1	BEFORE THE PUBLIC EDUCATION COMMISSION
2	STATE OF NEW MEXICO
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
10	SPECIAL MEETING May 22, 2015
11	2:00 p.m. New Mexico State Capitol - Room 309
12	Santa Fe, New Mexico
13	
1 4	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	REPORTED BY: Cynthia C. Chapman, RMR-CRR, NM CCR #219
21	Bean & Associates, Inc. Professional Court Reporting Service
22	201 Third Street, NW, Suite 1630 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102
23	
2 4	
25	JOB NO.: 3015L(CC)





1	APPEARANCES
2	COMMISSIONERS:
3	MS. CAROLYN SHEARMAN, Chair, Telephonically MR. VINCE BERGMAN, Vice Chair
4	MR. GILBERT PERALTA, Secretary, Telephonically MS. KARYL ANN ARMBRUSTER
5	MR. JEFF CARR MS. ELEANOR CHAVEZ
6	MR. JAMES CONYERS
7	MS. PATRICIA GIPSON MS. MILLIE POGNA
8	MS. CARMIE TOULOUSE, Telephonically
9	STAFF:
10	MS. KATIE POULOS, Director, Charter School Division
11	MR. JOSHUA GRANATA, Assistant Attorney General, Counsel to the PEC
12	MS. BEVERLY FRIEDMAN, Custodian of Records and PED Liaison to the PEC
13 14	MS. JULIA BARNES, Contract Attorney to the PEC, Appeals and Negotiations
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	
2.5	









1	THE CHAIR: Commissioners, by my clock,
2	it's 2:00. Is everyone ready?
3	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Yes.
4	THE CHAIR: Then I call to order this
5	Special Meeting of the New Mexico Public Education
6	Commission.
7	And I would remind everyone, since some
8	are attending this meeting by phone, that when you
9	speak, please be sure you're recognized by the Chair
10	first and that you identify yourself.
11	The next order of business is roll call.
12	Secretary Peralta, can you hear well
13	enough to call roll?
14	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Madam Chair, I can.
15	THE CHAIR: Okay. Please go ahead. And
16	please ask each respondent to say whether or not
17	they're at the meeting in person or by phone,
18	please.
19	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Okay.
20	Commissioners, you heard the request by
21	Chair Chairwoman Shearman. So as I call your
22	name, if you would say "in person" or "by phone."
23	Commissioner Pogna?
24	(No response.)
25	Commissioner Carr?





1	MS. FRIEDMAN: Wait a second.
2	Commissioner Pogna is here.
3	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Is she in person?
4	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Thank you.
6	Commissioner Carr?
7	COMMISSIONER CARR: Here, in person.
8	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Thank you.
9	Commissioner Conyers?
10	COMMISSIONER CONYERS: In person.
11	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Thank you.
12	Commissioner Toulouse?
13	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Present by phone.
14	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Thank you.
15	Commissioner Armbruster?
16	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Here, in person.
17	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Thank you.
18	Commissioner Chavez?
19	COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Here, in person.
20	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Thank you.
21	Commissioner Gipson?
22	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Here, in person.
23	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
24	Peralta is by phone.
25	Commissioner Bergman?





1	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Here, in person.
2	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: And Commissioner
3	Shearman?
4	THE CHAIR: By phone.
5	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Madam Chair, that
6	is all members of the Commission are present.
7	You have a quorum.
8	THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. I
9	do declare that we have a quorum to do business,
10	with all ten Commissioners present in person,
11	three by phone.
12	Commissioners, if this meets with your
13	approval, at this point, I'd like to ask
14	Commissioner-and-Vice Chair Bergman to take over
15	chairing the meeting. I feel it will be much more
16	efficient to have the Chair in person for the
17	meeting.
18	Mr. Bergman, if you would please take
19	over. Thank you.
20	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you,
21	Madam Chair. We've already gone through the roll
22	call and the call to order. I would ask before I
23	do that, I would ask that everyone turn off their
2 4	cell phone and any other electronic devices that
2.5	might disrupt this meeting. Keep them off until





25



COMMISSIONER CARR: On Item No. 4, it

1	says oh, no. It says "Possible Action" on it.
2	Never mind. I'm good. I'm good.
3	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: All right. Thank
4	you, Mr. Carr.
5	We have a motion and a second. I believe
6	I'll do a voice vote on this. All in favor, say
7	"Aye."
8	(Commissioners so indicate.)
9	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: That motion carries
10	unanimously.
11	Turning to Item No. 3 and I'm going to
12	read this as it says on our executive summary.
13	We're now going to go to a Discussion and
14	Possible Action on the Health Sciences Academy
15	Revocation Hearing.
16	I will note in your binder that there was
17	a letter, a memorandum from Mr. Pahl, that started
18	this process. And also in your binder is a copy of
19	the Notice of Appeal that Health Sciences Academy
20	has already filed with the Secretary.
21	I have asked legal counsel whether we can
22	even do anything, because this appeal has already
23	been filed; and I have been told that we can.
24	And I will note, for the information of



the Commissioners who may not be aware of it, PED

```
1
     has already approved and assigned Julia Barnes to
 2
     serve as our counsel on this appeal. Mr. Granata
 3
     will not be working on the actual appeal.
 4
               And so I would ask Ms. Barnes -- are you
     still here?
 5
               MS. BARNES: I'm over here.
 6
 7
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Would it be easier
 8
     to work from there? I guess you have all your stuff
 9
     there.
10
               I would ask you to explain to the
     Commission and the audience why we are here today
11
12
     and what your recommendation is.
13
               MS. BARNES: Is it easier for me to move
14
     down there?
15
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: If that's easier
16
     for you.
               Can everybody hear her --
17
               COMMISSIONER CARR: Oh, yeah.
18
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: -- if she stays
19
     there? On the phone, can you hear?
20
               COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Can people speak
21
     up?
22
               COMMISSIONER CARR: She didn't have her
23
     mic on yet.
24
               MS. BARNES: Can you all hear me now, on
25
     the phone?
```





```
1
               MS. FRIEDMAN: Can you hear Julia on the
 2
     phone?
 3
               THE CHAIR:
                          No, I cannot.
 4
               COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I can barely hear.
 5
     This is Carmie. I can barely hear.
                                          I can also
 6
     barely hear Commissioner Bergman.
 7
               COMMISSIONER CARR: She'd be really good
 8
     right there, because it's right next to the --
 9
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Beverly, she's
10
     going to set up shop right next to you.
11
               MS. FRIEDMAN: Oh, all right.
12
               MS. BARNES: Okay. Can you guys hear me
13
     now?
14
               THE CHAIR: Yes.
                                 This is Carolyn. I can
15
     hear you very well.
                          Thank you.
16
               MS. BARNES: Commissioner Peralta?
17
               COMMISSIONER PERALTA: I am good.
18
     you.
19
               MS. BARNES: Okay.
                                   So on this action
20
     item, I am interested in asking the Commission to
21
     reconsider your previous decision on Health Sciences
22
     Academy, and, instead, withdraw that decision and
23
     issue a Notice of Intent to Revoke the Charter.
               The Notice of Intent to Revoke the
24
25
     Charter -- I actually have a proposed draft for you,
```



which I might go ahead and pass out. I think

Commissioner Peralta and Commissioner Shearman

already have it. And, actually, I'll go over it for

Commissioner Toulouse.

But let me back up for just a moment. The appeal by the Health Sciences Academy has already been filed, and much of the information in the appeal addresses the desire to have a response, to be able to provide a response to what was presented to you at your April 17th meeting.

At that hearing, there was conversation about having a hearing. My review of the law, and also of the contract, is that you will have the strongest possible appeal if you determine to revoke after a hearing. I know that that is additional work; but I want to tell you that my experience overall, and my recent experience, is that the district courts and the Secretary want to the make sure that you have had a sound process that provided due process for the school.

And it appears strong enough to me that I think that it's important to have a hearing. And I -- I know that you've talked about it; but I still want to let you know that it -- I think it's important.

SANTA FE OFFICE 119 East Marcy, Suite 110 Santa Fe, NM 87501 (505) 989-4949 FAX (505) 820-6349

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



This would mean that you would temporarily withdraw the revocation; but you would immediately indicate your intent to revoke the school.

This is something that we would issue immediately; in fact, it's already drafted for Vice Chair Bergman's signature, since I knew that Commissioner Shearman would not be here.

We've looked at some tentative dates, if you decide to do that. And I think that it could be done in a very strong way.

I am interested, I think, as all of you are, in having your decisions be done appropriately, properly, and also be very strong.

So for that reason, I'm asking you all to consider that. It would be a two-step process. The first step would be to reconsider the revocation decision. If you decided to reconsider it, then you would, I guess, remove it or revoke it, or I don't know what verb we would use to do that; but to temporarily remove it.

And I think it should be immediately followed by a motion to issue an intent -- a Notice of Intent to Revoke the Charter, which would establish a hearing.

I'm going to say one more thing that's



1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

just about if you were to hold a hearing. One of the possible days is the day before your next June meeting; or else at the end of the day after your June meeting, you might have to move some things to the day before.

I'm certainly available to answer questions. We did use this process when TL- -- The Learning Community was revoked. I was the appeals attorney on that decision; and I tell you it was strong and supportable and complied with due process.

Everybody, including, I know, every single one of you, takes it very seriously when you revoke a charter. And those are the types of situations where due process matters a lot.

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you, Julia.

Commissioner Carr?

Strongly concur with Ms. Barnes that we follow -actually follow her suggestions to the letter. And
due process is extremely important. We may or
may -- we may or may not come up with the exact same
decision. But, you know, we know that after we've
heard people testify, this Commission has changed
their mind sometimes, you know, when we've heard



1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

everything.

So it's -- and I -- it's just -- it's extremely important to me that -- that people feel like they've received due process and that everybody's been heard. And I -- and I want to hear everybody, too.

So thank you.

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you. I will note that our next meeting is June the 19th. It'll be a fairly robust meeting. I believe we have at least eleven additional contracts to go over, and there might be one or two others by that date that would be added to that list.

The date that Julia has proposed would be the afternoon of the 18th to hold the hearing. And I am presuming if we do have that hearing, that that would also provide HSA the opportunity to perhaps explain any changes they have made since we did take our vote; so that would be perhaps an appropriate venue for that.

I think I will start with the folks on the phone first.

Commissioner Shearman, what are your thoughts?

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner





Bergman. This is Commissioner Shearman. I do agree with the recommendation. I agree with what

Commissioner Carr said. I think certainly we want to follow not just the spirit of the law, but the letter of the law. And we certainly don't want to get overturned on appeal because we missed a step.

So if the step is that we hold the hearing, and we need to go back and rescind our vote and issue the Notice of Revocation of a charter, then I agree that's exactly what we need to do.

As far as the date, certainly whatever the majority of the Commissioners choose to do is fine with me. I think either have it first thing on the morning of the 18th, or in the afternoon of the 18th and then allow us all day on the 19th. Or we can flop it.

I understand that the school's attorney,
Mr. Ivey-Soto, is not available on the 18th; but he
has offered to hire another attorney to represent
the school that day. So I think whatever is the
pleasure of the majority of the Commission, I'm
amenable to whatever we choose to do.

Or one other option that we have done in the past is we, say, have started our meeting on the afternoon of, say, the 18th, have the hearing on the



1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

morning of the 19th, because it will be timed -- so 1 2 it will be a limited amount of time -- and then 3 finish any agenda items that we didn't get to on the 4 18th, finish those on the 19th. 5 So whatever the majority of the Commissioners wants to do, I'm perfectly agreeable. 6 7 Thank you. 8 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you Commissioner Shearman. 9 Commissioner Peralta? 10 11 COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Yes. Thank you, 12 Acting Chair/Commissioner Bergman. You know, I did 13 sit on the -- the hearing for the TLC when that was 14 done, and I strongly feel that we need to be fair in 15 the process for all schools when it comes to 16 revocation. 17 I also agree with Commissioner Shearman, and also the recommendation of Counsel Barnes, that 18 we should reconsider revocation and move to a Notice 19 20 of Intent in order to give the school adequate and due process before a decision is made. 21 22 I would suggest -- my feeling would be to 23 be the afternoon of June 18th to have this hearing 24 done.



25



Thank you, Commissioner Bergman.

1	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you,
2	Commissioner Peralta.
3	Commissioner Toulouse?
4	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Thank you,
5	Mr. Chair. This is Carmie Toulouse. I will defer
6	to the recommendation of our counsel. I don't care
7	which way we do the appeal; although I would want to
8	caution that by the time we do it, and then they can
9	go or the hearing, they can go for additional
10	appeal processes, and we're basically allowing the
11	school to open.
12	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you,
13	Commissioner Toulouse, for that perspective.
14	I guess I'll just start here in the room
15	and start to my right. Commissioner Gipson?
16	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I'm in concurrence.
17	I think in the light of fairness, it's the right
18	thing to do.
19	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you.
20	Commissioner Conyers?
21	COMMISSIONER CONYERS: I agree.
22	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you.
23	Commissioner Pogna?
24	COMMISSIONER POGNA: (No verbal response.)
25	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner



1	Armbruster?
2	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I'm in
3	agreement, too. I think we might just chat
4	before Commissioner Shearman, can you hear me?
5	You probably can't. Now, can you hear me?
6	MS. BARNES: I can tell her, if you
7	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I just think we
8	should see how many can come on the 19th, which was
9	already planned, as opposed to the 18th, so that as
10	many people as possible are here.
11	MS. BARNES: So just for the people on the
12	phone, Commissioner Armbruster was just saying that
13	she would like to have the Commission discuss how
14	many people can come on the 18th or the 19th is her
15	concern.
16	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: But I concur
17	with the rest.
18	MS. BARNES: But she concurs otherwise.
19	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner
20	Chavez?
21	COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: I also concur with
22	the recommendation. I cannot be here on the 18th.
23	MS. BARNES: Commissioner Chavez just
24	stated she concurs, but she cannot be here on the
25	18th.



COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I believe we would 1 2 need a quorum, would we not, for a hearing? 3 not mandatory that we all be present; is that correct? 5 MS. BARNES: Correct. COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: 6 Thank you. 7 I'll offer my thoughts. 8 Yes, I agree with the -- that sometimes we 9 may need to go back and rethink a decision. And now 10 I believe if -- since everyone seems to have 11 concurred, let's reserve talking about the dates 12 till we actually have a process. 13 Now, Commissioner -- or Counselor Barnes, now you've got to guide us through the process. 14 15 What is the first step we have to take? 16 MS. BARNES: I think you need a motion to 17 reconsider the previous decision to revoke the 18 charter of the Health Sciences Academy, and instead, 19 to issue a Notice of Intent, I guess, to rescind the 20 previous decision. After that vote has been taken, I think 21 22 you need to take a vote to issue a Notice of Intent 23 to Revoke the Charter. And if you have discussion 24 on that, I can talk about that a little bit.



COMMISSIONER BERGMAN:

25

Thank you for that.

```
I think the correct word would be "rescind."
 1
     that needs to be in the motion. Am I correct on
 2
 3
     that?
 4
               MR. GRANATA:
                             (Indicates.)
 5
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you.
                                                   Are we
 6
     proposed to go forward, then, with a motion, folks
 7
     on the phone?
 8
               COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Yes, go ahead.
               THE CHAIR: This is Commissioner Shearman.
 9
10
     Yes, I'm ready. As a matter of fact, I would like
11
     to make the motion, unless someone there wants to.
12
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN:
                                      Thank you,
13
     Mr. Carr.
14
               Commissioner Shearman, if you want to make
15
     the motion, then go ahead, please.
16
               THE CHAIR:
                           Thank you very much.
17
     that the Public Education Commission rescind its
18
     vote regarding Health Sciences Academy that was
19
     taken during the April PEC meeting.
20
               Can I -- let me just ask Julia. Can I
     make this a combined motion, where we also talk
21
22
     about issuing the Notice of Rev- -- the Notice of
23
     Intent to Revoke?
24
               MS. BARNES: Let's just do it in two
25
     motions.
```



1	THE CHAIR: All right. Then my motion
2	states that we rescind the Commission's vote on the
3	Health Sciences Academy that was taken during the
4	April 2015 meeting.
5	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you,
6	Commissioner Shearman.
7	Is that motion adequate the way it was
8	worded, do you believe?
9	Both attorneys are shaking their heads
10	"yes." That doesn't record well; but they're
11	shaking their heads "yes."
12	Do we have a second?
13	COMMISSIONER CARR: Second.
14	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner Carr
15	has seconded.
16	We have a motion before the Commission
17	from Commissioner Shearman to rescind the revocation
18	of HSA, the vote that was taken previously. We have
19	a second by Commissioner Carr.
20	Is there any further discussion?
21	Commissioner Peralta, then I would ask for
22	a roll-call vote, please. And everyone speak up as
23	you vote, please.
24	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
25	Gipson?





1	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
3	Chavez?
4	COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
6	Armbruster?
7	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yes.
8	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
9	Toulouse?
10	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Yes.
11	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
12	Conyers?
13	COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Carr?
15	COMMISSIONER CARR: Yes.
16	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Pogna?
17	COMMISSIONER POGNA: Yes.
18	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
19	Peralta votes "Yes."
20	Commissioner Shearman?
21	THE CHAIR: Yes.
22	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: And Commissioner
23	Bergman?
24	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Yes.
25	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Mr. Chair, that is





a 10-to-0 vote in favor of the motion. 1 2 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you, 3 That is a 10-to-0 vote in favor of Mr. Peralta. 4 that motion. We therefore have rescinded our 5 previous action. 6 Now, according to our counsel, I believe 7 we need a second motion. Would you kind of word 8 that for us, Julia? 9 MS. BARNES: Yes. I think you need a motion to issue a Notice of Intent to Revoke the 10 11 Charter, and to set the date -- and to hold a 12 hearing in the matter. 13 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you. 14 COMMISSIONER CARR: Question, then. 15 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Question, Mr. Carr? 16 COMMISSIONER CARR: Is -- should we not 17 also officially give them notice that we've changed 18 our vote? 19 MS. BARNES: Yes. And the -- actually, I 20 can discuss the Notice of Intent to Revoke the 21 Charter and what's in it right now, or if you want 22 me to do that right now. 23 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Actually, why don't 24 we do that? Actually, why don't we take just a 25 couple of minutes. I don't know if the folks on the



1 phone have a copy. Has everyone -- let's take just 2 a moment and read this Notice of Intent, if you 3 don't mind, Commissioners. 4 MS. BARNES: And then Commissioner 5 Toulouse is the only one who doesn't have a copy; so 6 I'm going to go over it in some detail so she 7 understands that. 8 Katie, is it possible -- are you online? 9 MS. POULOS: I am. 10 MS. BARNES: Is it possible -- I don't 11 think you have this yet. 12 MS. POULOS: I don't have this. 13 MS. BARNES: I didn't send this to you 14 because you're a party is the reason I didn't send 15 it to CSD. You're going to have it. I'm going to talk about CSD in a minute. 16 17 Commissioner Toulouse, I'm just going to 18 go over it in detail with you. Is that acceptable 19 to you? 20 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Mr. Chair, this is Commissioner Toulouse. I don't think I need it in 21 22 detail, if you'll just e-mail it to me later. 23 understand what those kinds of notices need to say. 24 MS. BARNES: Okay. Thank you. I didn't 25 realize you were going to be on the phone.



COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: That's fine. Thank you.

Thank you, Commissioner Toulouse.

Just a couple of minutes for us to read it, and we'll be right back with you.

While everyone is finishing up, I might note that it's a fairly standard legal document. It does allow for testimony from HSA and their counsel and their staff to answer any questions they may wish to answer. It also notes that the public will be allowed to make a statement at the hearing, and that will be limited to no more than five minutes per person.

Other than that, I believe it's a fairly standard document. It does note, at the end, that the PEC intends to issue a verbal decision on the date of the hearing, which will be confirmed by a written decision immediately thereafter.

So whatever date we select, we will make our initial decision on that date after hearing all the testimony from interested parties. And, of course, this decision will also be subject to the right of appeal for HSA, if they don't like what they hear that day.

MS. BARNES: If I can explain a few





points?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Go ahead.

MS. BARNES: So this -- you actually could change it. So the first paragraph does just set out what you've -- the procedural history up to now. It is my understanding, if this Notice of Intent does issue and there is a hearing, that the counsel for HSA and I will stay the appeal, I think, and see what happens after that.

Actually, he may remove that appeal and then file another appeal after the hearing is what we might do. I think he's nodding "yes."

I want to talk a little bit about the scope. And actually, CSD, I do want to -- Katie Poulos, I would like to specifically identify this for you.

I think it's important to know what the scope of the hearing is. The scope of the hearing at present is going to be set by those minutes of your April 17th hearing, those issues that were raised, particularly and in specifically in that memo from Matt Pahl, which was also read into the transcript; so that transcript is complete. It does — the violations that are listed here were the ones that were presented to you that day.



And we've just noted the legal authority for that information you received that day to have warranted immediate revocation, and that it's at least possible to me that there may -- it may give rise to other violations of the law. So just put that sentence in here.

But I did want to give -- and this does give -- again, it's in draft -- it does give the New Mexico Public Education Department, through any division, the ability to identify any other issues for revocation that they may choose to present.

You have, Katie, until May 27th. If you do that, if you have other issues -- it's 3B on the document -- if you have other issues that you would like to add or that any other division from PED would like to add, you need to present those in writing.

If we receive more issues, they will be added to the scope of the hearing. If we do not receive any more issues, then we're going -- then the hearing will be limited to the scope of what was presented to you on April 17th, and the school will have an opportunity to respond to what was presented on April 17th. And if any other additional issues are added by anyone at PED by next -- I think it's



1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

next Wednesday.

We will identify the time limit -- the time for the presentation. We'd initially talked about setting possibly a two-hour hearing. I think that Mr. Ivey-Soto would like to request that it's a little bit longer. So I would like to discuss that with him and probably the executive committee and then issue that.

But I'm thinking three is still plenty.

There is an opportunity for the public, which is very -- it's consistent with what happened at the TLC hearing. And that will be limited to five minutes per person. We will stick to that. I don't know how many people would like to present, you know, public information that day; but I think that it's important to have a short opportunity for people to do that.

And then it is not required that you issue a verbal decision that day. You did that in the TLC hearing, and I thought that was a very efficient way to do it; but it's a proposal that you could change.

So that's just what I wanted to explain.

COMMISSIONER CARR: In your talk, you brought up a question. It sounds like you were alluding to discovery, as in the court process, for





the PED to present anything new. Do we not also want to ask for anything -- any new evidence that's going to be brought forward by the other side to be brought forth by the 27th so that we can look at it?

MS. BARNES: Typically, you -- you are just presented with the testimony and the witnesses at the date of the hearing. So typically, there hasn't been information that's been presented to you beforehand; so the hearing is the time.

I'm more interested in -- and I don't really want to put Katie on the spot. I did want to give her some time to think about if there were other issues.

There -- if you're going to revoke, in my view, if there are more things -- items of concern, you should hear those then, as well. I actually don't think there's much. But I'm not -- I'm still going to give her that opportunity to present that.

And what we need to do is give notice to Mr. Ivey-Soto and his client, so they can be ready to respond to anything. So I'm more trying to set the scope of the hearing.

COMMISSIONER CARR: Okay. So I have a follow-up question to that, then, is if -- if something new comes to light that is of significant





bearing on this hearing that comes up a week before, 1 or even the day before, is that something we won't 2 3 be able to hear? 4 MS. BARNES: I think the purpose of 5 establishing the scope of the hearing is fairness to 6 the party. 7 COMMISSIONER CARR: Right. 8 MS. BARNES: So if something does come up, 9 and it's very serious, I think we're going to have 10 to talk to the school and say, "This has come up. What are we going to do about it?" 11 12 That, to me, would mean maybe pushing it 13 past that date of the 18th or something. 14 Please don't have any more issues. 15 COMMISSIONER CARR: He's an attorney; he's 16 going to have issues. 17 So I think if something very MS. BARNES: 18 serious came up and it was important for this 19 Commission to hear, then I think we would have to 20 address it, and I think we would probably address it 21 with adequate time. 22 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you. 23 Commissioners I would just like to say, please, if 24 you wish to make some comments, please indicate to 25 the Chair that you'd like to make the comments, and



I will acknowledge you at that time. 1 2 Commissioner Armbruster? 3 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Thank you. 4 just had a question regarding time. And I'm not 5 trying to limit it; I'm just trying to understand 6 it. So you're saying it's about three hours 8 for -- is this from beginning to end here, on the bottom paragraph, on Page 2, about giving testimony 9 and evidence and public comment? 10 MS. BARNES: Yes. I addition- -- I 11 12 initially established each side having about 13 10 minutes to do an opening statement; so that's 20 14 minutes. 40 minutes for each side to present what 15 they needed to present. And 10 minutes for closing. 16 That made a two-hour hearing. 17 Mr. Ivey-Soto indicated to me he thought 18 that he might want a little bit more time; so we would expand it, but have it be very set. 19 initial conversations with Charter Schools Division 20 21 is that two hours maybe was enough; but, you know, 22 we don't need -- I don't think we need an all-day 23 hearing. 24 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Well, that was



I think it's touching and moving, and

my concern.

if I were in the school, I would want to make a 1 But it's not always helpful to us, because 2 3 we've had several who have already expressed, with 4 deep concern and very heartwarming comments, about 5 their feeling about the school. But I don't want to hear 50 more. 6 7 MS. BARNES: Right; so... COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So that's why I 8 9 was asking about that time. 10 MS. BARNES: I'm sorry. 11 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: For the benefit of 12 Commissioner Armbruster and the other new 13 Commissioners, we do limit the comments. If there's a large group of people present, we ask that they 14 15 select a spokesperson if they're all going to say 16 the same thing. So, yes, we agree that it would be 17 time-consuming to have 50 or 100 people all up to a 18 microphone and speak and say the same thing. COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: 19 20 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: So, yes, that 21 announcement will certainly be made before we get to 22 those public comments. That has always been our 23 procedure. Julia? 24 MS. BARNES: And the parties are limited 25 to the scope of the hearing; so whatever is relevant



1 to that. 2 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Anyone else wish to 3 comment or ask a question? 4 All right, then, I guess we're ready --5 are we ready to proceed? Seems to be a consensus -am I correct? -- that we now are ready to issue this 6 7 Notice of Intent? Julia? MS. BARNES: So I would think there's two 8 9 things. One is, do you want to issue the Notice of 10 Intent to Revoke the Charter, and then does anyone 11 have any changes to the draft that I have proposed? 12 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Here, again, I'll 13 start with the folks on the phone. 14 Commissioner Shearman? 15 THE CHAIR: Certainly, I agree with the 16 issue that's being discussed. I think it needs to 17 be -- the notice needs to be issued, and the hearing 18 needs to be set; but I will defer to someone else to 19 make that motion. 20 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner

COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Same here,

Mr. Chair. The Notice of Intent that Julia had

forwarded to me looks very -- very well put; so I'm

25 okay with that.

Peralta?





1	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you.
2	Commissioner Toulouse?
3	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Mr. Chair, I'm
4	really comfortable with what's been discussed, and I
5	support and approve the notice, as Julia is
6	recommending.
7	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you,
8	Commissioner Toulouse.
9	Everyone here that's present in the
0 ـ	building, are you in agreement with going forward
1	with the Notice of Intent? Do any of you wish to
. 2	change the document that Julia has put forward?
_3	I see no one that wants to change your
4	documents, or your document looks fine. Then I
L 5	guess we need a motion to issue the I want to
6	word it the Notice of Intent to Revoke the
_7	Charter for the Health Sciences Academy and to hold
8 .	a public hearing. So who would
9	MS. BARNES: The one blank in the form is
20	the date of the hearing. So you might want
21	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Do we need to do
22	the date first, so we can put it in the motion?
23	MS. BARNES: I would. And then the
24	document is finished.
5	COMMISSIONER RERGMAN. All right Well.



we've discussed having the hearing on the 18th. 1 We initially discussed having it on the 2 3 afternoon of the 18th. And if there is a three-hour time limit, then that -- having it on the afternoon of the 18th should be sufficient. That would allow 5 the out-of-town Commissioners the morning to drive 7 up and save PED and DFA, and everybody else, one 8 hotel night. 9 So I -- as an out-of-towner myself, I 10 would kind of lean towards that one. 11 thoughts on that? Are -- is everyone on the 12 Commission comfortable with a hearing on the 13 afternoon of the 18th? COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: I can't be here. 14 15 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I understand Commissioner Chavez cannot be here on that. 16 17 Can everyone else be here on the afternoon of the 18th? 18 19 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: We did have a work 20 session scheduled for that afternoon. 21 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: If we did, we will 22 cancel it then. 23 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: 24 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Because 25 Commissioner Shearman and I didn't remember that,



1	apparently, yeah.
2	So then that would be then that would
3	be my suggestion, that we have the hearing on the
4	afternoon of the 18th. I know that will
5	inconvenience Mr. Ivey-Soto a little bit; but and
6	that we schedule it for 1:00 p.m.
7	And I assume Julia will work with CSD to
8	put us in a proper room to hold such a hearing, with
9	adequate facilities for the public to attend and
10	everything else.
11	Is that satisfactory to everybody on the
12	phone?
13	THE CHAIR: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: That's good by me,
15	Mr. Chair. This is Commissioner Peralta.
16	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you. All
17	right.
18	Who would like to word such a motion?
19	COMMISSIONER CARR: I'll make the motion.
20	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner Carr
21	will make the motion. Thank you.
22	COMMISSIONER CARR: Since I'm
23	volunteering, don't be too hard on me if I mess up.
24	I make a motion that we send out a Notice
25	of Intent to Revoke the Charter for Health Sciences



Academy, and hold a hearing on said revocation on 1 June 18th from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., adding a 2 3 location to be determined later. 4 COMMISSIONER POGNA: I second. 5 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: A motion from 6 Commissioner Carr. Most of you probably did not 7 hear it on the phone; but I have a second from 8 Commissioner Pogna. Is there any further discussion? 9 10 THE CHAIR: Mr. Chairman, this is 11 Commissioner Shearman. Would you repeat the motion 12 so we can all be absolutely sure what was said? 13 (The record was read as requested.) This is Commissioner Shearman. 14 THE CHAIR: 15 Again, what if the meeting goes long? Will we 16 violate our own motion? Because if the Commission 17 decides, as we did at the TLC hearing, to then have 18 an open meeting with discussion and vote on whether 19 or not to revoke after the hearing is over, and the 20 motion is set from 1:00 to 4:00, if we need to go 21 longer than that, will we be able to? 22 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner 23 Shearman, thank for you that question. I believe it 24 was our counsel, Julia Barnes, that said it would be 25 a limited time thing. But I would certainly be



1	amenable to leave off the 4:00 part and leave us
2	time to go over.
3	Would everyone be in agreement with that?
4	COMMISSIONER CARR: I'll amend my motion
5	to start the hearing at 1:00 p.m., with no ending
6	time.
7	MS. BARNES: Beverly has just indicated
8	she thinks Mabry Hall is available.
9	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Outstanding.
L 0	Commissioner Pogna, will you also agree to that
L1	amendment, as seconder?
L 2	COMMISSIONER POGNA: Yes, I would.
L 3	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner Pogna
L 4	has re-seconded that change in the original motion.
L 5	Any further discussion?
L 6	Then I believe we are ready for a vote.
L 7	Commissioner Peralta, please.
L 8	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Thank you,
L 9	Mr. Chair.
20	Okay. Commissioner Chavez?
21	COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Yes.
22	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
23	Armbruster?
2 4	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yes.
25	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Pogna?





1	COMMISSIONER POGNA: Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Carr?
3	COMMISSIONER CARR: Yes.
4	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
5	Conyers?
6	COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Yes.
7	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
8	Toulouse?
9	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Yes.
10	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
11	Gipson?
12	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes.
13	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
14	Shearman?
15	THE CHAIR: Yes.
16	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
17	Bergman?
18	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Yes.
19	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: And Commissioner
20	Peralta votes "Yes."
21	Mr. Chair, that is a 10-to-0 vote in favor
22	of the motion.
23	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you,
24	Commissioner Peralta. That is a the motion is
25	affirmed by a 10-to-0 vote. This Commission has





rescinded its original revocation process and has 1 2 now voted to issue a Notice of Intent to Revoke the 3 Charter of HSA, and we have scheduled a hearing on 4 that revocation for the afternoon of June the 18th; 5 and that hearing will begin at 1:00 p.m., and, at least tentatively, is scheduled to be held in Mabry 6 7 Hall in the Education Building. 8 Should that not prove to be possible, then everyone will, of course, be informed of where the 9 10 new hearing might be. I hope it's in Mabry Hall. 11 Any further discussion? Are you -- are we 12 finished, Julia? 13 MS. BARNES: Yes. I was actually going to 14 have you sign them right now, and I'll hand them to 15 Mr. Ivey-Soto and to Katie Poulos. 16 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Why don't we take a 17 very brief, five-minute comfort break, then? 18 (Recess taken, 2:43 p.m. to 2:48 p.m.) COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I'll call this 19 20 special meeting of the New Mexico Public Education 21 Commission back into session. We just took a short 22 break. 23 The next item in our agenda is Item 4. 24 And I am going to go ahead and approach this in the 25 order in which they're listed on the agenda.



1 So the first school is La Promesa Early Learning Center. If a couple of you would come to 2 3 the table, please? 4 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Mr. Chair, this is -- Mr. Chair, this is Commissioner Toulouse. And 5 I'm going to recuse myself from this item. 6 7 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you, Commissioner Toulouse. So noted. 8 Just for a quick refresher for everyone 9 10 that may not remember -- it's been an entire week 11 now. One week ago today, this Commission, in split 12 votes, voted not to accept the performance 13 framework, as originally negotiated, between the 14 Public Education Commission and La Promesa Early 15 Learning Center. 16 I believe that vote was 4 to 3, if my 17 memory serves me correctly. We have two 18 Commissioners here today who were not here then, 19 Commissioner Carr and Commissioner Pogna. They are 20 here today. Commissioner Toulouse, as you've heard, 21 She recused herself a 22 has recused herself again. 23 week ago. 24 It was brought to our attention very 25 shortly after that meeting that both schools, at



that point, had chosen not to go forward with their allowed appeal and asked -- I'm not sure who they asked. I don't know if they approached the Charter School Division, or if they approached --

MS. BARNES: (Indicates.)

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: And I believe the question was, "What can we do to perhaps change this?"

And I was not a party to those discussions. It's my understanding that it was suggested to the schools that perhaps their course of action would be that they go back to their governing councils and see if their governing council wanted to change the academic performance indicators in their performance frameworks; because I believe, without talking to my fellow Commissioners, that seemed to be the concern, especially of those four Commissioners who voted against it, were that the numbers that we negotiated were too low.

Now, it's my understanding that La Promesa has not chosen to do that. But I will now turn it over to La Promesa to tell us what they would like to do.

Please identify yourselves for the





1 recorder, and then go ahead. MS. MATTHEWS: Good afternoon, members of 2 3 the Commission and Mr. Chair. My name is Patricia 4 Matthews. I'm of the firm Matthews Fox, and I'm here on behalf of La Promesa. 5 THE CHAIR: This is Commissioner Shearman. 7 I cannot hear. 8 MS. MATTHEWS: I'm speaking pretty loudly. 9 Are the microphones not working? 10 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: We're doing "New 11 Frontier" items. We've never done a session with 12 people on the phone before; so as with a lot of 13 things, we're learning as we go. 14 MS. MATTHEWS: Can you tell hear me now, 15 Mrs. Shearman? 16 THE CHAIR: Yes, I can. Thank you. 17 MS. MATTHEWS: I can hear you, as well. 18 Again, my name is Patricia Matthews; 19 again, I'm the attorney for La Promesa from the 20 Matthews Fox Law Firm. I want to get some clarification. 21 22 know if we know why we're here today or what the 23 intent of the Commission is. I would like to 24 clarify, for the Commissioners' benefit, that, in



fact, the charter school did not waive the right to

appeal, and we filed an appeal, as of Wednesday, asking the Secretary, under the provisions of 22-8B-9A, to finalize the contract.

And our request in our appeal was that she finalize the contract with the performance frameworks, as finally negotiated with the subcommittee of the charter school -- of the Public Education Commission.

So that is pending before the Secretary; so I don't know if that changes, Mr. Bergman, what you would like to hear from us today or not.

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you for telling me that, because I, of course, did not know that. Mr. Granata, does that take care of it? Are we through with -- if --

MR. GRANATA: Well, it's really up to the Commission, if they decide they want to -- well, I guess, Ms. Matthews, the school doesn't have anything further to offer, other than what was negotiated with the subcommittee; is that correct?

MS. MATTHEWS: Mr. Granata, members of the Commission, the problem -- and I think that

La Promesa and South Valley are effectively two different questions here. When I -- I did get a copy of the transcript. Thank you, Mrs. Chapman,





for getting that prepared very quickly for me to review that.

When I did -- because, unfortunately, I was not here, did not anticipate -- and, certainly, my client did not anticipate -- that the subcommittee's recommendation would be rejected. So when it was rejected, what I was looking for in the record was some sort of proposal or counterproposal by the Commission. And I think this is where the process has broken down.

If you will recall, in the statute, what it says is that the Commission negotiates the contract; not a subcommittee of the Commission.

Now, I understand logistically the problems with that. But either the Commission comes to a decision that they're going to delegate the authority to bind itself as to the goals that are presented to the Commission, or the Commission has to then either take it as a recommendation and then further negotiate.

If you look at the transcript of those proceedings, very clearly, Mrs. Shearman states on the record, "We will not further negotiate."

So what it did was leave the school with goals that were agreed to by it and the subcommittee





with no counterproposal.

1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with their governing body to discuss what had happened. But when they took it back, the governing body was at a loss. They had no indication from the Commissioners, as a whole, as to what they were supposed to do, or what -- what any expectations for a counterproposal would look like.

So it was sort of an act of futility to go back and say, "Well, let's just guess what we might propose to the Commission."

And so, Mr. Bergman and Ms. Armbruster, we negotiated very long and hard that morning. And I do want to make a point to the Commission, and as a whole, this charter was approved with goals and with measures for -- that were acceptable for accomplishing those goals. It was approved that way, and for -- the subcommittee took that to heart. The goals were negotiated -- or negotiated with data, based on data the school presented.

In fact, the application itself says that if you're a renewing charter, that what you are supposed to do is present goals and measures for those goals based on prior history and data of the school, which is exactly what La Promesa did and



what the Commission approved back in December. 1 So what we were negotiating were tweaking 2 3 those goals, getting them into numbers that you all 4 would agree to measure -- or you agreed to, at least 5 with some rigorousness that you felt comfortable with. But now we're at a loss at this point as to 6 7 what the Commission, as a whole, is willing to 8 accept. And so it's not as if we -- back to 9 10 Mr. Granata's point, we didn't intend to come here 11 and say we weren't willing to further negotiate; but 12 the concern is we didn't know what to negotiate. 13 And I would like to include Mrs. Poulos on 14 this, because I think she has some suggestions as 15 far as how to proceed with recommending goals going 16 forward, or not; is that correct? 17 MS. POULOS: You know, I think --COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I don't believe 18 19 this is the forum to have that discussion. 20 MS. MATTHEWS: I'm sorry, Mr. Bergman. 21 I'll just stop the comments there. 22 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: First, I'll say



thank you for your comments. I respectfully

disagree with some of your comments, of course.

and I have actually had that discussion. The group

23

24

that shows up to negotiate these contracts does not have any power to bind any other Commissioners on accepting those negotiations.

It is a face-to-face, good-faith effort to arrive at something that will then be presented to the whole Commission, and they will then decide; and so there's no guarantee that the Commission will go forward.

I was involved in that negotiation. And I told you at the time that those goals were low. I told you that it would be a very difficult job to sell the Commission on -- you may certainly remember that -- and that I would do my very best, which is what I did.

And -- however, the Commissioners that were present that day chose -- at least four of them -- chose not to follow my recommendation. And you're right. You are -- this was the first one that had been rejected, and there's been another one since, of course.

I'm not sure -- I kind of agree with you on that. Since you filed your appeal, I believe we probably have reached a point where you need to just go forward with your appeal.

I -- and you're right. No process is



1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

perfect, Ms. Matthews. No law coming out of the Legislature is perfect. There's always unintended side effects and everything. But I stand by the efforts that I've made on these negotiations. And I believe they were -- they were in good faith.

And as you said, we must have spent two hours working on those indicators all by themselves trying to arrive --

MS. MATTHEWS: With all due respect,
Mr. Bergman, I did not mean, at all, criticism to
you or to Ms. Armbruster at the meeting. My point
is that you make the recommendation; but from those
recommendations, if the Commission decided, as a
whole, to reject them, then it is incumbent on the
Commission, as a whole, to continue to negotiate or
at least make a counterproposal; otherwise, the law
hasn't been complied with.

The law says the Commission negotiates.

If you don't have the authority delegated, then the Commission must negotiate. And that is my point.

It has no disrespect on you or any of the Commissioners that voted that day. But my concern is that the law contemplates the body negotiating; and either the recommendations are put to the side and then you have further discussions with the



school about what is acceptable, and then if we 1 can't meet them, we have an impasse -- got it. 2 3 But what happened that day was, "We reject 4 the recommendations of the subcommittee; we're not talking further." 5 And that's the concern. 6 7 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Okay. Thank you 8 for those comments. Mr. Granata, did you have 9 something to say? 10 MR. GRANATA: Yes, Commissioner Bergman and Commissioners. I want to point out that the 11 12 Charter School Act does not require the PEC --13 THE CHAIR: I'm sorry. I cannot hear. 14 COMMISSIONER CARR: Move the microphone is 15 closer to you. 16 MR. GRANATA: Can you hear me, Chairman --17 or Chairwoman? Can you hear me now? 18 THE CHAIR: Yes, I can. Thank you. 19 MR. GRANATA: Okay. I just want to point 20 out that the Charter School Act doesn't require the 21 PEC to negotiate. It requires that -- Section 22 22-8B-9 states that, "The chartering authority shall 23 enter into a contract with the governing body of the 24 applicant charter school." 25 And so it doesn't require negotiations.



Obviously, it contemplates negotiations; but I 1 2 differ with Ms. Matthews' interpretation of the law. 3 MS. MATTHEWS: Mr. Granata, I refer you to 4 It very clearly states that the Commission is 5 required to negotiate in good faith. MS. BARNES: You're going to have to 6 7 repeat that on the phone. MS. MATTHEWS: If you look at Subsection 8 8, "Chartering authority shall negotiate and 9 10 execute, in good faith, charter contracts that meet 11 the requirements of the Charter Schools Act with 12 each approved charter." 13 MR. GRANATA: Okay. So there are two 14 sections of the law which kind of differ; but, 15 Ms. Matthews is correct, in that 5.3 does require 16 the PEC to negotiate; so there we are. 17 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: But even that says 18 "negotiate and execute." There's an "and" in there 19 between those two words. I'm not sure -- I guess if 20 there -- if I have a question, even though you filed 21 your appeal, I'm not saying we would renegotiate. 22 Do you have -- and what would be the



23

24

25



purpose of renegotiation? You were very firm that

higher. And to me, if we were to renegotiate, that

you weren't going to raise the indicators any

would be the only function that we would be 1 renegotiating about would be raising the indicators 2 3 to satisfy the Commissioners that thought they were 4 too low. 5 Your thoughts on that, Ms. Matthews? Mr. Bergman, I'm going to 6 MS. MATTHEWS: 7 let Dr. Maestas respond, because I think it's up to her to make a decision about whether or not they can 8 9 accept higher measures. 10 THE CHAIR: I'm sorry. I cannot hear. 11 Something is squealing. 12 This is Analee Maestas. DR. MAESTAS: And 13 I -- Commissioner Bergman and members of the 14 Commission, when we came to negotiate, we did look 15 at our data. We looked at all of the information 16 from all of the assessments that we had. We did 17 come to you in good faith, based on both the

We did negotiate with you. We did feel that that was a pretty rigorous goal that -- that you had recommended to us.

approved Program Improvement Plan, which indicated

that's exactly what we would do; we would take all

of our data and design our goals based around

those -- that information.

What I would say is that we would be



18

19

20

21

22

23

24

willing to negotiate over a period of time, and in 1 2 my conversation prior to the Commission meeting with 3 Katie, that that might be a possibility in terms of how we move forward. I don't think that we could meet those 5 6 goals in one year, based on the population that we do serve. As I indicated before, we do need the 8 9 AMOA 1 and 2, which means that they do gain English 10 Language Proficiency and basic intercommunication 11 But academic language takes much longer. skills. 12 And so if we were able to negotiate over a period of 13 time, then reaching those goals, I would say, yes, we would be able to do that. And we would be 14 15 willing to look at that on a yearly basis. 16 But I do feel, based on the population

But I do feel, based on the population that we serve, we have to give them sufficient time to learn that academic language in order for them to perform at that last academic level.

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you for that.

Comments?

Commissioner Carr?

COMMISSIONER CARR: Chair, members of the Commission, I wasn't -- unfortunately, I was very ill last Friday and could not attend.

SANTA FE OFFICE 119 East Marcy, Suite 110 Santa Fe, NM 87501 (505) 989-4949 FAX (505) 820-6349

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



MS. BARNES: Commissioners, can you hear
Commissioner Carr?

THE CHAIR: No, I can't.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER CARR: I can speak much louder. The -- and I've been frantically trying to get as much information as I could on exactly what happened with the negotiations.

I have my own philosophy -- you know, coming out of the negotiation here. I hate -- first of all, I'd like to say that I hate to see we're just going to shut this thing off, and we're just going to go to appeal; because that's not what negotiations are all about.

We're simply here at an impasse. And I think that -- and it sounds like you're willing to give, in the aspect that you're willing to relook at this maybe three months down the road, six months down the road, like we've done with many other schools.

I don't like low goals. I don't think anybody here likes low goals. My view on these negotiations is we already voted to approve you. The fact that unless you bring something up that's horrible -- I know probably, in the minds of at least -- what? -- four Commissioners who voted "no,"



that they thought the goals were too low. There must -- you know, and -- and, you know, maybe -- I tend -- maybe I tend to agree.

But like Commissioner Bergman said, he didn't think the goals were big enough; but he was willing to live with it and continue to look at it. And so am I.

I -- you know, unless you bring something up here, like in a negotiation, that's just totally crazy, illegal or, you know -- then -- 'cause then I'm going to go with it; because this is something you decide -- this is your school; this is something you're putting together.

I want you to do well. Everybody wants you to do well. And it doesn't mean six months down the road, that we can't take another look at this and say, "Hey, you know, your school is falling apart; we're going to have to do something here," or a year down the road.

Those things are not set in stone in that way. We don't have to wait five years to look at your school; right?

So I'd probably like to see the goals a little higher, too. But I think I'm with Commissioner Bergman, in that I'm willing -- I'm

SANTA FE OFFICE 119 East Marcy, Suite 110 Santa Fe, NM 87501 (505) 989-4949 FAX (505) 820-6349

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



looking at that, as you're giving -- even though we 1 didn't ask you for something; apparently, it sounds 2 3 like you're giving us something. And it sounds like you're giving us this, that -- that you're willing to take a look at this down the road and -- and look 5 at your numbers and Short Cycle Assessments and 7 things like that, and maybe adjust them, you know, 8 And that sounds like you're willing --9 willing to compromise a little. 10 I -- when we're dealing with negotiations, 11 you know, people have to -- you know, there has to 12 be a little give both ways, you know. But this is a 13 little bit of different -- you know, all 14 negotiations are a little bit different. 15 I want -- I would like for us to have 16 another vote today is what I would like. And -- and 17 if we still say "no," then I would like to see us go 18 back into negotiations, and -- instead of going, you 19 know, to a hearing. That's my wish, for whatever that's worth.

20

21 And I believe that's all I wanted to say.

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you, Commissioner Carr.

Let me note for the record that these performance frameworks are one-year documents.



22

23

24



will be talking to every school a year from now, as we then talk about their next year's performance framework. So that's -- they're promising that.

They're promising what they're already going to do, anyway. We're going to revisit it a year from now.

All these -- all these schools will be revisited.

I'm not sure I agree with renegotiating at this stage if they're not going to raise their indicators at this time, even though I supported them. But I think I need to ask -- I'm just curious. I think I will ask the Commissioners that voted against it at the last meeting, are any of you -- those four Commissioners -- because my suggestion would be if there was to be any renegotiation, that the four Commissioners that voted against it be the ones that renegotiate it, and that then we'll know whether they're satisfied or not with the indicators, because they will have negotiated them.

So, Commissioner Gipson?

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Well, I just have a question. Because there has been an appeal filed, I don't -- you know, I don't know whether we can have this discussion at this point in time to now agree to renegotiate.



1 I have no problem sitting on the 2 renegotiation committee, you know. I have no 3 problem with that, except there's been an appeal 4 filed. 5 So I don't -- you know --COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: 6 Let's ask. 7 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I'm unwilling at 8 this point in time to revote today, because there's 9 been nothing put forward; so my vote absolutely 10 would not change. 11 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Mr. Granata, should 12 we just cut it off right now, or just go -- you 13 would think with 21st Century technology that we 14 would have come a little further than this. 15 MR. GRANATA: Commissioner Bergman, 16 Commissioners, whenever there is an appeal filed, 17 the Secretary encourages the parties to try to work 18 things out. Even though the appeal has been filed, 19 negotiations would be proper. 20 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Okay. 21 MS. MATTHEWS: Mr. Granata, also --22 THE CHAIR: Mr. Chair, I have a question, 23 please. 24 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Hold on just a 25 second, Commissioner Shearman. Attorney Matthews



1 was speaking. 2

8

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. MATTHEWS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and 3 members of the Commission. I just -- I think it's -- and maybe for the benefit of the newer 5 Commissioners, and maybe overall, an understanding of what happened by voting against these two 7 frameworks. By that vote, you closed the school. And I'm not sure that that -- that the -- the 9 severity or -- that that came across. That is 10 exactly what happened.

11 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I understand what 12 went on.

MS. MATTHEWS: And then, therefore, the -there has been no due process to close this school. The school was entitled to full due process.

If you recall, the State says these negotiations are supposed to happen within 30 days of the date you vote. That would have been by roughly the end -- middle of January.

Now, I understand that the charters signed an extension; but that was sort of, "Take it or leave it." And we've always had the understanding that, you know, the appeal process would continue.

But we are so late into the game that this school is going to close. In fact, this school has





already suffered a loss of teachers because of the decision by this Commission last week.

And so I'm very concerned of the violation of due process that's been created by extending the negotiations out. And I'm happy that Commissioner Gipson was fully aware that she voted to close the school. And I hope that the other Commissioners understood the full weight of what they did that day.

But it's not -- it wasn't -- it seems to me to be a very Draconian result for two performance measures that you weren't satisfied with that you didn't provide a counter-proposal to.

So that's where the school is coming from. You know, it was extremely shocking and a surprise; although, we negotiated, and you cautioned the school about the strength of the goals. As I think we've articulated at the end of every negotiation, everybody was on the same page. And so there wasn't an indication that -- that these would be rejected.

And so I just -- I want -- I think it's fair for the Commissioners to hear where the school is coming from and their perspective on what's happened; because it was an absolute surprise for the Commission to do what it did that day.



1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you, 2 Counselor Matthews, for those comments. Now, I 3 am -- upon what do you base the assertion that we closed the school? My understanding is we declared 5 an impasse, and that automatically is appealed to the Secretary. And then the Secretary rules, and she either sides with us, and then we would -- tell 8 us to renegotiate, or she would side with the school. 9 10 I'm -- I'm not aware -- what provision are you basing on the fact that we closed the school? 11 12 Because I certainly didn't know I was closing the 13 school. 14

MS. MATTHEWS: I'm happy to clarify,
Mr. Bergman. Members of the Commission, if you look
at 22-8B-9, and it says, "Failure to enter into a
charter or appeal to the Secretary, pursuant to this
section," precludes the chartering authority from
chartering the school.

So hypothetically, if the Secretary were not to finalize the contract in time -- and remember, we're at May 22nd, and there is no time line in this statute, unfortunately. As Mr. Granata can tell you, there's no time line by which she has to rule; so we're in a position of as of July 1,



15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

this school could close.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And so it's not perfect, as you already articulated. This statute is far from perfect. But you have -- we have a conundrum here. The school will have to close if we have no decision by the Secretary. And the decision of this Commission stands as of your decision on the 15th, come July.

also. You simply mentioned that 30-day thing. We have asked the Legislature to change that. There is absolutely no way on this earth that this Commission could have negotiated 25 contracts over the Christmas and New Year's holidays and done a credible job. So, yes, we ask schools to waive that.

We've asked the Legislature to change it, and you notice they have not changed it. We live with what the Legislature gives us, and then we live with what the real world gives us, and that's that we have to extend these out over a period of four months.

And I can tell you right now, I'm exhausted. I just finished the process yesterday.

I go to all of them, or just about all of them. And frankly, I'm exhausted.



1 MS. MATTHEWS: Mr. Bergman, I wholly 2 appreciate what you've done. 3 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I understand you're 4 not attacking me, personally. We do the very best we can with what the Legislature and the Charter 5 School Act has given us. 6 Now, there's something else been thrown 8 into the mix. We apparently have closed a school that we didn't think we were closing -- or two 9 10 schools. So now, I really have to ask legal 11 counsel -- in that case, I tend to agree with 12 Commissioner Carr, that even though -- but I don't 13 know what we can talk about, because they're not 14 willing to raise the numbers. 15 So, here again, I'm going to ask those 16 that voted against it. 17 COMMISSIONER CARR: Carolyn wants to say 18 something. 19 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Just a second, 20 Mr. Granata. MR. GRANATA: Okay. So I just wanted 21 22 to -- Commissioner Bergman, Commissioners, I want to 23 address just a few issues to hopefully try to 24 clarify some points of law and procedure in this 25 matter.



I agree with Ms. Matthews that this section of the statute could definitely need some help. And I understand the school's perspective regarding the time lines.

I believe that the statute allows for due process to occur once the school has filed their appeal. And obviously, Ms. Matthews has concerns with the time lines. I think she can file motions in the district court, like she has in the past, in order to expedite that process, if the Department isn't acting quickly enough.

I think one possible resolution for today is for the PEC to look at the contract itself and approve the contract and just leave the performance framework for future negotiations.

As the law currently stands -- this is until the new law takes effect -- the performance framework currently is not a material term; and as such, 22-8B-9.1 states -- Subsection B -- "Annual performance targets shall be set by each chartering authority in consultations with charter schools."

And to me, that's different than a negotiation. That's the PEC's determining what those performance targets are. Obviously,

Ms. Matthews might differ; but I think the





1 resolution would be to approve the contract itself today and leave those performance frameworks for 2 3 future negotiations. 4 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Mr. Granata, thank 5 you for that. Let me ask you this question: Since I don't believe the organizational part of the framework and the financial part of the framework are in question, would we want to leave them in 8 9 there? Because those provide certain safequards. 10 And then just leave the academic performance framework part of it out for future -- however you'd 11 12 want to word it? 13 Or would you want us to leave all of those 14 frameworks? 15 Remember, there's three different 16 frameworks. 17 MR. GRANATA: Commissioner Bergman, 18 Commissioners, I would suggest approving everything 19 that the parties have agreed to; so the parts that 20 are not agreed to, this academic component would be 21 left out of the agreement. 22 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you for that. 23 Commissioner Shearman, I know you've been 24 patiently waiting to speak. Go ahead, please. 25 where do you stand on this? And would you be



willing to sit down with this school, if a convenient time could be found in the very near future, hopefully, to again look at those academic parts?

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner

Bergman. Without a doubt, of course, I'd be willing to sit down with the school and come up with those academic indicators. I just -- before I ask my question, which may have already been answered, it is my recollection that during the meeting, what we asked the school to do was to go back to its governing council and work with the governing council to bring those numbers up on its indicators.

And certainly, my intention was, I thought those numbers allowed way too many students to be in the failing range and the school fail to meet standards.

But that was just my concern. And I thought we were clear enough when we said, "Go back to your governance council and bring us what -- a counter-proposal," and I thought that's what negotiations did.

So if I was mistaken in my knowledge of -of negotiations, then I apologize. But I thought
counter-proposals, in negotiations, were perfectly





acceptable, and everybody knew what that meant.

At the time we are now, the question I want to ask -- I heard one of the representatives from the school, and I'm not exactly sure which one it was -- say, "over time, develop new indicators or new numbers for those indicators."

Whoever said that, could you please clarify for me what you mean by "over" --

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Please identify yourself for Commissioner Shearman, and then --

DR. MAESTAS: Absolutely. This is Analee Maestas. I'm the executive director of the school. And my comment was about the goals over the

five-year period of time, that we would continue to look at performance every year and improve -- and increase the goals, as we increase the proficiency levels of our students.

And that was my statement. And it was based on a conversation, prior to our meeting, with Katie that that might be a possibility.

I would also like to just take a few minutes, if the Commission would allow me, to show you the type of student that we do serve; because I think that would give you a clearer picture of what we're talking about. If you would allow me about



1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

five minutes?

1

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: If you would please be brief, but, yes, go ahead.

DR. MAESTAS: Thank you. I know it's sometimes difficult to imagine the type of student that we are serving. And I think this would be very useful to you.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Hold on. That screen should drop down.

THE CHAIR: Mr. Chair, if I might, while Dr. Maestas is getting ready for a presentation, I would just ask, is the Commission considering renegotiation with the school in the very near future? Or is Dr. Maestas' comment, "over five years" -- is the school proposing to put off these negotiations for quite a length of time, or are we talking about renegotiation -- a complete contract for this coming school year?

MS. MATTHEWS: Mr. Bergman, members of the Commission, I think Mr. Granata had a terrific suggestion. And Mrs. Shearman -- or Commissioner Shearman -- I think what we probably could do today is vote to approve the contract, the organizational and financial frameworks, and then set a deadline for finalizing the academic performance framework,



if that makes sense.

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: That's an excellent suggestion. I know you want us to understand the school; but I think we're getting to the same point here, if you'll just let me proceed.

Let me ask the other Commissioners that voted against it, because I think I'm going to put your feet to the fire, like I say. I want you to be the ones, when it does happen, whenever it happens, that you are the guys that need to sit down with this school.

So, Commissioner Peralta, I believe you voted against it. What are your thoughts?

COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Well, I think the school and legal counsel has made their decision to go with the appeal. And so my feelings are is let the appeal take its course, and I'm willing to hear what the Secretary of Education has to say about it.

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Gipson, do I remember you voting against it?

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: But I've already stated that I'm more than willing to sit down and negotiate; so that's fine by me.

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: There's two, so





far. 1 Commissioner Chavez, I believe you were 2 3 the fourth who voted against it? Are you willing to 4 ao --COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: I have a concern. 5 6 You know, basically, I don't have a sense that --7 you know, I don't have a sense that the school is 8 willing to change what was presented and what was 9 negotiated in the subcommittee; so unless I have a 10 commitment that that's going to be the case, then I 11 am -- you know, I'm with Commissioner Peralta. 12 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you for that. 13 We've heard -- two of those Commissioners would be 14 willing to sit down, and that could be done. We've 15 had sessions with only two. I have to say I was not 16 aware --17 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: You've got 18 Commissioner Shearman. 19 COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Mr. Chair? 20 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Carolyn also voted 21 "No." 22 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: She already said 23 she'd be willing to sit down. Is that Commissioner 24 Peralta? Go ahead. 25 COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Right. I believe



1 you had the count wrong. I am not willing to negotiate. I'm willing for the appeal -- I'm 2 3 willing for the appeal to take its course. 4 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Okay. But if there 5 was a negotiation, would you be in favor of sitting in on it? 6 COMMISSIONER PERALTA: No. I concur with 8 Commissioner Chavez. 9 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Okay. All right. Well, I don't believe it was the intent of this 10 11 Commission, when that vote was taken, was to shut 12 the school down; it certainly wasn't my intent. So 13 I am totally surprised by that aspect. 14 I actually concur with Mr. Granata's 15 advice and Ms. Matthews' advice. I believe this 16 Commission needs to, at this point, vote -- have a 17 revote on the contract. And the -- and the 18 framework has three parts. I don't believe there's 19 any dispute on the financial part of it. I see 20 Counselor Matthews shaking her head "no." MS. MATTHEWS: Just for the record, that's 21 22 correct, Mr. Bergman. 23 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: And I don't believe 24 the school had a problem with the organizational 25 part of the framework.



1	MS. MATTHEWS: That's correct,
2	Mr. Bergman. There were two conditions on this
3	charter, and I believe they've already complied with
4	the improvement plan and prepared one; so that would
5	be part of the organizational framework, which we
6	concur would be acceptable.
7	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: If we included
8	those two parts in the contract and just left the
9	academic part out for future discussion, would that
10	be amenable to the school?
11	DR. MAESTAS: Yes, absolutely.
12	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Is that amenable to
13	all the Commissioners that can hear me?
14	Commissioner Chavez?
15	COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Yeah. I have a
16	question. I'll wait till you
17	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: You didn't know you
18	were going to get a workout today, did you?
19	COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: So my question is,
20	if we were to vote on the on the rest of the
21	contract, what guarantee do we have that we're going
22	to come to an agreement in terms of the performance?
23	Are we going to continue to just beat around the
2 4	bush on this one? What, basically what,
25	basically, would, you know, move the parties to an



agreement?

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: That's an excellent question. Before I ask Mr. Granata that question -- well, I -- there is no guarantee, one, unfortunately. But I lost my train of thought there.

So, Mr. Granata, what do you think about that question?

MR. GRANATA: Commissioner Bergman,
Commissioners, under the Charter School Act, it
requires the parties to negotiate in good faith. So
I'm assuming that the parties would agree to
negotiate in good faith. And I think that
Ms. Matthews' suggestion of putting a deadline on
this negotiation for that one component of the
framework would kind of make sure that if there is
an impasse, then that one particular part can be
appealed to the Secretary for finality.

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Is that how you would see it, then? Either -- if they don't agree, and we don't agree, the group that meets with them, then we are essentially saying that they would then appeal that to the Secretary, and it would be up to the Secretary to tell either them or us that we've got to do something further?





MR. GRANATA: Commissioner Bergman, that is correct. And perhaps if the Commission ultimately decides to take this course that I've suggested, then maybe Ms. Matthews could simply just amend her Notice of Appeal to kind of reflect today's decision. I'm not sure if that would be proper, or --

MS. MATTHEWS: I'd be more than happy to withdraw the appeal. I think that it's not going to be ripe for appeal if we approve the contract, the two frameworks, and then set a deadline to finally negotiate the academic performance framework.

Then I agree with Mr. Granata. Then if we reach an impasse on that one particular performance framework, that then it goes to the Secretary. And I feel much more comfortable about the time frame and the situation the school will be in at that point in time.

So I think that is the correct way to proceed.

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you for those comments. And I would appreciate that, because I'm just speaking for myself now, not anybody else on the Commission. As a good-faith effort on you guys' part, I would like to see you, perhaps, if we did a



1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

revote, go ahead and -- so that appeal is not hanging over our head while we're renegotiating.

MS. MATTHEWS: Mr. Chair Bergman -Chairperson Bergman and members of the Commission,
absolutely. We would -- we would -- if we had a
vote today to approve the contract, then the school
is moving forward. They can open. There's no
hiccup here.

And then -- and absolutely, we would agree to withdraw the appeal, and then let this process take its -- take its course.

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you for that. Now I'm back to I'm going to ask the folks on the phone first.

Commissioner Shearman, are you in favor of what we have discussed? What I'm contemplating would be a motion that would approve the contract and the organizational and financial frameworks for the 2015 and 2016 school year, with the provision that then the school and the PEC would then enter into a renegotiation on the academic part of the performance framework, to be concluded within a reasonable amount of time, not drawn out over some huge amount of time, that if it doesn't -- probably, hopefully, fairly quickly, would be my suggestion.



1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 Would you be agreeable to that, 2 Commissioner Shearman? 3 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Chair Bergman. 4 I would be agreeable to that, as long as the date 5 for the parameters for renegotiation would be part of the motion to establish the renegotiation. 7 want that to be very clear that we're going to do that soon, and make sure that all parties are in 8 9 agreement to that, that stipulated part of the 10 agreement. 11 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Then I believe we 12 have to establish a date at this moment. 13 and Commissioner Gipson have agreed to be a part of 14 this renegotiation. Throw a date out, and let's see 15 if the school can comply with that date. 16 THE CHAIR: Mr. Chair, how about the 17 morning of June 18th? 18 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Okay. We're 19 already meeting on another matter, as you well know; 20 you were sitting in the audience. How about the 21 morning of June the 18th? Would that be amenable to 22 the school? 23 DR. MAESTAS: That's fine. 24 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: The school said 25 they are amenable to that date. Is that the date



```
1
     you propose? Would it be 8:30 in the morning on
 2
     June the 18th?
 3
               THE CHAIR: Would you please check with
 4
     Commissioner Gipson and see if that would work with
     her?
 5
               COMMISSIONER GIPSON: That's fine.
 6
 7
               THE CHAIR: Commissioner Gipson says,
     "That's fine."
 8
 9
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Would you check,
10
     please, with anyone else that would like to be part
11
     of that negotiation?
12
               Anyone that voted for that contract, if
13
     you would like to sit in on that negotiation?
14
               COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: We haven't voted.
15
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Would you like to
16
     sit in, Commissioner Armbruster?
17
               COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER:
                                          (Indicates.)
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner
18
     Armbruster has indicated she would like to sit in on
19
20
     that negotiation.
21
               Are there any other Commissioners that
22
     would like to sit in?
23
               COMMISSIONER CARR: I would like to sit
24
     in.
25
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner Carr
```





has indicated he would like to sit in. 1 2 That is four. We have always stood by 3 four is the maximum number for us to be present. Wе don't want to overwhelm the process. So there are now four Commissioners committed to that; 5 Commissioner Shearman, Commissioner Gipson, 7 Commissioner Carr, and Commissioner Armbruster. Now we will deal with that. Now we need a 8 9 motion, and I will be happy to make the motion 10 myself, and I will need a second. Is there any 11 other --12 COMMISSIONER CARR: He's making up a 13 motion for us. 14 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Mr. Granata is 15 making up a motion. As soon as he's done with that, 16 I will make a motion, because I'll repeat it for the 17 record again. It was certainly not my intent to 18 shut any of these schools down. That's called "revocation." That's not what we were voting on. 19 20 MS. MATTHEWS: Mr. Bergman -- if I may, and members of the -- Mr. Chair? Mr. Chair --21 22 sorry -- members of the Commission, I just want to 23 clarify. When you were articulating for 24 Ms. Shearman what we were suggesting, you said a 25 one-year contract. I think you meant one-year



1	annual performance; because it's a five-year
2	contract.
3	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Yeah, the contract
4	is for five years; it's the frameworks that have
5	the we'll have to get that wording down precise.
6	We all understand, whether that's what I said or
7	not. The contract is a five-year document; the
8	performance framework is our annual document for
9	each school year.
10	Pardon me while I read this. Just a
11	second, please.
12	THE CHAIR: Commissioner Bergman?
13	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Yes.
14	THE CHAIR: This is Commissioner Shearman.
15	I think perhaps we should ask if Julia
16	Barnes is available on the morning of June the 18th
17	as our facilitator.
18	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Are you available?
19	MS. BARNES: (Indicates.)
20	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Is CSD will you
21	have someone at that meeting on the morning of June
22	the 18th?
23	MS. POULOS: We will have somebody there.
24	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you. So CSD
25	is all in; Julia is all in. I think we're all



1 all-in right now. 2 All right. I have a motion here. 3 sounds pretty good to me. I'm going to -- it doesn't mention the contract. We need a sentence 4 5 about the contract, about it being a -- that the contract is for the term of the charter, and then 6 7 the frameworks are for up to one year. 8 (Vice Chair consults with PEC counsel.) COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: He left blank the 9 10 date of the renegotiation. Since you're going to 11 renegotiate on the 18th, would June the 19th be an 12 appropriate date to all parties? 13 THE CHAIR: I'm sorry? 14 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I'm lost there. 15 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: We're going to put a date on the limitation on the renegotiation, 16 17 Commissioner Shearman. Would June the 19th, which 18 is the day after your negotiation -- that will allow 19 for a really long-winded negotiation, if that's what 20 comes down to. 21 COMMISSIONER CARR: We're meeting on the 22 19th. 23 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: That's when the 24 time limit ends --25 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So we have to be



1 done.

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: -- for our June the 3 19th meeting.

MS. MATTHEWS: Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, just because we've done this sort of uniformly with other schools, is it the intent of the Commission to vote on -- at your meeting on the 19th? Because this charter then needs to be taken back to their counsel. So I'm just trying to view logistically. I mean --

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: To accommodate everything, if it's done on the 18th and get everybody on board in 24 hours, with all the signatures and --

MS. MATTHEWS: I think -- if I may,
Chair, members of the Commission, since you're
voting to approve the contract, and we're not going
to have a hiccup as far as opening the school, we
could -- the vote on the annual performance
framework for the academic piece could be in your
July or August meeting. We will have reached an
agreement by then.

Then the school can go back, have its board meeting and then bring you back a finalized.

And then it won't be such a crunch, and I know you



```
1
     have a very busy schedule.
 2
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Is there any legal
 3
     objection?
                 July, of course, is in a new fiscal
 4
     year. We don't work on fiscal years; but the -- do
 5
     you see any reason why we couldn't approve it in
     July?
 6
 7
               MR. GRANATA:
                             No.
 8
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: There's no legal --
 9
     all right, then. Yeah, we wouldn't have to
10
     necessarily do in June then. We could do it -- so
11
     are we all in agreement at this point that the
12
     deadline -- for some reason, you all seem to have
13
     trouble with the June 19th. So should I set
14
     June 18th as the deadline?
15
               COMMISSIONER GIPSON: No, because we have
16
     to be done by the 18th, and we're not doing it until
17
     the 18th.
18
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: That's why I said
19
     the 19th.
                That seemed to confuse everybody.
20
     June 19th, then. Is everyone amenable to having the
     deadline be June 19th? I'm not hearing any voices
21
22
     on the phone.
23
               MS. BARNES: I think Ms. Matthews was
24
     talking about extending it out to July.
25
               MS. MATTHEWS: No, I think we're --
```



1 we're -- it's acceptable to have the negotiation completed by the 19th, but that the vote by the 2 3 Commission on the academic performance framework will not occur until your next board meeting. COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I believe that's 5 6 what we all understand, yes. 7 MS. MATTHEWS: That's not what --8 MS. BARNES: I was mixed up. 9 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Once again, I'll 10 ask the folks on the phone. Commissioner Shearman, 11 are you agreeable to that? 12 THE CHAIR: Let me be sure I understood 13 I believe what I heard Ms. Matthews say is that 14 the negotiations would take place on June the 18th. 15 Then the deadline for the Commission to approve it -- or the Commission would have it on its agenda 16 17 for the August meeting, or --18 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: July. 19 THE CHAIR: (Inaudible); is that correct? 20 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: July. 21 THE CHAIR: Okay. So we do the 22 renegotiation on June the 18th. Then the item is on 23 the agenda for the June meeting; is that correct, which is June the 19th. 24 25 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Not on June the



```
1
     19th. We can't have all the signatures. The vote
     would take place on -- we do have a meeting in July.
 2
 3
     I don't know what the date is right now. But it
 4
     would be at the July meeting when the actual vote
 5
     would take place.
               THE CHAIR: All right. So it's the July
 6
 7
    meeting; and I believe that's July the 17th, also.
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Whatever that is,
 8
 9
     yeah.
10
               THE CHAIR:
                           Okay.
11
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: So are you on board
12
     with that?
13
               THE CHAIR: Pardon me?
14
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner
15
     Shearman, are you agreeable to that?
16
               THE CHAIR: Yes, I am.
17
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN:
                                      Commissioner
     Peralta, are you agreeable to that? I know where
18
19
     you stand, but...
20
               COMMISSIONER PERALTA: No, I agree.
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner
21
22
     Toulouse?
23
               COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Mr. Chair, since
24
     after this evening, I no longer have to recuse
25
     myself on this school, I'm just fine with that, with
```



Ι

1	the
2	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I keep forgetting
3	you're recusing.
4	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I'm recused from
5	this vote after tonight. So in July, I can vote on
6	it.
7	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Like I say,
8	Commissioner Toulouse has relatives in about half
9	the charter schools in this state, it seems like.
10	say that in jest, Commissioner Toulouse.
11	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Mr. Chair, it may
12	be true. I haven't counted.
13	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you. I know
14	we're not voting yet. Are we pretty much on board
15	with where we're going to go from this point
16	forward?
17	I just want to be sure. I don't want
18	another surprise. And surprises are sometimes fun,
19	and sometimes they're not. This one turned out to
20	be not.
21	All right.
22	COMMISSIONER CARR: I call the question,
23	sir.
24	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: All right. Fine.
25	I am going to read a motion here. It has been



1 proposed by our counsel, Mr. Granata. 2 I, Vince Bergman, move that the Public 3 Education Commission approve the performance contract for a five-year term, and also approve, at 5 this time, the financial and organizational performance frameworks, which are for a one-year 6 term, at -- for the La Promesa Early Learning 8 Center, as presented at the regular May PEC meeting, 9 with the understanding that the parties will, in 10 good faith, negotiate on the academic component of 11 the performance framework. The renegotiation will 12 conclude by the end of June the 18th, with an 13 understanding that if the parties cannot come to an 14 agreement during negotiations, the school, or the 15 Public Education Commission, may appeal to the 16 Secretary, pursuant to Section 22-8B-9. That's -- I'll stop there. 17 18 Mr. Granata is writing furiously; so I want to see 19 what he's writing. No? That's okay? 20 COMMISSIONER CARR: I'll second it. 21 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: All right. I have 22 made a motion that you just heard. The motion has 23 been seconded by Commissioner Carr. 24 Is there any further discussion? 25 On the phone, is there any further



1	discussion?
2	THE CHAIR: Commissioner Shearman, no.
3	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
4	Peralta, no.
5	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: And I believe
6	Commissioner Toulouse is "no."
7	All right. We have a motion before this
8	Commission; we have a second. We have I believe
9	we're at the point where we can take a vote.
10	Commissioner Peralta, would you have a
11	roll-call vote, please?
12	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Okay. Commissioner
13	Toulouse abstains.
14	Commissioner Armbruster?
15	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yes.
16	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Pogna?
17	COMMISSIONER POGNA: Yes.
18	THE CHAIR: What was the vote, please?
19	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner Pogna
20	voted "Yes."
21	THE CHAIR: Thank you.
22	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
23	Gipson?
2 4	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes.
25	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner



1	Shearman?
2	THE CHAIR: Yes.
3	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Carr?
4	COMMISSIONER CARR: Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
6	Peralta votes "Yes."
7	Commissioner Conyers?
8	COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Yes.
9	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
10	Chavez?
11	COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Yes.
12	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
13	Bergman?
14	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner
15	Bergman votes "Yes."
16	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Mr. Chair, that is
17	a 9-to-0 vote in favor, one abstention, that is in
18	favor of the motion.
19	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you,
20	Commissioner Peralta. I will just note for the
21	record, this Commission has shown that we are not
22	unreasonable people, that we are willing to do what
23	is necessary when things come to our attention. And
2 4	sometimes things come to our attention that we
2.5	didn't know at the time



And I believe it's important that folks 1 2 understand that we are a reasonable group of people 3 and will listen to rational and reasonable arguments. 5 Thank you, again. Thank you to the I'll look forward to hearing that that 6 7 appeal has been withdrawn, and we will go forward. 8 And I hope you guys can come to some reasonable agreement on the academic performance. 9 10 Thank you. 11 DR. MAESTAS: Thank you. 12 MS. MATTHEWS: Mr. Chair, members of the 13 Commission, thank you very much. 14 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you. Now, we 15 still have one more to go through. Do we need a 16 break, or do we want to get going so we can all get 17 on the road? I hear, "Let's keep going." 18 So I would 19 call South Valley Prep to the table, please. 20 (A discussion was held off the record.) 21 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: All right. 22 ready to go forward. Before we start this one, we 23 now have information that we didn't have before. 24 And so I'm going to state from the very outset that 25 I believe this Commission needs to take the same



```
1
     steps with this school that we just took with the
 2
     previous school, that there was certainly no intent
 3
     for anybody to be put out of business; and so we
     need to rectify that, if we don't rectify anything
 5
     else today.
               So that's where we're going to start the
 7
     discussion.
                  In just a second, Julia has something
              Now, this school did choose to come back
 8
 9
     with a little bit of improvement on their
10
     indicators. And that's what I'm going to ask Julia.
11
     I believe she's --
12
               MS. BARNES: I think Commissioner Shearman
13
     had something to say.
14
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner
15
     Shearman, did you have something to say?
16
               COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE:
                                       It was
17
     Commissioner Toulouse.
18
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN:
                                      Okay. Go ahead.
19
               COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I just wanted to
20
     say, at the beginning of this, I drove home angry
21
     last Friday because I felt we had just closed two
22
     schools.
23
               And I want to say I don't think that was
24
     anybody's intent; but that's how I read the law.
25
               And I want to say I appreciate everybody
```



1 now looking at this again; because it was very 2 hurtful to think we would have done something like 3 that. And I'm very glad we're rectifying it. want to reiterate my support of this school coming 5 Thank you. up. COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: 6 Thank you, 7 Commissioner Toulouse. I'm going to call on Julia 8 She's going to start the discussion here. 9 Thank you, Julia. 10 MS. BARNES: Thank you. So I just want to explain the documents. And I -- we -- the same 11 12 request went out to South Valley. 13 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: They're not in your 14 They were what was handed out by Julia. book. 15 COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Got it. 16 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: These are new 17 documents. MS. BARNES: They were e-mailed out to 18 19 So I think all the people on the phone have 20 them, as well. There was the same request sent out to the 21 22 school to go to their board and come back with an

The one thing that I want to identify is

alternative set of indicators. And the school did



that.

23

the colored document is the new indicator. And what is in red is what is changed. So on Indicator 1 -- and Charlotte can add if I've gotten something wrong -- the school -- previously, the indicator was for two grades, seventh and eighth. Their board, and as they have provided us all the paperwork, have added that their board has approved it. They have added sixth grade to the indicator.

In the standards, the "Exceeds" category now reads at 65 percent; it was previously at 62.

The "Meets" standard was previously at 55 to 61 percent; the school has increased those percentages to 62 to 64 percent on reading, and changed it so that the students must make more than one full year's of growth or test proficient.

The same thing on "Does not meet the standard." They raised it from 44 to 54 percent, to now reading 51 to 61 percent; again, they put in the same, "more than one full year's growth."

And then "Falls far below" is 50 percent or less. It was 44 in the previous indicator that was rejected; and again, they changed it to "more than one year's growth."

On the Math Short Cycle, they did the exact same thing, added sixth grade, 65 -- it's



9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

exactly the same percentages, math and reading. So 65 percent, when it was 56. The "Meets" standard is 62 to 64 percent, and it's more than one year's growth. In the previous draft, that had been 50 to 55 percent. So there's a bigger increase in what they're proposing on math and on reading.

The "Does not meet" standards, 51 to 61 percent, and more than one year's growth; and at 50 percent or less would be "Falls far below."

The social emotional learning goal, I believe, is unchanged; but I do not believe there was a dispute about that. So I don't think that there was a request to change that.

So that's just my presentation in terms of what the school has presented. Again, I'll just reiterate that they've provided us with all the documentation that their board has approved that.

Ms. Barnes. I think we then -- on this situation, before we invest a lot of time in this, is we have two options here now. We can go ahead, and if the ones that voted against this school a week ago are satisfied with these new proposed indicators, we could just go forward and make the vote to include all the contract and all the frameworks; or the



1

2

3

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

second option would be if those of you that voted 1 against it a week ago still are not satisfied with 2 3 these thresholds, which are an improvement -perhaps not a large improvement, but some of the wording has been changed. And the sixth grade has 5 been added, and I believe that should have met some 7 of the objections. 8 So I'm going to take a survey here. I'll -- once again, I'll start with the four 9 10 Commissioners that voted against it a week ago. 11 Commissioner Shearman, what are your 12 thoughts? 13

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Chair. First of all, I want to thank the school for doing exactly what the Commission asked it to do. We asked you to go back to your governing council.

(A discussion was held off the record.)

This is Commissioner Shearman. I, first of all, want to thank the school for doing exactly what the school asked it to do, and that was to go back to the governing council, look at those numbers and come back with a counterproposal that brought us more realistic numbers.

And I am particularly speaking to the 50 percent mark. Prior to this, 50 percent, or



14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

right at it, of students could not meet the
indicators, could not make a full year's academic
growth, and the school could still meet the
standard. That was my biggest objection to these
indicators that were presented, both from this
school and the prior school.

So I thank the school very much for doing exactly what we asked, and for doing a reasonable, thoughtful job of it, and bringing us back something that I would be happy to make the motion to approve these academic indicators, as they have been presented, to approve the performance framework containing these new indicators, and the subsequent contract for this school for the 2015-2016 academic year.

16 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you,
17 Commissioner Shearman, for those remarks.

Commissioner Peralta, your thoughts,

please?

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Mr. Chair, thank

you. I would also agree with Commissioner Shearman.

I also do want to thank the school for making the

extra effort in coming back with something that I

think is presentable and agreeable to my terms. And

so I do vote to change my vote to a "yes."

PROFESSIONAL COURT REPORTING SERVICE



1	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner
2	Gipson?
3	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I will reiterate the
4	same thing.
5	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner
6	Chavez, I believe you were
7	COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Yeah. And I want to
8	say I also want to thank the school. Appreciate it
9	very much, you guys going back and, you know, having
10	the conversation with your board and, you know,
11	bringing some criteria, some standards that I feel
12	more comfortable with.
13	I have a question.
14	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Ask it.
15	COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: So basically my
16	question is, you know, are you how are you going
17	to and I'm sure that you've already thought about
18	it in terms of meeting the goals that you've set.
19	How are you guys going to do that?
20	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Before you answer
21	it, go ahead and identify yourselves because I
22	hadn't gotten to that point yet for the recorder,
23	please.
2 4	MS. TRUJILLO: Commissioner Chavez, my
25	name is Charlotte Trujillo. I'm the principal at



South Valley Preparatory School.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We have given a lot of thought -- you know, at the time that -- last Friday, when we talked about it, and at the time of negotiation when we set the original goals, we did look at the data that we had. Since then, we finished testing, and we have had some initial look at where our kids are at.

I think that in the improvement plan and the thing that we have had in place over this last year, we have seen some significant growth.

Do I think that every grade level is going to hit that mark? I hope so. And we're really close, particularly our eighth-graders. They have already hit that mark.

Our seventh-graders are not far behind.

It's our sixth-graders that always struggle and have to make the biggest growth. But I wouldn't say that they can't do it. I think they're close, and I think that the interventions that we've put in place, the after-school programming, the universal RTI class that we have in -- during the day, and just the dedication of the teachers to implement math in whatever subject they're teaching, has made a huge difference, particularly this year.



1	So I think, just continuing what we have
2	in place and adding to it, what we know is working.
3	I know that one thing that we have been doing for
4	the last two years, and we're we see our greatest
5	growth, is with our eighth-graders, is having that
6	additional math class with the algebra lab year.
7	That seems to be something that's extremely
8	successful for our kids and makes a huge difference
9	when they get to eighth grade and they're trying to
10	learn those concepts. So it's supporting them very
11	well.
12	And so probably increasing the amount of
13	algebra lab that we're giving in sixth and seventh
14	grade, so we can get them there faster.
15	COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Thank you.
16	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you,
17	Commissioner Chavez.
18	All right. Well, then, I believe we can
19	cut to the chase here. And I believe I
20	believe I think we can vote to accept this
21	contract, including all of the all three of the
22	performance frameworks.
23	But hold on a sec.
24	Commissioner Armbruster?
25	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I agree with



```
But I think Cindy needed Susan Fox to identify
 1
 2
     herself for the record. Am I correct or not?
 3
               MS. FOX:
                         Sure. I'm Susan Fox.
                                                For the
 4
     benefit of the Commissioners on the phone, I'm
     sitting here, as well; but I haven't had to say
 5
 6
     anything. So I've been quiet.
 7
               COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Do you work at the
 8
     school?
               MS. FOX: I am the school's legal counsel.
 9
10
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: She's partner with
11
    Ms. Matthews. They double-team us sometimes.
12
               MS. FOX: Patti did the heavy lifting
13
     today.
14
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: All right.
                                                  Then I
15
    believe -- is there any discussion? Are we pretty
16
    much on board on how we want to proceed with this?
17
               We make a motion that we approve this
     contract for the term of the charter?
18
               COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: This is
19
20
     Commissioner Toulouse. I believe that Commissioner
21
     Shearman has already made a motion, and I would be
22
     very glad to second it.
23
               COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yeah, she did make
24
     the motion.
25
               THE CHAIR: This is Commissioner Shearman.
```



1	I did make the motion.
2	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Was that an
3	adequate motion, then? Counsel Granata is shaking
4	his head "no."
5	MR. GRANATA: Commissioner Shearman, would
6	you go ahead and make your motion?
7	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: She stated it,
8	Mr. Granata. This is Carmie Toulouse. I will make
9	a motion you might want to have Ms. Chapman read it
LO	back.
L1	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Or Commissioner
L 2	Shearman could just repeat it for simplicity.
L 3	THE CHAIR: All right. I'll be glad to.
L 4	I move (The Chair cannot be heard.)
L 5	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Say it again,
L 6	Carolyn.
L 7	THE CHAIR: Okay. I think something is
L 8	moving. And certainly, it makes it where I can't
L 9	hear. So
20	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: You're good now.
21	Go.
22	THE CHAIR: Okay. I move that the Public
23	Education Commission accept the new indicators, as
2 4	proposed by South Valley Preparatory School, that



they be included in the performance framework, and

1	that the Commission approve the performance
2	frameworks and the contract for the 2015-2016
3	academic year.
4	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Carolyn, the way
5	you worded that, you put the contract in there. The
6	contract is a five-year contract; the frameworks are
7	one year. You need wording there that separates the
8	contract, that it's good for the term of the
9	charter.
10	THE CHAIR: Mr. Granata?
11	MR. GRANATA: Commissioner Shearman, if
12	you can just add the words, "as presented at the
13	PEC's May regular meeting," I think it should
14	suffice.
15	THE CHAIR: Thank you. I will add the
16	words, "as presented at the Commission's May 2015
17	meeting."
18	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you,
19	Commissioner Shearman. We do have a motion before
20	the Commission. Do we have a
21	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Commissioner
22	Toulouse would like to second.
23	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I was going to ask
24	for a second, but I believe I now have a second.
25	The Commission is ahead of me today. I



1	will say that.
2	All right. We do have a motion before
3	this Commission; we do have a second.
4	Before we vote, I would just ask
5	Mr. Granata, they don't have to come back in June.
6	We're now approving this today; right? They don't
7	have to be added to the June
8	MR. GRANATA: That is correct.
9	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I want to make sure
10	we have all understood that. So we're putting them
11	back in business.
12	All right. We do have a motion before the
13	Commission. We have a second by Commissioner
14	Toulouse.
15	I believe we're now ready is there any
16	further discussion?
17	I see no further discussion.
18	Commissioner Peralta, would you call the
19	roll, please?
20	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Okay.
21	Commissioner Carr?
22	COMMISSIONER CARR: Yes.
23	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
24	Conyers?
25	COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Yes.

PROFESSIONAL COURT REPORTING SERVICE



1	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
2	Armbruster?
3	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yes.
4	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Pogna?
5	COMMISSIONER POGNA: Yes.
6	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
7	Toulouse?
8	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Yes.
9	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
10	Peralta votes "Yes."
11	Commissioner Chavez?
12	COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Yes.
13	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
14	Gipson?
15	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes.
16	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
17	Shearman?
18	THE CHAIR: Yes.
19	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
20	Bergman?
21	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Yes.
22	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Mr. Chairman, that
23	is a 10-to-0 vote in favor of the motion.
24	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Mr. Secretary,
25	thank you for that vote. That is a 10-to-0 vote in



favor of the motion.

I, too, want to thank the school for going back on such short notice and making a "good faith" effort to increase those numbers a little bit. I am sorry for the anguish. I was not aware of the closing part of the function.

We will, also -- as we do everything else, we're going to address that in the future, very near future, I suspect. That needs to be looked at very closely, because I was not aware that's what this Commission was doing. That's the problem with legislation sometimes. Legislation and the real world do not always exist in perfect harmony.

So we are sorry for that anguish. We now wish you a successful five-year term, and we look forward to how this performance framework goes this year. And we'll talk to you in a year and see what we can do with the next performance framework.

I believe that closes your presentation. Thank you, South Valley.

MS. TRUJILLO: Thank you.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: That concludes our business, I believe. I believe if someone has a motion that we would adjourn, we will do so.





1	COMMISSIONER POGNA: (Indicates.)
2	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner Pogna
3	moves to adjourn.
4	COMMISSIONER CARR: Second.
5	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner Carr
6	moves to second.
7	All in favor, say "Aye."
8	(Commissioners so indicate.)
9	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: We are adjourned,
10	and thank everyone for all their time today.
11	(Proceedings concluded at 4:02 p.m.)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	





BEFORE THE PUBLIC EDUCATION COMMISSION 1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO 2 3 4 5 6 7 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 8 I, Cynthia C. Chapman, RMR, CCR #219, Certified 9 Court Reporter in the State of New Mexico, do hereby 10 certify that the foregoing pages constitute a true 11 transcript of proceedings had before the said 12 NEW MEXICO PUBLIC EDUCATION COMMISSION, held in the 13 State of New Mexico, County of Santa Fe, in the 14 matter therein stated. 15 In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my 16 hand on May 26, 2015. 17 18 Camilles Chapma 19 Chapman, RMR-CRR, Cynthia C. NM CCR #219 20 BEAN & ASSOCIATES, INC. 201 Third Street, NW, Suite 1630 21 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102 22 23 24



Job No.: 3015L (CC)