

Albuquerque Bilingual Academy
ABA GC Meeting Minutes for Virtual Meeting
Date: May 23, 2022

Board Members Present	Brenda Baca, Doris Cole, Melissa Trujeque, *Julian Munoz, *Jose Garcia	
Absent		
Others in Attendance	Chris Jones, Kyle Hunt, Danielle Miranda, Priyam Banerjee, Ross Chase	
QUORUM	<u> X </u> YES <u> </u> NO	
Meeting called to order	Brenda Baca called the meeting to order at 5:42pm & Roll Call by Brenda Baca	
Item	Discussion	Action/Recommendation
Approval of Minutes	04/25/2022	Brenda Baca called for a motion to approve the 04/25 minutes. Melissa Trujeque motioned Doris Cole seconded -Brenda Baca called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 3-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Approval of the Agenda	05/23/2022	Brenda Baca called for a motion to approve the agenda. Melissa Trujeque motioned Doris Cole seconded -Brenda Baca called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 3-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Budget Report Updates	<u>Hunt:</u> We are going to begin with our budget; this budget report is based on the end of April for the month of close. Starting with our Revenue Reports, we have been receiving all revenues as expected. We did get in some major RFR's in for Title I and IDEA-B; so we started receiving more of those. Community schools, we just recently completed our first one for that new award this year and the same for K-5 Plus; we should be seeing those RFR's hopefully turned around and issued by the state pretty soon. PSCOC is our other major outstanding one and we actually did get that at the beginning of May. We have the Expenditures Report, our budget is looking great. Most of the changes that we have for the year are entered and our Operational Budget is still showing availability of \$1.8 million and it's actually going to be slightly more after the additional changes. That is pretty close to the FY23 budget figure that we laid out and voted on in April; so that's great that our next year's budget will be close to what we had projected. Going down, we do have our federal funds which we are utilizing almost all the way. We do still have a lot of availability in our ESSER II and part of our ESSER III; however, we do still have a whole other year to spend these funds as they were given on 3-year cycles. The next grant that we really just need to try to figure out how to utilize more but it's hard given the parameters of the program is the K-5 Plus Pilot. This is 10% of all of our operational salaries and state funded salaries and it's still mingling about half of the award or a little less because it's based off 10% of our school day; so 10% of our employees payroll gets allocated from that fund. We do have the Family Income Index and Lease Assistance have been fully expended, HB-33, and SB-9; SB-9 does have a negative showing but that's just because we opened a PO for the roof project and it wasn't allocated between both but I will be fixing it to make sure that neither fund runs in the deficit. Going down to our Bank Account Register Activity Report for April, nothing major but we did have a few minor reimbursements. One thing I do want to bring to your attention is this Journal Entry and that means that I made an edit to the system of some type and it's not actually through the system like a check or through the payroll system; it's me doing things by hand. It is because we re-issued a check to a vendor that was lost in the mail and when we got this statement it was actually received so it's going to double hit our account twice but once I get the next invoice we'll issue a credit invoice to undue it. However, we did have negative cash flow this month. Mainly because we did have large payouts to our construction company and other big projects which is our water fountain installation. Going down to the Bank Account Reconciliation, a much larger negative cash flow because a lot of it was outstanding checks but we are still right over \$3 million in cash and right under \$3 million when you take out the outstanding checks. We did get large reimbursements for these so we'll be back above \$3 million. Going down to our Check Report, we do have a lot of outstanding fingerprinting checks and I'm not sure why people aren't cashing those; but a lot of these were issued at the end of the month and that's why they haven't cashed yet. Going to the Balance Sheet, majority if it's in Operational which aligns with our budget because it shows \$1.8 million available. We do have all of our negative funds which operational does have to carry for while we wait for reimbursements. Still \$1.3 million in HB-33 and SB-9. Going down to our Dashboard, year over year, pretty similar trends. The major differences are the state initiatives; we have a lot more state grants and those are the major factors for that shift in the state initiatives. And then we also have our food service which we didn't really operate last year with COVID.	
FY23 Budget Update	<u>Hunt:</u> Last meeting, you all voted on approving your FY23 budget which was submitted and approved by PED; we did a great job. However, going through the layers of PED review, we did have a large amount of cash carryover from this year allocated to supply assets and supplies and	

	materials in function 1000. We only did that for legislative requirements because they require that you have x budget in function 1000 which is direct instruction to make sure that students are receiving majority of these funds. However, after going back and forth with PED since we intend to carryover that money and use it for the capital projects such as the field that we're going to talk about later tonight, buildout of building C, and our roofing project. They decided that we'll actually split it to restrictive expenditures and then we'll dip into that with BARs as necessary later on next year. And they just did that since we don't want to budget all of it into construction services or anything right away; we want to hold onto it as long as possible until we exhaust all of our other grant and other capital funding sources.	
Approval to authorize ED and BM for Final BARs of FY22	<u>Hunt:</u> We do this action every year; we've had it in the previous minutes before. This basically just gives Chris and I the ability to do any final BARs for FY22 as we close up the remaining year. We do this because quite a few federal programs and other ones are still issuing budgets to us in award letters right in these last months. But PED does give us very strict deadlines so instead of having to call a special meeting, this gives us the ability to enter those BARs, get them approved, and then we bring them back to you at the next meeting which will be the June 27 th meeting. Or if we have any BARs in-between June 27 th and July we'll bring them to you in the July meeting. BARs do not affect actually cash; they are only for budgetary and authorization purposes for PED.	Brenda Baca called for a motion to approve the authorization of ED and BM for Final BARs of FY22. Melissa Trujeque motioned Doris Cole seconded -Brenda Baca called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 3-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Approval of BARs	<u>Hunt:</u> BARs for consideration: #0044-I 24308 #0045-D 11000 #0046-I 24189 #0047-I 13000 #0048-I 21000 - Justification: \$4,559- To increase ESSER II budget based on final award from PED. - Justification: (\$661)- To decrease SEG based on 2% withholding from ELTP Hold Harmless as described in attached email from SBB. - Justification: \$11,107- To increase budget abased on carryover and final award provided by NMPED. - Justification: \$793- To increase budget to match emergency fuel allocation as described in memo attached provided by PED. - Justification: \$320,441- To increase budget based on projected food service revenue from USDA.	Brenda Baca called for a motion to approve BARs #0044-I, #0045-D, #0046- I, #0047-I, and #0048-I. Melissa Trujeque motioned Doris Cole seconded -Brenda Baca called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 3-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Special Issues	Discussion	Action/Recommendation
Discussion RE: FY23 Salary Schedule & Approval of EA Salary Schedule	<u>Hunt:</u> Last meeting, same as budget, you guys did vote to approve the FY23 salary schedule. This was the FY23 salary schedule that was approved. We mainly wanted to bring this up because we've been hearing a lot of discussion regarding our salary schedule, APS's possible salary schedule, Rio Rancho's schedule because with these new minimums every district is once again competing for all of the jobs of teachers which are in short demand right now. Overall, from everything that I've seen within each district all levels are going to start at 50, 60, and 70 and they will progress very slowly; we did \$10. Rio Rancho is doing \$1. Until pretty much the bottom end of the schedule where they might have already had some distinction between years of experience and at that point the 7% or 10% depending on what the district decided to do will take over. So ours did do a 10% except for when that employee did not meet the minimum of the new level. Every one of our employees did receive at least a 10% raise which I'm very happy with. However, the union at APS and others have seen very generous interpretations of the law and some are stating that they'll be making a lot more than this as a level I with 0 experience or anything. We haven't seen any actual contracts and APS is still finalizing their salary schedule but our schedule is slightly more competitive than Rio Rancho. Ours is based on 186 contract days which is our standard contract. For this next year, we will have 198 after you include ELTP and PD days. All of our teachers participating in that will actually get 12 additional days of their ELTP rate which is this amount divided by 180. I say that just because ours technically starts at \$50,000 and Rio Rancho starts at \$52,777 but that's because they built that ELTP and those 10 extra days of theirs into their contract. So if we were to do it like that or similar, ours would actually be \$53,000 and change instead of \$52,777. Mr. Jones is there anything else you wanted to add to this? And speaking about how we are trying to do our best for our employees. <u>Jones:</u> No, thank you for that explanation Kyle. I think, more than anything, we've been really making an effort to be as competitive as we can to compensate our staff for the work that they do. But also be mindful of sustainability and ensuring that we work with you guys to set a salary schedule that's fair but also does not place us in position to where we may have to cut classroom spending in the future. Which, of course, salaries and benefits do count in that area but we want to be able to provide a well-rounded education. I think where we are now is providing a very competitive salary schedule which is above most and also increasing certain areas that benefit our teachers such as our endorsement stipends. Because we're a dual-language school, we have TESOL certified and Bilingual certified teachers and we've increased our stipends in those two areas significantly from \$1500 to \$2500 for our TESOL certified and from \$3000 and \$4000 for our Bilingual certified teachers. To make sure that we are again making sure we're mindful of the work that they do but also how they fit into our staffing plan and into our charter. We're working on other things; we also have a merit pay system and we're excited about that. In working with the board which we'll present next month. We'll increase teacher's incentivized pay by 100% so	Brenda Baca called for a motion to approve the FY23 EA Salary Schedule. Melissa Trujeque motioned Doris Cole seconded -Brenda Baca called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 3-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained

	they'll have the ability to earn up to \$5000 extra per year for meeting goals that we've established collaboratively; we're excited about that. Obviously there's been a lot of back and forth all over the place with this new salary structure. I've reached out to Gabriella Blakey who is an APS executive team member and she's right underneath the superintendent and they have not finalized their salary schedule yet; she's not gotten back to me with their approved salary schedule. We're excited about the work that we're doing and for the staff we have returning for next year. <u>Hunt:</u> Just to add-on to one of Mr. Jones's points about sustainability. This is a common theme in the legislature where they say they're going to pay educational providers, or increase teacher salaries, increase principal salaries, they're going to do all of this to benefit education. Yet when it comes down to it, they then take through the SEG and they do not fund it appropriately so it leaves districts and charter schools kind of scrambling to figure out how they're going to make this work while providing that appropriate compensation for teachers and other professionals. Just to give you an example, they've raised the unit value a little over 9% this year or our SEG only increased only 9%; the unit value did increase by a good amount. However, once you take into account all the additional amounts to pay for ERB and other benefits with this 20% raise, it's very difficult to do that. That's why we choose to do the small steps and remain near the bottom even though with our cash carryover we technically could've gone above it. But as Chris mentioned we're looking at sustainability in the future. Going forward in the item, we do have the salary schedule for the EA's. This was not provided at the previous meeting but this will require an action. We are starting our salaries at 20, 22, and 24. However, as a Title I school, we can only employee Level III EA's; so all of our EA's will start at least \$24,000. Just like the other salary schedule, this does not include 2 day PD and 10 days of ELTP.	
Approval of OpBud Calendar Revision	<u>Hunt:</u> To preface this before we actually get into this: Last year, with me being still remote to the school and not being a full-time employee, I still had a few disconnects on some of our communication. I didn't account for all of our early release days in the prior year calendar and so our calendar last year showed 180 instructional days even though it was technically 178. However, we did count for it this year and as we went to enter our operational budget for this year, they showed our early release days counting for ½ a day at the first Wednesday of every month. It does go towards this total base instructional days and certain departments in PED do check for total instructional day's vs prior years reporting. We did have 180 last year as reported but this year it was previously showing at 178 on the calendar you already approved at the last meeting. We did have to add back 2 full days; we ended up getting rid of the election break and 2 parts of the early release and that did bring us back into compliance of having 180 instructional days for next year as we reported this year. That leaves us with a base contract of 188 days in of that being PD and 10 days of ELTP. This is just a minor calendar revision to keep us in compliance with our K-5 Plus program which requires us to not lose instructional day's year-over-year. <i>*Jose Garcia enters meeting</i>	Brenda Baca called for a motion to approve the OpBud Calendar Revision. Melissa Truque motioned Doris Cole seconded -Brenda Baca called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Approval of Contracts-multipurpose field; summer transportation; FY23 Transportation	<u>Hunt:</u> - FY23 Transportation: Unfortunately, I haven't received the FY23 Transportation contract. That will be from Herrera and it'll be for the rental fee of the bus. We do not have it for you to actually vote on. - Summer Transportation: This is for \$6,000 and this is to fund the 10 days of ELTP that we do have this year, the K-5 Plus. That is running from 05/27/22-06/10/22. Multipurpose Field: <u>R. Chase:</u> Good evening from right here in Albuquerque. I appreciate the time that you give me to speak here. Members of your board, I'm the business development manager with Hellis Construction and we're the largest sports construction company on the US. We specialize in synthetic turf fields and we also do running tracks, tennis courts, pickle ball courts. You see our projects and our products from NFL stadiums all the way down to local parks and recreation centers. In fact, this latest Super Bowl at SoFi Stadium in Los Angeles was played on our synthetic turf. What I wanted to talk to you guys about tonight is our proposal for your academy. I did see a set of architectural plans for a multi-purpose field that's adjacent to your property there and your buildings. This plan of the multi-purpose field will incorporate a baseball/softball field as you can see with all of the dugouts, the backstop, the pitchers and the bullpen areas. But then as you can see, it extends out in left field with enough room there to put in a soccer field as well. One of the unique things about Hellis Construction is that we offer turnkey solutions. Not only do we manufacture the turf, we install it, we maintain it, and we do all of that with our own employees and our own equipment. Now to offer that turnkey solution and to give you one contact person for the entire project, we laid out a proposal that includes the concrete curb which is around what the synthetic turf attaches to. All of the concrete flat work, the bleacher pad, all of the drainage piping for underneath the turf, all of the athletic equipment which includes the bases, home plate, foul poles, the pitcher's rubber, and then within the synthetic turf field itself. One of the things that I wanted to point out, which we wanted to include within this proposal is the shock pad; a shock pad is another name for a safety pad. There are many synthetic fields that are out there today that basically is synthetic turf laid over the stone. With publicity with concussions and other body injuries from contact sport, we feel that having a shock pad or safety pad is imperative	Julian Munoz called for a motion to table the multipurpose field contract until next meeting. Brenda Baca motioned Jose Garcia seconded -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 5-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained Julian Munoz called for a motion to approve the summer transportation contract. Brenda Baca motioned Jose Garcia seconded -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 5-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained Julian Munoz called for a motion to table the FY23 transportation contract. Brenda Baca motioned Jose Garcia seconded -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 5-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained

	to the safety of your student athletes and your students who'll make use of this field. There is a score called a GMAX and a GMAX score shows the amount of force of contact with the ground. A well-manicured grass field, natural field, GMAX is around 100; the GMAX scale goes from 0-200. The addition of this safety pad will ensure that this field will GMAX at 100 which will be similar to a natural grass field. The synthetic turf would be the same turf we install in NFL stadiums. What makes this turf unique to Hellis and to this industry is this turf fiber stands up straight and stay up straight just like a natural playing surface. If any of you have had a chance to walk or play on synthetic turf fields, typically after about 2 years, the fibers actually lay down flat and when that does the playability of sports deteriorates. I like to use the analogy if you were to pitch a tent in the backyard if you have grass, over a couple of days, you pull the tent up and that grass is all matted down; that's typically what happens to most synthetic turf fields. So the major Hellis is our premium turf fiber and it will stay upright and keeps the playability on the natural grass surface. Obviously with all of the markings and then our real field subgrade which is a pea gravel vs a fine sand which will ensure proper drainage. Then of course, the 8 years of manufacturer's warranty. We also will include our fencing which is a black vinyl coated fencing. The dugouts and the back wall and netting system. You can see our proposal price there. There is an alternate piece on the proposal which included added, and this is discussing with Chris and Kyle, adding some 4 inch rock/stone that will cover the drainage. That concludes my proposal, does anybody have any questions? Or Kyle, do you have anything that you want to add? <u>Hunt:</u> I'm going to let the GC ask any questions they might have about the actual thing and then Chris and I can go into detail about all of the contractors we talked to and how we actually came to the decision of Hellis for this presentation. <i>*Julian Munoz enters meeting</i> <u>Munoz:</u> I'm sorry, my name is Julian and I'm late to this meeting, my apologies. I haven't had time to look at the proposal. Chris is this an action item for tonight? <u>Jones:</u> It's on the agenda designed to be an action item but of course depending on if the board needs additional time. You guys are more than welcome to take some additional time to review the proposal and come with a decision at that point whether you want to move forward with it. One thing I wanted to add is that we still have to sell our central facility in order for us to engage in this project. But we do have other funding sources that we could tap as well. The last thing I wanted to say is that this proposal that you're set to review, Kyle and I had the opportunity to review 3 proposals and we're very excited about this particular proposal. <u>Munoz:</u> Does anyone have any questions because I have to read this first and then I'm sure I will have questions later on. <u>Baca:</u> To me it looks pretty reasonable compared to the other ones that I saw that we were first looking at. <u>Jones:</u> So for the sake of the board, Mr. Munoz, I'm not sure if you want to create a follow-up meeting whether that be a special session or take the next 30 days to review. One thing that we do know is that the proposal will expire in time. However, I do want the board to take a careful look to see what the proposal entails. <u>Munoz:</u> What's the timeline on the proposal? <u>Jones:</u> As of now, the quote/proposal itself will expire within a certain timeframe. I would have to look at the proposal itself to see when it would expire. I will tell you in terms of doing the work and starting the project, we still have some things to do prior. Valid for 14 days from this date of proposal; obviously, we need to get that refreshed prior to getting into any agreements. We still have some time. Just to be honest with you, this is the one that we brought to you guys today and we'd be happy to sit in a special session and also to make sure that you have the other 3 proposals so that you could compare. This one for us is most advantageous because Hellis has such a great reputation but not only that they manufacture their own artificial turf. Based on the work and research that we've done, and in reviewing and speaking to so many contractors and vendors, this type of project is 1 ½ years out. What I like about Hellis is not only their reputation and their experience in installing these fields but the fact that they manufacture and they're willing to partner with us through this entire process and the fact that this is significantly lower than the other proposals that we received. I'm happy to meet with you guys again but we wanted you to review it. <u>Munoz:</u> Instead of another special session because I'm the one that's late to this dance right. How about just you, me and Kyle meet and we can kind of go over the proposal and then we can put this on the agenda for the next month for voting. So we table it for now or we can we can do a special session after I have reviewed this to vote on? What's the timeframe for this Chris? <u>Jones:</u> I'd say either way would be fine, Julian. Holding off until the next meeting is fine. That would give you guys the ability to review it more in depth and honestly in the next 30 days we are hopeful that our facility at central will sell. But again, we do have time. <u>Munoz:</u> Ok, sorry and again it is totally my fault. I haven't read anything in this proposal. It looks like a very nice picture, a nice layout here. Is this going to be behind the school as far as the location? <u>Hunt:</u> Yes, right behind our playground in that adjacent lot. <u>Munoz:</u> And is this just the field or does it also include the facility and all that stuff as well?	
--	--	--

	<u>Hunt:</u> So it does include the dugouts, the bleacher pads, and an ADA accessible path. But we won't actually put down the path for facilities down here in this corner; we'll do that as a separate pace because we've been advised by Penny, the architect, that that will need its own set of approvals. We decided to start with the fields first and then move on to the landscaping and facilities. <u>Munoz:</u> Ok, ok so that's good. So again, I'm sorry guys. I'll review this and then Chris and Kyle we can meet probably tomorrow or something and we can go over this real quick. Then we can move onto voting for the next session. My fault there; that was my fault. <u>Hunt:</u> I'll send all 3 proposals that Chris and I received since we do have more time in depth to review. <u>Jones:</u> Aright, thank you. And thank you Ross for joining us; we appreciate it. <u>R. Chase:</u> Thank you Chris; thank you Kyle and the governance counsel for the opportunity to speak. I'm available to talk if anybody needs to reference for me for this as well.	
Approval of State Grant Applications- Title I, IDEA-B, Title II, Title III, Title IV	<u>Jones:</u> 1. Title I Application- Title I is our biggest award of course. Right now, we were awarded \$182,912.17. Title I is our school-wide program for ABA and what it does is supports our disadvantaged students. Particularly in the areas of science, math, reading, writing, and technology. But also tries to incorporate a lot of parent involvement; there is a parent involvement pact that we come up with at the beginning of the school year and there are two annual meetings that are required for receiving input on how we spend these funds. Essentially, we create an application and send into the state for approval. We get stakeholder input from stakeholder surveys we post to ClassDojo. We have stakeholder meetings that are called parent advisory meetings. We had to give information on what we do with the stakeholder surveys and we ask many questions on several areas and we get input on how we evaluate our program and get input on how we should be utilizing our funding. Then we talk about what we'll do because we're a targeted support school. Our students in the area of special education did not reach their proficiency goals as set forth by the state, several years back. \$900 will pay for substitutes for our special education teachers so they can attend PD. Next, we go into detail about afterschool programming and tutoring; there's no money allocated but anyone who knows our school knows we offer a pretty robust afterschool program. School culture and climate is where we spend a majority of our funding every year. First is the school social worker, we have a full-time social worker listed at a .90 in this application and the remainder of her salary comes from through operational. She provides SEL support to our students and also collaborates with our school counselor to support not only discipline but other initiatives that we have throughout the school. Next we have our ELL Coordinator and Dean; this person is our Dean of students who is assists with attendance monitoring, ELL services, and supporting disciplinary efforts. Moving down, we have homeless section and we get into detail about paying for copies of documents needed and for those families lacking housing and if they need help with public transportation. We monitor the progress of our students when it comes to academics and we talk about reading and math assessments. Toward the bottom, we get into the percentage of students that are considered low-income; we have 100% of our students that are considered economically disadvantaged based on the qualifications. However, that's a pretty detailed formula. All in all, we do support SEL, we have an ELL coordinator who is supporting our mission in providing bilingual education while supporting discipline and that is essentially how we develop our Title I application. 2. Title II Application- This is to really support the staff development opportunities of teachers and for principals. So in this particular case, we have \$18,138; this is the award amount for ABA. We talk about student achievement and how we're going to accomplish high levels of student achievement and what we'll do for our teachers to support their initiatives in the classrooms. We talk about staff development opportunities that are adopted and required programs aligned to our core curriculum. This year we'll be adopting a new math curriculum. 3 years ago, as you remember we did adopt an ELA and SLA core curriculum for K-6; those are larger investments than what we're saying for this particular section of the proposal which is that we hope to provide additional PD in the areas of our programs. Next we talk about quality measures on what we're going to do for our teachers and how we're going to help them to achieve their goals. We talk about advisory as well as our teacher's goals; all of these things are going to support not only our teachers in providing a service to the diverse subgroups that we serve. Afterschool programming and interventions, reading and math interventions, tutoring, parent workshops and training, social work, school counselor; we have all of these different programs that serve students that are from diverse backgrounds from diverse subgroups and our teachers who make an effort to serve these students. The dual-language program which is implemented daily; CLAVES which is another initiative we spent \$22,000 about 3 years ago and we'll continue with visitas and some of the other components that we learned from them; we have an ELL coach who supports not only the monitoring of our ELL proficiency but also supports teachers	Julian Munoz called for a motion to approve the applications as presented by Mr. Jones. Brenda Baca motioned Jose Garcia seconded -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 5-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained

	in the classroom. Mentorships and supports for teachers and we have \$6000 allocated for that. They'll each earn \$3000 and that doesn't necessarily mean that these 2 individuals listed in the application are doing the mentoring, it could be anyone that aligns with the position in terms of who needs to be mentored. Finally, we have \$6100 which will all be allocated around domain 4b participating in a professional community. We're going to contract an individual to come out and help us with understanding a handful of areas but also how to facilitate meaningful collaboration meetings with one another as well as with parents; we have some collaborative work that we need to prepare for prior to engaging. Not only that but learning how we can become a more tightknit staff, I suppose. Endorsements and certain areas, \$3000 have been allocated; the school is prepared to put forth a substantially higher amount. This is our merit system for our staff, in this application it explains that we're paying \$250 towards these categories that amount will increase to \$500 per category. These are all based on these 8 goals that teachers set along with administration; each will be worth \$500 if they work with their grade level partner or if the interventionists work with their caseload students and they meet goals. We're excited about that as well. 3. Title III Application- This speaks to what we're doing with our ELL coordinator/coach. Mr. Gonzales and myself really share those responsibilities. Mr. Gonzales, part of his salary is funded through this application. It's about working with him to establish who it is that are having problems from an academic standpoint and that can mean attendance but for me, it's really about him participating in our leadership structure and assisting me with the monitoring of our ELL students. A percentage, only \$9000, is paid out of this funding source. The more exciting piece of this allocation is what we're doing in the upcoming year in a post-pandemic era where we're going to be providing ELD classes to our parents; so we'll pay an instructor to do that throughout the school year now that we can be back in person.	
21-22 CSD Site Visit Report	<u>Jones:</u> I wanted to share this with you guys, we had our site visit on April 27th. The site visit is an annual requirement in accordance with our charter contract. They bring out a small team from the CSB and they come out and they look at our school. By that they look at organizational, financial, performance framework, academic performance, and they look at everything from governance to how we manage finance to school safety and environment. I think what you're seeing here is that our leadership team is in place currently and our school staff as a whole are doing a great job alongside of our board; you guys are driving this home for us. The team that came out were really impressed with everything that we have going on. The team noted at the end, during the exit interview, that we have so many different funding sources, so many projects happening simultaneously, that they were very impressed with the organization that we have within our charter school. They did state from governance all the way through our operations and academics in the classrooms; they said that they really respected our efforts. The team consisted of 3 former principals; it was nice to hear from them what they see in the school because oftentimes you see in charter schools people with great intentions that aren't necessarily doing the best job with organizing, managing, and leading their organizations. From all of the construction projects, to all of the 12,000 funding sources and grant applications that we manage throughout the year, they were highly impressed. They went to many classrooms throughout the school day and they left feedback for our teachers. They sat in and looked at all of our employee files and looked at our finances. There was an element that was remote, a desktop monitoring, so they were able to look at our STARS reports. So if you look at all of these ratings, you see that it "Meets Standard" and that's pretty huge. Back in 2016, when I took over the school this entire document was red and what it indicated that we had a lot of work to do and that was a part of our revocation scare. Happy to do the work with you guys. There are a few different indicator areas that have "More data needed; No issues identified"; they will continue to monitor us remotely throughout the duration of the school year. But this is probably, for me, one of those reflective moments when we get to compare where we've come from to where we are now currently. And to not have anything that needs work or that they're requesting more documentation at this time. This is by far the best review that we've ever received and it's because of the great team that we have from our staff all the way through the board. So thank you guys for your work. <u>Munoz:</u> Thank you, Mr. Jones. That was definitely you and your teachers and administrators there. <u>Jones:</u> Well we appreciate it; we appreciate the support. That's really exciting for us as a whole.	
Closed Session	Time: 6:46pm <u>Munoz:</u> I invite Mr. Jones and Kyle to remain in the closed session.	Julian Munoz called for a motion for ABA's Board of Education to Convene in Closed Session pursuant to NMSA 1978, 10-15-1(H) (2) Limited personnel matter; head administrator evaluation. Brenda Baca motioned Jose Garcia seconded -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a

		vote of 5-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Reconvene to Open Session	<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.	Reconvene to Open Session
Action as Necessary from Closed Session (Discussion/Action)	<i>*Head Administrator Evaluation has been tabled until next meeting.</i>	
Special Issues	Discussion	Action/Recommendation
Head Administrator Report– enrollment, staffing, site visit, upcoming events	N/A	
Public Comment	N/A	
Announcement of Next GC Meeting	Next GC meeting: <u>Monday, June 27, 2022; 5:30 pm</u>	Julian Munoz asked for a motion to adjourn. Brenda Baca motioned Jose Garcia seconded Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 5-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Adjourn	Meeting was adjourned.	