



LARAEC Executive Board

Minutes- Special Meeting - Workshop

Saturday, February 9, 2019

8:30 AM – 12:40 PM

Van De Kamp Innovation Center
2930 Fletcher Drive, LA 90065

Executive Board Members in		Point Person Team Members		Staff	
Emilio Urioste, Burbank USD	x	Yanira Chavez, BUSD		Lanzi Asturias, Project Director	x
Veronica Montes, Culver City USD	x	Elvis Carias, CCUSD	x	Michele Stiehl, Advisor	x
Dr. Robert Miller, LACCD	x	Dr. Adrienne Ann Mullen, LACCD	x	Justin Gorence, Advisor	x
Joseph Stark, Los Angeles USD	x	Men Le, LAUSD	x	Grace Ocampo, Budget Analyst	x
Alice Jacquez, Montebello USD	x	Philip Tenorio, MUSD	x	Vacant, Secretary	

	Agenda Item
1 Call to Order	8:40 AM
2 Public Comment	N/A
3. Agenda Items	1. Welcome 2. PPT Presentation 3. Funding Discussion
	A. District Considerations B. Funding Criteria Perspective C. Timeline for New Formula D. Request for Additional Information
	4. Next Steps 5. Next Meeting/Adjourn

A. District Considerations:

A. **Ms. Veronica Monte (Culver City USD)**- provided the ground rules of the meeting. Discussed communication norms. Montes invited each representative from the respective districts to provide input.

Dr. Adrienne Ann Mullen (LACCD)- Stated she struggled to devise a formula as to how to think as a consortium. Her goal was to come up with a philosophy. The focus was to look at three areas:

- 1) Base plus X;
- 2) Accountability Measures; and
- 3) Adjustment data

She reported a number of scenarios and said the importance is to work through this process.

Dr. Mullen showed a power point presentation. (see notes from ppt)

Dr. Robert Miller - shared they we have our faculty, presidents, board and chancellor buy-in to support to build capacity as well as faculty development, until LARAEC Model came about. We are working to build consensus. Now, LAACD is leading legislation to get more adult education faculty. He stated colleges are very different than K-12. Based on shared government it's a primacy on 10 + 1 curriculum. Everything is a lengthy discussion on curriculum related issues. There is no top down authoritative model to run a college. In our case, we don't have one Queen Mary, we have 12; 10 if you include district office. But, the tide is shifting and we are beginning to turn all nine of these in a successful direction. We are making progress. On top of all this, is the student-centered funded formula education. First launched this year. Governor Brown finalized appointment of SCFS Oversight Committee comprised of four representatives: four appointed by the State Assembly and four represented by the State Senate. These individuals are a diverse group of people. One is a president. One is an outside person involved in the community college world, another is a person serving the underrepresented population; and the final person is a faculty member. Dr. Miller believes it will be at least two years before anything significant will come from these discussions as far as it relates to the changes in the formula. They slowed the formula down for a year. They decreased the amount of money allocated for performance. It was left at 10% level because they recognized the definition of performance and the quality of data they got from colleges up and the state down was somewhat suspect in many respects. Everybody is learning how to appropriately create a matrix for all of these. Vice Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness Ryan Corner and myself are working diligently and actively in the adult education arena. We are ensuring every dollar spent is going towards the students. My concern has been for innovation and in the counseling area. I am pleased to say that every dollar that we get is going toward that end. In the past we didn't have the support that I wanted to see; however the tide has turned. Now all seven permanent presidents and the two interim presidents are very supportive. Yet, from a fiscal and auditing point of view, we are tracking ADP dollars very closely. Those dollars are being spent toward service delivery and student growth perspective. Education continues to be a major growth opportunity in our district. 86% (constitutes as 240-250 thousand) of our students are classified as first innovation, underrepresented, low income. Close to 60% of the students are below the poverty level. Students who attend LAACD are among the needest in the nation by far. We understand the importance of our job.

