

LA PROMESA EARLY LEARNING CENTER
Governance Council Board Special Meeting Minutes
Date: October 10, 2017

Board Members Present	Julian Munoz (by phone), Judy Griego, Regina Sanchez, Cipriano Lucero, Brenda Baca	
Absent		
Others in Attendance	Chris Jones, Danielle Miranda	
QUORUM	<u> X </u> YES <u> </u> NO	
Meeting called to order	Mr. Munoz called the meeting to order at 11:12am	
Item	Discussion	Action/Recommendation
Approval of the Agenda	No discussion.	Julian Munoz called for a motion to approve the agenda for the special meeting. Judy Griego motioned, Cipriano Lucero seconded. -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 5-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Discussion/Action Items		
Corrective Action Plan (CAP) Updates	<u>Jones:</u> We need to finalize this last element of the CAP because it is a requirement. I have provided you a copy of the proposal as well as her credentials. I actually worked for Rochelle, when I started in Education; she was the principal and she hired me as an EA. She has a lot of experience; she is known by the CSD and by PED. I will defer the rest of the CAP updates until the October 24th meeting. I do have a tool and I will share it with you. I want to provide you all with what is being submitted, what we have done, and then you can review the documentation that supports each of the actions that we've taken.	
Approval of 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 Governance Council Self and Head Administrator Evaluations	<u>Munoz:</u> My only question is do we have \$5,000? <u>Jones:</u> I have a quick update on the status of our finances. After analyzing our overall budget, looking into outstanding PO's and all other expenses right now we have about \$177,000 that we can utilize for different functions. So we do have adequate funding to support the proposal amount which is \$5,000. We're in a good position when it comes to finances as opposed to last year. I do believe this contract would require that Patty look this over in terms of the contractual language. I don't think its specific enough and it doesn't give both parties an opportunity to dissolve the contract, if a dispute arises. It does say "provide follow-up support to work with the board per the PEC requirement for 2 years (upon execution of this proposal)". However, Patty should help us to ensure that if we are not satisfied with her work or if there is a dispute, that we are able to work that out. <u>Munoz:</u> What do you think? <u>Griego:</u> Based on the timeframe that we have, I think we're up against some timelines. I did review the proposal and I think we need to accept it and then get Patty to take a legal review. <u>Lucero:</u> I did look at her credentials as well and the proposal. Based on what's on the document, her credentials seem very good; it does seem she does have a wide variety of experience. <u>Sanchez:</u> It sounds like a fair amount, especially for 2 years. How many hours? <u>Jones:</u> I think that's another point of clarification that we need to get from her. I know that the development of an evaluative tool is going to have to come from the ground up. I did provide her with what we have in terms of the monitoring tool and the CAP. She's really going to have to fill the entire tool for both of these from the ground up. She said she's going to work with others; she has a team of people through her organization that have different expertise. They are going to work together to come up with something for us. We have the right to request that time. <u>Griego:</u> I'm not as concerned about the hours as I am as the finished product. As long as we have a product that meets our needs. But if you want, we can ask for an estimate, that way the Board has an idea. <u>Lucero:</u> It's not so much hours; it's our finished product like what Judy said. What are we going to get out of it?	Julian Munoz called for a motion to approve the contract proposed. Judy Griego motioned, Cipriano Lucero seconded. -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 5-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained

	<u>Jones:</u> To Judy's point, what it says within our CAP is that we have to have these tools for the next 2 years and we have to contract with a 3rd party. It's about the 2 evaluations. The CAP says "we must submit to the PEC in time for documents submittal for the October PEC Meeting." Which we have already missed; we have not submitted her credentials. But the last factor is that the PEC ultimately will approve or disapprove the contract. We will probably have to reappear in the November meeting at which time they will or will not approve this work through Shelly Cherrin. If approved, I think by the November meeting her work could be completed; that would give her about a 30 day window. But if they decide to defer their vote until they could review her credentials, we may have to wait until November before they tell us whether or not they approve her as a contractor. Ultimately, we don't have any authority to move forward until they approve it. <u>Griego:</u> I think we need to approve this contract, so we can put it in front of the PEC for approval.	
Public Comment Adjourn	N/A Next GC meeting: October 24, 2017 at 5:30pm Meeting was adjourned at 11:34am	Julian Munoz asked for a motion to adjourn. Judy Griego motioned, Brenda Baca seconded. -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 5-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained