moving forward as Dr. Gallardo suggested. He also thought they can put certain areas like curriculum writing and marketing in a path for the whole consortium as a group.
- h. Ms. Montes thought that options 1, 2, and 3 didn't really reflect the plans that had been submitted, and liked option 4 and its pathway-specific funding, with the option to modify or amend their allocation later.
  - i. She thinks their current funding allocation formula makes sense, but thinks that the ELL Grant is different because it's a specific funding source for a specific purpose.
- i. Dr. Gallardo said, after listening to Dr. Lancaster's opinion, he thought the pathways allocation makes sense with a regional approach to share resources and assist member districts creating new programs.
- j. Mr. Noguera thought option 4 was still based on student needs, so would still make sense to him. He added that marketing and curriculum development are still where consortium collaboration can help by sharing resources and knowledge.
  - i. He also wanted to emphasize that they may be looking for more money in subsequent years based on their needs, which will be dictated by their growth.
- k. Ms. Montes asked to look into some of the shared costs of the pathways option.
  - i. She noted that there were no LARAEC office costs in the proposed pathways allocation, so they developed a list of possible collaborative items to look at before they look into trimming budgets anywhere.
  - ii. She offered to adjust the proposed pathways for Culver City and push off EMT and Pharmacy Tech pathways to next year or later. They would like to try implementing a Medical Billing program.
- l. Ms. Neyra thought it made sense for Marketing to be in one pot for the consortium. For curriculum, she said that is not something she is willing to give up considering LAUSD is going to be the one basically writing it for everyone.
- m. Dr. Lancaster explained that their curriculum process was different at LACCD. So regional advisory committee meetings and things like that are crucial to keep them included across the pathway model. Unfortunately they cannot just adopt curriculums that are out there because that is not the way their system works.
  - i. He thought he could move Physical Therapy and Sports Medicine programs immediately over to year 2, but they may have to do this process as they are writing the grant.
  - ii. They may give certain Year 2 programs a little bit of seed money to start curriculum work, but for now they will work on expansions because those are low-hanging fruit.

- n. Ms. Montes asked if any districts could see anything that they could remove from Year 1 or anything they can see as being a consortium-wide program or activity.
  - i. Dr. Gallardo that most member districts seem to be doing a phlebotomy or EMT program; at MUSD they have CNA and Home Health programs. But he thought that MUSD submitted a very modest budget proposal that is underestimating some costs, so they are already bare bones for this first year.
  - ii. He thinks the only way he could look at the pathways is to look at the differences in development and include the teachers in the writing, almost having the Action Planning Teams write curriculum for this proposal so that the nuances for each district are taken care of.
- o. Ms. Montes reiterated that they will not be doing curriculum centrally funded for year one, suggesting maybe they just do marketing centrally for year one. She noted that they were looking at shared curriculum development, project management, and marketing.
- p. Dr. Gallardo asked Dr. Stiehl and Mr. Gorence what their recommendation was, and how it would look if member districts shared resources in the development of things like phlebotomy and EMT programs.
  - i. Mr. Gorence said that the obvious areas would be shared marketing and shared curriculum as they are rolling out phlebotomy. Furthermore, the curriculum would be rooted in state requirements, so shared curriculum should be easy to do.
  - ii. Dr. Stiehl added that the other part is supporting the ELL learners; one of the approaches she's heard from LAUSD people is creating scaffolded activities to allow the phlebotomy curriculum to be more accessible. These could be shared to all member districts, and would not be the approved curriculum, but the supports they give to ELL students.
  - iii. Dr. Stiehl then discussed marketing, and how LARAEC has typically done limited marketing together since each district has their own marketing brand and campaigns. So they tend to focus on how teachers can market their classes.
    - 1. She noted that might be more specific to individual districts unless they want to creatively collaborate on district-wide marketing, which would require more time looking at what that looks like and what it means to member districts.
- q. Ms. Montes asked if they hired an ELL Pathways Project Avdisor as a consortium, if they would be able to go to each district and assist them in the area they need it, whether it's curriculum or marketing.
  - i. Dr. Stiehl noted that that would add to LARAEC staff work and take up bandwidth, but thought it would be great to have someone more versed in Allied health who could be the champion for that. She said LARAEC staff got very excited when they started to look at what a project manager or advisor could do for Allied health.

- ii. She said they also looked at managing the data collection that would have to be done for the grant and managing what will happen in year 2 and year 3. It would also be great to have someone who can lead efforts to start new classes/programs and provide guidance for what the checklist is when starting, for example, a CNA class.
- iii. Dr. Stiehl thought they could also potentially do it as a regional, consortium, or super consortium thing and bring different Allied Health teachers together for professional development, facilitated by a project manager. And the issue of how to hire those directors required for some pathways came up as well.
  - 1. She added that an expert at LAUSD described finding one as like finding a unicorn. Some can cover multiple pathways, others are specific to one pathway.
  - 2. Also each pathway is different on what it requires at the state level.
- r. Ms. Neyra agreed that an advisor would be helpful, but noted that they could not be hired through LAUSD, because that would add to the R2 and incur an additional fee for that person.
  - i. Ms. Montes added that the consortium level does not necessarily mean they have to be housed and hired through LAUSD; wherever they put shared costs as a consortium, they could sit with whatever district is willing to have them sit at that provides support to all districts.
  - ii. She also said that the proposal was for \$150,000 for a project helper/advisor. Ms. Neyra asked if that included fringes and benefits, which Ms. Montes confirmed.
  - iii. Ms. Neyra noted that they have to see how they can raise their wage, because that is the reason they are a unicorn and they will not want to work at LARAEC for less pay when they can earn more elsewhere.
  - iv. Ms. Montes added that this position would be someone well-versed in Allied Health, but not necessarily there to get programs started and going.
  - v. Ms. Neyra noted that they have to be an RN to push anything along, and Dr. Stiehl said that those two things are separate, with a project manager distinct from an Allied Health advisor.
- s. Ms. Montes asked if the board had thoughts on adding a pathway advisor, or if they wanted to concentrate on more central things.
  - i. Dr. Gallardo thought they needed to concentrate on making a decision on how they're going to submit the grant in a week, otherwise it will not matter how much they are discussing centralizing. If they are going to focus on trimming funding to be allocated, MUSD cannot take off much because they requested so little. And he does understand that they need to have year 2 and 3 in mind, because right after they submit they will have 6 months left before beginning Year 2 planning.
- t. Ms. Montes asked how everyone felt about not putting anything in a centralized pot for now.

- i. Dr. Lancaster said he was okay with that, and noted that what LACCD is aiming to do is focus on expansion areas because they are low-hanging fruit and they can move on those quickly to capitalize on them and increase enrollments.
- ii. Then, his thought is that LACCD will take every pathway that was going to be new and provide lower amount of funds for planning money for some kind of academic development grantee so they can start putting curriculum together; essentially, seed money knowing they will likely fund those new programs fully in year 2 and 3.
- iii. Ms. Neyra noted that it seems that the Community College district has a lot of different funding sources that the other LARAEC member districts cannot tap into. She asked how essential the ELL Pathways Grant funding is to the Community Colleges in getting these programs up and running. She noted that the K12 member districts cannot do it without the funding.
- iv. Ms. Montes noted that every district has different funding sources. She said that the board has agreed that whatever they say in this forum is for where they are with adult ed, and urged board members to be careful.
- v. Ms. Neyra was asking how essential this funding is, because K12 districts cannot do this to the level they want without it. She noted her question comes from conversations that she had with multiple people and from community colleges at the CAEP Summit, where she learned that they are doing their programs through other funding.
- vi. Dr. Lancaster explained that although their funding sources are different, LACCD will still not be able to expand out their programs or add additional programs without this funding.
- vii. Ms. Montes asked board members if they were okay with no shared costs. Ms. Neyra said yes.
  - 1. Mr. Noguera said that if they are not sharing costs, then BUSD will keep their funding requests at 220,000 without trimming because what they are asking for is very modest and they have the students and the needs to expand.
- u. Ms. Montes summarized that the board is agreeing to not take anything off of the top for the consortium. Adjusted for Culver City's program trimming, they are still 1.9 percent over budget for the pathways.
  - i. She asked how they were going to trim 1.9 million; MUSD and BUSD are already at only \$251,000 and \$220,000, and trimming would make that harder; CCUSD trimming again would give them another proportional hit.
  - ii. Dr. Gallardo noted they should consider how proportionate or non-proportional allocations are, and that they need to look if LAUSD is willing to move some of their programs to year 2. Ms. Neyra said she is willing to move but LACCD needs to move too. It was noted that LACCD had already offered to differ programs to Year 2.

- iii. Dr. Lancaster said that his team was crunching numbers and slashing, and suggested they take a break. Ms. Neyra said she had looked with her team and was waiting to hear back.
- iv. Ms. Montes suggested a 5 minute break. **The board decided to take a 5-minute break at 1:11PM.**
- v. **The board reconvened at 1:16PM.**
- vi. Dr. Lancaster explained that with some cuts and things moved around, they have lowered their total requested to 1.1 million even.
- vii. Ms. Montes volunteered to cut a coding or medical assistant program for Year 1 because CCUSD is in so much transition and she does not want to take money she cannot spend; in addition, they still do have some carryovers.
- viii. Ms. Neyra said that they can move the medical assisting program to year 2, and slash marketing, the CPR program, and one of their centers, and remove about \$895,000 from their total requested.
- ix. Dr. Stiehl and Mr. Gorence input the new totals, and found that they still had an overage of \$99,410.
- v. Ms. Montes exercised board president privilege and asked if LAUSD and LACCD could split the difference of the \$99,410. Ms. Neyra said that LAUSD had already given up \$100,000 more than LACCD.
  - i. Ms. Montes noted that the ask from LACCD was different, and Ms. Neyra said the needs are different too and that she was cutting a lot. Ms. Montes said that she is not trying to nickel and dime her, but noted that CCUSD had cut 75% of its ask. She recognized that they were small and just starting, which is why she did it.
  - ii. She asked if there was anything else that MUSD or BUSD saw as a possibility. Dr. Lancaster said that he can likely make the cuts to eliminate the overage, but he needs to meet with his 9 adult ed sites. He thought they can likely take a big chunk of the overage or possibly the whole thing, but he needs to make sure he is not obliterating things that were already paid for and that meeting cannot happen until Monday.
  - iii. Ms. Neyra thought that the spirit of the grant is having integrated pathways from K12 into the college, and that is why they should have more articulation agreements to strengthen the K12 districts so that the students the Colleges receive are stronger. And she cannot see the K12 districts doing that by cutting more from them.
  - iv. Dr. Lancaster reminded the board to understand that these programs are the same; they matriculate from their adult ed programs into credit programs as well. So they are looking at articulation into the credit programs, which the colleges also do. So they are all in the same boat.
  - v. Dr. Gallardo suggested, since multiple districts are introducing phlebotomy programs, perhaps if LACCD is unable to find things to cut to get rid of the remaining overage, the 3 districts doing phlebotomy can do something together to possibly cut off some of the overhead.
  - vi. In the interest of moving forward with a decision, Dr. Lancaster volunteered to pull the remaining overage out of



	<p>their total request, and said he would push activities to year 2 but will need to make up that funding in year 2. He will deal with that on Monday with the colleges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>w. Ms. Montes thanked Dr. Lancaster, and acknowledged that those are not easy decisions to make but she appreciated him engaging in the conversation. She noted that they now had a balanced budget and ran down the final total requests for each member district. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Dr. Gallardo motioned to approve the budget as Ms. Montes stipulated that is balanced with the grant. Mr. Noguera seconded.</li> <li>ii. The board voted unanimously to approve the budget.</li> </ul> </li> <li>x. Ms. Montes asked the board members to thank their teams for their work on this project, and said she knows it's still a tall lift for the LARAEC office and Point Persons to finish the application. But she is really excited that they actually are going to have this grant.</li> <li>y. Dr. Stiehl explained the next steps before submitting, and that would be reaching out to Point Persons for final details with a draft hopefully ready by the middle of next week.</li> </ul>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4</b> <b>Announcements</b></p>	<p><b>4.1 Next Regular Board Meeting: November 15, 2023 Location(s): Teleconferencing locations and Zoom</b></p>	<p>Ms. Montes</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>5</b> <b>Adjourn</b></p>	<p><b>Ms. Montes adjourned the meeting at 1:30 PM.</b></p>	<p>Ms. Montes</p>