

## AV Adult Ed Consortium Public Meeting 6/27/16 - AVC A140 2:00pm

**Present:** Steve Radford, AVUHSD; Diane Walker, AVUHSD; Harold Roney, SKUSD; Ed Knudson, AVC; Sharon Dalmage, AVC; Tom O'Neil, AVC; Ann Steinberg, AVC; Les Uhazy, AVC; Debi Keys, SKUSD, joins at 2:45pm.

**Review of Proposal Rubric:** Steve Radford asks for someone who was present to review the rubric. Diane Walker explains that she searched on the Internet and found a Colorado Adult Ed grant rubric and modified it, including AB104 principles for allowable expenditures. The proposal subcommittee reviewed it at the June 6 meeting, revised it, and this version is the result. The proposals which were submitted for June were reviewed to some extent with the elements, but not the points. Ed Knudson expresses that it is very thorough, and Harold Roney agrees. Steve Radford says it is, but wonders if it is too complex. Diane notes that Bob Jones suggested having a one page cheat sheet with the overall categories, but not provide the whole rubric, as it might put a chilling effect on outside proposals being submitted; Diane thinks we would need to provide it to them at some point. Sharon Dalmage feels the next step for the subcommittee would be to draft the cheat sheet. A link to the rubric is on the proposal. Ed states he feels that the subject headings would be sufficient to give to the proposers as a "cheat sheet," and the whole rubric is available as a resource, as in federal grants. Ann Steinberg says she thinks the whole rubric would dissuade them, particularly for a small amount. Harold Roney notes he feels this should be a "to do" for the group. We still need to use the rubric, and it's up to proposers to do the research, per Ed. Les Uhazy says he feels we don't want someone trying to get quick money without doing the work, and this implies accountability. Sharon says the second part of the rubric is that each proposal needs to have the objective, and there is a one-page list on the website to be reviewed. Sharon will show it to the group later.

**Review and approval of proposal requests:** Sharon forgot to bring the copies of the proposals she printed out. Harold asks to see the votes by the subcommittee; Diane inquires if the three voting members received a cover sheet with that information, and Harold says he did not. Ed asks if they were prioritized by the subcommittee, and Sharon says they were not; just a simple vote was done. A face sheet with all of the votes was not sent out, because Sharon indicates she forgot to do so. Ed also asks how much in total was requested, and how many were presented (5 basic skills and 10 CTE, per Diane); Steve advises we have about \$1.5 million in funding. The largest was \$750,000 for CTE 9, with the total of about \$900,000 for all. The indirect expense which is allowed for the fiscal agent is capped at 5%, which would be \$75,000 more or less. There is a three-year rollover allowed (now two years remaining), according to Steve, so there is enough to fund all of them. Ed says we might want to

approve all of them, if allowable. This would be subcontracted services with reimbursement. Sharon reviews the subcommittee votes as follows, including some individual members' positions:

- Basic Skills 1 (Pearson Vue SKUSD), approved by the subcommittee;
- Basic Skills 2 (HISET SKUSD), approved by the subcommittee; Steve asks how many sections it is, as AVUHSD pays \$3800 per instructor per section and the request is for \$27,000; Debi says it is multiple sections, not just one. Ed says that AVC pays \$3000 per section.
- Basic Skills 3 (math SKUSD), approved by the subcommittee;
- Basic Skills 4 (parenting SKUSD), not approved by the subcommittee;
- Basic Skills 5 (ESL) approved by the subcommittee;
- CTE 1 SKUSD withdrawn by SKUSD before a vote was taken;
- CTE 2 SKUSD sports med approved by the subcommittee;
- CTE 3 SKUSD auto withdrawn by SKUSD for further clarification, which was submitted;
- CTE 4 SKUSD welding approved by the subcommittee;
- CTE 5 SKUSD testing center withdrawn by SKUSD for further clarification, which was submitted;
- CTE 6 AVUHSD network tech approved by the subcommittee;
- CTE 7 AVUHSD personal fitness approved by the subcommittee with one abstention;
- CTE 8 AVUHSD personal care tech approved by the subcommittee;
- CTE 9 AVUHSD facilities lease was a split vote, 3-3. Harold asks about the discussion where AVC said there were enough facilities for classes, so it wasn't an issue; Ed says some facilities are available in the evening, so could have capacity for that, however, doesn't know if there would be capacity for networking or personal training facilities. Steve says that both of the AVUHSD sites are maxed out, and they need additional space. His thought was that classes would be offered during the day, and that they might not be able to retrofit AVC. Steve explains that there are 12 classrooms at the building on Avenue J, some of which could be refurbished. Ed says U of Phoenix just walked away, and it is completely furnished. Harold says that they withdrew their facility proposal, and there would be additional need for facilities now with Tehachapi being absorbed. Ann says there wasn't enough information for her to vote yes, e.g., for moving in, who would be there, and it was a lot of money (there was discussion about the building in a meeting, but not enough in AVUHSD's proposal; Steve provided additional detail on June 9th, as requested by some in the subcommittee). Steve says if it is a CTE center, things would be moved there, and that would allow further expansion of other courses; it wouldn't necessarily mean 12 new CTE programs. Harold says a building could be built on their high school campus, another on Sierra, and the church building is an option. Their proposal was pulled to get additional information from their CBO (SKUSD), but

there are questions about going on the base. Desert and Boron is not being served by the Mojave consortium. Les says he heard that Cal City is going to put in a welding program, so it would be available to them. Cerro Coso now is adding Tehachapi. Steve notes that the proposal can be adjusted according to what the group thinks. The lease for this facility on Avenue J is for a term the consortium would negotiate; it could be annually, could be three-year, and the City of Lancaster has indicated they would help in negotiating the best price possible. Harold says that each of SKUSD's proposals would be a purchase. Steve notes that there is a state approval process that would have to be done anyway. Harold asks if AVUHSD sees there is a need in Rosamond, to which Steve responds yes, so Harold says they can adjust. This building on Avenue J is in the center of the consortium, according to Steve, and it will serve all of the areas, including Littlerock and Lake LA. Ann has another concern, in that at the end of the three years if the funding goes away, then what happens to those students; Steve says if all adult Ed funding goes away at that time, everything will shut down anyway; hopefully that won't happen. There could be additional charges for the classes, as there is no limit by Ed. Code, and can do Pell Grants, as Ventura does, although not set up to do that. The cost to buy the building was \$3 million, without additional negotiation. There could also be a lease option with right of first refusal. Steve feels this is a good opportunity for connection with the Medical Main Street in Lancaster and ties to Tehachapi needs, add to CNA and home health aides with high labor market demand. Ed says the CTE Building in Rosamond would do millwright for a cost of \$500k. We should at least ask the state for approval of both. Ed says he can't go into the Cerro Coso area and start serving students without serious conversation with their President, Jill Board. The state usually doesn't want residual value of over \$5000, so would need to look at that. SKUSD has DSA-approved plans for renovation. We could end up with \$1.25 million that's not spent if the state doesn't approve it. Steve has no problem with doing things on both sides of the valley; he is concerned with the population concentration - he knows the bus runs both ways, but people aren't taking it to go out to Rosamond. Ed feels that a one-time purchase will serve students for years beyond the expiration. AVC has a right of first refusal on another 42,000 square feet in 7-8 years at the Palmdale Campus, and they may exercise it at some point to serve more people in the south valley. As they phase in over there, they can do some classes if they can get some apportionment. AVUHSD can do things at night, but needs space for the day, per Steve. Ed agrees that the University of Phoenix building is needed. There could also be space at the AVC facility after February. If the consortium has another \$1.5 million coming soon, then there is additional money to go. Diane notes that SKUSD has not submitted the revised proposal; it would need to be re-submitted so it could be voted on. Steve says he feels that it is not in the best interest to put it on the high school campus, but Harold responds that has already been dealt with, as it is on unused acreage adjacent to the high school. Steve also

expresses concern about a statement Harold made at an earlier meeting about using it for a charter school, to which Harold responds that the charter school idea was just thrown out as a feeder to pay for the building, not a current idea. The cost of the machines and building was \$500,000 plus in the original proposal that was withdrawn; it is on the perimeter with a separate entrance. The SKUSD board approved it and security officers were hired, both of which were addressed when the AVC campus came on board. Les inquires where exactly it would be located, and Harold says out by the Ag area. Steve also has a concern about getting released prisoners in there, but if SKUSD is okay with it, it's their campus, just not something that AVUHSD would do. Steve asks who would own the building, and Harold responds that the consortium would. If the consortium disbands, Harold would see that SKUSD would have to provide some funding for that, to which Ed expresses agreement.

- CTE 10 AVC fiscal and clerical support approved by the subcommittee.
- Ed Knudson moves that everything but the two proposals for buildings be approved outright, Steve Radford seconds, Harold Roney agrees.
- Ed Knudson suggests exploring whether the buildings can be done before taking action. Steve will contact the consortium's state rep (Neil Kelly) to see what the process is, and to explain what our capacity and space constraints are (Debi Keys requests that she also receive information about whatever requirements are provided by Neil). Ed opines that perhaps having that information will alleviate the issues expressed. If the consortium puts up the money up front, then owned facilities would need to be paid for by the district/s in some fashion later. Most grants did not allow brick and mortar, in Ed's experience; he also couldn't purchase a vehicle, but could lease one, so need to address that. Ed says there should be some space available in February to assist with the southeast area of the AV, and they can look into that. It is an extremely impacted area, and ideally would be the best location for a building of this type. Ed says it should be built on the land next to their expanding Palmdale Center. Steve agrees that it would be great to have Adult Ed next to the college; he notes that Richard Verches, head of the LA County Workforce Development Board, wants to partner with us, but Ed and Ann are concerned about budget cuts to that entity going forward.

**Review of updated proposal form:** Sharon projects [Avadulted.avc.edu](http://Avadulted.avc.edu), goes to the Document Archive tab, and reviews the updated proposal request form, including the objective list to choose from. Les says the proposal says proposal objective, but the chart says program objective, so it needs to be consistent. There is consensus that it should be "program," or "consortium" and the proposer need to identify what they are doing within the scope of the grant as a whole. Program status in the next question is for what they are submitting. Diane asks about the SACS codes for 1000, etc., for outside salaries being under 5000, or does it matter and can it just be an item for categorization; does

it need to be ready to go right into the accounting? Steve says he can check with Brenda Yardeen, AVUHSD CBO, to see how she wants to handle it. Ed says most are reimbursements, so that would be easiest. Leave it as is for now, for reporting purposes later. Currently, 5000 shows as "software," but it includes travel, contracts, technology maintenance contracts, etc. Ann says perhaps it should specify. Sharon will leave the categories for now, but delete the SACS codes. Page 2 includes instructions for how to email attachments. The AVC IT department said it would be extremely difficult to attach documents directly to the form. Everyone agrees that the form looks good.

**Data instrument review:** Steve reviews some of the data reporting elements that were just released (8 pages long from the AEBG site) for 15-16 for every student which has been funded. That may be difficult for students which have already gone, although AVUHSD has some information through WIOA. This year (15-16) is a no-fault year for data collection, according to the state. Those who are interested can look at the AEBG site and recent webinars for further information.

**Award letter template review:** Steve agrees that if the consortium makes decisions on funding today, there should be some benchmark dates for spending, or the money will be re-allocated, as Ed suggests. Sharon says AVUHSD and AVC have typically done a letter of understanding and then a request for contract. Ed says since there is already an MOU, we don't need a request for contract. It is handled the same as any other grant, and it's consortium money to be spent. Diane will provide Steve with an example of a letter of understanding being used for another grant.

**Annual report review:** The time keeps changing through communications from the state level, but the annual report is currently due near the end of July. We will need to meet before then to get the information together on a timely basis. The last one was not overly complex, so it shouldn't be too difficult. Steve has not had a chance to review this in great detail, as he just returned from vacation.

**2016-2017 report planning:** Steve distributes a calendar of upcoming due dates. The expenditure report is due about the end of July, and the annual report updates are due every 6 months from each entity which receives money. The coming year will be more of a learning curve, because each institution must submit its own document, and then it will be combined for the consortium. Ann asks if there will be a time for the consortium to do a mid-term report to see if funding is not being used, and then budgets would be re-allocated. Steve thinks reports need to be done in November and December for January submission. If the reports are not done, funding is withheld, so we need to do something like Ann suggests, unlike in the past where we have been late with reports as a whole. Ed asks if each entity submits a report directly to the state or as a consortium; Steve says the document he just downloaded is a bit ambiguous and seems to require both - for each entity, and then

as a whole. Ann wonders if it is similar to the VVC Career Pathways Trust Grant, with progress reports for each entity, and then the consortium reports as a whole. Harold says it would be best to submit to the fiscal agent, which then compiles it. Sharon says a template can be put together, if there's not one already from the state.

Steve tells the group that the Adult Ed Summit is November 1-2, 2016, and the consortium needs to send a larger group this year.

**Announcements/open discussion:** Steve will send out the data reporting information to everyone after he reviews the form. Sharon inquires how often the proposal review subcommittee should have meetings - only when proposals are submitted, or are there any other duties it should undertake? Steve feels it should only meet when there are proposals. Diane asks if the subcommittee should be including some sort of prioritization of each proposal submitted, as she asked about this during the rubric revision process. Ed feels there should be, as it helps with objectivity. Steve agrees, and that it is necessary for on-going expenses and new proposals being submitted. Ann asks if the subcommittee should put together a template for the award letter. Steve was going to ask AVUHSD Business Services, and Ed says he could get one from the Chancellor's Office.

Next meeting date: July 21, 2016, 10:00am to noon, AVC HS194

Meeting adjourned at 3:45pm.