

**Los Angeles Regional Adult Education Consortium  
Special Meeting**

**Los Angeles Unified School District  
333 S. Beaudry Ave., Board Room  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Friday, October 23, 2015  
3:30 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.**

**Minutes**

**Executive Committee Members in attendance: Emilio Urioste, Burbank USD  
Veronica Montes, Culver City USD  
Michael Romero, Los Angeles USD  
Larry Frank, Los Angeles CCD  
Kathy Brendzal, Montebello USD**

- I. Meeting was called to order by Michael Romero at 3:35 p.m.**
- II. Pledge of Allegiance**
  - Self – introductions of LAREC Board Members were made to audience.
  - Mr. Romero recognized Dr. Thelma Melendez, LAUSD and Matthew Kogan, UTLA in audience as interested parties to proceedings.
  - Veronica Montes recognized Laura Chardiet, CCUSD Board Member in attendance.
  - Mr. Romero acknowledged Lanzi Asturias and Darlene Neilsen for assisting in meeting.
- III. Public Comment**
  - a. Matthew Kogan, UTLA Representative and ESL teacher – The purpose of today’s meeting is Governance and Funding. It is important at this juncture that there is collaboration. This is not a contest – should not be interested in winning or beating out others. We all serve one community and need to develop trust with other members of this board. With this support from Sacramento, we have opportunity to build and grow. Many are concerned about the previous cuts that were vicious and deep. Because of those cuts, many in community were left out on street as schools had no room for them. Let’s not ignore the most vulnerable. They need Adult Ed. This funding is as opportunity to restore some of the cuts made previously and to give our students and communities the education/training they deserve.**
  - b. Sergio Hernandez, UTLA Representative and CTE teacher – Today’s agenda is about moving forward – about building/working together to be better. Our adult students need the resources this consortium funding will provide. As a region we can work together. But we all need to seek the common good. My concerns/questions are: ‘Where is the leadership? Where is industry? Are the teachers’ voices being heard?’ There is a need for those people to be represented on a steering committee so we can move forward and engage the right way.**
  - c. Laura Chardiet, Culver City School Board Member – When process began, there was concern on Culver City’s part about joining such a large consortium. Culver City is a small district and did not want to be left out of decisions. A weighted vote would do just that. There needs to be a 1 district/1 vote governance structure. That way all members will have an equal voice/vote whether large or small. This will recognize the energy and planning by all that has gone into this and value all members’ experience and expertise.**

- d. John Mears, West Valley OC/member of Assembly member Patty Lopez' Adult Ed Task Force – Came to speak of unmet needs in the LAUSD community. In August, 550 people showed up at WVOC for 60 ESL openings. The next day, 500 people came back – some as early as 4:00AM to try to get one of the few seats left. There was a line around the building. We do not have the money to operate in a way to support the needs of the community. These students are desperate for the services, education and training we can provide if given adequate resources to do so. All of us are doing important things but K-12 Adult Ed should not be treated as a step-child or be relegated to a lower status than other educational avenues. K-12 Adult Ed needs the support and respect of other educational avenues.

IV. Action Items

a. Governance Structure

1. A motion was made by Burbank USD that as a component of LARAEC's governance structure in all voting on action items and matters of importance which may require a vote, that each member of LARAEC will have one vote to represent their district. All voting matters to be decided by a 1 agency/1 vote method. Culver City seconded the motion.
2. LACCD proposed a second motion for governance structure that all decisions to be made by consensus.

Discussion on Burbank's motion:

- Culver City USD stated that at the Oct 16 meeting when various voting options were presented, first and foremost we should reach a consensus. If consensus could not be reached then the 1vote/1 agency method would be used. This recognizes each district's expertise and contribution and places equal value on each member.
- LACCD stated that up to now consensus has been used successfully – but we need to make complex decisions and reach agreement and for that we need a governance structure.
- CCUSD – What alternative do you propose when there is an impasse? In the initial implementation plan, the consensus model was used but we need something else as critical items continue to be put off. This prevents services from being offered to our students.
- LACCD – Legislation needs to give us direction. Governance structure comes up today but how the \$28m is apportioned today could very well lead to the money allocated for next year. LAUSD could face layoffs. At the moment, we need to ask how do we build out our partnership? Deeper level to conversation is needed before we sign off on proposal sent from Sacramento. There are a number of things today that are unanswered and it would be premature for us to try to do so.
- CCUSD – What part of 1 agency/1 vote is a problem?
- LACCD – That governance structure of full partnership with CCD is not possible with it.
- LAUSD – There are 71 consortia in state; 70 of them have 1 CCD and several/many K-12 districts; 6 plans are posted on AEBG website; 5 of the 6 have already agreed to 1 vote/1 agency method.
- LACCD – Which means 65 are still struggling; many other CCDs feel the same as LACCD. We are not alone in our exception to this. Goal of governance structure is to be full partners. This method would not allow that to be implemented.

- CCUSD – You asked about any other time a decision was made without full consensus. An example of 1 agency/1 vote was the decision for Project Manager - it was a majority rule. I myself voted for it and LAUSD voted against but we went with majority rule. Precedent has been set for this.
  - Montebello USD – Consensus is the way to go but a voting structure is needed in case consensus cannot be reached on an issue. 5 members/5 votes will recognize and acknowledge the value and importance of each member. Difficult decisions cannot be reached by consensus only.
  - Burbank USD recognizes that LAREC has been operating by consensus but it is foolish to think that this can continue as difficult decisions need to be made. A stalemate will result and it is the students in our areas that will suffer.
3. Mr. Romero called for second to LACCD's motion. No second was made. Motion failed.
  4. Lanzi Asturias called role for vote on original motion by Burbank USD:
    - Burbank USD                    Yes
    - Culver City USD                Yes
    - Los Angeles CCD                No
    - Los Angeles USD                Yes
    - Montebello USD                Yes
  5. Motion for governance structure passes.
    - LACCD registers an objection that the motion passes under a governance structure that does not exist.

**b. Funding Distribution**

1. Mr. Romero asked each agency to review their proposed model for funding distribution:
  - Burbank USD – three points: 1) Provide opportunity to develop and implement new programs and services that are responsive to local needs and aligned to RCP; 2) Close any gaps in programs or services which are in demand; 3) allows for innovation and creativity without duplication of services.
  - Culver City USD– five assumptions: 1) All agencies committed to using funds to support collaboration time for alignment, articulation and seamless transition between agencies; 2) Each agency has valid and documented needs; 3) Each agency will utilize the funds in accordance with the plan and AB104 legislation; 4) There is not enough money to meet all needs; 5) This proposal is for 15-16 AEBG Block Grant Consortia Funding only. Not intended for future allocations.
  - Los Angeles CCD – Acknowledges that they have some other money related to apportionment. We are serving same families as students. We need to reach out to real immigrant population. LACCD wants to step up and be full partner. The % shown on funding model represent the amount LACCD needs to invest to be full a partner. LACCD is a big ship and it takes a lot to move in a new direction. There is need for a large amount of professional development; release time for instructors to articulate curriculum. This comes with a price and it will take resources to make internal changes in such a large organization. To be a full partner, it will take money. Allocation decision today may be what comes in future. Sacramento needs to provide clarification.

We all need to be signed off and commit to work together in 15/16. MOE conceptualized for next year? Need to figure out if MOE may be needed if we have less money next year. It appears we have a 4 to 1 conversation.

- Montebello USD – Federal/State looking to us to have a model on work preparation. Our funding model acknowledges the needs of each district and is based on Table 4. It will allow each member to carry out their LARAEC plan with innovation/CTE/technology and teacher preparation. Montebello sees us in a partnership working for betterment of LA area. People expect LA to be dysfunctional, but we can come to consensus and accomplish many things without losing our identity as individual agencies. Certainly there are concerns about future years to come. K-12 has important position in our communities and our programs have close contact with them.
- Los Angeles USD – This model is slightly different. We used WIOA formula as starting point with performance based measures being critical. We reflected on the plan – Table 4 which identified needs we have without knowing allocation. We listened to public comment, stakeholders and colleagues. We believe this is a fair and equitable for all adult learners in LA region.

2. Mr. Romero called for discussion on selection on one of the funding proposals. Culver City USD asked for opportunity to provide clarity on CCUSD proposal. They looked at amount needed for PD, articulation, alignment and came up with \$575,000 per each of 9 community college campuses and 1 central office. Surely that is enough to accomplish task at hand and close gaps by working together at sub-regional level.

- Burbank USD motioned for LARAEC to accept Burbank’s model for distribution of LARAEC Block Grant funds. Montebello seconded.
- Lanzi Asturias called for vote:
  - Burbank Yes
  - Culver City Yes
  - LACCD protest/no governance structure in place
  - LAUSD Yes
  - Montebello No

Motion passes

- Culver City was confused because Montebello seconded the proposal which would indicate support and then voted against it. Montebello stated that it was not their intent to support so their second was withdrawn. LAUSD then seconded the motion.
- Lanzi Asturias called for re-vote on Burbank funding model:
  - Burbank Yes
  - Culver City No
  - LACCD protest/no governance structure in place
  - LAUSD Yes
  - Montebello No

Motion does not pass

- Culver City USD proposes the Culver City model as funding model. Montebello seconds.
  - a. Romero asked for amendment to change in funding \$

- i. LAUSD \$18,287,759
- ii. LACCD \$5,500,000
- iii. Montebello \$3,150,000

**Burbank USD seconds**

- **Lanzi Asturias called for vote on amendment:**
  - Burbank Yes
  - Culver City No
  - LACCD protest/no governance structure in place
  - LAUSD Yes
  - Montebello No

**Amendment fails to pass**

- **Romero asks for a second proposal adopting LAUSD model/no second**
- **Vote goes back to original Culver City funding model**
  - Burbank Yes
  - Culver City Yes
  - LACCD protest/no governance structure in place
  - LAUSD No
  - Montebello Yes

**Motion passes – Culver City Funding Model adopted**

**Next meeting scheduled for November 20, 2015. Time and location to be announced.**

**V. Meeting adjourned by Mr. Romero at 4:50 p.m.**