

MINUTES
Mack Middle School
School Organizational Team Meeting
Principal's Virtual Meeting
1-24-2022
3:00 pm via Google Meet
<https://meet.google.com/dpc-upvv-omp>

Please be advised that the meeting was recorded.

This meeting agenda is posted publicly on the school website at MackMiddleSchool.com

1.0 Welcome & Roll Call

Rosalia Bautista -Parent ABSENT
Jordan Cooper-Parent PRESENT
Cynthia Daniels -Teacher PRESENT
Gail Garrett - Support Staff PRESENT
Betsy Gillis - Teacher PRESENT
Roxanne James-Principal PRESENT

ALSO PRESENT

Assistant Principal Brently Garbutt
Assistant Principal Candace Aplin
Ana Carrara
Sharon Armstrong
Yolanda Velasquez

2.0 Old Items:

2.1 Minutes reviewed. –

Ms. Gillis asked if we would still receive the 80 new computers. Mrs. James responded that there was an update and that the district had sent Mack 1,000 new computers over the break that, "We had no idea were coming. She stated that we will start the new year with almost every student having a brand new computer in their hands. Ms. Gillis asked if we would still be ordering the 100 new computers in light of receiving the 1,000 computers. Mrs. James said that we were not allowed the cancel the order so we will still be getting those computers. Ms. Gillis moved to accept the minutes, Mrs. Jordan seconded, and the minutes were approved.

3.0 New Items

3.1 New Budget

Ms. Gillis asked if we would be required to vote on any budget issues. Mrs. James said that she didn't think so and that it would mostly be presenting and gathering information. She said she was giving an overarching view of the budget to see where we are at and where we are going for next year.

Mrs. James welcomed the members from the community. She clarified that we would not be talking about personnel matters.

Mrs. James stated that this year the law had changed so that all students do not receive the same funding. There are students who need extra help and extra support and the budget will reflect those increases where applicable.

Mrs. James explained that there is now a base rate of pupil funding and an extra rate of pupil funding.

She said Mack was expected to have an enrollment of about 1057 and added that our enrollments continue to drop for a variety of reasons. One of the reasons being when charter schools open and a new charter school will be opening on Desert Inn and McLeod for 6th and 9th grades called Girl Empowerment, although it is for both boys and girls. She said that students tend to try out the charter schools and end up returning to Mack after count day.

Mrs. James said that this year's budget reflected 233 English Learners and 745 At-Risk Learners. Mack would be getting an additional \$577,193 from that rated funding; \$58,000 from Hope2 and \$514,937 from Title I for a total budget of \$6,327,879.

Mrs. James then explained Carryover funds and said that the district historically did not give the schools that money until the fall. This earlier practice could result in the loss of teachers because the funding was not there. This year the district is providing a "guestimate" of the carryover funds based on previous years' funds. Mrs. James said she was concerned with the \$557,293 number from the district because last year's carry over was \$470,374.68. She believes the district is over-estimating the amount of money that Mack will actually have in carryover. She said it was problematic because she believes the district is off by about \$200,000. She said that they have to budget as if they are spending every dime of it. She said we have to be cautious because if we hire one or two more staff members and then come up short, people would not have their anticipated jobs at Mack. Also, Master schedules and classes are built around staff numbers. She said we should not spend everything we have because we should be "fiscally safe at this point."

She added that some of the additional funds such as Title I and Hope2 have specific requirements on how the funding could be spent.

Ms. Gillis asked what the current enrollment was. Ms. Aplin responded that it was 1,103.

Mrs. James turned the meeting over to Mrs. Garbutt who, along with Ms. Aplin, had been working on the budget.

Mrs. Garbutt explained that the budget reflected the addition of another assistant principal to help with advancing academic excellence at the school.

Ms. Gillis said that she could not support the additional assistant principal because of the three-year commitment that would have to be made. She said currently we are funded for a principal, and Assistant Principal. The second Assistant Principal was approved by SOT. Ms. Gillis also said the projected student enrollment for next year would be lower than the current numbers of 1103 and she did not believe it was in the best interest financially for the school.

She added that with the creativity of those involved, she believed other alternatives could be developed and was concerned that the school would become “top heavy” in what she said was not a fiscally sound move.

Mrs. Garbutt explained that it was her understanding that we were not constrained as to where and how we spend our money.

Mrs. James agreed saying that we currently qualify for a Principal, Assistant Principal and Coordinator. She added that there would not be a second advocate in the office, rather one advocate and one assistant principal.

Mrs. Garbutt explained that the money previously allocated for the second advocate, along with additional money was earmarked for the additional AP as we continue moving forward to a three-star school.

Ms. Gillis questioned the use of a Coordinator instead of an additional AP. Mrs. Garbutt said that one of the problems is getting a person to commit to more than a year in that position as a coordinator.

Ms. Gillis asked if an additional strategist would be more beneficial to helping the school move to higher ratings by being in the classrooms more.

Mrs. Garbutt stated that one of the current strategists is loaded down with testing, while an additional AP would be able to share that testing load to allow everyone to be in the classrooms more.

Ms. Gillis said that Mrs. Armstrong wanted to know what the specific jobs of the third AP would be. Mrs. Garbutt said that splitting up the testing load would be one of the jobs, but added that the current administration had not yet discussed the specifics of the position.

Ms. Gillis said she understood all of the discussion but was concerned that if the student numbers further declined, there would not be money to pay for that position.

Mrs. Garbutt explained that there was \$292,000 in supplies and services and asked Mrs. James for clarification on the numbers.

Mrs. James said that her main concern is not over-staffing, especially when the carryover is there. She said that the district is going to be “extremely picky about us spending our money.” She said they were getting “cranky by us having carryover year after year” because the money has to be spent on the students that year. She went on to explain that weighted funding was going to be in effect from “now on.” Mrs. James went on to say that a possible “theory” could be to hold this position until all of the funding has actually come in. She added that one of the caveats of the At-Risk funding was that it specified an administrator for that area, which would be in the dean’s or advocates’ office. She also said she was concerned about the carryover money and that there were no APs “to be found.”

Ms. Gillis voiced concern over the three-year commitment of a third AP. Mrs. James said she was not sure that 3-year commitment was in existence anymore.

Ms. Gillis asked other SOT members for their opinions or concerns. Mrs. Daniels said she was still listening to everything.

Ms. Gillis asked about the current and proposed teacher numbers. Mrs. James said that the one advocate position was removed so the numbers would go from 96 this year to 95 next year.

Mrs. James said the average amount funded for a teacher was \$95,000 and the average for an Assistant Principal would be \$45,900 from At-Risk funds and 96,200 from the General fund.

Ms. Gillis asked if a strategist could be hired to focus on the At Risk students.

Mrs. Garbutt said that the trend was to have an AP in the Advocates office and that that AP would be working closely with teachers in the classrooms and the strategists to address behaviors so that more learning could take place “from the get-go.”

She asked, “What’s the offering up you have?”

Ms. Gillis said that there have to be people in the district with administrative licenses who are not ready to become assistant principals yet.

Mrs. James said that there needs to be two people in the Advocates Office.

Advocates are not allowed to investigate bullying of any kind. She added that because it is no longer a requirement to be a coordinator before becoming an AP, no one is going to take that job. She said by having two advocates, the current Aps are having to deal with the things that a third AP would handle and are being pulled from the classrooms. Mrs. James said that we had three options: 1) Keep two Advocates; 2) Get a coordinator (which, she said, will never happen); and 3) Get an AP.

We have to have someone who can “legally sign the paperwork.”

Mrs. James showed a spreadsheet detailing expenses.

Ms. Gillis asked if the Carryover amounts came in less than expected would the difference comp from the Supplies and Services Category. Mrs. James stated it would.

Ms. Gillis stated that she agreed with the concept of tabling the topic because she was still a “no” and would have to think about it.

Mrs. James said that the day was really for discussion purposes and to see if anyone had any other ideas and encouraged them to bring them before next Monday’s meeting.

Ms. Gillis encouraged other SOT members to voice their opinions or concerns.

Mrs. Daniels said that Mrs. Garbutt’s proposal does have merit and noted that there is a difference when there is an administrator in the Deans’/Advocates’ office compared to just having two advocates. Mrs. Daniels said she believed that an additional administrator would help with the discipline side of the school and pointed out that when there is a need to get something done immediately, there would be an administrator available. She said that right now the other two assistant principals were being pulled from their work so that things could get “taken care of in a timely manner.” She said she wanted to think about having an additional assistant principal and added that “it will be a help for the school and the students.”

Mrs. Cooper said that if the Assistant Principal position is able to be done as a targeted position and to truly fill the need that others are getting pulled from, then there is versatility “you do not get from hiring another advocate or support staff.” She was

concerned that we were not creating a position where the additional AP would be doing the “exact same thing as the other two are.”

She asked if the AP would provide enough support for the extra money to be spent, whereas the same amount could be applied for a floater teacher.

She said it was something to think about especially if there “isn’t that 3-year commitment.”

Ms. Gillis agreed with Mrs. Cooper and wanted to know if a teacher was having behavior management problems, regardless of who their supervisor was, would the third AP help that teacher as well.

Mrs. Garbutt said she didn’t see why that wouldn’t occur.

Mrs. Daniels mentioned that years earlier there was an SP in the Deans’ Office and they did go in and help teacher with any behavior management problems.

Mrs. Cooper said that we do need an AP who can provide the legal signature when it relates to disciplinary action with the student. She said that was what was strongly needed even for the “trickle-down effect into the classroom.”

She stated that we have to have someone with an administrative license and asked if that position could be filled by anyone else.

Mrs. Garbutt confirmed that an administrative license was a requirement, but noted that the job could be filled by a coordinator.

Ms. Gillis asked for more input from members. Miss Garrett said that she agreed that we should probably table the topic. She added that she has confidence in “our leadership that they would put the person most needed in the position.” She said she thinks our administration has enough experience to know what is needed and what we’re going to need for next year. She added that everyone has voiced their opinion and notes that with anyone selected, “There is no guarantee that anybody’s going to stay. We can just hope for the best.”

Mrs. Cooper asked if we are able to confirm if it is a 3-year commitment between now and next week.

Mrs. James said there has been nothing in the paperwork she has received, but would be happy to get the information and bring it back to the group.

Ms. Gillis asked if all members could meet on the 31st. All members noted they could.

Mrs. Cooper moved to adjourn the meeting. Mrs. Daniels seconded.

Meeting was adjourned.

3.2 Title Spending

Nothing covered.

4.0 General Discussion

4.1 Agenda Planning: Items for Future Agendas

4.2 Discussion and Request for Future Meeting:

5.0 Information Next possible SOT meeting is tentatively scheduled for January 31, 2022 via Google Meet.

6.0 Public Comment Period (2 minutes maximum allotted)