

Los Angeles Regional Adult Education Consortium
Open Meeting
Burbank Unified School District
Board Room
1900 W. Olive Avenue, Burbank, CA 91506
Friday, April 15, 2016
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Minutes

Executive Committee Members in attendance: Emilio Urioste, Burbank USD
Veronica Montes, Culver City USD
Donna Brashear, Los Angeles USD
Marvin Martinez, Los Angeles CCD
Kathy Brendzal, Montebello USD

- I. Meeting was called to order by Emilio Urioste at 1:08 p.m. Mr. Urioste called roll and all Executive Committee members acknowledged their presence.
- II. Pledge of Allegiance was led by Kathy Brendzal.
- III. Mr. Urioste made a modification to the agenda. After *Public Comment*, item number 8 was added - an action item – *Distribution of additional Consortium Funding*. Number 9 became the Closing. He asked if any other changes were on the agenda. None were noted.
- IV. 2016-2017 Yearly Plan Overview.
Mr. Urioste introduced Lanzi Asturias, Project Manager, as the presenter of the Yearly Plan Overview. Mr. Asturias has worked with the Point Persons Team on this overview. (A copy of the LARAEC Activities power point is attached) Mr. Asturias stated he will be highlighting work that has been done up until now and he will be outlining how the Point Persons Team suggest the template we are about to complete for fiscal year 16-17 is completed and later more specific suggestions on what to include on that template. He also stated that the Consortium Fiscal Administration Declaration is due May 2 and he will introduce it later in his presentation.
 - a. Mr. Asturias discussed/explained each slide/topic. He stated that anything in blue ink represented active/in process activities: meetings and pilot programs.
 - b. Of the seven workgroups, ESL, CTE and Counseling are actively in progress through workgroup meetings. Pilot programs activity was also presented. (slides 2-8)
 - c. A Pilot Program Template draft has been created to report results from each one of the pilots to collect data, evaluate progress, and suggestions to analyze information. The purpose of the template is to collect data. Discussion regarding information on the template included: topics (description, expected benefits, criteria for success, timelines, and dates). It was asked if the draft would be distributed at a later time for a closer review. Ms. Brashear asked Mr. Asturias to email the template draft to the Executive Committee for review. (slide 9)
 - d. Yearly Plan: Language that is included in the plan is partial implementation; it means activity is in progress. Activity in black means it has not started and if it is not implemented by the end of the year, it needs to be removed from the yearly plan; it will be included in next year's plan. (slide 10)

- e. Regional Assessment Plan: The ESL workgroup is the only workgroup that will do a presentation at a future open meeting. Eventually all the other workgroups will be working on assessment integration and alignment. (slide 11)
- f. Student Tracking: We originally held off because we thought the State would take care of this; we found out they are not. We will revisit; we are waiting for clarification. (slide 12)
- g. Seamless Transition: all are currently in progress. (slide 13)
- h. Activities that Address Gaps: all gaps are being addressed by one of these items. All activities are identified by workgroups or pilot programs. (slide 14)
- i. Activities to Accelerate Student Learning: VESL pilot – a student can accomplish in one year where in the past it would take two to three years. (slide 15)
- j. Professional Development:
- k. Leverage Existing Structures: the creation of a resource guide for our students. This would include partnerships with outside organizations.
- l. Those are the highlights of activities. Any items not being implemented this year will be removed and moved to next year's plan.
- m. Consortium Fiscal Administration Declaration (CFAD): Due May 2. This is what we are proposing to do with your approval then we will proceed. This is the new governance allocation schedule for 16-17 plan. Most of it is the same as our former funding allocation and governance template. This is what we are proposing to do with your approval: Organizational Chart has minor changes. The changes have to do with the way the Executive Team and Executive Board are constituted. Summary of governance for LARAEC - one member one vote for non-monetary decisions. There were additional funds that were distributed to the consortia: \$870,855 (this is correct amount). We propose to use some of those funds for consortia operations, i.e., website issues and professional development. An individual accounting of those items will be provided as we get those activities approved. That leaves the amount of \$750,000 to be redistributed to the members of the consortia. \$120,855 is the amount suggested to be used for consortium operations.
- n. Timeline Due Dates: May 2 – CFAD; May 15 – Plan Amendments; June 20 – Budget Revisions; July 31 – Expenditure and Progress Report.
- o. One last item to note on the CFAD – item 6 (is not included in hand out) – this is where we report our progress and make estimates on what our performance is going to be next year. The State has informed us that we are not completing at this time. We will complete entire report except for that section. The decision has not been made yet on how to collect that information. Once that decision is made then the State will require us to report that information – August 1. May 2 is only the scheduled allocations and governance.
- p. Communications Plan of LARAEC: we proposed a monthly newsletter; you have suggested a quarterly newsletter. It will be sent out to all stakeholders. It was suggested it also be sent to Sacramento representatives. Any and all additional contact information please send to him to add to the newsletter list.

This concluded Mr. Asturias's presentation.

Mr. Urioste asked if there were any questions or comments regarding slides 1 -17. He commented on the fabulous work the ESL workgroup has done; very detailed, tremendous work.

Ms. Montes commented that her counselor from Culver City has expressed immense benefit to her professional practice in participating with everyone as a group.

- V. Additional LARAEC Consortia Funding (Redistributed Funds) - Discussion
- a. Emilio Urioste – where did this funding come from? Mr. Asturias - the State set aside for its own work for statewide activities with the consortia part of the 500 million. He believes they did not spend the bulk of that money so it was redistributed. Money also came from districts that opted out of belonging to a consortia and that money was given back to the State. Ms. Brashear gave an example of Palos Verdes School District and how they opted out of becoming part of LARAEC.
 - b. Donna Brashear asked for clarification of the proposal to use \$120,855 for consortia operations. Mr. Asturias – website design, development, maintenance, technical support, professional development. Given how quickly this has come about, no specific proposals have been done yet. We will come back to you with specific proposals for each one of the items.
 - c. Kathy Brendzal suggested a motion but it will come at the action item. She totally supports this proposal. It is a gift – they are many consortia activities that happen outside the members. I applaud this.
 - d. There was a discussion if the \$120,000 is enough.
 - e. Marvin Martinez - this will get us through year one. There is 25 million for data. The state is distributing 85% of that 25 million; that means 4 million to us for data collection. This gives us seed dollars to be able to figure out the operation; we can figure that this will be huge in 3 – 5 years.
 - f. Mr. Urioste – we are all in an evolving state. Money will be coming directly to the consortium for data. The consortia distributing that to its members – different than what we originally thought. Things change every day. We may see additional dollars; we will know better what the needs of the consortia in terms of documenting the business and the affairs of the consortium and better allocate additional dollars.
 - g. Kathy Brendzal – the fact that additional monies for data helps relieve the but we need to set aside additional money.
 - h. Lanzi Asturias reminded everyone that this information needs to be turned into the State by May 2.
- VI. Consortium Fiscal Administration Declaration (CFAD) – New Governance and Allocation Schedule: Due May 2, 2016.
- a. Mr. Asturias explained the computerized template the State has requested to receive the information. The information will have to be input on the template through a State website. The template is very similar to the Governance template in it adds to it the allocation schedule. The information for the first portion is the same as the previous template – that has not changed. It is in green; it is not public yet because it has not been approved by the consortium. Once it is approved by the consortium we can post it on the website. The green information will be input into the state system. (see handout)
 - b. Number 1 – Organizational Information; Number 2 – Reporting Period; Number 3 – 2015-16 Grant Number, this is automatically populated by website; Number 4 – Consortium Administration; Number 5 – Org Chart. Most telling change: the combination of the bubbles at the top one for the Executive board and one for the Executive team. Since the appointment of Ms. Donna Brashear as the representative for LAUSD, we were able to combine the two bubbles.
 - c. Consortium Membership – the table at the bottom of the page. It lists your names, phone numbers, emails, etc. the date you were approved by the Board, etc. There were concerns regarding Kathy Brendzal’s approval date. Ms. Brashear asked Mr.

Asturias to contact the AEBG office to check on this matter. He was also asked to check on Ms. Brashear's approval date.

- d. Fiscal Management - The consortium has chosen direct funding instead of a fiscal agent as a Funding Channel. A rationale is included.
- e. The Certifying Official/Coordinator – The name of the consortium's certifying official is Megan Reilly, LAUSD's Chief Financial Officer.
- f. Allocation Schedule – we are going to change the amounts in the table because of the proposal of the money for consortium operations. These are the recommendations from the Point Persons Team.
- g. The last page contains Additional Information and Supplementary Documentation items.
- h. Mr. Asturias asked if there were any questions.
- i. Marvin Martinez – can the Organizational Chart be changed throughout the year if needed. What is the process?
- j. Mr. Asturias – yes it can be changed provided there is agreement within the Executive Team; it be vetted in a public meeting.
- k. Mr. Urioste – discussion about the third bullet: Final decision-making by CONSENSUS (1 vote per each District) - this caused red flags and confusion by outside agencies. Should we consider making it more clearly in this organizational chart?
- l. After more discussion and input by Ms. Montes and Ms. Brashear and Mr. Asturias , everyone agreed to change the Organizational Chart to reflect the LARAEC Executive Board responsibilities as: 1. Identified as the representative; 2. Discuss, vet and deliberate multiple actions; and 3. Make final decisions.
- m. Mr. Urioste asked if all were in final agreement; all stated yes.

VII. Website: Maintenance Contract

- a. There was discussion about LARAEC website. Mr. Urioste stated that we are the largest consortium and are very much watched. It important that we have a website that is informative but also highlights what is going on.
- b. Ms. Brashear stated the current contract expired (Mr. Asturias confirmed it expired on December 31, 2016). The webmaster has been donating his time and energy since that time.
- c. Mr. Martinez asked if a contract, with the scope of services, come at the next meeting.
- d. Ms. Brashear – are we in agreement that we will move forward?
- e. Mr. Urioste asked if the vendor could attend the next meeting to answer questions. He also asked for feedback about the website.
- f. Ms. Brashear stated the website has met the needs of what we requested. It has the intranet where the workgroups in the future can talk together and put things up to work on it. Everything that we have asked for has been done. Unless any one has any suggestions, we can move forward on another contract. And what we want on that contract. The videos are posted; the minutes are posted. The webmaster is available at the last minute.
- g. Mr. Martinez - right now the primary function is to provide information. We can discuss and let the vendor know what we want. Do we want it to do more? We have evolved and what do we want to commit to.
- h. Ms. Brendzal - who gives the information to the webmaster?
- i. Ms. Montes – The Project Manager, Lanzi Asturias.

- j. Mr. Urioste – we have evolved and we are watched from Humboldt to Calexico and we need to highlight what are students are doing in our classes, in our programs. We need to make it more student centered.
- k. Mr. Asturias – plans from original development was to create a portal for students and a portal for teachers – tools, workgroup work. Student portal – distance learning components for each one of the Districts. The framework is there but is has not be implemented yet.
- l. Mr. Martinez – is it possible for the Point Person Team to meet with the vendor to identify the scope of services. Bring it back to us with a price on it.
- m. Ms. Brendzal – better organizational step; vet it out with him first.
- n. Ms. Montes – Point Person Team meet with him before next meeting and bring proposal.
- o. Mr. Asturias will have the Point Person Team meet with him and bring him to the next meeting.
- p. It was discussed to rotate the student stories since they are difficult to collect.

VII. Public Comment

Mr. Urioste introduced Burbank Unified School District’s Superintendent, Matt Hill. Mr. Hill recognized and thanked the consortium for all the time, energy and flexibility of us working together on that we have that shared common goal.

IX. ACTION Item on Distribution of Funds

- a. Veronica Montes: I move to distribute the \$870,855 dollars of additional LARAEC funds according to the following: allocate \$120,855 for consortia operations and the remaining \$750,000 allocated to the agencies based on the distribution percentages approved at our February 19th open meeting. Marvin Martinez seconded the motion.
- b. Discussion: Should the amount be upped to \$200,000. When does it have to be spent? It will be easier, if not spent, to allocate back to the members instead of trying to get more if it is not enough. We are making a decision on a point of no information. Can we have an additional week to decide? Should we have a motion; we should not motion since we don’t have information. It was proposed to support this motion unless we can get an additional week. Cannot do; it is a hard deadline. It still needs to be determined where the money will go. Bank account in the sky; what agency would get agreed.
- c. Mr. Urioste - we can vote no and then amend the motion.
- d. It was stated that Ms. Montes can amend her own motion and the second has to agree to the amendment.
- e. Veronica Montes amended her motion: I move to distribute the \$870,855 additional LARAEC funds according to the following: Set aside \$120,855 for consortia operations placed in LAUSD and the remaining \$750,000 allocated to the agencies based on the distribution percentages approved at our Feb 19th open public meeting. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion.
- f. Mr. Urioste asked if there were any questions. Ms. Brendzal asked if there was any more discussion.
- g. Mr. Urioste: All those in favor of the motion as presented and seconded signify by saying “I”. All stated “I”. Opposed? None.
- h. Mr. Urioste: We have consensus so that is what we will do. \$120,855 will be held by LAUSD for that purpose.

- i. Mr. Urioste: with that we have the close of our meeting. Thank you to those that have attended the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 2:29 pm.