

**PPEP TEC HIGH SCHOOL  
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING  
PPEP TEC High School Administration Office  
1840 E. Benson Highway  
Tucson, AZ 85714**

**October 11, 2017  
6:30 PM**

**MINUTES**

**Notice**

A notice of this meeting was posted at the PPEP TEC High School Administration Office, 1840 E. Benson Highway, Tucson, Arizona; the PPEP & Affiliates, Inc. Main Office, 802 E. 46<sup>th</sup> Street, Tucson, Arizona; the PPEP NFJP / DOL / Behavioral Health Office, 902 E. 46<sup>th</sup> St. , Tucson, AZ; the following PPEP TEC High School sites (Alice Paul Learning Center- Casa Grande, Raul Castro Learning Center-Douglas, Cesar Chavez Learning Center-San Luis, Colin Powell Learning Center-Sierra Vista, Jose Yopez Learning Center-Somerton, Celestino Fernandez Learning Center-South Tucson, on **October 4, 2017**

**In Attendance-Board**

Gertha Brown-Hurd, Board President-present  
Dr. Celestino Fernandez  
Hector Sanchez  
Ralph Romero, *via phone*  
Maria Chavez, Board Member-present

**In Attendance-Administration**

Barbara Coronado, PPEP Inc. CFO  
Wayne Tucker, PTHS Superintendent  
Eva Ybarra, PTHS Director of Business Operations  
Dr. Johnson Bia PHD, PPEP Inc. Deputy CEO  
Geraldene Levi, PTHS DOO  
Alma Vega, Business Office Manager  
Demetra Baxter-Smith, PTHS SPED Director

**Absent**

Dr. John Arnold CEO

**Call to Order**

The Meeting was called to order by Gertha Brown-Hurd at 6:40 PM

**Old Business**

**I. Approval of Revised Minutes from Meeting of July 12, 2017 – Action Item**

*The motion is moved by Celestino Fernandez and seconded by Maria Chavez-motion carried*

**New Business**

**II. Review and Approval of the PPEP TEC High School FY17 Budget Revision #2- Action Item**

Eva Ybarra provides an overview of the FY17 final budget for the PPEP TEC High School District through June of 2017. The district received in revenue, \$6,715,243.00 from various

funding sources which is listed on the cover page. Page one of the revised budget report provides a detailed list of all of the expenses detailed by “function codes” for FY17. On page two of the report there is a list of all of grant revenue received by the district, in total \$716,112.00. Comparing from FY16, the district took a substantial cut in grant revenues. Ms. Ybarra points out that the district received considerably less funding from grants FY17. Page three of the report shows a breakdown of classroom site funds, base pay, dropout prevention funds. These funds are restricted for particular use and are heavily monitored. Page four of the report shows zero (0) funding due to the fact that the district did not receive funds for those programs. The final page shows the funds received and final expenses of FY17.

Dr. Fernandez board member asks what the final numbers were in regards to expenditures vs. revenue. Ms. Ybarra states that the information in question is in more detail on the Annual Financial Report which is the next action item. Mrs. Maria Chavez board member asks about funds received for drop-out prevention monies and where it was stated on the report. Ms. Ybarra directs everyone to the “other” category under *classroom site project other-101 on page 3 of the revised budget report*. It is explained by Ms. Ybarra, “that the state and district call that fund category different things.”

*The motion is moved by Board Member Dr. Fernandez to approve the revised budget; it is seconded by Board Secretary Hector Sanchez-motion carries*

### **III. Review of the PPEP TEC High School FY17 Annual Financial Report-Action Item**

Ms. Eva Ybarra states that this is the report that will be filed with the Arizona Department of Education as it is a compliance requirement. She states once again the total amount received by various funding sources, which is divided into local, state, and federal sources. The “AFR” should match the budget. She explains that the expenditures were not as high as previous years due to a school closing and other variables throughout the year.

On page three of the report is the base pay amount which was determined by taking the salary and “JV” it with the base pay portion of it at the end of the year; this also included is the pay increases for the year, performance pay is also included in this, and the dropout prevention funds. The funding allocated for expenditures are broken down by percentage according to the state. The percentage is as follows: 40% for dropout prevention, 40% performance, 20% base pay; these funds are restricted and come from proposition 301 and ADM, explains PPE Inc. CFO Barbara Coronado.

Last year there were no expenses in instructional improvement, however, there is this year. There is funding in this category left over however, since it’s so restricted there needs to be a discussion regarding the use of these funds.

On page seven, (in the recording it is said that it is page six however, that was a mistake) there is a breakdown of the number of certified teaching staff, and other full-time positions as well as funds for textbooks which provokes a question from Ms. Ybarra. Due to the fact

that most districts use software for curriculum, books are not purchased regularly. “The state will be looking at that subject for next year”, states Ms. Ybarra. A board member asks if Chromebooks are used in the district. “Here at the district, Chromebooks are used for various programs. However, they are kept at the school and there is a limited amount per site”, states Superintendent Wayne Tucker.

Additional pages, 8-10 lists revenue for students in Special Education and federal and state projects, (grants), and a summary of all revenue spent throughout the district. In addition there is a page breaking down the National School Lunch Program which lists the number of meals served and the cost involved with that including the actual cost of food in addition to supporting staff and management of the program. It is stated that the district does have to provide a “match” in funding in order to be in compliance. Finally there is a summary of classroom site projects shows additional usage of funds for teacher compensation increases and dropout prevention.

In conclusion, PPEP TEC High School ended the FY17 fiscal year with surplus revenue of \$282,663.42. This includes revenue from Arizona Virtual Academy. Ms. Ybarra explained that when the AZVA revenues are subtracted, PPEP TEC shows a revenue surplus of approximately \$79,000.00 after operational and indirect costs. It was suggested by the Superintendent that the surplus funds be used by district to acquire more Chrome Books for the schools.

*Hector Sanchez motions to approve the Annual Financial Report; it is seconded by Maria Chavez-Motion Carries*

## **Miscellaneous-**

### **PPEP TEC High School Update-**

Geraldeen Levi PTHS DOSO presents information regarding district enrollment and withdrawers. Three sites have gained and maintained numbers since last year. Two sites will have focus from the administration staff and Jeff Mace with rigorous marketing efforts.

There was a list of new staff members across the district. There is a discussion regarding teacher turn-over and although there was a large number, the charter is under the state average. Dr. Bia states that teacher retention is directly correlated to student success.

The ELD program has grown tremendously across the district and the state which is driving the state to focus on new standards and accountability in regards to program and the delivery to students.

ADE’s School Improvement plan has been replaced with the IAP, Integrated Action Plans. The idea is to use one tool to monitor compliance for all the grants in the district; Title1, 2, & 3, the SIG grant or the “school improvement plan” into one tool. In the future ADE has expressed that all state and federal programs will be included as well. These documents are created at the district level and at various sites, (Jose Yepez, Celestino Fernandez, Cesar Chavez, & Raul Castro). There is a data

side and a business finance side to the plan. This plan uses data and a “comprehensive needs assessment”. The tool identified weaknesses at the sites and works forward to create interventions and support to move towards positive data. Once three or four areas are defined, the results are transferred to the IAP format which is first worked on paper then transferred online due to the formatting of the program itself. Smart goals, strategies, and action steps are used to implement processes of change. The IAP has six different principles in various areas. Each site identified their own priorities and the district agreed on areas as a whole. The IAP has been submitted but not reviewed by the state; the plan was reviewed by a specialist and it was stated that it is “good”.

The School Improvement Grant (SIG), there is some inconsistency between expectation and data has caused some awkward moments due to a time laps in accessible data and grant deadlines. The comprehensive needs assessment, through the IAP, provides the data to identify the needs at a site. However, the SIG grant is due before the data from the IAP is available therefore indicating that the funds are needed before providing the data to support the need, (one cannot “supplant” program funding according to Title 1 accountability). Once the data was deciphered it showed that two sites, Cesar Chavez and Raul Castro showed such improvement that they no longer qualified for the SIG grant. “This is both good news and bad news”, states Ms. Levi. This grant provided academic and career counselors at some of the sites which did have a positive effect, as the data showed. In order to keep the counselors without state funds there will have to be some creative ideas to make that happen.

Superintendent Wayne Tucker presents a narrative regarding The State Board of Education ;( SBE) which is posting “letter grades” for schools across Arizona, this can be found on their website. The criterion for this is the percentage of students passing the AZ MERIT exam and graduation rate. This information along with points aggregated from other program successes determines a school’s “grade”. Due to the fact that the state has not determined standards for alternative programs PPEP TEC High School has not received a grade as of yet. In addition, to help districts improve their grade the state has created CCRI indicators to allow districts to “add” extra points to the score to improve their letter grade. For example, above average scores in AZ Merit tests, ACT & SAT scores, and Baccalaureate and AP courses are forms of data to bring up said letter grade.

Because alternative programs usually don’t have these types programs or scores they have asked for additional points from support services provided to students by alternative schools; for example: service-learning, career readiness tests, second language credit, and excelled credit recovery. This is a more realistic snapshot of the data that alternative schools can use. In addition the State has been asked to bring down the proficiency levels 10-15% of the overall grade and give more room to show the growth of the student. As of now the board has not yet approved the suggested model for these additional CCRI indicators. The Federal Government has determined that one tool must be used for all of the schools. Therefore, if the state’s current model is used all alternative schools will get an “F” grade simply for not meeting the graduation rate due to the fact that the majority of the students do not meet the criteria to graduate within four years. There are many questions that still need answers before a concrete model is set into place.

Dr. Johnson Bia elaborates, “that the state department requires certain criteria for a school to have an alternative status. The state recognizes that this is a separate category for a school by its very nature and the population it serves. This forces alternative schools to be looked at differently because we are working with the most at-risk students; we focus on things like dropout prevention and all of the efforts to work with the students and their engagement in school. It is hopeful that the

state will adopt separate parameters for alternative schools because they have admitted that we are “different” from other programs.”

Superintendent Tucker speaks to the board about students from our PPEP TEC sites who spoke to the Charter Board in Phoenix regarding their experiences in an alternative program. One student was held back due to her parents’ deportation and her intention to still earn her diploma on time. Another student was being bullied in a larger school and her parents wanted her moved to a smaller school where she would get more support from staff. Both students are on track to graduate on time and both are currently taking college courses at the local community college. In addition Mr. Tucker provided a slideshow of programs that were presented to the board showcasing PPEP TEC students that have been give awards from various programs, serve on community boards, and assist the community in various ways.

**Call to the Public- Call to the Public** – This is the time for the public to comment. Members of the Board may not discuss items that are not specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore, pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.01 (H), action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter, responding to any criticism, or scheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date.

**Adjourn-Madam President Gertha Brown-Hurd**

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 PM

*Hector Romero moves to adjourn the meeting and seconded by Dr. Fernandez, motion carried*