
EC MEMBERS PRESENT*: **Carrie Bisgard, PYLUSD; Araceli Chavez, NOCROP; Carlos Hernandez, AUHSD; Fatinah Judeh, OCDE; Kenneth Lopour, Ed.D, LAUSD; Robin Patterson, GGUSD; Valentina Purtell, NOCE; Steve Zamora, FJUHSD**

EC MEMBERS ABSENT*: Karen Bautista, Ed.D NOCE; Sandi Layana, FJUHSD; Dana Lynch, NOCROP, Jennifer Prado, NOCROP

*Bold text denotes Board-Approved Designees and/or Alternatives who officially voted

ADDITIONAL WG LEADERS PRESENT: Margie Abab, NOCE (Basic Skills/High School Diploma); Karla Frizler, NOCE (ESL); Adam Gottdank, NOCE (DSS); Deb Perkins, NOCE (Transition); Dennis Davino, NOCE (K-12 Student Success)

NOCRC STAFF PRESENT: David Afshar (Basic Skills Liaison); Nathan Brais (ESL); Michelle Bringman (Basic Skills, GED/HiSET); Judy Craig (DSS); Renee Day (K-12 Student Success); Kenneth Kiesselbach (CTE/I-BEST); Denise Levy (Grant Support); Janeth Manjarrez (Project Lead); Jayzelle Mata (Project Lead); Diane Mendoza (K-12 Student Success); Hilda Rivera (ESL); Regina Russell (Project Lead); Roxanna Soto (Regional Workforce); Ivan Stanojkovic (DSS); Harpreet Uppal (OIRP)

GUESTS PRESENT INVITED BY NOCRC: Terry Cox (NOCE); Kenia Cueto, Ph.D (NOCROP); Dulce Delgadillo (NOCE); Jason Makabali (NOCE); Heather Reekstin (PYLUSD); Martha Turner (NOCE); Ty Volcy (NOCE)

-
- I. **Welcome:** Procedures for meeting participants reviewed by Janeth, with mention that meeting is being recorded. The meeting agenda was presented on slides three and four, where Janeth commended the work performed by Kenneth Kiesselbach, Denise Levy, and her, with all workgroups and funded members. Janeth expressed from the meetings the shared information, where the same level of opportunity was applied, “to make sure that we were clear, that we were transparent, and that we were equitable. So, every funded member had an opportunity to meet with us and talk about their budget.” Janeth further stated the purpose of reviewing the 2019-2020 budgets, with mention that 2020-2021 fiscal year budget review coming up soon. Roll call confirmed enough voting members present to satisfy quorum, which started with the first agenda item, a.
- a. Approval of revised March 19, 2020 meeting minutes – **VOTING ACTION ITEM**
- i. Correction made to page two, where date for “Next Online Executive Committee Meeting” was originally listed with the first meeting date of April 16, 2020 – revised to the date of April 30, 2020.
- Vote
1. Motion to approve revised March 19, 2020 meeting minutes made by Carlos Hernandez.
 2. Fatinah Judeh seconded.
 - ✓ With no abstentions or opposition, motion approved.

b. Approval of April 30, 2020 meeting minutes – **VOTING ACTION ITEM**

Vote

1. Motion to approve April 30, 2020 meeting minutes made by Carrie Bisgard.
2. Robin Patterson seconded.
- ✓ With no abstentions or opposition, motion approved.

c. Approval to extend the NOCRC meeting interim process until September 2020, due to COVID-19 – **VOTING ACTION ITEM**

With specific mention of NOCRC Mega Workgroup and Executive Committee meetings, Janeth stated that guidelines from the state indicating next steps for meeting in person have not been received. “We also have to take in consideration that we do not have a July meeting. This is the only meeting where we do not meet physically or online.” Janeth further explained by extending the process until September, the interim process supports workgroup members who would otherwise have a lot of meetings, attending one mega workgroup meeting benefits them. “I also want to support this process because, as we know, we’re moving forward with budget reductions. We understand now that the bread and butter of our guidelines of our CAEP funds is going to be a formula funding base.”