Joe Stark (LAUSD)– voiced a concern about it being a very large district. A point of pride is the quality of our program is the best you will find. He believes it's important to spend the dollars with accountability. He mentioned that we would not be able to keep the quality of our programs without a good administrative staff. He said we should look across the consortium to ensure that staff is retained. There is a role for part-time staff. He agrees with Bob about the counselors. We should make that a priority. We should not be going out to expand, but to look at the things we do best. We should look at how we leverage those expertise; not duplicate them. Another concern is LAUSD's relationship to LARAEC. We should look at this next cycle. Ideally, our concern is to not supplant, but rather supplement and enhance what we are already doing. His concern was if new programs are creating a pipeline and transition piece. Our focus is on student outcomes and balancing innovation. We're chasing enrollment. Our biggest threat in adult education is moving beyond the side of categorically type of status; which is where we are now. K-12 is NOT seen as a core program. Were not funded by LCFS dollars.

Veronica asked if there was anyone else from LAUSD and/or the community colleges.

Laura Chardie (LAUSD) – spoke about the integrity of our data. Instructed teachers on administering test and proctoring test. The process and procedures are very robust. It was adapted by the California Correctional Institute. The test taking doesn't stop. She assured everyone that the data is being certified each year.

Matthew Kogan (UTLA)– He believes we don't educate third graders very well. We care about our students. He believes counseling is essential. He would like to see us navigate the system of helping students. We are not there yet. He believes students don't need in-depth counseling, but they do need career counseling. He said let's get paid for the job our State wants and our students need.

Loraine - She believes we can make a difference. She believes students get lost in the counseling system.

B. FUNDING CRITERIA PERSPECTIVE:

Emilio Urioste (Board Member) - Shared the importance of the cost of base funding. He believes funding for adult education is complex; particularly for K-12 and higher. He said describing education is a formula; while sounding scientific and fortified through elaborate matrix doesn't take into account the complexity of adult education. This is especially important when taking into account the non-traditional students in adult education. Funding must take into account:

1. fixed cost operations;
2. negotiated salary increases; and
3. increases in health and welfare benefits

Another key funding allocation to consider is allowing member districts to be creative in developing programs. For example, while funding is tied to matrix; it can include, but not be limited to:

- Development of LVN program
- Infusing technology across all services, including student assessments;
- Providing guidance services to students where goals are identified and pathways outlined;
- Resources and supports are identified;
- Improving instruction and opportunities for students with disabilities; and

- Branching out to all portions of the community by bringing classes and programs to satellite locations, such as low-income housing developments

The cost associated with maintaining quality CTE programs involve: staffing, equipment and supplies.

Philip Tenorio (MUSD) - He would like to see more support staff. He would like to have Tech person on site. 90% of teachers are part-time. Would like to see programs expand and give part-time teachers more hours.

DISTRICT CONSIDERATIONS:

Alice Jacquez (Montebello USD) – Attended a conference in Sacramento, she thought it was relevant, informative and important. She felt the data doesn’t give the total picture. “it takes many years to get it right.” The philosophy is about funding. Adult education is learning life long learning skills to pass on to their children. She shared a story from the conference. Shared a story about her father in Texas. He graduated in 1967 and became a police officer. He learned that service was key to survival. She spoke about her sister who graduated in 1972 and became a special education teacher. Another sister became a typing teacher, and a 9-1-1- police dispatcher. Her mother was 1 of 17 children and she raised all of her children in the 1960’s and was a product of Montebello adult education

Gray hair gentlemen with beard, black jacket – He said they were committed to developing employability programs. Expanding partnerships, personal care aid, and job programs.

Deano Saceno (MUSD) – thanked Alice and Phil. She felt they both showed tremendous growth and wanted to thank them for their support.

Veronica Montes - shared that they are physically small and Culver City needs are very different. She said they never had an AP at Culver City. It takes time to have programs implemented. The District didn’t have an increase in funding in seven years. We should all continue to do those things that are successful. Sometimes we need to consider where we are using or existing funding. She thanked everyone for coming and sharing.

FUNDING CRITERIA PERSPECTIVE

Lanzi Asorias (Project Director) - shared on behalf of the consortium. He said he was a proud to be a product of an adult education. He reported: The Consortium conducted an audit report in Nov 2017 and there were 31 recommendations. Three recommendations were approved unanimously by board.

Dr. Miller asked what are the consequences of not complying with the audit presented by Lanzi.

Veronica asked what others thought about it.

Emilio - shared that K-12 funding for adult education is not being shared equitably. When a district negotiates a salary increase, that cost has to be taken from somewhere. He said that cost is being taken from the same place. He believes base funding is a misnomer. This was conducted through a survey a few years before it was implemented. He believes we should be bringing this to our legislators.

Joe Stark - Said if we're going to treat it as a zero. We don't have enough dollars. We need more. Hanover report, felt we can take in small bites. We should bring the power of the consortium to bear. His idea was to bring it in parallel to the consortium.

Emilio - He agreed with Joe's sentiment. The district was NOT granting increased funding. He believes we have to continue to press the issue. The squeaky wheel gets the grease.

Veronica - Shared that funding issue will be our next topic for the next meeting.

Dr. Miller --- He agrees with the Montebello presentation. He believes we have to focus on the social issue here. Breaking cycle of poverty. We have a dual message of economic justice. We have to make sure we address that.

Matthew Kegan (UTLA) - Said Sacramento can give the wrong impression. Lawmakers don't know what's going on. The experts advise the lawmakers. We might show interest in performing the things they have asked us to do. We have to show an interest in what they want. We owe it to their constituents. We want more money, but are we doing what lawmakers asked?

Veronica --- Asked when will we start? Is this formula something they want in 19-20?

Dr. Miller --- Let's get back to the consequences question. His big takeaways are:

- Work with local boards and districts
- Beyond LAREAC - we should get additional funds
- Focus on social justice and economic need
- Legislative staff need to see actual evidence they we are doing what they have asked.
- We need to identify a leading legislator who will champion our cause.

Joe Stark -- Said from a fiscal and human resource standpoint how is this possible? The idea that there will be some impact for 19-20. He doesn't believe there is enough time to adopt it.

Dr. Mullen - said what's the redistribution? We should know what we are walking away with.

Joe Stark - said we need to be cognizance of what we are doing.

Dr. Mullen --- we have crafted our narratives --- message need to be same and heard repeatedly.

Veronica - we need to show that the data is supporting the work we are doing. What was crystal clear from the Conference is that we have to identify our barriers. The barriers show the legislators the need. Barriers are critical to show the story of why the funding is needed. The data shows the outcome. She feels it's important to keep the conversation going. We cannot go to the legislature when we still have money in the pot. Also, felt that we should come up with an average.

Emilio --- felt that it makes us unique. If we don't show the numbers the funding will decrease. He asked the question of Veronica.

Veronica - clarified that's its difficult to go to legislature to ask for more money, if we haven't used the money.

Dr. Mullen feels it's okay to have some carry over. It shouldn't impact how we do our business. There are other ways to approach this.

Dr. Miller believes until adult education is seen a major service provider and makes a difference in everyone's life then it will be taken seriously. It has to be seen as an essential need. Right now we are just an appendage. That's our biggest problem.

Emilio – let's hear about the consequences.

Alice Jacquez - said we are turning away students. Still working on funding formula. How can we do that when our State representatives are NOT there yet. She asked if Joe had been included in those meetings. He replied. He has not. She believes they we are putting the cart before the horse.

Phil ----- They haven't defined the effectiveness of the data. He believes this idea is just floating. There was a question about a direct. The use of the data should be determined by _____. Data should be used in a positive way; not a punitive way. Moving forward we need to look at that. Priorities will be outlined by state.

Laura - said she facilitated panel about data at conference. Point was to encourage data collection. She said we know what they want. Because we perform higher than most consortium and we shouldn't be afraid.

Emilio – said he agreed with Laura. We should bring it to this consortium and know exactly what data is being shared. We are ready to rock and roll 19-20. Modify pilot performance matrix for new dollars that come in. We can use a performance matrix to see how they are being allocated. It worked for K12.

Veronica --- reiterated that this gives us time.

Emilio --- He doesn't believe our tail should be wagged by the auditors. Feels like we are being singled out. Other consortium(s) don't have matrix(s) to disperse monies. We don't need to be moved by this auditors report. We are thoughtfully addressing the issues.

FUNDING CRITERIA PERSPECTIVE

Alice – We are in accountability. It is 6.1, Went from 80 to 54. During the transition of ASAP. 1 part-time counselor and 1 full-time counselor. Commended others for sharing. We are moving forward. We need all the key players.

Laura Chardiet (LAUSD) - Believes State should come up with funding formula. Is it better to get ahead of this or let the state dictate the rules of the game.

Dr. Mullen - believes the State will dictate either way. The State has to be accountable to its mandate.

Joe Stark - we have heavy hitters in the room. Don't underestimate the allies we have.

******Veronica** ----- called for a break 10:35 am approximately

Reconvened at 10:50 am; Discussion on **C. TIMELINE FOR NEW FORMULA**

Veronica --- Decision to move forward about Next Steps; Need to capture data. Need to have a face with a cause; shared that its' not about particular data amount per program, but that we collect and share data.

Emilio - Asked if Lanzi could send an email to all the board members so that we know exactly “what” is the data that we should be collecting.

Joe Stark - shared this is what we should be tracking:

- **Adults served**
- **Improved literary skills**
- **Completion of high school**
- **Completion of post-secondary certifications**
- **Placement of jobs**
- **Transition of post secondary**
- **Improved wages**

Matthew - asked for clarification on where these topics came from; Joe responded it came from 84.29 effectiveness of the consortium.

Veronica – reiterated the report showed the tracking.

Matthew – commented we have to change some perceptions. We need to broaden that thought. Said we didn’t need that block grant. We have to be careful. We want the support of the democratic party.

Veronica - asked for clarification on who Matthew meant by “they.” We fight poverty. Matthew said this is another way to view what we do. This economy needs this.

Joe - added another statistic. In last 5 years we received over 86 million dollars in federal funding from the data we submitted.

D. Request for Additional Information

Veronica - asked if they were additional questions or considerations.

Dr. Mullen - Be careful distinguishing between state and federal funding in a local distribution. Need to be thoughtful and how we approach. Be very careful in articulating that.

Joe Stark - we are already collecting and reporting data. He reiterated we leverage what we have without recreating the wheel.

Victoria --- operating expenses should be at negative in reality. What does whole harmless mean. We will be cutting something for next year. The Montebello redistribution helped a lot.

Joe - I don’t want to be giving out pink slips. There’s a lot of moving pieces. If any redistributing causes pink slips he will NOT be in favor of that.

Dr. Mullen – asked at what point do we move to next steps?

Joe - Said this venue is a safe place to share ideas on the table. I don’t feel good, if there are districts who don’t have reserves; and we’re looking at districts who maybe in jeopardy. Asked if we have sorted that out locally? He doesn’t believe we can allocate that equitably.

Dr. Mullen – Believes it’s an unfair statement; description and response. Not necessarily a negative.

Joe – said there is a qualitative difference versus someone whose living paycheck to paycheck.... ADP is all general funds. We can ask the district for more funds. He doesn't believe it will be granted. K-12 is unique to what the college is doing.

Dr. Miller – We operate differently. It takes time to get there. We are making great progress. We don't have to spend money carelessly. Be harmful if LACCD was suddenly penalized. This is politically divisive. I can think of chancellors, lawmakers and members would not be served. The way to respond is to try to get more money. How do we all survive at best we can? Unless someone is willing to go to their board; it will cause enormous issues. LACCD is a political projectory.

Veronica --- is it reasonable, should we consider in the future all funds towards those program areas. We all have to submit a report for 2019. State is asking how much money are you contributing to State programs. We have that data for 17-18. I believe we should think futuristically.

Lanzi -- said yes we did. What do we actually need? Maybe we start from a staffing point of view.

Joe - said structural inequities stem from the past funding.

Dr. Miller - 3 types of students; 6 million people in community we serve. We need basic life skills to survive. That's part of the narrative we need to get across. No need to battle amongst ourselves; it's not getting us anywhere.

Veronica – future battle for sure. Any legislative battle is going to take time. This conversation will continue.

Dr. Miller – it took us years to get Adult Education to get on the Advocacy list.

Joe – Fundamentally if funding is going to be our thing, why? Are we going to come up with our own narratives?

Dr. Miller – we could spend more dollars; we can find an agency out there to support us and we can spend money on.

Veronica – 100%; 1 message; no convolution; it's about FUNDING. Assembly member MarCarty; we can't give them the data.

Dr. Miller - Read goals for next steps. Said if every district received the same amount of money, then there is 13 million dollars to allocate.

Alice – we are going to go in and check every number. Each district accordingly will be evaluated.

Veronica --- What is your expected budget? What is your need for 19-20 school year? Does that make sense?

Joe – you've already given your staff duties for next year? It's too late for a reduction in force?

Veronica --- they are already operating on less. If anybody is operating on less than what they are budgeted than there is some money there. The reality is, what's your expected expenditures are and what you can exist on. What are we going to have on this agenda on Friday?

Joe --- made a recommendation; a round career ticket --- for example, increase fees. We are relying on those for the budget.

Dr. Miller - community college funding. There's a lot of forces up and down the state that believe LACCD is fine where it is. What matters is what the people in Sacramento think. I would never advocate for nor would I change the system. However, if the State comes up with something new, we should NOT be penalized; unless the state requires us to do it.

Veronica --- Let's hear from Exes --- what's your expectation?

Joe - No changes it sounds like with KAPE. What we're getting is what we're getting. I'm hearing we're all happy with what we are doing. Can we coalesce around a particular point?

Dr. Miller-- it's not that we disagree. What are those performance-based parameters? Ensure the efficacy of the performance-based means?

Lanzi - Bob eloquently summed it up. Perhaps we can craft discussion items and formally adopt that with the board's approval to proceed. I think limiting it to a few items would work; adopting those items for the March meeting that came out of February meeting --- creating collaboration.

Joe - Don't want to waste time; can't advocate by individual district; unless we have collaboration.

Dr. Miller --- agree amount of money they received; everything else is status quo for next year.

Joe - what action or you declaring?

Dr. Miller --- everybody is going to keep the amount they received in the past year; with exception of Montebello.

Veronica --- not ready for agreement conversation.

Dr. Miller - We have to leave the room; the cake is baked.

Veronica - Culver City will be issuing pink slips because we will be operating on the same amount.

Dr. Miller - clarified Culver City will be issuing pink slips come March 2019.

Veronica - I am saying exactly that. That's my concern today, it wasn't last week. She asked Emilio what do you see going forward with Burbank?

Emilio - I am fine with an open matrix for funding for additional dollars coming into the district. If they were new funding for 20; we would be open to that.

Alice --- we want to make sure we are aligned for reallocation.

Dr. Mullen --- believes that needs to be a closed-door meeting.

Veronica - a closed staff wouldn't be necessary. It would be good from a sense where people are and where they want to go. We can go with existing funding for 19-20; but we have to figure out a way before money is on the table. It's important to count when you're not looking at them; so that we can support our students. Any other data we can bring to the legislators will have a great return on investment.

ADJOURNED AT 12:40 PM - Lanzi suggested members arrive at 9:00 am for a full agenda. Next meeting scheduled for Fri, Feb 16, 2019 at 9:30 am.

Adjournment

