

Albuquerque Bilingual Academy
ABA GC Meeting Minutes for Virtual Meeting
Date: April 26, 2021

Board Members Present	Brenda Baca, Melissa Trujeque, Jose Garcia, Julian Munoz	
Absent	Doris Cole	
Others in Attendance	Chris Jones, Kyle Hunt, Danielle Miranda, Priyam Banerjee	
QUORUM	<u> X </u> YES <u> </u> NO	
Meeting called to order	Brenda Baca called the meeting to order at <u>5:35 pm</u> & Roll Call by Brenda Baca	
Item	Discussion	Action/Recommendation
Approval of Minutes	03/29/2021	Brenda Baca called for a motion to approve the 03/29 minutes. Melissa Trujeque motioned. Jose Garcia seconded. -Brenda Baca called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 3-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Approval of the Agenda	04/26/2021	Brenda Baca called for a motion to approve the agenda. Melissa Trujeque motioned. Jose Garcia seconded. -Brenda Baca called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 3-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Special Issues (Discussion/Action)		
Budget Report Updates	<p><u>Hunt</u>: Starting with our Revenue Report, these are all the revenues we received throughout the year. We are receiving most of the items as expected. We do need to establish budget authority for Medicaid but we are expecting one more reimbursement. Going down to our Expenditure Report, you can see that we do have most of our budget are in line properly. We do have a lot budgets right here that don't actually have any expenditures, starting with this \$146,000, \$7,000, and this \$34,000; those are actually for our K-5 Plus Program and we did have to add those back in because we are going to be running our program here in June. So, we will see expenditures there once that begins. Other than that, we do have a few minor negatives throughout the minor lines but we are like I said almost positive in almost all the others and for those minor negatives we do have a BAR tonight that will be addressing these. This custodial line does show a major negative but that's actually do to the fact that all of our custodian salaries are hourly right now and the way our system works is it encumbers the entire amount of possible hours worked not the actual hours worked. So, we won't actually see most of this actualized and it'll probably be about \$20-30,000 and that is also being addressed with the BARs tonight as well. Overall, our Operational Fund is showing \$1.27 million available that aligns closely with the budget that we'll be taking a look at later tonight with a few minor changes that we'll keep going over when we present that. And now we are utilizing those funds as expected. Title 1 does have a lot of availability in Function 1000 and negative availability of \$21,000 with a minor amount we're going to carryover; we do have a transfer BAR to address that budget tonight as well. Other than that, most of our lines are fully booked out. Cares Act does show a minor negative but we will reclass that once the payroll expenditures materialize as they do go over budget on those benefits. Other than that, not too many other major changes. We do have a lot of buildings and ground maintenance booked for this, if those materialize before July 1st we will correct that with a BAR as well in June. Going down to our Bank Account Register Activity Report, this is anything that entered or left our bank account within the month, so please feel free to stop me if you see any items that you do have questions over. Overall, we did have positive cash flow; we did receive a large amount in SEG \$337,000. We were receiving \$300,000 or so in the first few months and then we got our additional programs stacked and our updated account and it's a little bit higher. So, we're getting a lot more money than we were in previous months and we're going to continue to probably have positive cash flow for the remainder of the year as we get all our final RFRs in. Going down to our Bank Account Reconciliation, even though we did have positive cash flow up at the top of this report, the bank account is actually what entered or left the account. So a lot of these checks or we had a lot of outstanding checks that were actually cashed so that explains the discrepancy between this \$431,000 dispersed with only \$430,000 in deposits. Other outstanding checks are lower, we don't have any variance, and of those outstanding checks you can see the breakout here of that \$24,000. Going down to our Balance Sheet, that shows how that \$3 million is laid out with a majority of it being in Operational cash, closely tying to what we saw in that available budget. So, a lot in Food Services and mainly in our Capital Funds of 31600 and 31701 which are HB-33 and SB-9 respectively. Going down to the Dashboard, we don't have too many changes year over year. We are operating a reduced food program which is the main reason for this discrepancy right here and then we also have increased spending in that SEG- Support Services and that is mainly due to the timing of the programs and our major expenditures that</p>	

	<p>we're paying this year which should be leveling out at some point. And that is all I have for the Budget Reports, Brenda would you like me to proceed straight into the BARs?</p> <p><u>Baca:</u> Yes, Please.</p>	
Approval of BARs	<p><u>Hunt:</u> BARs for consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #0031-IB • #0032-M • #0033-T • #0034-M <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Justification: \$609,965- To create budget based on award for current year. 2. Justification: \$0- To adjust budget to match expenditures for current year. 3. Justification: \$0- To match budget to expenditures due to remote learning. 4. Justification: \$0- To move budget to match current year expenditures. 	<p>Brenda Baca called for a motion to approve BARs 0031-IB, 0032-M, 0033-T, and 0034-M. Melissa Trujeque motioned. Julian Munoz seconded. -Brenda Baca called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained</p>
Approval of FY22 Operating Budget	<p><u>Hunt:</u> So this is the year 2022 rough draft that Chris and I completed over the last few weeks. Our budget due date was actually this last Friday, 4/23 and we turned it in with no issues. This is a very preliminary budget using the basic numbers that we got from PED; this is just a lot of planning that Chris and I have done with the state mandates that we know so far, you can still change all of this with BARs once we pass this into FY22. But again this is just us meeting our PED deadlines which was 4/23, Friday actually. So starting with our Revenue, these are all of our operational revenues that we expect to receive this last year in FY21. We had \$480,000 in carryover and we actually believe that's going to be going up to about \$1.2 million this year. And you guys have been operating on a very restricted program because you guys were in such a deficit in previous years when all of you first came on from the previous situation of the school that we've been operating on a restricted program. And now you guys have your program stacking up, you have a lot of items going through in a lot of positives, increased student count going through, and your program is expanding rapidly and you haven't really had as many expenditures especially with COVID to kind of correlate to that and expend, so it's great that we've been actually been able to build out such a cash balance. Our SEG is also going from \$4 million to \$4.3 million over the next 12 months which is good. That is mainly due to the fact that we are continuing our K-5 Plus and ELTP Program that Chris will be talking about later tonight and our increased student counts and the increased unit value. Going down, we do expect subs to return, so we are increasing that budget account. For the most part though, we are just continuing the same amount of staffing that we have had with a few additional items you know, we're adding a few SPED teachers, SPED EAs, and an additional bilingual teacher. We're classifying all of our teachers from normally what they were is just regular ed but since we are now an at risk school and have to match at-risk funding which is shown in our SEG, all of our regular ed teachers are now just being shown as at-risk and then additional programs for K-5 Plus and ELTP stipends. So these are all at a 1.5% cost of living increase that is mandated with the most recent legislation. Going down, we do have the turn of increase in a few accounts such as a lot of our PD and travel, we didn't have that previously because all of that was on hold with COVID, and we're now adding those back in the budget. We have a lot for PD as teachers are now able to travel again; Chris has already talked about retreats and stuff like that. Expanding our PowerSchool systems and other technology and software for the students and supply assets. A lot of this is in the fact that we actually don't intend to expend \$600,000 on just additional laptops for the students but we do have to present a balance budget meaning that we are showing usage for this \$5.54 million. We can't project carryover for FY23, so again the budget has to be balanced at all times for the year that we're talking about. So that's why some of these accounts have these extremely large numbers even though we don't necessarily anticipate using all those funds. We do also have the STARS Coordinated being moved back in from the Title I program, the addition of our Attendance Liaison being funded out of Operational which was previously funded through the CARES Act, and an increase in a lot of the ancillary services such as our SLP, the OT, all of those. Going down, there weren't too many changes within the function 2300, just continuing with our superintendent, the GC secretary stipend, benefits, the required ones such as auditing, our legal, advertising, you guys are going to have more board training and travel probably this year. We do actually have some more staff additions, we talked about moving the assistant principals to a full principal, getting another assistant principal, our director of operations and receptionist to help with the front desk more, and corresponding benefits for all of those positions. Going down to 2500, this is where my contract and the IT contract with Lackey, along with our software for Apta fund, there's not too many changes and we don't anticipate any changes that I've heard from my group or from Mr. Lackey. Going down to our custodians, we are looking at full-time hourly custodians a lot more than we were previously operating at in the previous year just because the campus was closed for so much of FY21, so there is a major increase within this function. Other than that, we did get to move maintenance to SB-9 and HB-33 funds and some padding for our utility accounts since students are moving back in, we expect those to be higher as well. And then we do actually have an additional \$240,000 set aside in capital services and this is just to help any buildout with vacant buildings just so we don't have to rely entirely on those</p>	<p>Brenda Baca called for a motion to approve the FY22 Operating Budget and SY 21-22 Salary Schedule. Julian Munoz motioned. Melissa Trujeque seconded. -Brenda Baca called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained</p>

	<p>capital funds, if we need more. Are there any questions or concerns with any of the items that I presented for the budget?</p> <p><u>Hunt:</u> So Brenda if you'd like to act on this now with the GC you could do that or the salary schedule is also the next item and those are pretty much both the same item as part of the budget. And you could act on both of those items together after I present it or approve this and then move on to the salary schedule.</p> <p><u>Baca:</u> Kyle, we could do both of them at the same time if that's ok with you.</p>	
Approval of SY 21-22 Salary Schedule	<p><u>Hunt:</u> So as I previously mentioned, the state did mandate the 1.5% cost of living increase for all employees, not just teachers, but all employees at the school. That budget that you just saw did have that built in for every single returning employee. The main reason that we're only continuing at the 1.5% which is the state mandate is because we did exceed the state mandate last year; the original state mandate last year was 4% and then with COVID they had a special session and changed it back to 1% but we said you know we're in a good enough position and we already approved all of this and promised our employees this 4% and we continued with the 4% regardless. To make sure that we aren't getting too far ahead of ourselves or any other school salary schedule, we're continuing with 1.5% that's mandated and not anything above and beyond just so we're staying sustainable and not over exceeding anyone else's salary schedules. And putting us into a position in the future where we might not be able to afford all of the staff that we've been working with. So this is the salary schedule built in with 1.5% as I been talking about. Other than that it's just these calculated cells from the salary schedule that we've been using for the past few years when the state mandated a minimums of \$41,000, \$50,000, and \$60,000. We do have a few employees who are above the 20 years and normally they'd be just capped at this top level but because of the state mandate saying that they get 1.5% they will be exceeding the salary schedule by a couple \$100 for those select employees that are over those years of experience. That is all I have for those two items.</p>	
Approval of Funding Applications	<p><u>Jones:</u> This is the Title III Application for the next school year; this is 21-22. This was submitted today. Of course the PED will review it with their team to make sure all of the budget that's been entered aligns with the actual proposal and review everything to make that we've met all of the requirements set forth by the federal government. The first thing that I wanted to review is just the total amount of our allocation which is \$15,629.75. We know that we can go ahead and include several areas within the proposal and I will walk you through each of the areas and summary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach to ELD: ultimately what I did here was I described what we do to serve our EL students. One thing I believe is they will require that I include more information about how we provide instruction during our literacy block or our 45 minute ELD block that's built into our schedule. But all it says here is that we do have an ELD block and it's a 45 minute requirement on a daily basis. All of our students who are identified as EL receive instruction if their parents have not opted out of such instruction. We use a certain curriculum which is called McGraw Hills Wonders and we use Language Power and Edgenuity for students in grades 7-8. So we try to tailor our instruction to the developmental levels of our students; we look at their ACCESS for ELLs assessment scores and we provide instruction based on where they are currently. • Language Supports: Some of our teachers are trained in Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD) and it provides supports to ELs that they can access the content and general curriculum which is reading, writing, speaking, and listening supports. We use the WIDA Can-Do Descriptors and each of them has a system of supports that you can implement along with any lesson plan to ensure that your students are being taught at their developmentally appropriate level. We also have CLAVES which is a big initiative and big undertaking that the school embarked upon and we paid about \$20,000 for it; it's wrapping up this year but we hope to continue. These were eight strategies that help us to not only provide instruction for students that is appropriate for our ELs but it's the contextualized learning in making sure it's assessable for all students. We try to make it more practical for our kids and by that there are certain strategies that teachers use daily basis such as incorporating language into everything they do and build on student's identities using their backgrounds. It is all very intentional and it's a part of what we do in lesson planning. • Enrollment: We included the current year, the enrollment information and we have 370 students and 181 EL students. • Student Academic Achievement: Again, we have a 45 minute block of instruction for students. This is again speaking of CLAVES that initiative that I just kind of described. Also using the software that we've adopted as a district and then sharing our best practices with one another. • Professional Development: The majority of our funds to be honest and that's the most important part is PD. We have some rollover from last school year in the amount of about \$13,000 which has not been expended. We couldn't necessarily focus on obtaining on and ELL Coach because what we needed to do was focus on online instruction and making sure that people were prepared for that huge paradigm shift because of course teaching online is a lot different than teaching in person. So, instead of providing a lot of PD via Zoom, we felt that we should wait until we were back in person for full re-entry. Next year, in addition with 	<p>Brenda Baca called for a motion to approve the Title III application as presented. Julian Munoz motioned. Melissa Trujeque seconded. -Brenda Baca called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained</p>

	<p>the \$13,000 that you're seeing in front of you, we hope to add the .5 position for someone that could come in and focus on ELLs, coaching teachers, providing pull-out instruction for students that require such, and helping me to coordinate all of our programs to make sure that we are in fact meeting our obligations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parent, Family & Community Engagement: We have EL classes available to parents. Obviously, we know that COVID hindering any efforts that have for volunteers or parent involvement. But we hope next year that we have a breakthrough with this terrible disease and we can go back to our plan of providing ELD for our parents of our EL learners. We want to make sure that we strengthen their skill set and their language proficiency so that they can support their students at home. That's the ultimate goal of this Parent, Family & Community Engagement proposal that's built into the Title III application. • Authorized Activities: This speaks to how were going to either adopt new programs, purchase resources, or do other things that are approved so that we can strengthen the development of our ELs. I would like to purchase the bound versions of WIDA English Language Development Standards Framework 2020 Edition booklets. We have \$800 that has been allocated for 20 booklets x \$40/booklet = \$800. We hope to purchase two WIDA Early Years English Language Pack, 2 packs x \$60 = \$120. The total is = \$920. <p>With your approval, we will ensure that we stick to this proposal. As the PED provides me with feedback, I will make sure to update you in future meetings. If it is approved then of course we will come forward with the BAR and seek your approval once again. If it's not approved then we will go back to the drawing board and I will update you on any changes that we make. I will need you to sign Brenda which I believe I already sent that to you. Other than that, the only additional approval comes from myself and Kyle and we will have to submit the meeting minutes as soon as they're prepared and indicate when in fact the board did approve our application.</p>	
Facilities Updates	<p><u>Jones:</u> I have been communicating with Brycon a little bit and of course, Brenda and I have a lot going on with construction and facilities on our end. So, we continue to seek out different contractors and individuals who can assist with our projects. We know that we have a few projects in mind 1) buildout of our bus building, 2) baseball/softball fields, and 3) landscaping. Based on our facilities masterplan we have some priorities and priority number 1 is the buildout of our bus building to add additional classrooms, an art space, a computer lab, and a gymnasium. I'm going to share with you right now the correspondence that I've had with Brycon. Just to refresh your memories, we've collected bids and proposals from different individuals and we've been working with real estate agents and you name it. So, Brycon was the first to present to the board; we know that we did have some questions regarding the lack of a max price guarantee. They explained to us that they couldn't offer such a guarantee because of rising costs in supplies and materials; of course, building costs are increasing on a daily basis. We were a little uncomfortable at that given the price proposal which was about \$1.45 million for the complete buildout of the bus building. It came with a lot of good amenities that our school needs and it allows us to add additional classrooms to boost enrollment to our max capacity. But again, the one point of emphasis for the board and for myself was if we can't get a max price guarantee then we can't enter into an agreement because from a fiscal management side, that's very irresponsible. Because if we have to chew out of Operational to support this project, it may end up costing us programing. With that in mind, we have Brycon that's apart of CES and they're in the Blue Book. That would allow for us to avoid going to RFP which is a lengthy process that requires a lot of man power, due diligence on our part, and it's probably a 2-3 month process of putting out the legal advertisements and creating a committee to review the seal bids and scoring them. So, one thing that I did was reach out to Brycon and I told them that we are very impressed with the plans that they put forth, and that we like Wendy and the relationship we've had in the past. In the sense that they know the building and built it from the ground up for us and it would be advantageous for us to work with them and we would have to go through RFP. In that same state of mind, I did reach out to Aaron Johnson who is the Vice President; he's the one who initiated the process with us. I told him that we have \$1.2 million, so that's \$250,000 less than what he proposed but that we would feel more comfortable moving forward with this very project and getting all that they've promised within the proposal and if we have to make some minor modifications that's ok. So there are some things that we can do to trim back those costs. As you look at the rest of our campus, you'll notice that we have polished concrete and everything is very much simple sort of design. What they had built into our proposal was a lot of extras. So, I told him that the \$1.2 million would be a price point that I feel I would be comfortable entering into and I believe our board would be more inclined to accept such an agreement that allows us to have that wiggle room to increase slightly but stay well underneath the \$1.45 which you initially gave us as a proposal. Aaron agreed and said that was something that they could do; he has committed to a \$1.2 million pricing agreement. If we were to sign a contract, it's a design-build agreement. He said they will work with The Design Group which will ensure that they meet the needs of our school and they don't exceed that budget that we were very much uncomfortable with. So, right now the \$1.2 million gives us that wiggle room in case we have to increase costs by \$50,000 at some point but it is well underneath the \$1.45 million. Again, I feel comfortable and confident knowing what the school needs as the head administrator and previous assistant</p>	<p>Brenda Baca called for a motion to give Chris Jones the approval to proceed into a contract with Brycon with feedback from Jose if he can.</p> <p>Julian Munoz motioned.</p> <p>Jose Garcia seconded.</p> <p>-Brenda Baca called for a vote.</p> <p>GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained</p>

	<p>principal. I've been there from a time from when this wasn't even a thought and you guys have been there with me. But I believe it's time that we start with the action side of what we're doing and I know we had this discussion with the lease purchase agreement and you helped with that a ton. Now we're in a good place and I believe it's time to really start with the actual buildout and construction. The ultimate goal is to have a space for our kids to use before it's too late. I don't want us entering into an agreement in December; I would prefer that we start it sooner rather than later and I believe Brycon is a viable option considering their willingness to value engineering. I wanted to present this to you today for your consideration and if you're ok with it, I would like to seek your approval to execute a contract with Brycon to begin the construction process and begin the preliminary work which can be done within the next 30 days according to Brycon. On that note, I'll go ahead and open it up for any questions or comments. But again I am asking for your approval to move forward with this design-build agreement.</p> <p><u>Munoz:</u> So what happened? I was really uncomfortable with their presentation because they couldn't tie down a number. So, what did he tell you?</p> <p><u>Jones:</u> Well we had a pretty lengthy discussion and the way he explained it is the numbers that he provided to us were best case scenario and same thing with the landscaping project which we aren't entering into any agreements other than the buildout of the bus building. So, with landscaping they gave use usable space that we could use for teaching and learning like outdoor classroom space which is nice in a perfect world with a lot of budget. He explained that they did the same thing when it comes to the buildout of the bus building. So instead of having the high-end of everything we could get things that could save us a lot of money. But ultimately, what I told them Mr. Munoz: is that "we aren't comfortable spending that amount of money. We aren't comfortable with the fact that there isn't a max price guarantee because for us we don't have money to play with like someone who is purchasing a house may. So, we need to stick to this price and this is what we have to spend. So, if you're ok meeting us where we are, then I believe my board would be willing to entertain what you're proposing with this design-build agreement." And he said ok; he said "we can make whatever work as long as whoever we're working with, your board or yourself, understands that it's going to be a give and take. You aren't going to get the bells and whistles but you are going to get everything that you need and then some." Then I said "I'm willing to present that to the board."</p> <p><u>Munoz:</u> So did they provide you a plan then for the \$1.2 or what are we approving here? Just for you to get into contract with that \$1.2 without seeing the plans, or what?</p> <p><u>Jones:</u> So, the plans are the plans. When they broke down all of the expenses based on supplies and materials, they will prepare that again and the total amount of those plans will be \$1.2 million. He didn't have time to provide me with an actual design-build agreement. What you guys looked at last time was a more detailed proposal and I believe that they aren't comfortable either spending the amount of time putting together a detailed proposal until they know that we had some commitment on our end. But ultimately, what's going to happen is we will get the same type of proposal but more detailed which includes architectural fees and so forth because Wendy would be directly involved and she is the architect from The Design Group. At which point, we would be able to review the proposal and we would have a total amount of \$1.2 million with all of the expenditures broken down for us. So we didn't get to that point because it was a discussion earlier today. Again, my intent is to start the project sooner rather than later as long as we are being responsible. So let me share something else with you, just so you can look this through. These were the two options that were presented. Option A: assemble the pre-construction agreement that details the design process and has language that defines the overall project budget, pre-construction fee- designer and Brycon. They said they could provide us with an example, if we choose not to move forward with the construction we have the design and we've paid for that design. Option B: it's the same thing but it's the full amount of the anticipated project cost. It's our budget that we just prosed of \$1.2. Similar language of course, the difference is that's all inclusive for the whole project and we would be able to go forward more quickly. Ultimately, that's the only difference is that we could actually move forward without having any additional meetings and kind of delaying the process before Brycon's willing to do any work on their end. I think what Aaron explained to me today was that once we enter into the agreement, it isn't like we have to just wait for everything. We can start to secure the sub-contractors and there's a lot we can do in the interim to make sure that we're on a project timeline that's satisfactory to the school. And Jose, you weren't here and I want to share with you what they sent us last time as the board took a look at that.</p> <p><u>Garcia:</u> So, I have a question: Is Brycon the only person that gave us a bid on the project?</p> <p><u>Jones:</u> Well, they gave us a bid and we received another one from someone who is not a CES vendor. So, Brycon is one of two that we found that are on the CES state contract. And again, what that means for us is that they've already gone to RFP through CES and that means we can begin work with anyone on that list as soon as we agree to any contract or proposal. So, in the interim while you're thinking about all of this, I want to share with you what was provided to us. So we have three different scenarios, Jose and you can see that there aren't a lot of differences. Option 1 is the most expensive and they do have all of the pricing broken out. When they presented this to us, we were all wishing that you were here because you're the only one that knows what this stuff is about; so I'm glad that we're taking a look at this now. So we have all of</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>the different expenses and materials and you're probably so familiar with this but for me it was brand new.</p> <p><u>Munoz:</u> So what option out of those are they going to be doing for \$1.2 million? Is it going to be option 3?</p> <p><u>Jones:</u> It would be option 3. This would include an art room and storage space gym court with bleachers, office and storage for coach, restrooms, 3 classroom spaces, and a computer lab. The art room will be used for PD. We can potentially have 3 additional classrooms and if you think about it that's about 24 students per classroom and that's something we can do to increase our enrollment. Jose, this is kind of what they gave us here; they gave us all the different costs. It's in the packet from the 29th; so it's in the packet from last month. If you want to take a look at that and for the rest of the board as well, you guys are more than welcome.</p> <p><u>Garcia:</u> So are they changing entrances and all that kind of stuff also?</p> <p><u>Jones:</u> Yeah, they'll have to accommodate and build new entrances and exits. One thing to put into perspective for the board, each of the building before, Brycon actually built them out and they looked exactly like our vacant shells. So you can see that they added windows in certain spaces and they did a lot to the building.</p> <p><u>Garcia:</u> Is there any way you can email me those? So I can go through them and see what they're including in there. Because we might be able to look at stuff now and say maybe we don't need that, maybe we don't need that.</p> <p><u>Jones:</u> Yeah, definitely. I think they're done about doing any additional work in advance and that's the hard part. But I'm sure they'd be willing to sit with us and have a meeting if they knew that we were committed to moving forward with either option.</p> <p><u>Munoz:</u> I have a recommendation, we give you a conditional approval to move forward with Brycon but only with Jose and this would be if you can do this Jose. To be there to check quotes and prices, something along those lines. Do you think that's possible?</p> <p><u>Garcia:</u> Well, we can look over this budget and see what they're putting in here. But I can almost guarantee you that they're not going to have exact costs for everything; that's going to be more on the architect because she is going to be the one that puts together all the fixtures, the flooring, and all the additional stuff. As far as construction, construction is standard stuff. So the person to sit down with and talk to would be the architect and that's where we would get costs down. The contractor, there set costs pretty much.</p> <p><u>Jones:</u> I am willing to follow whatever the board decides to do. But I will ask that whatever we're going to do, we make a decision quickly. I don't want to sit on this for longer than we have to. So I'm perfectly fine with any additional reviews or meeting requests, but I don't want to be having the same discussion into June and July because I believe our students deserve and need the extra space. We have programs stacked but we need to increase our enrollment very soon and without additional classroom space we're not going to be able to do that.</p> <p><u>Garcia:</u> What's the construction time frame that they're giving you to finish the project if we pull the trigger on it now?</p> <p><u>Jones:</u> They haven't committed to that quite yet. What they told me is that it shouldn't take any longer than 6 months but that was 2 months ago when we first started the discussion with Brycon. So, I don't know, Jose. I would love to meet with you and them because you have all the right questions to ask and you have the experience. So, if you're ok with it I would like to schedule something and we can get in there and get on the same page with them very quickly.</p>	
Approval of Facility Leasing Structure	<u>*Item tabled until next meeting.</u>	<p>Brenda Baca called for a motion to table these items for discussion until Mr. Jones is ready to present.</p> <p>Julian Munoz motioned.</p> <p>Melissa Trujeque seconded.</p> <p>-Brenda Baca called for a vote.</p> <p>GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained</p>
Approval of Sports Facility Naming Proposal	<u>*Item tabled until next meeting.</u>	
Reentry Update	<p><u>Jones:</u> I wanted to let you know that things are going well. It's nice to see the students and it seems like attendance is increasing. Students and teachers look happy. We have experienced a couple of positive cases at our school; we've had 3 in the past two weeks. We didn't meet the 4th threshold, so the 4th case would have put us on a list where the PED could've potentially closed us for a couple of weeks. But the major update that I wanted to provide you with is to let you know that PED is choosing not to close down schools for the 4 positive cases. Rather they're hoping that we rely on our cohort model. In the fact that, if there are a couple of cases in a classroom, we resort to closing down that classroom and making sure that we notify close contacts and follow protocols as opposed to closing down the entire school. But all is going well to be honest with you. It looks like we have adequate technology; our internet infrastructure that was established in preparation for students to return is working very well. We have some grade levels that are much more full than others like 3rd grade. Our muddle school student's look like they're thriving a little bit more than they were before and getting the in-person help. The re-entry update for you is that all is well right now. I appreciate your support in having students and staff return. Aside from our pick-up routine, I think all is well.</p>	

<p>Approval of Staff Policies RE: COVID-19 Reentry</p>	<p><u>Jones:</u> As you guys know, we approved policies in the past and this was a set of policies that were developed by Patty Matthews and Sue Fox, those are the attorneys that represent our school. We passed the policies and many of them were to do with staff and the students. One example of a staff policy was staff had to return; there was not an option for them to stay online at home. If they had an underlying health condition that would preclude them from consideration in return, they actually were forced to get a vaccine by the PED and if they choose not to get the vaccine and not to return they were unemployed. Those were some critical steps taken by the PED to ensure that educators were in the classrooms and I think it's paid off for our students. With that in mind, we've had a couple of positive COVID cases and there is some concern on my part. As the school administrator, we do have those teachers that chose not to get vaccinated even with the school vaccination clinic that was set up by Ms. Baca. We have all but a couple of our staff members, all but 3 of them as a matter of fact, that didn't get vaccinated. One issue that came up is as a staff member that's been vaccinated and have been exposed to a positive case, they're no longer are required to quarantine because they've vaccinated and they wait for symptoms to arise. This is to try to prevent any shortage of teachers and to ensure that our program continues. We haven't had any positive staff cases since we were all vaccinated and that's fantastic. But we do have 3 staff members that have not been vaccinated and of course I can't give you their names but it puts us in a very difficult situation. If I'm a staff member that chose not to get vaccinated and I'm in a classroom where a student tests positive and they're symptomatic in the classroom, it means that everyone in the classroom has to be sent home for a 10-day period and that is a mandatory quarantine. It means that the unvaccinated teacher also has to go home because they opted against the vaccine. Again, that's everyone's right to opt against the vaccine and we can't force that on people. However, it puts us in a situation as a school to where we're paying the staff member to be at home for 10 days and we're also paying a substitute to be in his/her place for 10 days and it's throwing off our entire program. So instead of having quality teaching, we're having people that fill in and are doing the best they can using someone else's plans and impromptu lessons. As much as we tried to prepare in advance, we're still in this situation where we have these issues that are arising. Now my request for policy change is to require staff that has not been vaccinated to use their leave to cover the 10 days so that we can afford to continue on this system of paying for our substitute. This leave has been earned by teachers; we frontload personal days and they accrue 4 hours of sick leave every single paycheck. So many of them are sitting on 200 hour balances of sick leave. What I'm proposing is that we ask that they use their sick leave to cover their 10-day quarantine period if they chose not to get vaccinated. Since they opted out of the vaccination, it's caused a disruption to our program. We've had 3 staff members in this situation and it is a big deal for us as administrators to have to scramble to find coverage and it takes away from everyone else. My proposal, not necessarily to incentivize the vaccine, but to ensure that we're handling things appropriately and that we're giving clear communications to staff about expectations and we're able to afford substitutes in moving forward is to ask that the board improvise our policy so the revision would require that any staff member that is not vaccinated use sick time in whatever balance that they have. Now, I'm willing to work with staff if they don't have an ample leave balance, so personal and sick leave, if they've already exhausted that. We can work through that and not require that they take leave without pay but I do want to ensure that they're utilizing any leave that they have so that we again can run our program effectively. But that's my request tonight for you, for your consideration.</p> <p><u>Munoz:</u> Quick question, Jones: Is this a revision that was done by Patty or for like other schools as well or is this just what we're proposing?</p> <p><u>Jones:</u> This is something that I'm proposing after having discussions with colleagues and colleagues are in the same situation. If you look at what's happening with APS, they actually have people that are called "sitters" similar to a hospital setting. The sitters in hospitals go sit with patients as opposed to having a nurse or even a nurse's assistant. So APS has sitters that are sitting in classrooms supervising kids as they watch the Promethean Board. Now, this is not something that Patty has added but rather in speaking to Patty she said it was a local decision. She believed it was a good idea and she asked that the board take it into consideration because she cannot drive our policies, only the board can.</p> <p><u>Munoz:</u> Is this temporary? Is there going to be an expiration date on this or is this going to be kind of I guess since COVID might be an ongoing thing and if your teachers refuse to get vaccinated, I guess?</p> <p><u>Jones:</u> Right, so it'll be as long as COVID lasts. Ideally COVID will go away in the next month but we know it may be around until next school year.</p> <p><u>Munoz:</u> But it only applies to the non-vaccinated teachers, correct?</p> <p><u>Jones:</u> Absolutely, that's right. The federal government removed the emergency leave requirement that made it mandatory for schools to provide basically free leave for anyone that is sick. Now if a staff member got sick from being on campus, I would work with them no matter what. You know, if they're there and they've been vaccinated or not, my concern is if you're in a room with someone and it turns out that their symptomatic and test positive for COVID and we have to send you home for 10 days. That's a huge blow for the school. So again, it isn't to incentivize the vaccine, it's to make sure that everyone understands the expectation. It's also procedural. One thing that happened recently is we had our 2 middle school teachers, and I won't</p>	<p>Brenda Baca called for a motion to approve the Staff Policies RE: COVID-19 Reentry for non-vaccinated employees. Julian Munoz motioned. Melissa Trujeque seconded. -Brenda Baca called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained</p>
---	---	--

	<p>name who they were, weren't following our protocols and guidelines that we set forth and they were combining their classrooms and all students came together to do an assessment in one classroom and they shouldn't have. Turns out that the teacher's relative came into the classroom when she shouldn't have. Then here we have more kids that were supposed to be in the classroom sent home for 10 days plus 2 staff members, one of which wasn't supposed to be in the classroom. So, I think this policy is a reminder that we need to follow protocols that exist. Not only that but hopefully it does encourage those who just really were waiting to maybe take the leap; it isn't to incentivize it again we can't force it upon anyone. I'll tell you from experience, we've had a lot of teachers who didn't want to come back at the very beginning and they didn't want to get a vaccine; they wanted to stay home and teach. I understand we get comfortable but we need to run a program. So as long as COVID exists I would like to have this policy in place for 2 reasons: 1) understand policies and procedures and follow them and 2) make sure that we're able to continue to stay on pace in providing high-quality instruction without the use of substitutes.</p> <p><u>Garcia:</u> What happens if a teacher that has been vaccinated does come in contact with a child that has COVID and they do get symptoms and have to take time off, are they going to have to use their sick leave also?</p> <p><u>Jones:</u> Yeah, that's the state protocol on re-entry. But if someone's sick, I'll tell you, I would do whatever I could whether they've been vaccinated or not. If they've put themselves out there and they get sick, whether I have to give up my own leave to somehow provide it to them, which is another policy change that we can get into in a subsequent meeting. But we want to try and take care of our teachers. But that is the rule, Jose. If I get sick as the principal, I need to use my personal leave, sick leave, etc.</p> <p><u>Trujeque:</u> Mr. Jones, you did say you spoke to Patty about this, correct?</p> <p><u>Jones:</u> Correct.</p> <p><u>Trujeque:</u> Ok, I'm for it as well as long as it's legal. I mean it does go into like a payroll issue type of thing but if Patty said its fine, then so be it.</p> <p><u>Jones:</u> I mean the only other thing we can do, is we can leave it as well. That's the other consideration for you guys. We can leave things alone. The only issue that the school would have to deal with is a) we need to find coverage for 10 full days and b) if it's a recurring issue in one classroom, then that teacher could very well be on extended leave for the rest of the school year which means they're getting paid for not having to teach. So I know it's a risk and they came back at their own risk, we all did. But it's up to the board.</p> <p><u>Munoz:</u> Just to make sure I understand, so current policy right now is if you're vaccinated and you come into contact with somebody that is positive with COVID, you have to use your sick leave, right?</p> <p><u>Jones:</u> No, if you're vaccinated and you come into contact with somebody that is positive, you are not required to quarantine.</p> <p><u>Munoz:</u> So again, this is just for teachers that are not vaccinated and come into contact with somebody that is positive with COVID. Instead of them getting basically a free vacation, they'll have to use their sick leave? Is that correct?</p> <p><u>Jones:</u> Right.</p> <p><u>Munoz:</u> I'm fine with that, ok.</p>	
K-5 Plus and ELTP Updates	<p><u>Jones:</u> I just wanted to let you know that K-5 Plus and ELTP will happen again. I told you guys that there are certain flexibilities in a previous meeting which means that we can have our days added before, during, or after the school year 2021-2022. We already applied to stack both programs as we did this year and it's a huge fiscal benefit for us. I wanted to let you know that, I did apply to be a part of a pilot. The pilot would allow us to not have to extend the school year until late June; we would actually be able to add hours in to our regular calendar and extend the school day by 45 minutes. For us, that would meet the additional time requirement that's built in to K-5 Plus as well as ELTP and if approved they will notify me in the next week or two and I will notify the board. But that would help us out a lot. Basically we would just have a longer school day and for us we're accustomed to having long school days anyhow. That would allow us to satisfy both program requirements while taking advantage of course the huge financial benefit that comes with stacking the two programs as well as the huge academic benefits that come with it. It's additional time on task for kids, it's additional PD for teachers through ELTP, it's after school programming for our kids, and again it's that intensive access to instruction that our kids need when it comes to reading and literacy. I'll let you know as soon as I receive those results.</p>	

Head Administrator Report – SY 21-22 enrollment; staffing; reentry; charter amendment; K Plus and ELTP pilot application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. SY 21-22 enrollment b. staffing c. reentry d. charter amendment e. K Plus f. ELTP pilot application <p><u>Jones:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. SY 21-22 enrollment- next year we're at 370 students without Pre-K. 370 looks ok and it's pretty much equivalent to our current enrollment. That is if all students show up on the first day or even the second or the tenth. We still have a ways to go and we talked about what could potentially come out of the buildout, right? So 55 additional students if we have the additional classroom space that would be huge for us. We have the amenities and it may attract the kids that we need. Our projection is 406 kids, that's all we can accommodate with our current facility. The additional space will surely help us. But we're on our way. We did purchase two radio ads; one will be on a Spanish radio station and one on an English radio station. I believe its Radio Lobo and 93.3; hoping to have those done and finalized pretty soon and you'll start to hear our school on the radio. We've never done that before but we're hopeful that it will attract some kids for us. b. Staffing- looking good for next year, so far. I have to re-write contracts. But our staff will be happy to receive the 1.5% increase. Everyone had indicated that they want to return and they actually returned their contracts to me with the exception of one. It's a new teacher, an 8th grade teacher, who is looking to go more part-time and I've already found a replacement for her. The other staffing addition will be a 4/5 combo class; I did submit the charter amendment so I'm hoping that we can move forward with the 1-hour heritage program. We're hoping to get some additional special education teachers in there to try a full-inclusion model. Also making Mr. Bryant our principal as opposed to the assistant principal; he's done a great job for us. We're also bringing back music to our school and we'll eliminate the technology position. I will contract Mr. Villa to come in; he'll come back as our full-time music teacher. Also, looking for a STARS Coordinator and that'll be happening soon. c. Reentry- seems to be going well as I mentioned. d. Charter amendment- it was submitted on Friday and all of the requirements were met. Now, it's to get on the agenda to get PEC approval. e. K Plus & ELTP pilot application- I already went over that. <p>And at this time I stand for any questions on my update.</p>	
Public Comment	N/A	
Announcement of Next GC Meeting	Next GC meeting: <u>Monday, May 24, 2021; 5:30 pm</u>	Brenda Baca asked for a motion to adjourn.
Adjourn	Meeting was adjourned at 7:08pm.	Melissa Trujeque motioned. Jose Garcia seconded. -Brenda Baca called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained