

Los Angeles Regional Adult Education Consortium Open Meeting
Open Meeting
Van de Kamp Innovation Center, 2930 Fletcher Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90065
Friday, December 8, 2017 2:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Executive Committee in attendance: Emilio Urioste, BUSD
Veronica Montes, CCUSD
Robert Miller, LACCD
Joseph Stark, LAUSD
Dan Garcia, MUSD

Project Manager: Lanzi Asturias

I. Opening

- a. Called to order at 2:36 PM by Lanzi Asturias.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

III. Minutes Approval: September 29, 2017

- a. Mr. Stark motioned to approve, Mr. Urioste seconded.
- b. Board voted unanimously in favor of approval

IV. Consortium Updates:

- a. LARAEC Data and Accountability Plan
 1. Mr. Asturias gave some background on the Data and Accountability Plan which began in 2015-2016 with \$25 million which was appropriated by the State's AG *[phonetic]* office for consortiums to develop Data and Accountability systems. In that same school year 2015-2016, the AG office appropriated an amount of money to all consortia. LARAEC received \$870,855 dollars at that time. Mr. Asturias then referred to a slide showing the money as allocated in the 2016-2017 school year.
 2. LARAEC waited for the state to provide guidance on how to proceed, but the guidance only came in the last few months. With that also came the additional distribution with the allocation that the consortium received equivalent to \$4,680,853, seen as the "grand total" on the slide.
 3. The second amount that was distributed to member districts was \$2,549,998 dollars, and the first column of the slide referred to by Mr. Asturias.
 4. Those two amounts, the \$870,000 along with the \$2,549,998, in addition to the amount that was set aside for a Common Data system and request for proposals make up the 4.6 million. Mr. Asturias explained that the amount allocated for the CDS and request for proposals is incorrect on the slide, it should be \$1,260,000.
 - A. The amounts are supposed to be spent according to the plan submitted to the state. In the plan, the consortium indicated the majority of the spending would be allocated to two main elements. The first was for the training for the employees of the consortium on data and accountability issues.
 - B. The second was the acquisition of equipment to help students input information on the system to facilitate the collection of data and accountability items.
 4. Mr. Asturias explained that the common data system was one of the biggest part of the three year plan. Mr. Stark said that LAUSD will recuse itself from the next item on the agenda, and requested someone let him know when it's finished and he'll come back.
- b. LARAEC Common Data System Request for Proposal
 1. Mr. Asturias introduced a brief update: on November 6, 2017 the consortium through Burbank Unified SD released a request for proposal for development of a common data system for LARAEC. On November 17, that request for proposal was cancelled and at

the same time the LAUSD recused itself from the process of releasing request for proposal for a common system for data and accountability for the consortium. The consortium may continue to pursue their release for a request for proposal.

2. Ms. Montes had a question: she thought when the money went out to the field for a common data system (because originally the state was going to develop a system). Then the state pushed it out to the field. But now the state is asking everybody to use CASAS and the consortium's districts all have their own student info system. Ms. Montes asked if the common data system was still a necessary item, still something LARAEC should continue to pursue?
3. To follow on with that, Dr. Miller asked why LAUSD was recusing itself and not participating. Mr. Asturias said he would let the LAUSD executive director answer that and someone was dispatched to retrieve Mr. Stark.
 - A. Mr. Miller then clarified if the state was actually going to create a common data system. Mr. Urioste referred to a document released in August of 2017 titled "Measuring our Success" where the state indicated two programs that could be used in that role: TopsPro Enterprise TE and then for the community college district, MIS.
4. Dr. Miller asked again Mr. Stark why LAUSD recused itself. Mr. Stark explained that they were implementing a new student data system and that whatever contractor they end up with might also be bidding on the contract for the common data system for LARAEC, so recusing was to prevent a conflict of interest. LAUSD would be in favor of a common system at a certain point in time, just at this time they couldn't participate during the implementation and roll-out of their new system.
5. Mr. Stark asked given the size and scope of LA Unified and given the significant participation LAUSD has in the consortium, isn't it incumbent on them to wait until LAUSD picks its SIS vendor to make sure that what LARAEC comes up with will be compatible? Because if they buy a product and it ends up not being compatible with LAUSD's system, it'll cause issues.
 - A. Mr. Urioste read again from the publication "Measuring our Success" for the benefit of Adrienne Ann Mullen, talking about two Student Information Systems used by the various districts, TopsPro for K-12 and adult ed, and MIS (Management Information Systems) used by community colleges.
 - B. Adrian Ann Mullen explained that community college systems would be measured by TopsPro along with K-12 for 2017-2018. The community colleges would be measured using MIS in the 2018-2019 school year and going forward.
6. Ms. Montes reiterated her previous question of whether they need a common data system. Dr. Miller also asked that if they're all functioning as they need to with regards to reporting to the state and the feds, why do they need another data system on top of their individual systems?
7. Mr. Asturias talked about how the initial thought behind the Common Data system was that none of the existing systems provided means to track and provide information on students in the entire region. At present, TopsPro Enterprise TE wasn't able to be used to track students transitioning between programs/districts. Another component of the system was to develop a unique identifier for each student so that it would be easier for member districts and the community college to track students moving through the area and through career paths.
8. Mr. Stark said that he thought they were talking about two different things, that they weren't looking for a system above their existing layer of systems, but rather integration among the systems so whatever system LA or Culver City had, there would be a possibility or a way to integrate that student data into the college system so there wouldn't be a need to collect all-new data as if people are starting from scratch. The intent of pursuing a common data system was for streamlining as students are moving across various systems. Need to emphasize integration, not redundancy or adding additional layers.

7. Dr. Miller again said that they should defer pursuing a common data system until LAUSD finds their system so they can create one reporting system that satisfies the needs of the state.
 8. Ms. Montes asked about the timeline connected to the money they got for data and accountability. Mr. Asturias explained that the funds were 15/16 funds and they were supposed to expire on December 31 of this year, but the state released a letter that their instructions to the consortium were late, so they extended the deadline until 2018.
 - A. Ms. Montes said it was an issue they can discuss, but asked how they would eventually integrate LAUSD, because four districts use TopsPro, but other districts use MIS.
- c. LARAEC Office Staffing Request
1. Mr. Asturias provided background on the staffing request: from the onset of the consortium, they've talked about adding additional staff as needed to carry out the duties of the consortium. The original application left it to the project director to define the needs of the additional staff to implement the regional comprehensive plan.
 2. As of last open meeting, the executive team approved the hiring of four individuals for the LARAEC office in the positions that were to integrate or compose this office where the project director, Mr. Asturias, and two teacher advisors, a fiscal analyst and someone to assist with clerical tasks of the consortium.
 3. One of the things that they've done to justify the request for additional staff is to look at some of the consortia that are already out there in other counties within California and look at what their staffing composition is.
 - A. Basically Mr. Asturias did a survey of consortia websites and ascertained that Mount San Antonio, which is a \$33 million dollar consortia, has three members in staff and is the second-biggest consortium next to LARAEC. He did not
 - B. South Bay, which is San Jose, a \$16 million consortium, has two employees. State Center, a \$14 million consortium, has eight employees, a number of which are navigators. Contra Costa, a \$14 million consortium, has seven employees. Capital was the most specific, an \$11 million consortia and they had four employees: program director, coordinator, project specialist to assist in financial matters, and an administrative assistant.
 4. The request that LARAEC made for the staffing of the consortium was for four positions with a budget for \$660,000. He emphasized that he did not interview any members of the consortiums he researched, he just looked on the websites for each consortium.
 5. Ms. Montes asked which agencies the consortiums were funded through, whether just one agency or multiple agencies. Mr. Asturias replied that the website didn't indicate that, but in his conversations with consortium directors he knows, those are funds taken off the top of the consortium allocations and routed to specific districts that would employ the individuals.
 6. Mr. Stark said it would be helpful that given the LAUSD is the fiscal agent for the project director position, some clarity was needed among board members because those agencies might have to become fiscal agents of the other positions. LAUSD was going to become the fiscal agent for the other positions, but if it wasn't clear, other board members need to be brought up to speed. Mr. Asturias said that last meeting it was established that the positions would be housed at LARAEC.
 7. Ms. Montes raised the concern that Mr. Stark recusing himself from the data plan discussion meant that all of LAUSD was recused from the conversation, and so if a situation similar to the potential conflict of interest with LAUSD's data plan contractor happens again, everybody else is going to be left behind. Should LARAEC consider possibly running the employment of the other positions through several agencies so that the support those positions provide is still there for other districts or at least bring the conversation back to the table given some of these new situations. She asked Dr. Miller to help her formulate the question.
 8. Dr. Miller asked if they were talking about the specific location of the people, and Ms. Montes clarified that they were talking about which agency pays them. Dr. Miller talked

about how they had someone who was still on the books of the Pasadena Area Community College District despite LACCD currently being the fiscal agent and location for them. So they were under the understanding that LAUSD could hire the positions, then place them where they need to be placed.

- A. Ms. Montes clarified that her concern was, if they're funded 100 percent by one district and that district has to recuse itself from some issue, therefore recusing all members of its agency, the rest of the programs would be left without that kind of support in getting through a particular issue. How do we make sure that that doesn't happen? Can we fund them out of different agencies and put them in another location?
9. Dr. Miller suggested doing a what-if: what if the positions were hired by LAUSD but they were housed at Culver City. LAUSD has a forced reduction in staff and bumping goes into effect. Now they can ask Culver City to hire the individual while still paying money to Culver City to fund that individual.
10. Mr. Urioste raised another consideration, the size of this consortium. He acknowledged that Mr. Asturias has done great work, but his question is when we consider agencies that are nowhere near LAUSD/consortium's size, should we consider adding another position to the planned four?
- A. Dr. Miller said that's another topic because they adopted the budget for these positions, he believes they should move forward with these positions but consider additional staffing as needed to keep consortium running smoothly.
11. Mr. Stark agreed, depending on what district is housing them they'll have to conform to the individual policies of a district, so situations could arise involving the particulars of any one district. To alleviate that concern, look at possibility of being very clear about defining the responsibilities of a position and to what degree are other districts able to step up and be the fiscal agent for other positions that may be necessary.
- A. Mr. Garcia said it would be a very viable option for Montebello to look into something like that.
12. Ms. Montes requested that not all positions come from one district, at least look at the possibility so that if a district is affected by an issue, the impact doesn't hamper all support positions. When they talked about it initially to have positions posted at LAUSD, it was a logistics issue, but she wanted to make sure that they didn't consider logistics over support.
- A. Mr. Asturias asserted that the only two positions that would be posted were the teaching advisors.
- B. Mr. Garcia interjected that they could table those two positions and see if another district in the consortium could be the fiscal agent for those positions.
13. Mr. Stark said that they need to give clear instruction to the staff, which they aren't doing yet, and proposed having point persons for districts tasked with coming up with a plan based on what they share today and provide that as a recommendation for the next open meeting as an action item for the board to take action on.
- A. Dr. Miller thought it was a very sensible approach, and since they're personnel issues, should be discussed in a closed session first.
14. Mr. Asturias wanted to make sure he understood what they were talking about: is there agreement about Mr. Garcia's proposal for the two positions currently frozen – fiscal analyst and clerk. Mr. Garcia is fine with Montebello taking on those two.
15. Dr. Miller asked if it's soft money and not LAUSD money, why are the two positions frozen? There's no hiring at LAUSD at the moment, no matter the source of the funding? Mr. Asturias explained that all positions have to go through consideration by a freeze committee. They had some additional requirements to comply with for the fiscal analyst and clerk.
- A. Dr. Miller asked how long the process would take, and Mr. Asturias said they had provided the necessary information and are waiting for a response.

- B. Dr. Miller said that because of LAUSD and LACCD's personal commission structure they shouldn't have positions go through them and should fund the positions through Burbank or Culver City because they don't have personal commissions and there's less red tape.
 - C. Ms. Montes agreed with Mr. Stark's point that they should bring it to discussion because it's not an action item.
16. Dr. Miller asked when the next meeting was, and Mr. Asturias said it was tentatively scheduled for January 19, 2018. Mr. Asturias explained that the board has a lot of tasks to accomplish, including planning a conference, so the longer they wait, the more difficult it will be.
 17. Dr. Miller asked if they had already been funded, does putting them through Burbank and Culver City have to be an action item?
 - A. Mr. Stark said that clarity and transparency on the part of the board are needed, because of the understanding that some issues would be run through LAUSD, which set certain things in motion. If there's going to be a change in that arrangement, it should be a board action. Given the timeline, if the board feels they should have a meeting before January, that's fine.
 18. Mr. Urioste's concern and where he would be willing to have conversations about it is with regards to their operation as the largest consortium in the state, and would be up for looking into additional staff or positions. Given the budget of LARAEC and the work it has before it, he would hope they could use another staff member there, and they should think about their geographic location as well.
 19. Mr. Asturias confirmed that the two teacher positions were ready to fly through LAUSD. Ms. Montes asked if LAUSD continues to hire them, if they consider the possibility of additional staff potentially outside of LAUSD, could they move forward on the two teacher advisors with LAUSD?
 - A. Dr. Miller confirmed and said he was just trying to expedite the two positions, and agreed with Mr. Urioste that they had a lot of work to do and technology to perfect.
 20. Mr. Asturias recapped for clarity's sake: going along with a decision already made by the board, they were good to proceed with the two teacher positions already cleared by the freeze committee. The point person team would be tasked to come up with a proposal for the board about the other positions and possible additional positions so the board could evaluate it in the January 19 meeting.
 - A. Ms. Montes reiterated her worry that if every position is funded through LAUSD and something else happens, they'll be without support.
 - B. Mr. Stark said that he understood the concern and that they're trying to address it moving forward. Situations can occur in any district unforeseen, and it sounds like the other districts would like to augment that support with additional positions, maybe with a project manager or new point person in other districts.
 - C. Dr. Miller added a hypothetical situation: if Bob Miller was hired by LAUSD to work for LARAEC and he got bumped, presumably one of the other LARAEC partners could pick up that position and rehire him to work for another district, which would be a way around instances like the LAUSD one.
 - D. Mr. Stark said that they were only talking about a few solutions, there are others as well. For instance, if people thought LARAEC needed to contract with an outside agency to provide this support, or form a JPA. Could be that LARAEC needs to take a fresh look at which option will best meet their needs.
 21. Mr. Asturias clarified that they were free to proceed with the two teacher advisor positions and asked for any additional comment. There was none.

V. Montebello USD State Audit

- a. Recommendations for LARAEC
 1. Mr. Garcia addressed the board that the state audit findings had come back and were posted on the state auditor's website and the MUSD website. The findings were for MUSD and for their adult programs. Recommendations from state auditor for issues

with MUSD's adult education have come, and the Montebello board is dialoguing on how to address those as quickly as possible. They are also drafting a letter response due January 2 to what the auditor has proposed. Montebello has been very actively working with all board members and thanks them for their help in trying to be as transparent as possible and progressively move forward as quickly as possible.

2. Ms. Montes stated that she wanted to publicly thank Mr. Garcia for his candor, transparency, and forthcoming-ness in looking at all of this, and that they are very fortunate to have him as part of the executive board. They have his back.

VI. Public Comment

- a. Mr. Asturias said they had a request if it please the board, for a member of the public to speak, as a Culver City community member and as LAUSD personnel.
- b. Ms. Laura Chardiet was introduced and said that maybe Adrienne Ann would want to back her up on this. She said that when she first heard that the LARAEC board had to follow the Brown Act rules, she felt bad for them because it adds a layer of complication that affects how they do business. but she said that it didn't look like they were following the Brown Act rules yet, and hoped they would get training for that. One example was that no reporting came out of the closed session, no agenda was released for the closed session, and there were sidebars that no one outside the board was privy to. Everything has to be public.
 1. She said that moving forward since it's such a large budget to deal with, more people will be interested in what the board is discussing and who's making what decisions. Also, public comment should come earlier for action items before they actually voted, so the public could be heard on those issues.
 2. The other issue was the additional LARAEC staff: having the additional work around the Brown Act makes it imperative that they have additional staff. She described Mr. Asturias as being like a duck: calm on the surface, but paddling very hard underneath in that he has to come begging to central office for people to support LARAEC work and is putting in a lot of frenzied work to ensure the smooth running of LARAEC.
- c. Mr. Asturias thanked her, and Dr. Miller asked that staff be trained as quickly as possible on the Brown Act requirements as far as posting proper agendas and the like. He said it just says to him that they need to get Mr. Asturias the support he needs as soon as possible, so the board should move forward on it ASAP to get their house in order.

VII. Closing Comments

- a. Mr. Asturias thanked Dr. Miller and asked if any other Exec Board members would like to comment and gave a quick shout-out to the LARAEC conference coming up. It's coming up on March 10 and Mr. Asturias displayed graphics related to it on screen and said that now that the graphics and theme are finalized, there would be a lot of material and media released about it. With that, he said that the next meeting would be tentatively scheduled for January 19th, 2018.
- b. Dr. Miller said that as they were going forward in a more formal way, they should arrange the tables in a U shape so the board members could see each other, Mr. Asturias should have a seat with them, and the podium and power point should be placed for maximum visibility for all participants. He noticed that the minutes were actually a verbatim transcript of the previous meeting, and said the minutes should instead be action-oriented with action items. Mr. Asturias duly noted his recommendations and would try to implement them by the next meeting.
- c. Mr. Urioste asked if the next meeting would be at the current meeting's location. Mr. Asturias confirmed that the location was also tentative.

VIII. Next Open Meeting tentatively scheduled for January 19th, 2018. Tentative location is the Van de Kamp Innovation Center, 2930 Fletcher Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90065.

IX. Meeting was adjourned at 3:40 PM