

LOS LUNAS SCHOOLS BOARD OF EDUCATION
REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 18, 2024

A. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Osowski called the Los Lunas Schools Board of Education meeting to order at 6:02 pm and welcomed those who were participating in the board meeting in person and those who were watching the board meeting via livestreaming on YouTube. She asked that anyone addressing the Board use the microphone at the podium and to be sure to identify themselves for the record. Dr. Osowski added that, as a reminder, the link to the meeting was on the District's webpage, under the Board of Education page. She stated that the streaming would run through the end of the meeting. In the event there was a disruption in the audio portion, she would pause the meeting until it was reestablished.

LLS Board Members Present: Dr. Michelle Osowski, President
Monica Otero, Vice President
Justin Talley, Secretary (*Attended via teleconference*)
Bruce Bennett, Member
P. David Vickers, Member

Administrators Present: Dr. Ryan Kettler, Superintendent
Brian G. Baca, Deputy Superintendent
Andrew Saiz, Chief Personnel Officer
Sandy Traczyk, Chief Finance Officer
Tiffany McMinn, Dir. of Maintenance & Construction
Michelle Romero, Dir. of Purchasing
Chelsea Servantes, Dir. of Secondary Programs
Albert Aragon, Principal, Valencia High School
Teri Gough, Principal, Katherine Gallegos Elementary
Mathew Pendrak, Principal, Los Lunas Elementary
Amy Viramontes, Principal, Peralta Elementary

Others Present: Felina Martinez, Valencia County News Bulletin
Approximately five additional individuals were in attendance.
A range of 28 - 30 individuals watched via live streaming.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Eight-year-old Gabriel Otero, son of Board Vice President Monica Otero, who will

be in third grade this coming year at Peralta Elementary, led the audience in the Pledge.

2. ASCERTAIN QUORUM

- **Dr. Michelle Osowski, Board President**
- **Monica Otero, Board Vice President**
- **Justin Talley, Board Secretary**
- **P. David Vickers, Board Member**
- **Bruce Bennett, Board Member**

Dr. Osowski had the Executive Assistant call for a roll call of the board members. It was noted that all board members were in attendance, and that Board Secretary, Justin Talley, was participating via teleconference. Dr. Osowski confirmed that Mr. Talley could hear them and that they could hear him.

B. ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEETING

Dr. Osowski asked Dr. Kettler to announce the meeting.

Dr. Kettler reported the meeting had been announced in accordance with the NM Open Meetings Act and LLS Open Meetings Resolution, and was a legally constituted meeting of the Los Lunas Schools Board of Education.

C. EXECUTIVE: APPROVAL OF PRIORITIZED AGENDA

Dr. Osowski announced that took them to Item #C. EXECUTIVE: APPROVAL OF PRIORITIZED AGENDA. She asked Dr. Kettler if there were any changes or deletions to the agenda. Dr. Kettler stated that he had no changes or deletions.

Mr. Talley moved to approve the agenda as submitted, with the following exception. He stated that he would like to move Item J. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT FOR AN ATTORNEY TO REPRESENT THE LOS LUNAS SCHOOLS BOARD OF EDUCATION to follow this item, Item C. EXECUTIVE APPROVAL OF PRIORITIZED AGENDA. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion. Dr. Osowski asked if there was any discussion.

C. EXECUTIVE: APPROVAL OF PRIORITIZED AGENDA (Continued)

Mr. Vickers told Mr. Talley he was wondering why he was asking for the change in the order of the topics. Dr. Osowski asked Mr. Talley if he would provide a reason. Mr. Talley responded that there was an eight-hour difference in time where he was. He hoped to be a part of that discussion, and, following, the discussion, he hoped to drop off so he could go back to sleep. Dr. Osowski asked Mr. Vickers and the other board members if they had other comments or questions.

There being none, she called for a vote with the following results: Mr. Vickers - yes; Ms. Otero – yes; Mr. Talley – yes; Mr. Bennett - yes; and Dr. Osowski - yes. The motion to approve the prioritized agenda as amended passed: 5/0.

Item J. was moved per Board Action.

(The original numeration listed on the agenda is listed in parenthesis - kw)

D. (J) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT FOR AN ATTORNEY TO REPRESENT THE LOS LUNAS SCHOOLS BOARD OF EDUCATION

Dr. Osowski called for a motion.

Mr. Bennett moved, and Dr. Osowski seconded, to approve Item D. (J) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT FOR AN ATTORNEY TO REPRESENT THE LOS LUNAS SCHOOLS BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Dr. Osowski asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Talley stated that he was wondering what the reasoning was for approving another attorney for the Board, because the Los Lunas School Board already had a contract for attorneys to represent them.

D.(J) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT FOR AN ATTORNEY TO REPRESENT THE LOS LUNAS SCHOOLS BOARD OF EDUCATION

He wanted to understand why. If they were unhappy with the representation, he asked if they'd asked for a different representative from that law firm to represent them, or what happened with that representation – did they send a letter of concern to that firm, so they were aware of the concerns that they had?

Mr. Talley added that he thought that they had an open contract, and, unless they had done their due diligence, he did not see the reasoning, or thought that it was necessary to hire another law firm for representation.

Dr. Osowski thanked Mr. Talley, then asked Mr. Vickers if he had any questions or comments.

Mr. Vickers stated that he did in regards to the attorneys they had now for the administration and the Board, etc. They were all vetted through a RFP and he was wondering what it did to those hired from the RFP and if there would be any repercussions from sidestepping the existing attorneys in doing that.

Dr. Osowski asked Dr. Kettler if there was any answer to that. He replied that Michelle Romero, the District Purchasing Director, should be able to answer that.

Ms. Romero stated that in regards to the RFP process, as Mr. Vickers had mentioned, and, that was previously stated by Mr. Talley, last year, they went out for an RFP for legal services. Four firms were vetted by that process. They utilized the RFP process for the procurement for that type of service over \$60,000, and it was a four-year contract.

They had just ended the first year, and those firms were on contract. They did have a right to get the business through the vetting process that was done. She was not familiar with the item that they were discussing, because it did not go through the District's Purchasing Department for vetting prior to that meeting.

D.(J) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT FOR AN ATTORNEY TO REPRESENT THE LOS LUNAS SCHOOLS BOARD OF EDUCATION (Continued)

Ms. Romero stated that she couldn't answer about the specifics of the item they were discussing, because she wasn't included in that. It had not gone through the Purchasing Department. She asked if that answered his question.

Mr. Vickers said that it did – somewhat. The contract in question, that was before them, was for less than \$60,000 for the year. He said he guessed that was allowed in the procurement code... what did that do?

Ms. Romero stated that first off, she would need to know what the scope of work was. That would be the first question that she would look at when it was being vetted. They had a Central Purchasing Office at the District that was tasked and responsible for vetting all purchases for the District. Again, that contract did not go through her office and so she did not have the opportunity to review it or look at the scope of work. But, in looking at the agenda item, it said "professional services contract for an attorney to represent the Los Lunas School Board of Education" and that sounded like a scope of work that would be right in line with the other law firms that were contracted and had gone the vetting process through the RFP.

If that was in direct competition, with the ones that already went through that process, then she would think that they (other law firms) might have a problem with that and the District could end up with a protest. It sounded to her like it might be taking business from them after they went through a process to get that, and this company, whoever it might be, was going to get a contract out right.

Mr. Vickers thanked her.

Dr. Osowski told Ms. Romero that she (Ms. Romero) had said it 'could' end up as a protest. What she understood was that all board members who were present at the law conference had an opportunity to visit a representative of this particular firm.

D.(J) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT FOR AN ATTORNEY TO REPRESENT THE LOS LUNAS SCHOOLS BOARD OF EDUCATION (Continued)

This individual, as well as, another member of that firm, informed at least two of them (board members), who had conversations with them, that it would not be a violation with the RFP process and they (that firm) were very familiar with it.

They'd also have assured two of them, and any other board member that attended and who was given a contact card, that this was in line with what the Board could request. In response, that it 'could', they'd received information that it was not in violation at the Law Conference. She added that she was putting that out there for information.

Mr. Vickers interjected and said to let him clarify. He was at the Law Conference and he was not involved in any kind of discussion or negotiations with any member of this law firm.

Ms. Otero stated that neither was she.

Mr. Bennett stated that when they went back to last year, with the last of the representation of law firms that they'd had, there were a lot of situations that happened last year that the attorneys were used to protect the Board. The District might have been dealt with some injustice, as there was a lot of information that was provided from those attorneys, and there was some information that those attorneys should have provided prior to those meetings.

Like he'd said, he did do his part at the Law Conference, and he did interview several people, and he just thought that they, specifically, the Cuddy Firm, could represent this District/Board, better than how they had been represented by others.

Dr. Osowski stated that she would like to add on to that and come along with Mr. Bennett's comment about being unsatisfied. She noted that they'd had one particular situation where

they'd received a letter - Vice President Otero and she – had received a letter from the Attorney General about requests for information concerning text messages on cell phones.

D.(J) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT FOR AN ATTORNEY TO REPRESENT THE LOS LUNAS SCHOOLS BOARD OF EDUCATION (Continued)

She said that a representative from the Walsh Law Firm could not find that information in law. However, when they (the Board) attended the last conference session, it was in the packet that was provided to them, and it was also on the webpage for any person who wanted to see it. It clearly stated that text messages were a part of any of the Open Meetings Act request.

So, in terms of them contacting the Walsh Law Firm, she did not make that contact and she did not understand from the RFP that she had seen, that she must do that. She asked if Ms. Romero could clarify that. Were they required to notify them if they were unhappy with the services?

Ms. Romero replied yes. For any contractor who was not performing the scope of work, they had to give them an opportunity to cure that.

Mr. Vickers asked if they could still issue a letter saying that they were unhappy?

Ms. Romero said that, like Dr. Kettler had mentioned or Mr. Talley, she didn't remember who said it, there were a lot of attorneys that were in those firms. If the Board was not happy with one particular attorney, then she was sure that the Board would have an opportunity to choose a different one, or could use one of the District's other law firms that they did have on contract.

Dr. Osowski stated that the other firm was the Modrall Firm, and asked Dr. Kettler if that was correct. Dr. Kettler stated that it was correct. Dr. Osowski stated that he (Dr. Kettler) regularly went to them, so there was not a separation between Board functions and administrative functions. Dr. Kettler stated that when speaking with Mr. Melendres, since they (Modrall

Firm) were representing the administrative functions of the District, they'd indicated they would not also represent the School Board.

**D.(J) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT FOR AN ATTORNEY TO REPRESENT THE LOS LUNAS SCHOOLS BOARD OF EDUCATION
(Continued)**

Dr. Osowski asked if that was the same thing with Walsh/Gallegos and with the Ortiz/Zamora Law Firm out of Santa Fe? They had performed several administered functions, correct? Dr. Kettler responded that they had. He further confirmed that he'd contacted a member of the Ortiz/Zamora Law Firm earlier in the spring, so that was correct, he'd had conversations with one of their attorneys.

Dr. Osowski stated that was her concern, that there was not a clear separation between the Board and The Administration. As a Board, they'd had some conversations about their level of satisfaction, so that was why they'd pursued another option. She asked if there were any other comments.

Mr. Talley asked if there had been formal requests/complaints made, and if they had told the law firm about their concerns. Dr. Osowski that there had been expressions of displeasure from board members given to her but not to the law firm. So, that was correct, and she thanked Mr. Talley for clarifying that.

Dr. Osowski asked if there was any other discussion.

Ms. Otero asked for clarification. The item was listed as consideration of approval. There was nothing set in stone, and they did not have to decide on what they were going to do with it as it was list for consideration of ... Dr. Osowski interjected and said that yes, they could pull it from this meeting and put it on the next board meeting agenda – they did have that option.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the wording of the item, during which Dr. Osowski clarified that, as it was listed as consideration of approval, and not discussion with action, they could choose to take action on it or not.

Ms. Romero asked if she could add another comment. She stated that there were four law firms on contract, which had been vetted through the RFP process. She noted that the other firm was Holcomb. She didn't know if she (Dr. Osowski) had mentioned that name earlier.

D.(J) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT FOR AN ATTORNEY TO REPRESENT THE LOS LUNAS SCHOOLS BOARD OF EDUCATION (Continued)

Dr. Osowski stated that she didn't think they knew about that earlier - the fourth one? She asked if Dr. Kettler if he'd had any interaction with that law firm? He responded that he did have a slight interaction - it was just to introduce himself to them when he first became superintendent. At that point, since he had been Superintendent since August, they had not used that law firm for any administrative business in the district.

Dr. Osowski thanked Ms. Romero, and reiterated that she didn't think they'd had that information.

Ms. Romero told Dr. Osowski she was welcome. She stated, that if she might, since Mr. Bennett had mentioned the Cuddy Law Firm, she would add that they'd (the Cuddy Firm) had actually attempted to submit a proposal for the RFP for legal services that they'd done.

She added that their proposal came in after the time of the deadline, so they were considered nonresponsive. An attorney sent an email a couple of hours later and asked the Superintendent, who was in place at that time, whether or not she would override her (Ms. Romero's) decision and be considered to be part of the RFP process. The email and request was referred to the Central Purchasing Department, and the request was denied because of the Procurement Code.

Dr. Osowski stated that she was aware of that, and thanked Ms. Romero for clarifying that for the public record. Dr. Osowski stated that they did not have an action because it was consideration, so they could move on.

A brief discussion ensued, during which clarification was given, that there was motion and second on the floor regarding the item. Further discussion ensued as to who made the motion and second. It was confirmed that Mr. Bennett had made the motion, and that she, Dr. Osowski, had seconded it.

D.(J) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT FOR AN ATTORNEY TO REPRESENT THE LOS LUNAS SCHOOLS BOARD OF EDUCATION (Continued)

Dr. Osowski asked if there was any further discussion before she called for a vote. Mr. Vickers stated that he felt they had to let the law firm (s) know that they (the Board) was not happy with the current attorney assigned to them. Dr. Osowski asked if there were any other comments.

There being none, she called for a vote with the following results: Mr. Vickers stated that if a yes was for the approval of the contract before them – his answer was no; Ms. Otero – no; Mr. Bennett - yes; Mr. Talley – no; and Dr. Osowski - yes. The motion to approve Item D. (J) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT FOR AN ATTORNEY TO REPRESENT THE LOS LUNAS SCHOOLS BOARD OF EDUCATION failed: 3/2.

Mr. Talley stated that he would be signing off and going back to bed.

Dr. Osowski thanked Mr. Talley and told him to be safe.

Mr. Talley left the meeting at 6:25 pm.

Dr. Osowski stated that they would then move on to what was Item D. but now was Item E. and that was the Superintendent Report, then turned it over to Dr. Kettler.

E. (D.) SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS' REPORTS: Dr. Ryan Kettler, Superintendent

(Discussion/Informational)

1. Recognition: NMSBA Scholarship Recipient: Jovanny Maldonado, VHS

Dr. Kettler stated that they had with them that evening, the NMSBA scholarship recipient for Los Lunas Schools, who had been submitted for consideration by the Board of Education, Mr. Jovanny Maldonado, a recent graduate from Valencia High School.

E.(D.) SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS' REPORTS: Dr. Ryan Kettler, Superintendent
(Discussion/Informational)

1. Recognition: NMSBA Scholarship Recipient: Jovanny Maldonado, VHS
(Continued)

He read the following letter from the New Mexico School Boards Association:

Dear Mr. Maldonado,

You have been selected as one of the Region IV 2024 New Mexico School Boards Association scholarship recipients. You should be proud as we received many outstanding scholarship nominations from school boards throughout New Mexico, which were reviewed and recommended by the officers and approved by our Board of Directors.

Enclosed, then interjected that Dr. Osowski had his certificate for him and packet) you will find your scholarship award of \$1250, which can be utilized to pay for tuition fees, books, or any other costs necessary to pursue a degree at an institution of higher learning.

We offer our most sincere congratulations and wish you luck in your future educational endeavors.

Dr. Kettler noted that of the 89 school districts that had submitted nominations, Jovanny was one of only 24 recipients statewide to be chosen for the scholarship.

The board members individually commended Jovanny.

Dr. Osowski presented Jovanny with the packet that contained the certificate, letter from the NMSBA, and the scholarship check. She stated that she was very proud of him. The young

man had been a delight to hear from when he gave a school level report for them earlier in the spring. He was incredibly active in the school, and he approached them at the academic lettering ceremony and he was almost jumping out of his skin, if you will, because he was so certain that he may have been named valedictorian, and that it was a secret. It was so exciting to watch him as he excelled, and they were very proud of him. She told Jovanny that he would do amazing things, and asked him to please come back and let them know how things went for him.

Dr. Osowski announced that they would take a short break to take pictures.

BREAK

The Board went on break at 6:24 pm.

REGULAR SESSION

The meeting was called back into Regular Session at 6:28 pm.

E.(D.) SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS' REPORTS: Dr. Ryan Kettler, Superintendent (Discussion/Informational) (Continued)

2. Construction Report: Tiffany McMinn, Director of Maintenance & Construction

Dr. Kettler stated that they had Tiffany McMinn, Director of Maintenance and Construction there to give them a brief update on a few projects including the stadium at Los Lunas High School, the Central Office parking issues, Desert View Elementary's cafeteria and Peralta Elementary construction.

Ms. McMinn stated that she just wanted to highlight some things they were working on, as well as smaller projects, and things that happened during the summer including full-fledged cleaning and fixing the classrooms.

As far as the larger projects ... the Los Lunas High School Stadium Phase 1, was issued the notice to proceed this Monday, and they were mobilizing out there so they

would see some fencing, redirecting of some traffic around the stadium area. As the project began, at the same time, they had another vendor that was going to be resurfacing the running track at Los Lunas High School.

E.(D.) SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS' REPORTS: Dr. Ryan Kettler, Superintendent
(Discussion/Informational) **(Continued)**

2. Construction Report: Tiffany McMinn, Director of Maintenance & Construction

Another item their teams were working on was the Central Office Parking Lot project. They were working with an engineering firm right now to finalize designs that were needed. It was a DOT partially funded project that they were awarded funding every year. They did go out for that fund and they were awarded pretty much every year, a certain amount, and they picked a project that was in high need. This parking lot would receive asphalt renovations; specifically, they were repaving the parking lot here at Central Office.

Ms. McMinn then highlighted some things they were doing across the district as part of our facility master plan. They agreed to move away from VCT tile, the old standards or tiles, that took away from their custodian's time during the summer because it needed to be stripped and waxed each year. Some of the options for that was to either go to polished concrete, or LVT, luxury vinyl tile. That would allow their custodians to not have to do whole process every summer, and they would be saving a substantial amount of money on materials and time for them. She showed a slide of the first elementary school in which that had replaced the whole cafeteria. She noted that the project was completed as of yesterday.

Next, she showed them a couple pictures from Peralta Elementary, that showed the Pre-K portion ceiling being roughed in with the walls to soon follow. Ms. McMinn stated that they were having a beam signing from 8 AM to 9 AM on Thursday. They were taking one of the larger beams and invited retired staff, current staff, and also invited anyone who had ties to Peralta Elementary, to come by and sign their name, and add what grade they taught, etc. That beam would later be erected in the new

building. Again that would take place on Thursday, between 8 AM and 9 AM, for one hour. She invited them to stop by if they'd like, and sign their name.

**E.(D.) SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS' REPORTS: Dr. Ryan Kettler, Superintendent
(Discussion/Informational) (Continued)**

2. Construction Report: Tiffany McMinn, Director of Maintenance & Construction

Ms. McMinn stated that, lastly, she wanted to highlight all of the work the custodians were doing during the summer. Last week, they participated in their annual training. They brought in new vendors who talked to them about chemicals, chemical safety, floor maintenance, ladder safety, and cleaning tips. Some of it was a refresher, and some of it was new. She showed a picture from that day, and noted that they'd provided them with a great luncheon and that it had been a time to get all the custodians together and let them know how much they appreciated them and to recognize all the work they had done for us during the school year.

A brief discussion ensued during which Dr. Osowski asked Ms. McMinn about the new flooring they were using, the process to clean, where it was being put in this summer, and if they liked it. Ms. McMinn stated that it was called LVT - Luxury Material Vinyl. It did not require the same extensive work to maintain as did other flooring. They'd added it in various spaces to see how it worked including the dance room at VMS, and in a couple bathrooms. So far, they all like it. She added that it came with the standard one year manufacturing warranty.

The board members individually thanked Ms. McMinn. There being no other questions, Dr. Osowski turned it back to Dr. Kettler to continue his report.

**E.(D.) SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS' REPORTS: Dr. Ryan Kettler, Superintendent
(Discussion/Informational)**

3. Budget/Finance Report: Sandy Traczyk, Chief Finance Officer

Dr. Kettler asked Sandy Traczyk, the Chief Finance Officer, to come to the podium.

Ms. Traczyk stated that they were getting towards the end of this fiscal year and so it was good to reflect on where they were as far as revenue coming into the district towards the end of the year, as well as, expenses. She then gave a PowerPoint Presentation during which she provided detailed information the revenue, year-to-date actual expenses, as well as, year-to-date expenses plus encumbrances. The information she provided started from the beginning of the fiscal year – July 2023 to now. As they could see it kept going on an incline as the year progresses. It showed the revenue including the monthly portion of the SEG, the expenses that had been paid out via payroll and or AP checks, as well as those items included open orders and contracts. She then discussed how the funds were watched and how they adjusted for the areas they knew would be in the red, such as transportation.

Ms. Traczyk stated that as she believed they had already been awarded, they had received an increase to our initial unit value. At that time she didn't have the information as to how it would be distributed, but did know they would be able take a BAR to Finance and then to the Board in July. She anticipated that the money would just reduce the cut into the cash reserve.

4. Audit Committee Report: Sandy Traczyk, Chief Finance Officer

Ms. Traczyk stated that the next thing she had to talk about was the Audit Committee Last Tuesday, they had their Audit Entrance Meeting with our auditors from JAG. They went over what was expected, talked about the list they would provide, and asked some of the initial questions.

E.(D.) SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS' REPORTS: Dr. Ryan Kettler, Superintendent (Discussion/Informational)

4. Audit Committee Report: Sandy Traczyk, Chief Finance Officer

Of course they had not finished this fiscal year; however they could review the internal controls that they had, this year versus last year, if there were any type of administration changes, including that she was new into this position, so what was she doing, versus what she did before and stuff like that. Those were some of the

things that they went over in this initial review. She noted that they were there this week – they came in Monday and they would be here until Friday, except for Wednesday, as they had the day off as did the District.

Ms. Traczyk added that they had since received JAG's list of requests, and she and her staff had been working on gathering a lot on those requests and had provided quite a few informational items. She stated that they were off to a good start.

Dr. Osowski asked if the board members had any questions. There being none, she asked about Ms. Traczyk about the auditors – was it the same company that presented to them in the spring? There was something about a rotation mentioned.

Ms. Traczyk explained and clarified the term of the auditor. They were not at the maximum number of years on the contract yet. She added that she thought they had one year that they could use them, but they were going to go ahead and go out, not anything for that reason, just to put it out, and see what kind of responses that they got, and that would be something that they worked on with the Audit Committee.

Ms. Traczyk was thanked for her reports.

E.(D.) SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS' REPORTS: Dr. Ryan Kettler, Superintendent
(Discussion/Informational)

4. 3 Mill Update

Dr. Kettler reported that they were inching closer to the three-mill election. It would be conducted via mail-in ballots, and what he could give them in terms of an update that evening, was that postcards were being printed. The Clerk's office was providing them with addresses of voters, and they were graciously going to eliminate households who had addresses that had multiple voters in the household so they were not sending three postcards to the same house. Again, in an effort to save on our postage they would only be sending one postcard per voting household. They were also exploring other options for advertising. In addition, they were scheduled for an appearance on KRQE's to speak specifically about the three-mill election and what it meant for Los Lunas Schools and instructional technology.

Dr. Osowski asked him to talk to them a bit more about the other options for advertising. Dr. Kettler responded that one option was Starlight Theater in Los Lunas.

They were offering them very low cost advertising on their screens for the next month, leading up to the election. Other options included adds including the Valencia County News Bulletin. They had not explored the Albuquerque Journal further – it was rather expensive and that was not our target audience. There should be signs going up on our campuses or at least on the corners, and one would be put out by the Special Services Building.

5. Other Comments

Dr. Kettler stated that had a couple more things under the Superintendent's Report. He'd had the pleasure with meeting with one of Raymond Gabaldon's sons last week, Dennis, who happened to be one of the teachers in Los Lunas about RGE. It was the family's request that their father's name be maintained. First, they would like to have the building remain and repurposed, that was the very first ask of the district. If that was not possible, they asked that the name be retained, used, as some sort of memorial or in another way in the district. During that conversation he let Mr. Gabaldon know that he would be sharing that with the Board of Education that evening. In response to Dr. Osowski's question, Dr. Kettler stated that he worked at LLE, and had been in education for 40 years, and had the energy to go another 40 years.

E.(F.) SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS' REPORTS: Dr. Ryan Kettler, Superintendent (Discussion/Informational)

5. Other Comments

Dr. Kettler reported that the day before, he'd attended the Government Education Summit in Farmington. It brought together government officials, from not only the State of New Mexico, but also all of our tribes and pueblos, as well as, superintendents. The summit was well attended, and they'd participated in several roundtable discussions. He felt it was a valuable experience. There were many pueblos and tribes said they'd experienced many difficulties with their districts across the state. The Governor of Isleta Pueblo spoke up and said he was appreciative of the relationship that Los Lunas Schools has Isleta. He felt that their communication and their efforts with them were very good and very strong and he was appreciative of the District.

Dr. Kettler was thanked for his reports. Dr. Osowski stated that the Superintendent's Report was for informational purposes only, and that action was needed or warranted.

F.(E.) BOARD COMMENDATIONS

Dr. Osowski asked if any of the board members had anything for that item. There being none, she stated that she had two. First, there was a project where the LLHS Boys Basketball Team picked up trash along the HWY 6 Trailhead. The pictures were amazing. There were 30 - 40 young men and their coaches out there performing a community service, it was awesome to see their community pride during the summer. She wanted to acknowledge and commend them for their efforts. It was outstanding.

The second item was the result of what occurred during the Red vs Green All-Star Football Game. Recent LLHS Graduate, Dominic Trujillo, received a \$1000 scholarship from the NMAA Foundation "Compete with Class" Sportsmanship Scholarship for his action, or lack of action, during the Red vs. Green All-Star Football Game held in December. During the game, he was the subject of many taunts and other unsportsmanlike behaviors. He turned the other cheek and played with class and grace. He brought pride to our district and so she wanted to praise him – it was outstanding.

G.(F) PUBLIC COMMENT *(In Accordance with Board Policy B-2150 Public Address to the Board)*

Dr. Osowski asked if they had any persons who would like to address the Board. She was told that no one had asked to address the Board.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS

1. Discussion with Possible Action about a format for the year-end evaluation of the Superintendent and timeline for completion *(Requested by Dr. Osowski)*

Dr. Osowski stated that Item H 1-5 were items requested by board members, the first was the discussion with possible action about a format for the year-end evaluation of the Superintendent and timeline for completion. The Board had received background information about the processes that had been used this past December for Dr. Kettler's review. He'd prepared a small presentation for them and she would have him go over it .

Dr. Kettler gave a comprehensive PowerPoint Presentation regarding the Superintendent's evaluation and timeline. Topics that he referenced and discussed included the following:

Board Policy C-0600 Evaluation of Superintendent

- Relate to duties, responsibilities, and progress toward established goals
- Superintendent provides BOE members copy of evaluation instrument
- Takes place in executive session
- Copy of written evaluation provided to Superintendent
- Becomes part of confidential personnel file

Superintendents Contract Language

- Evaluate and assess in writing annually in December
- Based on goals established by the Superintendent – doable and measurable based on Board goals and/or strategic plan
- If determined, BOE provides any unsatisfactory performance and gives guidance/direction for improvement

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS

1. Discussion with Possible Action about a format for the year-end evaluation of the Superintendent and timeline for completion *(Requested by Dr. Osowski)*

2023 -24 Timeline and Action

- The timeline that was established was as follows, in summer or early fall, July and August timeframe, the Board and superintendent review the Superintendent's job description and evaluation process, as well as, any forms timelines or possible supporting documents, information and data that would be used to measure performance. In addition, the superintendent creates goals based on the Board of Education's goals that are measurable and doable, and are then shared with staff.
- Quarterly, the superintendent makes interim progress reports to the Board on the district goals and superintendent goals. The report will be made during a board work session. During the winter, specifically in December, the board members complete the evaluation forms and bring them to the evaluation session. Board members meet to discuss their evaluations in that session, and

the Board's official evaluation documents are then shared, clarified and discussed with Superintendent in a special meeting. Changes to the evaluation may be made as a result of that discussion. A copy of the final written evaluation is placed in the Superintendent's personnel folder.

- During the spring and summer, specifically in June, the Superintendent will report on the progress of the district and those goals. The cycle then started over again. He noted that the evaluation process cycle included evaluation process from summer/early fall, quarterly, winter, and spring/summer.

2023 -24 Evaluation Instrument

- Rating scale or 1 (ineffective) to 4 highly effective
- Evidence provided by Superintendent
- Superintendent scored on:
 - 7 BOE Priorities
 - Governance and Board Relations
 - Community Relations
 - Staff Relations

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS

- 1. Discussion with Possible Action about a format for the year-end evaluation of the Superintendent and timeline for completion *(Requested by Dr. Osowski)***

2024-2025 Recommendations

- Maintain previously established timeline as the December time matches what is in the contract in terms of when the final evaluation is done as well as the potential for contract extensions
- Use the same rating scale as the 2023-2024 SY
- Replace BOE priorities with goals from the strategic plan
- Utilize a 360-degree survey to provide feedback to the BOE that was done previously to provide feedback to the Board
 - It would not used in feedback scoring
 - Would be used as a discussion tool for the Superintendent and BOE, to aid in setting professional development goals

Discussion ensued during regarding the quarterly report. Dr. Osowski clarified that the quarterly report would have been in May but it was postponed. They

would need to still talk about it when that come up, and they would discuss the schedule there in a moment. The presentation was really to provide some background information and give the board members plenty of time to read and process, and be able to think about what was coming up in front of them, so they could take this matter seriously and be well informed and prepared.

2. Presentation on the method for evaluating the current Instructional/digital coaching model and the effectiveness for student outcomes (Requested by Dr. Osowski)

Dr. Kettler stated that the item was the first of two presentations back-to-back regarding evaluating specific programs that LLS currently used. The item was specific to the instructional /digital learning academic coaches. He then gave a PowerPoint Presentation during which he discussed in detail the following areas:

What are Academic Coaches

Coaches are experienced educators who provide guidance, support, and professional development to teachers. They worked collaboratively with teachers to improve instruction and create a more effective learning environment for students.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS

2. Presentation on the method for evaluating the current Instructional/digital coaching model and the effectiveness for student outcomes (Requested by Dr. Osowski) (Continued)

Key Responsibilities of Instructional Coaches

- Coaches had a multifaceted role in supporting teachers and enhancing student learning. They were responsible for a wide range of activities aimed at improving teaching practices and student outcomes. Those included, observation and feedback, professional development, and curriculum alignment

Improving Instructional Practices

- Coaches work with teachers to identify and implement effective instructional strategies that promote student engagement and deeper understanding through differentiated instruction technology integration, and collaborative learning.

Enhancing Student Learning Outcomes

- By improving instructional practices, Coaches contribute directly to enhancing student learning outcomes, ensuring all students achieve their full potential.

Supporting Teacher Professional Growth

- Mentorship
- Workshops and training
- Collaborative Learning

Fostering Collaborative Learning Environment

- Open communication – they create a safe and open environment where teachers can freely discuss the challenges that they are facing and the problems that they are having and seek support from their peers
- Shared resources – they provide access to shared resources, including lessons plans, teaching materials and online platforms, to support collaboration and knowledge-sharing
- Peer Coaching – they encourage peer coaching where teachers observe each other's classroom and provide projection and provide constructive feedback to improve their practices

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS

- 2. Presentation on the method for evaluating the current Instructional/digital coaching model and the effectiveness for student outcomes**
(Requested by Dr. Osowski) **(Continued)**

Importance of Measuring Impact

- Accountability
 - Limited resources of time, money, and effort
- Data-informed decision-making
 - Coaching strategies and interventions aligned to data and grounded in research
- Teacher professional growth and student achievement
 - Improving teachers' instruction to increase student achievement and outcomes
- Continuous improvement
 - Allowed coaches to refine practices, improve PL efforts, and better meet teachers needs and enhance student learning outcomes
- Advocacy and support
 - Evidence of coaching impact demonstrates value and supports investment

Academic Return on Investment

- It was the practice of scientifically evaluating the cost-effectiveness of academic programs and deciding where to allocate the resources accordingly. It was a structured approach, getting the most bang for our buck.
- It could help districts answer questions such as, what worked, who was working for and what is the cost? While it sounds like a simple concept or question, it requires a deeper look at analyzing mastery for learning objectives, growth over time, direct/indirect cost, cash and time, educational needs, and specific groupings. Those fell under different parts of the academic return on investment.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS

- 2. Presentation on the method for evaluating the current Instructional/digital coaching model and the effectiveness for student outcomes**
(Requested by Dr. Osowski) **(Continued)**

Process of Academic Return on Investment

1. Invest – what was the program and what was the investment
2. Ask the questions - Were our students served by the program growing faster than they would have grown without the program?
3. Evaluate - Create a personalized growth production for each student, assuming the program did not exist before. Then compare, observed growth for each student with the program and projected growth without the program.
4. Act - Validate the program’s effectiveness, use resulting from the program or consider reallocating resources to other programs.

Beyond Academic Return on Investment

- Outcomes of academic coaching are complex and multifaceted
- Data collected should be both quantitative and qualitative

- Relying on quantitative data gives limited insight into the experiences, perceptions, contextual factors or unintended consequences of a coach's impact
- Relying on qualitative data may lack measurable outcomes, making it more difficult to identify data-informed decisions

Ways to measure Coaching Impact

- Student Achievement Data (quantitative)
- Teacher surveys and feedback (qualitative)
- Classroom observations (quantitative)
- Teacher reflection and self-assessment (qualitative)
- Longitudinal data (quantitative)
- Peer collaboration and coaching feedback (qualitative)
- Case studies of teacher growth through coaching cycles (qualitative and quantitative)

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS

- 2. Presentation on the method for evaluating the current Instructional/digital coaching model and the effectiveness for student outcomes**
(Requested by Dr. Osowski) (Continued)

LLS Digital Learning and Academic Coaching Assessment

Dr. Kettler stated that the way that he wanted to evaluate the effectiveness of our digital learning and academic coaches started with planning during the August timeframe, develop and finalize actionable evaluation plans with digital learning and academic coaches. Obtain baseline data, as well as, establishing our data collection instruments. Around 1st of September, begin data collection which would run about six months, getting them to the end of February, taking roughly one month, and if they needed to do the analysis, and then deliver an evaluation report in April on the effectiveness of the program. That lined up with budgeting season.

Discussion ensued regarding the following areas:

Mr. Vickers asked if this was the first year they'd used coaches. Dr. Kettler stated that it was his understanding that coaches had been used on and off, for quite a long time – maybe 10 or more years. When budgeting had taken a hit, they'd seen a drop off in the number of coaches, but it was prioritized that they bring coaches back in the numbers that they were at now. One for every school and six digital coaches.

They had been used, but he could not speak to the consistency of their use. For example, this year, they were stationed out of a central location, which was very difficult for the coaches and not as beneficial to the schools. They'd made the switch and each coach was now assigned to a school and they would be housed there.

Mr. Vickers was given confirmation that their salaries had partly been paid through operational, but had all been moved to federal funds for this coming school year.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS

2. Presentation on the method for evaluating the current Instructional/digital coaching model and the effectiveness for student outcomes (Requested by Dr. Osowski) (Continued)

Mr. Vickers stated that from the little bit of interaction he'd had with coaches in various open houses, in some work sessions, and from that night, it seemed like they were really valuable. It might be anecdotal, but it seemed like the teachers no longer were set to be solo and on their own, they actually had some help and it seemed like it killed two birds with one stone. With teacher mentoring and help, and student help at the same time, it seemed to him that it's a really good concept and beneficial.

Dr. Kettler stated that he would also add that, as they saw teachers enter their twilight years of education, and begin retiring, they were replacing them with young, brand-new people, straight out of college, or some out of the workforce, to go through an alternative license program, and they needed a lot more support as they began their

journey in education and teaching. The coaches really filled that role in a big way for them.

Mr. Vickers thanked him, and stated that it sounded good, and he would be looking forward to the report at the end of this coming school year.

Mr. Bennett asked if it was the first year they were evaluating, them, or was it the prior year, if that was the case, how were they going to measure their success.

Dr. Kettler stated that coaches had always been evaluated on the three-tier licensure system, which was separate than what he was proposing here. What he was proposing, was evaluating the program as a whole for effectiveness. The concern that had been raised to him that spring was exactly what he's said, why was there not reading proficiency. Mr. Bennett was given confirmation that the numbers were still below.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS

2. Presentation on the method for evaluating the current Instructional/digital coaching model and the effectiveness for student outcomes (Requested by Dr. Osowski) (Continued)

Dr. Osowski led discussion regarding the teacher surveys, whether they were qualitative and teacher surveys could be quantitative. She said she thought one of the concerns that that she had in addition to wanting to make sure the program was effective was because they did not have the proficiency in this district that they should be having. Several of them in the spring raised various levels of concern about the academic proficiency. Some of the comments that she'd heard, true or not, just putting them out there so they could deal with it head on, was that in many instances the instructional coaches had become adjunct administrators or counselors. How could he (Dr. Kettler) ensure that they were doing instructional coaching and not assisting with the administrative functions or counselor functions.

Dr. Kettler stated that Mr. Talley had motioned to add those assistant principals back in, and that eliminated any thought of any coaches being on standby and having them have any administrator responsibilities, so each school, with the exception of Peralta and CHS had an assistant principal, and the coach would not be used in that way. In terms of using them in counseling situations, he was unaware of any such incidents and it had never been brought to my attention; however, he would say that personnel had been working really hard with special services to make sure that they were fully staffed with counselors and social workers. He guessed what he would say was that he knew they were in a different time period, but his word would be that his instruction to the school site would be that the coaches were coaching only and they were not serving in those other capacities.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS

3. Presentation on the method for evaluating the current model of SROs for each school site. *(Requested by Dr. Osowski)*

Dr. Kettler stated that the item was the second presentation on evaluating program effectiveness and this one was specifically about our School Resource Officers Program. They had a very robust School Resource Officer Program; and in fact he thought it was the first in the state, and he thought that APS even modeled its program after what we were doing in Los Lunas. This past year, our School Resource Officers received national recognition because they'd achieved the tri-concept on school-based policing. Dr. Kettler then gave a PowerPoint Presentation during which he provided detailed information regarding the following areas.

History

There was an extensive history going back to the 1950s in the use of SROs. The first known usage was a SRO permanently assigned to schools in 1953 in Flint, Michigan, and their use has steadily increased across the US from the 1980's to the present.

Who is a School Resource Officer (SRO)?

A School Resource Officer was a career law enforcement officers with sworn authority and deployed in community-oriented policing, assigned by the Police Department or agency, in our case, Los Lunas Schools, who worked in collaboration with schools. They were employees commissioned by Los Lunas Police Department or County, but assigned in our schools. They were commissioned law enforcement officers trained to work within the school community, and they were carefully selected.

He would say having worked in other places, our district had a luxury because we do have carefully selected commission law enforcement officers. At other places, they tended to have armed security guards, which if you went to work at AGF and got a level IV, certification which was what it was called they could carry a firearm. They were not law enforcement officers, they were security guards with guns. Our SROs were specially trained, and followed the National Association of School Resource Officer Best Practices.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS

- 3. Presentation on the method for evaluating the current model of SROs for each school site. *(Requested by Dr. Osowski)***

What is the goal of a SRO Program.

The goal of a well-rounded SRO program included providing a safe learning environment, providing valuable resources for school staff members, fostering positive relationships with the youth, developing strategies to resolve problems affecting youth, protecting all students so they can reach their full potential. The triad concept which we won the award for, defines the roles of the SROs in this way, number one is educator, number two is informal counselor and mentor, and number three is law enforcement officer.

Some guiding principles for SRO programs, they should not be involved in school discipline, that is not their function. That is why we have school administrators within administrative licenses. They should be judicious in their law-enforcement powers, and go through a specialized hiring process, which we have, tailored performance evaluation and supervision, specialized training, student and family engagement, and they should have an annual program assessment. That was what they were talking about today, that's why that was bolded. Duty assignments, they should be fixed with one, or a limited number of, schools, and that was the recommendation from the US Department of Justice and their community-oriented policing services, and they should have a community of practice and professional support.

Role of a SRO

On the next slide, the role of an SRO. It was broken down a little bit more, again from the US Department of Justice, they were a law enforcer, they promoted safety and serve as a liaison between the school and outside agencies. They were mentors, built relationships, fostered positive behaviors, and connected youth with services when needed. They were educators, they taught classes, and they collaborated with different groups. They were emergency managers should something happen, they were the ones who developed and implemented the comprehensive safety plans and strategies, with school administration and local first responders.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS

3. Presentation on the method for evaluating the current model of SROs for each school site. *(Requested by Dr. Osowski)* *(Continued)*

The goals of the SRO program was to, according to the national school resource officers, was to bridge the gap between police officers and young people, increase positive attitudes toward law enforcement, teach the value of our legal system, promote respect for people and property, and reduce juvenile delinquency by helping students formulate an awareness of rules, authority and justice.

Some of the training that they received, and it's all through the national association of school resource officers included basic SRO courses, advanced courses, SRO management for those who would be a lead, SRO response to active shooter, crime prevention and school law.

There were many proven benefits of SRO. Number one, prevention or minimization of property damage in the school and surrounding areas. Two was prevention of student injuries due to violence, drug overdoses, etc. Number three was reduction of the need for schools to call 911. Four was the reduction in the likelihood of that a student would get a criminal record, increase the likelihood that students would get help from social service and healthcare system, and number six was increased feelings of safety among staff and students.

When they looked at evaluating our SRO program he was recommending a little bit of a different approach than with the academic coaches and digital coaches. He had it in the same timeline but in three phases. Phase 1, August and September, researching SRO programs and comparing what we do here to other models. Statewide and nationally. In reviewing the issues that Los Lunas Schools faces and where the SRO, what their role is in terms of fitting into those issues that we face in resolving the issues.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS

3. Presentation on the method for evaluating the current model of SROs for each school site.
(Requested by Dr. Osowski) *(Continued)*

Phase 2, October to January, was to conduct the surveys of students, parents, guardians, staff, SROs themselves, community including local, county and state law enforcement agencies. Hold community meetings for input. Data collection on our attendance, discipline and service referrals. But again, Phase 1 was important because they needed to identify the role of our SROs and separate that from things that they were not responsible for or should not be responsible for.

Phase 3 was to analyze all of that data that had been collected in Phase 2, develop any recommendations and make a report to the Board around the same time frame as the academic coaches and digital coaches.

Mr. Vickers stated that he thought it was a valuable program, and the SROS played an important role. When renting a place, a person had to have security if the gathering had 50 people. He felt that if they had a goal of 3-400 kids and staff there should be at least one SRO at each site as they served as a first responder in the event of an emergency.

Ms. Otero agreed with Mr. Vickers and stated that she also felt it was important to have them there and that it was a valuable program.

Mr. Bennett asked whether the SRO policy was ever upgraded. Mr. Baca and Mr. Garcia stated that that they had an ongoing standard operation procedure that they lived by and it was updated regularly, and current and up-to-date. Mr. Bennett said he would like to see them. Dr. Osowski interjected and said that the question was about the policy being updated.

Discussion ensued regarding the protocols and board policy. Mr. Baca and Mr. Garcia stated that the procedures and protocols their department operated under were up-to-date but did not have information for them regarding the policy. Dr. Osowski told them that they would be working on them in an upcoming meeting and asked them to be part of that discussion. Dr. Osowski thanked Mr. Bennett for asking about a topic that she was curious about

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS

3. Presentation on the method for evaluating the current model of SROs for each school site. (Requested by Dr. Osowski) (Continued)

Dr. Osowski told Dr. Kettler he could address the concern that she had and that was on Slide 5 that stated the SRO should not be involved in school discipline. She knew that over the spring budget workshop, as they began discussing different possibilities for budget cuts, she received some community comments. One concern was that they include an evaluation. A current subjective social policy research was that we had a school to prison pipeline and there was a concern that we quite possibly could be contributing because we had higher numbers. She said that maybe that was something that he could add to his evaluation protocol so they

could be looking at that. She would hate for that to be something that inadvertently happened when we had good intentions.

4. Presentation on the timeline for the preparation of APE to accept RGE students AND the status of moving the transfer process along. (Requested by Dr. Osowski)

Dr. Kettler stated that they'd discussed Raymond Gabaldon at a work session before the board meeting. When they got to the meeting, there was no additional presentation. He said he wanted to run back a few of these slides from that work session that he probably should have presented during the open meeting as well. Dr. Kettler discussed the following areas:

- Current school boundaries
Two slivers from the Meadow Lake area had been carved out in prior boundary decisions. One sliver went to RGE and one went to VE.

- APE Design and Requirements
They had been awarded the designed phase funding for Ann Parish Elementary. When that school was completed, they had to fill that school with 500-525 students, as a requirement for the funding that they'd received. The group that does the work with our data and our addresses, Vision and Planning, had determined that those two slivers should both go to Ann Parish Elementary school.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS

(Continued)

4. Presentation on the timeline for the preparation of APE to accept RGE students AND the status of moving the transfer process along. (Requested by Dr. Osowski)

- Re-Zoning and Transfers
They will need to ensure the procedures were in place and implemented. They would need to look at transfer requests to eliminate issues with transfers early on. They will need to consider what to do with those students who had transfers already in place, as well as sibling transfer requests.

Vision and Planning suggested a phase in approach over the next two years to

minimize disruption and changes for students and families, by allowing them to gradually return to their home schools.

- Considerations

Pre-K Award and what they were going to do with it.

The elementary zone changes should be done in tandem with secondary boundary changes to minimize disruption to feeder patterns.

Impacts to APE, VE, and LLE. Until the award was finalized with APE, they would not know the extent of the construction. Until that was known, they would not know the impact of moving students during the construction, and/or of bringing in additional students and displacing them. The big issues at hand was Los Lunas Elementary, because they did not have sufficient capacity to accommodate RGE students. Depending on what was decided with the closure, additional rooms would need to be built at that site to accommodate them

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS

(Continued)

4. Presentation on the timeline for the preparation of APE to accept RGE students AND the status of moving the transfer process along. *(Requested by Dr. Osowski) (Continued)*

Recommendations

The recommendations, with providing the Los Lunas Schools with elementary attendance zones. Prior to the final implementation of the proposed attendance zone changes in their current form, they would do an updated geocoded analysis that would be done in the spring prior to opening the new Ann Parish School. They were talking three years out which will be 26/27 SY. Any adjustments could be made depending on the capacities and where our students and families were living.

Update the transfer policy to meet our needs.

Reconstruct Ann Parish for 540 students which we will then, again we are underway with that.

Replace Raymond Gabaldon Elementary with new Pre-K Center to accommodate the 160 students to that current location or another school site.

He did not want to belabor it, but the classrooms at Raymond Gabaldon, just from a square footage perspective were not adequate. The main building cannot be expanded to meet those square footage requirements, and so, the replacement of the school was really the only option there or to construct a 13 classroom addition plus ancillary spaces at Los Lunas Elementary to replace existing portables and provide efficient classroom space to accommodate the increased enrollment.

If RGE completely closed, those students would go to LLE, and again, currently they did not have the capacity, even with the few portables that they did have on campus, if they moved ancillary staff into those. They would have to go somewhere else.

It was problem that compounded itself. Again, it might be a minor change to the boundary between Los Lunas, but they may need to reduce those number of classrooms to be constructed at Los Lunas Elementary. Cost and time, even at a 13 classroom wing was pretty great.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS *(Continued)*

4. Presentation on the timeline for the preparation of APE to accept RGE students AND the status of moving the transfer process along. *(Requested by Dr. Osowski) (Continued)*

Dr. Kettler's recommendations in that work session were to move forward with the constructing of Ann Parish, which would be three years roughly from receiving funding for design. They had now received funding from the PSCOC. The approval of the preliminary boundary study, that the board approved based on the geocoding on May 7th, was the first step in pushing them over the edge in getting that design funding so that was very important.

Second was the recommended timeline suggested by Visions and Planning, adjusting dates for three years out which was the reality of construction. He recommend that Cabinet and Facilities review the Pre-K Award for RGE with PSFA, then allow him to present the options after that for RGE to be Board of Education in a work session. He would have Visions and Planning present an updated boundary for the secondary schools so that any necessary changes can be made to minimize disruption in feeder patterns.

Timeline

The very first activity was to meet with Visions and Planning to identify all options for RGE. They had requested a meeting this month or in July, with Cabinet and with Facilities to discuss what she saw as the options based on housing, based on where families lived currently, based on our space, capacities etc.

After that meeting, Ms. McMinn, our Director of Facilities was scheduling a meeting for July, August time frame with a PSFA to review those options for RGE. They are the ones that would be funding us at least part of it, for whatever the outcome was or the design is. Again, they were going out with a RFP APE soon. That could take up to a couple months or three months so they were looking at July through September. Visions and Planning could make a presentation to the Board of Education on the secondary boundaries in August or September. Around the same timeframe, September /October, he would present the options for RGE after meeting with Visions and Planning and PSFA to the Board of Education for a decision.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS

(Continued)

4. Presentation on the timeline for the preparation of APE to accept RGE students AND the status of moving the transfer process along. *(Requested by Dr. Osowski) (Continued)*

Once a decision was made, he believed then community meetings would be held to inform them on the process and gather input as appropriate. Because there were only so many options that they could do with RGE, and if they did that in reverse order, there would be a lot of options that were just not realistic or actual options.

As to the Ann Parish design phase, hopefully a cost time analysis could be done in the February timeframe, so that they would know what's going to happen at Ann Parish. For example, if the architects come back and say, it's better to rebuild the current building, rather than a new build, we have students we will have to move around during construction and displace those kids. At that point, they would have a better idea if they could actually move those 112 students that were RGE, to Ann Parish. If they came back and say we needed a complete new building, they would build it adjacent to the old building. That would change things and there was probably less capacity to moving those students early.

The design phase they would hopefully start for Ann Parish, October through June. Hopefully in those first three months/four months, the architects can give them the cost and timeframe analysis so the Board can then make a serious decision about whether or not to move those students early.

Dr. Kettler stated he agreed that they needed to establish working committees, but he believed that was something they needed to do after they had a better idea of what the construction at Ann Parish was going to look like, and what the plan for RGE was. A lot of that depended on the architects, and PSFA and again, a lot of it depended on the outcome of the Ann Parish design.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS *(Continued)*

4. Presentation on the timeline for the preparation of APE to accept RGE students AND the status of moving the transfer process along. *(Requested by Dr. Osowski) (Continued)*

He did recognize that it was the desire of the Board to move those students as soon as possible. But he did want to caution them to make sure that they didn't create issues a year from now if it came back that the existing building just needed to be remodeled and they'd have 112 additional students that they needed to move around

during construction. Construction was an inconvenience to staff and students even at a school with a smaller enrollment like Peralta.

Discussion Items

- Mr. Vickers stated that he hoped they would have workshops to discuss the options rather than just have them handed to them at a board meeting. He would like to be able to listen to all the pros and cons so they could formulate a decent decision prior to the actual meeting.

Dr. Kettler stated that he had blocked off two months time in their for that exact reason. He would update the chart to reflect the work sessions ahead of any Board Meeting when action would be taken.

- Dr. Osowski said something else she would also like at the work session was more information about the number of siblings that they had in regards to sibling transfer requests. She knew that they couldn't know how many siblings there were exactly but that might be interesting to learn more about. She thought that it was something they needed to be very cognizant of and felt that the transfer policy was very circular.

The next thing was the Pre-K Award. They'd had a very brief, cursory conversation and talked about some options for that Pre-K Award. It would be nice to have a more information regarding that.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS *(Continued)*

5. Superintendent's Quarterly Report & Status of Strategic Plan *(Requested by Dr. Osowski)*

Dr. Kettler stated that they would have a more in-depth report in July, but he just wanted to mention a few data points. They were at high level and he recognized that. They needed to do more in-depth analysis with our data and to the point that they knew where

our students were struggling, including specific skills, standards etc. For the purposes of that night, he wanted to share just a few graphs from the end of the year.

Our kindergarten through second grade iStation outcome. The percent of student proficient according to iStation benchmarks, at the beginning of the year, they had about 39% of our students when they got to the end of the year was 42%. He would say comparing this year's kindergarten students to last year's kindergarten students, was somewhat apples and oranges. They were different students and different kids.

First grade, they saw a dip district wide, 33 to 26... Second grade increased by one point. 30 to 31. When you go to math, they saw many more students reaching proficiency measures, and in the six primary domains of mathematical processes - number operations, algebra, geometry, measurement and data analysis. Kindergarten went 33 to 63, first grade 35 to 61 and second grade 19 to 24.

From 3rd to 6th grade and they went from Istation to iMSSA, and they were looking at how many students met end of year expectations. That was more of a measure of proficiency and so the reading assessments were designed to provide reliable and valid scores in the comprehension and analysis and interpretation of text areas.

From the beginning of the year, they had about 14% of students, and by the end of the year they had 36% of students meeting end-of-year expectations. In fourth grade, by the end of the year 43% of students. It stayed the same at fifth grade from the beginning of the year to the end of year, and sixth grade they also saw a little increase in the number of student meeting expectations.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS *(Continued)*

5. Superintendent's Quarterly Report & Status of Strategic Plan *(Requested by Dr. Osowski)*

In terms of math, in third grade, they saw a lot of many more students meet those expectations by the end of the year, and it was the same with fourth grade and fifth grade. They could see in sixth grade, that nearly half of our students were meeting those

expectations in terms of what mathematical practices were and the concepts were problem-solving, logical, quantitative reasoning, evaluation of arguments, modeling and those sorts of things.

When they got to the seventh grade, we had many students, 41% of students in seventh grade and 31% making end-of-year expectations and again that was more of a measure of proficiency. He said he would like to just add, that it was backing up to reading, and it was really the first year that we've had whole implementation of their curriculums.

They'd piloted something last year and amplify was that second year, So in year one the goal was introduction of the curriculum, so teachers could learn it, know it, become familiar, with it. Year two was continued implementation focus and as they began to transition to year three they began to focus on the improvement of quality of instruction using that curriculum as the operational piece. He expected to see even better gains and growth next year.

As far as seventh and eighth grade math, again, he saw students from 18 in seventh grade and 14 in 25 in eighth grade. This was just really, really high level. The high schools were still working on their Horizons data, as well as SAT and the Mexico Assessment of Science Readiness. He added that he was still waiting for his Horizons account to be activated so he was unable to get any data.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS *(Continued)*

5. Superintendent's Quarterly Report & Status of Strategic Plan *(Requested by Dr. Osowski)*

Dr. Kettler then provided information of the status of Strategic Plan that included an updated timeline. They were currently in Phase 6 of the Strategic Planning Process, Performance

Management: How will they monitor progress and performance against our goals, milestones, and deliverables? What do we need to adjust in order to continuously improve?

He then discussed in detail the strategies to advance priorities and their Year 1 milestones of the 2024-2029 priorities which were:

1. Build collaborative, student-centered culture
2. Build trust with families to serve as partners in their students' academic learning
3. Build systems, strategy, and capacity to support strong instruction
4. Develop strong people systems to foster a strong student centered culture in LLS

Strategies to advance Priority 1 and Milestones

- Engage in a strategic planning process that includes a wide range of perspectives and is communicated transparently to stakeholders.

Milestone: Engage in a strategic planning process that includes a wide range of perspectives and is communicated transparently to stakeholders. Strategic Plan complete and shared with community by 9/30/24

Milestone: Develop comprehensive performance management routines and implement an ongoing practice of monitoring and shepherding district culture at the district and campus level to ensure strategic plan creates focus, consistency, and alignment across the organization.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS (Continued)

5. Superintendent's Quarterly Report & Status of Strategic Plan (Requested by Dr. Osowski)

Strategies to advance Priority 2 and Milestones

- Develop and implement an evidence-based and comprehensive strategy for regularly

gathering, analyzing, communicating, and taking action on ideas and feedback from families.

Milestone: Collect baseline data on whether parents feel LLS considers them partners in their children's education

- Create consistent, strategic, and tailored opportunities for families to engage with district leaders, campus leaders, and teachers that include flexible, multi-purpose options designed to meet the needs of all district families.

Milestone: Develop school-level family engagement plans by 6/30/24

- Strengthen staff skill sets, practices, and mindsets to communicate and engage with families so that they view themselves as welcome and valued partners in their student's learning.

Milestone: Train school leaders on family engagement expectations and vision by 4/30/25

- Strengthen, clearly communicate, and effectively implement a set of district-wide student and educator expectations and practices, including grading and attendance.

Milestone: Policies updated by 6/30/25, pending board review timeline requirements

Strategies to advance Priority 3 and Milestones

- Design, communicate, and hold clear, role-specific expectations and structures that prioritize school leader, coach, and educator participation in coaching, professional development, and collaborative planning

Milestone: All schools have shared planning time/ PLCs for at least 60% of teachers, and 90% of teachers attend.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS (Continued)

5. Superintendent's Quarterly Report & Status of Strategic Plan (Requested by Dr. Osowski)

Strategies to advance Priority 3 and Milestones (Continued)

- Provide all educators high-quality, user-friendly assessments and instructional materials, as well as supporting tools, to support best practices for inclusive planning.

Milestone: Materials and assessments adoption and selection timelines and policies outlined, including priorities for grades and content areas, based on a full audit of material and assessment use across LLS. Baseline data collected on HQIM and assessment use across district.

- Build instructional leadership capacity to support school leaders and coaches in providing consistent, coherent, and actionable feedback to educators.

Milestone: Multi-year strategy for instructional leadership development finalized and shared with instructional leaders.

- Build educator capacity to support educators in providing all students, including special populations through an inclusion model, access to Layer 1 instruction.

Milestone: 40% of schools implementing inclusion model and percent of teachers in these schools that are effectively implementing this model align to best practice and expectations

Strategies to advance Priority 4 and Milestones

- Develop centralized processes and tools to attract, select, and onboard high-quality educators and leaders based on talent acquisition best practices.

Milestone: Design and rollout updated and centralized processes/policies

- Establish processes and routines to collect, analyze, and act on talent data to inform organizational development/talent strategy.

Milestone: Establish centralized process and tools

**H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS
(Continued)**

5. Superintendent’s Quarterly Report & Status of Strategic Plan (Requested by Dr. Osowski)

Strategies to advance Priority 4 and Milestones (Continued)

Note- the next three strategies have been prioritized for implementation in years 2, 3, and 4

of the plan given limited team capacity.

- Establish and implement a performance management system to include individual and team goal setting and planning and expectations for reviewing and assessing progress in alignment with district priorities and competencies.
- Conduct a total compensation study to compare LLS salaries against similar markets and use the results to inform salary actions and budget planning for the next 5 years.
- Develop and implement capacity-building opportunities that support district administrators to coach and develop their direct reports.

Next steps to finalize our strategic plan

- Metrics and Milestones
Refine and finalize goals based on stakeholder feedback from staff and board
(June 30)
- Refinement and launch
Create public-facing materials to support org-wide and public communications about the plan (July 15)
- Performance Management
Update and finalize performance management routines, including dashboard to share quarterly with board (June 30)

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS (Continued)

5. Superintendent's Quarterly Report & Status of Strategic Plan (Requested by Dr. Osowski)

Dr. Osowski asked if there were any questions from the board members.

Mr. Vickers stated that he would like to see that whatever roadblocks there were that were preventing them from seeing better results would be identified. If it was language learners or whatever the roadblocks were to see how they could get through them.

Mr. Bennett nor Ms. Otero had any questions.

Dr. Osowski asked if iStation reading or math was predictive of state summative exam. Dr. Kettler stated that he didn't know if it was predictive. iMSSA was. She asked why iStation was selected. Dr. Kettler stated that it was the one offered from the State and did not know why the State selected it.

Dr. Osowski stated that the scores were from 2023-24 and asked if he had the 2024 SY. Dr. Kettler stated that they did not have the 2024 SY scores. Dr. Osowski reviewed the proficiency scores.

Dr. Osowski asked about the Amira curriculum, and whether they were using the professional days offered by them. Dr. Kettler stated he would get back to them. She added that it fits in with one of the comments about tying to priority three and noted that they were looking for cohesiveness. It talked about baseline data collected for high-quality instructional materials and assessment used across the district. A vendor for Amira can provide the support so we don't have to push that out any further than a month.

She said she was going to quote one of her colleagues, this data was frustrating. It was really hard although we got to celebrate 500 kids meeting a milestone at graduation when they knew from this data, that only one out of three kids was proficient. In her opinion, academic performance had to take a lead. It had to be the first in those targeted focuses for this next year. And it had to be considering all students in the disaggregated and the requirements in the ESSA. She thought it was disappointing.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS *(Continued)*

5. Superintendent's Quarterly Report & Status of Strategic Plan *(Requested by Dr. Osowski)*

Dr. Osowski asked if the other board members had questions about the Strategic Plan. There

being none, she said she did have a couple.

She said she thought that in terms of Priority One - Engaging in a strategic planning process that includes a wide range of perspectives and communicated to the stakeholders by the end of September. PDPs were due on the 40th day so why were they waiting until September 30 when they began school August 1st – wasn't that late in getting the strategic plan out so that the they knew where the leaders and licensed staff should be aligning the PDPs to?

Dr. Kettler stated that it would be rolled out to all the administrators on July 18th at the Administrators' Retreat. He expected to roll it out during the initial day when staff returned and they had professional development days. The September 30th date would be changed as it was not accurate. It would be rolled out first internally but would be rolled out shortly after and well ahead of September to the community.

Dr. Osowski reference Priority 2 C - strengthen staff skill sets practices and mindsets to communicate and engage with families. She stated that they had trained school leaders so they can meet these expectations by May 2025. Again, she said that she had concerns with that. She thought that's way too late - We need to be engaging effectively with our community and our families.

Dr. Osowski state that Priority 2 C. Rating and attendance, updating policies by June 2025, was unacceptable in her opinion. They cannot have another year again where they did not have parents properly informed in a timely way or where their students were at in terms of grades. They'd raised this in February or March and they were not letting this be another year where parents and students were not informed and they didn't have clear expectations for reporting grades and progress to families in a timely manner, that's was not acceptable.

Dr. Osowski stated that on Priority 3 All schools have shared planning time for at least 60% of teachers and 90% of teachers attend, why aren't 100% of the teachers attending? Dr. Kettler stated that he did not have that information that evening and would have to look into it.

H.(G.) ITEMS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS *(Continued)*

5. Superintendent's Quarterly Report & Status of Strategic Plan *(Requested by Dr. Osowski)*

Dr. Osowski stated that the coherent study could happen with your vendor for Amira, they offer that for free.

Priority 3 also on D when talking about 40% of the schools implementing the full inclusion model, this was the first time she knew she was hearing that they had six schools implementing the full inclusion model and she knew that was controversial. She stated that she thought that maybe they ought to be talking about how they could do it with ongoing monitoring to make sure they were first and foremost meeting the student's individual needs, but were also providing tremendous support to our educators as they were asking them to take on, in many times, some new skill sets.

Dr. Osowski stated that those were the comments that she had on that.

She thanked Dr. Kettler as that was a lot to present in one evening. She added that those items were for information only; no action was needed or warranted at that time.

I.(H.) APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS

(Discussion/Action)

(Indicates Items for Consideration by Consent. There will be no discussion of these items unless a board member so requests, in which event the item may be placed on the regular agenda.)*

Dr. Osowski stated that the next item was Item F. APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS and called for a motion.

Mr. Bennett moved, and Mr. Vickers seconded, to approve all of the action items listed on the Consent Sheet as presented.

I.(H.) APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS

(Continued)

(Discussion/Action)

(Indicates Items for Consideration by Consent. There will be no discussion of these items unless a board member so requests, in which event the item may be placed on the regular agenda.)*

Dr. Osowski repeated the motion and second then listed all the items that were listed for consent. I.(J.) 1-2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES May 21, 2024 Regular Meeting and June 6, 2024 Special Meeting; K. FINANCE COMMITTEE ITEMS (Meeting Held June 11, 2024) 1 – i-v. Approval of Reports for May 2024 - Monthly Check Summary; Cash on Hand; Investments on Hand - Monthly Budget Reports and Revenue; 2. i. Approval of Purchases - Maintenance Department – Annual Request to Approve Vendors Estimated to Exceed 60K, Utilizing Price Agreement Contracts 31701, 31703 & 31200 Two Mill State Match & HB 505(C)-086 ; 3. I – iii. Approval of General Contracts - Approval of Annual Contract Renewals 2024-25 FY - District Internet Services; District Interconnected Voice Over IP; and On-Call Asphalt Improvements & Repairs; Approval of Annual Student Nutrition Use of Commodity Food Processing Cooperative Contract No. 23-24-01 c/o Las Cruces Public Schools; and Approval of Annual Student Nutrition Use of Food Service Products, Contract Extension No. 2 of No. 25-General 2022-23 c/o Santa Fe Public Schools; 4. i. Approval of Construction Contract - Progressive Roofing Sundance Elementary Roof Coating 31137 Bond; 5. Approval of Application: Title I - Part A; 6. Approval of Application: Title II- Part A; 7.Approval of MOU: Between LLS and VC Foster Grandparent Program 2024-25 SY; and 8.Approval of MOU: Between LLS and Village of Los Lunas for Refuse Removal 2024-25 FY.

There being no discussion, Dr. Osowski called for a vote regarding the consent items with the following results: Mr. Vickers - yes; Ms. Otero – yes; Mr. Talley – absent; Mr. Bennett - yes; and Dr. Osowski – yes. Motion regarding the consent items passed: 4/0. 1 Absent.

A brief discussion ensued during which Mr. Vickers pointed out that that re-numeration was not needed from K on.

J.(I.)APPROVAL OF MINUTES*

- | | | | |
|----|--------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | May 21, 2024 | Regular Meeting | (Approved by Consent) |
| 2. | June 6, 2024 | Special Meeting | (Approved by Consent) |

J.(D.)CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT FOR AN ATTORNEY TO REPRESENT THE LOS LUNAS SCHOOLS BOARD OF EDUCATION

Per action taken under Item C, this Item was moved and listed as Item D. - ksw

K. FINANCE COMMITTEE ITEMS (Meeting Held June 11, 2024) *

1. Approval of Reports for May 2024

- i. Monthly Check Summary (Approved by Consent)**
- ii. Cash on Hand (Approved by Consent)**
- iii. Investments on Hand (Approved by Consent)**
- iv. Monthly Budget Reports (Approved by Consent)**
- v. Revenue (Approved by Consent)**

2. Approval of Purchases

- i. Maintenance Department – Annual Request to Approve Vendors Estimated to Exceed 60K, Utilizing Price Agreement Contracts 31701, 31703 & 31200 Two Mill State Match & HB 505(C)-086 (Approved by Consent)**

3. Approval of General Contracts

- i. Approval of Annual Contract Renewals 2024-25 FY
 - a. District Internet Services (Approved by Consent)**
 - b. District Interconnected Voice Over IP (Approved by Consent)**
 - c. On-Call Asphalt Improvements & Repairs (Approved by Consent)****
- ii. Approval of Annual Student Nutrition Use of Commodity Food Processing Cooperative Contract No. 23-24-01 c/o Las Cruces Public Schools (Approved by Consent)**
- iii. Approval of Annual Student Nutrition Use of Food Service Products, Contract Extension No. 2 of No. 25-General 2022-23 c/o Santa Fe Public Schools (Approved by Consent)**

K. FINANCE COMMITTEE ITEMS (Meeting Held June 11, 2024) *

4. Approval of Construction Contract

- i. Progressive Roofing Sundance Elementary Roof Coating 31137 Bond (Approved by Consent)**

5. **Approval of Application: Title I - Part A** (Approved by Consent)
6. **Approval of Application: Title II- Part A** (Approved by Consent)
7. **Approval of MOU: Between LLS and VC Foster Grandparent Program 2024-25 SY**
(Approved by Consent)
8. **Approval of MOU: Between LLS and Village of Los Lunas for Refuse Removal
2024-25 FY** (Approved by Consent)

L. NEW BUSINESS: Board Member Requests for Topics for Upcoming Board Work Sessions and/or Board Meetings

Dr. Osowski noted that this item was for items board members would like to see on upcoming meetings and or work sessions. She asked the board members if they had anything they'd like to be added.

She told Mr. Vickers she knew he had listed from one for the upcoming work sessions. He'd wanted some report out regarding RGE with community input was that correct. He said that they would need to make a decision on that at some point. Dr. Osowski stated that they needed to have that as a work session so that needed to go on as work session topics. She added that she'd asked for a work session topic to be on understanding the siblings, the number of siblings that would be impacted for RGE and then an understanding regarding the sibling transfer policy. She would piggybacked right off of the RGE.

M. ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEETINGS

Dr. Osowski stated that took them to Item M. ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEETINGS. She added that, as allowed by the NM Open Meetings Act and the District's Open Meetings Resolution, on occasion, a quorum of the board members attend the same function, including those held at school sites, sports functions, as well as, community events. The board members agreed they would not discuss school business while at those functions.

M. ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEETINGS (Continued)

Dr. Osowski stated that they would be having on Tuesday, July 2nd a special meeting with a Closed Executive Session. The topics would be to address or correct dates of the

superintendent's contract for his contract addendum which was signed on 12/19/2023. Discussion would take action on a 3% raise approved for public school employees. As a Board of Education they had to act on that separately for the superintendent. Also it would be for if there are any topics or concerns that may be coming up for the upcoming annual evaluation.

Tuesday, July 16 was the finance committee meeting which would be held in this boardroom at 3 pm. Also on July 16 there will be the audit committee meeting in the conference room or the board room and attendance is for audit committee members only.

On July 23rd they would be having a board work session from 2 pm until 4 pm. This will be all proposed policy updates. She told Mr. Garcia - that's what she had referenced before, and that would be the time to be bringing updates for that work policy that Mr. Bennett was curious about.

From 4 pm to 5 pm would be closed session which the Board of Education would be receiving updates on pending litigation that was ongoing in the district, and 6 pm to 9 pm would be the Regular Board of Education Meeting and with those topics that will be announced in the agenda. This would occur in the boardroom beginning at 6 pm.

She then called for a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Vickers interjected and noted that there were additional meetings scheduled that were not on the list of upcoming meetings and asked her to go over the dates that were not listed.

Dr. Osowski stated that she would be happy to ... July 2nd was a special meeting with a closed executive session. Mr. Vickers asked what time that would be. Dr. Osowski asked what time was good for everybody. Did they want to do a 6 pm or at 5 pm? A brief discussion ensued after which she announce that they were going to set a time for the special meeting to be at 5 pm. She reiterated that they had to address and correct the dates the superintendent's contract terminates.

M. ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEETINGS (Continued)

The Executive Assistant then asked for clarification on the dates and topics of the additional meetings as she was having trouble hearing the details. When the meeting on July 2nd was

listed, she noted that both she and Dr. Kettler were out the week of July 1st – 5th .

Ms. Otero asked for clarification that the superintendent was out on that day. It was confirmed that he was. Ms. Otero stated she would prefer if he was there for that discussion. Dr. Osowski stated if they changed that date, they would need to postpone correcting his contract until they could set another special meeting. Ms. Otero stated that she felt he should be there.

Dr. Osowski asked Ms. Otero when she thought they should have it. She responded that she felt it should be scheduled when the Superintendent could be there. A brief discussion ensued regarding dates. Dr. Kettler was asked when he returned – he replied July 8th.

Dr. Osowski stated that she knew the week of July 8th through July 11th that she was completely out of pocket.

Dates were discussed and it was stated that they could go the week of July 16th and go after the Audit Committee Meeting. Dr. Osowski clarified that date would work for everyone. The special meeting announced for the 2nd was moved to the 16th to follow the Audit Committee meeting to begin at 5:00 pm.

The following dates were announced after the discussion.

- July 16, 2024 Finance Committee Meeting
CO Board Room 3:00 pm
- July 16, 2024 Audit Committee Meeting
CO Conference Room or Board Room 4:00 pm
(Attendance by Audit Committee Members only)
- July 16, 2024 Special Meeting including a Closed Executive Session
CO Board Room 5:00 pm
(Topics will be listed on the Agenda - kw)
- July 23, 2024 Board Work Session
CO Board Room 2:00 – 4:00 pm
Topic: All Proposed NMSBA / LLS Policy Updates, Revisions,
and/or Additions

M. ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEETINGS

(Continued)

- July 23, 2024 Closed Executive Session
CO Conference Room 5:00 pm

Topic: Updates Regarding Pending And Threatened Litigation

- July 23, 2024 Regular Board Meeting
CO Board Room 6:00 pm

N. ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Osowski stated that before she called for a motion to adjourn, she would ask the board members to remain seated for a few moments after the meeting as they had signatures that the staff needed to obtain.

Mr. Bennett moved, and Mr. Vickers seconded, to adjourn the meeting. Dr. Osowski called for a vote with the following results: Mr. Vickers -yes; Ms. Otero – yes; Mr. Talley – absent; Mr. Bennett - yes; and Dr. Osowski- yes. Motion to adjourn the meeting passed: 4/0 1 Absent.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 pm.

Approved this 23rd day of July 2024.

Dr. Michelle Osowski, Board President

Justin Tally, Board Secretary

ksw