

## AV Adult Ed Consortium Meeting 4-28-16, RHS

Present: Harold Roney; Diane Walker; Bob Jones; Steve Radford; Sally Dibbini; Sharon Dalmage; Ann Steinberg; remote call-in - Les Uhazy (10:30-11:00am)

Review and Approval of CFAD Document: This was distributed last time, with the majority of content from the Governance Document. There is one item that needs to be completed, which is determining who will be getting what funding over the next two years. The CFAD is due on May 2, so it needs to be done before then. The second item is procedures for approval of expenditure requests, so that people receive, have time to review, and then make a decision. Other than that, the consortium is moving forward.

Sharon asks about whether a line-item budget for the institution can be submitted. Steve says yes, but there needs to be a fruitful discussion of processes and allocations. For example, SKUSD has submitted a request for \$400k (1/3 of our total allocation) for what they have been doing, plus their plan to increase.

All of the members of the consortium should have been working on this all along. Neither Les nor Ann has an idea of what AVC has done or needs; Sharon doesn't believe that there have been any other than possibly welding, and Sharon submitted a small proposal for clerical staff. Steve notes that when there was a meeting at AVC PMD, there were 4 programs which were discussed, and only 3 of them have gotten off the ground.

Steve wonders about calling the state representative to see what they want in the report, e.g., can it be estimates or does it need to be actuals. If he says it has to be actuals, then Steve will call everyone immediately (will revert back to old numbers if no plan provided by May 2). In preparation, each institution will need to get a budget going in case it's needed. The budget needs to be done for 16-17, and can't be amended for that fiscal year, according to what they said at the meeting.

Should there be initial agreement that it will be divided equally among the three institutions in case that's required? Steve's reservation is that the spending is supposed to be for the region, not for one member (per capita disbursements?). Ann asks about percentage of adult population which would be served by the proposal, in the service areas (whole AVC service boundary described) - we all have huge boundaries (Harold says with charter management, their boundary covers the whole US, and that includes for adults; AVUHSD also has charter rights), so wouldn't just be limited to Rosamond population. Steve says dividing in 1/3 goes against what's been planned over last two years; if it can then be done collaboratively after that division, then he's okay.

Steve verbalizes the proposal as/moves, solely for the purposes of the May 2 CFAD report, the funds would be split equally among consortium members, but funding proposals still must go through the established proposal process as noted below, and funding won't be used just for the proposer's own district purposes. Harold seconds that. Sharon asks if an email vote by Mr. Knudson would be acceptable, and both Steve and Harold agree.

Procedures for Consortium Programs and Spending: Sharon asks if the funding is something that was already done before the consortium was instituted, or if it is a new program? The plan is specific that it must be spent for new programs, not something that is existing, per Steve. Ann wonders if it is feasible to get together in 48 hours; is it a projection for two years? The needs of the community will shift during the two years, so can it be modified going forward. Harold notes that the items he submitted are what SKUSD has been planning for, e.g., fitting into the Airframe Manufacturing Technology degree program at AVC. Ann asks if we can put together something with just a three-way split, but Steve feels that would not necessarily be best for our region. The report won't take long to put together, but there needs to be an agreement on how it will benefit the consortium. Harold says these items have been discussed the whole time, but Steve disagrees - wasn't discussed at AVC meeting in December (notes distributed). Harold says the group talked about parenting classes, so SKUSD hired a mental health counselor and connected with SELPA. Sally asks if the consortium needs to vote on it before it's done, or if each institution just spends how they want. Steve says we haven't had funding until

about 2 months ago. Ann notes that there has been action in silos, such as work with YouthBuild, prison, community, etc., through AVC. They responded to community needs. Some of those fit into the adult ed program components, but not all. Inmates, for example, may not be able to be assisted by the high schools, to help reduce recidivism. Some people who are released may need assistance from adult education.

The gap is in the review and approval process. Sharon asks if, in the interest of time, we should review what has been submitted by SKUSD; then AVC and AVUHSD will need to submit their proposals for review and approval before next week. AVAS has a projected budget for next year with planned programs, but didn't submit to the consortium because there is no process in place. Ann asks how much time was spent by AVAS in writing the documents, etc. - Sally says that would have been the planning grant, not implementation. Steve agrees that there must be research as part of the proposal process, also. Sharon says the proposal form is online (Google Forms), so when it is filled out, it goes to her office, and she forwards it to the consortium members immediately, which would save time so it doesn't have to wait until the next regular meeting. Ann asks if there is a Google Doc or something that would allow a vote online. The plan also requires that there has to be a public meeting and review process, which hasn't taken place.

Harold asks why we are holding the money, and Steve says that we need to determine what is best for the region and have the process in place first (example of \$90k for testing center, when there are already two testing centers in place). Sharon mentions that there must be a review-by date for proposals to be submitted for consideration - that didn't happen at the last meeting. Can we do that now? Diane suggests working backwards from the date of the public meeting, and the designated representative must participate to vote. Sharon inquires whether there should be a public meeting monthly? If they're not done monthly, then there would be a long waiting period for proposals to consider. Sally suggests that they should all be considered at one meeting so that, otherwise, you wouldn't know how much there is to spend. Ann says that isn't responsive for community needs; it would be better to have it as a standard monthly agenda item, with 10 days advance notice. The three institutions would have priority, while outside agencies could also be considered. Bob explains that SKUSD's efforts have been toward implementing feeder programs into those at the college (e.g., aircraft fabrication; can't do composites lab at HS site). Steve says there has been a major shift in how the state wants the funding taken care of, in that they don't want pass-through with reimbursement because a stumbling block time-wise. They want a regional plan for consortium activities.

There has been a determination that CTE and apprenticeships are the priority for the region, so we need to determine what those are going to be. Harold says they can provide employees to help with report preparation, as they have done for AVC.

The group discusses sticking with the third Thursday for regular public meeting dates, with prior notice to the community (at least 72 hours for Brown Act) as was agreed in the past, per Steve - all seem to be okay with that. Sharon asks if there will be a location rotation, but most agree that having it at AVC would be fine - consistency of location is best, with CCC Confer for remote access.

With respect to a timeline, ten calendar days in advance of the public meeting for submission of proposals, and immediate distribution to the voting members of the consortium, as well as posting for public view on the consortium website. Sharon will forward it to all voting members the same day.

Once the three voting members receive a proposal, the entity decides upon their vote internally, and then it is considered and voted on publicly at the meeting. Ann hypothesizes if YouthBuild puts in a proposal, for example, utilizing support from AVUHSD and SKUSD, so no support funding to AVC, then all of the voting members would have to decide if it is best for the adults of the community and vote accordingly, hopefully.

Diane reads information from Governance Document regarding general meeting and notice provisions- it can be done at one meeting, rather than heard at one meeting then continued to the second meeting for a vote.

The next meeting is May 19, so proposals for that meeting need to be in by May 9 through the Google Form on the Consortium website. It will take attachments.

Steve asks about the propriety of member discussions before meetings; there can be informal questions between two members, can't be all in on a call, otherwise it becomes a Brown Act issue, per Harold. A proposal could be tabled for later if a vote is not feasible (e.g., additional information needed). Harold would like to have phone calls with questions in case data is necessary. Make sure that all/as much as possible of the information is included in the proposal form, as discussed at the last meeting, so that it can be promptly and thoughtfully considered.

Diane leaves at 11:35am

Reimbursement of Previously Established Programs:

Review and Approval of New Program Offerings at RHS:

Building Reviews/Proposals for Warehouse:

State Adult Education Conference Update: