1	BEFORE THE PUBLIC EDUCATION COMMISSION
2	STATE OF NEW MEXICO
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
LO	PUBLIC MEETING VOLUME ONE
L1	September 24, 2015 9:00 a.m.
L 2	Jerry Apodaca Education Building - Mabry Hall 300 Don Gaspar
L 3	Santa Fe, New Mexico
L 4	
L 5	
L 6	
L 7	
L 8	
L 9	
2 0	
21	REPORTED BY: Cynthia C. Chapman, RMR-CRR, NM CCR #219 Bean & Associates, Inc.
22	Professional Court Reporting Service 201 Third Street, NW, Suite 1630
23	Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102
24	
25	JOB NO.: 3808L(CC)





1	APPEARANCES
2	COMMISSIONERS:
3	MS. CAROLYN SHEARMAN, Chair MR. VINCE BERGMAN, Vice Chair
4	MR. GILBERT PERALTA, Secretary MS. KARYL ANN ARMBRUSTER
5	MR. JEFF CARR MR. JAMES CONYERS
6	MS. PATRICIA GIPSON MS. MILLIE POGNA
7	MS. CARMIE TOULOUSE
8	STAFF:
9	MS. KATIE POULOS, Director, Charter Schools Division
10	MS. JULIE LUCERO, General Manager, Options for Parents
11	MR. JOSHUA GRANATA, Assistant Attorney General,
12	Counsel to the PEC
13	MS. BEVERLY FRIEDMAN, Custodian of Records and PED Liaison to the PEC
14	The figure of the file
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	
25	





## PROCEEDINGS 1 INDEX ΤO 2 Page 3 Call to Order, Roll Call, Pledge of 4 Allegiance and Salute to the New Mexico Flag 4 2 Approval of Agenda 5 5 7 3 Approval of PEC Hearing Transcripts 6 and Minutes 7 Approval/Disapproval of New Charter School 13 Applications 8 Columbus Community School 14 4 A 9 4B Academic Opportunities Academy 37 10 4 C Desert Willow School 55 11 Six Directions Indigenous School 90 4 D 12 The STEAM Academy 133 4E 13 176 4 F SAHQ Academy 14 Discussion and Possible Action on 216 15 Charter School Amendments 16 Report from Options for Parents and 227 the Charter School Division - Discussion 17 and Possible Actions 18 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 251 19 20 21 22 23 24 25





1	THE CHAIR: I call to meeting to order
2	this regular meeting of the New Mexico Public
3	Education Commission. Mr. Secretary, may we have
4	roll call?
5	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Pogna?
6	COMMISSIONER POGNA: Here.
7	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
8	Toulouse?
9	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Present.
10	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
11	Ambruster?
12	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Here.
13	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
14	Conyers?
15	COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Here.
16	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
17	Gipson?
18	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Here.
19	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
20	Chavez?
21	Commissioner Carr?
22	COMMISSIONER CARR: Here.
23	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
24	Peralta is here.
25	Commissioner Bergman?





1	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Here.
2	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
3	Shearman?
4	THE CHAIR: Here.
5	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Madam Chair, you
6	have nine Commissioners present today.
7	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.
8	Commissioners, I did hear from
9	Commissioner Chavez earlier. Her husband is quite
10	ill, and that's why she is not able to be here. But
11	she did let me know that she would not be able to
12	attend.
13	Let's move on to the Pledge and the Salute
14	to the New Mexico Flag.
15	Commissioners Pogna and Carr.
16	(Pledge of Allegiance and Salute to the
17	New Mexico Flag conducted.)
18	THE CHAIR: Thank you, all.
19	Item No. 2 is Approval of the Agenda. And
20	I need to let everyone know that we had a request
21	from Katie, Director of CSD, and from
22	Secretary Skandera, that the Secretary would like to
23	meet with us tomorrow at 9:00 a.m. to discuss the
24	proposed new Strategic Plan for CSD.
2.5	So I would suggest I got ahead of



```
1
     myself.
              I'm awfully sorry. No, I'm sorry.
 2
     didn't.
 3
               I would suggest that we move Report from
 4
     PED Leadership, which is Item No. 5 on the agenda --
 5
     that we move that to Friday.
               Are there any other changes or corrections
 6
 7
     to the agenda?
               COMMISSIONER CARR: Madam Chair?
 8
               THE CHAIR: Commissioner Carr?
 9
10
               COMMISSIONER CARR:
                                    I move we accept the
11
     agenda, as amended.
12
                            Thank you very much.
               THE CHAIR:
13
               COMMISSIONER POGNA:
                                     Second.
14
               THE CHAIR: Motion by Commissioner Carr,
15
     second by Commissioner Pogna, to approve the agenda,
16
     as amended, moving Item No. 5 to Friday.
               And I don't really know what number on the
17
18
     agenda we would move it to know that it was Friday.
19
               Is it legal for us just to say we're
20
     moving it to Friday?
21
               MR. GRANATA: Yes.
22
               THE CHAIR: Yes?
                                  Okay.
23
               Any discussion?
24
               Hearing none, all those in favor please
25
     say "Aye."
```







SANTA FE OFFICE

Santa Fe, NM 87501 (505) 989-4949

FAX (505) 820-6349

119 East Marcy, Suite 110



1	School Community Input hearing.
2	Any discussion?
3	Josh tells me we can have a voice vote.
4	So all those in favor of approving that
5	transcript, please say "Aye."
6	(Commissioners so indicate.)
7	THE CHAIR: Any opposed, please say "No."
8	(No response.)
9	THE CHAIR: The transcript of that
10	Community Input hearing is approved.
11	Next is the STEAM Academy transcript. Any
12	corrections, additions, or concerns?
13	Hearing none, the Chair would entertain a
14	motion.
15	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So moved.
16	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Second.
17	THE CHAIR: Motion by Commissioner Gipson,
18	second by Commissioner Toulouse for approval of that
19	transcript. Any further discussion?
20	All those in favor, please say "Aye."
21	(Commissioners so indicate.)
22	THE CHAIR: Any opposed, please say "No."
23	(No response.)
24	THE CHAIR: The transcript of the STEAM
25	Academy Community Input hearing is approved.





1	Next is the SAHQ, S-A-H-Q, Academy input
2	hearing.
3	Any corrections or concerns?
4	Hearing none, the Chair would entertain a
5	motion for approval.
6	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I would so move.
7	THE CHAIR: Commissioner Bergman moves to
8	approve. Do I hear a second?
9	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Second.
10	THE CHAIR: Commissioner Peralta seconds.
11	Any discussion?
12	All those in favor, please say yes
13	"Aye."
14	(Commissioners so indicate.)
15	THE CHAIR: All those opposed, please say
16	"No."
17	(No response.)
18	THE CHAIR: The transcript of the SAHQ
19	Academy input hearing is approved.
20	I just said that to see if you all were
21	paying attention.
22	Next is the transcript for the New Mexico
23	Gateway Academy Community Input hearing.
24	Any corrections or concerns?
25	Hearing none is that they didn't





1	withdraw?
2	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: No, we had the
3	hearing. They withdrew after.
4	THE CHAIR: And then they withdrew. Okay.
5	Hearing no corrections, the Chair would
6	entertain a motion for the New Mexico Gateway
7	Academy transcript.
8	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: So move.
9	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Second.
10	THE CHAIR: Commissioner Toulouse moves
11	for approval. Do I hear a second?
12	Commissioner Ambruster?
13	Any further discussion? All those in
14	favor of approving the transcript, please say "Aye."
15	(Commissioners so indicate.)
16	THE CHAIR: Any opposed, please say "No."
17	(No response.)
18	THE CHAIR: The transcript is approved.
19	Next is Academic Opportunities Academy
20	Community Input hearing transcript.
21	Any corrections?
22	Hearing none, the Chair would entertain a
23	motion for approval.
24	COMMISSIONER CONYERS: (Indicates.)
25	THE CHAIR: Commissioner Conyers?



```
Do I hear a second?
 1
 2
               COMMISSIONER GIPSON:
                                      Second.
 3
               THE CHAIR: Commissioner Gipson seconds.
 4
               Any further discussion?
 5
               Hearing none, all those in favor, please
     say "Aye."
 6
               (Commissioners so indicate.)
 7
               THE CHAIR: Any opposed, please say "No."
 8
 9
               (No response.)
10
               THE CHAIR:
                            The transcript of Academic
11
     Opportunities Academy Community Input hearing is
12
     approved.
13
               Next is Desert Willow transcript.
14
     corrections?
15
               Hearing none, may we have a motion for
16
     approval?
17
               COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE:
                                        So move.
               THE CHAIR: Commissioner Toulouse moves
18
19
     for approval.
20
               COMMISSIONER PERALTA:
                                       Second.
               THE CHAIR: Commissioner Peralta seconds.
21
22
               Any discussion?
23
               Hearing none, all those in favor, please
24
     say "Aye."
25
               (Commissioners so indicate.)
```





e-mail: info@litsupport.com

```
Any opposed, please say "No."
 1
               THE CHAIR:
 2
               (No response.)
 3
               THE CHAIR:
                            The transcript of Desert
 4
     Willow is approved.
               Last is Community -- pardon me -- Columbus
 5
 6
     Community School transcript.
 7
               Any corrections?
               The Chair would entertain a motion to
 8
 9
     approve.
10
               COMMISSIONER PERALTA:
                                       So move.
11
               THE CHAIR: Commissioner Peralta moves for
12
     approval.
13
               COMMISSIONER CARR:
                                    Second.
14
               THE CHAIR: Commissioner Carr seconds.
15
               Any further discussion?
16
               Hearing none, all those in favor, please
17
     say "Aye."
               (Commissioners so indicate.)
18
19
               THE CHAIR:
                           Any opposed, please say "No."
20
               (No response.)
21
               THE CHAIR:
                            The transcript is approved.
22
               Lastly, we have the minutes for the PEC
23
     meeting of August 19th, 2015.
24
               Are there any corrections or additions,
25
     mark-ups of any kind?
```





e-mail: info@litsupport.com

1	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: You don't have any?
2	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: She wasn't there.
3	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: But she always goes
4	through the minutes and finds corrections.
5	THE CHAIR: That was very well done. I
6	read every word of it, I assure you.
7	Any corrections?
8	Hearing none, the Chair would entertain a
9	motion for approval.
10	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: So move.
11	THE CHAIR: Commissioner
12	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Bergman.
13	THE CHAIR: Bergman. Boy, I'm just really
14	having a breakdown today.
15	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Second.
16	THE CHAIR: Commissioner Bergman moves for
17	approval. Commissioner Ambruster moves to second.
18	Any further discussion?
19	All those in favor, please say "Aye."
20	(Commissioners so indicate.)
21	THE CHAIR: Any opposed, please say "No."
22	(No response.)
23	THE CHAIR: The minutes of the August 19,
24	2015, meeting are approval.
25	We're to Item No. 4, which is





1	Approval/Disapproval of New Charter School
2	Applications.
3	The first is Community Charter School.
4	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Columbus.
5	THE CHAIR: Columbus Community School.
6	Will everyone please look at the agenda,
7	and let's all be aware of the time limits that are
8	imposed for this section of the meeting.
9	The Charter School Division will have ten
10	minutes to make their recommendation. The applicant
11	has 15 minutes for their comments. The time is
12	unlimited for PEC questions or comments to the
13	applicant or to the CSD. And then there be a final
14	determination vote.
15	I have asked Mrs. Friedman to be our
16	timekeeper, and she has signs that she will let you
17	know how much time you have left so that we're
18	upfront and fair with everyone, okay?
19	Do we have representatives from Columbus
20	Community School here today?
21	MR. SKINNER: Yes, ma'am.
22	THE CHAIR: Good morning.
23	MR. SKINNER: Good morning.
24	THE CHAIR: Katie, whenever you're ready,
25	please go ahead.



1	MS. POULOS: Madam Chair, Commissioners,
2	in its final analysis and recommendation, CSD
3	recommended the denial of the application for
4	Columbus Community School.
5	CSD had made the following findings and
6	believes they support the denial of this
7	application:
8	90 percent of the responses in the
9	education plan were rated "partially meets" or "does
10	not meet."
11	97 percent of the responses in the
12	organizational and governance plan were rated
13	"partially meets" or "does not meet."
14	90 percent of the responses in the
15	business plan were rated "partially meets" or "does
16	not meet."
17	100 percent of the responses in the
18	evidences of support were rated "partially meets" or
19	"does not meet."
20	CSD found that many of the responses were
21	lacking essential details to fully understand the
22	applicant's plan or ability to meet the requirements
23	of operating a charter school.
2 4	CSD also found that several of the
25	applicant's responses violated provisions of the



Charter School Act.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The applicant's various responses contained contradictory information, which did not allow the readers to understand a clear plan for implementation of the proposed school.

There were other specific findings in CSD's analysis that included the following:

The applicant did not provide specific, measurable, obtainable, rigorous, or time-bound goals that aligned to the mission, and did not adequately describe how the goals would be measured.

The applicant did not adequately describe a curriculum or plan for developing a curriculum aligned with the New Mexico Common Core State Standards.

The applicant did not adequately describe instructional methods that would improve student achievement.

The applicant did not adequately describe how the proposed school would address the needs of all special population students, including students with IEPs, ELLs, and students who qualify for 504 plans.

The applicant did not adequately describe an assessment plan that identified appropriate



assessments or how the assessments would be used to inform instruction.

The applicant did not adequately describe how corrective actions would be implemented if the proposed school's academic performance fell short of expectations.

The applicant did not adequately describe a process that would ensure a skilled and capable governing body.

The applicant did not provide an adequate plan for governing body training or evaluation.

The applicant did not adequately describe how the governing body will monitor school outcomes.

The applicant did not adequately describe a staffing or recruitment plan that would ensure the school hires a skilled and capable administrator.

The applicant did not adequately describe a professional development plan that will ensure teachers are able to implement the curriculum and improve student achievement.

The applicant did not provide adequate information to demonstrate the capacity to develop appropriate and legally compliant policies.

The applicant did not adequately describe a school schedule and calendar.



1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The applicant did not provide adequate 1 2 information to demonstrate the capacity to implement 3 New Mexico school funding and budget for long-term sustainability. 5 The applicant did not provide adequate evidence of community and student support for the 6 proposed school. 8 In addition, the applicant's responses included a conflict-of-interest policy that violated 9 10 the statutory requirements of 22-8B-5.2. 11 For these reasons, CSD made the 12 recommendation to deny the application for Columbus 13 Community School. 14 After that final analysis and 15 recommendation was submitted to the PEC and to the 16 applicants, the applicants were given an 17 opportunity -- an opportunity to provide a response 18 and additional information to help the PEC 19 understand the applicant's original responses. This 20 applicant did not provide any additional 21 information. 22 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 23 Good morning. 24 MR. SKINNER: Good morning. 25 THE CHAIR: You have 15 minutes. Please



identify yourself, too, for the record.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SKINNER: Madam Chairman -- is this -- and Commissioners, thank you for the opportunity to be here and address you this morning.

My name is Philip Skinner. I'm with

Columbus Community School from Columbus, New Mexico.

And my only comments this morning is if we're denied our charter school this time, we plan to come back again next time, and we plan to do better.

And so we -- we understand that we -- we need to continue to try to do better.

My only appeal to this Commission would be to find -- try to find ways within -- within the law, within the statute, to -- to help the charter schools that are applying. There's a few of us, two or three of us, that have been here many times.

We're -- we're -- obviously, we're failing. We're not doing, you know, the job that we need to do.

But we need some help. And so if there's a way within the system that this -- this body can provide that help, additional training, opportunities to apply and then correct, or something, that would help us to be successful.

So that's our only comments today. Thank you, Madam Chair.

PROFESSIONAL COURT REPORTING SERVICE



1 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Skinner. Commissioners, do you have questions, 2 3 concerns, comments? 4 Commissioner Bergman? COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Madam Chair and 5 6 Commissioners, thank you. Madam Chair, I did read and study this 7 8 application of Columbus Community School. read and studied the preliminary analysis that was 9 10 presented by the Charter School Division and their 11 I did attend the Community Input hearing. staff. Ι 12 did read and study the final recommendation and 13 analysis, here, again, for this application. 14 And I just, at this time, cannot support 15 this application. In general, I believe the 16 application was inadequate and incomplete. 17 because of that aspect, it was -- in many of the sections, if not all of the sections, I believe at 18 19 this time that this application would be contrary to 20 the best interests of the local community and the 21 students that the school would propose to serve. 22 But I also have some specific reasons for 23 feeling like I do, and I'm going to bring those into 24 the record at this time, also.



One, the applicant chose to not submit

proposed academic performance indicators and goals in the S.M.A.R.T. format, as presented as example in the application instructions.

The goals applicant did submit were therefore not specific, not time-bound, difficult to determine that if the goals were rigorous and attainable.

The applicant did not provide adequate plans and methods to assess each of its proposed goals. When I asked at the Community Input hearing why the applicants chose to not take into account the suggested format to follow with goals, they said that they did not see how they could provide specific goals.

Number two, the applicant did not provide a description of a developed curriculum. Instead, applicant stated at one point in the application that it will be developed by the students as the year progresses. Now, their proposed start-up was to be with sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-graders, who would be -- consist in the first year of operation. I feel that sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-graders do not have the knowledge, nor the experience, to design their own curriculum. Starting a school year with no curriculum in place, I believe, would be a



recipe for disaster.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Number three, the applicant further stated that the students would design their own assessments. And at that point -- I actually have the page here from the application, and this is what they stated:

"Students will simultaneously be designing curriculum, creating course material, and designing assessments as they work on their projects."

One of the projects that they were discussing there is they intend for these students to build their own school buildings. And, here, again, I -- I do not believe that students have the knowledge or experience to successfully accomplish such a vital and complex task. I sometimes wonder if the people that are designing assessments perhaps have missed a few points here and there. So I was concerned about that.

Item number four, the applicant further proposed that students would build their own school facilities by the end of the fourth year. Since this construction would essentially be a full-time situation, I did ask the applicants again in the Community Input hearing, "When would the students actually be in classrooms learning reading, math,



science, et cetera?"

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And their answer was that the students would be learning those things while they were doing the projects and doing the construction.

Number five, the applicant again proposes to use a facility for this school that was abandoned by the Deming Public Schools some years ago. And when they -- what Deming did, they built a new facility there for the elementary school in Columbus, and then they abandoned that property.

In an earlier Community Input hearing some years ago, the applicants, at that time, also proposed to use that facility. And at that time, there was a representative from the Deming Schools there that shared with the Commissioners that were there at that time that the reason that they chose to build a new school and abandon that property was that the building needed so many renovations and such substantial renovations to bring it up to Code and to make it suitable to have students in it that their estimate at that time was \$4 million to do that.

That -- so we discussed that briefly, and I did ask the applicants about that. And his -- I would note that Mr. Skinner said he thought that the



PSFA had an E-occupancy rating on that building.

And I'm not sure how a building that's been

abandoned for years -- that may apply to it when it

was in service. But I think what we finally decided

is that Mr. Skinner and I would agree to disagree on

that one.

Number six, CSD, in both their preliminary analysis and their final recommendation analysis, highlighted, as has been previously stated by the director, a number of substantial shortcomings and deficiencies in every section of the application.

Just, for example, when the applicant was asked to provide a professional development plan, they did not furnish any plan.

Finally, the applicant indicated that most of its proposed students will be U.S. citizens who don't actually live in New Mexico, but, actually, live in Mexico. This suggests that there may be some legal requirements that would need to be addressed that were not discussed in the application.

Further, number seven, the applicants stated, in one part of their application, that it will hold family meetings throughout the year where parents and students will meet with school faculty



1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 to work together on behalf of the students. 2 of course, is a great idea. But throughout the 3 application, the applicant also noted that many of 4 these same parents that do reside in Mexico will not 5 cross into the United States. So I would question how they will attend these parental meetings if they 7 won't come into the United States. That was not 8 addressed in the application; so that concerned me, 9 too. 10 Anyway, like I say, I just feel, because of all the shortcomings that I saw in that 11 12 application, that I cannot support that application. 13 Thank you, Madam Chair and Commissioners. THE CHAIR: 14 Thank you, Commissioner. 15 Further comments or questions? COMMISSIONER CARR: Madam Chair? 16 17 THE CHAIR: Commissioner Carr? COMMISSIONER CARR: I'll try to be brief. 18 19 I -- I -- every time you guys have come before us -and there were a lot of different faces there when 20 you first did -- it's always tugged at my heart a 21 22 bit, because I believe there should be a school 23 there. 24 Unfortunately, I have to vote "No" again. 25 I have to give you an "A" for perseverance.



think that -- you know, I think Deming School
District will say, "Well, we're meeting all the
needs of those children."

I don't think we're meeting all the needs, as best we can, for those children.

And financially, yeah, maybe that's the best they can do. And that's a problem for the State, that we're not -- maybe we're not funding the schools adequately.

We need education professionals to come in to plan a school. Starting a school from scratch is extremely difficult. And people who have started this charter process have come to realize how difficult it is to start a school. It's another thing to take an established school and make it better.

I just want to put a call out there -- we can't put a public school. And I hope there are people out there who would feel the call to either -- to build a charter school there, or -- or a traditional public school there. Probably a traditional public school is the only thing that will end up working there.

I'll continue to -- whatever, you know, I
can do, even though you're clear on the other end of



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the state from me, I will tell people that I think 1 you need a K-through-12 school there. 2 I know you 3 have K through 8 now; but I just want to say that I 4 would like to vote "Yes"; but I can't. And I hope 5 someday that this will be different. 6 MR. SKINNER: Thank you. 7 COMMISSIONER CARR: Thank you. 8 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner. 9 Other comments? Commissioner Peralta? 10 11 COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Thank you, 12 Madam Chair. This being my fifth year on the 13 Commission, I believe, I think I've seen your 14 application each year that I've been on this 15 Commission. And I could say that each coming year, 16 there hasn't really been much of a change in the 17 applications. I haven't seen much of an improvement 18 or a different spin on the application about 19 additional needs, since you're sincere in starting 20 up a charter school. 21 I believe that the reasons stated by 22 Director Poulos, in my opinion, are applicable. 23 think they have solid reason for not accepting your 24 application; but I do want to just point out some 25 things that stick out to me, personally, as a



Commissioner.

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And these are the ones that pretty much weigh heavily on my decision in not to approve your application. One, being the curriculum, and that being student-driven and not aligning with

New Mexico Common Core Standards is a big concern of mine.

This has always weighed heavily on my mind, is how do we attract highly qualified teachers to that area? It's a very rural area that's way in the southwest corner of the state. And I just don't feel like you'll be successful like that in bringing highly qualified teachers to the area.

The facility lease. Still, in my opinion, I still feel like there's a conflict in that -- in that situation. I've never really been able to get a real solid answer to whether there is or not. But in my opinion, I still feel like there is -- with the position of the mayor and founder and the facilities that are going to be used for this school, there's still some conflict.

The academic goals, as Mr. Bergman stated, lack specificity, rigor, et cetera. And all those areas were pointed out in the letter from Director Poulos.



Mostly, I think, again, I reiterate what Commissioner Bergman said, as well. I believe students are not part of an economic development plan, in the idea that these students are going to be building their own school. I feel like they're to be in school to learn and not to be construction workers or architects or whatever in that case.

And so those are the specific reasons why I am choosing to deny your application.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Other comments?

Commissioner Ambruster?

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I, too, admire your persistence. I know it's a dream, and I certainly understand that.

I think our responsibility is to make sure that when we divert public funds from public schools, that this school has to be the best. And I know that it's a long drive, and I appreciate that. I think that that's probably part of being a rural community, that I understood that the people -- or the students -- in Columbus actually don't travel as far as some other students who are also going to Deming Schools. It's clearly an issue to which I have no answer, if you're in a rural community.



1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

My concern was also in special education, since that is my background. And I find that they probably are even better than what everyone would call normal children without disabilities in being able to do construction and doing hands-on kinds of things. I think that's a strength that they generally have.

But at the same time, I didn't see any specific plan to have an IEP and to give direct instruction. My 39 years of experience in the classroom with special education children is that they don't learn incidentally. They have to be taught exactly what you want them to do.

So I would suggest, because you asked for that, that you make sure that you develop a plan where students with disabilities have direct instruction in reading and math and writing, because those are generally the areas that -- that they are qualifying in; because if you don't have that, there -- if you can't read and write in America, you really don't have a chance, even if you're the best builder or architect or whatever you are.

So that would be my suggestion.

MR. SKINNER: Thanks.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner.





Commissioner Gipson?

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes. I would also -- this is my first year here, so I have not seen you before. But I certainly appreciate your persistence in this matter.

But I do have similar concerns with the curriculum and the lack of any clarity in terms of the curriculum that is going to be offered.

And I do appreciate your comments with needing some more direction. But in the parts of the application where there are specific examples given, like the S.M.A.R.T. goals, you chose not to answer them.

And in the public input hearing,

Mrs. Armendariz even said that we're asking more of
you to do that than we are a traditional public
school. And I truly don't think that's the case.

So I have significant concerns with the parts of the application where there were directions given, like the lack of S.M.A.R.T. goals, the lack of clarity with your -- with your curriculum, that those were just completely ignored.

And I do have -- and I expressed concerns about the construction aspect, the lack of budgeting for many of your plans with teaching the students



the construction aspect, that I don't think there 1 2 was really adequate planning that was given. 3 And I also expressed a concern over the 4 lack of an E-Occupancy. And you did tell me that 5 you had one, and I don't think we have any support for that. 6 And, in addition -- and I do appreciate 8 the fact that it was a long drive for many of the 9 community members to come up to offer support. But 10 after the fact, there was no additional support for 11 the school. When the opportunity was there to add 12 input and send it to the PED, there was no 13 additional community support. 14 And the Superintendent of the Deming 15 School District, I think, provided an adequate --16 reasons for the Deming school system not supporting 17 the schools. 18 Thank you. 19 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner. 20 Other comments?

Commissioner Toulouse? 21

22 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Madam Chair, only 23 I miss your partner. We missed him at the briefly.

24 hearing, too. Please send the regards.

25 MR. SKINNER: Thank you.





COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: We know his health keeps him from being here.

I voted for your school the last two years. I'm going to reluctantly say, at this time, I can't, but I would like to. I would say if you're going to build -- it's hard when you're working with middle school kids to do the building. If you're doing high school kids, that becomes a different issue in how they can learn.

I think your community needs at least a middle school. I mean, I think you need to continue. But I also am concerned without any curriculum or whatever.

But I would welcome you back. And this is only my third year; but I've been there -- I know your community down there on the border. I know it has its particular needs. And I think they really aren't being met.

So I, reluctantly this time, am going to say "No," but not because -- my heart's down there with you. And I hope you can somehow find a way to come up with a curriculum that will work for mid-school that then can take your concept of building -- ACE High School in Albuquerque does a real good job with the high school kids. But their



1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

academics have slipped a little lately. But they've 1 been building for a while; so they might be somebody 2 3 you could talk to. 4 But I do have a problem with 12-, 13-, 5 14-year-olds having to do that kind of building. But certainly not 16, 17-year-olds. 6 7 encourage you to keep it up. 8 MR. SKINNER: Thank you. 9 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Thank you. 10 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Other comments, 11 Commissioners? 12 I see no other comments. 13 Before we move on to a vote, I've asked Josh for a statement for all of us before we 14 15 consider the vote of any of these applications. 16 This applies to all. 17 MR. GRANATA: Madam Chair, Commissioners, the Chair has asked me just to remind the Commission 18 19 that pursuant to the Charter School Act, that if any 20 of the -- the members of the PEC were not present at the hearing, that they should be familiar with the 21 22 record in terms of all the documents provided and 23 the transcripts. 24 So if any Commissioner feels uncomfortable 25 with voting today, just make sure to abstain from



voting for any of these schools.

And also, if there are any conflicts for any of the schools, to just go ahead and state that conflict prior to the vote.

Thanks.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Josh. And I just want to say, since I was not able to attend any of the community input hearings, I want to assure everyone that I have thoroughly read and studied all of the applications. I've thoroughly studied and read the transcripts, the preliminary recommendations, the final recommendations, all of the additional information that might have been supplied.

I do feel comfortable in voting on all of the applicants today; so I just want to assure everyone of that.

Commissioners, are we ready to move on to a motion concerning Columbus Community School?

Would someone care to make that motion?

Commissioner Peralta?

COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Madam Chair, I move that the Public Education Commission deny the 2015

New Charter School Application submitted by Columbus Community School, based on the Charter School





1	Division's recommendations stated on the record, as
2	well as the reasons stated by the Commissioners on
3	the record.
4	THE CHAIR: Thank you. You've heard
5	Commissioner Peralta's motion.
6	Do I have a second?
7	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Second.
8	THE CHAIR: Commissioner Ambruster
9	seconds.
10	The motion is to deny the application of
11	Columbus Community School for the reasons stated on
12	the official record.
13	Is there any further discussion?
14	Hearing none, Mr. Secretary, may we have a
15	roll-call vote?
16	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Carr?
17	COMMISSIONER CARR: Yes.
18	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Pogna?
19	COMMISSIONER POGNA: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
21	Gipson?
22	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes.
23	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
24	Toulouse?
25	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Yes.





1	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
2	Peralta votes "Yes."
3	Commissioner Ambruster?
4	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
6	Conyers.
7	COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Yes.
8	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
9	Bergman?
10	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Yes.
11	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
12	Shearman?
13	THE CHAIR: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Madam Chair, that
15	is nine to zero in favor of that motion.
16	THE CHAIR: Thank you. The motion to deny
17	the application is unanimous.
18	Thank you, sir.
19	MR. SKINNER: Thank you, Madam Chair and
20	Commissioners.
21	THE CHAIR: The next application is
22	Academic Opportunities Academy. Is there anyone
23	from that school here today?
24	Seeing none, Katie, would you give us the
25	CSD recommendation, please?





1	MS. POULOS: Madam Chair, Commissioners,
2	in CSD's final analysis and recommendation, CSD
3	recommended that the application for Academic
4	Opportunities Academy be denied.
5	The application analysis had the following
6	findings:
7	The application was inadequate because
8	100 percent of the responses in the education plan
9	were rated "partially meets" or "does not meet."
_ 0	100 percent of the responses in the
1	organizational and governance plan were rated
2	"partially meets" or "does not meet."
. 3	90 percent of the responses in the
4	business plan were rated "partially meets" or "does
L 5	not meet."
6	100 percent of the responses in the
_7	evidence of support were rated "partially meets" or
8 .	"does not meet."
9	Many of the responses lacked essential
20	details to fully understand the applicant's plan and
21	ability to meet the requirements of operating a
22	charter school.
23	Some responses contained policies or
24	statements that would violate provisions of the
25	Charter School Act.



The applicant's various responses contained contradictory information which did not allow the reader to understand a clear plan for implementation of the proposed school.

The applicant did not adequately identify a clear mission for the proposed school, and the application contains two conflicting potential mission statements. One of the proposed mission statements did not align with the grade levels to be served.

The applicant did not provide specific, measurable, attainable, rigorous, or time-bound goals that align to the mission, and the applicant did not adequately describe how the goals would be measured.

The applicant did not adequately describe a curriculum or a plan for developing a curriculum aligned with the New Mexico Common Core State Standards.

The applicant did not identify any curriculum, but, rather, a variety of potential resources and materials that would need to be created.

The applicant did not adequately describe instructional methods that would have improved





student achievement.

1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The applicant did not adequately describe how the proposed school would address the needs of all special population students, including students with IEPs, ELLs, and students who qualify for 504 plans.

The applicant did not adequately describe an assessment plan that identified appropriate assessments or how the assessments would be used to inform instruction.

Several of the assessments identified in the application were not appropriate for the grade levels proposed to be served, and several of the assessments identified did not exist.

The applicant did not adequately describe how corrective actions would be implemented if the proposed school's academic performance fell short of expectations.

The applicant did not adequately describe a process that would ensure a skilled and capable governing body.

The applicant did not provide an adequate plan for governing body training or evaluation.

The applicant did not adequately describe how the governing body will monitor school outcomes.



The applicant did not adequately describe a staffing or recruitment plan that would ensure the school hired a qualified, skilled, and capable administrator.

The applicant did not adequately describe a professional development plan that would ensure teachers are able to implement the curriculum and improve student achievement.

The applicant did not provide adequate information to demonstrate the capacity to develop appropriate and legally compliant policies.

The applicant did not adequately describe a school schedule or calendar.

The applicant did not provide adequate information to demonstrate the capacity to implement the New Mexico funding and budget for long-term sustainability.

The applicant did not provide adequate evidence of community and student support for the proposed school.

The application also did not propose to offer an educational program consistent with the requirements and purposes of the Charter School Act, because the response in the application included proposed lottery preferences that did not comply



1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 | with NMSA 22-8B-4.1.

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

requirements in 22-8B-5.2.

The applicant's proposed

conflict-of-interest policy violates the statutory

The applicant's proposed governance structure violates the requirements of 22-8B-4B, which requires the governing body of a charter school to have at least five members.

The applicant's responses did not demonstrate an understanding of New Mexico charter school laws; rather, the applicant's responses appear to be geared toward the requirement of Texas charter school laws.

Lastly, CSD found that the application was otherwise contrary to the best interests of the charter school's projected students, the local community, or the school district in whose geographic boundaries the charter school applied to operate.

Because the applicant's responses in the application raised serious concerns about the applicant's ownership over the information in the application and its intention to be faithful to that information. [Verbatim.]

Specifically, the applicant's responses





1	consisted of a substantial amount of information
2	taken directly from other organizations' websites
3	and promotional materials, statute, and various
4	government or agency program compliance guides.
5	The applicant did not demonstrate an
6	understanding of this information or a coherent
7	program that would utilize this publicly sourced
8	information.
9	The applicant was provided, as all
LO	applicants were, an opportunity to respond to CSD's
L1	final analysis and recommendation. CSD did not
L 2	receive a response from that application.
L 3	THE CHAIR: Thank you. I ask again if
L 4	there is anyone from Academic Opportunities Academy
L 5	here that would care to speak today.
L 6	Okay. I see no one.
L 7	Let's move on to PEC questions and
L 8	comments.
L 9	I'm sorry. No? No?
2 0	Commissioner Bergman?
21	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: High-tech sound
22	system gets me every time.
23	Thank you, Madam Chair, and fellow
2 4	Commissioners.
25	Director Poulos, I believe, did an



excellent job in her remarks, highlighting a number of the shortcomings on this particular application of the Academic Opportunities Academy. She actually covered a number of the specific areas that I wanted to speak to; so I'm going to skip over those.

But I still have a few that I perhaps want to expand on.

I wanted to note that under the curriculum, in the application, the applicant had identified a computer programming curriculum and a curriculum mapping database and software that does not even currently exist. And they proposed that they would somehow do that while they were doing their curriculum; they would come up with their database. And that certainly concerned me.

Under their governing body section -- the Director briefly mentioned this -- but the applicant included bylaws for a Texas nonprofit corporation, which provides for no members and three officers of the board of directors.

In the capacity interview that they had with the Charter School Division Staff, the applicant indicated that their board would receive at least some of their training in Texas, with no indication of how training in Texas would be



1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

relevant or appropriate for New Mexico governing board members. Further, no plan was provided for evaluations of the board members.

And I'm not suggesting that our friends in Texas don't have the capability to do these kind of things; but they wouldn't be familiar with New Mexico charter school law, I don't believe.

Here, again, the applicant did not provide an organizational chart that identifies appropriate relationships between governance, administrators, teaching, support staff, and external agencies. In fact, they provided some inadequate job descriptions, in some cases that aligned more with Texas requirements rather than New Mexico requirements.

The applicant also indicated that the business manager candidate must be familiar with the Texas student reporting system, rather than the New Mexico reporting system. That certainly concerned me.

One thing that they put in their application is they proposed that they would actually use curriculum and teachers from a currently existing charter school in New Mexico, which happens to be New Mexico Connections.



1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And that certainly raised serious 1 2 questions in my mind about their understanding of 3 what financial consequences could ensue from such an arrangement and having students simultaneously 5 enrolled in two separate charter schools; because I don't believe New Mexico Connections would teach their students without counting them in their 8 student base. That certainly concerned me. And for all the reasons that have been 9 10 stated so far, I certainly don't believe I can 11 support this application. 12 Thank you, Madam Chair. 13 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Other comments? COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Madam Chair? 14 15 THE CHAIR: Commissioner Gipson? 16 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I would just like to 17 thank CSD for that thorough evaluation. 18 certainly cannot support this application. There was clearly difficulties with, 19 20 number one, the governing board of the charter 21 school, the proposed governing board. In fact, 22 stated in the application and in the input hearing, 23 there was -- there was no governing board that 24 really was willing to serve. 25 In fact, the applicant stated, if you



remember, that he had posted on Craigslist to try to find governance council members. So that is an indication that there is not much of a community support for the -- for the applicant, in addition to the concerns with the curriculum.

He stated, as has been stated, the curriculum that was supposed to be teaching students to learn programming; but there is no curriculum that provides for that. He had spoken to someone from NMSU; but there clearly was not agreement that that NMSU professor was going to help in creating that curriculum, and that it was a curriculum that really was not appropriate for middle-school students.

And I will, once again, reiterate my admiration for anyone who's willing to work with middle-school students. So I appreciate that. But I think something more appropriate needs to be offered for the students there.

And, once again, the Deming Superintendent provided very clear reasons why they were not in support. And a number of the comments in the application by the applicant in regards to statistics that he used referencing the Deming Public Schools, he had no supporting documentation



And the Superintendent clearly disagreed for that. and challenged him to show him those supporting statistics.

Thanks.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SANTA FE OFFICE

Santa Fe, NM 87501 (505) 989-4949

FAX (505) 820-6349

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Let me just say a couple of things that jumped out to me, and then if anyone else -- I didn't see any hands. But let me just mention a couple of things.

Budget is one of my big areas. And I -- I couldn't find anywhere that this budget supported the educational program or educational programs that it seemed to me that this school was proposing.

It seemed to me that a lot of money was being shuffled off to various areas that then left very little money for teaching positions, because a 40-to-1 teacher-student ratio was being proposed, which I think is completely unworkable for any kind of school, but particularly for a middle school with very intense programs that were described within this budget and within this educational programming.

So I thought that was very unreasonable.

They talked about an extended school day that was never supported in the budget. no money for it.

I question whether or not they can





actually find the highly qualified people to teach the programming classes in Deming. Deming is a nice town; but those type of people have lots of job opportunities and make a lot of money, and most of them are in larger metropolitan areas or in university areas, in my experience. So I think particularly with the proposed salary schedule that they have, they would have a very difficult time providing that instruction.

And to take 300 hours out of a student's instructional year and devote it to computer programming with no plan on how you're going to make up for your other courses -- there was no mention of what's going to happen to math and science and English and all of those kinds of things. Just 300 hours a year devoted to computer programming was -- was very troubling to me.

And I think to promote a program that is so focused as computer programming that then does not have a comparable program for those students to move into in the high school -- what are sixth- and seventh- and eighth-graders going to do with computer programming knowledge if they can't continue with it?

It's sort of -- they missed the mark, I





believe.

I thought their facilities were completely unreasonable. He had lots of ideas, but no plans, nothing concrete. He wanted to build a building for the -- and have it ready for the first year, but he had no money. That's really tough. And we have to know more than -- we have to know that these students are going to have a school when the thing starts.

So things like that really bothered me in the application. And that's -- I cannot support it for those and the other reasons that were listed.

"Computer" Armbruster. You see, I've got computers on the brain?

Commissioner Ambruster, please.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I answer to anything.

I had other concerns, too. Since I am -or was, I should say -- a middle-school teacher -wearing my little princess crown here today -- but,
again, there were no clear plans or practices of how
special education was going to be delivered.

I also have a huge concern on how you would even find a special education teacher, or a teacher with certification for special education, to





come to an additional school.

1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Again, special education students need direct instruction. Computers may be somewhat helpful; but I don't think that they would solve all of the issues and prepare these students for high school or for life.

Also a concern of mine was the discipline policy for teachers and other employees was not clear. The time lines or protection of employee rights or how issues might be resolved were not addressed. And there was actually not a way to describe -- that I saw, anyway, or heard -- to evaluate administrators.

So the entire program seemed like it would just collapse, because there weren't these things in place.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. All right.

Commissioner Toulouse?

COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Madam Chair, my concerns are that this didn't even really look like an application. It just wasn't there. It wasn't even a rough draft of one. And there was no filling it out at all in the public hearing.

I think most of it came out of El Paso, out of a tutoring center, not even a school, in



And I don't know whether it's an intent to 1 2 move into New Mexico and then expand, which it may 3 well be, or whether it's -- there -- for some 4 reason, they thought it would be easier to set up a school in New Mexico than in El Paso. But I 5 couldn't figure out why, if they really wanted a 7 school, they weren't doing it in the much larger urban area of El Paso. 8 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 9 Commissioner Peralta? 10 11 COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Madam Chair, I just 12 wanted to affirm the compliments that some of the 13 Commissioners had towards the Charter School 14 Division and their thorough evaluation of this 15 application. 16 The fact that the founders or stakeholders 17 did not respond to the analysis and recommendation 18 from the CSD and that we have no one here present 19 from this proposed school demonstrates that this 20 school really is not ready to begin. And so, 21 therefore, I cannot support this application. 22 Thank you. 23 Thank you. THE CHAIR: 24 Other comments? 25 Hearing no further comments or discussion,



1	the Chair would entertain a motion.
2	Commissioner Bergman?
3	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Madam Chair, I
4	would move that the Public Education Commission deny
5	the 2015 New Charter School Application submitted by
6	Academic Opportunities Academy, based on all these
7	specific reasons read into the record by Director
8	Poulos, and because also the very specific reasons
9	that were read into the record by the various
10	Commissioners today.
11	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Second.
12	THE CHAIR: Thank you.
13	You've heard the motion by Commissioner
14	Bergman, seconded by Commissioner Toulouse.
15	Is there further discussion?
16	Hearing none, Mr. Secretary, may we have a
17	roll-call vote?
18	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
19	Toulouse?
20	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Yes.
21	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
22	Ambruster?
23	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yes.
24	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Pogna?
25	COMMISSIONER POGNA: Yes.





1	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
2	Conyers?
3	COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Yes.
4	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
5	Peralta votes "Yes."
6	Commissioner Carr?
7	COMMISSIONER CARR: Yes.
8	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
9	Gipson?
10	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes.
11	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
12	Bergman?
13	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
15	Shearman?
16	THE CHAIR: Yes.
17	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Madam Chair, that
18	is a nine-to-zero vote in favor of the motion.
19	THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.
20	The motion to deny the application of
21	Academic Opportunities Academy has passed
22	unanimously.
23	Thank you, all.
24	Commissioners, are you ready for a break?
25	It's a little after 10:00. Shall we take ten



1	minutes and come back at a quarter after, according
2	to that clock right up there?
3	Okay?
4	All right. We're on break.
5	(Recess taken, 10:00 a.m. to 10:15 a.m.)
6	THE CHAIR: We are back in session, ladies
7	and gentlemen.
8	Let's move on to the application of Desert
9	Willow. If anyone is here from that school, I would
L 0	ask them to come forward, please.
L1	Good morning.
L 2	Katie, whenever you're ready.
L 3	MS. POULOS: Madam Chair, Commissioners,
L 4	in its final analysis and recommendation, CSD
L 5	recommended the denial of the application for Desert
L 6	Willow School, based on the following findings:
L 7	The application is inadequate because
8 .	68 percent of the responses in the education plan
L 9	were rated "partially meets" or "does not meet."
20	81 percent of the responses in the
21	organizational and governance plan were rated
22	"partially meets" or "does not meet."
23	90 percent of the responses in the
2 4	business plan were rated "partially meets" or "does
2.5	not meet."





50 percent of the responses in the evidence of support were rated "partially meets" or "does not meet."

Many of the responses lacked essential details to fully understand the applicant's plan and ability to meet the requirements of operating a charter school.

Some responses contained policies or statements that would violate the provisions of the Charter School Act.

The applicant did not adequately describe a curriculum or plan for developing a curriculum aligned with the New Mexico Common Core State Standards.

The applicant did not adequately describe instructional methods that would improve student achievement.

The applicant did not adequately describe how the proposed school would address the needs of all special population students, including ELLs and students who qualify for 504 plans.

The applicant did not adequately describe how corrective actions would be implemented if the proposed school's academic performance fell short of expectations.



1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The applicant provided an inadequate description of an organizational structure and did not provide an adequate organizational chart or narrative of the relationships between governance, administration, teaching, support staff, and external agencies essential to the proposed school.

The applicant did not adequately describe a process that would ensure a skilled and capable governing body.

The applicant did not provide an adequate plan for governing body training or evaluation.

The applicant did not adequately describe how the governing body will monitor school outcomes.

The applicant did not adequately describe a staffing or recruitment plan that would ensure the school hires a skilled and capable administrator.

The applicant did not adequately describe a professional development plan that would ensure teachers are able to implement the curriculum and improve student achievement.

The applicant did not provide adequate information to demonstrate the capacity to develop appropriate and legally compliant policies.

The applicant did not adequately describe a school schedule and calendar.



1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The applicant did not provide adequate information to demonstrate capacity to implement

New Mexico school funding and budget for long-term sustainability.

The application was also found to be incomplete, because, as the applicant stated in their response to the final analysis, the application did not contain the required Appendix B organizational chart.

The application was found not to propose to offer an educational program consistent with the requirements and purposes of the Charter School Act because the applicant's responses do not comply with open enrollment requirements; specifically, the applicant's responses indicate an unlawful policy that would control enrollment to increase enrollment around the date of budget counts, specifically for the purposes of increasing SEG funding, and would close all enrollment after the 120th day.

The applicant's proposed laundry preferences do not comply with NMSA 12-8B-4.1.

The applicant's proposed conflict-of-interest policy violates the statutory requirements in NMSA 22-8B-5.2.

Additionally, CSD found that the





application was otherwise contrary to the best interests of the charter school's projected students, the local community, or the school district in whose geographic boundaries the charter school is applying to operate, because the applicant's responses to questions at the Community Input hearing raised serious concerns about the applicant's ownership over the information in the application and its intention to be faithful to that information.

Specifically, the applicant stated on more than one occasion that it was unaware of information that was contained in its application.

After the final analysis and recommendation was provided to the applicant and to the Commissioners, the applicant was provided the opportunity to provide a response. The applicant did provide the response.

From that response, CSD felt that the information in that response may have provided additional information to help the Commissioners understand the need and community support for the proposed school. The information also recognized the need for the applicant to complete substantial additional work to develop policies and plans in



1 order to prepare to commence operations of the 2 proposed school. 3 And, finally, the information demonstrated 4 the applicant's continued willingness to continue to 5 work with CSD to ensure the proposed school is able to open timely and effectively. 6 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 8 If you will please introduce yourselves, 9 please, give us your association with the school, 10 your position, and then after that, you'll have 11 15 minutes. 12 MS. AVERSA: Thank you. 13 THE CHAIR: Push the lever down. 14 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: You have to hold 15 it, unfortunately. 16 MS. AVERSA: Good morning. My name is 17 Emily Aversa, and I am one of the cofounders. 18 MS. BAILEY: I'm Fiona Bailey, one of the cofounders. 19 20 MS. EDWARDS: I'm Alicia Edwards, governing board. 21 22 MS. AVERSA: Good morning, Commissioners, 23 and Secretary Shearman. [Verbatim.] 24 We of the Desert Willow School founding 25 board are here to demonstrate that we do have the



capacity to open and successfully maintain excellence in a charter school.

We will begin by outlining our experience, both within and outside of the charter writing process, our knowledge of education, and our competence as responsible community leaders.

My name is Emily Aversa. I graduated cum laude with a master's degree in special education. I have taught students in kindergarten through seventh grades, with twelve of the thirteen educational exceptionalities recognized in New Mexico, in all service placements, from full inclusion to homebound, for 15 years, plus one more year teaching typically developing first— and second—graders in a private school.

My colleagues in special education and general education at the three schools at which I have taught look to me for pedagogical advice and resources. I mentor two new teachers, and I have consistently received marks of "Effective" and "Highly Effective" on my performance reviews.

This year, I have decided not to teach so that I can give my time and attention to this charter school effort and to taking several master's-level classes to further my educational



1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

skills. I am a dedicated and hard worker and am committed to meeting high standards.

Besides leadership in the workplace, I have at least five years' experience organizing committees and action groups within the civic, educational, and church circles of which I am a member.

MS. BAILEY: Good morning. I am Fiona
Bailey, and I decided when I was five years old that
I wanted to be a teacher. Counting only my official
years teaching, that means I have taught 25 of my 50
years.

I graduated summa cum laude with my elementary education degree and a minor in biology. After teaching for four years at my ideal position, teaching kindergarten, I then went to receive my --went on to receive my master's degree with high honors in outdoor education.

Outdoor education, in the broadest definition, is teaching outside the classroom, be it the woods, a museum, or the school garden.

In my 25 years, I have taught kindergarten, first grade, fourth grade, and fifth grade, in three different states. I have served on multiple curriculum committees. In a district who



1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

prided themselves on their rigor of their academics, I helped write the science, social studies, and math curricula, producing well-developed curriculum both longitudinally and horizontally, all aligned to the Illinois standards and student need.

Unfortunately, in Silver City, the language arts curriculum committee on which I was asked to serve was disbanded by the Associate Superintendent before any new curriculum could be written.

In total, I have mentored nine student teachers and numerous new teachers. I have acted as SAT chair and conducted dyslexia training for our staff. And I have worked collaboratively with my colleagues to perfect our skills at teaching reading through balanced literacy.

My evaluations show me to be "Highly Effective" or "Exemplary" in all areas as an educational professional. I am now taking classes towards getting my administrative certification.

As a parent, I became acutely aware of the limitations of our district schools. When I recognized the signs of dyslexia in my daughter and then realized she wasn't even on her second-grade teacher's watch list for struggling students, even



1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

though she had not progressed in reading since mid-first grade, her teachers were not concerned, because so many students were even lower than my daughter.

I found the specific reading program that she needed outside of school. And now that she is a successful high school student, I am able to dedicate my attention to creating a school that will meet the needs of all students, allowing none to fall through the cracks.

At the end of last year, I left my job to give full attention to the creation of Desert Willow School.

MS. EDWARDS: My name is Alicia Edwards.

I am the Executive Director of the Volunteer Center in Grant County. We serve an average of 1,000 low-income families a month.

Our purpose, the purpose of our organization, is to end hunger and poverty in Grant County.

I'm a member of the Community Health

Council, founding member of our local Food Policy

Council, board member of the Community Foundation,

and a member of the New Mexico Strategic Leadership

Institute. I have over 25 years of for-profit and



1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

non-profit management experience.

1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I will speak for the other two members of 2 3 our team that are not present today. William 4 Knuttinen, a CPA, licensed in New Mexico and 5 Arizona, and a partner in the accounting firm of Morones & Knuttinen. William is a member of Rotary, the president of the Rotary Foundation, a board member of the Chamber of Commerce and LifeQuest. 8 Не has also been a Big Brother for the last eight 9 10 years.

George Lundy retired from the U.S. Forest Service, where he designed and built campgrounds and recreational facilities, as well as coordinated legislative initiatives and provided strategic planning, leadership training, meeting facilitation, and management for the 20-state eastern region.

