

Albuquerque Bilingual Academy
ABA GC Meeting Minutes for Virtual Meeting
Date: February 28, 2022

Board Members Present	Julian Munoz, Doris Cole, Brenda Baca	
Absent	Melissa Trujeque, Jose Garcia	
Others in Attendance	Chris Jones, Kyle Hunt, Danielle Miranda, Priyam Banerjee, Esteban Cole	
QUORUM	<u> X </u> YES <u> </u> NO	
Meeting called to order	Julian Munoz called the meeting to order at 5:34pm & Roll Call by Julian Munoz	
Item	Discussion	Action/Recommendation
Approval of Minutes	01/31/2021	Julian Munoz called for a motion to approve the 01/31 minutes. Brenda Baca motioned Doris Cole seconded -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 3-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Approval of the Agenda	02/28/2022	Julian Munoz called for a motion to approve the agenda. Brenda Baca motioned Doris Cole seconded -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 3-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Budget Report Updates	<u>Hunt:</u> Starting with our Revenues, as we have received through this year. As you can see, many of the BARs that we've previously approved have now been approved by PED and are showing on our budget. We will still have minor adjustments as we get other fees that are coming in and other revenues. Such as the food services which PED makes us wait until we actually receive a large amount of revenue then budget it; so we will be doing another few BARs for those items later on in the month. We've also gotten a large amount of Medicaid money but we originally did a BAR for a different fund and I'm going to be going into detailed explanation later on. Going down to the Expenditure Report, overall our operational budget is looking very strong. We do have the K-5 Plus that was moved out in February along with a large portion of other salaries but those aren't reflected until the February report. Overall though, we do have almost positive lines in every single account category and definitely in every function; functions where it matters when it comes to compliance with PED standards. You can see that the overall available amount in this right column is a large amount for most of the categories. Our total operational budget is now showing available of \$1.5 million. Last year, we ended with \$1.3 million in cash carryover and that means that we are now operating in surplus meaning we are not even dipping into our carryover; we're actually going to extend our carryover even further. With the K-5 Plus changes that are going to be shown in the February reports, we're actually increasing our carryover by a few 100,000 which with how many projects we now have going on is really good as we will be having to use that. We have a few legislative updates that'll probably cause us to dip into it in the next few years, but I'll be going into that more later. But overall, the good news is we are now operating in surplus and again extending our carryover even more. Food services does show a negative budget but as I previously mentioned on the revenue report, we do have to increase that carryover because we only received our November USDA claims and by the time we get our May in we're going to have several 100,000 more. Really we just did a smaller budget because of the COVID counts from the previous year which caused us to begin the year with a much smaller budget than previous years. Going through our Title funds and other funds, we are pretty much utilizing everything as we have been. Community schools, we did issue our additional compensation and we will have a few BARs we're talking about tonight which adjusts for benefits and a few categories; but we are expecting to fully utilize that grant by the year end. Title III, we also did some rearranging and are utilizing that grant fully as well. Title IV also shows negative but we do have a lot of carryover and a new grant year; we're just waiting on PED to issue a new award letter so we actually have about \$20,000 more in this award than I can see. But actually have to wait for the program at PED to issue carryover memos and award letters before they allow us to actually do the BARs to bring that budget in. That's why it shows negative, even though we will actually have the funds to cover that. ESSER II, we're still rearranging some parts to match some of the legislative updates that we recently had and to cover some of the new projects that we're undertaking next year. ESSER III, we are continuing the same strategy of covering auto-subs mainly and some other minor categories. The new big thing is the encumbrance that we have for the \$684,000 which is part of the buildout for building C, now that we've actually begun and Brycon's begun billing as they finish their planning phase and we're about to begin construction. Again, I'll give you a detailed explanation later on. Going through the other funds, we do have good availability of Pre-K and that is because we are lacking a Pre-K instructor so fortunately our Pre-K program is capped at 20 students right now; as soon as we find another instructor, we will be expanding on that. For HB-33 and SB-9, you'll see some negatives but we do have BARs to address those tonight to address the Brycon PO that was opened up and correlation to the	

	amendment that you recently approved in the previous meeting. Overall though, our budget is looking very healthy. As I mentioned before, our operational budget is still operating at surplus; heading into next year, we're still going to be in a great position. Going down to the Bank Account Register Activity Report, this is everything that entered or left our bank account through the month, stop me if you do have questions on any single line item. I believe my name is actually on this one for \$45; I did have to take a fundamental coaching course for a license which the school helped pay for. But other than that, we did have positive cash flow of \$522,876, while only dispersing \$448,370; we're back on the positive cash flow which is great. Going to our Bank Reconciliation, we went from \$2.99 million to \$3.07 million with only \$11,000 in outstanding checks. Of those \$11,000, you can see the distribution of those; you can see Monica also had to take that fundamental coaching course, we had a fingerprint reimbursement, and a parent reimbursement. Going down to our Balance Sheet, this is how that \$3 million is laid out. As you can see our operational fund continues to grow at \$1.8 million almost which is great. A large amount in USDA cash as I previously mentioned; our budget was small because we weren't expecting a lot of revenue because of the COVID prior numbers but this year will be expanding again. Then we have our federal funds while we wait for RFRs to come in, they show negative which operational technically has to cover. A large amount of capital money which we will be using for our capital projects, buildouts, and other things that we're gonna be talking about later tonight. Going to YTD Dashboard Report, we are pretty much staying in line. We have shifted a little more to the instructional side of expenditures that's in the classroom expenditures; that's where PED likes to see our main portion of our budget going so that's good. We have decreased our support services and that's mainly due to the lease purchase being shifted to capital outlay which is also reflected down at the bottom. The main difference in federal programs is mainly due to the fact that we really ran through our CARES program last year; we expended all of that immediately and now we have our ESSER II and ESSER III which we're preparing to spend a lot of but we're still kind of in the planning phase for both of those.	
Audit Update	<u>Hunt:</u> The audit was recently published at the end of January, so we are now able to talk about it in a public setting. Our audit was good this year. We did have one finding this year, down from two. Unfortunately, it was a significant deficiency to financial closing and reporting. Every year, at the end, I have to look at our books and I have to calculate what was a capital asset and what was not a capital asset to be added to a depreciation schedule. This year I did miss the turf because we did break up the turf installation into multiple parts; we paid multiple vendors. It was all technically one asset but when I was reviewing our books I didn't realize that all those transactions were related. So, I unfortunately missed those. However, this is not a repeat finding which is what CSD and PED really look at. A significant deficiency isn't a big deal; we did put in a response to make sure that it's not going to happen again. Next year, we're going to identify all projects with unique numbers so that I know that each transaction is related to a bigger project. If it is. Going on to the actual audit, these are in the packets but now that it's published this is just the details of the schools financials if you ever wanted to go through them; I could definitely show you what these numbers mean. But overall, they did state that the school is in a healthy position even though when you get into it shows some negative numbers. Such as this net position end of the year negative \$5 million is what those parentheses mean. ERB and NM retired healthcare are technically underfunded right now and every school gets a portion of that liability. But the school itself is in a good position. Does anyone have any questions or concerns over the audit? <u>Munoz:</u> What was our corrective action or response? <u>Hunt:</u> Our "Management's Response: Two capital assets/projects were not originally capitalized on the schedule due to the assets/projects being made up of several smaller transactions that did not individually meet the \$5000 threshold for capitalization. The school will mark new related/intermittent capital asset/project transactions with a unique number to make sure all transactions for each project are included in the Fixed Asset Schedule in subsequent years." <u>Munoz:</u> Was this a difference of interpretation of that criteria or what? <u>Hunt:</u> No, so what happened is every year before I send reports to the auditors or I close our books, I review our general ledger and I specifically looks at transactions over \$5,000 and I see if they need to be added to the schedule. There were three transactions that were each individually below the threshold and they were the purchase of the turf, the installation of the turf, and then another portion of the installation of the turf. Not grouped, none of them qualified to be capitalized but when you realize that is all one section it did mark over meeting the \$5,000 threshold. So now, I have started assigning project numbers to make sure that we do capture all of them. With me being onsite, I actually have a much better understanding now of what's being installed and how some of these transactions are linked to each other instead of just receiving invoices as opposed to the prior year. <u>Munoz:</u> Ok, thank you.	
Legislative Update	<u>Hunt:</u> House Bill 2 and Senate Bill 1 were both passed this last legislation. Senate Bill 1 is the significant one. It raised all teacher minimum to 50, 60, and 70 starting at; it was previously 40, 50, and 60. So \$10,000 raise for all teachers. It also raised principal minimums and a few other things; other basic mandatory licensure salary schedule requirements. House Bill 2 is the one that included the language of mandatory raises for the year which everyone will get a quarter of a 3%	

	raise for FY22 which is the year we're currently in. PED is giving guidance that it should be classified as a retention stipend; so anyone that finishes out our contract with us this year, will get a quarter of a 3% raise because it is not retroactive. But it is raising each individual person's salary by 3% but it's for the last quarter of the fiscal year. Then going on to FY23, an addition to the new salary schedules, all employees have to receive an average of another 4% raise equaling 7%; when you take previous 3 and the 4% into account. Since we will also participate in ELTP/K-5 Plus, we have to give an additional 3% over that. So our teachers, since they're receiving what is going to be really an equivalent to about a 20 to 12% raise already with that new salary schedule just because funding from 40/41/42 to 50/51/52 that's 20% and 50 to 60 that's 15%. They're all going to be beating those standards as well but all other returning employees of ours will get a 10% raise effectively from 07/01. Another additional portion of this is the funding of ERB; they're increasing the ERB contribution percentage for the employer side by 2% which means all of our retirement accounts will be raised by about 10% which is effective on our ledger when you're going from 15.5 to 17.5. <u>Munoz</u>: There is additional funding for these increases, I hope, right? <u>Hunt</u>: Yes, they say they've allocated \$400 million into the SEG fund to do this. You know, they did this when they jumped the levels from 30/40/50 to 40/50/60. But really, it's usually a 10 or 12% raises and then actually an 8 or 9% increase in SEG. They like to say its equivalent but when we look at it, year over year, it's not always works out the way they say it will. We will be looking very closely when it comes budget time to make sure that as I mentioned we are not drawing too much into our carryover and that really we're creating a sustainable budget going into the next few years with these new salary schedules. <u>Munoz</u>: Ok, thank you.	
Approval of BARs	<u>Hunt</u>: BARs for consideration: a. #0028-M b. #0030-T c. #0031-M d. #0032-M e. #0033-M f. #0034-IB g. #0035-I h. #0036-IB i. #0037-IB 1. Justification: \$0- To adjust for benefits for stipends. 2. Justification: \$0- To adjust for benefits for Coordinator position. 3. Justification: \$0- To adjust budget to allocate for Pre-K Coordinator Stipend. 4. Justification: \$0- To adjust budget to match expenditures. 5. Justification: \$0- To adjust budget to match current expenditures and encumbrances. 6. Justification: \$30,039- To create budget to match cash transfer of funds from 25152 to 25153. 7. Justification: \$96,023- To increase SEG budget to match 40D worksheet provided by PED. 8. Justification: \$199- To create budget based on carryover memo provided by PED. 9. Justification: \$473- To create budget for ELTP Transportation based on memo provided by PED.	Julian Munoz called for a motion to approve BARs #0028-M, #0030-T, #0031-M, #0032-M, #0033-M, #0034-IB, #0035-I, #0036-IB, and #0037-IB and the Permanent Cash Transfer Request Fund 25152 to 25153. Brenda Baca motioned Doris Cole seconded -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 3-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Permanent Cash Transfer Request Fund 25152 to 25153	<u>Hunt</u>: This Permanent Cash Transfer Request is to shift cash originally placed in Medicaid fund 25152 in prior years to correct Medicaid fund 25153 per PED. As I had mentioned, we had been previously using this fund for eight or nine years without a problem and no one had ever said anything. And then as we approved the BAR last month and I submitted it to PED, our budget analyst said "Hey, why do we use this fund and not 25153?" I just said historically we've always used it and I didn't want to have to push it to another one or do a cash transfer like this. But some emails back and forth and talking to the rest of her bureau, she decided it would be best to transfer it over. So this does move all of our entire cash flow carryover from 25152 to 25153; it's really just shifting our historically placed Medicaid funds into the correct fund. We will use these funds for nursing services which is great. We did receive \$27,000 additionally already, so we have a large amount of money in this fund now. We just sent this to PED along with that BAR that we previously approved and they allow us to transfer that cash.	
Special Issues	Discussion	Action/Recommendation
Facilities Update	<u>Hunt</u>: We have been working with Brycon and we do believe the project buildout of building C will hopefully begin in April. It's been a long time coming; we thought we were going to start this project back in July or August last year and now it hopefully looks like we're going to be breaking ground in April. We have looked into other restroom projects for building b, our training facility, as we originally asked Brycon a proposal for that; their proposal was really kind of ridiculous and we didn't think we'd want to invest that kind of cash. We're thinking about how we can better utilize that space; we didn't want to give up such a large portion of it to house restrooms inside. We've now been talking about doing a portable restroom right outside in front of the building. This would be a restroom for both boys and girls and it would have a small storage area included with washer and dryer hookups which we actually need as we are a Title I school; so we have to provide those laundry facilities for parents if they were such as homeless students. This is looking to be about half the cost once they build the building and actually running the utilities from the building to the portable right in front and it wouldn't interfere with	

	pickup line or anything like that. Chris and I have also been meeting with other vendors to begin our field which is going to lead into the next item. We've been talking to quite of few vendors about starting a multipurpose field which we originally contracted with Penny Dudley and her group to start the design and architecture. We still received bids from Brycon, Ellis Construction, and Turf Field. They are all over \$1 million; it's a big project doing turf for what it would be a softball field and extending it to do a multipurpose area so that all of our students can enjoy. Brycon's estimate was \$1.3 million and we're still waiting on quotes from the others. A good portion of that estimate was for grading and we're looking into having approval of Rio Rancho Landscaping to do the initial grading which would save us a lot of upfront costs.	
Approval of Rio Rancho Landscaping Contract	<u>Hunt:</u> The contract is for \$60,000 and it is to do the grading of the entire area to meet with Penny's specs and stuff like that. When Brycon did their initial quote, they originally quoted us \$300,000 to do out grading. Once we told them that we would have it done ourselves, they dropped that number all the way to \$40,000. So by using this smaller vendor, that has to kind of be held to our procurement threshold of \$60,000 where he's trying to make all of his work fit into that thing and not go over; it's really forcing him to stay within our budget and saving us several \$100,000. There are other associated costs that we do have to this. We have another company looking at the actual permits. There's a lot of ecological permits that we have to do like a swift permit and rain and dust permits; those are all pretty minor contracts under \$10,000 or so. There's always, we just found out, bringing in the dirt. We're going to need to bring in \$9,000-\$10,000 worth of dirt to finish the grading; we thought there was enough but the change is we're going to actually have to truck in dirt. But overall, this contract that we're asking you to approve was quoted at \$59,440 or right near that \$60,000 threshold. As I mentioned, the other estimate that we had looked at were several \$100,000. <u>Munoz:</u> Kyle, was this sent in the package because I'm not seeing it? <u>Jones:</u> We're looking for the email now and I can request it. I'm not sure if I put it in there because of course I create the board packets; so I'll have to look through my files and that is my mistake. We can go ahead and include that in the packet and you guys can take a look. I would ask for conditional approval in the interim. The work is supposed to begin here in the, I believe, next week as far as finalizing. One thing I will say, just to kind of touch on Kyle's points and to attest that we received estimates from other bidders and I'll also go ahead and include the Brycon estimate for the fieldwork. It was ranging in the \$300,000 just for the dirt work. Through AK Sales, I was quoted at one point over \$500,000 just for the dirt work. It is a pretty big cost when it comes to doing this kind of project. <u>Munoz:</u> What's the cost that you guys have right now? <u>Jones:</u> Yeah, working with these individuals it would be around \$59,500 plus some additional dirt because there is going to be a terrace to create the additional space based on the grading and plan that was provided to us by the engineer. So we have \$59,500 as opposed to between \$300,000 and \$500,000; immediately we're looking at cost savings of \$100,000's. The dirt part of \$12,500 is a minor expense; I do have, of course, within my threshold to approve that and it's a part of the plan to make sure that we can actually expand and have a soccer and football field. <u>Munoz:</u> You're asking for \$59,500 for this action item here? <u>Jones:</u> Yes sir.	Julian Munoz called for a motion for a conditional approval of \$59,500 pending documentation from Rio Rancho Landscaping Contract. Brenda Baca motioned Doris Cole seconded -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 3-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Staffing Update	<u>Jones:</u> With staffing, I'm really excited to share with the board that we're actually increasing our staffing. We've hired an additional auto substitute to cover in the event that a staff member will be out. We have a big coverage need and without having a pool of qualified candidates like we used to, we're really relying on just a couple of EA's to help over classes. On average we have at least probably two staff members out per day for different reason including training. We hired an additional EA and they will support right now the 1st grade teacher because her EA is covering our 3rd grade class until we place a permanent person in there. Which brings me to my next update, we have a teacher that we will contract for the duration of the year as she will be covering the 3rd grade class until next year. Then we will place her in a special education position because she is highly qualified in special education. We have a front desk person who will be an administrative assistant receptionist that we just made an offer to and we're hopeful that she'll accept. She's going to assist with really staying in the front without having to move in terms of providing coverage for people for duty. We really need someone who is going to be consistent at the front desk who can provide great customer service. I will let you know in the next meeting how that goes. Last but not least, Diana Diaz, our previous Director of Operations, had stepped away for a time to pursue other interest of hers including photography, she has expressed some interest in coming back. If she accepts the part-time position, she can support student reporting through STARS reporting. Kyle has being doubling up when it comes to his duties and Diana is an expert in that area and can assist a great deal. Also she would serve as an office manager and she would also go back to our registrar. For us, I think it's a big benefit in that we would have a person who has great institutional knowledge. She was with me alongside when we were going through the revocation scare and it was really she and I. So we have a good team right now including Mr. David Bryant and Mr. Hunt and we have Jimmy Gonzalez the Dean; of course, we have good teacher leaders. Happy if she accepts that offer and she'll be there to offer support as well. We're also looking to making some staffing shifts for next year and put people in places that we think they'll really thrive. We have the full-time reading interventionist position that we	

	created and Ms. Banerjee has filled that position; we're excited about the work that she'll do next year. We adopted a curriculum for her to use. We're going to open up our Math Interventionist position again and we're really excited about that one. We're hoping that a couple of our really highly qualified internal candidates will apply for that position because math is an area of need when it comes to student proficiency. I'll keep you guys updated on additional staffing changes as they come.	
Head Administrator Report	<u>Jones</u> : enrollment is going pretty well so far. We aren't necessarily where we want to be but we have shifted to online registration and that's a huge step forward for us. We have the lottery that's underway but we won't have final numbers until most likely the end of March into April. At which time, we can adjust our staffing pattern and make some changes as necessary. Mr. Bryant was pivotal in helping us to implement that process. Having Diana on board to help Kyle will be huge for us as well in getting these parents in and taken care of; they'll both be able to assist with the registration process. We have athletics that are happening and something really exciting is Mr. Cole has taken over as the volleyball coach and they're doing fantastic. So congratulations to Mr. Cole and to Ms. Chavez who is assistant coach; they are doing great and students re happy. Athletics is a big part of really motivating students in building community in a school. We have Access testing that is happening; Mr. Cole is not only the volleyball coach and classroom teacher but also the DTC. He right now has coordinated Access testing and we're hopeful that students will show some great growth in comparison to last spring. We have the PED that will be visiting us soon; I did receive a notification from the PED CSD that they will be coming to conduct the annual site visit. They haven't solidified the date quite yet but we're preparing on our end as the administrative team and we're very confident that we'll do well in the visit. But I will keep you notified as new developments come about.	
Public Comment		
Announcement of Next GC Meeting	Next GC meeting: <u>Monday, March 28, 2022; 5:30 pm</u>	Julian Munoz asked for a motion to adjourn.
Adjourn	Meeting was adjourned at 6:16pm	Brenda Baca motioned Julian Munoz seconded Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 3-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained