



**North Central California Adult Education Consortium (NCAEC)
Executive Committee Meeting Minutes**

Regular Meeting, Friday, April 12, 2024 1:00-2:00 PM

Meeting Location: Woodland Community College
Colusa County Campus
99 Ella Street
Williams, CA 95987

Members Present: Garth Lewis, Superintendent, Yolo County Office of Education; Tawny Dotson, President, Yuba College; Rob Gregor, Superintendent, Yuba County Office of Education; Michael West, Superintendent, Colusa County Office of Education; Tom Reusser, Superintendent, Sutter County Office of Education; Brock Falkenberg, Superintendent, Lake County Office of Education; Lizette Navarette, President, Woodland Community College.

Guests Present: Karin Liu-Principal, Woodland Adult Education; Patricia Barba, Interim Dean, Woodland Community College; John Ithurburn, Assistant Superintendent, Colusa County Office of Education; James Lohman, Principal, Marysville Adult; and Lorilee Niesen, Assistant Superintendent- Career & Adult Education, Sutter County Superintendent of Schools.

1.0 CALL TO ORDER IN OPEN SESSION

Chairman Rob Gregor called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m.

Action 1.1 Roll Call- taken through roll call and representation of Leadership team members as Proxy.
1.2 No changes to the agenda; therefore, **moved by Brock Falkenberg and seconded by Michael West.**
Agenda approved by all “ayes”

Action 1.3 Approve Minutes of 01/12/24 Meeting- (**Tawny noted name misspelled-drop the “e”) Tawny Dotson moved to approve the minutes of the 01/12/24 meeting and Rob Gregor seconded.**
Minutes approved by roll call voting members stating “aye/yes”.
1.4 There were no public comments

2.0 COMMUNICATIONS/REPORTS

2.1 Executive Committee
No Reports from the Executive committee members

2.2 Secretary to Committee/Consortium Director: Sutter COE

CAEP Update: AB 1491-Agencies have to provide details regarding how they are going to spend down remaining funds if they are not at target. CCAE conference-a lot of chatter about adult education funding model redesign-LAO language. Those of us in the room were asked for input. Priorities/Maxims from CCAE included: California adult education would be stronger if the funding model incentivized responsiveness to local learning needs; California adult education would be stronger if the funding model incentivized delivery innovations that increase access to learners; California adult education would be stronger if the funding model incentivized positive learner outcomes; California adult education would be stronger if college non-credit programs and K12 adult schools in consortia were incentivized to collaborate effectively; California adult education would be stronger if local CAEP consortia continue to have a measure of decision-making control over allocations; California adult education would be stronger if all consortia used member performance data to inform local allocation decisions; California adult education would be stronger if the two systems (K12 adult schools and community college non-credit) reported identical data elements; and California adult education would be stronger if the programs provided

by K12 adult schools and community college non-credit were measured in the same manner and used the same funding model.

Lorilee explained agency funding-if as an agency currently you would receive more or less. Discussed funding tool calculator. Current allocations could change drastically. Tawny- how do outcomes from Sutter County Office of Education play into the tool. Lorilee-they are trying to determine what the criterion are. We were asked of these maxims, what are our priorities. Lorilee provided an example of an Adult School in Merced and how their allocation would go down because of outcomes. They are looking to see how to make sure that those who are performing the outcomes are getting the bigger piece of the pie. Tawny-let's say your outcomes are worth 100 points, is this based on the fact that you are funded at a certain amount. Lorilee- they are looking at an ADA allocation enrollment allocation for example. These numbers would be the same. If we have HSD gains, ours would go up. If you did not have outcomes, yours would go down. Lizette- is there is a model for the data sets? Lorilee- this is just an example. Lizette- we need follow up on who is proposing it as it would be helpful to have this information. My recollection is that LAO is fighting CAEP. This positions us in a way to our response rate. Lorilee-when we were at CCAE there was an LAO office person and a senate budget committee person (CAEP is pushing back on their recommendations). Lorilee-I can share the funding model. Rob inquired about a timeframe. Brock emphasized that this is just a proposed model. The bill has not even been written. Rob- this is concerning. I just want to make sure I understand this. Michael- to put this in perspective, they just want some accountability. Mike discussed Sutter and Tri County ROP, Brock mentioned WJUSD. Mike gave history of how we morphed from original funding model. Lorilee-LAUDS stands to lose a great deal. Mike-this is just something they threw at the wall to see what this looks like. Lizette-thank you for bringing this, Lorilee. Lorilee-we want to be responsive, we want to get ahead of this and be part of the solution. Mike-entities getting huge amounts and not spending. We created our mandates. I look at the amounts. Rob-1.3 for Woodland and then Sutter getting eight-I do not know why. Mike-we have to have some alternative to present to them. Lorilee-gave flat rate for CTE programs. National adult education week ends tomorrow, Saturday, April 13th.

Fiscal Update:

CAEP payments through Feb 2024 have been issued to agencies. March will be done next week.

ELL Grant Recipients (Yolo, SCSOS, LCOE, Yuba College and WJUSD) has been split into 2 installments, first payment was issued on March

3.0 INFORMATION/ACTION (Action may be taken on any items below)

3.1 Proxy Language Discussion for By-Law Amendment- Rob reviewed proxy language presented at last meeting. Referenced red-letter language in bylaws. Agency can send a proxy two (2) times to vote. We cannot have it where people are not showing and are not seeing the urgency of it. Brock-you are requiring that we be here for the CFAD meeting. Is this our policy or a Norm? The reason to not have a proxy at this meeting/rationale is that this was one of the most important meetings of the year. Attendance is not in statute. Lorilee will check with some of her cohorts-Mike-Proxies must have full authority to make decisions. Brock-if you choose to send someone you have to live with their vote. Mike-this just applies to current fiscal year? Garth-had the same question. Rob-I would say yes. Year to year. Not two misses in totality. Discussion ensued. Lorilee said that statute says local governing board must approve representatives. Rob to Garth- language does state two (2) times per year. Garth and Brock both requested clarification of fiscal year. Garth- in my mind this should be once a year and then asked for help in understanding. He questioned the rationale. Brock-I sit on another consortium and I never attend. I always send my representative. Rob-in my mind, at minimum; it should be at least 50%. Tawny-conversation is not as good when proxies are here because they do not have the history. Discussion today is an example of why this is important. Brock-I like the wording that you have here. Lorilee read language from Trinity/Tehama about revoking members voting rights if they do not attend. Garth asked if zoom is an option. Lorilee explained requirements. Tawny-for grammatical clarification-counted "at" subsequent meetings. Garth-change **can** to **may**.

Motion: Lizette Navarette moved to approve with the grammatical and clarifying changes to page 2. Seconded by Tom Reusser

6 ayes/yes 1 no (Garth Lewis)

Discussion continued: **Amendments to bylaws changes: will be counted 2 times.** Get rid of the “allow to”. Make sure we want to add two (2) per fiscal year in between two (2) per agency. Garth wants to add a period at the end of fiscal year.

Garth Lewis: Motioned to change section 7. Brock Falkenberg- seconded

All in favor-motion carries

- 3.2** NCAEC Committee Structure- Lorilee wants to revisit this. Sent out proposed restructure. We are not asking for changing to the bylaws just how we conduct business. Executive and Leadership does not change but committee work will be assigned. Lorilee has identified roles and committee leads. Committee work groups will report out at Executive. For example, our data committee will report in August. Rob asked, is this a vote or just informational? Lorilee responded that this is just informational. She is not asking to change the bylaws.

- 3.3** One-time Project Monies Discussion- Lorilee shared that at our last meeting we talked about using our \$40,000. We are proposing using monies consortium wide. Logo up for interpretation. Proposing these monies be spent on marketing. This aligns with our 3-year and annual plan. Also proposing using funds for professional development.

Motion: Brock Falkenberg moved to approve per the ½-sheet plan. Michael West- seconded

Discussion: Tawny asked for clarification

Revised Motion: Brock Falkenberg moved to approve per the ½- sheet plan just add “2023-2024 monies” to the original motion. Garth Lewis-seconded

All in favor-motion carries.

- 3.4** MJUSD Update-James Lohman Thanked group for support and shared information on progress on MJUSD. Looking to have at least 45 graduates this year. Able to double number of classes. Increase in instructional hours. James worked with ESL team to revamp program. Last year’s outcomes were not effective-now in person. On track to have 15-20 students complete the ESL program this year. Started CTE coursework-17 CTE courses. Reviewed community partnerships. Internships and apprenticeships. Working with Yuba County One-Stop. Next year adding capstone courses to get more hands on career prep. Working with local businesses for externships. Adding satellite campus in Robbins in fall. High population-huge need there. Garth-congratulations on your outcomes. Asked about number of staff members and other funding sources. MJUSD assistance, Health and Human Services, Parent and Community Education and others. James wanted to make it clear that he is not paid from Adult Ed. They have a lead, a clerk, and six (6) teachers. Garth asked about FTE. James said they have four (4) FTE. Mike-I was not going to vote for this but I think you should come to all of our meetings and petition to become a member.

- 3.5** CFAD 2024-2025 Discussion-Lorilee indicated the proposal before you has COLA. Highlighted items are areas on which we need to make a decision. Far right indicates May revise and how that was allocated in NOVA. Statute says that you cannot receive less than your prior year’s allocation. Discussion item is what we do want to do with the \$100,000 that was one time monies awarded to Marysville and the one-time pool monies. Recommendation from leadership is to put it in the pool money and put it into the allocation. Group asked Lorilee for clarification. Had concern that this was also 2024-2025. Discussion ensued. ½ sheet is for 23-24. Lizette-once we consider this we need to have a separate line item for the \$40,000. Rob-my understanding was that the \$100,000 was only going to happen once and questioned why we are going about this again. Lorilee-this is a proposed allocation model. Brock-provided clarification-we could give it to Marysville, we could take it and redistribute it. Lorilee-leadership makes a recommendation and executive makes the decision. Rob-Dr. Fal breaks promises to Yuba COE. She continues to break her word. Lizette-interesting that you are essentially allowing new members into the consortia but they had an adult school when CAEP was established. Is there historical context that Maryville is a member? I have seen this in my prior role in the Chancellor’s office; I have seen it then go into very ugly legal battles. I am just trying to understand the history and how we got here. Garth-when I asked about other funding sources, I just wanted to understand what this contribution means. I do not have a contextual understanding. Rob-this should be MJUSD’s responsibility. Superintendent tends to bully into things and I do not appreciate it. Garth-what are the facts, the issues-in terms of dollar amounts? I still do not have enough information that would affirm another allocation. Mike-we decided that if you wanted to be part of the consortium then you needed to apply. It was an allocation that we allowed because we

had the funds and we knew it would impact students directly. Tawny-MJUSD was initially brought in as a non-funded member, then next year one time money. More money allocated to Yuba to run these programs. Lizette-is there a proposal attached to these? Rob-how is money going to be spent-where is it going to go? We have nothing to show what that \$100,000 went for. James-we turn in fiscal reports to Sutter County. K12 dollars are for K12 students. Provided example about one time grant purchase of Chromebooks. Rob asked for percentages regarding how much was spent. Rob-someone needs to make a motion. Group discussed not giving \$100,000 to MJUSD but where are we going to put that money. Garth-document should have reflected that MJUSD is not a funded member. This document does not present well. Brock- recommended to honor leadership recommendation of \$3000 from may revise, \$40,000 and a one-time pool that Marysville can apply for...group said no. Discussion of language ensued. Rob- this gave red flags to me because it makes them appear that they are a member and they are not. Tawny-can we consider giving that funding to Yuba COE and then Marysville would have an opportunity to work with them. Lizette-would this be one-time or ongoing? Garth-I am not comfortable with ongoing. I do not have enough information to make a decision. Mike-we can meet again if we have to. Rob-maybe at this point it gets redistributed amongst the whole. Nothing was presented or brought to our attention of how this \$100,000 was going to be spent. This is coming across as if we are trying to do an ongoing. Rob- to Lorilee -did they present anything to your group? Tawny-this is presented as if it is an ongoing thing- even a COLA is included in this document. Garth-the way things are presented, the processes-in this case-we missed the mark. Rob agreed and questioned why are we doing this again. Tawny-do we have any ideas that can get us traction because we cannot leave today until we approve? Brock-if we were to take the \$100,000 and set that aside, would that allow us to redistribute the money how we see fit. Lorilee-yes, we can with an allocation amendment. Concern of Executive Committee group: Need to remove Maryville USD from this document. In addition to this, their COLA would need to be removed. Lorilee-the way this reads is how it was reflected last year and I just took those numbers and put it in 24-25. Recommendation was that there is not going to be a one-time pot of money it was to be redistributed among agencies. This would become a permanent allocation. Once it is in CFAD, there is no flexibility in the future unless we get a COLA.

Motion: Lizette Navarette moved to approve a two-part motion to

- 1. Reallocate COLA to eight (8) agencies instead of nine (9)**
- 2. Establish a one-time pool for 2024-2025 year for \$100,000 to be determined at a future meeting for consortia needs.**

Tawny Dotson stated that we would need a third part to the motion to designate the \$40,000
 Lizette agreed and Karin Liu asked for clarification of the motion.

Motion restated by Lizette Navarette as:

- 1. Reallocate COLA to eight (8) agencies instead of nine (9)**
 - 2. Establish a one-time pool for 2024-2025 year for \$100,000 to be determined at a future meeting for consortia needs.**
 - 3. Reallocate \$40,000 to the eight (8) agencies.**
- Garth Lewis-Seconded**

5 ayes/yes 1 abstention (Michael West) Note: Tom Reusser did not vote as he left the meeting early

- 3.6** AB 1491 Guidance/Carryover Update- Lorilee- recommendation from Leadership was to not be as prescriptive. Rob-green part is suggestions of Leadership. Rob-red part is what we had discussed in Executive. Garth thanked Rob for showing up to yesterday's Leadership meeting. Rob asked Lorilee about change to 18 months. Lorilee explained a 12 month with a six-month spending time to give time to spend finds. Lizette asked for clarification on spending timelines 18 and 6- now 12 and? Lorilee- if a member does this for two consecutive years and we do nothing about it then the State comes in and gives Technical Assistance. Brock-asked about last green and last red statement-is there overlap in these two statements? Rob-is this redundant, more defining? Lorilee-"red words-can be redistributed to other members. Red is AB 1491 language stating that members funds cannot be reduced by more than the carry over amount. Brock-this limits how much can be redistributed. Lizette-fiduciary responsibility of the grantee and one of the consortia. Recommended splitting this in two. Tawny-is the intention if you do not spend it within 18 months, it automatically getting redistributed. Grammatically incorrect. Discussion followed around current language regarding redistribution. Tawny-what you are describing and what is written are two different things. Brock agrees. Lorilee-that is why we are here. Rob-do we want to discuss this now because Tom has to leave at 2:00. Rob- I would like to tie this up and put a bow on it but I do not want to rush it either. Brock-coming back to your point here. Maybe this

should not say 18 months. Maybe it should just say two years. Rob-if we can spend the money down and we can do it amongst the group. Mike-officially notification at 18 months. Rob-intent was to give 6 months to spend it. Essentially, to not wait until we got to 24 month. Lorilee-leadership thought to have a little cushion. Brock-do we want to draw a hard line and just say 18 months? Discussion continued. Mike-what constitutes spending-what constitutes allocation? Gave PGE example...Garth-question around vote become incredibly important for dialogue so that it is not an automatic trigger. Language currently does not speak to that. Continued discussion about language-MUST, apply, infer. Tawny-this is the first time we have considered this language. I personally do not feel that I could get to a vote on this today. Mike-is there a sense of urgency of when this needs to be completed? Brock-sounds like we can wait until the next meeting. Rob-yes, let's wait until the next meeting. Brock-I respect director's opinion to not prescribe spending targets. Garth-sentence after yellow highlight-rather than prior allocations we should call out excessive carryover. No vote

3.7 Announcements

3.8 Next Meeting-August 2024 date and location? No decision

Action 4.0

ADJOURNMENT-

Motion to Adjourn: Tawny Dotson **Seconded:** Brock Falkenberg

Motion approved by all members stating "aye/yes". No roll call taken

Rob Gregor adjourned the meeting at 2:47 p.m.