“There’s probably been one workgroup that has been voicing to and meeting after or aside from the (mega) workgroup meeting. If time permits that you find the time to meet outside of these two meetings, please go ahead and do so. You have our full support. I would like to be notified and would ask that you let us know, since every workgroup is not a silo. We are all in this together, and if it’s NOCRC related, we ask that you notify me and let me know how we can support you in that process. If there are not any guidelines returned to us in September, we can revisit this process.”

Kenneth Lopour asked if a date has been set for when the state wants the revised budgets.

Janeth responded that she does not foresee anything in September, “because right now, the biggest focus is on the budget reductions that are due June 15th from the May revise from our state governor. After all of that is settled, then they will give us some information about what those guidelines are going to be so that we can follow them.”

Vote

1. Motion to approve the extension of the NOCRC meeting interim process until September 2020, due to COVID-19 made by Kenneth Lopour.
2. Carlos Hernandez seconded.
- ✓ With no abstentions or opposition, motion approved.

II. Approval of revised CAEP budget (2019-2020) per program area: NOCRC Workgroups

Janeth started by reiterating that at the “last Mega Workgroup meeting and until yesterday, we finalized all workgroups from our consortium to reach consensus on their budget revisions. Every funded member had an opportunity to really focus on their budgets; tried to maximize the funding and the activities to best align with the consortium. They were given that opportunity to come together collectively and figure out next steps.” Janeth further explained how each program area would be displayed, which all would see the original approved budget alongside the revisions and difference. Finally, Janeth recommended that assigned workgroup leaders come forward if anything is missed during review of their workgroup section.

a. Basic Skills/High School Diploma

VOTING ACTION ITEM – TABLED FOR EMAIL VOTE JUNE 5, 2020

1. 2019-2020 revised budget allocation:

a. original: \$705,160

b. revised: \$705,160

Initial vote, soon after revised*

~~1. Motion to approve the Basic Skills/High School Diploma 2019-2020 revised budget allocation made by Carrie Bisgard.~~

~~2. Fatinah Judeh seconded.~~

~~✓ With no abstentions or opposition, motion approved.~~

***With no questions, voting took place on the Basic Skills/High School 2019-2020 revised budget allocation but was later revised.**

INFORMATIONAL ITEM

1. Remote learning software (2) for high school equivalency instructional strategy: \$5,109.00

a. “Kuta”

b. “Study.com”

Janeth explained there were no reductions for Basic Skills, which contains four strategies and one line item for one special project manager. “There (were) no reductions given the fact that all of their funding will be fully spent by June 30th. There was only one adjustment, and we did this with all funded members for 2019-2020; rather than sending that carryover funds, we gave them the opportunity to see where else could they place those funds, and every funded member did that. In this case, we have allotted about \$5,000.00 for software purchase within their budget. It originally was one of the one-time projects, however, we reduced it to about \$10,000.00 so that they could have utilized their carryover funds from 19-20 to offset that cost. It did not come from anywhere else, it came from their original encumbrances, or allotment in this case.”

b. Career Technical Education/Workforce Development

VOTING ACTION ITEM – TABLED FOR EMAIL VOTE JUNE 5, 2020

1. 2019-2020 revised budget allocation
 - a. original: \$1,849,405
 - b. revised: \$1,219,531

INFORMATIONAL ITEM

1. NOCROP-reallocating funds in the CTE data and accountability budget from 2000's to 6000's: \$3,000.00

Janeth commented on and thanked ROP and NOCE for doing “great job of coming together and really understanding the need of revisions and modification, and understanding the place we are in.” Janeth explained the total of four strategies and one line item for the special project manager, with a total reduction of \$629,874.

Raine Hambly, CTE Workgroup Leader, provided an in-depth overview of the overall reduction, “A lot of this was salary savings because we weren’t able to hire our permanent staff. So that was where a great majority of our CTE outreach, pathways, and student support. Then we also moved the counselor position out to the transition strategy, so that was also an additional big savings that we had in our budget line item.”

Kenneth Lopour stated that was his next question, which was where it all came from?

Janeth responded, “A lot of things were allotted; salaries were sort of a placeholder where the amount was in place. That is one of the reasons we will get into the logistics and the next steps for the 20-21 fiscal revision, but we need to make sure that we fully execute 19-20 so that we can adjust the numbers accordingly. Just know that not every fund reduction is actual funds and money that gets moved, it just gets deleted. One of those was the salary encumbrance, and again, they had an opportunity to move it either elsewhere or keep it as is.” “In this case, we moved out the salary for the transitional counselor, but it was not technically deleted. It was moved from elsewhere from this budget.” “It’s either reducing the amount, like deleting the amount, it’s not entirely that way. It’s just a reduction of the overall cost.”

Carlos Hernandez interjected his need “to understand the ‘reoccurring’ costs of what is staying and what is not staying. So are the staff members that \$101,000?” With confirmation that Carlos’ understanding was correct, Carlos asked, “What staff members are these?” Janeth answered, “This is for one of the special project managers. Most workgroups have a special projects manager (K-12, DSS, CTE, etc.) but there has been a change. As you know, we have shared this in the past on some of these special project managers have been helping

other workgroups. At least for NOCE, there has been an institution-wide reduction on temporary positions and personnel. So, you have got to remember that these 'reoccurring' can change for 20-21 fiscal budget. But this is the way it states and must be stipulated for the 19-20 budget, so that all items can be fully spent. So, what can be reoccurring for this year's budget may not be reoccurring for next year's budget."

Carlos expressed that this did not make sense, and Raine offered explanation, "When we wrote the 19-20 budget, we had reoccurring which was salaries, and then we had one-time requests. The reoccurring that still shows there, that is for the special project manager that was kept in that budget because paid them out of the CTE or the Workforce Development budget. That is why it shows reoccurring, so that we can change, and there were two special project management positions, sorry. Those were reoccurring because we were expecting to hire them, or an equivalent the following year, and then everything else was in one-time. There were more positions in the reoccurring, the staff positions I was talking about like my Student Service Specialist, but those were reduced completely out. That is why they are not showing in reoccurring anymore because we are not just going to spend those for 19-20. But what Janeth is telling you is, just because it was reoccurring in 19-20, moving forward for 20-21, that has all changed again, based on the positions we've been approved for 20-21. So, that's just how we had it built for 19-20."

With understanding, Carlos stated he had more questions. Janeth stated she would be sending out a template that contained guidelines for what is reoccurring and what is one-time. "There is a flexibility and some things being interchangeable, like when some strategies as a whole can be seen as a one-time because collectively, you are piloting a project that we do not know if it is going to work or not. That was one of the earlier priorities for CAEP, to figure out what projects helped our adult learners in our community. Collectively in every guideline, there are things what are one-time and reoccurring.

Technically, if we are going to go into technicality, nothing should be reoccurring because it is a grant. We can (only) have that much faith in it, without losing the realism in it. CAEP is also a program which is a little bit harder than an actual grant. We are reviewed every three years. So, in every three years, collectively, with the guidelines we can decide what is reoccurring and what is one-time. Typically reoccurring could be a project manager that most workgroups have it that way, or it could be one of the strategies that continues to support our adult learners, such as instructional support for our students" i.e., ESL classes, adjunct faculty, counselors, etc. "That is what we collectively have decided, and it can always alternate and change on a annual basis because technically, the funding is not 'on a reoccurring basis's since it has a deadline every fiscal year.

With specific reference to the CTE: I-BEST Support Instructors, TOTAL ORIGINAL Budget EC Approved category amount of \$187,891, and nothing now being reoccurring, Carlos expressed interest in knowing what the actual staff reductions are. Janeth clarified that the reoccurring is not just inclusive of staff for which Carlos countered wanting to “understand what the reductions are because this is impacting our community. It’s impacting our students and our families, and I want to make sure to do what I’m supposed to do, which is I’m supposed to be voting to approve, or to not. So, this is, these are critical decisions we’re making, and so I want to make sure that I understand what is best for our students and our families and adults in the lives of, the hard work that you are doing, you know, before I can approve some, you know decisions like this where I’m not looking at what the actual, you know, staff or programs.”

With acknowledgment and thanks for Carlos’ input, Janeth offered a few minutes to open and review the spreadsheet that was sent by email, to review the CTE strategy for which Carlos countered that a few minutes is not sufficient time “to be able to evaluate the reductions and adjustments” with awareness of the June 30th deadline.

Janeth then sought recommendations from voting members, “that we can move forward and address your questions and get to the budgets that we need to get (to). If we run out of time, we can always set up another meeting and take it from there before June. We still have to give time to the workgroups and the funded members to revise their budget for the 20-21 fiscal year.”

Valentina Purtell pointed out that we only have one month left in the 19-20 year, “and from what I can see there are certain adjustments that need to be made that are critical for us to be able to close the year, and I’m open to different solutions and ways of looking at our budget, but I also want to encourage all members, I know, speaking on behalf of NOCE to do everything that we can to make the changes in 20-21 budget, because that is the budget that is coming up. And that is the budget that’s getting hit by, if I remember correctly, close to \$500,000 for our consortium. So, just for the planning purposes and investing of our time in the most effective manner at NOCE, we are focusing right now, and we are planning very significant reductions in 20-21 to meet our budget reduction target.”

Janeth offered offline meetings with the voting members, or whomever necessary in terms of understanding the technicalities that we too have to take care of, and understand that all of our budgets, we will not be presenting this if it was out of compliance. We will not be presenting if this is going to negatively impact all of our budgets and our funding. That is not our intent. And so, we want to make sure that is clear and that is understood and learned in terms of educating and learning about the budget process. I think that's something that

we definitely have to do collectively. I'm happy to put that together, but given the circumstances today, voting members, I do ask you to that, if we can please move forward with any, like I said I'm also open to what the majority of you feel best is needed for our consortium for the 19-20 budget. Again, I want to reiterate, this is due June 30th so if we were to extend it, we would have to probably address it in the next couple of days.”

Raine spoke to Carlos, because of her mention of it being for salaries, “One of the unique things, as I’m sure most of you who have CTE programs, are where we have multiple funding sources for Career Technical Education. We have Strong Workforce, which is now in K-12 and community colleges. We have Perkins, and then we have CAEP. We’ve always tried to leverage all those funding sources, but sometimes expenses happen amongst the different funding sources. So when we looked at our budget specifically for NOCE CTE, which is the Outreach, Pathways and Student Support, the I-BEST, and then the Regional Workforce development one, we had discovered that some of the things we wanted to do, we actually spent out of other funding’s because sometimes we have them in multiple things in order to cover all the costs. So, the costs aren’t as great as we had expected, and just didn’t need the money for CAEP. In our effort to give money back, knowing that we’re going to face a \$500,000 cut next year, but at least we decided to just release that funding and continue covering those activities through our other funding sources, with the exception of salaries. Salaries are just something we hire those individuals. The plan was to hire them in 20-21.” In closing, Raine stated that funding was leveraged too well, and it was no longer needed from CAEP, “we just wanted to make sure that the money went back into the pot for us to use in planning for the future, but all activities that we had planned did happen. We were able to do them, getting through with either temporary or permanent staff.”

Pointing out the time, and other budgets and action items, Janeth called for consensus in either proceeding or readjusting as needed.

Fatinah expressed interest in scheduling another special meeting to allow time for revision review, enabling informative voting.

Kenneth Lopour echoed Fatinah’s interest stating he has some questions as well.

Steve Zamora resonated with Fatinah and Kenneth.

Janeth called for voting members to bring up their calendars in order to set-up a date in the next few days or early next week, which would leave other workgroup members less time to focus on their (20-21) revisions, further reminding all of the (June 30th) deadline and next Executive Committee meeting, which is June 25th.

Kenneth Lopour sought clarity on what was presented today as it seemed different from what was presented in the previous meeting, which was “overflow”, and seemingly now two different budgets?

Janeth clarified that the 2019-2020 matches, but at the previous meeting, what was presented was a compilation of 2019-2020 and 2020-2021. Janeth further explained that the spreadsheet that was sent earlier contained all revisions, welcoming review, and questions from voting members in a meeting that will include NOCCCD budget and fiscal representatives, Terry Cox and Denise Levy.

Kenneth Lopour posed a second question which in relation to his “previous time on boards such as these, usually a staff (member) makes a recommendation on what the appropriate budget is” and “after all the reductions, we are in line with what they out to be, and this is your final recommendation?”

Janeth confirmed that the workgroups have been working on their budgets diligently, and “we did our due diligence to meet with them individually. Our office was very thorough and included Denise Levy, Terry (Cox) and everybody on the fiscal side to make sure that these numbers online are reflective and they’re in compliance.” In guaranteeing this, Janeth offered additional time for those who need to understand how budget procedures work. Janeth also explained a closed meeting option for voting members, which is done in all consortiums, however, given the amount and time of all involved, she is happy to transcribe and present question and answers to the entire consortium.

Valentina stated “there is a lot of value in having content experts in the room when we talk about budgets, because we can hear from the first source on what the strategies were meant to be, the expected outcomes, and also the intricacies at times shifting the funding around.” Also commenting on how much time this can take, Valentina made the, “recommendation to approve the 19-20 budget, as recommended by staff and by our workgroups, and to really spend the bulk of our time in June on the 20-20 budget because, like I said, this is where most of the revisions will take place and I foresee us taking a significant amount of time and diving deeply, and understand where those reductions will take place.”

Janeth acknowledged Valentina’s recommendation, as well as the chat box where attendees commented that the meeting being open. Janeth then addressed voting members with mention of the time being 2:20 p.m., the recommendation of doing “a thorough review on the 20-21 (budget), which was expected because we have more time. We have until June 25th to actually approve the budget and then June 30th to submit for CFAD, and having all of the voting members certify it, going into NOVA.” Reiterating the time for 2020-2021, Janeth stated that “we need to come to a consensus, if not immediate for this budget, and I do want to say it has been vetted.”

Addressing her comment about special meeting, Fatinah did not “want anyone to think that was without the workgroup members. The intention wasn't to only have it with the voting members, I would prefer that it'd be open to all, if we do meet again regarding the budget. I just want to emphasize that point.

Steve Zamora referred to Valentina’s suggestion, asking “is there a problem with us going ahead in and approving the 2019-2020 budget and then talking about the 20-21 budget in a special meeting next week sometime?”

Janeth answered, “No, in terms of the compliance part of the numbers and the budgets, and doing due diligence with all the workgroup members, that has been vetted. So, there's no problem with that.

Second Vote, later revised**

- ~~1. Steve Zamora then made the “recommendation that we make a motion to approve the 19-20 budget, and then to postpone approval on the 20-21 until we can come up with a date sometime next week. Obviously early next week.”~~
- ~~2. Carrie Bisgard seconded.~~
- ~~3. Carlos Hernandez opposed.~~
- ~~✓ With one opposition, and no abstentions, motion approved.~~

***With no questions, voting took place on the overall 2019-2020 revised budget allocation but was later revised.**

- c. Disability Support Services
 1. 2019-2020 revised budget allocation – **VOTING ACTION ITEM – TABLED FOR EMAIL VOTE JUNE 5, 2020**
 - a. original: \$997,805
 - b. revised: \$981,005
 2. Transferring funds from transition strategy to ARISE strategy, for salary, benefits adjustments, and furniture order: \$15,000.00 – **VOTING ACTION ITEM NOT YET APPROVED, TABLED TO JUNE 25, 2020**
- d. English as a Second Language

VOTING ACTION ITEMS – TABLED FOR EMAIL VOTE JUNE 5, 2020

 1. 2019-2020 revised budget allocation
 - a. original: \$914,413
 - b. revised: \$817,371
 2. Furniture purchase for the ESL Learning and Assessment Center: \$71,144.25

e. K-12 Student Success

1. 2019-2020 revised budget allocation – **VOTING ACTION ITEM – TABLED FOR EMAIL VOTE JUNE 5, 2020**

- a. original: \$1,163,803
- b. revised: \$861,957

2. Community Schools Model strategy MOU extension from June 30, 2020 to June 30, 2021: \$255,439.45 (originally encumbered on September 1, 2019) - if amount is approved, it will be added to year two, one-time funds for this project – **VOTING ACTION ITEM NOT YET APPROVED, TABLED TO JUNE 25, 2020**

INFORMATIONAL ITEM

- 1. Move funds from 5000s to 2000s, from travel to PE salaries to cover additional PE salary costs for transition to distance learning: \$5,000.00

f. Project Lead-NOCRC/CAEP Office

VOTING ACTION ITEM – TABLED FOR EMAIL VOTE JUNE 5, 2020

- I. 2019-2020 revised budget allocation
 - a. original: \$2,606,005
 - b. revised: \$1,666,479

III. NOCRC Budget Decision Making Guidelines –

VOTING ACTION ITEM – TABLED UNTIL JUNE 25, 2020

Janeth led, “As a department head of the consortium and it is my responsibility and accountability to make sure that we provide guidance and processes for budget disbursement, as well as CAEP metrics. We have not had an actual, in writing, it's always been by the good support and good stewardship and knowledge and collaboration of our workgroup and our consortium, as a whole. We've have had the luxury of having to program, to fund, if not all strategies. Unfortunately, things have changed, and we have now a budget reduction by the state, and we will continue (to) have a budget reduction by the state until 2024. That's the agreement, as well as you know now means completely measured by our outcomes. So that's going to be our bread and butter moving forward.

So, the guidelines really come from the experience that we have had had in the last couple of months. Also in working with, and I say Valentina in this case as the not only the NOCE voting member but also the fiscal agent representative of the (NOCCCD) district and our consortium, in that sense, and put these guidelines together to make sure that we continue to be equitable and as fair as possible, and transparent with how we allocate our funding moving forward. Our goal is not to approve proposals versus the other ones voting members, but we don't know if that's going to be the case moving forward. So, that's something that we have to prepare for in order to continue our help our consortium and our adult learners.

I do want to say that the criteria for Education Code 84914, it is directly for our bill, which is (our) CAEP, the California Adult Education Program. So, whether we approve this or not, isn't started or not. We have to abide by it that it's an automatic.

I just want to make sure that it was also included so everyone has an opportunity to learn and know, as well as other CAEP criteria that was done by NOCE for the proposed permanent positions. Janeth turned the floor over to Valentina for further elaboration.

Valentina thanked Janeth and started stating that the document is just a draft, further welcoming feedback, suggestions, and revisions from all consortium members. "It's just a good practice for any consortium to have budget decision guidelines, sort of a philosophical document that we can adhere to, not just in bad times, but also in good times something a guideline that would guide our decisions in terms of resource allocation." In the interest of saving time, Valentina highlighted the "first section" of the document, specifically the "philosophical part" which "talks about things like being student centered. Also being good stewards of the funding categorical in this case grant funding. Expanding the consortiums capacity in serving our students and really leveraging of each member of the consortium without necessarily duplicating efforts and duplicating services where it's not necessary, but rather, sort of like when we are together we're stronger than when we are apart.

The second part, for 'Criteria for Budget Reduction Strategies due to COVID-19 Emergency', obviously that's a more specific section that has to do with present time and talking about the uniqueness of this situation where we all transition to remote operations and instruction. And, on top of it, we are now dealing with the state budget cuts so we would have to mitigate both. So, the second section talks about when we make decisions, should we focus on the expenses, the strategies that would enhance our ability to serve our community remotely?" Valentina continued with providing information as to how the (NOCCCD) district for example is going to be providing the majority of services and instruction remotely, with in-person limitations for "what is essential in today's world" and non-essential items such as "travel, off-site rental agreements" which have been eliminated. "When we make those difficult decisions, are we making them from the perspective of long-term plan and sustainability?"

Valentina further recognized the strength of the consortium, as well as awareness of separate members and districts, "and a lot of things we do, are dictated by the policies and guidelines or decisions of our district. We are a compilation, a consortium of service providers and just speaking on, from the perspective of NOCE, we will continue, of course, providing services in the consortium. That is what we do. That is our core service without education, but we will have to do it within the constraints of our district. So, if our district makes a certain decision when it comes to budgets, a hiring freeze for example, or permanent versus temporary positions, and we were talking about having

these difficult conversations as a service provider or as a member, would have to abide by that because we are part of the district.

We tried to reflect that in the second section. If it needs to be strengthened, of course, we could do it, unless as Janeth mentioned the bottom section is the quote from the ed code that was just shared recently by the state CAEP leadership because, I am sure many or all consortia are in the same position.”

Valentina opened the floor for questions or comments on the guidelines, which at that time, Fatinah pointed out that the discussions being held in chat may need to be addressed.

As Janeth confirmed the chat box was being addressed, Carlos agreed with Fatinah and commented on the “issue” of approving the 19-20 budget, which if there are “errors and the current budget that was presented and it hasn’t been corrected, and we haven’t been given the corrected budget, and how is that responsible of us?” Janeth responded to Carlos, that is “not the entirety of the all the workgroups. I believe there's only one that we can always come back and have it approved online with those corrections. Are you comfortable with that?” Fatinah stated, “I think the concern is that we did not know that there were changes, and we just voted on that budget. Does that make sense? Like, we voted on the budget, but did not know that there was a change.” Janeth deferred to Karla Frizler, and asked that she “come forward and say what revisions were not addressed in the budget?” With the 2019-20 revised CAEP budget on screen for the English as a Second Language workgroup, and later with specific reference to the Non Credit Pathway to College strategy, Karla pointed out the incorrect number of adjust instructors of four, which should be three. Unsure as to if corrections were going to be made on screen during this meeting or revised offline and redistributed, Janeth called upon voting members on next steps which included having all workgroup leaders review their budgets one last time, with revisions being voted on, online. Karla interjected the need for detailed items such as the budget need to be distributed to workgroup leaders 24 hours at minimum prior to meeting to allow for adequate review. Valentina asked about the consortium using “the practice of approving items via email”, which Janeth confirmed was her recommendation. Valentina inquired if this “would give the voting members enough time for the needed assurance that they are approving what they have reviewed and understood?”

In response, Janeth brought up the potential for an online vote for the 19-20 budget, by Friday, June 5th (not 20-21, which is another meeting) and called upon Denise Levy and Terry Cox, for a fiscal perspective and how this impacts time and processes. Denise confirmed stating there is not a whole needed for the 19-20, but rather what is needed is 20-21. “As long as it's, everyone's in agreement that this is their bottom-line budget, that's the only thing I need when they, once they get a chance to look at it and approve it in, that's fine.

Then 20-21 is going to be the biggie where everyone really needs to look at it and see what's next year is going to be." Janeth asked Terry to confirm, which she agreed.

With confirmation of fiscal and business affairs, Janeth circled back to voting members with Valentina's recommendation of sending out to the "budget member owners (to) double confirm with the entire workgroup that those are the numbers, if they are accurate and then resubmit by June 2nd, which gives voting members the 3rd, 4th and 5th end of day by 5:00 p.m., to approve on the 19-20."

Valentina asked if a motion was needed, which would require voiding out the prior motion? Janeth confirmed this, which Carrie Bisgard sought clarification that with "only one month left of the 19-20 budget year, these are all cuts that have already been made for the most part" that this is "primarily a revised budget with money that we have already not spent?" Janeth confirmed further stating, "Correct, yes. All of these, most of these expenditures have been spent. So technically, we can't disapprove, something that has been already spent on. It's not even basic grant standard practice. What we're wanting to make sure is that everyone's transparent about what are these reductions for the overall allocation that they did. And make sure that we are in the exact number that we were originally going to be, that were given to us for 19-20 as an overall amount. And then those conversations about, now, what is going to be our current budget starting July, I think yes, those definitely require a little bit more time, more processing or collective work. Because this is something that's going to impact moving forward. This has already happened."

Carrie acknowledged Janeth's clarification and further stated being okay with taking a few days to review and vote in the coming week. Steve Zamora echoed Carrie's thought, which Janeth stated that the group is coming to a consensus to void the prior motion, "[or maybe motion to update the vote on the 2019 budget with extra days for the workgroup members to confirm their revisions by June 2nd, 5:00 p.m., which then gives voting members June 3rd to June 5th, end of day to submit their vote on the revised budget.](#) Again, these funds have been fully spent."

Vote

1. Valentina motioned to revise the prior motion, changing the vote for the 19-20 budget only, to occur by email by June 5th, 5:00 p.m.
2. Steve Zamora seconded.
- ✓ With no abstentions or oppositions, motion approved.

Before returning to the NOCRC Budget Decision Making Guidelines, Carlos asked that Janeth include "workgroup member leads, their contact email and phone numbers in case we have questions about the budget?" Valentina provided feedback to this, proposing "if voting members have questions about the

proposed revisions, would it work for them to send the questions to (Janeth), and for (Janeth) to forward it to an appropriate contact person, copying the voting member so that it is clear?" After Janeth confirmed, Valentina explained, "Because I want to make sure that our, and maybe even other voting members – because if one has a question, then others may have the same question." Fatinah agreed with Valentina, which determined handling of questions as pertaining to the 19-20 budget revisions forthcoming.

Returning to the guidelines, Janeth asked voting members if they wanted to move forward in approving them, or if they would like additional time to review for later input or discussion. Kenneth Lopour responded that he would like more time, asking further if there is a bullet point, or if one needs to be put in, that is "related to be attaching monies to metrics, like how many students have been impacted?" Janeth said there was and upon Kenneth inquiring which one, Valentina stated she was "nodding because I think it is a good suggestion. I'm not sure if it is listed." Kenneth then highlighted that "if it affects as many people as possible, it may be an awesome strategy, but if it is not really getting to students, then it may not be something that totally makes sense. Going forward, I do not know if this is the right document for that. I think that is already in the guidelines of the grant?" Janeth concurred, which Valentina continued, "I think it's good to reiterate it. I think it's, from my perspective, for our consortiums typically. Do you want, not to put it on you, but do you want to suggest that wording for that bullet?" Kenneth agreed.

Janeth stated "There's also, if you look at additional criteria hope that we don't get there because the goal is to make sure that we all get funded, meaning, all of our work groups as best as possible; but it is stipulated in additional criteria in terms of budget reduction on the percentage that they, so if collectively they get an amount that's the collective amount that they would also reduce to, and that's the other one. But if we want to discuss that further and implement another amount Ken, it is definitely open."

Kenneth responded that he would need some time to formulate the language to be shared at the appropriate time. Janeth acknowledged this, and sought recommendation on moving forward with the guidelines to either Friday, June 5th during the same time as the online vote, or at the June 25th Executive Committee meeting.

Vote

1. Valentina Purtell moved to defer the final approval of the NOCRC Budget Decision Making Guidelines to the June 25, 2020 Executive Committee meeting.
2. Seconded by Carlos Hernandez.
- ✓ With no abstentions or oppositions, motion approved.

IV. Closing Discussion and Member Updates (as shown on screen)

- a. CAEP 2020-2021 budget reductions for all program areas due to Janeth Manjarrez:
 - i. Monday, June 15, 2020, 5:00 p.m.
 - ii. Instructions for how to submit are forthcoming
- b. Next online Mega Workgroup meeting:
 - i. Wednesday, June 17, 2020,
 - ii. 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.
- c. Next online Executive Committee meeting:
 - i. Thursday, June 25, 2020,
 - ii. 1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
- d. CFAD deadline:
 - i. Tuesday, June 30, 2020

In closing, Janeth emphasized the deadlines, and the need to have timely information for voting member review (at least 24 hours prior). Janeth also emphasized that there is no extension on the CFAD deadline, making “sure that we move forward and finalize and approve the 19-20 budget because we also have to upload it into NOVA. As well as the Executive Committee meeting to meet the final 21 fiscal which is 20-21 fiscal year budget collectively by the 25th so that all (voting) members in this case, will go back into NOVA before June 30th. Failure to do so will cause us payment delay, and we cannot get reimbursed, or proceed with our funding. So, it is in our best interest to make sure that we abide by and prepare for that deadline.”

Janeth opened the floor for questions or concerns, which Carlos sought clarification on the 24 hours as “sort of what we agreed on. So, if that timeline is what it is, then on Wednesday, June 24th, we would get the proposed 20-21 budget finalized and so, we can review?” Janeth confirmed this is correct, in hopes that we can have the information before, but this is a “good deadline for us.”

With no additional questions or concerns, the meeting adjourned at 2:52 p.m.