George is a board member for the Habitat for Humanity, a member of the Land Use Code Revision Tax Force -- Task Force -- Commissioner on the Silver City Planning & Zoning Commission, a member of the Silver City Masonic Lodge, chairman of the board and founder of the Learning Center for Dyslexia and Academic Success.

I'm supposed to keep going, am I not?
All right. So we know -- all of us know





that children in New Mexico are in crisis. In 2013, the Annie E. Casey Foundation rated New Mexico the worst for child well-being. And education is one of the measures they used to rate that well-being.

New Mexico's high school graduation rate is only 70 percent. Nearly 200 children live in households that don't have secure employment.

346,000 children qualify for Free and Reduced Lunch. Studies show there is a direct correlation between poverty and a lack of educational attainment.

Historically, we have seen education as a one-size-fits-all model, a model that is less and less viable as we try to address the monumental challenges of poverty in a rapidly changing world that will continue to demand more highly educated people, not fewer.

George, William, and I are active, engaged members of our community who have, between us, given hundreds of hours of volunteer time in service to the idea that every single person, children included, deserve equitable access to everything they need to have the very best quality of life.

Each of us is experts in our chosen fields, have given hours and hours of our precious time and expertise to this charter proposal in



1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

support of two of the finest teachers you'll ever meet. We do this because we believe with all of our hearts that it's time to listen to teachers when they tell us how to best teach children.

Emily and Fiona have dedicated an incredible amount of time, energy, and research towards this charter. Beth Sutton, the creator of Enki, has dedicated her entire adult life to figuring out what's best for children. I was the only non-educator at Beth Sutton's weekend workshop, "Rousing Intuition," that was held in July in Silver City, the first part of training for Enki teachers. I left that workshop wishing that every child in New Mexico could have the opportunity to be Enki-educated.

Enki has the power to change the world one child at a time. Emily and Fiona both left teachings jobs to dedicate themselves full-time to making Desert Willow School happen.

Why? Because they know children. They know what children aren't getting, and they know what children need to succeed. Most of all, they want children to have the opportunity to be lifelong learners and to prepare them to change the world.

I believe very strongly that this charter



1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

actually does support that mission.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I know that each of you cares deeply about children, or you wouldn't be here today. We also care deeply about children, or we would not be here today.

We are prepared to do what it takes to make Desert Willow School happen. I personally believe very strongly that this is the answer to a significant number of problems that are happening in our community.

We thank you for the incredible amount of time and attention that you have given to this process and to our application, and provided us a roadmap to create a very successful charter school.

MS. AVERSA: The facts demonstrate that children need something different than what they're receiving in education today. Our vision is a school where children are empowered to learn, value themselves as learners, and are met with a well-conceived and developed educational plan.

Unlike in the traditional education system, Desert Willow School is for everyone, whether you arrive with all the early experiences necessary to learn, or with none.

Our charter provides a unique and



comprehensive curriculum that has the potential to raise student achievement by aligning lessons not only with standards, but to children's developmental needs. It engages children through story, allows them to express their learning through the arts, and motivates them to learn through movement.

Using story, humanity's oldest educational tool, and the arts, humanity's oldest means of expression, Enki provides an integrated educational experience that fully embraces who each child is and who they are becoming. Enki allows children to own what they learn through their classroom experience. Without ownership, learning is meaningless.

In addition to this wholly unique curriculum, we have a plan and a budget in place to meet the needs of children who struggle that fulfills the mandate of House Bill 230 and goes above and beyond what our local school district provides for children in special education.

Just as House Bill 230 was written to ensure high-quality reading instruction for all students, through special ed, Title I, and the regular education classroom, Desert Willow's curriculum is designed for all students and instructional levels through an



1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Orton-Gillingham-based phonics program and integrated Enki curriculum.

The Charter School Division found places where detail is lacking in our charter at this point. And I'd like to briefly say that when we were meeting on a weekly basis, or biweekly basis, to determine what exactly we would need to do so that we would have a clear plan, we looked to active charters to see the extent of planning that they gave. We were trying to navigate what sort of details one provides in a charter, versus what sorts of details are worked out in a planning year.

And so what we included in our charter is at least as much, if not more, than what active charters provided.

MS. BAILEY: For example, the comments made by the Charter School Division about our lottery process are valid ones, as I admitted at the Community Input hearing. However, the comment made that these missteps show lack of ownership is simply not true.

As recommended at one of our charter school trainings, as Emily just said, we looked at approved charters, especially those of active schools in our similar demographics. I primarily



1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

looked at the lottery processes of three different charter schools, two elementary and the one in Silver City. As I read through their proposals, I selected, modified -- and modified what I thought would work best for us.

For example, when I read that a school gave priority to children of their employees, I was trusting that this followed State statute, since it was in their approved charter. I thought it would be a nice benefit for our employees, since, initially, our pay will be slightly lower than the district schools.

When I read that a school stopped enrolling new students after the 120th day, I did not put this in our charter for monetary reasons, but because I know, as a teacher, how difficult it is for a child to begin in an already established classroom.

MS. EDWARDS: We do have an organizational chart for our school. I do not have an explanation for why it was not transmitted electronically. This was created at the time we created our charter, not after we knew that the charter -- that CSD did not receive our org chart. It was clearly in the instructions that we could not submit documents



after the charter had been submitted; so we did not. 1 And there is, in fact, text in the charter 2 3 application that describes the organizational chart. 4 MS. FRIEDMAN: Excuse me. 5 MS. AVERSA: Okay. Really fast. 6 MS. EDWARDS: 7 MS. AVERSA: Okay. While we acknowledge 8 that we made some missteps in the organizational 9 framework, these mechanics are fixable, and we are 10 willing to do the work, especially given the level 11 of expertise we have to call upon. We ask that 12 rather than deny our application, you approve it 13 with conditions, giving us the opportunity to 14 correct our missteps, add the details, as needed, 15 and have the official designation to begin 16 fundraising. 17 MS. BAILEY: Thank you. 18 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 19 Commissioners, do you have questions? 20 Comments? Commissioner Carr? 21 22 COMMISSIONER CARR: I would like to -- to 23 say that I see and feel your passion. I see your 24 experience. Passion usually never gets so high as 25 when we're doing something in regards to children.



I'm guilty of being overly passionate all the time,
I'm sure. And I justify it because I'm speaking for
children. Sometimes I probably go too far.

I -- passion is not always enough. We have to hear -- look at the applications in this Commission. They have to be excellent. They have to be complete. And we've had to close schools -- opening a school and closing a school is much worse than denying a school the first time around.

Now, I can't predict the future. But I would also like to say, at this time, for the record, that I have looked at -- thoroughly looked at all the applications, the minutes from all the meetings that I was not able to attend. And I probably should have said this for the other schools, but I guess I'm just now getting used to Director Poulos' thoroughness.

And I -- I'm quite often just left -besides making the statements that I make, personal
statements, that I'm left with just saying that I
concur with CSD in their -- in their analysis, and
I'll leave it at that.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner Carr.

Commissioner Peralta?

COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Thank you,





Madam Chair, and welcome. I know it was a far trip for you to make it up here to Santa Fe.

I can say that in reading your transcripts from the hearings, that I have to tout that you guys -- the people that are involved in starting -- in trying to start this charter school in Silver City, all vested stakeholders, I'm very impressed with your background and all the resources that you've mentioned in your -- in the hearing that was stated, in your presentations in Silver City.

I commend you on that, and you seemed to have very good ideas in how to support curriculum and how to support instruction and the direction you want to take your kids and what-have-you.

Looking at your application, I have to say that there are some items that I want to mention.

But the last one I really want to mention is probably the most deciding factor in why I cannot support the application for your school.

I saw -- I noticed there was a number of holes in your budget. I know that you mentioned you thought \$150,000 was sufficient enough for you to start your school. I think, in my experience, it takes about double that. You probably need about \$300,000 just to get your school started up.



1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I saw that there were no projected costs for technology, legal fees, professional services, et cetera. I think those things need to be addressed and identified.

You mentioned that some of the funding sources that you were looking at were some grants that you were looking to write up and what-have-you. And I have to mention to you that in my experience, grants are very competitive and a lot of times often don't find their pathway to start-up schools. They really want to look at schools that have been established and have a history of success and what-have-you. So I wouldn't rely totally on grants to support your financial base.

Facilities. I know you mentioned that you were looking at some land. I know the Montessori school and land they had available was mentioned and what-have-you. I didn't see a definite plan on where you're going to be. You mentioned land use, purchase of portables. This is one area where I really think you need to have a definite plan of how you're going to purchase those portables, if that's what you're going to use to start up your school.

Again, this all points back to it's really not a very good idea that start-up schools start out



1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

with a debt. I think you really need to make sure that you're financially ready to start your school and what-have-you.

And as I said earlier, the one and most deciding factor in looking in how I was going to determine whether I was going to approve this application or not was, you know, our public schools, in most recent years, have had a lot of -- have had to face a lot of financial burdens. And I know, in my school particularly this past year, we had to shave off \$300,000 in our budget. That meant cutting programs, cutting teachers, et cetera, and so forth.

You know, that's very impactful to the kids and the losses in support they're going to have when the district has to, you know, look in areas to cut in order to -- to plan their budget.

And so I'm concerned that in supporting this school, in establishing the school, my guess is that there are other schools that are in the same situation. And from what I hear, the Silver City Public Schools is, you know, experiencing that financial burden currently.

And so, in my opinion, I think by establishing the school, I'm concerned that this can



create a greater financial burden to the Silver City Public Schools, because by taking 120 kids away from their public schools and moving them over to your charter, that is going to lose hundreds of thousands of dollars, close to \$700,000 in the next year. That means cutting teachers, losing programs, et cetera, valuable resources that are important to those kids that are in public schools. I think the impact of that possibility in impacting those kids in the Silver Public Schools,

I'm concerned about that. And that weighed heavily on my decision not to support this application.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Toulouse?

COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Madam Chair, I'm going to disagree with my colleagues, because I was one of only three of us who were there at their public hearing. We were in the Grant County Commission Chambers. And that room had standing room only. And I think if a fire marshal had come in, they probably would have shooed an awful lot of the people out. There was a tremendous amount of community support there.

And while not being an educator, I got a



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

good explanation from them on their curriculum and how they planned to use it and what they plan to do.

I have an overall concern, as we're getting into the rest of these schools, that while there is a very thorough analysis by the Charter School Division, I'm not exactly sure who did it or how they did it, which is my problem. But I also see there's a fine line between what you need to have at application time and what can be developed during your planning year. And I think sometimes we've stepped over into concerns that come up during the planning year on how you get the details.

If the overall plan and approach is clearly there, I don't think the details can be there until you're actually sitting down and seeing what you have.

As to the facility, I heard the Montessori School folks tell us that the space would be available. I heard Aldo Leopold say, "We want this school to be the feeder school for us."

And I think Aldo Leopold is one of our very good charter schools that we have.

I wish you had made a little more point of your working with Aldo Leopold, because I think our mid-school kids are some of the most difficult to





reach. And they're also the kids who are most in danger of dropping out. And yet we don't have many of our charter schools that specifically deal with only mid-school kids, because they are difficult, because it is difficult to get your school ratings what they need to be to meet all the bureaucratic stuff now.

And I think these people with their plans are ready to go.

I understand Mr. Peralta's approach,
because he is a school bureaucrat, to knowing -no -- and I know. I know every one of the
superintendents who gets up and speaks. I'm not
going to look at the individual district's budget,
necessarily, except for some very tiny school
districts. And there's -- the Charter School Act
takes care of that.

I'm going to look at what's in the best interests of those schools, because that money may leave the school district; but it does not leave the community. It does not leave those children. And if the need is there, then it needs to go to those kids in need.

And that's the me who is a bureaucrat in Human Services and who has been raised in New Mexico



1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 and spent some of my happiest years as a little kid 2 down in Silver City, when it was a much, much 3 smaller place and my uncle had the Presbyterian 4 church there, and I was allowed to roam the town. 5 And I just -- I'm still overwhelmed and wish the rest of you had been able to see the 6 7 community that turned out for this school. 8 Thank you. 9 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 10 Other comments? 11 Commissioner Bergman? 12 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: High technology. 13 Madam Chair, Commissioners, I did, of 14 course, read and study the application. I had the 15 preliminary analysis presented by the -- and 16 prepared by the CSD Staff and their final 17 recommendation. And I also -- and I did attend the 18 19 Community Input hearing in Silver City. And I also 20 did -- there was a fairly good amount of follow-up 21 materials that did come in: The local 22 superintendent, Silver City superintendent and a 23 couple of his administrators actually filed fairly 24 lengthy documents than -- giving us their take on 25 this.



And one reason they did that is because the Superintendent had signed up on the Community Input part of the hearing. And all he did was stand up and say he would submit his comments later in written form. And that's what they did.

Doing all that brought me to the point that I did not feel that I could support this application.

In general, I did believe it was inadequate and incomplete in a number of key areas. While they are certainly focusing on a targeted community, I am not sure, in taking a look at the overall picture, that this proposed school would be in the best interests of the community that it would be located in. But I also have some specific reasons that I wanted to share as to how I've arrived at my decision.

Number one, the proposed Enki

curriculum -- and that's spelled E-N-K-I, if you

didn't already know that -- apparently had not been

aligned to the Common Core State Standards or

New Mexico Content Standards. Some observers stated

that the Enki curriculum was a home-school

curriculum.

The applicant did indicate in their



1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

application and in the Community Input hearing that two founders would work to align that Enki curriculum to those standards and that they hoped to be done by December.

Well, perhaps they -- that's a very complex and time-consuming process, as most educators know. They might make it; they might not. So that certainly concerned me.

Considering that the school's proposed target population would consist of students with dyslexia and other brain-based learning differences.

I felt that the applicant did not provide a clear description of how instruction would be differentiated based on identified student needs, and, further, considering that the applicant indicated what the target population would be, what it would consist of, that that population may present a higher proportion of need than in a traditional public school.

I felt their proposed budget did not reflect the higher costs that might be associated with that specific population.

Two, in the area of IEPs, 504 plans, and ELLs, I did not feel that the applicant clearly described how the school would serve, evaluate and





monitor the success of those students. For ELLs in particular, I did not see how the applicant described how the school will budget and staff itself to meet, here, again, those perhaps higher needs.

And number three, in the area of leadership, applicant did not address how the governing board would monitor organizational and academic performance. Further, the applicant did not address a plan to evaluate a head administrator.

In the applicant's -- four, in the applicant's hiring plan, the following statement was made twice, referring to candidates. And I quote, "Discuss whether, for political reasons, these candidates should be added to the pool."

And I think they were talking about candidates for their head administrator's job.

I actually asked about that statement in the Community Input hearing, because it concerned me. And the applicants stated -- their answer was they did not remember that being in the application.

Well, it was in there twice. And they did indicate that they would remove them. They did indicate that, because we all have different political beliefs; but we all work together to --

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

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



sometimes, at least in this country -- to come to common solutions for things. And I was never aware that that was -- at least in most jurisdictions, it wouldn't be -- a requirement if you wanted to serve in some capacity for a good organization. So that's why I asked about that.

In the capacity interview, CSD apparently asked them also about that, and they were told that this hiring plan was actually created by a "Fred Nolan" from Minnesota, and applicants apparently did not have a clear understanding or a knowledge of what he had in his plan. I think that's probably what led to the director making the comment about perhaps not having full ownership of their application. Some of it was apparently prepared by others.

Five -- and I'm going to explain this -- I question whether this school is unique and innovative. They're targeting the dyslexic population in Silver City. In one regard, that would be a unique and innovative approach to it. The message came through in the application, I thought, and in the Community Input hearing, that they felt that the dyslexic community was being underserved in the Silver City Schools.



Now, in their responses, Silver City
Schools indicated that -- submitted after the
Community Input hearing -- that they quite naturally
disagreed with that assertion. They felt that -they indicated that they felt they had a very strong
program serving the dyslexic community in the
Silver City area.

Now, they're not using the proposed programs that this school was; but they said they had a very -- what they considered a very strong program of their own. So that concerned me.

Actually, I -- under number six, I found a chart in there called an "organizational chart" that they called the "Enki Web." And I thought that that Enki Web did not necessarily provide an adequate narrative of the relationships between governance, administration, teaching, support staff, and external agencies. That chart did not identify any clear reporting lines and did not identify the appropriate relationships between all those groups.

Number seven, I felt that the applicant did not provide clear student discipline policies.

The policy provided failed to address due process requirements for all students and specifically for students with disabilities, their target population.



No plan was provided for addressing alternative educational settings and did not identify or address the legal protections that are required in those circumstances.

I had a reason there, talking about the enrollment; but I think that's probably been addressed. Here again, the next one also was on enrollment. I believe the Director had addressed that one.

The next specific area, I thought, in the area of Open Meetings Act, the applicant cut and pasted an Attorney General's Open Meeting compliance checklist; but apparently, that checklist was out of date, and there was a more current version available that had some changes to that. And that concerned me a little bit.

The applicant identified third-party relationships that would seem to be essential to their model; but I felt they did not provide a clear description of those relationships or discuss what legal implications, if any, might be.

They mentioned the Learning Center for

Dyslexia and Academic Success, and they apparently

have an MOU with this Enki organization. There was

also a general description of a potential



1

2

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

relationship with the Guadalupe Montessori School. 1 I also felt that the applicant's proposed 2 3 budget did not demonstrate the capacity to implement New Mexico school funding and budget for long-term 5 sustainability. The budget did not address facilities, start-up costs, business software, and a student information system. And apparently, I missed something that 8 Mr. Peralta saw, they were talking about \$150,000. 9 10 Apparently, I missed that reference. 11 I felt the applicant did not provide 12 adequate long-range goals and strategies that would 13 build the school's capacity to ensure that the 14 school would be sustainable. 15 Here again, because of those general and 16 specific reasons, I do not feel I can support this 17 application at this time. 18 Thank you, Madam Chair. 19 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. 20 Any other comments? Hearing none, the Chair would entertain a 21 22 motion. 23 I'm sorry. No? Okay. Would someone care to make the 24 25 motion?



1	Commissioner Peralta?
2	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: I move that the
3	Public Education Commission deny the 2015 New
4	Charter School Application submitted by Desert
5	Willow School, based on the Charter School
6	Division's recommendation stated on the record, as
7	well as the reasons stated by the Commissioners,
8	also on the record.
9	THE CHAIR: Thank you. You've heard the
10	motion.
11	Do we have a second?
12	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Second.
13	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Commissioner
14	Conyers.
15	THE CHAIR: Commissioner Conyers? Thank
16	you.
17	Motion by Commissioner Peralta, second by
18	Commissioner Conyers.
19	Is there any further discussion?
20	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I must be his little
21	puppet.
22	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Patti seconded it.
23	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I thought I heard
24	Commissioner Conyers. I thought it was his voice.
25	THE CHAIR: Let's correct it, please. The



1	motion was by Commissioner Peralta; the second was
2	by Commissioner Gipson. Thank you very much.
3	Further discussion?
4	Hearing none, Mr. Secretary, may we have a
5	roll-call vote?
6	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
7	Ambruster?
8	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yes.
9	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
10	Conyers?
11	COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Yes.
12	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
13	Peralta votes "Yes."
14	Commissioner Carr?
15	COMMISSIONER CARR: Yes.
16	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
17	Gipson?
18	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes.
19	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Pogna?
20	COMMISSIONER POGNA: Yes.
21	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
22	Toulouse?
23	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: No.
24	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
25	Bergman?





1	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
3	Shearman?
4	THE CHAIR: Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Madam Chair, that
6	is eight to one in favor of the motion.
7	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. By a
8	vote of eight to one, the application of Desert
9	Willow Charter School is denied.
L 0	Thank you, all.
L1	Next is the Six Directions Indigenous
L 2	School.
L 3	Do we have representatives from that
L 4	school?
L 5	Good morning to you all.
L 6	MR. TOWERY: Good morning.
L 7	THE CHAIR: Katie, would you start when
L 8	you're ready, please?
L 9	MS. POULOS: Madam Chair, Commissioners,
20	in its final analysis and recommendation, CSD
21	recommended the denial of the application for Six
22	Directions Indigenous School, based on the following
23	findings:
2 4	The application was inadequate because
25	62 percent of the responses in the education plan



were rated "partially meets" or "does not meet." 1 78 percent of the responses in the 2 3 organizational and governance plan were rated "partially meets" or "does not meet." 5 70 percent of the responses in the business plan were rated "partially meets"" or "does 6 not meet." 8 50 percent of responses in the evidence of support were rated "partially meets" or "does not 9 meet." 10 11 Many of the responses lacked essential 12 details to fully understand the applicant's plan and 13 ability to meet the requirements of operating a 14 charter school. 15 The applicant did not adequately describe 16 how the proposed school would address the needs of 17 all special population students, including students with IEPs, ELLs, and students who qualify for 504 18 19 plans. 20 The applicant did not adequately describe how corrective actions would be implemented if the 21 22 proposed school's academic performance fell short of 23 expectations.



plan for governing body training or evaluation.

The applicant did not provide an adequate

24

The applicant did not adequately describe how the governing body will monitor school outcomes.

The applicant did not adequately describe a staffing or recruitment plan that would ensure the school hires a skilled and capable administrator.

The applicant did not adequately describe a professional development plan that will ensure teachers are able to implement the curriculum and improve student achievement.

The applicant did not provide adequate information to demonstrate the capacity to develop appropriate and legally compliant policies.

After CSD provided the applicants and the Commissioners with the final analysis and recommendation, these applicants were given an opportunity to provide additional information in a response. The applicant's response, CSD believes, demonstrated the following:

Strong support from the NACA-Inspired
School Network. Need and community support for the
proposed school. Additional clarity to the
applicant's original responses that demonstrates an
understanding of the requirements for serving
special populations, and a capacity to meet these
requirements. The need for the applicant to



1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

complete substantial additional work to develop policies and plans in order to prepare to commence operations of the proposed school.

The applicant team has the resources and support sufficient to complete this required work. The applicant is willing to continue to work with CSD to ensure the proposed school is able to open timely and effectively.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Katie.

Good morning to all of you. Those of you who are going to speak -- and if the others would care to be identified, that's fine. But please give us your name, spelling, if it is unique, and your position with the school, please.

And you need to press down the button on the microphone so that we can hear everyone.

SPEAKER: Good morning. Can you hear me?

THE CHAIR: Just barely.

SPEAKER: Good morning. My name is Anpao Duta Flying Earth, A-N-P-A-O, D-U-T-A, F-L-Y-I-N-G, E-A-R-T-H.

 $$\operatorname{And}$  I'm the current Head of School of NACA and also representative of the NACA-Inspired Schools Network.

MR. SOCE: Good morning. My name is Ben



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



```
Soce, S-O-C-E. I'm a cofounder of Six Directions,
 1
 2
     and also an educator with the National Indian Youth
 3
     Leadership Project.
 4
               MR. TOWERY: Good morning. My name is
 5
     Lane Towery, L-A-N-E, T-O-W-E-R-Y. I'm going to try
 6
     to not talk too fast today.
               I am sort of the original organizer and
 7
 8
     cofounder of Six Directions Indigenous School.
 9
               THE CHAIR:
                           Thank you.
               MR. BLUEHOUSE: Madam Chair and members of
10
11
     this committee, I appreciate being here. My name is
12
     Philmer Bluehouse. First name spelling is
13
     P-H-I-L-M-E-R. Last name is "Bluehouse,"
     B-L-U-E-H-O-U-S-E, member of the governing
14
15
     committee -- I'm sorry -- governing council.
16
               THE CHAIR:
                           Thank you.
17
               MR. TOWERY: Should we have someone
18
     identify anyone else who's in support or do that
     later?
19
20
               THE CHAIR: Do they have a role with the
     school?
21
22
               MR. TOWERY:
                            Through the NACA-Inspired
23
     Schools Network, some of them do.
24
               THE CHAIR: Yes, let's introduce them,
25
     please.
```





1	MR. TOWERY: Thank you. Go ahead.
2	MR. ULIBARRI: My name is Daniel Ulibarri.
3	U-L-I-B-A-R-R-I. I'm the Director of Operations and
4	Facilities for the NACA-Inspired Schools Network.
5	MS. CHAVEZ: Hi. My name is Corinna
6	Chavez. I work with the NACA-Inspired Schools
7	Network as a School Development and Evaluation
8	Director. And there are several of us from the
9	NACA-Inspired Schools Network. So would it be
10	sufficient if we ask people who are here
11	representing support for the school through that
12	network to stand up?
13	THE CHAIR: That would be fine.
14	MS. CHAVEZ: Or do you want to hear from
15	each one individually?
16	THE CHAIR: No, that would be fine. Just
17	ask them to stand, please.
18	Full house. Thank you very much.
19	Whenever you are ready, you have 15
20	minutes. Thank you, ma'am.
21	MR. SOCE: First of all, it's good to be
22	here. It's good to see everybody here. Again, my
23	name is Ben Soce. I'm actually a product of the
24	Gallup-McKinley County School District. I graduated
25	in 1991. I almost didn't graduate. My high school



years were not as good as I would have liked it to be.

Same goes with my mid-school year. In 1984-'85 school year, I came to Gallup-McKinley County School District, the mid-school portion, Gallup Mid School. I was separated from my classmates, from my elementary school, which was mostly non- -- mostly Native population students and teachers. When I got to the mid-school, I was tracked differently from my classmates and my peers and my friends. My academic performance in the elementary separated me from them.

The first three quarters of the first year, sixth grade, I made the honor roll. Towards the end of my sixth-grade year, things started changing. I started lacking support. I started feeling unwelcome, and I started feeling disconnected from the class and the school. I was the only Native in all my advanced classes at Gallup Mid School.

By the time I started seventh grade and eighth grade, I started deliberately not doing so well in class and in school. I wanted to be with my friends. I wanted that feeling of, you know, belonging with people, belonging to the school. I



felt like the school didn't provide me with something like that.

So I didn't do so well academically. In sports and everything else, I excel. But with the way the school was set up, I felt like I was not supported properly. I wasn't challenged properly.

I think back on it, and in -- in real life, there was a lot of wasted opportunity. The school district could have done a lot more to support students like me.

Now, 30 years later, we still have that problem. We have young people going to mid-schools and high school, and they feel like they don't belong, that they don't -- they're not challenged; they're not supported. And I feel like I've come full circle now, and I have a chance to offer something back to the community of Gallup and the surrounding communities there.

So hopefully, Six Directions School will get started there. That way, we can address some of the needs that are lacking with the Gallup-McKinley County School District.

Thank you.

MR. TOWERY: Thank you all very much. We're really excited to be here this morning and to





be able to describe our school for you all. We're excited about our school, and we hope you are, too.

I'm going to spend a few minutes talking about our idea and why we think it's a really important idea. Then we're going to spend a few minutes getting into our team and our team's capacity and some of the support we have.

And then we'll finish up back with our mission and vision, and that's how we want to spend the next few minutes that we have together.

Our work together really started a year ago when a group of folks in Gallup came together with a shared concern over the historical failings of the public education system serving Native youth, especially in our area of the state. And we spent, really, the last year asking amongst ourselves, and with many of our community members, what it would take to provide a really excellent education to youth in Gallup, in particular, that does mean Native youth, because they're the majority of the students in the district, and they also suffer disproportionately low outcomes compared to other students.

Our answer about the ways to provide really excellent education to Native youth, and to



all youth in Gallup, really coalesced around three
big ideas, the first being culturally responsive
teaching or culturally responsive schooling; the
second being frameworks of positive youth
development and holistic health and wellness; and
the third being really rigorous project-based
learning.

Culturally responsive teaching, in particular, is important to us because a wealth of research shows that when Native youth feels safe and they feel their identify and community are affirmed and welcomed in the school, that their performance improves markedly. This improvement is captured in both attendance rates, graduation rates, and test scores.

Different local schools in the Southwest, schools like the Native American Community Academy, or NACA, or schools like Puente de Hozho in Flagstaff, are schools that have demonstrated success with culturally responsive models.

NACA has had nearly 100 percent of its senior class admitted to college and has been named a School to Learn from by the LESC last year.

Puente de Hozho students in Arizona have outperformed their Native peers on Arizona State



8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

tests, which are given in English, even though they attend a Navajo emergent school model.

Positive youth development and holistic health and wellness are also incredibly important, because we feel like there's evidence that when a school focuses on relationships and social and emotional wellness, that it can fuel improved learning. We address this directly through systems like our advisory, and through restorative justice process.

I think it's important to note that this last idea, in particular, came from talking to parents in our community who told too many stories and too many frustrations of students being suspended and expelled. Our goal, specifically, is to keep students in school and happy in school and highly functioning in school.

Finally, the process that we articulate around rigorous project-based learning, combined with the skills labs, is important to us for its rigor, for its high engagement levels, and for its ability to allow our local youth to explore their learning and apply their learning to their community, while still focusing on Common Core Standards and State Content Standards to dictate the



content of students' learning.

1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We believe explicitly that this is a very innovative model, different than anything that has been tried before in the northwest corner of our state. We feel confident that it will lead to an excellent school and improve outcomes by meeting the needs and the values of our community. We feel strongly this idea is very credible and important.

Talking about our team and our support, part of culturally responsive schooling is close engagement of your community and allowing community input into the model of schooling that you provide. Over the course of the last year, we've done over 70 one-on-one meetings of parents, educators, policy-makers from within Gallup and from tribal government around Gallup.

These meetings have fueled our design by hearing people's stories, values, and aspirations for the youth in our community. We've hosted public planning meetings weekly. We've worked with local chapters. Coming out of that, we have the support of two chapters, Tsayatoh and Mariana Lake, specifically through Resolutions of Support, which is something I'm particularly proud of. It's not always easy to get Resolutions of Support from



chapter houses.

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 also have the explicit support of places like University of New Mexico/Gallup, the National Indian Youth Leadership Project, who is also represented here today, and through the NACA-Inspired Schools Network.

I want to mention just a few things that come with that partnership with the NACA-Inspired Schools Network. One is that through folks like Carmen, who didn't introduce herself specifically, we have a business manager, licensed business manager and business support with our budgeting processes.

Through Josh Krause, who has taught at Central New Mexico, we have support with designing curriculum through the Understanding by Design process.

Through Daniel and his team, we have support with finding and preparing facilities for our school.

One update is that recently, a building downtown in Gallup just very, very recently became open. And we met with the owner of it, who happens to also be the family that provides the land for Uplift Community School, the other charter school in



Gallup, and who expressed -- we just met yesterday, and he had great excitement with working together and finding a way for us to use this building. It's really beautiful and in great condition right in downtown Gallup.

Nothing is a given, but we're excited about that update and wanted to share it with you all. Of course, we also are provided start-up funding through the NACA-Inspired Schools Network. At this time, I want to give Duta a chance to provide information about the financial support NACA Inspired Schools Network offers.

MR. FLYING EARTH: Thanks for having us. It is with great excitement we talk about our schools. A year ago, we were in this room deciding whether or not to authorize the DEAP School. Good news is they opened their doors last week and are serving over 20 families in a community that is transforming as we speak.

Dream Diné is currently in its second year, with 100 percent of their students coming back, and also adding an additional eight to ten families to their -- to their enrollment, as well.

So I started with this context, because I think about New Mexico as a place of -- of great





educational promise. And I have some good news to share with you, as well.

And the reason why Director Bobroff couldn't be here, she'll be on a call in probably about 40 minutes with Secretary Duncan and Secretary Jewell to announce that the NACA-Inspired Schools Network was selected as 12 awardees of the Department of Education, nationally, for our work around college-and-career readiness for Native American communities. And so we feel like we have a proven track record, and it's being supported externally.

And so the supports that Mr. Towery, that
Lane talks about, are real. And ten years in as the
head of school, we have graduated four classes, and
we've refined our approach and have a very
systematic and calculated way of supporting, like
Lane was saying, with finance, with facilities.

And I know that there was a question of special education, as well, and so something that we take very seriously in transforming education in this network.

Part of the support that -- that Mr. Towery will receive is -- is the -- the \$50,000 that he receives in the first two years, as well as





some start-up funding, and then three years in, also supporting initiatives like we've seen in Dream Diné and DEAP.

So that is something that will not go away. And that is something that we have been leveraging support around.

So with that, I just want to acknowledge you and say thank you for the choices you've made as a representative of the network, and to let you know that your communities are feeling it. Our communities are feeling the impact, just like in Shiprock and Navajo.

Thank you.

MR. TOWERY: Thanks, Duta. I also feel really strongly about our governing council, about the ways they represent our local community and the many different funds of knowledge they bring to our work.

So Philmer wanted to speak briefly about their preparation to offer oversight of our school.

MR. BLUEHOUSE: Currently, I personally feel that we're in the process of getting approved, and we want to be approved. We want to become an approved Board of Finance. We also want to have and elect officers. We want to contact the Attorney



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

General's Office to request for Open Meeting Act training.

We plan for five committees to help manage all the work this year, which includes curriculum, wellness, family engagement, staff hiring, family engagement, as I think I mentioned earlier. And those are areas that we want to work on specifically to develop them.

We have asked Lane to be our person in charge of posting agendas and minutes, notifying the paper and other things, to let folks know in our community about the meetings we want to hold with them.

MR. TOWERY: Thanks, Philmer.

We're really excited about our school this year. One person that we have in attendance here in support of us is an attorney who's here. And we have a statement we'd just like to read briefly, which is, "Our team has done our best, we believe, to respond to meet the standards required under what appears to be a shift in the Charter Schools Division's overall evaluation process. And we fully participated and adhered to the information and guidance provided by the trainings we attended, by the application tool kit, and the additional



1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

requests for more information.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"And if anything, we believe that our persistence in the charter process is further evidence of our full commitment to the success of our students, our school, and our community."

To close, I want to bring this back briefly to New Mexico. I think one of the best parts about working in New Mexico is that we have a really strong Indian Education Act, which is something I'm really proud of.

The Indian Education Act states, in the very beginning, that its purpose is to, A, ensure equitable and culturally relevant learning environments, educational opportunities, and culturally relevant instructional materials for American Indian students enrolled in public schools.

To ensure maintenance of native languages.

And to provide the study, development, and implementation of educational systems that positively affect the educational success of American Indian students.

The strength of that language, I think, belies the truth in places like Gallup that serve mostly Native students. Right now, in the city of Gallup, specifically 65 percent, give or take, are



Native. And each public middle school, in the last year that their rankings are available -- in the '13-'14 school year -- each public school was rated with a "D," and all the public high schools were rated with a "C."

Right now, we don't believe that students have access to options that are focused, in particular, on affirming their identities. Local public schools continue, we believe, to pursue similar strategies as they've pursued in the past. And we sit before you today offering what we believe is an innovative model, aimed at getting to the root of historic failures, a combination of persistent low expectations for Native youth and youth of color, and a wide chasm between students' cultural identities and the identities they're asked to have in their classrooms.

Thank you.

We offer a model focused on culturally responsive education, positive youth development, and rigorous, project-based learning, all intended to ensure that students and families alike feel safe and affirmed in their school and that students are held to the highest expectations for their performance in school.



1	We're here today to ask your support and
2	your approval for offering a new model of education
3	in Gallup. We believe that together, the
4	opportunity to do something that's different that's
5	never been done, something that provides really
6	excellent education to youth in our community.
7	Thank you very much.
8	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.
9	Commissioners, do you have questions or
10	concerns?
11	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Yes, ma'am.
12	THE CHAIR: Commissioner Bergman?
13	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you,
14	Madam Chair and Commissioners. Before I get into
15	the other remarks that I wish to make, I think it
16	would be important for me to note that, particularly
17	in my case, I've been doing this for seven years
18	now. This is the seventh class of applications that
19	I've worked through.
20	Commissioner Shearman has been with me in
21	that process. Commissioner Carr has, too. I
22	believe we're the and Commissioner Pogna, because
23	she's served longer than all of us.
24	But I wanted to note that it may appear to
25	the audience each year, as we deal with these



applications, that somehow -- and I'm speaking solely for myself -- that when I arrive at a "yes" or "no" answer, that it must have been an easy process.

I can assure you, it is never an easy process. I have agonized over decisions each and every year. There are no perfect applications. I have never seen a perfect application. I have only seen one or two that even came close, and it wasn't particularly close.

So then the question becomes, if all applications have deficiencies and shortcomings, how do you decide which one you feel you can support, and how do you decide? And that's where the agony comes in.

It is -- I assure you it is not an easy process for us. And there have actually been a couple of occasions when my name was called to vote, and I still had not decided whether I should vote "yes" or "no." And I actually hesitate. And I think everybody thought I had missed my name or something. That's how tough the decisions are sometimes.

In the case of this particular application, I -- have really wavered on it. But I



1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

think I'm going to decide -- I have some specific
comments I want to put into the record. But I'm

putting them in there for a reason, because I

actually think I'm going to support this application
at this time, even though it is not a perfect
application and has some significant shortcomings.

Part of what has propelled me to that decision is they have the support of the NACA Network. For those that don't know, I don't know when that school opened. As they know, the N-A---NACA school, is that in Albuquerque? I believe that's in Albuquerque.

MR. FLYING EARTH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: That is, from everything I can hear -- because I don't believe it's one of our schools -- but I understand it is a successful school that is accomplishing successful things.

I also was impressed -- one of the panelists there is from a group called the National Indian Youth Leadership Project. They had a trademark thing that they called Project Venture, and their motto for that is it's about "Empowering Native youth for the future, starting today."

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

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



So in this case, I believe this school has

the potential to have a supporting network that is already operating a successful school; and, therefore, they should be able to overcome some of my specific concerns and the concerns perhaps of the Charter School Division.

So in this case, I am going to respectfully disagree with the Charter School Division recommendation. I do want these voted into the -- or noted -- my concerns noted in the record. I never know how my fellow Commissioners are going to vote; I never tell my fellow Commissioners how I'm going to vote. It should always come as a surprise to them, because sometimes, as I've said, it's a surprise to me. And I mean that in a good way.

I -- I am here for the same reason that everyone else is here. I want every school that this body authorizes to be a successful school, not because it's important for us, or even important, necessarily, for the founders, but because it's important for the kids, to give them a running start in life. And so I want to read these into the record.

One, I felt that the applicant's assessment plan failed to identify how the





assessments will be used to inform instruction, with one exception. They're going to do the NWEA MAP.

They provid- -- the applicant provided a limited response regarding what corrective actions would be taken if the school falls short of student academic achievement.

There was a lack of meaningful detail as to how collective -- corrective actions -- excuse me -- would be implemented, what would trigger those actions, who would implement them -- those corrective actions, and how their effectiveness will be assessed.

Two, the applicant did not provide, in my opinion, an adequate plan for governing body training. They just cited the legal requirements. Applicant also failed to provide meaningful detail about how the governing body will evaluate its performance further. There was no clear plan for how the governing body will monitor student outcome. Applicant failed to provide a plan for how the governing body will convey and delineate the roles and responsibilities of the head administrator and the executive director.

I'm sure my colleagues notice that they're going to have a two-tiered thing there. And I had



1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

some concerns about how that might work in real life.

I also felt that the applicant's organizational chart did not address governing body committees, a licensed business manager, or any external agencies that are essential to the school.

And, actually, I'm not sure why I wrote that, because as even I just said, they have some external agencies that probably, I felt, will be.

So I -- I did some of these at midnight, sometimes, at night; so perhaps I can give myself an excuse for that.

Applicant indicated that they will provide transportation and food services to their students; but I thought they provided only the limited detail of how these needs would be met. And they did not -- and he just answered that -- their projected facilities needs.

They may -- now, keep in mind the way the process works, by the time actually had the funding for the facility, the facility they think they had may have disappeared somewhere else. So it's -- facilities are probably the most important thing that any new school faces anymore. And yet, because of the way the funding works from the State, they



1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

can't really do anything about their facilities until we've already approved them and they've already gotten into their planning year. So it makes it tough for them and tough for us to try to pin down what kind of facilities they're going to have.

I offer those thoughts. I wanted them on the record. I'll state later why I wanted them on the record. But, actually, I think I'm going to vote in favor of this application.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR: Commissioner Toulouse?

COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Madam Chair, I also want to say hopefully, on this one, I'll have more people voting with me. I am absolutely in support of this group. And the one thing you didn't mention, but I think is important, is that there is an agreement here between not just the Navajo Tribe and the people who are Navajo in the McKinley County School system, but also with Zuni. And I think that's, for us New Mexicans who know all of the different feelings between different groups of people in different areas of this state, I think that's a major accomplishment.

And at the public hearing, there was a lot



1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of support from Zuni there, and Zuni students will 1 be included in this. And I just want that on the 2 3 record, because I also am going to support just about anything that the NACA-Inspired School group 5 is doing, because they are well-organized; they are well-staffed; they plan well, and they have a track 7 record. 8 So it's going to take a lot for me not to 9 support one of their groups. But I'm just very impressed with the 10 11 inclusion of Zuni in this school. 12 So thank you. 13 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner Carr? 14 15 COMMISSIONER CARR: It's been rare that 16 we've gone against the recommendation of CSD. 17 think the last one, I believe -- and I don't even remember for sure; there's been about two -- was 18 19 also a school that was serving Native American

And I think I kind of led that. And people started -- and quite often, what happens in these meetings -- had no idea; I was surprised -- Commissioner Bergman was going to vote. I had no idea. Most of the time he and I agree, you know,



students.

20

21

22

23

24

when -- on matters before this Commission. We may not agree on some other things; but we agree on matters before this Commission most of the time.

I'm a history teacher. I taught in Taos.

This is my 15 years. And I work with Taos Pueblo children. And unfortunately, I have seen, repeatedly, Native American children treated with disrespect, treated with ill regard in regards to their culture. And I strive continuously to serve those children and support those children as best as I could, circumstances not always being good.

I've seen educators not come up to what they should have been, caring for some children more than others because of who they were, who they came from. And that has always been a terrible thing for me to witness.

I can imagine what it would be for a Native American child coming through a system that doesn't always support.

I -- my feelings are, we don't do enough for all of our children. We don't do enough for our minority children. We certainly have never done enough for Native American children.

Matter of fact, in some cases, going back to the Indian schools, we've gone too far in trying





to strip their culture away.

I don't know that it's ignorance or what the cause is. People don't want to learn, don't want to -- to know what it means to be a Native American. I can't say that I do. But I can say that I've worked very diligently to try to understand.

I am very impressed with the -- with the support that's here today. And I -- I know we're going -- if the rest of the Commission -- I don't know how -- just like Commissioner Bergman said, I don't know how everyone else is going to vote unless they've already said it before I talk.

I know if we do accept you, I know there will be conditions. You've got a lot of support. I can see that. And I hope that -- I guess I wish you great success. I -- I will vote in favor of this application.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner.

If I could just ask a couple of questions before I forget them?

Mr. Towery and Mr. Soce, you are the co-founders? Is that -- did I hear you correctly?

MR. TOWERY: There have been a number of different people who have been involved in the





school throughout the course of this year. I would say the three people who probably most identify as co-founders would be me, Mr. Soce, and then a young woman who's a teacher, Masika Sweetwyne, who's also on our governing council, who's not here today, who's teaching in her classroom. She's from Zuni.

Our group has grown and changed. We have a lot of people involved. We three most identify as the earliest people involved.

THE CHAIR: I'm just curious what your involvement would be -- should this school be approved, what your involvement would be going forward. It's been my strong belief that if the founders continue with the school going forward, it's stronger. When the founders leave, for whatever reason, the school has many problems.

So would you address that, please.

MR. TOWERY: Absolutely. And that's a lesson I've definitely learned, especially talking with folks from the Uplift school in Gallup, trying to learn lessons from their history. That's one thing they expressed with us.

Part of the plan that Mr. Bergman brought up about the sort of two leaders, the principal and head administrator and executive director. In part,



1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that was created in order to simply allow for a 1 2 principal to be an instructional leader, and an 3 executive director to play more of the superintendent organizational role. It was also done that way so that as we 5 move forward, like you said, the founders can 6 continue to be involved. Mr. Soce has committed to being on our 8 9 governing council. Ms. Sweetwyne is committed to 10 being on our governing council. And the intent for 11 me is to play the role of executive director at 12 least for the first three to five years, so that 13 there's continuity in the planning and the 14 relationship-building that has been done, and the 15 philosophies that have been built, and then the 16 school opening.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. That answers my question.

My other concern, or question, is on your application. On school size, you start out with Year One, 50, and go through Year Five, 190 students. And then it says, "At capacity enrollment, 300."

This Commission has -- has a problem with that. We need to know what's the capacity. And the



19

20

21

22

23

24

way I read it, the enrollment cap would be 190 for the first five years, for the five-year contract of this school.

If the school then wanted to move up to a higher number, it would require either an amendment to their charter or a change when they -- when the next contract was negotiated.

But there is a disconnect between those numbers. And I would like for it to be clarified at this moment.

Katie, has CSD looked at that, and have you all visited with it, and has that been clarified in discussion?

MS. POULOS: It hasn't. I think the challenge, certainly with past applications was that the charter became the contract. And that's where some of that lack of clarity would come in.

I think now that that cap is clearly stated in the contract, that would be a place where that could be very clearly settled at the contract negotiations, or at this point, if that's what you're asking.

THE CHAIR: Okay. But at this moment, the way I read it, the enrollment cap for this five years would be 190, okay, just so there's no

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

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



1	confusion?
2	MR. TOWERY: Okay.
3	THE CHAIR: Okay? Any other comments?
4	Commissioner Conyers I'm sorry.
5	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Shouldn't you ask
6	them, is there an agreement with that, or with
7	the 190?
8	THE CHAIR: They wrote it.
9	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Well, he kind of
10	hesitated.
11	MR. TOWERY: Can we offer a comment or a
12	response?
13	Thank you.
14	This might be my naivete in writing
15	certain aspects. Our hope is to write an enrollment
16	cap for a six-through-twelve school with
17	300 students, which would leave us with about 40 per
18	grade. By our fifth year, we still wouldn't even be
19	all of our grades. It would be six through
20	eleventh.
21	The numbers written there were written,
22	for me, were written with a conservative estimate of
23	our growth, so that as we wrote our budget for
2 4	five-year projections, it was conservative. If we
25	had more students than that enroll over the first



five years, I would be thrilled for it. 1 And so my idea would be to have the 2 3 enrollment cap at 300. I know there's confusion. 4 THE CHAIR: The way I read this, 190; but 5 if your school is successful, at contract 6 negotiation, that could always be a negotiation 7 point. 8 MR. TOWERY: Great. Thank you. 9 THE CHAIR: I would say to my fellow 10 Commissioners, I am leaning towards approval with 11 conditions. I -- I hear what you all have said 12 today. I even hear what Katie -- or see what Katie 13 has written as suggested conditions and the rationale for those conditions. And I agree with 14 15 that. I think the school has answered most of the 16 concerns that were brought forward. 17 So, Commissioner Conyers? COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Madam Chairman, 18 19 members of the Commission, I want to add my 20 compliments to CSD for their analysis. Certainly, it's been very thorough, and a lot of things that I 21 22 would not have been aware of or noticed came as a



while they did not receive your -- your

23

24

25

part of that.

SANTA FE OFFICE

FAX (505) 820-6349

119 East Marcy, Suite 110 Santa Fe, NM 87501 (505) 989-4949



And I know on this particular application,

recommendation, they, I think, scored very high, 1 2 compared to the other applications. 3 And also, I kind of agree with what 4 Commissioner Toulouse said earlier, that some of 5 these details are worked out during the planning year and can be addressed during that time. 6 7 And I did attend the public input hearing. 8 And I'm -- my memory isn't always great; but I don't 9 remember anyone from the Gallup-McKinley District 10 speaking against it --11 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: No. 12 COMMISSIONER CONYERS: -- for whatever 13 reason. And so I feel like I can support this 14 application. 15 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 16 Other comments? Commissioner Peralta? 17 18 COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Thank you, 19 Madam Chair. I must say that I'm very much 20 impressed with the network of support that you've 21 got here today, and, of course, the presentation 22 that you've had before the Commission here. 23 I have to share that the reason for my 24 "no" vote on this application are two reasons: 25 One is that my "no" vote would be based on



the merits of the evaluation by the Charter School 1 2 Division, first of all. 3 And secondly, I always remind myself about being consistent. If I voted for other schools because of inadequacies in the application, I want 5 to be consistent and fair to all the rest of the applications that come before me, personally, on this Commission. 8 9 Based on those two reasons, I have to --10 it looks like I may be the only "no" vote. 11 again, thank you for coming. And, again, best of 12 luck. 13 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner. 14 Other comments? 15 Commissioner Ambruster? 16 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Thank you, 17 Madam Chair, Commissioners. 18 I am where Commissioner Bergner [ph] is --Bergman is -- in terms of, "Wow, what should I do?" 19 20 It will come at the very last moment. I'm impressed by what NACA has done, the 21 support that you offer. 22 23 My concern is that, although it may not be exactly that we're creating a segregated school, 24



where Native Americans would be at least the

majority, as they already are the majority in the Gallup-McKinley School districts. And from a person from a civil rights background, that, in a sense, does bother me.

I don't know that it's a good or bad bother. But it's sort of like saying, "We're taking charter schools, which were originally designed to help all students, and not segregate them" -- if you think particularly of New York, and what's happened is, they're all segregated.

So the -- not necessarily Native Americans and New York City, but certainly Hispanic, or Puerto Rican, or whatever, Black students, that we've segregated them, and then they're not assimilating and being part of the environment. Because we would hope that to be successful -- I think we could agree -- that you do need to assimilate into -- you have to be part of the melting pot to be there.

And you guys were here first.

But to be successful, as you all have been, takes being a part of that. And so that's just an issue for me.

On the other hand, Gallup's apparent failure to address the Native American needs also bothers me. I have not been there; so I can't



1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

speak -- you know, have experience. I can only
speak from what I've heard.

They -- why aren't they being culturally responsible? How have you -- or has anybody tried to intervene in their situation? Because you're talking about helping 190 to 300 and -- it doesn't really matter what the number is -- students.

Wonderful.

But there's a whole lot of more people there. So I'm concerned that Gallup is not responsive, and, equally, that they didn't even attend the hearing where I was in attendance.

And so that makes me think, like, well, they just want you to do this because they're not willing to do it.

And I don't know how you would, or under what conditions you even are, allowed to expand your ideas and what's successful for you to make it successful for all students; because I see my job as not just helping charter schools and that small group of students be successful, but to have all of New Mexico students be successful. It would be hard to say, "Just you six." No, that's wrong.

So -- so I'm disconflicted on that, and I wanted to share that.





1	I think that's enough. Thank you.
2	THE CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner.
3	Do we have further comments?
4	Let me just take a minute.
5	(A discussion was held off the record.)
6	THE CHAIR: Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like
7	to take about a five-minute break so we can confer
8	with our attorney before we go any further, please?
9	Okay?
10	(Recess taken, 11:47 a.m. to 11:52 a.m.)
11	THE CHAIR: Let's come back in session
12	again, please. Thank you for letting us take that
13	break.
14	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Madam Chair?
15	THE CHAIR: Commissioners, if we're ready,
16	I will call on Commissioner Toulouse to make a
17	motion.
18	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Madam Chair, I
19	move I'd move that the Public Education
20	Commission approve, with conditions, the 2015 New
21	Charter School Application for Six Directions
22	Indigenous School, through a combination of capacity
23	interview, the Community Input hearing, and the
24	written response to the final analysis and
25	recommendation. The applicant has addressed the



concerns identified in the analysis of the written application.

The conditions that we propose are, and are subject to, the following conditions on this approval:

Let's see. These should be able to sufficiently address all concerns identified in the analysis of the application and are prepared to begin operating a charter school that will meet the purposes of the Charter School Act.

These conditions require that the applicants must:

- 1. Timely obtain standing as an approved Board of Finance no more than 120 days after receiving written notification of the approval of this application;
- 2. Timely secure a facility that meets
  PSFA approval, including E-Occupancy, no less than
  two weeks prior to the scheduled first day of
  school;
- 3. Complete the Planning Year Checklist with any revisions approved by the PEC at the November meeting, including correcting all findings by the deadlines identified by CSD, when materials submitted as part of the Planning Year Checklist are



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	evaluated for completeness and statutory and
2	regulatory compliance;
3	4. Attend all planning year training and
4	technical assistance sessions hosted by CSD;
5	5. As part of the contract and framework
6	negotiation and approval process, obtain the Public
7	Education Commission's approval of any substantial
8	proposed changes to the educational model, staffing,
9	organizational, and governance plan, or finance plan
_ 0	that are presented in the application. And;
1	6. That the applicant will address the
. 2	deficiencies that were noted by both the CSD and the
. 3	Commissioners during the planning year.
L 4	THE CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner.
L 5	You've heard the motion.
L 6	Do we have a second?
_7	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Second.
8 .	THE CHAIR: Motion by Commissioner
9	Toulouse, second by Commissioner Bergman, to approve
20	the application, with conditions, as stated on the
21	official record.
22	Is there any further discussion?
23	Hearing none, Mr. Secretary, may we have a
2 4	roll-call vote?
2.5	And I would remind you that a "yes" vote



1	is for approval, with conditions.
2	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
3	Conyers?
4	COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
6	Gipson?
7	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes.
8	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Pogna?
9	COMMISSIONER POGNA: Yes.
10	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
11	Peralta votes "No."
12	Commissioner Armbruster?
13	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
15	Bergman?
16	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Yes.
17	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
18	Toulouse?
19	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Carr?
21	COMMISSIONER CARR: Yes.
22	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
23	Shearman?
24	THE CHAIR: Yes.
25	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Madam Chair, that



is an eight-to-one, in favor of the motion. 1 2 THE CHAIR: Pardon me, Mr. Secretary? 3 was coughing when you gave the numbers. 4 COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Eight to one. 5 THE CHAIR: Eight to one. Thank you very much. 6 The motion to approve the application of Six Directions Indigenous School, with conditions, 8 as stated on the official record, is approved by a 9 10 vote of eight to one. 11 Congratulations. 12 (Applause.) 13 THE CHAIR: We look forward to you --14 Thank you, all. Thank you MR. TOWERY: 15 very much. We know it's been a lot of work on your 16 part; so thank you very much. 17 THE CHAIR: Commissioners, I suggest we take a lunch break. But before we do, Mrs. Friedman 18 19 has some information for us. 20 MS. FRIEDMAN: Commissioners, I just received an e-mail that the south-side doors of the 21 22 PED building that lead to the coffee shop in the 23 next building are closed due to construction. 24 so if you want to go to the coffee shop, you will 25 have to go through their Don Gaspar entrance or the



```
1
     main entrance on the right here. Go out this
     building and go into the main entrance of the next
 2
 3
     building.
 4
               THE CHAIR:
                           Thank you very much.
 5
     Commissioners.
               How much time would you like to take for
 6
 7
     lunch?
             It's now 12:00.
 8
               COMMISSIONER CARR: We can do an hour
 9
     today.
10
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Let's do an hour.
               THE CHAIR: An hour? Okay.
11
                                             Sounds good
12
     to me.
               All right. We'll be back at 1:00.
13
                                                    Thank
14
     you, all.
15
               (A recess was taken at 11:57 a.m., and
16
     reconvened at 1:04 p.m., as follows:)
                           I call back into session this
17
               THE CHAIR:
18
     meeting of the Public Education Commission. I would
19
     ask the representatives from The STEAM Academy to
20
     please come forward.
21
               And, Katie, whenever you're ready, please.
22
               MS. POULOS:
                           Madam Chair, Commissioners,
23
     in its final analysis and recommendation, CSD
     recommended denial of the application by The STEAM
24
25
     Academy, based on the following findings:
```



1 The application was inadequate because 2 67 percent of the responses in the educational plan 3 were rated "partially meets" or "does not meet." 4 75 percent of the responses in 5 organizational or governance plan were rated "partially meets" or "does not meet." 6 80 percent of the responses in the business plan were rated "partially meets" or "does 8 not meet." 10 25 percent of the responses in the 11 evidence of support were rated "partially meets" or 12 "does not meet." 13 Many of the responses lacked essential 14 details to fully understand the applicant's plan and 15 ability to meet the requirements of operating a 16 charter school. 17 The applicant provided academic performance goals that rely on averages, which can 18 19 hide the poor performance of some students. 20 The applicant did not adequately describe how the proposed school would address the needs of 21 22 all special population students, including ELLs and 23 students who qualify for 504 plans. The applicant did not adequately describe 24



how corrective actions would be implemented if the

proposed school's academic performance fell short of expectations.

The applicant did not adequately describe a process that would ensure a skilled and capable governing body.

The applicant did not provide an adequate plan for governing body training or evaluation.

The applicant did not adequately describe how the governing body will monitor school outcomes.

The applicant did not adequately describe a professional development plan that will ensure teachers are able to implement the curriculum and improve student achievement.

The applicant did not provide adequate information to demonstrate the capacity to develop appropriate and legally compliant policies.

The applicant did not adequately demonstrate the capacity to implement New Mexico school funding and budget for long-term sustainability.

The applicant did not adequately demonstrate broad based support for the school in the community, and there's clearly a substantial sector of the community that does not support the proposed school.



1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

After CSD's final recommendation -- final analysis and recommendation was provided to the PEC and to the applicant, the applicant was provided the opportunity to provide an additional response to that final analysis.

In that response, the applicant provided information that demonstrates strong support from partner organizations, including the NACA Inspired Schools Network, Google, UC-Berkeley, and St. Joseph's Elementary School.

The applicant provided information that demonstrates the need and community support for the proposed school.

The applicant provided information that provides additional clarity to the applicant's original responses and demonstrates an understanding of the requirements for serving special populations and a capacity to meet these requirements.

The applicant provided information that recognizes the need for the applicant to complete substantial additional work to develop policies and plans in order to prepare to commence operations of the proposed school and demonstrates the applicant team has the resources and support sufficient to complete this required work, and demonstrates the



1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

applicant's willingness to continue to work with CSD to ensure the proposed school is able to open timely and effectively.

THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. Good

afternoon.

If you all would introduce yourselves, please, spell your name if it's unique, and after introductions, you'll have 15 minutes.

9 MR. ULIBARRI: Hi. My name is Daniel
10 Ulibarri. I'm with the NACA-Inspired Schools
11 Network. I'm the Director of Operations and
12 Facilities.

MR. FLYING EARTH: Anpao Duta Flying

Earth. I'm the Head of School at the Native

American Community Academy and a representative of

the NACA-Inspired Schools Network.

DR. FRANCIS: Good afternoon. My name is Dr. Lee Francis, IV, F-R-A-N-C-I-S. And I am one of the co-founders for The STEAM Academy.

MS. DOUMA: Hi. Good afternoon. My name is Shannon Douma. I'm from the Pueblo of Laguna and a co-founder of The STEAM Academy.

MR. FLYING EARTH: And we just wanted to introduce our NACA-Inspired Schools Network support back here, as well.

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

6

7

8

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



THE CHAIR: Can we do as we did before and just ask them to stand, please?

Thank you very much.

DR. FRANCIS: Thank you. Well, good afternoon, again, Madam Chair, Commissioners, colleagues, and guests. Thank you very much for your time today in hearing about The STEAM Academy.

There were a number of things, positive and negative, that were cited by the PED as to why The STEAM Academy was not recommended initially; but I believe we have responded to these issues over the past three months and have demonstrated how much of these issues cited were indeed addressed in our application.

But right now, we're going to focus on two particular areas that we want to look at, which is what we think is the most important in terms of the decision-making, which is the need and the readiness of this -- of this application and The STEAM Academy, in and of itself.

For those of you, we've told the history a lot. This is something that began about 20 years ago within that community, within Laguna and Eastern Cibola County. There were a lot of folks that wanted some different type of educational





opportunities for their students within there. Some could say it even goes farther back than that, with the establishment of the local high school in the area. But we focus on this nearby time.

We know political intent can shift over time; but the demographics tell a different tale.

Students are leaving the area. They're choosing to go to different schools. They're ending up here in Albuquerque, where a number of schools we have from Laguna and Acoma are at the Native American

Community Academy. We know that there are a number of students that commute from that same area in Eastern Cibola County to go to school in Grants.

They're choosing school like Santa Fe Indian School.

This is not work that's dependent -necessarily, these kinds of choices are not
necessarily dependent upon governments or anyone
else in those realms; but also, because of the
people.

And this is one of the reasons why the Tribal Council at the time, in its wisdom, moved this under an independent body, when we began this initial exploration into a charter school under the Laguna Community Foundation, which was a way that we could address and engage with the community that



would not be -- that would be separate; because the Tribe saw that that was important, which is one of the reasons why we've continued and why we've tried to open this up to a number of other schools.

We go back to this concept of choice and need and necessity. We know that rural students in New Mexico have very few options, and especially options around STEM or STEAM or technology. And it's curious, because Eastern Cibola County has five choices for elementary choices. There are five choices parents can choose from within that area, all with a different type of educational approach. This is something that's important.

There are three middle schools within the area. Each one of them highlights a different educational choice.

Only one choice for high school, or else the family has to take on an economic burden to be able to drive sometimes 30, 50, 90 miles to be able to attend a school where their student will have a different type of choice and a different type of education.

A number we talk to within our work want to be at home, want to be a part of their community and want to be able to work with their community.



1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So it's about connecting community, but it's also about equity. The idea that parents have to spend out of their own pocket to make a choice within rural schools is something that puts a burden on them and economic strain.

So as we begin to think about this, it's not only about academic excellence for students; but it's also about equity for communities and families.

As we were working with our community, we developed our mission statement. And our mission statement is, "To provide engaging, project-based STEAM experiences -- and that's Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Mathematics -- which challenge and inspire students to be academically advanced, technologically proficient, and, most importantly, community-minded, to enable post-secondary success.

This was developed over multiple conversations with community members. We had direct surveys, and also my ten years and the number of years that Shannon has been in the community, of working with our communities and the conversations that we heard during that time.

We believe that STEAM is this big -- it has a potential to engage students, their curiosity.





We also know that this is something that is well-needed here in the State of New Mexico. We know that 1.5 percent of Native students are the ones that graduate from New Mexico Tech, this with a population of 10 percent of Native Americans within the state of New Mexico, and New Mexico Tech being the premier tech school in the state.

We know that Native American students entering the University of New Mexico choosing to pursue a STEM career, that out of 100, only eight complete this. This speaks to a couple of things:

One is their lack of preparation in the schools in a number of these rural areas; two, the lack of persistence in completing all this type of work; and, three, the fact of the outreach that needs to go on with Native American students to be able to complete these degrees in STEM.

We also cite that over the past four years, math proficiency in the State of New Mexico has decreased by 3 percent, and science proficiency, in that same amount of time, has decreased by almost 4 percent.

So we know that this is what -- a type of school like this has the ability to offer something and be a model for rural schools within New Mexico.



But we know that this isn't the only thing. Our school is not dependent solely on technology. We built our school around being a project-based school, a school that would be able to engage in the community. And so our first efforts are focusing on the methodology, not the technology. We want to ground students in the process, in the scientific inquiry, and then the technology becomes a way that they can express that, utilize that, and be able to give back to their community.

We know that when we had you all out to San Fidel, that technology was mentioned as maybe one of the big hurdles in that particular area. We know that it seems like a big challenge. But as we illuminated this, our plan around mobile devices, because we know that high-speed cellular access means that anything on the web can be accessed by this mobile technology.

We know that the LTE network, which is the highest and fastest cellular network that's out in that area, blankets the area from Laguna all the way out to San Fidel. And we've checked that. We don't need T1 lines or hard lines anymore. This is A mobile world, and the young people that are growing up in this are mobile students. We want to make



1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

sure they use these things in service to their communities in the capacity that they have in order to make their communities better in a way that is not only respectful, but ethical, and that we want to make sure that they are using those for these particular goals.

One of our great advisers in this is

Dr. Shelly Valdez, who's been a part of this. She
is very well-regarded in the United States as an
indigenous science scholar, has given us a lot of
direction. We know that the Native Education

Department in the State of Washington is exploring
STEAM possibilities. And the STEAM component, the
part we left out is the "A," which is the "Arts,"
because we believe that also allows that creativity
for our students to come out. As this supports the
project-based learning action, this is something
that moves forward.

We know Zuni Pueblo has been having great success with project-based learning, and we know that this is something we continue to work forward on this.

I'd like to ask Shannon to talk a little bit about our outreach efforts and something we want to make sure that all of our students are supported.



1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. DOUMA: Okay. My name is Shannon.

And I have a little over 15 --

THE CHAIR: Pardon me. Would you please press down the button on that so we can hear you better, and hold it down?

MS. DUMAS: Okay. So I have a little over 15 years of working in public education through Albuquerque Public Schools and developing the Native American Community Academy as a founding wellness Specifically, my role has been in youth adviser. development programming, developing and implementing enrollment policies, and cultivating family relationships through student recruitment and outreach, and creating a pipeline for college-age individuals to serve in an educational setting by overseeing staffing and professional development with organizations such as Community Engagement Center, through the University of New Mexico, and Southwest Youth Services, through the AmeriCorps/VISTA program.

I have worked hard in developing and implementing a wellness philosophy, much like the Mentoring Circle of Care model proposed through The STEAM Academy. This model looks at the child as a whole person, understanding that each student comes



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

with a unique background, culture, and lived experience.

With that, my experience and my work has been to meet the needs of the individual and their family in order to successfully and effectively support a student's academic learning and the needs that they may have.

As we have worked to gain input from families, we have talked with young and single parents, grandparents raising grandchildren, and working families, parents, who are making great sacrifices to support their students' choice in education, and sometimes this takes them away from their home community.

As a parent of a potential student attending The STEAM Academy, I support the school and its innovation and hands-on learning and what it provides the students in terms of real-life and hands-on skills that they can apply towards their college-and-career readiness.

I believe this STEAM Academy provides an opportunity for our students to stay within our community, but also to give back to our community.

DR. FRANCIS: When we were approaching these students, the idea is that we catch them even



1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

before they get in the door, and that we'll be
working within the community, with the parents, to

be able to talk, to assess the needs that these
students will have. Whether it's their 504, whether

it's special education, ELL, all of our students
will benefit from this type of approach and this
type of access.

So one of the things that we know is that now we've talked about the need; so we'll talk a little bit about readiness.

I'll have Mr. Flying Earth to talk a little more about the network.

MR. FLYING EARTH: Good afternoon, once again, Commissioners.

One of -- one of the measures by which we recruit fellows into the NACA-Inspired Schools

Network is community support. We wouldn't stand behind a school that doesn't have community support, that doesn't have the support of the people whom -- of whom we'll be affected.

One of the conversations that we had very recently was actually with some of the -- the political leadership of Laguna and of Acoma. And as a network, have received support from the Pueblo of Laguna Governor. So I just wanted that to be out



8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

there in terms of the concern that -- that the

Pueblo may or may not be standing behind this

school. I think it gets into the piece about who

will be affected and do the -- and are the students

and are the parents behind what's being proposed in

that community.

And something that we've nurtured a relationship over time with and whom our current director, Kara Bobroff, sits on the Department of Education -- their education board for the Pueblo of Laguna.

And so our relationship is deep. Our relationship isn't superficial. And so speaking to the long-standing kind of buy-in that we're committed to is that over time, we want to change education in this community.

We recruit a number of students from The Pueblo of Laguna, and I've seen the concern over time of having a local school.

And so Dr. Francis alluded to this being a 20-year, and some may say 30-, 40-, or 50-year. Some say it's existed since colonization.

So as a network we're prepared to offer many supports. And the exciting announcement that I gave you this morning about the support of Secretary

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

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



Jewell and Secretary Duncan also carries with it
financial stipulations that we can -- we are
committed to helping communities like the Pueblo of
Laguna support the initiatives around -- around
STEAM and technology.

The last thing that I want to say is that as the Native American Community Academy, we have some of these very questions at the center of our curriculum development and the idea of innovation. How do we integrate technology? And so there's really some exciting cutting-edge findings that we're having regarding language retention and teaching, as well as the integration of relevancy into science curriculum, which we're really excited Dr. Francis will lead into.

With that, I'll conclude, and I want to say "thank you" once again.

DR. FRANCIS: Mr. Ulibarri will speak a little bit about our facilities in terms of the readiness, as well.

MS. ULIBARRI: Yeah. With regard to facilities, there's a piece of property in the Village of San Fidel, right next to the St. Joseph's School, I think where the hearings were at. We really feel confident that we can place some

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

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



modulars there. There's utilities nearby. And we have contractors that are willing and ready to -- to be enacted upon approval.

And so we're really confident about that.

We've also received a letter from the U.S.

Department of Agriculture, who are willing to

provide resources and support in regard to

facilities. And our mission aligns a lot with their

funding priorities regarding rural communities. And

so we're excited about this next step and stage in

DR. FRANCIS: So we realize that when we kind of come back, we know that any application, as mentioned, will have issues and concerns. And we know that goes with establishing a new school. It's part of an organic process to create a strong school.

When we talk about readiness, we know that readiness is acknowledged a little bit in the fact that we had the score that was second only to our colleague, who just was approved with conditions, as well, our good friend, Mr. Towery. So we know that we also have the ability to be able to pursue this type of a school.

When we look at raising academic



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this process.

academic excellence and support for students, the question is how. We believe that everything we've laid out over this past three months, starting from our application, to our responses, to our public hearing, to where we are now, is to be able to give a whole sense of how we will be able to operate the school and raise the academic achievement and levels for students, bringing those students home, reengaging those number of students that we have, and that we are ready to have high expectations and holistic support for all the students, both from Laguna, from Acoma, from Cubero, from Seboyeta.

This is the kind of education that's needed for New Mexico for Native students and rural students alike.

We would like to state our team has done our best to respond to meet those standards required in what appears to be a shift in the charter school evaluation overall process. We also have continued to fully participate. We've adhered to this information and guidance provided by the training application and tool kit, and additional requests for information.

We believe that our persistence in the



1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	charter process is further evidence of our full
2	commitment to the success of our students, school,
3	and community, much like Mr. Towery existed
4	[verbatim]. And we hope that we're able to continue
5	our work with this school, moving forward.
6	Thank you.
7	THE CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you very
8	much.
9	Commissioners, we're down to the point
10	where you may ask questions or voice your concerns.
11	Does anyone have questions or concerns?
12	Commissioner Bergman?
13	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I'm looking at I
14	always want to go first. People shouldn't be
15	reluctant to be the first one.
16	I do have a brief question first. As was
17	noted, we did have our Community Input hearing in a
18	facility of the St. Joseph's School. And I probably
19	should have asked while I was there, but I didn't.
20	And I when we get to my comments on
21	facilities you'll see why I asked the question.
22	Is that a private school affiliated with
23	the Catholic Church?
24	DR. FRANCIS: Yes, that is private school
2.5	associated with the Catholic Church.



COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I think the 1 2 headmaster was the local priest; is that correct? 3 DR. FRANCIS: He's secular. But he -- he 4 was the local priest. He transitioned out of that to be a head of school. 5 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: That's why I asked 6 7 that question. 8 Absolutely. DR. FRANCIS: 9 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Here, again, this 10 is one that I'm having difficulty. And I've been 11 wavering on it. In this case -- I'll offer some 12 specific reasons here in a minute -- I probably 13 don't feel like I can support this application at 14 this time. 15 And everybody is sitting there saying, "Wait a second, Mr. Bergman, Commissioner Bergman. 16 17 You just supported the previous one that had some 18 deficiencies." 19 I'll explain why I can't support this one 20 at this time. I believe that your application was weaker 21 22 than the previous application. I know you've worked 23 very hard to try and answer those weaknesses, and 24 you -- and you did that.



And I'm fully cognizant of what

Commissioner Peralta said on the other one about
being consistent. I feel I'm fully consistent when
I read and study the applications. I'm fully
consistent when I read and study the preliminary
analyses. And I'm fully consistent when I read and
study the final -- final recommendation and the
analysis.

I believe I've always been fully consistent in how I approach the Community Input hearings, and I've always been consistent as I've studied whatever comments come in after the Community Input hearing.

But, here, again, I just believe that this application is a little weaker than the other one.

And because of that, I believe that they would have a really uphill battle, if they were approved, trying to correct all the deficiencies in the planning year.

I'll cite some specific reasons here why
I'm kind of feeling this way.

The first one is the applicant proposed academic performance goals for math and reading that were based solely on cohort averages. And you remember I asked about that in the hearing, and you answered it. You answered it again in your



8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

follow-up, that you -- because of the nature of your school and the students that are going to go there, you felt you wanted to do an overall goal that lumps everybody together.

I expressed my concerns then about that, and I will again. As we all know, I favor individual goals for the students. With a cohort goal of just one average for a school -- I'll just give you an example: Two students. One gets a 100; one gets a 50. Well, the average is 75 on the surface. That may sound like a good average; but one of those students got a 50, and he's failing.

I'm afraid kids in a cohort goal like that may fall through the cracks. Now, I know they will work very hard to ensure that doesn't happen. But I'm never comfortable with a cohort goal. In fact, I don't think we have any students with cohort goals. So I express my concern. And I'm still concerned about that.

As I said, you answered that. You do -- we do agree to disagree on that.

Your -- the technology goal that you offered only requires students to earn certificates in Word, Excel, PowerPoint -- they have to type 50 words per minute, and you will allow them to get



1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

a certification in one additional software program.

I presume, of their own choice.

Well, this will certainly help your students with computer skills and navigating the Internet and all that. But I have a hard time seeing how those additional computer skills are going to necessarily help the students increase their academic proficiency.

You have a community education -- excuse me -- community engagement goal, which, while certainly commendable, here, again, I had a hard time seeing what effect that would have on academic proficiency. And yes, I fully understand, if parents are not engaged with their kids in their education, if you can get them engaged, that it could be a positive effect there.

But the fly in that ointment is everybody has great ambitions and great ideals; but getting the parents to actually commit and come and help you guys, that's going to be a struggle. And I suspect you know that. I suspect you know that. So I'm a little concerned about that.

Some of the goals were not specific. They were not time-bound. And you didn't really give us information to understand if goals are rigorous or



1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

attainable.

I happen to be somewhat the goals "guru" for this Commission. I have been to almost every negotiation performance contract that's been done. Of the 48, I've been at 45 of them. So I'm fully conversant of the goals that we ask and the goals that schools have offered and the goals we ultimately end up with when we get to a contract stage. That just happens to be one of my personal interests.

I thought your assessment plan did not adequately explain how assessment data would inform instruction and provide accountability. There was a limited response describing what corrective actions would be taken if the school falls short of achieving student academic success.

There was not a good explanation, I thought, of how corrective actions would be implemented, what would trigger those actions, who would implement those actions, and how effectiveness would be assessed, once the actions were completed.

And I put a sentence here, "The applicants indicated that you hope to appeal to struggling, at-risk students."

It is imperative, then, that this





corrective action plan be robust to be successful, because that's your target. We have a number of charter schools that fall under our oversight, and that's exactly what they're doing. They're going after the dropouts, the highly at-risk kids. And it is a struggle for them to get that academic achievement. So I have some concerns there.

I thought you provided a limited response for creating a governing body, provided a limited process for selecting new members, with the identified skills necessary to govern the proposed school, and only briefly identified relevant areas of expertise, with no meaningful description of desired qualifications.

Further, applicant did not provide an adequate plan for governing body training or evaluation. Applicant did not provide a clear plan for how the governing body would monitor school outcomes. And, of course, here again, based on my previous comments and your goals, that's going to be a very key component of your school with at-risk students. That is very important for those struggling students.

I felt you provided a limited organizational chart. One of the basic cornerstones



1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of your school is your "Core Care Teams," which you mention frequently in your application. And yet that was not even listed on your organizational chart, where the Core Care Team would fit into the organizational framework and all that.

I also did not see that you addressed the governing body committees that are necessary to successfully implement a school. You propose to provide transportation to students, but provided limited information as to how this would be accomplished.

And this is very important -- because I'm going to describe for you that didn't go -- didn't get the opportunity to come to the Community Input hearing. They are in a remote area. They're about 25 miles east of Grants, which means they're -- what? -- 35 miles west of Albuquerque. You get off I-40. You go across three cattle guards; I remember that. You hit the Old Highway 66, I think. You turn left. We went down a little ways. We turned right on a narrow, paved road that turned into a dirt road before we got to the St. Joseph's School.

So it is remote. And they did host us and did a great job, made us feel very welcome there.

But it is a remote area.





I know you've indicated, even today, you've identified some land; probably, I guess, can put some portables on there until you can build a building or something. I'm very concerned about the facilities.

You indicated in the Community Input

hearing that you might be able to share these facilities with the St. Joseph's Church. That's why I asked the question. You know, under the Charter School Act, there can be no religious affiliation. I believe, at the best, if you were sharing facilities with a private religious school, there could be some legal implications involved there. So that makes me uncomfortable.

So if you didn't use those facilities, what facilities would you use?

As I left that location, as we were done, as I was driving down on I-40 again, I made a point, looking along there for a while, looking for potential places. There's not a lot out there. I'm sorry. You come to the pueblos that are along the highway there -- as I was coming back to Albuquerque, I didn't see a surplus of facilities that you might use if you can't get in with -- and it wasn't legally possible to get into the



1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

St. Joseph's School. So I would be very concerned 1 2 about your potential facility. 3 I say that, because as these folks know, Dream Diné, particularly, just now, after two years, 4 solved their facility problem. And DEAP's having a 5 little problem, I think, too, with a facility. 6 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: No. 8 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Did they get their facility? Did they? Okay. 9 10 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I was out there. COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I was wrong then. 11 12 But they just now are getting it. 13 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: They're in it. 14 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: They're in it. 15 Okay. 16 So I'm just a little concerned about your 17 ability to get your school into a facility if you 18 were approved. 19 I understand your dream, that this is a 20 dream, as they point out, for something like 20 or 25 years. Folks want a school in Eastern 21 22 Cibola County. I'm certainly sympathetic to that. 23 But because of the nature -- that's why 24 I'm concerned about your transportation, too, how 25 you're going to get your -- up to your cap, you have



to accept students. If the kids in Grants want to come out to your school, if you're not at your cap, you have to accept them. If you go over the cap, then you have to do the lottery.

You could get kids from all over that area. If you're going to transport them, I would have liked to have seen a more fleshed-out plan, because of the remote nature there.

You also propose to offer food services for the kids. I understand that. But in your proposed budget, you had no funding for food services. Obviously, that speaks for itself. How are you going to feed them if you can't pay for it? I would be concerned about that.

 $\label{eq:definition} \mbox{Discussed the facility.} \mbox{ Discussed the mission.} \mbox{Okay.}$ 

Oh. And because you don't have a lot of options right there identifying the facilities, you didn't really address your capital outlay needs in your proposed budget. I know it's hard. You don't know what facility you're going to be in. But I think you could have explained a little more in that area.

I thought you had some weakness in your financial policies and internal controls. You



1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

stated they would be developed on through the 1 2 planning year. And that is common to most 3 applicants. And I'm never comfortable with that. Most of them say, "Well, we'll develop that in the 4 planning year." 5 Well, each of these Commissioners, 6 7 including myself -- I have to vote on the 8 application that's in front of me. What are they going to develop in their planning year? 9 10 down the road. And I've never been comfortable with 11 schools telling me, "I'll develop that in my 12 planning year." 13 I wish they would develop it and tell me 14 what they're going to do before I vote on their 15 application. So I'm a little uncomfortable with 16 that. 17 I think everything else has been covered.

So I believe I'm being consistent. I think this application is -- I don't know if the word "significant" would apply -- but I think it's certainly weaker than the one we just saw, and I believe it would be more difficult to correct during a planning year, even if we approved them with conditions.

So I'm reluctantly going to not support



18

19

20

21

22

23

24



```
2
     because you have the same support network, I
 3
     believe, to some extent, that the previous school
 4
           But I think that is outweighed by the
 5
     additional deficiencies I saw on the application.
               I believe I'm being consistent.
 6
 7
     certainly hope so.
 8
               Thank you, Madam Chair.
 9
               THE CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner.
10
               Further comments?
11
               Commissioner Carr?
12
                                   Well, I don't think I
               COMMISSIONER CARR:
13
     can add or subtract anything that hasn't been said
14
     by CSD or Commissioner Bergman. I think it was
15
     pretty extensive. But I do have -- I do have a
16
     question.
17
               I have a couple of questions.
     question maybe is for CSD. I -- I heard -- there
18
19
     was a -- was there a letter from the Superintendent?
20
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: He was at the
21
     hearing.
               He spoke at the hearing.
                                   I thought he -- but
22
               COMMISSIONER CARR:
23
     did he --
24
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: He felt he had no
     notice. He had received the -- their letter way
25
```

this application. And I use the word "reluctantly,"



1 back in January, and it must have gotten lost in the 2 pile of letters on his desk or something. And the 3 executive director of the Superintendent's group, Joe Guillen, he actually mentioned to the 5 Superintendent just a few days before, "Are you going out to San Fidel?" 6 7 And he said, "What?" 8 So, yeah, he was there, and he spoke. 9 COMMISSIONER CARR: My question -- I knew 10 he was there and that he spoke. Did I hear it right 11 that he submitted an additional letter afterward or 12 not? Because I couldn't find one. 13 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I don't remember 14 seeing one. 15 COMMISSIONER CARR: That didn't happen. That was just in my mind then. 16 Good. 17 So I have one question, and -- in regards 18 to the private school. And it's -- and I guess it 19 has to do with the other schools, too. So one thing 20 that we have to look at, too, are the local schools



21

22

23

24

25



providing the same thing that you're going to offer

and -- you know, so that -- you know, because I know

as one of the things that we need to look at.

a private school give scholarships to children,

there's not a lot of people that have a lot of

income -- I know Catholic schools, quite often, give scholarships for kids. I just wonder what it costs to go to that school and if there are scholarships available for poor children, which there are many in that area.

DR. FRANCIS: Unfortunately, I'm not able to speak to that. We didn't inquire about their scholarships or their finances. The most we were looking at, sort of in response to Commissioner Bergman's point, was the fact of trying to separate out -- which is why we were looking at property over there, and moving in modulars instead. So that was the extent of our discussions with the school board over there.

COMMISSIONER CARR: So you're not considering sharing facilities with them?

DR. FRANCIS: No. Both on one of their -as we spoke with their board, because they have
younger students; but they did offer us the
property, and also because of things we've seen
legally, as well. So if we are separated from the
building and the facility itself, it makes things a
lot easier, because there is a lot of available land
on both sides of that little road.

So you see the school; but the Diocese



1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	also has a lot of land on the other side, as well,
2	which is would be available it's powered.
3	It's watered, it's got all the ability to be able to
4	put down portables.
5	And we're going to be meeting, in theory,
6	with the Archdiocese about that here within the next
7	month
8	COMMISSIONER CARR: What grades does that
9	private school cover?
10	DR. FRANCIS: They run K-through-6
11	currently. And then they're going to I believe
12	they said they were going to add 7 and 8.
13	COMMISSIONER CARR: All right. One thing
14	that I guess I'm not sure if it was mentioned by the
15	CSD or any of the Commissioners, was the lack of
16	some community support, lack and most concerning,
17	lack of support from the Pueblo. And that's of
18	great concern to me.
19	And I don't you know, I understand he
20	didn't say a whole lot. But in the other school
21	that we looked at, there was a great deal of support
22	and/or no opposition from anybody.
23	So that's a concern of mine, plus all the
24	other things that were brought up.



THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Commissioner.

Further questions or comments? 1 2 Commissioner Toulouse? 3 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Madam Chair, I 4 know this is one I've had a harder time with. think part of it, because it is such a technical 5 approach to education. And I can look at it and think of lots of ways you can do your technical 8 teaching. For instance, I mean, within pueblos and 9 the ancestors of Acoma and Laguna, you're looking at 10 11 outliers of Chaco Canyon. They engineered all kinds 12 of stuff. I can see pulling that in. 13 But I can also see how it is much harder 14 to take the descendants of those people and teach 15 them that your ancestors did this, when it hasn't 16 been taught to them before. But I can see a lot of room to do, within 17 the history of the cultures, a lot of your technical 18 19 types of training, whether it's astronomy, whether 20 it is engineering, whether it is construction, whether it is calculations in math. 21 22 And I had some concerns about the two 23 pueblos being able to work together. And I -- I think that it's very hard, in any of these groups, 24



when you have the farming villages out around both

pueblos, too, you have a different little component in each area.

And I think the best you can do is get a majority support in any of those areas than when you have one group living all in one place; or if we were up in, you know, Northern New Mexico, and you have one little community and then another little community.

I would like to approve this; but I also can see where another year's worth of work would really solidify a lot of the planning and the budgeting and the building. And I'm not sure at this point how I'm going to go. I am leaning toward you; but I could also go the other way.

And, again, I -- if I voted for you, it was because I have absolute belief in your supporting group. If I vote against it, it's because, while I have a belief in that, I'm not sure you're quite ready, and I would hate to have the school start up and then have to be closed, as we've had to do one in this past year, that probably would have benefited with longer time in us having a closer picture of it.

So I'm not even taking a stand right now.

I'm honestly thinking of where my vote is going to



1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

go.

But I think this school has a future. I think this area needs this kind -- you know, you're close to Albuquerque, but you're not a part of it; and yet people are there. They see it.

You need to find a way for students to grow in that area, be able to be educated, go get jobs, come back and live in that area and commute to those jobs with the skills that this kind of school would start them toward, and let them work their way through from a baccalaureate degree at UNM to them working somewhere else, to go get advanced degrees, to even starting with CNM and some classes that they're prepared for.

Because I can guarantee you, after my

12 years on the CNM Board, most of the students

coming in from the surrounding school districts are

not prepared even for community college, much less

for the other.

So I see such a future for this kind of a program in a rural setting in New Mexico that's also close enough to an urban setting.

I know I'm rambling a little bit. I'm already getting tired. These meetings are intense, and I want to give everybody a fair shake. But I





want our Native students, and I want the Hispanic 1 2 communities out there to have the same access to the 3 kind of education you can get in more urban areas. 4 So even if I vote "no," I want to 5 encourage you to continue with this and bring it back next year with something much more fleshed out 6 in those areas that we've been looking at; because I 8 also know we're tightening up each year as we go. 9 This is a learning process for all of us, too, and 10 trying to see who will be successful and who won't 11 be successful. 12 As an aside, Madam Chair, I was out at the 13 opening of DEAP. And they have their facilities. 14 They have their facilities up. I went in and looked 15 at them. They've got all the supplies in there. 16 They were ready to go on the 3rd of September when 17 we were out there. 18 And my grandsons loved the mud from the 19 rain before. And I thoroughly enjoyed all of the 20 community support. So -- but they are up. They're in a --21 22 everything's going. 23 So thank you. 24 THE CHAIR: Glad to hear that. 25 Thank you.



Other comments?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Madam Chair, I'm joining the ranks of the conflicted; all right?

I really see this more in the concept stages, still, than in the -- in the stage that I'm ready to vote on it; although I know I have to.

I have deep concerns about the facilities, as I think many of us did when we went out there.

I appreciate the -- the time that you spent in answering the -- the concerns that were addressed in the application. But the greatest concern with the goals wasn't answered, as I hoped it would be answered. I know -- I know I expressed out there at the input hearing that it was not addressed in the manner that had been suggested and the example in the application. And the response didn't come back with anything that mirrored that at all. So I do have concerns about that. And I have concerns about the -- what the curriculum is really going to look like.

I saw this application as specifically weaker than the other application that we accepted, so that I truly hope if this does not go forward, that you do come back, because I support the concept of this. But I just -- right now, I don't feel it's



_	
1	ready to go at this point.
2	THE CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner.
3	Other comments?
4	Hearing none, the Chair would entertain a
5	motion.
6	I see Commissioner Gipson was putting on
7	her glasses.
8	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I was.
9	THE CHAIR: Does that mean you're ready to
10	make a motion?
11	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I guess.
12	Madam Chair, I move that the Public
13	Education Commission deny the 2015 New Charter
14	School Application submitted by The STEAM Academy,
15	based on the findings of CSD and comments made by
16	Commissioners in this hearing.
17	THE CHAIR: Thank you. You've heard the
18	motion.
19	Do I have a second?
20	COMMISSIONER CARR: Second.
21	THE CHAIR: Motion by Commissioner Gipson,
22	second by Commissioner Carr.
23	Is there any further discussion?
24	Commissioner Bergman?
25	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I don't know about



discussion. Since I don't know how that vote is

going to go, I share my colleague's comments

about -- I really hope you guys go back, answer

those, particularly in the area of the

transportation -- try and flesh out facilities and

transportation, answer those questions.

If a child from Grants wants to go to your school -- that's one of your complaints is your kids are having to go into Grants. Are they bussed in from Grants, or do they have to get there on their own?

DR. FRANCIS: Yeah. They usually have to get there on their own.

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Those are the kinds of questions I would like for you guys to answer. How are you going to handle that? How are you going to handle the food service? I used the word "reluctantly" earlier. I do hope you will take that step and take what you've heard in all the various papers, flesh them out, strengthen them, make them more robust, and I hope you will come back next year.

That's my personal opinion now. It's not my Commissioner opinion. That's my personal opinion.



8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



1	Thank you, Madam Chair.
2	THE CHAIR: Thank you. Any further
3	discussion?
4	Mr. Secretary, may we have a roll-call
5	vote, please?
6	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
7	Toulouse?
8	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: No. Had to think
9	on that one.
10	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
11	Bergman?
12	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Yes.
13	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Pogna?
14	COMMISSIONER POGNA: Yes.
15	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
16	Ambruster?
17	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yes.
18	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
19	Conyers?
20	COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Yes.
21	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
22	Peralta votes "Yes."
23	Commissioner Gipson?
24	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes.
25	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Carr?



1	COMMISSIONER CARR: Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
3	Shearman?
4	THE CHAIR: Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Madam Chair, that
6	is eight to one in favor of the motion.
7	THE CHAIR: Thank you. By a vote of eight
8	to one, the application of The STEAM Academy is
9	denied.
10	We hope we'll see you next year.
11	DR. FRANCIS: Thank you very much.
12	THE CHAIR: Could we take about five
13	minutes? If I don't go feed the parking meter, I
14	think I'm going to get one of those \$16 parking
15	tickets.
16	So let's reconvene at 2:00, if that's all
17	right with everybody.
18	(Recess taken, 1:53 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.)
19	THE CHAIR: Let's come back into session,
20	please. The last school on the list is the SAHQ
21	Academy. Are you by yourself?
22	MS. RODE: I am today.
23	THE CHAIR: Katie, whenever you're ready,
24	please.
25	MS. POULOS: Close those doors. I think



1	the sound
2	THE CHAIR: Whenever you're ready.
3	MS. POULOS: Madam Chair, Commissioners,
4	in its final analysis and recommendation, CSD
5	recommended that the application for SAHQ Academy be
6	denied, for the following reasons:
7	The application was inadequate because
8	90 percent of the responses in the education plan
9	were rated "partially meets" or "does not meet."
10	83 percent of the responses in the
11	organizational and governance plan were rated
12	"partially meets" or "does not meet."
13	70 percent of the responses in the
14	business plan were rated "partially meets" or "does
15	not meet."
16	75 percent of the responses in the
17	evidence of support were rated "partially meets" or
18	"does not meet."
19	Many of the responses lacked essential
20	details to fully understand the applicant's plan and
21	ability to meet the requirements of operating a
22	charter school.
23	Some responses contained policies or
2 4	statements that would violate the provisions of the
25	Charter Schools Act.



The applicant did not provide specific, measurable, attainable, rigorous, or time-bound goals that aligned to the mission, and did not adequately describe how the goals would be measured.

The applicant did not adequately describe a curriculum or plan for developing a curriculum aligned with the New Mexico Common Core State Standards.

The applicant did not adequately describe instructional methods that would improve student achievement.

The applicant did not adequately demonstrate knowledge or understanding of current graduation requirements.

The applicant did not adequately describe how the proposed school would address the needs of all special population students, including students with IEPs, ELLs, and students who qualify for 504 plans.

The applicant did not adequately describe how corrective actions would be implemented if the proposed school's academic performance fell short of expectations.

The applicant did not adequately describe a process that would ensure a skilled and capable





governing body.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The applicant did not provide an adequate plan for governing body training or evaluation.

The applicant did not adequately describe how the governing body will monitor school outcomes.

The applicant did not adequately describe a staffing or recruitment plan that would ensure the school hires a skilled and capable administrator.

The applicant did not adequately describe a professional development plan that would ensure teachers are able to implement the curriculum and improve student achievement.

The applicant did not provide adequate information to demonstrate the capacity to develop appropriate and legally compliant policies.

The applicant does not provide adequate information to understand the relationships between SAHQ Academy, SAHQ, and SAHQ Backers, three different organizations.

The applicant did not adequately describe a school schedule that will improve student achievement and ensure appropriate time for implementation of a New Mexico Common Core-aligned State Standard curriculum.

In addition, the application does not



propose to offer an educational program consistent with the requirements and purposes of the Charter Schools Act, because the applicant's responses raise concerns about the applicant's willingness and ability to comply with open enrollment requirements.

The applicant's proposed lottery preferences do not comply with NMSA 22-8B-4.1, and the applicant's proposed conflict-of-interest policy violates the statutory requirements in NMSA 22-8B-5.2.

After the final analysis and recommendation was provided to the Commissioners and the applicant, the applicant was provided an opportunity to provide a writing -- written response. The applicant did provide the written response.

CSD evaluated the written response to determine if there was information that would help address the concerns identified in the analysis of the written application.

CSD did not identify any potential statements to support addressing those concerns.

THE CHAIR: Thank for you that. If you would, please, identify yourself and tell us your position with the school, and then you'll have

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

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



15 minutes.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. RODE: Thank you very much. My name is Charlotte Rode.

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Unfortunately, you have to press that button and hold it down.

MS. RODE: That's okay. It's held. I think they found a trick.

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Oh, great.

MS. RODE: My name is Charlotte Rode, and I am a founder of SAHQ Academy. We have, over the years, had many people involved in the founding of this school. And as you know last year, we had the honor of being here with Chairman Shearman and the rest of the Commission, some of you who are new this year. And we have had dozens of educators, coaches, trainers, businessmen and women over the years contribute to the writing and establishment of our school.

The ones that are involved with the board are Richard Luarkie, who is the former Governor of Laguna Pueblo, and also the former head of Santa Fe Indian School Board of Directors. We also have Michael Madonia, who is working with the Labs at Sandia as a huge project manager, who deals with billion-dollar projects and is willing to come in



and help us to establish our systems and our project management within the school.

We also have Lindsey Kerwin, who is a math department head at her charter school; and as well as many public and private educators who have contributed to the establishment of our curriculum and our educational plan.

Michael Vigil of the Vigil Group is also on our board, and he has established and worked very hard with our financial plan.

And I would have to respectfully disagree with the evaluation of this year's Charter School Division when it comes to our application.

I started in 2011 with an interest in education and as a concerned parent. I have seven children, two grandchildren. And I came to Santa Fe in 2011 and worked with Senator Mark Boitano as an assistant through the 60-day Legislative Session to understand and educate myself as to how the government interacts with education and what things could be done in order to improve the outcomes for our state; because education has always been something that's been very important to me.

That started the process of the charter application. I attended every training since 2011



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and have been through many people within the Charter School Division. I'm curious as to whether or not every member of the Commission received my response to evaluation.

MS. POULOS: Madam Chair, Commissioners, that material was provided on the link on the website, which is publicly available, which -- as well as on the disks that all the Commissioners were provided with materials for today's meeting.

MS. RODE: I bring that up, because she said that -- the Director had said that there was no information on that response to evaluation that would have assisted in helping to determine the areas of concern within our application.

And it's interesting to me, because what I had stated within that response to evaluation was that last year's application and this year's application were identical, along with the rubric being identical.

Last year, they gave us a step-by-step evaluation and score based on every single question. This year, they gave us a composite score and a long paragraph, or sometimes a page worth of evaluation for that segment. So they didn't dig down into each actual question within the rubric. They gave a



1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

composite score. And the rubric was the same, and the questions were the same; however, our scores were very different.

So we, on certain segments of our application, like our academic plan, are addressing special needs. Last year, we had large segments of that, that scored as "exceeds" or "meets." And with the same answers to the same questions with the same rubric, this year, we "did not meet."

And so it's interesting to me the arbitrary nature of the evaluation, in the sense that she may be establishing her competency in being able to evaluate these applications; but from an applicant's standpoint, if an answer is correct, there should be no reason to change the answer. And if the answer is the same, to the same question with the same rubric, then that answer cannot possibly be wrong or insufficient or lacking this year, when it was "exceeding" last year.

And so, from my position, we have an organization -- we've been -- we have our own building. We have all volunteers who work seven days a week, year-round, working with children, as volunteers.

And so our program, along with this



1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

charter application, has been in development for many years. So to have a moving target is very difficult for us to invest that energy and time into a process that we don't know where it stands from one year to the next.

But I can tell you what we're seeking is that we are very proud of our application. We're very proud of our processes. We know the target: kids that we're trying to meet their needs. We have based it off of other programs who are using blended models who have "A" ratings across the state and are meeting New Mexico kids where they are at with quality education.

And we're taking that model of blended education, applying it to athletes, applying it to people who have an interest in sports. Maybe there's -- they have a statistics mind; maybe they just want to get well as far as their health and their well-being.

But we're applying that to interest kids in showing up to school, and we're using a proven model. And we're taking every single kid -- not just those who need IEPs -- but we're taking every single individual who comes to our school and providing them an individualized plan, as you've



1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

seen last year and this year.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, last year, we filled the hall at our -- our community hearing. Last year, we had about ten educators who came up here and took the day off in order to support this.

But we really felt as though this year, that the evaluation was so condemning and so demeaning that I was here to take the hits, if need be, and to answer the questions.

But our purpose survives. Our purpose today will be the same as it is tomorrow and is the same as it was four years ago when we opened, and for the past 30 years that I've been serving my community as a volunteer.

So what we're here to ask is not that you validate us, because our validation comes from the kids that we serve on a daily basis, and we're doing a pretty good job of that.

Our validation comes through the efforts and the combined unity and purpose of the teachers and the business people that have put our application together. And we'll proceed to a school, regardless of who those partners might be.

But we are here to ask respectfully and humbly that we partner with you, and we partner with



APS, and we partner with the Charter School Division to create a better opportunity for kids in New Mexico.

And maybe it's just for those few kids
that we serve; but what we're hoping is that we
create a model that serves children better and that
we can then share our best practices, that we can
share our things that we've learned, our facilities.
We can put our kids out there, our teachers out
there, and make education for New Mexicans better.

We are from here. The ones that have founded SAHQ Academy are New Mexicans. We don't have a national company with lawyers and with people who are staffed to write the application.

But we have teachers; we have business people; we have volunteers; we have people who have dedicated their lives to the community who have written a very fine application and who want to partner with you to provide a great education for the children that we come in contact with.

We have set ourself up for success. We have a building with low overhead. We have equipment; we have furniture; we have supporters.

We already have a 501(c)(3) that we applied well in advance so we could get that recognition from the



1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

federal government in advance so we could hit the ground running and start raising funds for our school.

But we want to partner with you. If
that's not possible, I understand. You have a huge
responsibility. But last year, we were recommended
by the CSD to be approved with conditions. Last
year, we were denied that opportunity on a five-four
vote. Understandably, there were some questions.
We addressed those questions. Much of them had to
do with our goals. We took those goals and turned
them into academic goals, and we actually mirrored
some of the very successful schools, and we mirrored
their goals to accommodate the questions and
concerns that this body had of us last year.

And a part of what we provided in the response that she said was not -- there was nothing of value in our response -- was a -- a document that shows how those goals are -- are connected to our academic plan and our outcomes. And it shows, very technically, each set of goals and how they align with our -- our mission and our academic plan, and how those, together, produce the outcomes.

And so I find it very interesting that they would say that there was no value in that



1 document to address the concerns that they had. 2 But I don't want -- I know you all are 3 tired, and it's been a long day. And I know that I 4 represent a large body of people who are in support 5 of what we're doing. But tomorrow, they'll be in support of 6 7 what we're doing. And -- and we will -- we will 8 still have a building. We will still be serving 9 children, and we will still wake up and make our 10 plans for a school. 11 So we hope that tomorrow, when we wake up, 12 we are now partners with the State in extending our 13 reach and to be able to impact the lives of our 14 children. 15 Thank you. 16 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 17 Commissioner Pogna? 18 COMMISSIONER POGNA: Madam Chair, you 19 mentioned -- there's something you mentioned. Last 20 year, we received the application with the 21 recommendation to accept with. 22 THE CHAIR: Conditions. 23 COMMISSIONER POGNA: Yes. And so what 24 happened between last year and this year, when this 25 application was -- said "Denial" -- to "Deny" --



when the application last year was, "Accept with reservations"?

Can anybody tell me? Was it the scoring situation?

MS. POULOS: Madam Chair, Commissioners, this year, the scoring, I believe, more accurately reflects the standards that were set by the Commissioners in the application.

During the scoring process, as an example -- and the easiest example to provide -- last year and in prior years, policies that directly demonstrated non-compliance with statute were evaluated as "meets," were evaluated as "exceeds." I don't know why. I can't speak to that. I wasn't here in years past. I didn't go back and look at and study all of last year's applications.

I worked with my teams this year and ensured that the standards that were written in the application to evaluate the responses were utilized. If they weren't, I asked questions, I provided feedback, and I gave guidance.

If they hadn't clearly identified the statutory provisions that were identified in the application in their analysis, if they didn't reference that, if they didn't cite it, if they



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

didn't ensure that the response complied with that,

I directed them to do that, and I gave them that

information, and I ensured that the work that was

provided to the Commissioners met the standards that

had been set by the Commissioners.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

Other comments? Concerns?

Let me -- let me just say, from my perspective, I intend to support this application, just like I did last year.

I think this application is stronger,
even, than it was last year when it was recommended,
in that the goals have been fleshed out even more.
I think their unique aspect of this application is
the fact that they do focus on athletes.

One of the things I believe about charter schools is that they are supposed to be unique. I don't think they're supposed to do the same thing that every other school in town does.

This one proposes a team approach to kids who respond to that type of approach, who are, in their own minds anyway, athletes. Some of them may be superb athletes; some may want to become an athlete; and some may simply want to participate.

But in their own minds, they respond to



1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



that team approach, to that coach having that really personal interaction with students.

I support that. I think it's strong, and I think it's worthwhile.

I think the one drawback I see to this entire approach is the lack of competition. I said that last year. I think athletes need competition. However, I think this school, through their program that's already going on, is finding a way to meet the needs of those kids in competition. And certainly, a place as big as Albuquerque, there are many teams that those students could compete with.

As far as this application being recommended for approval last year and not being approv- -- recommended for approval this year, I think that's unfortunate. And if we have been more rigorous in looking at this application this year, that's probably a good thing. We want to be rigorous. But we also should make the applicants aware of it. And if they didn't know this was happening to their application that came to us last year, and then again this year, perhaps we have stumbled in not making sure they're aware of it.

So even if I didn't have that concern -- and I'm not absolutely sure in my own mind that it



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

is totally valid. But even if I didn't have that concern, I am supporting this school. They are targeting a group of students that nobody else has targeted.

We've done a school for flamenco dance.

We've done schools for arts and sciences and all manner of things that target unique kids and their unique needs. Why would we not want to offer that same opportunity to our sports-minded kids? I think they deserve it. They're our kids. We should serve their needs.

So I intend to support this school for those reasons.

Commissioner Pogna?

COMMISSIONER POGNA: Madam Chair, I would like to make some comments, if I remember to hold this.

The concept of this academy accords with my strong beliefs in teaching children in academics and sports. The academy represents our family philosophy in raising our children and how we raised our three little girls.

We had a strong, solid core belief in sports and academics. When the babies were born, we refused to read books on parenting by specialists.





I always believed that you used your good common sense. And one of the common senses is later, we believed that if you involved your children in sports and music, they would be too tired to get into trouble. And that's what we really believed all through their high school and college years.

And I believe that we have been very blessed, because our beliefs have worked out very well.

When the girls were little toddlers -they were all very close in age -- we spent -- our
recreation was hiking, because it didn't cost any
money, except for gas. And that was about \$.25 a
gallon. And so we -- we just hiked everywhere, the
foothills, Sandia Mountains, Jemez Mountains; and we
continued hiking forever.

In the wintertime, we did tubing and tobogganing.

Later on, as they were growing up, they became more involved in, I guess, competitive sports. And they belonged to the Olympic Track Club, which was coached by a young man who was at Sandia Labs and spent his evenings and his weekends coaching the girls. And we had mobs of parents, voluntary parents, who kept it going.



1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And then they had diving club, which they also participated in, and which was also a volunteer coach and a lot of parent volunteers.

The -- the, I guess, toward the end of my story is that our three little girls are now in their 50s, and they have continued very strongly in sports involvement and activities. And they are still -- it's a very important part of their lives. They have successful careers; but they always -- are always involved in running or jogging, bicycling.

My youngest daughter is a middle school principal who doesn't get home before dark; so she -- her main thing is kickboxing. But they're all involved in sports.

But that's from their very early childhood that we involved them in sports and activity of all types. And I just think it's very important. In those days, we did not have computers; but they would rush -- one daughter would rush to diving, which we had to find swimming pools to schedule diving classes. And often it was at the University of New Mexico, which is very far from us.

And on frigid, cold winter mornings at 6:00 a.m., it was not much fun. But she would go -- she would practice her diving, run home, change





clothes, and run to catch the bus to get to Eldorado High School.

But it wasn't easy; but it was a part of their lives. And it has been wonderful for them, even for their 50s. That's it. I just believe in it very strongly. I believe it's a place for a lot of kids. Our girls would have loved it because it would have combined everything in their lives, instead of segregated. But I just hope that you continue.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner.

Further comments or questions?

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I will have comments, Madam Chair, but I'd kind of like to hear, for a change, from some of my fellow Commissioners before I make my comments. So I'm going to defer for a bit.

TRIAL OFFICER: Commissioner Toulouse?

COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Ms. Rode, I think you have done a much better job of presenting to us this year than last year. You've come close to selling me. I don't know which way I'm going yet, which is better than last year, because I do agree with the Chair that we need a place for the athletic kids, and because I saw a different emphasis in your



1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 presentation and how you have structured it. I certainly am much closer to making my 2 3 decision; but I do want to congratulate you for approaching this very differently this year. made it easier for me. 5 6 Thank you. 7 MS. RODE: Thank you, uh-huh. 8 THE CHAIR: Commissioner Gipson? COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I want to thank you. 9 10 I attended your packed house last year; so I 11 certainly appreciate the enthusiasm. As I mentioned 12 at the public input hearing, I spent more years than 13 I want to admit at this point in time coaching 14 varsity soccer, and basketball, as well. So I've 15 got a lot of appreciation for the mind-body 16 relationship, and I understand the importance that 17 sports places in those individuals that -- that are 18 leaning in that manner. And I fully support the 19 concept that you have. 20 I do have -- and I think I expressed it at 21 the input hearing -- I've got problems with the way 22 you wrote the goals. And I did read your response. 23 MS. RODE: Thank you. 24 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And, for me, it 25 didn't answer --





```
1
               MS. RODE:
                          Okay.
 2
               COMMISSIONER GIPSON: -- the concern that
 3
     I had.
            But I don't think that's going to sway me at
 4
     this point in time. I'm leaning towards supporting.
 5
               MS. RODE:
                          Thank you.
               COMMISSIONER GIPSON: But I'm still on
 6
 7
     that -- you know, the fence is being constructed as
 8
     we -- as we speak. But I think I'm willing to
 9
     support.
10
               MS. RODE: Can I make a comment?
                                                  Ιn
11
     regards --
12
               THE CHAIR: Unless she asks you a
13
     question, no.
14
                          Okay.
               MS. RODE:
                                 No comment.
15
                           I just wanted to say,
               THE CHAIR:
     Commissioners -- let me clarify what I said.
16
17
     support approving this school with conditions as are
18
     listed here, as we would do any school.
19
               Commissioner Bergman, are you ready?
20
     you --
               COMMISSIONER CARR: He wants to hear from
21
22
          I got to hear from him first.
23
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I'm putting it off
24
     as long as I can.
25
               COMMISSIONER CARR: You know, I -- I don't
```





think -- the question is whether sports are a viable part of a young person's life. That's un- -- unquestionable. Obviously, that's, you know, true. All the data supports that.

I'm a former coach. My daughter participated in sports all throughout her school years. And I fully -- my wife and I fully supported her in all those efforts.

I do have concerns on the academics. When I was there for the public hearing, I know you're using Edgenuity, which I'm very familiar with, and it is an excellent program. But I was -- I was not impressed by the knowledge of the program. And maybe that's a kind of a built-in bias, because I know so much about it now.

But also, we heard from the Albuquerque
Public Schools. They were not supportive of it.

And I -- I'm not -- you know, I -- you have a great
after-school program, and you're -- you know. And I
want to commend you on your public service. And you
are respected on both sides of the aisle
politically -- I know this -- for your integrity.

And so there's definitely no question about that. If you're respected by both sides, probably a pretty good chance that you have some





```
1
     integrity.
 2
               The -- I don't feel like you're really
 3
     offering anything that the public schools aren't
     already offering. And I am concerned about the
 4
     academics. I feel like there's too much stress on
 5
 6
     the sports-related part.
 7
               It seems that it -- you know, that could
 8
              I don't know.
                             If it looks like people are
 9
     leaning -- well, we haven't heard from everybody. I
10
     don't know where, for sure, everybody's leaning;
11
     but, you know, I'm going to -- I'm going to vote
12
     "no."
13
               But I won't feel bad if it goes the way of
14
     we accept you with conditions; but -- but I will
15
     vote "no."
16
               THE CHAIR:
                           Thank you, Commissioner.
17
               Anyone else before we get to Commissioner
18
     Bergman?
19
               COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Does that
20
     eliminate us later?
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: "Eliminate."
21
                                                     Boy,
22
     that sounds ominous.
23
               COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER:
                                          I know.
24
               THE CHAIR: Go ahead, Commissioner
25
     Ambruster.
```



1 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: She wants to wait. 2 THE CHAIR: Okay. Then go ahead,

3 Commissioner Bergman.

4

8

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Here, again, let's -- I'll wrestle with this. Hopefully, this 5 time -- okay. I, too, am ambivalent on this one. 6 I'm having -- as I noted earlier in the day, some of these, I do agonize over. I actually have to 9 confess, I do not even remember how I voted last year. I don't remember whether I voted to approve 11 or deny last year, which is irrelevant, of course.

I certainly do have concerns about this application. I have no problem with the athletic component, as long as it doesn't interfere with the academic component; because, as with every one of those schools that the Chair mentioned, we have a lot of specialized schools. But I have told each one of them the same thing: "you're in business to teach academics. Your side stuff is great; but that's not why your school exists. You have to teach the kids. They have to learn to read, write, and all that stuff."

You people have heard me say that to applicants before. That is the primary purpose for every school.





So I do have some concerns. I'm not going to say what -- which way I'm going right now, because I'm not even sure. But I am going to read my concerns, as I have with the others. I want them on the record, should the final vote on this be -because I have no idea how it's going to go.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SANTA FE OFFICE

Santa Fe, NM 87501 (505) 989-4949

FAX (505) 820-6349

Either -- I will certainly want -- my concerns are certainly included in those conditions, that they be addressed, because I do have some serious concerns. The Director has talked about the goals, so I won't say a lot there. I will say even though they looked like some good goals, each one of them had some weakness. They all had a deficiency in some area or other.

You were asked about that -- as you remember, I asked you about goals. And I always ask about goals to the applicants. So we had a discussion about that at the Community Input hearing. The Staff, in their capacity interview, asked you again about it. And your answer in that part was that you hoped to see a year's worth of growth in your students.

Well, that -- here, again, this group has heard me say this a hundred times, I bet. The Public Education Department operates on the basic





assumption that all students in this state will show 1 2 a year's worth of growth every year. 3 presumption is if you are in the fourth grade this 4 year, you will be adequate to be in the fifth grade 5 next year. So to me, that is not a rigorous goal. The question that I always follow that up 6 7 with when I say that is, you will undoubtedly have 8 some students that are one or two grade levels 9 If your philosophy for your school is behind. 10 you're only going to grow one year a year, how do 11 you catch up those kids that are one or two grades 12 below grade level? 13 MS. RODE: That's a question; right? 14 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: That's not a 15 question. That's a statement. Sorry. 16 And, yes, your enthusiasm came through 17 every time you've been in front of us. 18 I would love to answer that. MS. RODE: COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: So that -- if --19 20 should this go forward, I would certainly want to say that be addressed. 21 That would then be your 22 opportunity to address that. 23 And I wanted to read something here right 24 out of your application, here, again, in that area. 25 You put the statement in there that, "Therefore,



```
if..." -- I don't now how you pronounce this --
 1
     "...SAHQ Academy falls short of achieving student
 2
 3
     academic goals or growth expectations as a school,
     all staff will demonstrate a sense of personal
     accountability for the professional role in school
 5
     improvement."
 6
 7
               That's a great statement.
                                          It's a very
 8
     ideal statement. But unfortunately, that does not
 9
     constitute a plan for how you will do that.
               And that was the concern I saw in that
10
11
            What is the plan to get those kids that are
     area.
12
     below grade level up to --
13
               MS. RODE: And we have --
14
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: And at the proper
15
     time, you might be allowed to address that.
16
               MS. RODE:
                          Thanks.
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I understand.
17
18
     I didn't ask a question there.
19
               Here, again, the curriculum has been
20
     mentioned. Edgenuity has been mentioned. All those
21
     things. But I thought there was a little weakness
22
     in the -- it was a limited description of your
23
     provided curriculum. And I understand how difficult
24
     it is to put together a curriculum for any school.
25
     Even though I'm not an educator, I've looked at
```



them, and I guarantee you I can see how they are difficult to put together. I understand that.

I thought you did not adequately describe your instructional strategies, the methods that would be used, or how they would be effective with that target population, your athletes.

Here, again, should this thing go forward,

I would want something in the planning year that
would address that concern of mine.

That -- one thing that did concern me that has been mentioned, under the graduation requirements, you stated -- the applicant stated that students must pass all components of the New Mexico Competency Exam, which you apparently were not aware was no longer used.

MS. RODE: Yeah, that was unfortunate.

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: There were some other assessment requirements, including the EOC exams in the PARCC which you didn't address. So I would be concerned about that.

Here, again, in that capacity interview, you were given an opportunity to clarify those issues. But what I saw, I didn't see a clarification. Maybe I missed something there.

I think corrective actions have been



1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

mentioned, but I do have a little concern there. 1 Here, again, it goes back to what if they fall 2 3 short? What if your school falls short? Everybody wants to have a great school. Sometimes reality 5 intrudes, and it turns out you didn't do quite as If that occurs, you have to have a corrective 7 action plan. And here, again, I didn't see a totally fleshed out one there that made me totally 8 comfortable. 9

Oh. And this was mentioned, but I am real concerned about those three party -- your SAHQ

Backers, your current SAHQ, or however you pronounce that, and then your school. You've got three entities there. And they're all intertwined right now, or could be intertwined.

All I will say about that is we've had other schools with those kind of relationships, and there were some problems. So I would want some clarity, somehow -- I would want some more clarity and more explanation of how the relationships between your school, the entity currently called SAHQ, and a separate 501(c)(3) called the "SAHQ Backers."

Your organizational charter depicted the SAHQ Backers as part of the school to be overseen by



10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the principal. And this group was shown to have
responsibility for operations, including facilities,
maintenance, and security. And I'm not sure how a
separate fundraising foundation, or whatever they
are for your school, can be intimately involved in
the operation of the school.

Perhaps I am wrong. I'm not a lawyer, of

Perhaps I am wrong. I'm not a lawyer, of course. So I would certainly want that clarified in any kind of a program -- conditions, should this go forward, because that really does concern me.

And I turned it over, and that's the last thing I see; so I must be done.

I -- thank you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

Now, Commissioner Ambruster.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I have a number of comments that are not necessarily connected to one another.

In a sense, it's kind of a win-win for you. You win if we approve the charter, and I guess for kids, it's a win-win, because you would continue with the wonderful job that you are currently doing.

My concerns are I think Albuquerque has over 70 openings right now for special education.

And I'm not willing to go back, I might add. I

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

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



think that every school has sports. And like the other people have mentioned, all of our children were in sports -- our child, first time the girls won a track meet in the history of Los Alamos. But I do think it's important. I think they still have that opportunity.

I think that the special education part concerns me. It's fine with a blended education. It's fine for the -- to be in a classroom.

You stated that you are not going to -- at least, as I understood it -- not going to take them out of an inclusion setting. Personally, I think that they should be, all of them, for remediation, because I don't think that actually generally occurs in a classroom. But you may have a way of doing that; although, I didn't see that.

You did mention that there would be an additional layer of support with a coordinator; but I didn't know what would be done or what programs would be instituted or how special education could be brought up.

I honestly don't suspect that special education students are going to be on grade level.

That's why they're called "special." So that is not my concern that you wouldn't make two years' growth.



You would see growth, and they do hit a ceiling earlier than others.

I -- you did talk about the -- about graduation; but I'm not sure exactly how they were going to get on each of those pathways. A concern I know in ELL about which I'm not an expert -- but I know you can't just release them, that even though when they meet that criteria, you still have to monitor them for a few more years to make sure they maintain on an academic level.

And I'm not sure how you are going to identify special education students in the classroom who are not already identified, obviously. If they come with an IEP, you know and how that will be.

And the last thing, just as a concern for me, is this project-based learning. I know that's the new buzz word. I think it takes an enormous amount of energy and extremely talented teachers to really do project-based learning.

I'm also not sure how that reflects a reading program or a math program or a remediation program of language, writing, whatever. It's not that the project itself is such a concern; but I'm not sure that that always teaches students, particularly those who are struggling -- and that



1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
1
     could be special ed or not -- to learn to read and
 2
     write; because at the end of the day, all students
 3
     need to be able to have a certain level of reading
 4
     and writing literacy and math, to be able to
 5
     function in 2000- -- whatever year you want --
     whenever they're going to graduate; but certainly,
 6
     in 2015.
 7
 8
               But on the other hand, I love your spirit,
 9
     and I love the concern, and I love all that you have
10
     done, which is an immense amount. But I, too, am on
11
     the fence.
12
               So those are my concerns.
13
               THE CHAIR: Any other comments or
14
     questions from Commissioners?
15
               COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I want to go last.
16
               THE CHAIR:
                           I'm sorry?
17
               COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I want to go last.
18
               THE CHAIR: You want to go last.
19
     somebody's got to be first.
20
               COMMISSIONER GIPSON:
                                      I know.
               THE CHAIR: I hear no more comments.
21
22
     see no one's hand up.
                           So I'm ready for a motion.
23
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I would think it's
24
     going to depend on which motion it's going to be.
25
     So if someone wants to make a motion to approve,
```



1	they should be the ones working with you and Josh to
2	establish conditions that would be a part of the
3	motion.
4	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I think we need
5	to take a break to do that. Didn't we the last
6	time?
7	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: We can't do that.
8	We can't take a break to decide what the motion
9	THE CHAIR: Let's take about five minutes,
10	and I will visit with Josh. And if anyone else
11	wants to visit with Josh about this motion, you are
12	welcome to do so.
13	(Recess taken, 2:46 p.m. to 2:52 p.m.)
14	THE CHAIR: All right. I think we have
15	all returned. If everyone is ready, I believe
16	Commissioner Gipson has a motion for us.
17	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Madam Chair
18	Madam Chair, I move that the Public Education
19	Commission approve, with conditions, the 2015 New
20	Charter School Application for SAHQ Academy
21	COMMISSIONER POGNA: Second.
22	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: with the
23	following conditions:
24	The approval is subject to the following
25	conditions, which are intended to ensure the



applicant is able to sufficiently address all concerns identified in the analysis of the application and prepared to begin operating a charter school that will meet the purposes of the Charter School Act.

These conditions require that the application -- that the applicant must:

- 1. Timely obtain standing as an approved Board of Finance no more than 120 days after receiving a written notice of approval of this application;
- 2. Timely secure a facility that meets
  PSFA approval, including E-Occupancy, no less than
  two weeks prior to the scheduled first day of
  school;
- 3. Complete the Planning Year Checklist with any revisions approved by the PEC at the November meeting, including correcting all findings by the deadlines identified by CSD when materials submitted as part of the Planning Year Checklist are evaluated for completeness and statutory and regulatory compliance;
- 4. Attend all planning year training and technical assistance sessions hosted by CSD;
  - 5. As part of the contract and framework





1	negotiation and approval process, obtain the Public
2	Education Commission's approval of any substantial
3	proposed changes to the educational model, staffing,
4	organizational and government plan, or financial
5	plan, that was presented in the application;
6	And, 6. Applicant will address the
7	deficiencies that were noted by both the CSD and the
8	Commissioners during the planning year.
9	THE CHAIR: Thank you. You've heard the
10	motion by Commissioner Gipson, second by
11	Commissioner Pogna.
12	Is there further discussion?
13	Hearing none, Mr. Secretary, may we have a
14	roll-call vote?
15	And I will remind you that a "yes" vote is
16	for approval with conditions.
17	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
18	Bergman?
19	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I will come down
20	off my fence and I will vote "yes" in favor of this
21	application, with my concerns that have been noted.
22	And I will expect them to be fully addressed during
23	the planning year. I will vote "yes" on this
24	motion.
25	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner



1	Gipson?
2	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes.
3	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
4	Peralta votes "No."
5	Commissioner Conyers?
6	COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Yes.
7	COMMISSIONER POGNA: Yes.
8	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
9	Conyers?
10	COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Yes.
11	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
12	Ambruster?
13	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: No.
14	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
15	Toulouse?
16	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: No.
17	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Pogna?
18	COMMISSIONER POGNA: Yes.
19	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Carr?
20	COMMISSIONER CARR: No.
21	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
22	Shearman?
23	THE CHAIR: Yes.
24	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Madam Chair, that
25	is five to four in favor of the motion.



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



1 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. It's the same 2 motion passes on a five-to-four vote. 3 vote we had last year, wasn't it, and a different 4 result? 5 MS. RODE: And I just appreciate it very And I'm looking forward to being a partner 6 7 with you to create a good school. 8 THE CHAIR: We wish you very much success. 9 MS. RODE: Thank you. 10 THE CHAIR: All right. 11 Commissioners, that finishes Item No. 4. 12 Item No. 5, we chose to move to tomorrow at 13 9:00 a.m. 14 That takes us down to Item 6. And it is 15 Do you want to move forward today, or do you 3:00. 16 want to adjourn for today and take it up again 17 tomorrow morning? 18 Madam Chair, Commissioners, I MS. POULOS: 19 do have two individuals here that have traveled long 20 distances that I think it would be good to at least 21 get to their items. That is the amendment request 22 by J. Paul Taylor -- as well as he just stepped out 23 of the room. Mr. Martinez from Albuquerque Sign 24 Language Academy was here to address the Commission. 25 THE CHAIR: Commission, would you like to



```
address those two items? Just those two items?
 1
 2
               COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Personally, I would
 3
     like to get as far as we can. I need to leave
 4
     tomorrow by 2:00.
 5
               THE CHAIR: I think we'll be finished by
 6
     noon.
 7
               COMMISSIONER PERALTA: You think so?
                                                      You
 8
     guarantee that?
 9
               THE CHAIR: I quarantee it. I quarantee
10
     it.
11
               Okay.
                      Then let's move ahead with Item
12
     No. 6.
13
               COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I'd rather get as
14
     far as we can today -- and.
15
               THE CHAIR: Item 6, Discussion and
     Possible Action on Charter School Amendments.
16
17
               And the first is J. Paul Taylor.
18
               Good afternoon.
19
               Katie, would you please go ahead?
20
               MS. POULOS: Madam Chair, Commissioners,
21
     Item 6A1 is a request from J. Paul Taylor Academy to
22
     increase their enrollment cap. This was an issue
23
     that was addressed earlier by Commissioner Shearman,
24
     where, in the application, and as that became part
25
     of the contract in prior years, the applicant had
```



```
1
     many opportunities to identify a phase-in plan, as
     well as, separately, to identify capacity at full
 2
 3
     enrollment.
 4
               There is conflict within that information
     for J. Paul Taylor Academy. It's unclear whether
 5
     that should be 180 students or 200. Because, in the
 6
 7
     phase-in plan in the fifth year, it does identify
 8
     180 students, we believe that's the appropriate cap,
 9
     because there's a lack of clarity, and also, because
10
     J. Paul Taylor's three-year school grade average is
11
     a B, CSD does recommend the approval of this
12
     enrollment cap increase to establish the enrollment
13
     cap at 200 students.
14
               THE CHAIR: Would you care to make a
15
     presentation on that issue?
16
               MS. GARCIA-POST:
                                 No, I just --
17
     Madam Chair?
18
               THE CHAIR: Let me ask you to identify
19
     yourself first.
20
               MS. GARCIA-POST: Madam Chair and
21
     Commissioners, my name is Aine Garcia-Post, and I'm
22
     the new head administrator at J. Paul Taylor
23
     Academy, starting in July. I'm thankful that you're
24
     willing to hear this today. That's all.
```



THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.

25

Is there

1	any discussion?
2	Commissioner Bergman?
3	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Just a question.
4	And you're new, so I don't know if why are you
5	limiting if you're going into a new building,
6	which I know you're going into, why are you limiting
7	your request at this time to just 200? Wouldn't it
8	make some sense to go a little higher and give
9	yourself more room.
10	MS. GARCIA-POST: Right. Well, part of
11	the charter and the way the school is set up is to
12	have one class per grade level at this time. And so
13	if we adhere to New Mexico Administrative Code at
14	those levels, for the class-load caps, that would
15	put us right at around 100; so I don't anticipate
16	ever exceeding 200 at this point.
17	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you for that
18	clarification.
19	THE CHAIR: Anything else?
20	Hearing no further discussion, I see we
21	have the request Josh, are you looking for the
22	minutes?
23	MR. GRANATA: Yeah, I am.
24	MS. POULOS: Those are at the very back.
25	So those are three amendments all three



```
amendments are included in the minutes. And so the
 1
 2
     minutes, in order to allow them to apply to all
 3
     three, are in the very back of this item.
 4
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: In the last three
 5
     pages.
               MS. POULOS: Directly before the tab for
 7
     Item 7.
 8
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Actually, there's
 9
     more than three. I'm still finding J. Paul Taylor
10
     pages.
             I'm still -- I see some holes.
11
               THE CHAIR:
                           Keep going. It's beyond that.
12
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Somewhere in the
13
     middle of that area, I see a vote on something.
14
                           If you know exactly where in
               THE CHAIR:
15
     these minutes these amendments are referred to,
16
     please point them out to us.
17
               COMMISSIONER GIPSON:
                                      It's on the -- if
18
     you go to the very end, it's on the first to the
19
     last page [verbatim] in the third paragraph, I
20
     believe.
21
               "Move to approve the charter amendment..
22
     class size and potential enrollment."
23
               THE CHAIR: That's the 200 students.
24
     see that.
25
               Okay. Josh says we have adequate minutes
```



1	to support this amendment request.
2	Anything further?
3	Hearing nothing, the Chair would entertain
4	a motion to approve this amendment request.
5	Commissioner Gipson?
6	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Madam Chair, I move
7	to approve the amendment presented by J. Paul Taylor
8	Academy to increase the enrollment cap from 180 to
9	200, because the school has maintained a three year
10	average of a "B," which maintains a high level of
11	student achievement.
12	THE CHAIR: Thank you. You've heard the
13	motion.
14	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Second.
15	THE CHAIR: Motion by Commissioner Gipson,
16	second by Commissioner Bergman.
17	Any further discussion?
18	Mr. Secretary, may we have a roll-call
19	vote?
20	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Carr?
21	COMMISSIONER CARR: Yes.
22	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
23	Conyers?
24	COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Yes.
25	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Pogna?



1	COMMISSIONER POGNA: Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
3	Gipson?
4	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
6	Toulouse?
7	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Yes.
8	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
9	Peralta votes "Yes."
10	Commissioner Armbruster?
11	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yes.
12	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
13	Bergman?
14	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Yes.
15	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
16	Shearman?
17	THE CHAIR: Yes.
18	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Madam Chair, that
19	is a nine-to-zero vote in favor of the motion.
20	THE CHAIR: Thank you. The motion passes
21	unanimously to approve the first amendment on
22	enrollment cap for J. Paul Taylor.
23	MS. POULOS: Madam Chair and
24	Commissioners, Item 6A2 is a motion by J. Paul
25	Taylor Academy to amend the class size provisions on



1	Page 47 of the charter.
2	The amendment seeks to follow the NM PED
3	guidelines for State class size. That includes
4	class loads that allow 20 students in kindergarten,
5	in first grade; 22 students in second grade; 22
6	students in third grade; 24 students in fourth
7	grade; 24 students in fifth grade; and 25 students
8	in sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade classes.
9	CSD recommends approval of this amendment
10	request.
11	THE CHAIR: Josh tells me the minutes are
12	sufficient.
13	Any discussion?
14	Hearing none, may we have a motion?
15	Commissioner Toulouse?
16	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Madam Chair, I
17	move that the PEC approve the amendment presented by
18	J. Paul Taylor Academy to amend class size on
19	Page 47 of their charter.
20	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Second.
21	THE CHAIR: Thank you. Motion by
22	Commissioner Toulouse, seconded by Commissioner
23	Peralta.
24	Do we have further discussion?
25	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Should the number



1	"20," which is what they asked for should that be
2	in the motion, or is that necessary?
3	MS. POULOS: Madam Chair and Commissioner,
4	they're not asking for 20 students. They're asking
5	to remove the language that limited them to
6	20 students, and simply comply with state class-load
7	requirements.
8	THE CHAIR: Any further discussion?
9	Hearing none, may we have a motion?
10	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: We did.
11	THE CHAIR: Do we have a motion? We do
12	have a motion. We certainly did. And it was a
13	lovely motion, too.
14	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Thank you.
15	THE CHAIR: Mr. Secretary, may we have a
16	roll-call vote?
17	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
18	Shearman?
19	THE CHAIR: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
21	Bergman?
22	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Yes.
23	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
24	Gipson?
25	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes.





1	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
2	Peralta votes "yes."
3	Commissioner Conyers?
4	COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
6	Ambruster?
7	COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yes.
8	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner
9	Toulouse?
10	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Yes.
11	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Pogna?
12	COMMISSIONER POGNA: Yes.
13	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Commissioner Carr?
14	COMMISSIONER CARR: Yes.
15	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Madam Chair, that
16	is nine to zero in favor.
17	THE CHAIR: Thank you. The motion to
18	approve the amendment for the grade level cap for J.
19	Paul Taylor is approved unanimously.
20	Their third amendment request has to do
21	with governance board responsibilities.
22	MS. POULOS: Madam Chair and
23	Commissioners, Item 6A3 is a request from J. Paul
24	Taylor Academy to amend the contract section of
25	their which is part of their original application





1	that identified the governing body's responsibility
2	to approve all contracts. The school is seeking to
3	amend that provision that was originally in the
4	application, which does not exist in our current
5	contracts but this is a holdover to allow that
6	
	the governance council would approve only contracts
7	that exceed \$25,000.
8	CSD is recommending approval of this
9	amendment request.
10	THE CHAIR: Thank you.
11	Any questions? Concerns?
12	Hearing none, may we have a motion?
13	Commissioner Peralta?
14	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: I move that the PEC
15	approve the amendment presented by J. Paul Taylor
16	Academy to amend Section B, "Description of the
17	Governing Body," 7, "Confidential matters of the
18	governing council," 3, "Financial matters," Page 72
19	of the charter.
20	THE CHAIR: Thank you.
21	Do we have a second?
22	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: (Indicates.)
23	THE CHAIR: Commissioner Toulouse?
24	And the minutes are sufficient, Josh is
25	telling me.





1		Further discu	ission?		
2		Hearing none,	Mr. Secre	etary, may we	have a
3	roll-call	vote?			
4		COMMISSIONER	PERALTA:	Commissioner	
5	Peralta vo	tes "Yes."			
6		Commissioner	Gipson?		
7		COMMISSIONER	GIPSON:	Yes.	
8		COMMISSIONER	PERALTA:	Commissioner	
9	Bergman?				
10		COMMISSIONER	BERGMAN:	Yes.	
11		COMMISSIONER	PERALTA:	Commissioner	
12	Shearman?				
13		THE CHAIR: Y	Zes.		
14		COMMISSIONER	PERALTA:	Commissioner	Carr?
15		COMMISSIONER	CARR: Yes	5.	
16		COMMISSIONER	PERALTA:	Commissioner	Pogna?
17		COMMISSIONER	POGNA: Ye	es.	
18		COMMISSIONER	PERALTA:	Commissioner	
19	Toulouse?				
20		COMMISSIONER	TOULOUSE:	Yes.	
21		COMMISSIONER	PERALTA:	Commissioner	
22	Armbruster	?			
23		COMMISSIONER	ARMBRUSTE	R: Yes.	
24		COMMISSIONER	PERALTA:	Commissioner	
25	Conyers?				



1	COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Madam Chair, that
3	is nine to zero in favor.
4	THE CHAIR: Thank you. The amendment
5	request for J. Paul Taylor for governance council
6	responsibilities is approved.
7	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: And thank you very
8	much. That is a long way to come for such a short
9	amount of business.
10	MS. GARCIA-POST: Well, I appreciate your
11	time. Thank you very much.
12	MS. POULOS: Madam Chair, Item 6B1 and 2,
13	both were withdrawn from the agenda after the last
14	amendment we didn't want to make another one
15	because the school did not timely submit all the
16	required documents.
17	Next, I think we can just
18	THE CHAIR: Let's move on to Item No. 7,
19	which is Report from Options for Parents.
20	We'll start with the Schools of Concern.
21	MS. POULOS: On the Schools of Concern, as
22	we've been doing the past several months, CSD has
23	provided an ongoing "actions and monitoring"
24	document that identifies the status of all ongoing
25	monitoring and/or actions.



If there are any updates, that's provided on the form. But only if there are updates that would require action by the Commission would that be put on the agenda.

And so that's just for the Commissioners to have the opportunity to review. If you have any questions on that, I'm always happy to answer them.

THE CHAIR: Any questions on the Schools of Concern?

Yes. Commissioner Toulouse?

COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Madam Chair, I have a legal question on the Anthony school. With PED negotiating an extension to the contract, are they allowed -- despite whatever the Court orders, are they allowed to actually do an extension to the contract? I thought that was up to us, rather than to PED, to enter into a contract extension.

And so it's a legal question. I don't care what they've done. I mean, we're messed up with dealing with Anthony for quite a while now, anyway, because of the Court decision and PED not having even been there to defend it when the order was issued.

But I'm worried about the legal -- our legal status in regard to the extension of that



1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

contract.

MS. POULOS: Madam Chair, Commissioners, I think we're moving on to Item 7B. So I just wanted to acknowledge that, because that is separated as an item, because we don't believe there's -- so I can address the conversations that I've had with Dan Hill, the Office of General Counsel.

He was part of the settlement negotiations with the school as a result of the appeal of the Secretary's decision to uphold the non-renewal. As a result of those settlement negotiations -- which, my understanding from Mr. Hill was that he did give the PEC the opportunity to be part of those settlement negotiations and was told that they didn't want to. That was the information that was passed on to me.

THE CHAIR: I don't want that on the record. It is not correct. PEC had an opportunity to submit some possible conditions that would be brought forward during those settlement negotiations; but we were not invited to the table for those negotiations.

MS. POULOS: Again, that was the information that was presented to me. What he did then tell me was that based on those settlement





negotiations, a settlement agreement had -- they had come to terms on a settlement agreement that included the extension of the contract of Anthony Charter School, that same contract -- not the same performance framework, but the same contract -- for an additional three years.

As a result, CSD is recommending that the -- and I have to get to the right page -- that the Commissioners require -- that CSD recommends that a subcommittee of the PEC engage in a negotiation process with the school to establish a 2015-2016 framework and framework goals for that school, because that school is currently in operation, and my understanding is, based on that settlement agreement, will be, under the terms of the current contract for the next three years.

COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Madam Chair,
that's good background information. But I would
like our legal counsel to give me -- because I don't
want us to have any more legal problems with this
school or whether -- I don't know that we're even
authorized at this point to go into those
negotiations, because I -- my understanding of the
law is we're still the ones who do the terms of
contracts and the length of contract.



1 So I just want to be clear -- I want to be 2 clear on this. 3 MS. POULOS: Anthony's attorney is here. 4 I don't know if you want to hear from her. THE CHAIR: Josh? 5 MR. GRANATA: Madam Chair, Commissioner 6 7 Toulouse, it's a very good question that you've asked, and I don't -- I can't really give you a very 8 9 good answer, unfortunately. I mean, the question is 10 whether or not the Judge could extend the contract 11 of Anthony. And, like I said, it's a very good 12 question. It's one of those legal questions where 13 the answer could be "yes," could be "no." 14 At this point in time, I think if the 15 Commission would like to discuss this further, I 16 think the best thing to do would be put it on the 17 agenda and we can discuss it during an executive session. I think that's really the best that I can 18 19 say at this point in time. 20 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Thank you. THE CHAIR: Patti, I saw your hand up. 21 22 Did you have something to add? MS. MATTHEWS: Madam Chair, members of the 23 24 Commission, Patricia Matthews, for the record. 25 That's news to me (indicates).



just -- I will tell you, I have not had any
communications with Mr. Hill, other than to present
him with a proposed resolution. And since the
proposed resolution went to his desk, I have not
heard whether or not it was acceptable to the
Department.

But, Commissioner Toulouse, to your question, the Judge stayed any further action on the appeal and kept the school open until further determination of the Court. In the interim, the Department and the school have -- are in discussions to negotiate a resolution. And the resolution, we've been discussing, although it's not finalized, was the concept that the request would be to extend through the full five years of the -- you know, they were a two-year charter -- to extend to the full five.

That's where we are, and I have no -- I have no response back from General Counsel that we have a deal. So my client absolutely would be willing to come and meet with the Commissioners and talk about annual performance targets and that whole process that they would be in normally for the next three years. But I'm as clueless as you are; so...

COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE:

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

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



Madam Chair, my

question still is, then, I think we have a legal
question. I'm not opposed to your settlement. It's
just who can -- whether PED can agree to the
settlement on behalf of us, without our involvement,
or whether we need to approve it after PED's done
it.

I'm -- because to me, the only person who can do anything with a charter contract is the Commission, not PED. I can see the Court having some orders; but -- I'm confused.

MS. MATTHEWS: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, I'll take a stab at that, if you would like. Much like the other appeals that you've had before, which is if it goes to the Secretary on appeal, and she -- and in this instance, what she would effectively be doing would be agreeing to resolve the appeal by settling the appeal and approving, or reversing -- right? -- her own decision.

And then it would be much like the other charters -- or the other decisions. It would come back to the Commission with her directive to approve the charter.

Now, I'm not sure that's exactly how she's done it in the past. I think she might have



7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 actually gone ahead and said, "On appeal, this charter is granted a... "three-year, or a five year, 2 3 or whatever it is she does. So... 4 THE CHAIR: The contract that that school 5 was operating under, we gave them a two-year -- we 6 renewed them for two years; and then when they came 7 back, we denied it. But they were under a two-year 8 contract. 9 So that contract has expired; am I 10 correct? 11 The Judge has entered MS. MATTHEWS: No. 12 a restraining order or a temporary injunction to 13 keep the school open, pending a resolution of the 14 appeal that's before him right now. Nothing has 15 happened on that appeal. THE CHAIR: Yes, I realize that. 16 But how 17 does that affect the contract that was for two 18 years? 19 MS. MATTHEWS: He said -- and I apologize. 20 I don't have my pleadings file with me today. because I hadn't heard anything, I thought we 21 22 wouldn't be talking about Anthony today. 23 So if I recall correctly, the injunction is that the school will continue under the same 24 25 terms and conditions of the existing contract until



1 a final resolution of the appeal. So can PED extend an expired 2 THE CHAIR: 3 contract or issue a new contract? Because that 4 contract was for two years. So if there's a 5 settlement, does that not satisfy the Judge's injunction, and that would no longer be in force, 7 and the school would then be operating under the 8 settlement agreement, which does not include a 9 contract? 10 MS. MATTHEWS: That's not how we see it. 11 We see it that the settlement is an extended 12 That's how the negotiations have gone. contract. 13 THE CHAIR: Does PED have the authority to 14 extend a contract that is, by law, extended by us? 15 MS. MATTHEWS: She has the right, on appeal, to tell you whether or not that contract 16 17 should continue or not. 18 THE CHAIR: Which hasn't been done. 19 MS. MATTHEWS: But right now, we're under 20 the injunctive directive of the Court to continue that school in its place, under the terms and 21 22 conditions of the -- of the contract. 23 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: It would seem to



me that we have no contract, that we would need to

negotiate a three-year contract to finish this,

24

1	because this one
2	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Not according to
3	the Judge, apparently. I'm saying "apparently."
4	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I'm thinking this
5	is PED, and the Judge hasn't signed off on anything.
6	Because, remember, we have the rules were
7	changed, and the Secretary no longer sends us back
8	anything with direction to do any action. She
9	changed the procedures and did a rule-making so that
LO	she can make that decision for us; but it doesn't
L1	come back to us with directions telling us.
L 2	THE CHAIR: I don't think that's right.
L 3	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Well, that was
L 4	part of the settlement, when we all
L 5	THE CHAIR: The settlement said it did not
L 6	have to come back to us for a vote.
L 7	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: No. I'm saying
L 8	that she approves it, though. It's on her head. It
L 9	does not come back to us with instructions to
20	approve it.
21	THE CHAIR: Let me put it this way: We
22	can't settle this today, anyway. We don't know the
23	answers. We hardly even know the questions.
2 4	Can we ask that everybody that might be
5	able to find an answer, please do so?



1 MS. MATTHEWS: I've been doing my best, 2 Commissioner Shearman. 3 COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I'm waving my hand At some point, I want --4 here. 5 THE CHAIR: Okay. COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I have a couple of 6 7 comments. One, that in the event it turns out that 8 this contract has been extended by three years, then this Commission has two options is all we have left. 9 10 Like I say, we're in the water. We either 11 will then negotiate some goals, academic performance 12 goals, with this group to fit that contract, or we 13 will not negotiate any goals, and then they will 14 operate for three years without any goals. 15 My second observation is -- and I'm 16 speaking personally as Vince Bergman now -- I am 17 astounded that a school that we revoked for abysmal 18 performance now has an extra three more years to 19 operate. That's a personal opinion, not a 20 Commission opinion. 21 That's all I will say. I'm astounded. 22 Thank you, Madam Chair. 23 THE CHAIR: Let us just ask -- and I 24 agree. We don't have any options, really. If this 25 school is being allowed to operate, then we need to



1	meet with them and negotiate a framework and get
2	some academic and mission-specific indicators
3	specific to this school and get them on board with
4	some accountability.
5	So, Katie, could we ask you to facilitate
6	that, please?
7	MS. POULOS: And there is motion language
8	for the Commissioners on Page 7 of Item 7.
9	THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Patti.
10	Has everyone found that language? Would
11	someone care to make that motion?
12	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I'm going to note,
13	before you make the motion, that my calendar is
14	already booked for October. I say that, because I
15	am at most of those. So if this ends up scheduling
16	in October, I won't be there. I have a full
17	calendar in October right now.
18	THE CHAIR: Does it say a date in here?
19	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: No. But it says
20	that the somebody's going to require Anthony
21	Charter School to work with CSD "and contract
22	attorney."
23	MS. POULOS: That would be Julia.
24	THE CHAIR: Yeah.
25	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Well, I would



```
1
     somebody from the PEC has got to be involved in
 2
     that.
 3
               MS. POULOS: Just to prepare for
 4
     negotiations and schedule the time for the
 5
     subcommittee.
               COMMISSIONER BERGMAN:
                                      We're always
 7
     involved in the time for the negotiations and where
 8
     they are and when and everything else. In fact, we
 9
     normally suggest the times and the places and all
10
     that.
11
               And that's the only point I'm going to
12
            Keep that in mind.
13
               THE CHAIR: Okay. Are we prepared for
14
     this motion?
15
               COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Madam Chair, I'm
16
     not sure that we are, because we don't know what the
17
     status of the settlement is.
               THE CHAIR: The thing about it is we
18
19
     don't -- I almost think it doesn't matter.
20
               MS. POULOS: And this motion is not --
21
               THE CHAIR: We've got to get this school
22
     under a performance frame, so there's some
23
     accountability. The rest of it can just float
24
     around out there.
25
               COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE:
                                       Okay.
```



1	THE CHAIR: The school is going, really.
2	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I agree,
3	Madam Chair. Let's go.
4	THE CHAIR: So would you like to make a
5	motion?
6	COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Okay.
7	Madam Chair, I will move to require
8	Anthony Charter School to work with CSD and the
9	contract attorney to prepare for negotiations and
10	schedule a time for a subcommittee of the PEC, with
11	PEC involvement in that scheduling, to engage in a
12	negotiation process to establish 2015-2016 framework
13	goals.
14	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.
15	Do we have a second?
16	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Sure.
17	THE CHAIR: Did you second?
18	COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes, I did.
19	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: The puppet down
20	there.
21	THE CHAIR: Motion by Commissioner
22	Toulouse, second by Commissioner Gipson, as you
23	heard, as noted on the official record.
24	Is there further discussion?
25	Hearing none, may we have a roll-call





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





is nine to zero in favor of the motion. 1 2 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 3 motion passes unanimously. Patti, I think sooner 4 rather than later on that. 5 COMMISSIONER CARR: Madam Chair, we moved so quickly, I didn't realize we were done on "A" and 6 7 we went right to "B." And I had just had a question 8 about Item A. 9 THE CHAIR: Oh, I'm sorry. Let's go back 10 to it then. It's just I -- Southwest -- Southwest 11 Schools, are they no longer a School of Concern? 12 MS. POULOS: They are. And they're on the 13 list. 14 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: They're on the 15 chart. 16 MS. POULOS: It's because of the way it 17 printed. And I apologize. I'll be more careful 18 about that in the future. They're at the bottom of 19 the second page, top of the -- bottom of the second 20 page. 21 And it's just -- there's an ongoing 22 investigation. At this point, we have no update. 23 COMMISSIONER CARR: Okay. 24 MS. POULOS: If we do, we will, of course, 25 bring that information.



1 COMMISSIONER CARR: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Anything else?

All right. If you're ready, then, let's move on to Item C, Katie.

MS. POULOS: Item C is the notice of charters looking for a new facility. CSD has been notified that Tierra Adentro, New Mexico School of Academics, Art, and Artesania, that is looking for a new facility. CSD will continue to provide updates to the Commissioners through the ongoing actions and monitoring document, as they're available.

And you can see on that one that on the last page, we've added that item. And you can see that we still know that Taos Integrated School for the Arts and South Valley Preparatory School are looking for facilities.

As we get any others, we will add those.

THE CHAIR: Commissioner Bergman?

COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: For those of you who saw the front page of the Santa Fe paper this morning, New Mexico School for the Arts has closed in Sanbusco Center. It's going to take them a while to finalize it and get all the tenants out. That was in the paper this morning. It closed. That was in the --



5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Madam Chair, I
 1
 2
     think we also have Mr. Martinez from the Sign
 3
     Language Academy.
 4
               THE CHAIR:
                           That's next, yeah.
 5
               COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I keep turning the
 6
     pages and reading what's on the page.
                                             I'm sorry.
 7
               THE CHAIR:
                           All right.
 8
               If we're finished with Item C, let's go to
 9
     D.
10
               Please come on down.
11
                              Should I put these just out
               MR. MARTINEZ:
12
     on the table? Will that work, or --
13
               MS. POULOS: Yeah. I'll help you set up.
14
               MR. MARTINEZ:
                              Thank you.
15
               Madam Chair, members of the Commission, my
     name is Rafe Martinez, Raphael Martinez,
16
17
     R-A-P-H-A-E-L, Martinez.
18
               We just -- thank you for having me today.
19
     I want to update you on our quest for a new
20
     building.
               We're aggressively working -- we've
21
22
     launched a capital campaign to build our own
23
     building. So we've gone through a few processes.
24
     Starting last year, when we -- when we -- we were
25
     connected with the Sawmill Community Land Trust
```



development, the community, about the possibility of stepping into a 4.8-acre piece of -- plot of land that they have in Albuquerque. So it's very close to the Hotel Albuquerque, Old Town area, close access to the museums.

So we went through a pretty arduous process of meeting with them, going to the board, going to community meetings, and then being somewhat scrutinized by the neighborhood. And it was awesome, by the way. So it worked. It worked well for us, because I think a lot of people were able to see the potential of a school like ours sitting in a smaller community inside the Albuquerque area.

And so we're excited to say that they've voted us -- they welcomed us to the community, which then started the process of us going to the different legalities around RFP, meeting with PSFA, Martica Casias, particularly, and others, to start the RFP process, with the idea that through the RFP process and choosing a design-build team, the construction wouldn't happen until funding is secured.

So everything is on -- is transparent around all the processes, knowing that we're starting now to be able to access funding, both



1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	capital funds, private funds, if possible,
2	federal whatever it takes to get the building
3	constructed.
4	And the reason we did choose to to go
5	this route about building our own building was
6	because of the needs of our students, knowing that
7	we could tailor something to our kids, both not
8	just DHH Deaf, Hard of Hearing but also the
9	high special needs that we have in our building. So
10	that's where we sit.
11	THE CHAIR: Looks super. Questions,
12	Commissioners?
13	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Not necessarily
14	maybe it is a question. You may have addressed this
15	before, but refresh my memory.
16	What are you contemplating building, Rafe?
17	Do you have a size yet in mind and
18	MR. MARTINEZ: Good question. And that's
19	what's throwing everybody off. So, yes, we have an
20	idea. But we constructed the RFP and we went
21	through all the proper legal channels to get
22	opinions and I think we're good with this.
23	We constructed the RFP in a kind of
24	general fashion and non-specific, so that we would



allow design-build teams to be creative, but with

the confines knowing that these are students, these are the number of students that we're able to serve as far as our charter cap, and these are the programs that we have committed to serving our community with.

So we -- we anticipate somewhere around a 30,000-square-foot building. We're in a 10,000-square-foot building now, and on top of each other. So we're going to 30,000 square feet, with, you know, like, a gym that can have, like, wheelchair facility basketball, that kind of thing, you know, those type of -- of ideals -- or those -- kind of that vision is out there. And we want the design teams to step up to the plate and be creative.

And just so you know, when we published the RFP, we were hoping to get three or four participants. We had 24 step up. So I think there's some excitement in the community about the school, about the prospect of the building itself and being not just -- not just another building -- right? -- but somewhat -- especially in that community, something that's integrated and integral to that community and serves just the need of the entire metro; so...



1	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: I'm presuming,
2	since you're always on top of these things, anyway,
3	your building will be state-of-the-art to fit the
4	special needs of your population, I would presume.
5	MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, Madam Chair, members
6	of the Commission, absolutely. That's one of the
7	biggest things is we fit the adequacy standards for
8	our students. But we want them to be visionary,
9	too, in their conceptual design; so
10	COMMISSIONER BERGMAN: Thank you very much
11	for that clarification and explanation.
12	Thank you, Madam Chair.
13	THE CHAIR: That is an exciting, exciting
14	time for you all, I'm sure. And it's very exciting
15	for us, too, to know that we authorized such a
16	unique school, and, I think you said, the only one
17	in the United States.
18	MR. MARTINEZ: That's correct.
19	THE CHAIR: That's a pretty big star for
20	New Mexico.
21	MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, thank you.
22	THE CHAIR: I am thrilled that you all are
23	having this opportunity to have a building that
24	absolutely meets your needs.
25	Do you have any idea about when you will



1 be able to get it started? MR. MARTINEZ: Well, Madam Chair, members 2 3 of the Commission, very good question. 4 So we're hoping, ideally, if all goes well -- and if I could dream my own dream on this 5 and the money comes like we're hoping it will -after the Legislative Session, we'll know what we have and the amount that we have to work with. 8 So then it would be just the legal process 9 10 of getting the money transferred into the places 11 that we can actually start construction. So our 12 hope is we break ground this year or early next 13 year. And it will probably take a year to build. 14 So we're okay with the idea that we're 15 going to be in our facility for at least one more 16 year, but with hopes that we'll be in a brand new 17 facility next year or the year after. 18 THE CHAIR: We thank you for being here. 19 We thank you for staying all day to bring us this 20 good news. 21 MR. MARTINEZ: Yeah. 22 THE CHAIR: Commissioners, we are now to 23 Item No. 8. Shall we adjourn -- it's 25 till 4:00 --24



and start with -- well, we'll actually start with

Item No. 5 in the morning and go to Item 18; all right? We are adjourned. See you all in the morning. (Proceedings in recess at 3:35 p.m.) 





1	BEFORE THE PUBLIC EDUCATION COMMISSION
2	STATE OF NEW MEXICO
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 September 30, 2015.
17	
18	
19	Cynthia C. Chapman, RMR-CRR, NM CCR #219
20	BEAN & ASSOCIATES, INC. 201 Third Street, NW, Suite 1630
21	Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102
22	
23	
24	



Job No.: 3808L (CC)

SANTA FE OFFICE

