

LA PROMESA EARLY LEARNING CENTER
Finance Committee Meeting Minutes
Date: February 27, 2018

Board Members Present	Regina Sanchez, Brenda Baca	
Absent		
Others in Attendance	Chris Jones, Danielle Miranda, Alyssa Lucero, Baylor Del Roasrio	
QUORUM	<u> X </u> YES <u> </u> NO	
Meeting called to order	Regina Sanchez called the meeting to order at 5:15pm	
Item	Discussion	Action/Recommendation
Approval of the Agenda	No discussion.	Regina Sanchez called for a motion to approve the agenda for the finance meeting. Brenda Baca motioned. -Regina Sanchez called for a vote. Finance Committee approved unanimously by a vote of 2-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Approval of Minutes	01/30/2018	Regina Sanchez called for a motion to approve the minutes from the 01/30 finance meeting. Brenda Baca motioned. -Regina Sanchez called for a vote. Finance Committee approved unanimously by a vote of 2-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Budget Report Updates	<u>Lucero:</u> - Page 1- Revenue Report as of January 31st: Actual YTD column is \$2,921,568.47 is all revenues received for the year and Available \$2,762,820.45 is what we expect to receive. We did get the SEG increase of about \$22,000; these reports do not reflect that yet and I do have a BAR to present to you for that. - Pages 2-7- Expenditures Report as of January 31st: Operational Total is \$316,057.35 available and again we have to subtract that \$229,000 of emergency reserves, with that subtracted there is actually about \$87,000 available for the rest for the year. We do have to add in that \$22,000 of the SEG increase, so that will go up for next month. Besides Operational all other funds should be positive. Again we are waiting for the IDEA-B Award Letter and that should come in next month. - Pages 8-9- Bank Account Register Activity Report: This shows all checks that came in and went out for the month of January. There was about \$173,000 more in deposits than in withdraws; that is a good thing for us for keeping more money than spending it. - Pages 10-12- Outstanding PO's Report: These are all open purchase orders as of early February. The PO's listed as 'Dollar' type are regular, monthly expenses that receive multiple invoices for and 'Regular' type PO's are one-time expenses. - Page 13- Bank Reconciliation: Ending balance \$930,902.34. If you notice there is a Variance in the GL due to payroll (direct deposit) clearing bank on 01/31/2018 but recognized in system on 2/2/2018. Item will clear systematically and no action or entry is needed to correct. - Page 14- Cash Summary Report: If you recall last month, Mike brought you the Cash Transfer Request and we approved that and it went through. So if you notice Operational is now negative \$122,180.90 because of that Cash Transfer; it did clear up all those other funds but that does leave Operational negative. Just a reminder that if the insurance claim does not come through, the school will be expected to set aside \$245,000 in restricted expenditures as we build the next budget for FY 19. <u>Jones:</u> We had a call with NMPSIA last week, they asked a series of questions and they're now requesting some documentation about former employees and from there they're going to establish their understandings and decide if they can move forward with processing our claim. They still need to determine the claim amount; if they are able to reimburse the school that would put us back on track. We have made progress in that it's now to the Forensic Accounting Firm; we're getting closer and closer.	
Review of BARs	BARs for consideration: 528-000-1718-0021-D 528-000-1718-0022-I 528-000-1718-0023-M 528-000-1718-0024-I <u>Lucero:</u> - Decrease: from the final Instructional Materials allocation of \$159 (decrease from the budget) - Increase: to recognize the revenues received for the Medicaid Fund \$4,862 - Maintenance: adjust any negative lines in the Operational Fund. There is not an increase or decrease of cash with this bar, it's just simply moving budget around. - Increase: SEG final allocation of \$22,276 increase to the Operational fund. *Meeting was adjourned at 5:31pm	

LPELC GC Meeting Minutes

Date: February 28, 2018

Board Members Present	Julian Munoz, Regina Sanchez, Brenda Baca, Andrew Mathis	
Absent	Judy Griego	
Others in Attendance	Chris Jones, Danielle Miranda, Alyssa Lucero, Patty Matthews, Baylor Del Roasrio	
QUORUM	<u> X </u> YES <u> </u> NO	
Meeting called to order	Julian Munoz called the meeting to order at 5:36pm	
Item	Discussion	Action/Recommendation
Approval of the Agenda	Remove items and move to next meeting: • BAR 528-000-1718-0025-D • GC Training Tidbits • Approval of K-3 Plus Application (application is incomplete and pending the guidance of the K-3 Plus department)	Julian Munoz called for a motion to remove 3 items from agenda. Andrew Mathis motioned, Regina Sanchez seconded. -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained Julian Munoz called for a motion to approve the amended agenda. Andrew Mathis motioned, Regina Sanchez seconded. -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Approval of Minutes	01/30/2018	Julian Munoz called for a motion to approve the 01/30 minutes. Brenda Baca motioned, Regina Sanchez seconded. -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 3-0; 0 opposed; 1 abstained
Discussion/Action Items		
Budget Review	<u>Lucero</u>: Looking at your reports, Page 1- Revenue Report as of January 31st: Your Actual YTD column is \$2,921,568.47 is all revenues received for the year and Available \$2,762,820.45 is what we expect to receive. We did receive an SEG increase of about \$22,000 and is not reflected in this report but we do have a BAR and you'll see that next month. Moving on to Page 2, Expenditures Report as of January 31st: Operational Total is \$316,057.35 available but after you subtract that \$229,000 of emergency reserves, with that subtracted there is actually about \$87,000 available for the rest for the year. Besides Operational all other funds should be positive. If you look at IDEA-B on Page 4, it is a negative \$33,657.43 and we expect to receive an Award Letter and that should come in next month to adjust that. Page 8- Bank Account Register Activity Report: These are all checks that were paid out and all deposits that came in for the month of January. I did point out to the Finance Committee that there was about \$173,000 more in deposits than in expenditures; that is something that we like to see. Pages 10-12- Outstanding PO's Report: This report is as of early February. The PO's listed as 'Dollar' type are regular, monthly expenses that receive multiple invoices for and 'Regular' type PO's are one-time expenses. Page 13- Bank Reconciliation: You'll notice that there was a \$42,861.86 Variance and that is just a systematic error that was due to payroll (direct deposit) clearing bank on 01/31/2018 but recognized in system on 2/2/2018. Item will clear systematically and no action or entry is needed to correct. Page 14- Cash Summary Report: You'll notice the Operational SEG fund is negative \$122,180.90. That is due to the Cash Transfer that the GC approved last month. That was to fix all funds that we weren't ever going to receive any reimbursement for from past mistakes. Again, Mike wanted me to point out that unless the insurance claim does not come through the school will be expected to set aside \$245,000 in restricted expenditures as we build the next budget for FY 19. <u>Munoz</u>: I thought that the \$229,000 that we had in reserve was going to take care of all those negative funds? <u>Lucero</u>: That is what the \$229,000 did take care of but we have to have \$245,000 in the Operational fund to show that the finances have been corrected, that there is no longer mismanagement of funds and we are in the positive. They are 2 separate things. <u>Munoz</u>: I discussed with Mike Sr. that we were not going to be having to do that again. Because he cannot operate; he has no curriculum. Can you email/text Mike saying that we do have concerns regarding that and who is putting that \$245,000 in place? This is going to be interpreted that we are still negative \$245,000 from previous mismanagement. <u>Jones</u>: We will have to get with you guys and get some more information. I know you said that they are 2 separate things and I know that we are trying to reconcile something that happened before with those negative fund balances. But now I'm trying to figure out where the additional \$245,000 is coming from and what's that the result of? Because when you look at it, it means we are \$500,000 in the red and that is not the impression I want. <u>Munoz</u>: Let's just get more information from Mike before we go any further. If you can email Mike and include us along with Patty in the email.	

Approval of BARs	BARs for consideration: 1. 528-000-1718-0021-D 2. 528-000-1718-0022-I 3. 528-000-1718-0023-M 4. 528-000-1718-0024-I <u>Lucero:</u> 1. Decrease: from the final Instructional Materials allocation of \$159 (decrease the budget) 2. Increase: to recognize the revenues received for the Medicaid Fund \$4,862 (for ancillary services) 3. Maintenance: adjust any negative lines in the Operational Fund. There is not an increase or decrease of cash with this bar, it's just simply moving budget around. 4. Increase: SEG final allocation of \$22,276 increase to the Operational fund.	Julian Munoz called for a motion to approve BARs #0021, #0022, #0023, and #0024. Brenda Baca motioned, Regina Sanchez seconded. -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Review of New Board Member Application	<u>Munoz:</u> A couple of weeks ago, we had a Mrs. Bustos that wanted to join the board. Unfortunately, we can only have 5 members at this point, so we can't have her be a board member. But I think Ms. Judy said she was going to keep her as recruitment for next year, so if we need to we can expand the board to what we originally had of 7. Ms. Judy also said she would keep her in the loop, so she can have an idea of what we do. <u>Matthews:</u> Mr. Chair and members of the board, since you have a member of the division here, I have a question about that. Let's just say hypothetically that their bylaws actually do state that they can have more than 5 members, just because they articulated at the beginning of the year that they would have only 5 or whatever number they chose, what's preventing them from coming to the commission and stating "we would like to increase that number" and why would they need to do an amendment? <u>Del Roasrio:</u> I don't know if there is anything prohibiting it. Like you had said, obviously if it's in the bylaws; statute requires 5 minimum. I don't know if there is anything prohibiting that, saying if you said this year you'd only have 5 and decide to have 7. <u>Matthews:</u> Well I know there is not but I just wondered internally what the protocol is because lots of boards need more members, if they want to have a really working board. So if they have a fabulous candidate, who wanted to increase, it seems quite artificial to limit a charter school. <u>Munoz:</u> I would love to have an extra member; it would show growth of the board. It would be a positive thing when we go to the PEC saying there are qualified people who are interested in the board. <u>Matthews:</u> There should be a pretty easy process to say our bylaws say 7 and we're letting you know as of this meeting we're adding one more. It should be a written notice verses having to go to the commission. They don't have to amend their charter because their bylaws actually state it. That's just a question I have and I can tell you that almost every time I come to this board they have people interested and wanting to be on it. I would like to know the answer and because it's not in the law, I can't really give an answer. <u>Del Roasrio:</u> I think it's a good question. Laurel Piece in our division is in charge of that area like governing board questions and issues. <u>Munoz:</u> As far as this goes, if we can get her on the board sooner rather than later it would be better. Ms. Judy is going to keep her around, invite her to meetings, and give her an overall background of this is, what we do and what's required. <u>Jones:</u> First of all this is a part of our Recruitment and Selection Process, it was a part of the Corrective Action Plan that we do vet anyone interested with our board. With this individual, Mrs. Bustos, what we discussed is perhaps adding her to a pool, having her come out and do a presentation and then once we're able to get some sort of answer on increasing the board, we can do that. <u>Munoz:</u> I can send Ms. Pierce an email asking for clarification on the process.	
Facilities Update and YDI Proposal	<u>Jones:</u> You're looking at a letter from YDI, it's a proposal that they've recently made. YDI is a partner of ours, who started the charter with Dr. Maestas some time ago. They do provide a service in which they have a 3 year old program, called Head Start. Head Start partners with us, so that we have a pipeline of students who may apply and enter our lottery system for Pre-School and then they eventually enter our Kindergarten program. They are proposing that we allow them to expand and the expansion would be early Head Start. Currently, they utilize 2 classrooms and a hallway with restrooms; they proposed that they use 2 additional classrooms. They're proposing right now that we take them on a walkthrough with their CFO because there is some interest from YDI to lease out the entire facility. Now there are several steps that we have to go through in order to lease or dispose of real property. But I wanted to give you some information about the proposal that has been made and we should have additional information in the coming weeks. The walkthrough will be held on Friday morning. <u>Matthews:</u> You had asked me what you have to do with regard to disposal of and/or leasing the Central property. It's governed by the State Board of Finance rules on how a charter school would dispose of property. They just sort of throw or apply rules that really just say school district and in this case I am going to read the regulations, literally because it says district in some places and charter school in other places. So just very quickly, if you sell the property you have to go through a process that requires you to submit to the State Board of Finance various documents but most what it requires is an appraisal. I don't know if we got an appraisal yet but the first thing you need to do is get that appraisal process going. That appraisal will have to go to Tax and Revenue to have its blessing and then we submit to State Board of Finance. So just as a time span you're looking at a minimum of 2 months from the time you actually have the appraisal. It takes time; it's not going to happen overnight. It would be lovely if you could find another charter school and/or some other public entity that wants it because then you wouldn't have to get an appraisal and we just have to go to the State Board of Finance. <u>Jones:</u> We started to work with someone from Maestas & Ward and she did give us a general appraisal but I don't think it's an official appraisal; it's like a Fair Market Value Report. At the next meeting, I will have more information for you.	

Approval of Facilities Master Plan	<u>Jones:</u> Since last year, we've been working on a Facilities Master Plan with The Design Group and the PSFA. They were gracious enough to give us an extension on the completion of the Facilities Master Plan and our committee has worked since last April to complete it. A Facilities Master Plan is required to be completed every 5 years. We have a lot of good ideas and it started with the committees input on prioritizing all of the needs that we have here at La Promesa. It does only encompass this campus right now; we're focusing on this facility trying to make it our home. Ultimately, what they do with the Facilities Master Plan is they take a look at your program and what are your goals for your program. We had a steering committee and we had to provide information about our program. We shared with them our demographics, enrollment information, specifics about our dual-program, and we gave them a wish list. Through this entire planning process, we identified a couple focal points for our school: 1. Student Safety: we identified a need for landscaping between the buildings. 2. Acoustics: the noise level in our cafeteria is unbearable. 3. Gymnasium Space: build out a building for PE and Art. 4. Outdoor Field: open space can be used for recess, sports, parent events, etc. <u>Matthews:</u> If in the long run you could acquire the facility and you could own it, you could do those improvements using the capital outlay, SB9 and HB33 dollars. It is possible right now, as a pure tenant that you could do some things that are not potentially permanent fixtures to the building but anything permanent you could not. <u>Jones:</u> The total bill for this was about \$10,000 and we had to pay for that immediately. There are many parts to the plan, please review it and let me know if you have any questions. As a body you can decide on what we can and should invest in right now.	Julian Munoz called for a motion to approve the Facilities Master Plan. Andrew Mathis motioned, Brenda Baca seconded. -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Performance Framework Updates	<u>Jones:</u> I wanted to give you an update on the most recent Monitoring Visit. I want to take you through the Web EPSS and it's an online portal that we use for many things like monitoring tools and applications. On the Monitoring Tool you can see all the areas that you're doing well with and all the areas that are in need of improvement based on the Monitoring Visit from the CSD. One of the things that we needed to improve on was the NM Dash Plan. The CSD is using the NM Dash Plan and that online system to evaluate the progress we are making toward school turnaround; they go in and monitor our implementation of the plan and then we're given feedback. The problem that I'm having with this plan is that we received a 'far below the standard' because 'the school did not submit its draft plan to the Priority Schools Bureau and to the CSD to Icela Pelayo by October 16th as required'. Icela had just come on and nowhere in the PEC minutes does it specify that we had to send this to Icela; it was just to be submitted to the Priority Schools Bureau in which it was. For that reason, it falls 'far below the standard' and that's final; those little things are what I have a problem with because it was not communicated to the school that we needed to submit to Icela. We are not allowed to respond as of now but there are a couple of things we can do. For example, they are asking for us to submit screenshots of what I just showed you, although they can access it directly. <u>Matthews:</u> I don't understand why the division would demand dual-reporting if they could look themselves. The whole intent of that provision was not to have the schools duplicate reporting requirements and it's in the contract and yet it's been largely ignored. Chris and I need to go through the monitoring instrument together and push back on anything that he believes he has done correctly and demand that is be resolved and if it's not resolved than we push back. This is my advice to schools that if you get a monitoring visit and you disagree with the outcome, you need to push back. We need to collectively put all the issues together and write a letter to the Commission and if that doesn't work then we go forward with the Dispute Resolution Process. <u>Jones:</u> For me the major concern is our circumstance, I wouldn't be as up in arms if it were not for the potential revocation and the scare. I want to show Baylor the Monitoring Tool that was developed by the board with Mrs. Matthews's help. So we have our Performance Framework built out into these tabs; we are able to use this to ensure that we are satisfying our Performance Framework and to also provide any documentation that aligns with what we have claimed. So now when I'm making the connection to the Monitoring Tool it's a lot easier for them to make sense of. The next concern is McKinney-Vento under Title 1. They're asking for me to provide evidence that I have been tracking services that have been provided to students identified as homeless. I did submit to them a tracking form and it's still apparently insufficient and now I need to figure out what's the next step. During the Monitoring Visit, they did say they were going to share things from other schools but I haven't received anything quite yet. I will reach out to other schools and see what they're using. During the exit meeting, they told me that if I submit in a timely manner then they can give me the 30 days to remedy the problem. The next concern has to do with Gifted Services. We have one student who requires gifted services and his mother knew at registration that we did not have a gifted instructor. I have made an effort; I reached out to ACES and have run ads in Craigslist to get a part-time gifted instructor and they just are not available at this time. I did upload all the communication between myself and ACES. But now it's asking for the evidence that demonstrates that the Gifted Endorsement instruction has been successfully procured and below it says a waiver. I reached and there is not such a waiver for someone who has a Special Education license to work off of a gifted endorsement. I'm going to see if Rebecca Reyes will respond to me. However, this is going to be one that we probably won't resolve this school year. Right now, I sent something to my staff seeing if they wanted to go to a summer institute to gain that certification but that's still a year long process. <u>Del Roasrio:</u> I think it may be a waiver for a long term sub or an endorsement for someone teaching over 45 days; I think that may be what Icela meant by a waiver. There are a lot of waivers but I believe it's the one for someone who is licensed but unendorsed. <u>Jones:</u> So hopefully we'll get some clarification from Ms. Reyes. The next thing has to do with the January Agenda and Announcement and that they weren't uploaded in a timely manner online. They are posted in the reception room and that is what we said in our bylaws. But it says we need to become compliant. The next item has to do with our bylaws and it's saying that we must revise and resubmit them based on the CAP. It looks like the area of concern is the "New Recruitment and Selection Process". Do you remember we had a conversation after we analyzed the bylaws and we said it meets the requirements as specific within the CAP?	

	<u>Matthews</u>: No one bothered to take a look at what we did and we said we revised them to amend what they wanting us to amend. We submitted the bylaws at the October Meeting; we submitted all of the documentation and there was no full closure. One of the suggestions I was going to make is to go back and formally address the Commission through a letter saying “On our October meeting, we presented you with all of this information and we need closure to say that we’ve complied with that part of the CAP”. Because that’s exactly what I was afraid of is you would have things the Division would identify as not completed, when in fact we thought we had done what we were asked to do at the October Meeting. <u>Munoz</u>: In order to get this resolved, we need to write a letter to the Commission stating that we presented the information. <u>Jones</u>: So it’s asking us to provide evidence that its bylaws have been updated to include the Nominating Committee as described in the Recruitment Plan and the other CAP required changes are also reflected; so that would be apparently uploading what we have. Maybe the bylaws weren’t updated on the website and maybe that was an error on my part and I just need to re-upload them. I don’t know and I will take a look at them. The other one is evidence of implementation of the Recruitment Plan and we need to take a hard look and maybe ask for clarification about what that means. <u>Matthews</u>: Why would they be actively recruiting when they cannot bring anyone on? I think submitting the minutes of your meeting and it’s on your agenda. <u>Jones</u>: The next thing is the evidence of evaluation tools and it says that they’ve been presented at the February meeting and that the minutes clearly indicate the discussion on the item. They also want to see a copy of the tools and they’re going to see if they conform to the Cap requirements. When we submit that evaluation tool, it’s very likely it’s not going to meet the standard and then we’re going to be chasing our tails. <u>Munoz</u>: At this point, the evaluation tools were created by a PEC approved contractor and if it doesn’t meet what they want, then it’s on them. <u>Matthews</u>: Here’s the criteria, we will have a problem if they are going to come in and take the tool from us and say it’s not good enough. First of all, that’s the first point because they agreed to the contractor. The CAP specifically says ‘for at least the next 2 years the school must contract with a third-party to work with the board to develop an evaluation tool and train the counsel on how to appropriately evaluate the principal. The tool must address academic, financial performance and leadership with both the principal and the board.’ It does not say that the tool must be approved by the Commission or the Division at all. I would assume that the most the Division could do is say “Does it have governance? Does it have all the categories that are required” but to come in and take it apart and say it’s not an appropriate evaluation tool is not within the provisions. <u>Jones</u>: There are 13 compliance concerns and several of them relate to the audit which is understandable. There are some that I’m confident we can resolve as long as they accept what I submit. Others like the School Letter Grade and NM Dash Plan I am more concerned about.	
Corrective Action Plan (CAP) Updates	Approval of Head Admin. And Gov. Council Evaluation Tools: <u>Munoz</u>: Shelly says that if we approve the evaluation tools, then she is going to have training in March or April to go over them. Some of these questions are very subjective and we need concrete examples of what certain items mean. Can you prove that you have done these things? <u>Sanchez</u>: Maybe we should come in and spend some time at the school and see what the kids are doing. I don’t know what is happening in the school unless I come in and see. <u>Jones</u>: What is acceptable evidence in terms of quantity? For example, if I give you 1 example does that give me a 1 or if I show you 5 examples does that give me a 5? I don’t know how the difference between Unsatisfactory and Far Exceeds Expectations. #10 for Staff Retention: I am already at a disadvantage because this is not the school to come to and it’s difficult to find staff. So when you talk about top performers, what are the criteria to be considered for that? So not only are you evaluating me but also my current staff. #9- Incorporates the diversity of the student population in making curricular and school policy decisions: I can provide you with a reading list for next year and how we’re using Title 1 funds to develop a supplemental reading list mandatory for all grade levels in Spanish and English and school policy decisions- if we have a school justice program. Those are 2 examples that come to mind but would that be sufficient and how would I rate? <u>Munoz</u>: Some things we can use data for like academics and we can give him a score based on that data. But some of the other things are subjective. This is something that we are going to be graded on ourselves. She’s going to provide more training on this but if we don’t feel comfortable doing this evaluation tool, we’re going to get ripped to shreds. <u>Mathis</u>: One thing that gets me uncomfortable is we’re expected to approve this tool and then she’ll come and explain it to us; it seems a little backwards. <u>Baca</u>: Yeah, I have some questions too. <u>Munoz</u>: Here is what we need to do as a board we don’t have to approve this as is. We can go back saying per our discussion in the board meeting, these are questions that we have that need to be answered before we approve the training session. At this point, I do need your feedback so I can email her back saying what we need to incorporate into the tool so we can approve it. <u>Mathis</u>: Do you feel that this evaluation tool was designed specifically for our institution or is this just the one that she has in her pocket? <u>Munoz</u>: No, this is all based off of guidelines in NM State Laws but it wasn’t specific for this school. I had her incorporate some stuff from the framework like financial and academic performances in order to say we are hitting those. But at this point, if you still have questions give them to me and I will compile them and send them to Shelly and say we need them to be incorporated before we approve. That’s within our right, correct? I asked her to come to this meeting but she wanted us to talk about it first. When do we have to have this approved? <u>Matthews</u>: My first question is does it hit all the requirements of the CAP, as far as the topics? I’m thinking that perhaps it makes sense that you do a preliminary on the condition that she come and present and answer questions. Then we would have a revised tool but we have to have it done by x	

	date, you have to have it pretty soon because the year is almost over. <u>Munoz:</u> I sent the CAP requirements to Shelly and told her we need to incorporate this into the evaluation tool. <u>Matthews:</u> For the purpose of Chris responding to the CSD, I think you could do a preliminary approval and just say that we're approving a preliminary draft and that we're asking the contractor to come in and present and maybe have a Special Meeting for this. I think you do need to have a discussion about how do you get a 5 over a 4 because that seems rather arbitrary. I think she described fairly well what she meant by 1, 2, 3, and 4. I think it's hard if you don't know specifically what evidence you should be considering. <u>Munoz:</u> I just want something that is going to be fair to our Head Administrator because he has had challenges that other Head Administrators haven't had to go with. <u>Sanchez:</u> Where it says 'Head Administrator promotes the success of all students' and we were just talking about that one student, so what would that be then? So what do you say for that one student who is gifted and doesn't have a teacher? It's not your fault, I'm just saying. <u>Munoz:</u> The next document is to look at our self-evaluation. To me, it looked a little weak for us and I think we can come up with a better evaluation. What are your thoughts because we are going to be grading ourselves? Overall I'm going to suggest some basic format changes because this should be on excel, if we are going to be rating on a number system. I think we should do a preliminary draft approval but then incorporate what we want into the tool as well. It's going to have to be a Special Meeting within the next couple of weeks. <u>Mathis:</u> My question would be is we want to make sure, first and foremost, that we're meeting the requirements that have been set forth upon us. We want to make sure that it's a useful tool. With that being said, I don't want to prolong the process but I think a Special Meeting is needed to have her go over it and us get a final say on it. Quite honestly, I don't think the Head Administrator tool needs to be so complicated. <u>Munoz:</u> We got to keep it general enough that we can incorporate anything and that we're not locked down to certain items but also sufficient evidence to know why we're giving a score. At this point do we approve based on this being a rough draft, that we will be incorporating changes after we meet with Shelly to create a better framework within the next couple weeks. <u>Matthews:</u> I think like a conditional approval with the understanding that the contractor will incorporate the evidence that will help us understand how to evaluate. Third Party Data Analysis Contractor: <u>Jones:</u> Just so you know, we have to submit data with the CAP. We have to do a final data analysis based on NWEA to determine if we've met the proficiency and growth goal that have been established. The plan right now is to seek out a third party contractor to help to validate the data. I will do my own calculations and we will analyze the data on our end and submit raw data to the CSD. They will also do the calculations for themselves. But the third party will help to confirm or refute the school's and the CSD's data. <u>Matthews:</u> Just to be clear Mr. Jones, the CAP anticipates that the school first submits the data. Mr. Jones will need to do his own evaluation and submit the raw data to CSD and if he disagrees with what they come out with, then we get the opportunity to bring a third party expert to say we disagree with your interpretation. <u>Jones:</u> I would honestly like to have someone anyhow who could help me do the analysis of data. I can do my own of course but when you look at sheets and sheets of NWEA data you can make some mistakes. I think that would be in our best interest. I worked with someone at APS Bettina Eklund and I will try to make contact with her. <u>Del Roasrio:</u> I remember talking to you and it's oddly written like 1 ½ years of growth. You may want to talk to your attorney because with the NWEA I have never seen 1 ½ years, how do you even figure that out? And at the site visit, I said "I don't know how this is calculated". <u>Matthews:</u> What we talked about is at the April Meeting is being able to articulate that concern, that it's not even a valid way to calculate and have for example a third party expert there to say that and support that position. We need to prepare for that April Meeting to raise this issue. <u>Jones:</u> La Promesa is supposed to defy the odds apparently. I will tell you that the goal itself, as established, we're about 55 students away from meeting the goal. The only way to measure it is a way that isn't recommended anyhow and really that isn't a concrete measurement for NWEA; there is no calculation for 1½ years of growth. They have excluded Kinder and Special Education students and that is another problem. The one student on a Gifted IEP exceeds expectations but we cannot bank him because he has an IEP. We have students who are Other Health Impaired because of ADHD and are sharp but can't be banked because they're on IEPs. The goal was just given to us and we're going to see if we can meet the goal. If we can meet the goal, I still feel that we are in an even better position and then we can talk about what needs to be changed.	Julian Munoz called for a motion for a conditional approval on the evaluation tools- Governing Board Evaluation Tool and Head Administrator tool- pending the meeting with the contractor Shelly Cherrin to incorporate the changes we want to include in these documents. Andrew Mathis motioned, Brenda Baca seconded. -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Closed Session		Julian Munoz called for a motion for La Promesa Board of Education to convene an Executive Session for the Purpose of Discussing 3 items: -Threatened or pending litigation concerning former school employees -Purchase, acquisition or disposal of real property or water rights -Deliberations about the issuance, suspension, renewal or revocation of a license. Andrew Mathis motioned,

		Regina Sanchez seconded. -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Reconvene to Open Session	Reconvene at 9:05pm <u>Munoz</u> ; Roll Call- states that all members agree that the matters discussed in the Executive Session were only limited to those specified in the agenda. Roll Call by Regina Sanchez	Reconvene to Open Session
Action as Necessary from Closed Session (Discussion/Action)	No Actions	
Public Comment	N/A	
Announcement of Next GC Meeting	Next GC meeting: March 27, 2018 at 5:30pm	Julian Munoz asked for a motion to adjourn. Andrew Mathis motioned, Brenda Baca seconded.
Adjourn	Meeting was adjourned at 9:06pm	- Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained