

**MINUTES OF THE
COMMUNITY IMPLEMENTATION COUNCIL**

May 10, 2017

The meeting of the Community Implementation Council was called to order by Chair Glenn Christenson at 1:07 p.m. at the Nevada System of Higher Education Building, Room 102, 4300 South Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada, and via videoconference at the Western Nevada College, Reynolds Building, Room 101, 2201 West College Parkway, Carson City, Nevada. Exhibit A is the Agenda and Exhibit B is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Glenn Christenson, Chair
Brent Husson, President, Nevada Succeeds; Vice Chair
Felicia Ortiz, Member, State Board of Education, Congressional District 3; Vice Chair
Vikki Courtney, President, Clark County Education Association
Verenice Flores, Senior Accountant, Fair, Anderson & Langerman
Nora Luna, Director of Diversity and Grant Funding, Nathan Adelson Hospice
Ken Evans, President, Urban Chamber of Commerce

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Erin Cranor, Member, Clark County School District Board of School Trustees, District G
Ryan Woodward, Area Manager, JPMorgan Chase; Member, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce

STAFF MEMBERS

Risa Lang, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Mindy Martini, Principal Research Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Angela Hartzler, Secretary, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Jordan Haas, Interim Secretary, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau

OTHERS PRESENT:

Tom Skancke, President, CEO, TSC² Group
Deanna Wright, President, Clark County School District Board of Trustees
Dr. Linda Young, Vice President, Clark County School District Board of Trustees
Carolyn Edwards, Clerk, Clark County School District Board of Trustees
Kim Wooden, Deputy Superintendent, Clark County School District
Carlos McDade, General Counsel, Clark County School District
Michael Vannozi, Vice President of Creative Strategy, TSC² Group
Andrew Doughman, Vice President of Policy and Communication, TSC² Group
Richard Neal, Chief Operating Officer, Clark County School District
Brian Knudsen, Senior Associate for Analysis, BP2 Solutions

Dr. Mike Barton, Chief Academic Officer, Clark County School District
Lisa Mayo-Deriso
Cheryl Rambaran
Kevin Child, Clark County School District Board of School Trustees, District D

Glenn Christenson (Chair):

I will now open the sixth meeting of the Community Implementation Council (CIC). Welcome, everyone. It's nice to see so many familiar faces. I certainly want to thank the School Board of Trustees for being here. I see Trustee Young, and Trustee Wright will be here shortly, and Trustee Edwards, Trustee Child, thank you all for being here. I want to thank everybody on the CIC for your participation and your hard work on the Council.

With that, I guess we'll go ahead and open up agenda item II, which is public comment. Is there anyone in Carson City that would like to speak under the public comment section of the agenda? I'll take that as a no. Is there anyone here in Las Vegas that would like to speak from the public comment perspective? Very good.

Then we will go to agenda item III, which is the Chairman's remarks. I'd like to begin by saying that I believe that we're at an important inflection point in our work to realize the Clark County Schools Achieve reorganization vision. In the last month, Assembly Bill (A.B.) 469 moved through the entire legislative process with the strong support of both Democratic and Republican leaders in both the Assembly and in the Senate. The bill was signed by the Governor on Monday. We'll hear more about the new law later today from the consultant team. It's very positive to see such bipartisan support in the Legislature to codify the regulations that we've been working under now for some time. It's equally positive to see the support from the Superintendent and Trustees who jointly hosted a press conference last week, in which they expressed support for the tenets of the Clark County Schools Achieve initiative, and noted that the lawsuit over the regulation is now on hold. It has taken 6 months to get to this point, and now our collective focus can be on putting the Clark County Schools Achieve initiative in place in a timely and professional way. We still have a lot of work to do, and some tough decisions are still before us. Meanwhile, the consultant team has reported to me that they continue to be fully integrated with the top Clark County School District (CCSD) leadership, all of whom are working hard to implement the reorganization. There's hardly a day that goes by that the consultant team is not in the administrative building working together with the CCSD leadership, which, again, is a very positive sign.

I do, however, worry that there is significant work left to do. The clock is ticking to the start of the next school year. There are many items that have not yet been worked out. The weighted funding formula and the amount of funding ultimately to be dedicated to the weighted funding formula is still to be determined. Also, a higher base funding level means more money per pupil for the schools, and that will also help resolve the issue around the 80-20 funding mandate. Funding for the human capital management system, which we have discussed at length among this body, is still before the Legislature. As we've said many times, the human capital management system is critical. If a new system is implemented correctly with the right vendor, it can help arm the District with real

management tools that should help create efficiency and free up more money for the classroom.

Finally, the CCSD budget and the 80-20 funding mandate must still be finalized and approved. This is a process. There is progress in this area, and I realize that the effort is very complicated, but every dollar counts when it means more money going to our schools. That said, let's keep in mind that the end goal here is not 80-20, per say. The goal is to dramatically improve student outcomes across the board, and the 80-20 mandate is simply a means to an end. It seems like every month is a critical junction for this reorganization, but this next month could see meaningful decisions made around these important areas.

With that said, there are several items on our agenda today. First, we'll hear from the officers of the School Board of Trustees. I want to thank the Trustees in advance for presenting today, and also thank the CIC's own Trustee member Erin Cranor, who's a vital member of our CIC. As you may recall, the Nevada Department of Education has asked the CIC to serve as a forum for conversation with the Trustees about the reorganization and the new legislation. The Community Implementation Council is happy to serve as a forum for discussion, and we're looking forward to hearing from the Trustees this afternoon. We will then hear from the consultant team about A.B. 469. Much about this bill has already been presented in the media, but for those who do not know the bill, it codifies the regulations around the reorganization. The consultant team will provide an update on this legislation and its effects. We'll then move on to agenda item VI, where we'll hear an update from the consultant team on their work since we last met. The agenda item has several sections; first we'll hear an update from the consultant; second we'll hear from members of the Superintendent's executive team on their efforts to implement the Clark County Schools Achieve vision. Specifically, we'll hear about their efforts to make progress in complying with the 80-20 requirement for 80 percent of the District's budget to be accounted for at the school level. We'll then hear about progress on optimizing the school organizational team (SOT) process. It was very valuable to hear from parents at our last meeting, and if any of you are watching today, thank you for your earnest feedback. Following last month's meeting, the District is doing more outreach to SOT members in conjunction with the consultant team, and we'll hear more about that and those efforts later. And finally, we'll hear from the consultant team on the next steps for this process, leading to the development of a District implementation manual for the Clark County Schools Achieve reorganization. Are there any questions, then, on the agenda? Okay.

We'll then move on to agenda item IV, which is approval of the minutes. We have minutes from the April 12 meeting ([Exhibit C](#)).

MR. HUSSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 12, 2017 MEETING

MS. COURTNEY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Christenson:

Agenda item V is the presentation by the School Board of Trustees and the consultant team concerning progress and feedback on the plan and recommendations to reorganize CCSD. So, I'd like to call forward Trustees Wright, Young and Edwards, and also Tom Skancke, who will provide a few remarks and make the introduction.

Tom Skancke (President, CEO, TSC² Group):

I would like to begin my remarks today by saying that what a pleasure it has been to work with these three individuals sitting to my left today for the last few months. We know that we, and I say this seriously, but I'm smiling, because we know that we don't always see eye to eye on every issue all the time, but in the spirit of cooperation, I would say that no one ever really does. I would like to acknowledge Trustee Cranor, who is not here today, but she has been in the middle of the CIC and the Board of Trustees for the last 6 months, and so I want to acknowledge her work and publicly thank her as well for her service in the CIC and also serving on the Board of Trustees for CCSD.

Last month, the President of the Board, Deanna Wright, reached out to me, and we had a conversation, and we decided that it'd be a really good idea to have the executive committee from the School Board of Trustees make a presentation to the CIC. If you'll recall, I believe it was 2 months ago that the State Superintendent suggested to CCSD that they work with the CIC going forward with any changes to—at that time—the regulation and any concerns that they had around the regulation. I would submit to you today that that recommendation still stands by the State Board of Education and the State Superintendent, and so the purpose of these three individuals giving testimony today is to really start that initial engagement between the CIC and the Clark County School Board of Trustees. We were hoping to have these ladies with us last month, but because of spring break, unfortunately they were not available to present last month. So, I'm excited to have them here today. As I said earlier in my previous remarks, it has been a real pleasure working with all three of them, and it is very exciting about the opportunities of success for the full implementation of A.B. 469 and the previous iteration of A.B. 394 (2015). With that, Mr. Chairman, I would turn it over to the President of the Clark County School Board, Ms. Deanna Wright.

Deanna Wright (President, Clark County School District Board of Trustees):

Thank you very much, Mr. Skancke, and thank you Mr. Christenson for having us. We appreciate coming to you and being able to work in the spirit of collaboration. I am serving as the President of the Clark County School Board of Trustees, and I also am the Trustee for District A. So, again, thank you Mr. Christenson. When my colleagues chose me to be President of the Board, I asked all of us to come together as teammates to work for kids. I'm coming to you now in that same spirit as a teammate and a collaborator. You all on the CIC took on this volunteer responsibility to help us implement the reorganization and work as a team. We did so as well when we stepped up to be elected as Trustees. We all want the best for our kids, and we all want the best for the 40,000-plus employees of CCSD. As you know, on Monday the Governor signed A.B. 469, the reorganization bill. The Trustees and

the Superintendent held a press conference where we declared our intentions to fully implement. We are supporting the reorganization because we know that it has spurred great parent involvement in our schools, and, as we all know, parental involvement spurs student achievement. For the past several months, the Superintendent and his staff have been working cooperatively and in conjunction with the consultant team to move the implementation forward. We want them to continue to help in this new framework. Our team has continued, for almost a year now, to work on this implementation, and it has been a heavy lift, and we really know—and want our team to know—how much we appreciate them and the tremendous amount of time they've put in.

As we move forward with the work, I thought it was important that the Trustees communicate clearly to you about the reorganization. As for me personally, I want to take this opportunity to share with you some concerns I have with the law. While these concerns that I have are law, we are going to continue to implement fully and we hope we can work with this body and have open discussions about those concerns. The first thing I would like to bring to your attention is the weighted student funding formula. We know that the weighted funding formula is being deliberated in Carson City, and we are hoping that we can move this forward. We know that this will be better for students, and it will also help direct monies to the students that need it the most. But if it doesn't move forward, I have to think about the operation of the School District. I'm a Trustee; if there's no additional funding with the weighted funding formula, I have to make a decision either to implement the law as written without additional resources for the weighted funding, or deal with the consequences. And that's really being within a rock and a hard place for me. We don't want to not comply with the law. I want to be very clear. We support the weighted funding formula. We need more resources from the State to make this work.

The second thing I want to bring to your attention is the 80-20. We're completely on board with the 80-20. We think Central Services can operate more efficiently, and we completely believe in the parental involvement and the local school empowerment. But we would ask for some flexibility in this. We're hoping to look at it more of as a mindset versus an actual strict line in the sand, and I hope that there would be some open and honest discussions about why we're having such a hard time getting there. Say for example we need to transfer responsibilities for utilities down to the local school level to make the 85-15 work, but parents and local schools don't want that to happen. Are we going to force them to take on that new responsibility, or are we going to allow some flexibility so that—what we're hearing from principals is there are some other responsibilities that they don't want, and so, again, flexibility is kind of my key word today.

The third thing I would like to bring to your attention is the municipalities' role in hiring our school associate superintendents. I think we have great teammates in our municipalities. We have had the Henderson APPLE Core (All People Promoting Literacy Efforts and Counting Our Reading Efforts) reading program for years, and now that has expanded out to other municipalities. We have the City of Las Vegas Downtown Achieve program, and that's really helping our kids. And we truly, truly appreciate their involvement. But I have to be honest—this provision strikes me as a little odd. On the Board of Trustees, we have two employees: the Superintendent and official Board counsel. We have no input over the appointment of other staff, but this law says cities have input over our school associate

superintendent hires. I'm all for collaboration, and I think our school associate superintendent should be in the communities. They should be known by the city council people. They should go and interact with those elected officials. But if the School Board doesn't have any input over hiring those school officials, why should cities?

Finally, I'd like to bring to your attention once again the human capital management system, which I'm sure everybody's tired of hearing about, but it is really so vital to us to be able to implement this to its fidelity. We have really old systems, and I think you've heard that over and over again. We don't tend to invest in our systems because we make decisions and spend money where it's most needed, and that's on the kids. Without the support of a fully implemented human capital management system, the 80-20 is very, very difficult to do.

In closing, I really want to thank you for all your teamwork and helping and working with our superintendent team, the CCSD staff, in implementing the reorganization. This is a huge undertaking. This is a monumental task. But I believe that, working together, we can do great things for kids.

Dr. Linda Young (Vice President, Clark County School District Board of Trustees):

I'm the Vice President of the Clark County School Board of Trustees, and I represent District C. So, it's good to be with you this afternoon, and we look forward to a continuous dialogue and continuous opportunity to engage this very important task, so thank you very much for the opportunity to speak to you this afternoon. First of all, and I've said this on a number of occasions that have come up over the last year or so, is that we—and I—want to express our support for moving forward with the reorganization, the Clark County Schools Achieve initiative. We always were there, we just had some concerns on how we wanted to improve the process, and it was never—often we were categorized in papers and by some as saying we were blocking. If I could use a quick example, if you're building a home from scratch, and you're setting the foundation, and you hire someone to take over this task of managing the building of this structure, your involvement or your putting ideas or concerns or your recommendations—not necessarily blocking, but how to improve the building of that structure, and you have some responsibility for that. So, that may be an example of what we were trying to do in building this structure, of having some concerns and bringing some of our thoughts to the table. So, we continue to do that and we're happy to do that again this afternoon. We know that the empowerment schools have worked for the District. I was a part of that group that helped to bring in empowerment schools, and we have been long time promoters of local school empowerment. We know that the critical part to that is always parent—and we know that one of the critical parts to any educational program is the parent engagement, parent involvement. That is a part of our, what we call, strategic imperative, engagement. But parent involvement also helps us support our children in their learning, so it's just absolutely key. We have students 6 hours and 11 minutes a day, and after they leave us, we've got to have that engagement from the home and the community. You can feel it at a school when parent and community members are involved. It's just a different place. It's a wonderful place. It's an engaged place, and it's a happy place.

We want to thank Trustee Wright for sharing some of our concerns. I just would like to reiterate our desire for flexibility during this process. You know, they always say—some

people say the devil's in the details. I always say the angels are in the facts, so we want to continue to see how we make this work in a more efficient and effective way, and sometimes you don't know until you're really engaged in the process. I worked in CCSD a long time, a little over 32 and a half years, and now I've been on the Board 8 years, so add the 8 to 32, and you see what that means. But I started when I was 3, so I was just a baby. I was in kindergarten, preschool, something like that. And I know that when it comes to the administration of education, there's no simple answer. So, as much flexibility as we can get, we'll take.

Now, I'd also like to reiterate that the need for a fully funded weighted formula is just critical. Having been in the District and as an administrator and working in special student services as a special education teacher, and I also taught during the summer program in the severely emotionally handicapped program—I could not have done that program without having those extra funds and having that extra aid. It was a very challenging kind of program, so we need all of that to make it work for the educators, not only in the schools, but our support staff and our teachers, of course. In our District, we need to recognize that different children have different needs. Many students have recognized this for many years, but we have only started to put our money where our mouth is. If you do a correlation between funding of schools and their district and educational achievement outcome, you'll see a direct correlation between how schools are funded and the achievement level of those school districts. I think you will be able to see that, and often if you look at our funding, our funding is toward the bottom, and there's a correlation between that as well.

I want to thank the Legislators. I want to thank the Governor for pursuing this funding for our children. And I want to keep that whole engagement piece about parent involvement at the central focus of our discussion. Sometimes, people set up systems with the best intentions, with the best ideas, and the best, what we call, goals. But they don't realize what these systems mean to everyone, all of us. The whole thought—it does take a village to educate a child. It takes all of us. A school organizational team can be a wellspring of parent and guardian involvement, but it can also be an intimidating process to parents, support staff, teachers and community members. We want the door to be open to all in our communities to the schools. We want them to feel welcomed, and we want them to feel, even though they may not have all of the, perhaps, formal educational knowledge, they have the heart of educational support for their child and the community. So, the community at all phases and stages must be involved. But just because the door is open doesn't mean that people who go in will feel welcome, and so we want to hope and work with all of our staff to make sure that that's just a hallmark of as soon as you come through the door, you are a welcome entity to this whole process. The Community Implementation Council has talked a little bit about the need for translators at the SOT meetings. Translators are important, but it's more than that. It's a part of our culture. It's a part of knowing where a person comes from. Language is that mainstay of an organization and of a parent and of a family, so it's real important that those translators be a part of the SOTs, from a variety of languages. I believe, and I don't know if I have my numbers right, but I believe we have close to 128 different languages. We have 152 languages in CCSD, and that represents 152 cultures, 152 families, in terms of that language class. So, it's important that they feel totally engaged, and totally accepted and valued. So those translators are important. Public schools are open to all children regardless of their background, disability or economic

status. If we are to have parents, community members, support staff and teachers assist the principals with budgeting and the school plan, we must make sure that the school can be as inclusive and diverse a place as possible. We should be vigilant, watching how parents and SOT members engage in this process. We should listen, and we should teach, and we should model the best methods of empowerment.

I just want to close by just saying a couple things about A.B. 469, that we are very supportive of all of our students. They're like a rainbow, like a bouquet, all cultures, all races, all colors, and we feel that making this work for them is going to make it work for CCSD. We also want to make sure that not only is the language a part of it, but many of our parents who are so engaged with just having their children to subsist with food and shelter and clothing, may have to work two and three and sometimes four jobs to do that. They may not often have the ability in terms of the time to be able to get to those schools. Some kind of way, we have to do an outreach. We have to go to them, and if necessary, sometimes knock on the doors and bring some of our information and our encouragement for their participation to the home, and how we do that, we'll have to work together on that. We also want to share that sometimes our homes and families don't have computer or internet access, and much of our information is on the internet or on the computer or on the phones, and yes, some have phones, but maybe not the access to being able to get information off of a smartphone. So that's a real important piece as well. And we just want to say to you as our collaborators and team partners that we want the best for our children. We want the best for all of our students. We are committed to this work, and we know that, working together, we can make it happen, and if you remember TEAM—Together Each Achieves More.

Carolyn Edwards (Clerk, Clark County School District Board of Trustees):

I'm a clerk for the School Board of Trustees, in addition to which I represent District F, which is mostly the southwest part of the valley. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today, and I want to go over just a couple items, specific in the law that was signed this week by the Governor, A.B. 469. I want to speak, first of all, about the SOTs. The requirement for monthly meetings can be cumbersome for some schools, and if there were flexibility in that requirement, I think that will go a long way to helping the schools be able to meet not just the letter of the law, but the spirit of the law, and so—for example, in December, our students are in session for 2 weeks, so trying to hold a monthly meeting in December will be difficult, especially now that we've changed our calendar, and final exams are the second week in December, before the third week when they go on break, and so just a little flexibility. If it were to say three per semester or a minimum of two per semester, or three, something like that will give them some flexibility in terms of when they meet.

One of the other requirements in there is union membership to be on an SOT. I think that hampers some individuals, and I will say some individuals feel disenfranchised because they cannot even apply. If you're support staff, the requirement is that you have to be a union member. I have a support staff person who does an amazing amount of work for the school in Sandy Valley, and she's not a union member and could not be on the team. She wants to have a voice on that team and can't, because of the way the law is written. I think

flexibility there would go a long way to resolving some of the discontent by some of our employees, because they feel essentially ostracized from being on the team.

There's been a suggestion that, as we move forward, we might want to create staggered terms for our SOT members, so that maybe one serves for a 1-year term the first year, and half maybe, and the other half serves for 2 years, so that when you start to bring in somebody for a second 2-year term, you now are having some continuity and some experience on your team, so that it's not all new people every single year. I think that will go a long way. We do that with our Attendance Zone Advisory Commission. I appoint two people to that Commission, and they're both 2-year terms but it's every other year that they are appointed so that I always have one that's had some experience.

And then, finally, I want to talk about the quarterly reports to the municipalities. I'm not sure that this needs to be addressed in the law, but perhaps it does. It appears that what the municipalities most want to talk about are constituent concerns, and I don't think that forum is an appropriate place to be talking about individual concerns about children or about parents. That should be a place where what we're reporting is the achievement levels at our schools. What are the achievement levels? What are the graduation rates at the high schools? Maybe, what is the attendance rate at schools? But to talk about "Johnny is having this problem at this school," that's not the place for that, and so that would be one of the other things that I think would be valuable to try to address.

Finally, in terms of principal selection, not even the Superintendent sees or interviews all candidates for potential principals. So, I don't think municipalities should be involved in that either. In addition to which, I think it's important to ensure clarity, which I think is there in the law, that SOTs have input on principal selection, but they don't make the principal selection.

So I've been very specific. I'm not a very rosy person. So, I do a lot of glowing things in my personal life, but here I'm just sort of business-like. So those are the things that I think need to be addressed in the law, and I was trying to be very specific so you could actually take a look and see if there's anything that could be done. Thank you so much for this opportunity.

Mr. Christenson:

Ultimately, we essentially work for the Legislature. They've asked us to come in, oversee, participate and help with this process. We have—or the consultants have the responsibility, and ultimately we would approve those or concur with them to make recommendations to whatever changes need to be made. Some of these things are still very much in flux. I think the comments that were made today are things that we should ask the consultant team to think about. Let's determine what we think is appropriate, what can be done, talk to the appropriate parties. The part that's so encouraging to me now, as our relationship has evolved—this is an incredibly disruptive process, taking a centralized organization and making it an empowerment school district. That disruption has caused some bumps along the road, but I think now we're starting to see some commonality in vision. The fact that you folks have now come out, you support A.B. 469, things are coming together, and that helps free up a lot of time that we've been wasting, and actually go towards coming up with some better outcomes. I can't necessarily promise you that all of the things that you've suggested to us will be done, but I can promise you we'll consider them, bring them to the appropriate

parties, and let's see what we can do. But if the Trustees are in line now, the Superintendent and his leadership are in line, the CIC is in line, the State Board of Education is in line, this really, I think, is an important time in this process. I wish that we could have done this several months ago. We are where we are and I'm thrilled to death with that, so let's go get it done. But, I'm not sure if that's a complete explanation, but I think that's where we are.

Felicia Ortiz (Member, State Board of Education, Congressional District 3; Vice Chair):

So, initially, President Wright, you mentioned that you're worried about, if we don't get the weighted funding formula approved and get more dollars, that there could be some consequences. Could you possibly elaborate on what those consequences might be, because I just want to have a better understanding.

Ms. Wright:

So, we're going to actually ask staff to answer your questions, because anything potentially that we answer could be something we have to vote on, so we want to be really careful about the Open Meeting Law, and so, if I could ask Deputy Superintendent Kim Wooden or Carlos McDade to answer your questions, is that okay?

Ms. Ortiz:

That's absolutely fine. I totally respect that. I get it.

Ms. Wright:

I wasn't sure if we were going to get questions, so I wanted to make sure you knew. It's not because we don't want to, but the whole Open Meeting Law thing, so we're being very careful.

Kim Wooden (Deputy Superintendent, Clark County School District):

Can you repeat the question?

Ms. Ortiz:

So, President Wright mentioned when she discussed the concerns about the weighted funding formula the fact that deliberations are still going on, and if it is not fully approved or we don't get the money we're expecting, that there could be consequences into the operations of CCSD, and I was hoping to get some clarification on what those consequences might be so that we could, both as a board and community members, have a better understanding and be able to push our Legislators accordingly.

Ms. Wooden:

Under A.B. 469, we are required to implement a weighted student funding formula. There's been, shall we say, a lack of clarity about what that might mean, whether or not that's take the pie that we currently have for funding and re-divide it, which could be devastating depending on how that works out, or if it means new money and looking at ways to distribute that for the groups such as English language learners (ELL), special education students, gifted and talented, and free and reduced lunch students. So, you can imagine the impact that might have on the school community, given the numbers and proportions of those students that they may have in their schools.

Ms. Ortiz:

Okay, that helps a lot. Are there any other direct consequences that you can think of that we should be aware of and following?

Ms. Wooden:

With regard to weighted student funding? I think it's really important to note too that our kids come from different places. They have different starting points. We know that every child that enters kindergarten has a different educational level even upon entry, so we have students that have great need and we have students that have less need as far as dollars invested in their education. I think special education is always used as a great example of that, but also in terms of ELL and free and reduced lunch students. So, giving our schools some flexibility around the dollars that they're able to provide for students based on their category is really important to the schools. We've always believed that autonomy is really important, but having that flexibility to meet the individual needs that are in front of you on a daily basis—and also recognizing that those needs may change throughout the year. Kids come and go, and we get new kids in or their needs change as they're identified by our caring adults throughout the year, and we want to be able to provide them the resources to care for their educational needs, and/or their wrap-around service needs.

Ms. Ortiz:

Okay, that's helpful, because I think I've had the same lack of clarity in once the dollars hit the school, are there any rules as to how they're spent? So we're on the same page there. So my other question was, as far as the quarterly reports to municipalities, does the language in the regulation—because I can't recall right now exactly what it says—outline exactly what needs to be reported, or is it pretty vague?

Ms. Wooden:

Currently, the language is pretty open. It just provides language to say quarterly reports to the municipalities. We did attend five municipality meetings in the last February or March time period, and the kinds of things that we did hear are just what the Trustees stated. There were some overarching comments, some gratitude for the work that we've been doing, but also some individual constituent concerns. So, we really feel like, when we

provide our next quarterly report, that we really want to focus on the schools and the work that they're doing, giving each of the municipalities an update on what's happening within schools within their jurisdiction.

Ms. Ortiz:

Okay, so, maybe silly question, but do we have to codify that in the regulations in any way, or can we just walk into these municipality meetings and say, "We're here to present this and that's all we're here to discuss," or is it like, kind of not possible to avoid those silly questions?

Ms. Wooden:

So, I don't know if it's not possible, but at the same time, I think there needs to be some collaboration. And we're learning, so this was the first one, and we're kind of getting an idea of what the interest level is and what kinds of things they're interested in hearing about, and it was different as we went from municipality to municipality. Our bottom line is that we really want to provide the information that they need, so that they can know what's happening within their schools, and so that we can all work together in partnerships to raise student achievement.

Ms. Ortiz:

So, did they give you an idea of the information they need, or are we just guessing?

Ms. Wooden:

Some of them did provide some information, yes.

Ms. Ortiz:

Okay. So, do you believe—and this is totally, obviously your personal opinion—that they were bringing up the constituent issues because they don't know the right communication path to address those issues, or just because they had an active audience?

Ms. Wooden:

I don't know if it was so much about having an active audience. I think that some things are just more fresh in the mind. So, you might have just had an encounter at a public event just recently and heard something, and you wanted to bring that to our attention, and we appreciate that.

Ms. Ortiz:

So, I guess I would just recommend that the next time you go to the meetings, have like, a handout, a nice little infographic, "If you have constituent issues, here's what you should do."

Ms. Wooden:

Great idea, thank you.

Brent Husson (President, Nevada Succeeds; Vice Chair):

I just wanted to comment on a couple of the issues that President Wright brought up. Number one, the weighted funding formula. As we know right now, that's being debated in the Legislature, so there may be—to some extent—some resolution to that issue. But I also recall hearing, in public comment or in one of our meetings, from the State Department of Education that there's an opportunity for the District to apply for a waiver so that, if there's no new money, it wouldn't have the consequences that Deputy Superintendent Wooden just described. So, I don't know that that needs to be held out as a major concern. I think, regardless of how it's resolved during this Legislative Session, there is an opportunity for the District not to be harmed by that, and I think it's been pretty clearly laid out as to how to pursue that way.

The other one—the municipality—I wanted to weigh in on that too, because I think it's incredibly important. It might seem small, but the whole point of the reorganization and movement towards autonomous schools is to refocus the District in their ability to collaborate with community members, and this is a tool for doing that. Obviously, those meetings aren't productive if they focus on constituent concerns, but the idea is that the District and the municipalities work together to work through that so that that's not what those meetings are, and that they do become very productive, and that you all have the benefit of input from other members of the community. That's what it is, for the District; it allows you to have eyes and ears in places where you can't be. And I know that, as in this District, you're all over, but you're not all over in the same capacity. So, I would encourage all of you to use that particular piece to expand the work you do, not to look at it as a negative because maybe the first couple aren't great. That's where you get to use your leadership and really work with those folks to make them meaningful meetings. The human capital management system we've discussed. I think everybody's on board with working to get that—at least, there's no conversation on this panel that I've heard that's been saying that you don't need that. And the 80-20, that'll probably be talked about a little later, so I'll hold on that.

Mr. Christenson:

I had a couple questions around the municipalities' involvement with selection of principals and school associate superintendents. What I didn't get clarity in my own mind was, what is it that the Trustees want to see? Is it that you don't want them involved, or is it that you want to be more involved with it, because my understanding is that you have two employees. Mr. McDade, you probably should identify yourself for the record, too.

Carlos McDade (General Counsel, Clark County School District):

I am the General Counsel for CCSD.

Mr. Christenson:

Thank you. So, perhaps you can help me with that. I'm just trying to understand what it is that you're looking for as a concern.

Ms. Wooden:

I will turn that over to Mr. McDade, but I just wanted to explain what that is for the record, and that's where the municipalities have an input, a seat at the table, for the school associate superintendent selection, not the principal selection. So I just wanted to clarify that.

Mr. Christenson:

Okay. I was surprised—I thought somebody said principal. Maybe I misheard.

Mr. McDade:

Yes, just to clarify, the municipality provision that we're discussing only applies to the school associate superintendents. And to answer your question, I think it's a little bit of both. Right now, the Superintendent has sole authority over hiring and firing, and the Trustees aren't involved in that process and the municipalities are, under this bill, to a degree. So, that's kind of what we would like, just to talk with the CIC and get a sense of what the appropriate level of participation is outside the District. As we've maintained all along, it's odd to have another body in the hiring process for another body. But, considering that it's in the law now, we just want to be able to continue the discussion about the best way to implement that.

Mr. Christenson:

Okay, I guess it's in the law now, and you're talking about the implementation of it later, to whatever extent they should or should not be involved?

Mr. McDade:

Correct.

Mr. Christenson:

All right, thank you.

Mr. Husson:

Mr. McDade, could you give me your understanding of what the requirement is, as the law is written?

Mr. McDade:

If I recall the statute correctly, the municipalities have a public hearing, the Superintendent and the school associate superintendent candidates attend that public hearing, and then there are questions from the entity and then from the public of the Superintendent and the school associate superintendent, and then a recommendation is made from the entity to the District.

Mr. Husson:

Is there anything in the law that mandates any weight given to that recommendation?

Mr. McDade:

No, there's not. And that's why I'm framing this as we would like to continue the discussion with your group as how to best implement it so that it's useful for all parties.

Mr. Christenson:

We're going to be talking about 80-20 here in a minute. I don't know how much flexibility we really have in it, and I want to reiterate what I said before. I think the most important thing we can do is focus on how we use this opportunity to improve student outcomes. But I thought that some of the suggestions that were made by the Trustees have some merit, and we'll see what we can do, but my sense is that there's a pretty strong feeling about the 80-20, and so I think we need to focus on what we can do with that that ultimately ends up in better student outcomes.

For the record, I quickly wanted to acknowledge that Member Verenice Flores is here now, as is Member Ken Evans. I neglected to mention before that Member Cranor is not here today. She is actually helping her daughter prepare for her 18-month mission somewhere in South America—I can't remember if it's Argentina or Chile, but it's one of the two—and Member Woodward is out of town on business today. The other thing I wanted to do is, I saw that former Assemblyman David Gardner is here. I'm sure he's probably doing the happy dance after this last week. I saw your picture all over Facebook and Twitter with the signing of the bill, so congratulations, and we've enjoyed having you here at most, if not all, of our meetings.

We are then on to agenda item VI, which is the update regarding the implementation of the plan and recommendations to reorganize CCSD and the regulation to carry out the plan and recommendations adopted by the State Board, including without limitation the requirement that 80 percent of the unrestricted money of a large school district be transferred. That would be talking about training, optimizing the use of the SOTs and so forth.

Michael Vannozzi (Vice President of Creative Strategy, TSC² Group):

Mr. Chairman, actually, I think we are still on agenda item V. We have Mr. Doughman's report on A.B. 469.

Mr. Christenson:

Then I apologize for that. Mr. Doughman?

Andrew Doughman (Vice President of Policy and Communication, TSC² Group):

I'll briefly be addressing this afternoon an update to recent legislation that affects the work of the Council. Throughout these remarks, I will be referring to a memo that you have in your meeting packet, "Changes to Reorganization Under A.B. 469" ([Exhibit D](#)). Assembly Bill 469, as many of you already know, is an important bill that was sponsored by all four leaders, Democrat and Republican, of the Assembly and the Senate. It helps move the reorganization forward by ensuring that the regulation we have all been working under is codified into state law. It has been noted in the media that this legislation "would likely clear any legal challenges to implementing the plan in time for the next school year." This is essentially correct. Most of the language of the regulation is copied verbatim into A.B. 469. Again, as many of you are already aware, the Governor signed the bill into law earlier this week, and immediately after we saw that Superintendent Pat Skorkowsky released a positive video on the reorganization website that welcomed the legislation and committed the District to continue to move forward with the implementation of the work of the reorganization.

With that background established, I would like to again point out that A.B. 469 is the new paradigm under which we are all operating. Assembly Bill 394—as Chairman Christenson mentioned, we have the sponsor of the legislation in the room today—is from the 2015 Legislative Session and first established the reorganization. It was followed by state regulation R142-16, which further established the parameters of the reorganization and has guided our collective work since that was passed last autumn. Assembly Bill 469 takes that regulation and codifies it into law. The consultant team, however, notes that there are several differences between the regulation and A.B. 469. In recognition that we have a lengthy agenda, I'd ask the Chairman if he'd like me to continue to walk through each section of the changes, or ask that the CIC members review on their individual time.

Mr. Christenson:

Why don't you quickly go through, and certainly highlight any things that we need to...

Mr. Doughman:

Section 1 states that this bill modifies state law. Again, the reorganization that was in effect via regulation now has the force of state law behind it. Further, in section 2, the Legislature added a clarifying "Findings" section that helps shed some light on the policies that are further described. Section 7, it is noted that this law affects "large school districts." It is not particular to Clark County, but the definition of a large school district functionally means that it is only applicable to CCSD at this time, because no other district in the state meets the 100,000-pupil threshold to qualify as a large school district. Section 14 further clarifies that this bill applies to a large school district. Section 26, this is something that we have discussed in this body before; Senate leadership earlier said that they would like to see an

immunity provision added to protect SOT members from liability for civil damages in their service to the SOT. This section provides for that. Section 33 provides that the Nevada Superintendent has new oversight powers over implementation of the law. Section 34 provides a role for the State Board of Education to make regulations necessary to implement the law. Sections 38 and 39 clarify intent and applicability of purchasing language that was in the regulation. Section 41 requires compliance with dates in this bill, even if those dates have passed, and deems actions taken under the regulation to have been taken pursuant to the bill. Section 44 makes the aforementioned regulation void, and section 45 allows the Advisory Committee that was established under A.B. 394 to continue with the same membership until August 31, 2018. Section 48, finally, repeals A.B. 394. With that, I conclude my testimony, and will take any questions.

Ken Evans (President, Urban Chamber of Commerce):

Just a quick clarification—so the Advisory Committee that they’re referring to is the Advisory Committee that is a composite of the elected officials and a few other appointed individuals?

Mr. McDade:

That is correct. It is the same Advisory Committee composed of Legislators.

Ms. Ortiz:

So, section 33 gives the Nevada Superintendent oversight powers that were previously delegated to the Advisory Committee, but section 45 allows the Advisory Committee to continue. Is there a reason why? So which body is going to govern, if section 33 says it's the Nevada Superintendent. And I know I'm asking you to be a lawyer right now, but...

Mr. Vannozzi:

Yeah, I think we'd have to take that one back to the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB).

Mr. Evans:

And then I just wanted a clarification on sections 38 and 39. I know that we were trying to do something or have some discussions offline. Regarding purchasing, how will that impact the ability of a large school district to do purchasing, but still keep in mind supplier diversity issues that may have been brought up in the past?

Mr. Doughman:

Again, I would defer to LCB on the specific technical nature, but it's my understanding that this was simply clarifying language that doesn't necessarily touch on or change those points.

Ms. Ortiz:

On section 41, it says, “Requires compliance with the dates in the bill even if those dates have passed, and deems actions taken under R142-16 to have been taken pursuant to the bill.” In our last workshop at the State Board of Education, we agreed to change some of those dates. Does that stick, or does that go away, do you know?

Mr. Vannozzi:

That’s actually a really good question that we would have to defer to LCB. My sense is yes, but that’s something that we would have to defer to LCB. Ms. Martini, if you have any answer for that?

Mr. Christenson:

We’re having some technical difficulty. Actually, we think Risa Lang might be able to help us. Is there anything else that you’d like to bring forward? Perhaps we can come back to this. Any other questions from the members? Then we will go, then, forward to agenda item VI.

Why don’t we take about a 5-minute break here, and then we’ll come back.

We will now reconvene. Before we get started, Mr. Skancke, Ms. Martini, why don’t you respond to the question?

Mindy Martini (Principal Research Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

There was one question looking at section 33, and that was giving the Superintendent oversight powers, versus section 45 which allows the Advisory Committee to continue, and my understanding is that the Advisory Committee would be advisory—still making recommendations, so it would still be out there providing that information, but the Superintendent would be in charge. So, still an advisory position. I believe there was also a question about what was incorporated into the measure, and whatever was in the regulation was incorporated, but I believe the other elements that were discussed have not been incorporated at this time. That’s my understanding, so that’s the update that I have for right now.

Ms. Ortiz:

So I will take that information back to the State Board of Education and talk to the Superintendent about ensuring that what we discussed in the workshop with CCSD gets—somehow, I think, since it’s now his responsibility—put into regulation so that the dates that we agreed upon changing will be included.

Mr. Skancke:

If I could just interject into that conversation for a moment as well—for those of you that have read our contract, we are required in Phase 3 of our contract to make recommendations to the State Superintendent and the State Board of Education for any recommendations that we may have to the regulations as it relates to the implementation of A.B. 394/A.B. 469. So, as we work with CCSD senior management, we are taking notes of those things and we will, at the appropriate time, make those recommendations to the State Superintendent for him to consider and the State Board to consider, as it relates to the implementation of now-A.B. 469. So, we are required under contract to do that review as well, and to make those necessary recommendations to the State. And, for the record, we have been in regular communication with the State Superintendent as we have gone through this process.

Mr. Christenson:

I think we've already opened agenda item VI, so, if you'd like to proceed?

Mr. Skancke:

This afternoon, my remarks are going to be focused on the work that we have been conducting and the work that still needs to be done. Since our last meeting, a great deal has happened, and, not to say the least of which, the report that Mr. Doughman gave to you in a previous item. Mr. Chairman, thanks to the tremendous efforts of the legislative leadership on both sides of the aisle, the reorganization, the work of the Advisory Committee, the Nevada Department of Education and this committee, has now been codified into law. While the School District still has some concerns about the legislation, which we just heard a few moments ago, I believe that everyone is committed, to us and to the public, that we will now work very hard, collectively, to ensure this reorganization is implemented by this fall. And indeed, we have seen at the staff level, at the District, at all levels, that we are all working hard to make that happen. This commitment has already begun to positively affect our work. The work that has been completed to date has been in the areas of the following: one, organizational structure, which there is still some additional work that needs to be done there, which I will be speaking about in a few moments; roles and responsibilities within the District; training and culture; communications, which we are intimately involved with on a regular basis; and overall strategic guidance. These are the broad areas, but they represent thousands of hours of work that our team has been assisting the District on—everything from training video language to the creation of big picture frameworks for budget processes. And now in the final phase, we are completing the most challenging work that needs to be completed. We're confident that our work will be completed by the end of October of this year. However, this reorganization is an ongoing effort. The Clark County School District will need to work every day to improve on the work that has been done, and continue to meet the requirements of the law. In my opinion, this work will truly never end.

You just heard from the Trustees. After my presentation, you'll hear from the Deputy Superintendent and the Chief Operating Officer of the School District. In their testimony, they will talk about the ways they can move forward on the budgetary portion of the

reorganization, specifically how CCSD will move toward the requirement that 85 percent of its unrestricted budget is spent at the local level and 15 percent is spent at the administrative level. As we have maintained over the last 6 months, CCSD is a long way from the 85-15 provision as prescribed by the law. But we are hopeful, and we continue to work together to get to that end. Previously, we told the CIC that CCSD was not meeting the 80-20 provision, and they had a long way to go in that effort as well. After going through an exhaustive survey of CCSD's budget, down to each individual department and purpose line, personnel have found that only 54 percent of CCSD's unrestricted budget is spent at the local level the way they currently account for dollars. By making some significant changes to the financial distribution, CCSD believes that they will be able to get to 70 percent by January 15, 2018.

We believe that CCSD can get further to the 80-20 requirement, and we will be working with them to assist in that effort. But to get there, CCSD must deal with several barriers. Each one of these comes with its own unique challenges. The first barrier that I will talk about today is the strained relationship between CCSD and the five employee groups. This is a disappointing state of affairs because, ideally, labor-management relations at any organization should be in a healthy state—especially as an organization undergoes large changes in the way it does business and the way management relates to labor and vice versa. To be clear, I do not lay the primary onus of the poor relationship at the feet of the employee organizations. I have told the CIC, the School District and anyone who has ever asked me that there will be times that we will be critical of the District. There will be times that I will need to publicly identify and call out what I have referred to in the past as stoppers to the reorganization work. This is one of those times. We have a great working relationship with many in the School District. It is a relationship of openness and collaboration, but on this one particular issue, we have frankly run up against a wall. Information we have repeatedly requested and asked for is simply not being provided. Let me lay out the situation and provide some background. We have found that the District, as it relates to the employee and management relationships, has a poor operating environment that results in turmoil, litigation and a hostile working environment. This has recently caused elevated levels of internal disruption within District management. I would like to be more specific, but I have been advised at this time that I cannot provide greater details to you. I can say that we have seen impasse after impasse, arbitration after arbitration, and we have noticed a startling level of independent power relationships at play outside of the official leadership of the School District. This is very unhealthy for an organizational culture, and unfortunately, it affects very weighty issues like the budget, and in fact the whole operation of the School District. This is, frankly, untenable if we want the Clark County Schools Achieve initiative to be successful in changing a culture. What we do know is the District has spent millions and millions of dollars in legal fees in the past 5 years fighting impasse with their bargaining units. Last year alone the District exceeded its legal budget by more than 450 percent. This is unacceptable, and this is not sustainable for the District.

We have repeatedly asked the District for further, more detailed information about litigation, arbitration and other matters around this relationship between employees and management, and I have clearly just run up against a wall. Therefore, we will be formally submitting tomorrow a Freedom of Information Act request to the School District so that they can furnish the public information to us and the public generally. This is a roadblock that we

need to get over if this reorganization is going to be successful. In order for the reorganization to proceed in an orderly manner, the District needs good relationships with its employees' groups. Structurally, we are recommending that the Employee-Management Relations (EMR) Department be put under the Human Resources Department. This move will put a cultural shift that is needed in order for the District to function more efficiently. We submit to you that there will be a substantial cost savings to the District, which will put more money into schools and improve and increase student achievement. After all, that's what this reorganization is all about.

We hope that our Freedom of Information Act request will help shed more light on these issues, and we believe that ultimately this is a constructive act that will result in greater transparency and will lead to positive change that better enables the CIC, our team and the District itself to effectuate all of the great things that we have discussed about the reorganization. We have gone department by department doing a necessary analysis, and this is one area we are still having challenges. That, Mr. Chairman, is the first barrier I'd like to outline today.

The second barrier I'd like to outline is one that is more of a complex solution, and that is of unfunded mandates. Mr. Chairman, I have owned businesses and consulted on businesses and government for nearly 3 decades. In business, the CEO must be careful before making long-term investments. As you know, when you take on employees, you take on more than just the cost of a paycheck every 2 weeks. You take on the ancillary costs of that employee. You take on the costs associated with their development. You take on long-term propositions that they depend on. Long-term commitments like that should not be entered lightly, but for the School District, they often are, and it is not entirely their fault. In this state, the school system has been "failing" for many years, and every elected official, and every appointed official for that matter, takes a hack at "fixing" the system. In many instances, the fixes to the failing system come in the form of a mandate. Because, quite frankly, it feels good to tell others what they should be doing. Over the past 10 years, CCSD has dealt hardily with these mandates. We have conducted research and found more than a dozen pieces of legislation that create unfunded mandates for the system. Why are we bringing this up? It is not to cry that CCSD has no money. They do. But when the Legislature or the State Board or anyone else pass a mandate on the system, those mandates rarely account for the Central Services costs that are created by that mandate. Every dime, from Zoom School funds and the Victory School funds, for example, is spent at the local school level. Those costs of administering these grants, monitoring compliance, setting District-wide standards, responding to requests from schools, are all borne by the Central Service Office. If we are to build a system that keeps central costs under control, we must think about the controls that we put on these mandates. That is barrier number two.

To address this barrier, our team will work internally with the District to ensure that the true costs of these efforts are accounted for, and how the District can improve its communications with stakeholders as these unfunded mandates arise. Our team will work with CCSD to find ways that it can manage these mandates more effectively to maximize the amount of dollars going to the classroom and minimize the amount of dollars going to the administration. Mr. Chairman, you may recall I asked the members of the A.B. 394 Advisory Committee in January to please limit the pieces of legislation passed for this and

the next two sessions of the Legislature that affect the School District. Every time a new piece of legislation is passed that charts a new course or direction, the teachers and the District just cannot respond or implement quickly enough until the next session of the Legislature. Every time we try to fix something, it actually creates a new obstacle or barrier that the District must address. Eighteen months is not a sufficient amount of time for a teacher or a principal or the District to implement a policy from the previous session. When you talk to teachers and you talk to administrators and you talk to people within the School District, by the time the next legislative session meets, they have barely had time to implement what the last session required them to do. So, they try to meet the deadlines, and they try to make things happen, but before they can even get there, there are new Legislators elected who all believe that they have the solution to the problem. I will submit to you that after the last 9 months of working on this effort, the teachers and the principals and the School District and the parents actually do know what's best for their schools. And I would submit to you that we just need to give them a chance to do the work that they have been trained and educated to do.

Finally, we come to barrier number three, one that frankly we have made a lot of progress on in just the last few weeks. Mr. Chairman and members of the CIC, we're about halfway through our contract term. We have conducted a lot of work up to this point. We've conducted analyses, designed plans, collaborated on budget solutions, drafted communication documents, assisted in realigning and restructuring personnel and departments—we spend a lot of time on that—and conducted a great deal of outreach. We've collectively, as a consulting team, conducted more than 2,000 hours of work on this project to date. You may have seen in the newspaper my quote, and I will use it again today. In fact, we've dealt with a lot of “crap” from a couple of people along the way as well that have a chronic desire to stop the process or cause problems for the Superintendent. These distractions are not productive and do nothing but break down the trust, stop forward motion and take the Superintendent away from his job, which is to run the School District. In those efforts, we have always been constrained, sometimes overtly and sometimes covertly. We'd be working cooperatively along something like 80-20 or budget reforms, and then all of a sudden our work would stop, and it would stop for weeks. Why? Most of the time the reason given was a trustee would come down and put a red light on the process. That is to say, a trustee came down to the Central Office and told them to do nothing or cooperate with the consulting team. The members of the CIC have heard many times before—in fact, the Superintendent himself presented to the public back in December that one or two trustees were actively attempting to block the reorganization. But, as you've heard from the Trustees today—and I am very encouraged, and as I said in my opening remarks, it has been an honor and a pleasure to work with these three individuals and other members of the Board over the last several weeks in a very positive and very progressive manner. We have come to an accommodation. We have come to a working relationship. And that would not have happened had the leadership of that Board stepped up and said, “We are going to move forward.” That would not have happened had the leadership of the Legislature stepped up and codified the regulations of A.B. 394. This is what happens when people work in a collaborative and productive way.

I want to extend my sincere thanks to the Trustees for agreeing to move forward on the reorganization. In just the last few weeks alone, we have seen major progression in our

ability to move forward with the work that we have asked to be done by you and the Legislature. With their assistance, we can stop sending mixed messages about this reorganization and start to drive a public narrative focused on providing local schools the autonomy they need to pursue strategies for better student achievement. In a few days, you'll start seeing messages on a social media campaign, one that CCSD and this consulting team has developed jointly. This campaign will start to set a shared vision for the reorganization. This is a major step forward, but it doesn't solve all of our problems. Because mixed messages have been sent about the reorganization, we now have some groups and individuals that have erroneous information about Clark County Schools Achieve. They have started to act on this erroneous information, and we're starting to see the consequences of that. This is barrier number three, which may be more of a concern than a real barrier. There appear to be some mixed messages in the community about what the SOTs are able to do, and what the "involvement" really means. There appears to be some misunderstandings in the community as a whole of what the reorganization is. We saw some of this misinformation on display at Newton Elementary School. As you probably know, the SOT and the parents—by the way, this is a very emotionally charged issue, so I'll probably have to start my car from a remote location this afternoon—but it's a classic example of what I'm talking about around misinformation. The school organizational team and parents at Newton Elementary School have made known their dissatisfaction with the principal hired to manage their school. You heard from them at the last CIC meeting, this misinformation about what the parent "involvement" is. There are some groups that believe parents get to hire and fire principals, or select principals for their school. Some people believe that parents are the ultimate authority at the local school. I will tell you that this is just not true, nor does the law say that. Parents are a partner, as well as teachers, support staff, principals, students and community leaders. That is the intent, and that is the law. At Newton, people with very good intentions acted in a way that they felt was right based upon the information that they had. And by the way, we love all of this involvement in selecting their preference for a principal. We love all of the parents and community involvement in this process. After review, the Superintendent went in a different direction, which is the prerogative and within the law of the Superintendent. Parents were understandably upset about this, and they started to engage in a process so that the decision could be re-reviewed. The Superintendent re-reviewed the decision, and today that decision stands. Newton has a new principal. She is qualified, she works hard, she brings a great deal of energy and experience to her job. Unfortunately, some parents still remain unsatisfied and a bit frustrated—and understandably so.

What I would say to every SOT and all that are involved is that we are still working out some of the kinks as a community, and that we need to work together as we move through the cultural shift. We're still in the first 6 to 8 months of this process and of these changes at the District. Rome wasn't built in a day, and this process is not going to take place and finish in just a few months. I know we all want things to move quicker—no one wants that more than me—and I think we are moving at a very fast pace now. It certainly has been improving over the past 2 months, but we still have a long way to go. I will say this: had CCSD's communication early on been much clearer, the District may have been able to dispel some of these misconceptions and some of this misinformation, and maybe this situation could have been mitigated or prevented, but it wasn't. And now, we have come together to make peace. With the majority of the Trustees supporting A.B. 469—again, thank you—and I

believe that we are on a course now that the CCSD team knows, the reorganization is in full steam ahead, and no more interruptions or misinformation will happen internally. So, what's important now is this: number one, we all want the best for our children; number two, the only way we're going to succeed is if we work together.

So, I don't want to focus today just on all of the negatives and all the barriers. I would like to highlight one very positive thing that we have seen, and there are many, but I want to highlight this today. I have been working with the Transportation Department on a bi-monthly basis for the past 4 months. The Transportation Department is under the direction of Shannon Evans. I have been meeting with Ms. Evans as I said for the past 4 months, almost two times a month, sometimes it's been one. We have been doing a Department-wide review of purchasing, inventory, management, security, fleet control and transportation management policies, to name a few. Ms. Evans has done an outstanding job of her review. She told me yesterday that her Department is making the cultural shift from Central Services to a customer service provider. I have actually asked Ms. Evans to make a presentation to the CIC at a later date, to show this committee and the public the progress she has made. She is a role model for how each department at the School District should be acting in order to implement A.B. 469 to its fullest extent. I believe that when we are finished in her Department, that we will find savings, the policy, and the culture will be changed in that one Department. I see it happening already. And by the way, we are seeing it happen across the entire District.

I will tell you something all today. We have run across very few people within the District that don't want this to happen. In fact, we've only come across about two people that are really obstacles to this process. On a staff level, we have run across a couple of people as well. Everyone wants this to happen; they want it to be successful. I wish we had 50 Shannon Evans in CCSD, and as we go department by department, we are going to identify those other individuals who are doing everything they possibly can. There are several shining stars at the District, and she is just one of them.

Finally, we will be having another workshop with the School District senior management team in June to continue to move this effort forward. We have found that these workshops allow for amazing interactions and a collaborative idea-building opportunity that really helps keep everyone on the purpose line and heading in the same direction. This will be our fourth workshop, and we plan to do others as our work is complete throughout the end of October.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I am actually going to channel Dr. Young today for a second, and quote Nelson Mandela. I couldn't help myself. By the way, I have to tell you something. I had the opportunity to go to Dr. Young's It Takes a Village Foundation fundraising event a couple of months ago. What a remarkable event. I highly recommend you all go to that event. The keynote speaker that evening was very inspirational. I found the remarks by everyone that was in the audience and the enthusiasm that was there to be quite amazing. This past Saturday, I wasn't able to attend—I was out of town and had to go visit my mother—but this past Saturday the It Takes a Village Foundation handed out their scholarships. I wished I could have attended that event to see those young people receive those scholarships from that Foundation. But that's just one area where some amazing work is being done in our community that I don't think goes as well-recognized as it should.

So, Dr. Young, I want to thank you publicly today for all the work that you are doing and have done for the past 38-plus years, both as an educator in the School District and the It Takes a Village Foundation. It does take a village, and that little piece that she contributes to the community really helps those kids. So, in my attempt to try and channel her today, I would like to quote Nelson Mandela. "If you want to make peace with your enemy, you have to work with your enemy. Then he becomes your partner." Mandela also said, "Education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world." In that spirit, Mr. Chairman, I think we should all take a little of Mandela's advice. That's why I'm proposing to you that in the next month, the CIC and the Trustees schedule one or more public meetings to talk candidly about the reorganization. Not action to be taken, but to talk candidly, transparently and openly about the reorganization. We've got a lot of challenges ahead of us, and those challenges are too important to be left in the dark. We need to be partners if we're going to take them on as a community. If you, Mr. Chairman, and President Wright were amenable, I would like to suggest that we work together to set up dates for these meetings. By working together, we can form a partnership, and we can do really good things for our kids, for our teachers, for our principals, for our parents and for our community as a whole.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, the consultant team has made a great deal of progress over the last month, and I would submit to you over the last 8 months. We are on an accelerated track to complete our work. We've made the necessary connections within the District to drive change, and the District, in partnership with us, has started to lead the way on the reorganization. After I've answered your questions, you'll hear from two of our best partners in the District, Kim Wooden and Rick Neal. These two extraordinary individuals have been the driving force behind much of what the District has done on the reorganization. In their presentation, they will talk about how CCSD will make decisions on the reallocation of the budget so that local schools have the autonomy they need to drive student achievement. With that, I would be happy to take any questions from the CIC.

Mr. Evans:

Thank you very much, Mr. Skancke, very good report, and I definitely appreciate the Mandela quote as I personally had an opportunity to go to South Africa myself and see how—what I want to put on the record is—what I was impressed with is, despite what President Mandela went through, what he understood is that he had to bring about change in a manner that would not destroy the very organization, in this case his country, even as he was attempting to get rid of some of the negative impact and effects of apartheid, so point well taken about us working together. My question is, I wanted to go back to the first barrier you mentioned, and I'm not asking for details, but I just want to make sure I better understand—EMR, I'm going to assume, has to do with employee-management relations, and it's a unit that works on employee-management relationships between the five bargaining units and the School District. First, I'm surprised that it wasn't already under the human resources function, but I guess I'd just like kind of an idea of where are the opportunities for improvement, without getting into the nitty-gritty details?

Mr. Skancke:

Mr. Chairman and members of the CIC, one of the things that we have been doing in our effort is we've sat down with the organizational chart as a whole in the District, and we have gone department by department and we are looking at realigning how the departments should interact. We have gone through almost every department, and this is the last department that we have to work through in the realignment. What we are trying to do is find the necessary efficiencies. Where there are duplicative resources and duplicative services, that duplication requires a huge demand on the School District's budget. There are multiple departments that do similar things, and so what we are trying to say is, as we go through this process, we need to align and realign some of these departments and the functions and what they do, and so as we go through this process, we are doing just that. And so, the recommendation that I'm making today and the recommendation that we have made internally is that that department become a function and go under the Human Resources Department, which is a natural function. There are duplicative efforts, and we just believe that those duplicative efforts should be minimized within the District to drive more money into the schools, which is what the full intent of A.B. 394 and A.B. 469 has been from the beginning.

Mr. Christenson:

I'm curious as to this Transportation Department. Being a former chief financial officer, I'm always interested in ways that things can be done more efficiently, and perhaps she'll come and speak with us in the next meeting, but what are we talking about in terms of magnitude, dollars here? Is this tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, is it a big number?

Mr. Skancke:

I would say it's substantial. I do not want to take away the Superintendent or the Chief Operating Officer or Ms. Evans' thunder if we can get her to come here and present. I will tell you, the entrepreneurial spirit that I have seen throughout the District with most of the department heads is really impressive, and the seriousness that she has taken on in restructuring and reprogramming her Department has just been extremely impressive, and I will tell you that comes from the top down. She's taken this on herself, but her boss is the Chief Operating Officer, and his boss is the Superintendent, and they have encouraged this Department-wide. And she took it upon herself in her responsibility to reach out to the private sector, to take a look at things like lease versus purchase. She's conducting this effort as if she was the CEO of her own Department. She's learned a lot along the way, and she's been given the authority to do that, and I'm impressed with the Superintendent and the Chief Operating Officer and the Deputy Superintendent by encouraging all department heads to do this type of work. I've just been working with her because my background has been in transportation for the last 30 years and I have an understanding of it, but we're working across the board. Some of the things that she has looked at and she will recommend to the Superintendent and the Chief Operating Officer and the Board are innovative. From the way students and parents interact with the buses and the way—potentially creating an application. Again, I don't want to go into all the details because these are all her ideas that she has not presented to her boss. Hopefully, I won't get her in

trouble today with Mr. Skorkowsky or the Trustees, but I felt it important to highlight her, because of the work that she is doing. I think we will find across the board, Mr. Chairman, substantial savings in each one of these departments, now that we are moving forward in a collective and collaborative effort—which I believe at the end of the day was the intent of everyone to begin with. So, it really comes down to her number one priority as the Director of Transportation is school or bus safety and getting kids to and from those schools in a safe and timely manner. That is not an easy logistical job to do. But she's making the necessary changes. In fact, she's now referring to making the necessary cultural changes within her Department to become a customer service department. When I meet with her, she smiles about it. She's actually enjoying this work. And she's enjoying it because of the people that she actually works for and she reports to.

So, that's a longer answer than what you really needed to hear, but I think it's important for everyone to understand that this particular Director is really doing everything she can to make it happen.

Mr. Christenson:

Two things occur to me: one, hopefully we can take this entrepreneurial approach that she's taken throughout all of the departments, and I think if we do that, obviously that's going to have a significant impact on the 80-20 requirement. The Sage Commission report suggests that the District get proposals for expert management, so hopefully that will also be an incentive to get people to understand that there are real opportunities here, now's the time. A number of these folks, I'm confident, have wanted to do some of these things for a long time, and now's just a great time to do that.

Mr. Skancke:

We have seen, across the District, entrepreneurial spirit in a lot of departments. We've talked in the past about the Information Technology Department and how they've had to bring multiple systems together in order for the District to communicate with each other on a technological level. Mr. Wray and his Department have done a superb job of connecting these things. He hates it when I say this, but it's like a wire and two cans. What they have done to make this work with this antiquated, outdated COBOL system is remarkable. That spirit is throughout the District. This legislation, now, and the law allows them to do that, and again, we've only come across two, three, four people that just don't see the potential here. Do I think we can get to 80-20? I do. And is it going to be difficult? Yeah. Nothing is ever easy. So, I think you will see, across the entire District, this type of spirit. We've already seen it happening, so it's beginning to occur.

Mr. Christenson:

Well, 80-20 is just the first step. Then there's a second step after that, with the 85-15.

Mr. Skancke:

Well, I'll be in Laguna Beach at 85-15, so... No, in all seriousness, we have, over the next 4 months, it's in our scope as well, to lay out the framework for the 85-15. And by the way, I

know it's a challenge, but I've known the Superintendent a long time, and I've worked with the District now for the last 8 months, very closely, and from the Superintendent to the Chief Operating Officer to the Deputy Superintendent and the entire senior management team, they are all still working 18-hour days to get to that. It's not easy. By the way, there's—and I'll preface this remark by saying I'm a big boy, I've taken a lot of shots—but there are a lot of people out there hoping this doesn't work. There are a lot of people taking shots at the District, taking shots at us, taking shots at Legislators. My hope would be that they would maybe listen to the Mandela quote today, and hopefully we can figure out a way to all work together to go forward and make this happen.

Mr. Christenson:

You're talking about substantial cultural change. I guess, since the consultant group is there every day, are you starting to see some of that, because again, I come back to this Transportation Department. If we can get that type of—I'm anxious to hear how much we're talking about here, but if we can get that kind of approach across the board, it'd free up a lot of dollars that can go into the classroom.

Mr. Skancke:

Mr. Chairman and members of the CIC, I can tell you, at the staff level, and I don't think I'm speaking out of school when I say that there are probably some Trustees as well at the time that really, firmly believe that this is the right thing to do. These individuals start their day—and I know it because my phone rings oftentimes with questions—around 5:30 a.m., and some days that's a late start for some of these people. And the phone rings well after 9:00 p.m. with questions or with ideas or comments or thoughts or “can we work it this way or work it that way?” The spirit of cooperation has been there. The challenges are many. There are lots of distractions throughout the day. Keep in mind that, in addition to the reorganization, there are other pieces of legislation. We're in the middle of a Legislative Session that they have to deal with. There are school district general issues. They've got to run the District day in and day out in addition to this reorganization. And I'm not certain—and I'm not saying this because we have the contract—they could have done this by themselves. They certainly would have tried. But, I would submit to you that the iterative process and the collaboration and the conversations, many of them very heated—I'm not a wallflower, in case you guys haven't read anything about me in the last 30 years. I push people, my team pushes people, they push back, and then we come to an agreement. I'm confident, and I'm 100 percent confident, that we will get to where we need to be by October 31. As I said in my remarks, will the work be done? No. In fact, in many cases, the work will just begin when we leave, because the District is going to have to carry this out month after month, year after year. This is a living, breathing process. Teachers, principals, parents are going to have to adapt and adopt to new teachers, new principals, new parents and new support staff coming on the SOTs. Those are not lifetime terms—or in some people's cases, sentences—but new people will move on and roll off, and new people will be engaged, and they have to be trained and they have to be informed. And that is not an easy process.

One of the things that we're required under our contract is to create a manual for the District that will have in the manual how these SOTs are supposed to interact. And I would say this to you, Mr. Chairman and members of the CIC, we should listen very intently and very seriously about what the District is saying. We are making a list of things, recommendations that we will be giving to the State Superintendent on necessary changes and necessary modifications to the regulations. We're required to do that. Now, will some of them and all of them be popular? No, I'm sure I'll—I can read that editorial or that headline, I can see that one coming. But, this is not a popularity contest. This is about driving more money to the schools; this is about empowering teachers, parents, principals, support staff and kids to determine what's best for their school. And what people better know than the people that are in that school? I mean, Ms. Courtney, you've been a schoolteacher your entire professional life. I'm going to ask you a question. Don't you think you know what's best for your classroom, at the end of the day? I would submit to you that teachers know what's best for their classroom. The Superintendent was a schoolteacher. He knew what was best for his classroom. So, that's the intent of this.

We are seeing more parents engaged, we are seeing teachers engaged, administrators engaged. Some of them are happy, and some of them are angry. We actually like the angry people. You know why? Because they are concerned and they are emotionally attached to this. And I think people should get angry, and personally, I think they should be involved, because the angrier they are, the more involved they are, then the more solutions we will find. So, there are some angry people in the School District at me and at my consulting team. We welcome that, and we want it, and we want their input. And I again, in my closing comments—unless there are other questions—we have seen a cultural shift in attitude in the last 2 months that—and by the way, this is coming from the Trustees as well. You heard from these three ladies today. They're fully on board, they have some concerns, and that's their job. Their job as Trustees is they are elected officials, they should have concerns as well. And this will be my final remark: we as a community have to do a better job of working with them, too. We cannot just sit out there as a business community and throw stones and criticize and be critical all the time, when we've never been involved. And I saw an article in the paper last week in the business section on how the business community now has a mentoring program. Guilty—we should have done that 40 years ago. We didn't; we'd rather complain. It's easier to complain than it is to make change. And today, we see more business people involved, we see more teachers, more principals, more administrators involved, more parents involved, kids involved. That's what education should be about, in my opinion. So, I think we as a business community—and I certainly will commit to you that I will do better at this myself—we've got to work more closely with the Trustees and help them. This is a big organization, and it's easy for us to say that they don't know what they're doing, or that they don't know their job. Maybe they don't, but we should have done a better job of working with them to help them know their job, and help them do a better job. And I think that the business community and the community as a whole should be more engaged with that process. So if we can stop throwing stones at each other and start working with each other, then I think we can actually get to where we need to be. But, if you want to throw stones and fight the process, there's a special place for you over there. The rest of us are going to go this way and we're going to make progress. You don't want to be a part of the progress, go find another project to work on, because this train has left the station and is moving forward. And I think you heard that today from the Trustees, you have certainly

heard it today from the consulting team, and I know you've heard it from the Legislature. And you've heard enough from me today, so I'm finished unless there are any other questions.

Mr. Husson:

Your optimism and your newfound praise for the District is refreshing. I have to say, it's been wonderful to hear that in the last couple months, the collaboration has been where it should. Everything you described about what's happening now is what you would expect to see when you look at a reorganization of this magnitude and the peaks and valleys that you're going to go through. There are challenges in the beginning, there's uncertainty, there's doubt, there's a time of learning, then you get a peak because people are starting to come around and understand. I daresay you may find another valley in the future, because that's just natural, that's how it works. People go through that emotional rollercoaster. But what you're describing to me is exactly the vision that the Technical Advisory Committee had when they said that this is the way we should do it, everything you just said. But, one thing you did bring up that does concern me, and I wanted to dig into it just a little bit if we can—I understand you may be constrained in some ways. If you are, just say it, but if you can tell me, tell me. There are, I believe, somewhere near 30 different departments in the District if you take the operational side and then the ancillary services side, and you said that you've worked your way through all or most, and you've only found one that's recalcitrant at this point. Is that an accurate statement, or did you just point out one? Are there others that are not wanting to do this work?

Mr. Skancke:

We've been able to work through the resistance on the other levels. We were able to work through those challenges. This is kind of the last obstacle, as we see it, to make progress. So, we will continue to work with the District in this arena and this realignment, and I'm optimistic that a positive outcome will come from that.

Mr. Husson:

Okay, so you're saying there's one, the EMR Department is the one that you're identifying. Help us and the community understand what kind of threat that Department is if they don't want to do the work. Can it derail the entire effort, or are they just something that's going to have to—can we do this and be successful even if they remain obstinate?

Mr. Skancke:

I think it'll be a challenge. That's the best way for me to put that. We have to have everyone aligned. In my opinion, we have to have full alignment, and that's beginning to happen, but can we get all the way there? Maybe. But it would be our preference if this alignment could occur, the necessary information could be provided. Though, when I as a businessman look at a 450 percent increase in legal spending, and all of the things that go around that you read about publicly, there is cause for concern. And can we get to 80-20 or 85-15? Mr.

Husson, I don't know, but I would be happy to come back to you in June and give you a better answer.

Mr. Husson:

Fair enough. Thank you, Mr. Skancke, and just one last comment and I'll be done. Any time you're trying to change the culture of an organization this large, there are going to be people that are obstinate, recalcitrant, whatever you want to say, but there will also be people who are looking to see if that's allowed. And so, even a small group that can't have any tactical or practical effect on the organization, they can derail the effectiveness of a cultural change by their example. So, I can't say loudly or clearly enough how important it is that, if that truly is a problem, it be rectified internally. I don't know what the levers are. You haven't been able to give us a lot of detail on how we can help, but if there is a way when you come back that this body can help rectify that situation, the first instinct that I always have is that you work with them, as you have been with every other department, so I'm assuming you've already tried that approach. But anyway, anything this body can do to move the process along, help the District, or help you all, get that, I would want to entertain that.

Vikki Courtney (President, Clark County Education Association):

Although I appreciate the question, Mr. Skancke, do I know everything that's best for my students in my classroom—yeah, a lot of times I thought I did know everything that was best. But I also knew that I had colleagues who have lots of better ideas, and that I would take advantage of those and listen to other folks, and I think if we look at everything as a team effort in our schools and everything we're trying to accomplish, and I think that's how you're looking at this, that we will do better when we come at it with an open mind, and I think, as someone who spent time in negotiations with the District for our contract when we did it with interest based, and looked at it issues and talked about it that way and were very open about what we wanted to achieve and why we wanted to achieve it, it was refreshing and exciting to see what we could accomplish. And the empowerment schools were a piece of that. And I think it was a really different time, and it really had a different impact on the climate and culture of our school district and the work we did. But I think it works. It made me a better educator, and hopefully it will make us all better at what we're trying to accomplish.

Mr. Christenson:

Thank you, Mr. Skancke. I'd like to now bring forward Ms. Wooden and Mr. Neal.

Ms. Wooden:

It's a great pleasure to be here this afternoon to talk about the Clark County Schools Achieve initiative, and give you sort of an update on some of the progress, but also talk a little but about where we're headed. I want to take the opportunity to thank the TSC² Group, and specifically Tom Skancke, Michael Vannozzi, Brian Knudsen and Andrew Doughman and Laura Hutton for their guidance. When they say they've been with us, they have, and we appreciate the assistance that they have given us, and some of the times the

encouragement that we've needed, so I appreciate them. Thank you. We've accomplished much already, as you know, and we have a lot of work ahead of us. As Trustee Wright indicated earlier, we're all in support of the reorganization, but before I begin, I wanted to start with a message from the Superintendent that was shared with all CCSD employees when the Governor signed A.B. 469 into law.

"Hello, I'm Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent of the Clark County School District. For the past 6 months, we have been implementing a massive reorganization of the Clark County School District, an effort we call Clark County Schools Achieve. Since we have expressed some concerns about the regulation governing the reorganization, some have said that we really aren't serious about implementing it. But I can tell you, we are. I believe whole-heartedly that educators and parents in local schools drive student achievement, and that local schools should be empowered to do what they need to do to ensure student success. That's why the CCSD team has worked hard, over many years, to increase flexibility in local school budgets. We've also formed school organizational teams, made up of parents, teachers, support staff and community members at each one of our schools. And we've changed the guiding principles of our organization, moving us from a method of Central Office compliance toward a method where local schools are empowered to drive student achievement.

"I'm addressing you today because something very important to this effort has happened. The Nevada Legislature passed, and the Governor just signed, a bill known as A.B. 469. This bill was sponsored by both Democrats and Republicans, and had near-unanimous support. It addresses some legal concerns raised by CCSD about the upcoming reorganization, and it elevates the reorganization to state law. What does this law mean for CCSD? What does it mean for our 322,000 students and our over-40,000 employees? It means that the Clark County Schools Achieve reorganization will continue to move forward. While CCSD has expressed some reservations about certain aspects of this law, on the whole, I believe that this is the right work to drive student achievement in our District. Over the next few months, you will see CCSD changing the way it does business, especially at the Central Services level. We will develop ways that CCSD can give local schools greater autonomy to do things that lead to better student achievement, while working with school leaders and the Central Office to ensure that resources are managed responsibly. The Clark County Schools Achieve initiative will empower our local schools to drive student achievement, and our Central Offices will do everything we responsibly can to support you. So, to principals, members of school organizational teams, and to the community, expect to hear more from us in the next sixth months, to ask for your input and to notify you of our ongoing efforts to give our schools autonomy. We will reach out via community meetings, surveys and focus groups, and we will also provide an email address for comments. Thank you so much for your help in this process. Kids are the reason we are here every day. Every student, in every classroom, without exceptions, without excuses."

Ms. Wooden:

So, as you can see from the video, we are reaffirming our commitment to this reorganization and the work that needs to be done. I just want to talk a little bit about a little history ([Exhibit E](#)). School autonomy has been a District priority for some time, and in fact, we've brought

forward initiatives such as the Ensuring Every Dollar Counts initiative—some of you served and worked on those subcommittees—and more recently rolling out strategic budgeting. I would like to talk a little bit about specifically an example about 5 or 6 years ago when then-Deputy Superintendent Skorkowsky and I worked on an initiative where we had intervention programs that were pretty much just centrally managed. So, we had some great intervention programs that were sent out to schools. Well, some conversation was sparked when one day we received a picture from one of our veteran principals who had recently moved to a new school, and in that picture there was a classroom, and it was an empty classroom and it was filled with some materials, instructional materials, intervention program kind of materials, that were unopened and not used. And we realized, at that moment, that we needed to do something about using resources more effectively. So, Deputy Superintendent Skorkowsky and I worked on an initiative where we didn't just send the dollars to schools, but we provided the service at a central level of doing a request for proposal, getting feedback from principals, getting feedback from teachers about what works, taking the vendors that wanted to apply to be on the list to be an intervention provider through a rigorous process so we could provide some options for schools that were high quality, research based, that we knew worked for kids, and provide them those options that they could use the dollars to purchase those materials, or they could take a completely different approach to meet the needs of kids. The bottom line here is that we needed to be more responsible with our resources, and we took the initiative to do it, and to this day, that funding still exists within the schools' budget. We're going to speak a little bit more about some of those other initiatives as we go through the presentation, but it's because of some of these efforts that we see CCSD as leading Nevada in leading the nation as being one of the fastest improving states in education.

Of course now, with A.B. 469, we have some muscle behind the school autonomy, and we can expand it on a much larger scale. And while this will increase school autonomy, it will also have a great impact on our employees at the Central Office, but also within our schools. Let me be clear; this is not about checking boxes on compliance to be compliant with a law. This is about doing what's right to raise the level of instruction and providing the kind of student achievement that we need. Everything that we do is led by our philosophy that started way back then, that decisions are best made closest to the classroom by the people who know the children best. So, when it comes to transfer of responsibility, we realize the process and the approach really matter.

Before we get into that, I just want to highlight some of the accomplishments that we've had so far. We've been working fast and furious, and many staff are here today that are involved in that work on a daily basis, and they're going to be embarrassed by this, but I would like them just to please stand behind me. If you're a CCSD staff member or here from CCSD, would you please stand? They have devoted so many hours to making sure that this work is being done right, and we've learned so many lessons together. We have really developed a relationship where we can almost read each other's' minds, and encourage each other when we know that things need to be improved. So, we know that things aren't perfect, and we know that we're still working to make things better, but this team has been just absolutely amazing. We estimate—from the slide you can see—a number of staff hours have been spent—thousands of staff hours—participating in trainings and in meetings regarding the reorganization. We created a new organizational structure that puts schools at

the top of our organizational chart, and I know that you guys have seen that. If you haven't, it's out on the website, and it really, visually gives you the image that we need to portray. We have new principles of organization that guide the approach in our decision making at every level, and we've defined roles and responsibility throughout the District to guide how we engage with each other, how we communicate with each other, how Central communicates with schools. This is a complete culture change, and a complete new way of thinking and working at our District. So, we are in the beginning stages, but we know any time you undergo that kind of culture change, it's going to take some time. We're glad we have partners like TSC² to help us do that.

Here are some school-based accomplishments: tens of thousands participated in SOT elections; 2,300-plus parents, teachers, support staff, students and community members are participating in monthly SOT meetings; seven training modules have been launched and school based staff have participated, as well as SOT members; school performance plans and strategic budgets were completed for every school; multiple surveys, including District-wide and Central Services surveys, for all school based staff have been launched. Here are some accomplishments at the central level: 16 school associate superintendents were hired; we've provided five municipality updates; core team members contribute daily in functional meetings; 50,000-plus visitors visited our reorganization website; hundreds of communications to stakeholders have been provided; two training modules for Central Service employees; and the Central Services survey that that has been launched. We've done a lot, but we know we have a lot to do in the coming months.

So, now that I've shared some of the great accomplishments of the team so far, we're here today to talk more about our plans to expand school autonomy, especially around providing more flexibility and funding to schools. We've been thinking about this approach for a while, and what the approach should be to guide the work. So, what you see are three basic guiding principles. They seem simple, but the work behind them is rather complex, and Chief Neal will talk about that. The first is moving dollars spent on schools to school budgets. The second is tracking expenditures where they occur, and the third is freeing up additional dollars for schools. So at this time, I'd like to turn this over to our Chief Operating Officer, Rick Neal, to walk you through those approaches.

Rick Neal (Chief Operating Officer, Clark County School District):

Thank you for this opportunity this afternoon to run you through some of our plans and approaches to moving more money toward the schools. As Deputy Wooden stated, we've identified approaches to help us in the effort to get the funds closer to the school and into the schools to help the students. First, and perhaps the most intuitive, if not actually the easiest, is to code the work that is already being done totally in schools to the school budgets. The authority of these services, the employees providing that work and the supervision of that work is already being done at the school level. An example of this approach would be special education teachers. Currently these positions are centrally based, even though these teachers are selected, hired and supervised by principals at the schools in which they work 100 percent of their time. This example could be up to \$218,000,000 transferred into school budgets. This work is a continuation of the cultural

shift in which the District is, and part of the evolution of the autonomy that has been in progress for some time.

The second approach is to transfer budget and responsibility to schools for the services that they receive. This particular option only works where we already have a way of knowing what the service and funding levels are and will be for each school. An example of this approach is the change we made to professional development that was once provided by the Instructional Design and Professional Learning Department. Two years ago, professional development was provided by a central department for schools, but now, budget is given to the schools and they choose professional development from a list of outside providers, and the licensed professionals that used to provide the professional development have been returned to the classrooms where we desperately need teachers. Another option is also, depending on the service that is being transferred, using the process outlined in the law, deliverables can be defined, requests for proposal can be developed, and schools can choose how to use these funds to meet that deliverable.

In talking about the third approach, we must recognize that we work in a human business. Our students and staff are transient, and some needs of our schools can change on a daily basis. Many services are provided to schools on an as-needed basis, and thus, potential expenses at the individual school level are unpredictable and cannot be planned. There are many centrally based staff that serve multiple school locations throughout the year, but on an on-call basis. Currently, those services are allocated centrally because we allocate them based on the needs, and the needs change daily, weekly or monthly depending on the students they serve. The cost for these services are tracked by salary of employee and not disaggregated to the school level. An example of this would be our crisis response teams. There's really no way to predict when a school is going to need any or a lot of the crisis response team's services. Take, for example, the mercury spill that we had last year. A spill at a specific school or where the next counselor is going to be is just a mystery to us. We just don't know where it's going to come. So therefore, we have to control those funds centrally to make sure that we have them available, and we can actually attribute them to the school that is being served. Another example would be maintenance, where we're called out for a major system failure, such as when a heating, ventilation and air conditioning system breaks down. Or, the pool of substitutes that we provide every day. So, planning in advance for costs such as personnel can be challenging, but with this third approach, those employees and departments could track and report their time spent in each school at the conclusion of each year, and those costs could be attributed to those school budgets, because we believe it is important that schools understand what is actually being spent on their schools already. Once the human capital management system is in place, those tracked expenses could be reported each year, and eventually transferred back over to those school budgets. I have to admit, this is going to be a heavy lift for us, even beyond a new human capital management system. This will require new tools and, most importantly, new ways of doing business and new ways of thinking about how we do business and provide services to schools. This is an opportunity, however, for our business partners to help us identify and implement the best in time-keeping practices to meet our needs.

Finally, the fourth approach. This approach is one that may be listed last, but is crucial to our work. When Pat Skorkowsky became the Superintendent, he created the Executive Advisory Group, as Deputy Wooden alluded. At least two of you here have served on that group, and we thank you for your help in that foundational work. That led to our Ensuring Every Dollar Counts initiative, which helped departments self-assess their services and help management look for areas of inefficiency or opportunity. An example of this approach and associated results came from Deputy Wooden's team several years ago. Several years ago, there were 32 licensed teachers assigned to travel from school to school to provide prep time for site-based teachers. After encouraging and assessing the opportunities for cost savings, those 32 special education teachers returned to classrooms where students needed them. Instead, we offered extra pay for a teacher at each site to take on the teacher prep responsibility. It's a little more complicated than this oversimplified example, but as a result, we saved \$2,400,000 that was able to be used to offset spending in special education, and 32 classes of kids with autism had great teachers, and that is priceless. Another example would be Jeremy Hauser's work when he took over the Operations Department. Bringing in the perspective of a former principal and academic manager served to completely change the culture of that Department and how they served our schools. Another example would be our recent allocation of employees from our Ombudsman Department, which saved more than \$700,000. We will continue to look for ideas like these. The Operational Services Unit is updating an idea depot to solicit input from employees who identify inefficiencies, ways to work smarter and opportunities to cut costs throughout the District. Another important aspect of this idea depot is that it's to bring in ideas from not just employees, but from the community also. Our challenge right now is to make sure that we have a way to manage that massive amount of information that we think we're going to get in, because we don't want to ask for opinions and then not be able to respond. Our school associate superintendents are also rolling up ideas and feedback from their principals, and my involvement and my Department's involvement in the Superintendency help to collaborate and get those ideas into action. This important work will also continue at the department level as we ask our leaders to provide detailed descriptions of the services they provide and the costs for those services. A lot of this effort will ultimately result in the transfer of more funds into school budgets, although right now, the potential cost benefit of this effort is unknown.

It is important to note that compliance is requisite with the law. However, it is not sufficient to realize the hope of not just the community, not just the students and the teachers in the schools, but the entire District—the hope that we have for what A.B. 469 will do in making our District a better place and improving outcomes for students.

So what do we need to move forward with this planned approach? Up on the chart you can see some of the issues that we need to deal with. As you all know, we are in desperate need of a human capital management system. I think we've talked to that one ad nauseam. To upgrade our current system and make the tracking of people and budgets more efficient, to accomplish the things that I talked about earlier in this presentation, we also need to identify the right tools and processes to begin timekeeping in many departments that serve schools on an on-call, as-needed basis. This is something that we hadn't had to do before, so it's a new way of doing business and a new way of thinking of how we provide those services. And we need time. As has been discussed before, we don't change culture

overnight. Not in an enduring manner. Once these systems are in place, to fully operationalize this plan and to reach our goals for expanded school autonomy, time is going to be critical. Assuming we begin implementation of a human capital management system and timekeeping systems in 2017-2018, we would expect to more fully operationalize this approach across affected departments in the 2018-2019 School Year.

Cultural change is also a requirement for making this movement a success—a complete shift in how the District thinks and operates. School organizational team expectations—we need to manage them as well as meet them. Also, because this is new, there is still some role clarification that needs to be cleared up for all stakeholders. In fact, we are meeting with the school associate superintendents on Friday to discuss their important role. Training needs, also, we've discussed some of the training that is going on, but we also need to make sure that we adapt the training and move it forward for the SOTs as well as District employees. And finally, continued transparency and accountability through communications, and that's as much a cultural function as it is a mechanical one.

Mr. Evans:

First thing, I'm glad that you did the video, plus talked about the important—I liked your quote “expectations—we need to manage them as well as meet them.” Great quote, as well as your suggestion that we can't just stop at compliance, we have to go above and beyond that in order to get to where we want to be as one of the fastest improving school districts, so what I would say at this point is thank you very much, to yourselves as well as other members of the CCSD staff that are here. So, not so much a question just yet, but I do believe in acknowledging publicly when people do things well and are moving in the right direction, so thank you.

Ms. Ortiz:

Number one, I am thrilled to hear about some of the plans, specifically moving dollars, or accounting for dollars, where they're spent. I understand the complexities in that, given that I have an accounting background. I hadn't thought about the professional development. That's yet another complexity to all of this, so I'm glad you used it as an example, because that's a really good one. I'm a little concerned. So, I'm just going to state this question very bluntly. Do you have a backup plan in case the money from the Legislature doesn't come through for the human capital management system?

Mr. Neal:

Yes. Number one, that's going to make it a bit more complex, if the funding does not come through. Obviously, to put that system into place, we need to put that system into place pretty quickly. Let me give that a second of thought... Shared school-based employees will just have to continue to be managed centrally, initially, because we won't have the ability to track them. But the ultimate Plan B is that we will continue to be responsible to schools. We'll continue to work towards the requirements. We will look for alternate funding sources, both internally and externally, but the one thing is we can't promise the efficiencies that we're trying to get to, especially not as quickly as we want to get to them.

Mr. Christenson:

Under any circumstances, there's going to be a transition period from where you are now, and my understanding is it's like, a year or two? Is that right?

Mr. Neal:

Yes, even with the human capital management system, it'll be about a year or two to fully implement that. And so, we're looking for a delay in that, because it is a phased implementation. So, it's the second year we'll have full implementation.

Ms. Ortiz:

So, I do this for a living. It'll be at least 2 years. I just want to set clear expectations.

Mr. Christenson:

As a former chief financial officer, I'd like to—one sounds pretty good to me, but maybe we can get there. Yeah, that's our job. How confident do you feel about achieving, at least initially, the 80-20, and then going into the 85-15?

Mr. Neal:

Confidence on the 80-20... I think we may be able to get to the 80-20, given some of the processes that we've gone forward with, but I really don't know where that number's going to come out, because again, we're focusing on actually—what are the outcomes that we're driving? The Trustees spoke before on—let's say we get to a certain percentage—I'm not sure, 70, 75—and that last bit is consistent of responsibilities that principals either should not have or do not want. That puts us in kind of a conundrum, because we're not going to compel them to do things that should not be on their plate. That's actually counter to what we're trying to do here. We're not trying to add additional responsibilities or distractions to a principal or to the school to detract from those outcomes for the students. What's really important here is that we make sure that we give the proper resources to give the autonomy to the schools so that they can drive the student achievement. There were a number of things that were brought up associated with 80-20 over time, several things—are we going to force schools to manage things that they don't want to? The answer is no, we're not going to do that. From a Central Services perspective, can we be transparent about amounts those services cost, whether we're coding them to the school or actually just remaining central? Yes, absolutely, I believe we can do that. And can we find efficiencies to get closer to that 80-20, or to the proper number, whatever it's going to be? Yes, I believe we can. I don't know what that final number is going to be. I think we will get to the right number. It may get us even to a higher number, I'm not sure. What you can be assured is the real measure of success is going to be those outcomes for those students, and so that's what's driving the thought process behind how we allocate these funds.

Mr. Christenson:

So that actually combines two questions that I had: one, Mr. Skancke was talking earlier about cost savings in Transportation, which obviously will significantly help in getting to 80-20. Have you internally set any goals for cost savings within the organization as you've been working through this whole concept of moving to 80-20?

Mr. Neal:

In some specific departments, we have. I have not done that overall for the Operational Services Unit, but we have in certain areas, and we are starting to see some of those goals. What we're trying to do is kind of frame what kind of savings we're looking for up front, because we don't want to be arbitrary about it and make the number the objective. We want to make sure that we're getting the proper services and streamlining as best as we can, but we have some, but not large, across all departments.

Mr. Christenson:

At the appropriate time, I'd be interested to hear what your thoughts are as far as what you think that that total might be, which then, as you mentioned, the reason that we're doing all of this is student outcomes, and maybe this is better directed to the Superintendent, but how do you define—we're now the fastest growing, when do we start to realize our dreams as far as where we think this is going to be? Have we set a goal internally as to, do we want to be at x percent or x level within the country as far as student outcomes, or how do you define it? How are we going to ultimately define success here?

Ms. Wooden:

So, I'm glad that you asked that question. I think that we started this journey when we started with our Board and their strategic imperatives and academic excellence and support to schools and engagement of families and clarity of focus, and then after that came out of our pledge for achievement goals. So, we have a measure of success that is quite focused, and have been making progress towards each of those six goals. The trick here in the organization right now is the enculturation piece, and that's the piece where what we believe, and what those philosophies and those beliefs get deeply embedded into the fabric of the people that are on the ground every day doing the work, so from the people at the school level, but also the people that work in the Central Services Departments. And that's where the disconnect right now currently is, and that's where I think we need to work to show more improvement. When it comes to student achievement, absolutely, that's number one. That's our business, that's what we do. We want kids to be successful. But, to bring us all there, we really need to continue working with training and communication and messaging and videos such as that that the Superintendent put out, saying from the leaders "this is what we believe," and then also bottom up approaches so that we can open up things like the idea depot so when people do have something that they want to contribute, they're listened to and acted upon.

Mr. Christenson:

When do we get to 35th in the country, however those things are evaluated, or 25th? Is that 10 years, is that 5 years? I guess one of the things that we've found very instrumental in our business is getting people to understand exactly what the goal was and where we were going, and I understand the pledge of achievement and those sorts of things, and they're very, very important, but sometimes having kind of a goal established would be helpful. I'm not asking you—you don't need to comment today, but I guess maybe as you're thinking about these things, that might be worthwhile.

Ms. Wooden:

Thank you, and the brief answer is not fast enough.

Mr. Husson:

Ms. Wooden, I was glad to hear you say that the culture piece is the most important, because what I know you will find is, when that culture that you all have clearly adopted is filtered down into the rest of the organization, your burden will be much less, because they will be taking on these tasks for you. The ideas that you will get from people in the field, if you will, will be 10 times more valuable than anything any of us or any of you have thought of yet, and they will transform your organization completely, beyond anything we've all contemplated today, and that's when you'll see the real change in the District and they'll have real outcomes for kids. Some of the metrics that are in the pledge of achievement are graduation rates, are achievement gaps, and those are all great metrics. I think what Mr. Christenson was getting at is maybe a metric that would be a little more relevant to the broad community, because I don't know that people without kids are really looking at graduation rates necessarily, but everybody always looks to where are we in the nation. That's an easy one for everybody to get. So I don't know that it would be a bad idea to include that as a goal, somewhere, just say, "Hey, objectively measured, where are we," and right now we know where we are. And I'll tell you, if this happens and it's done the way I think it's going now and we're successful at this, we'll be in the top 10 in the next 15 years, because it'll happen fast. It'll start slow, but changes will really come about quickly once you tap into the power of your organization, which that's just not happening right now, but it's starting.

Nora Luna (Director of Diversity and Grant Funding, Nathan Adelson Hospice):

How will moving the budgets to the school level—how do you see that helping those schools that have the really high rate of substitute teachers? And then the other question is, how will the English language learners (ELL) master plan be implemented, considering the school autonomy?

Ms. Wooden:

The answer to your first question is—the answer to both questions is rather complex, but the first question I think has to do a lot—we have a rare opportunity right now to talk a lot

about climate and culture in the District, so it's kind of identifying why there are lots of substitutes in schools and, in addition to just having a teacher vacancy rate that needs to be addressed, but also kind of the why and the reasons behind that. So we've been working with schools and have rolled out a school-wide culture and climate training to assist. We're only in level, like, 1.0 of that, and we need to do a lot more to enhance that and do a 2.0, but we know that we have—I know that Dr. Barton has been working with the association to help with those kinds of issues.

The second question goes to our ELL students, and I think this goes to what we kind of talked about a little bit earlier, with regard to the weighted student funding formula. We have all kinds of interventions and supports in place, particularly with our Zoom program, but also District-wide where we have English language learners throughout our District, and empowering schools to be able to make choices, but not just choices that are based on thoughts—and I would have to say probably good thoughts from the staff and community—but also research-based thoughts, providing some—through our ELL master plan—of the training for the staff about what are best practices, and then letting schools decide based on the needs of the particular child. We have children that may be ELL, but they also may be free and reduced lunch, and on top of that they could have a disability, and so what is the best approach for those particular children. I think that's what's happening here, is the autonomy for making those instructional decisions in the classroom and at the school where those decisions should be made, and the ideas about what they should do to address those needs are being made at the school level. And that's where I think it goes to Mr. Husson's response about we'll see our gains grow faster.

Ms. Ortiz:

Thanks for bringing that up, Ms. Luna, because this is one of the issues that keeps me up at night. I totally, obviously support autonomy of schools and so on and so forth, but when it comes to addressing children's needs, especially our most needy children, I worry about us not having the control from Central, because today, we have the control where we're pushing down programs because the folks at Central specifically—if we're just talking about ELL—have the experience and the expertise to know what is the best programming to help these students. And what keeps me up at night is, are there going to be schools or principals out there that say, "Well, we only have 10 of those kids, let's not worry about it, we've got this other stuff to worry about," and so those 10 kids get left behind. Or, "Oh, we don't need that program, we've got our own, and it's not research-based, results-driven," and those kids are also left behind. So, I struggle with that quite a bit, and I'm curious to know. You guys are the experts. I'm putting all my trust in you that you guys are addressing these things. I'm curious to know how you guys—because it affects everything, like the special education, there's wrap-around services that are happening today because of Victory, and if it's not categorical and focused, will those things still happen, and so those are the kinds of things that I struggle with in trying to decide is this going to work, is it not going to work, and so I'm curious to know how you guys are addressing some of those issues.

Ms. Wooden:

So, one of the—that is a concern, and it's a great question, and something that, I think is conversations that we're still having at the central level and through our school associate superintendents, who really are the school supervisors, and that sort of changes the conversation in a way. So, before it was "here are some really great things, go and implement, and then if it doesn't work, well, you told us to do it that way." Now, it's taking some ownership and responsibility at the school level for the ideas and the thoughts and what we believe they know best for kids, and then there are some measures and accountability that go on top of that. So, you have to develop sort of this loose, tight relationship, providing enough, but knowing that we need to be compliant with certain initiatives. It also involves some trust. We know we have some amazing school professionals and amazing SOT members on SOTs, and teachers, support staff, our parents and our community members that we need to trust that the decisions that they're making, and that the input and advice the principal is receiving for the decisions that they're making are the best for their individual kids. There are certain programs—you mentioned special education, you mentioned ELL—there are some compliance issues that will still need to be managed to ensure that certain steps are being followed and that we're meeting the needs of all of the children. So, I think it's really important to focus on the trust, having that overall compliance piece and continuing to have sort of that loose, tight relationship.

Mr. Neal:

Deputy Wooden actually called out one of the things that I think has been a little bit of a misperception about what's going on with the reorganization. They kind of create a binary type of equation; it is either schools or Central. From an Operational Services Unit perspective, the Central support is there to support. That's one of the things—we are not divesting ourselves. When we give a responsibility and the authority, that's absolutely theirs. However, there is still Central support to schools that'll be provided in a number of ways. In purchasing, in particular, that was one of the concerns, and so I think that's one that you and I discussed offline. From a purchasing perspective, we are now entering into the discussion as to "Okay, how do you want to handle the support that we're going to provide you for purchasing," because there are a lot of resources that we will still have centrally, and we're going to have to maintain them, which goes back to the 80-20, to make sure that we can support schools. They're not going to get purchasing specialists out there in the schools, not should they be spending an inordinate amount of time trying to work through that process, and so we're still there for them. This is not a divorcing of the two; this is still one district, and we're one district strong. If you look at the organizational chart, it represents somewhat of a tree. If we're not participating—if that bottom of the tree and the trunk of the tree and the roots of the tree are not participating, the branches will wilt, and that is not in anybody's interest. So, we are all vested in the success of those schools.

Mr. Evans:

I had a follow-up question to my colleague, Ms. Ortiz. I wasn't privy to it, or I wasn't paying attention before—what is the actual dollar amount that we're going to the Legislature for to support the human capital management system?

Mr. Neal:

So, the amount—we gave them a range, and the amount that is in the bill draft request, which actually hasn't been introduced yet, is \$17,000,000.

Mr. Christenson:

The next item within that agenda item VI relates to the SOTs, and if Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Vannozzi would also join Ms. Wooden at the table. Please introduce yourselves.

Ms. Wooden:

So, I'm super excited today to sit here with my colleagues from TSC² and talk a little bit about something just to sort of give you a peek under the tent about something that's taking place that came out of the last CIC meeting that we had, where we wanted to launch a listening tour. And, in the end, it shouldn't just be listening, it should be listening with some action involved. But we are going out into the community, and so Trustee Wright graciously accepted an invitation for us to come to her Parent and Community (PAC) meeting last week for the opportunity to talk to members of the SOT and members of her parent group about what are some of the things that are going really well with their SOTs and what are some things that are maybe some challenges. So, I had—it was great, because we have the assistance of TSC², and the Clark County Education Association (CCEA) was invited, couldn't make it, they'll be at some of the upcoming ones. The Education Support Employees Association (ESEA) came along, so we had this great partnership to engage in this facilitated conversation around the SOT experiences that people had that were widely varied. So, I am going to turn it over to Mr. Knudsen, and he'll give us a little update about how those have gone.

Brian Knudsen (Senior Associate for Analysis, BP2 Solutions):

I appreciate the opportunity to be here, Mr. Chair and members of the CIC. If you look at the pictures up there, from my perspective, this is what I believe is version 1.0 of some pretty significant cultural change, and the advice and guidance that we've gotten from members of the Council—Mr. Christenson, Ms. Luna—that cultural change really starts one conversation at a time. In this picture, you see our colleague Mr. Vannozzi facilitating with Kim Wooden's team, talking to parents, talking to SOT members, asking about their experience, as the Deputy Superintendent just mentioned. On the next slide, what we've found is there are common experiences to what you heard in our last CIC meeting. So, there's a greater sense of engagement, there's diverse team experiences benefitting decision making, there's an ability to influence positive change at your school, and the list goes on. There are a lot of positive things happening at the schools. You heard that in our last CIC presentation. Parents are engaged. This is a really positive aspect of this reorganization process is that there are far more people that are thinking about children in schools and thinking about how they can support CCSD.

There's also opportunity to improve. I think that's an awesome thing, that the School District can stand up here and say that we're listening now to parents and SOT members, and they

have been all along, but this is a new experience, and we're giving the community a chance to weigh in on how we can improve. And so, we need to define, in better terms, what the role of an SOT member is. They're asking for more funds to spend, more flexibility with budgets—that is the crux of what we've been talking about for the last several months—and equal opportunity for collaboration at every school, longer term lengths, staggered elections. This is a really great opportunity for us to contemplate that there are themes that are emerging, themes that emerged from our parent panel that was here last month and themes that are emerging from our first SOT listening tour session, and thanks to President Wright for allowing us to jump in on a meeting with her. We have some themes emerging, and over the next several weeks, we're going to be working with parents, working with CCSD, working with SOT members to identify what are strengths and what are weaknesses so that we can report back to you overarching themes so that we can improve upon the process overall, ensuring that the leadership at the School District has the opportunity to listen to the grassroots, what's going on at the school level with the SOT members.

Ms. Wooden:

So, through the work of Dr. Barton and the academic unit, we took it upon ourselves to create a survey to facilitate feedback from SOTs to the school associate superintendents. This is another mechanism for feedback in addition to the listening tour, especially for those who may not be able to attend events. And the survey content is being developed right now, and we'll certainly share that when it's completed. It's being developed in collaboration with CCEA and ESEA, and the survey will be distributed from each school associate superintendent to the SOT members in their performance zone. So, this was an incredible opportunity. Like we said, we just got started, but I'm also thankful for the incredible collaboration we've had so far, and for the candid and honest feedback that we've had from our community members, and we hope that that continues as we go forward.

Mr. Knudsen:

The school organization team listening tour that we just discussed was outlined—it came from the CIC, it was an issue that was brought up in the last meeting. It truly shows that CCSD is being responsive to the CIC and the input from your group. As a further follow-up to the training conversation that the CIC had at the last meeting, CCSD has endeavored to gather survey data from the people who took trainings. The School District has also elected to incorporate surveys into their training modules, and that survey data on upcoming trainings will be shared at a later session of the CIC. Some initial data shows us that they have some very high remarks, very high comments, or high regard, for the training that's already been provided. Taken together, strategic efforts around the reorganization are starting to take on a wider scope. While the consultant's interaction with CCSD started out as narrowly defined and limited to a few key areas, today CCSD and the consultant team are working together on a broad range of topics affecting the reorganization.

Going forward, the consultant team will partner with CCSD to form a think tank. Our first meeting is tomorrow. This think tank engages high-level members of the CCSD team who are empowered, and who have a vision for the future of CCSD shared with the Superintendent and his team. The think tank can help us to steer our efforts over the next 6

months, but more importantly it can help to create a culture in which this team can help steer the leaders to a healthier organizational culture. The shorter term product from this think tank group will be an implementation manual with the following components: policy briefs looking at best practices from all around the country on work related to decentralized school systems, parent involvement and school empowerment; fiscal policies for local school autonomy, how we get the budgetary goals as laid out in the statute; outreach, communication and engagement to ensure the creation of standards for communications, outreach and engagement of school communities; and local school precinct model assessment, codifying ways that CCSD can ensure that it is measuring, tracking and incenting local school autonomy. At each step of the way, the consultant team and CCSD will present on the progress of the implementation manual, leading up to a final presentation on September 1. When finished, the think tank will create a product that can show the public, the Legislature and the nation what CCSD is capable of. The Clark County School District can be a model for other districts that want to pursue this sort of reform, and it will empower local schools through the process. Mr. Chairman, we're happy to take any questions.

Ms. Ortiz:

So, I'm just curious—because I'd love to be at all of these, but you know, work gets in the way—if you could each individually tell me the one most positive and one most negative, or shocking response, that you got at the listening tours. I just would love to hear some anecdotal responses.

Ms. Wooden:

The most positive is that they love the opportunity to interact with each other and have the dialogue and ask the questions. I think the most, I would call challenging, maybe not negative, but challenging, is that there's still some role clarification that needs to happen. When they all got together and started talking about the things that had been discussed in each of their individual SOTs, that varies widely depending on what has been brought to the table at those particular schools. So, I think some of them were thinking "Oh, that might be a good idea," or "that might be a good idea, where can we get a list of all the things and topics we can discuss?" So, ultimately, at the end, it'd be nice to provide some kind of list, but it's really the SOTs' decision on what they want to talk about—but if they don't know it's even in the realm of possibility, it may not happen.

Mr. Vannozzi:

To answer your question directly, the most positive I think was an individual who is in Finance, and just happens to be an SOT member. She wanted to contribute, she was like, "I was excited about the budgeting process, I was excited to do this," and she really wanted to. On the flip side of it, she said, "There's not enough there, so I want more, I want more," so that was both good and bad. I think one of the things that was a little cautionary, listening to one parent was the expectations game covered a lot, but this particular parent thought that her principal wasn't being very transparent with her, and trying to formulate the SOT into "all right, you do this, you only do this, and that's it." You're going to see that. People all

have different management styles, but here, in this reorganization, I think we really have an opportunity to elevate different sorts of managers. They don't necessarily have to be the principals in a school. A principal in a school can have a management style that is way different, but still be successful on an SOT, and it'll be interesting to see how those things work over the long term.

Mr. Knudsen:

I wasn't at this particular listening tour, but I have several friends who were elected to their SOTs, and their themes have been consistent for me. One is that they want to engage, because they're civically minded, politically active people who want to do right by their community, and I think that's a really great positive. On the not negative, but more challenging side is, they're realizing that this is much more complicated than they thought it would be, that being a principal isn't the easiest job in the world, that there are some very serious challenges that they're dealing with, and now this community, the parents and staff members, get to help support some of those challenges.

Mr. Christenson:

What kind of interaction do you expect the school associate superintendents to have with the SOTs? And if the SOTs have concerns about things that are happening at the school that are not necessarily being addressed by the principal, how does that bubble up to someone who can consider potential actions?

Ms. Wooden:

I'd like to invite Dr. Barton up to see if he could take on that question.

Dr. Mike Barton (Chief Academic Officer, Clark County School District):

Great question. I think that the answer to it is evolving, because we started out with the associates when they took on their roles in December. We never wanted it to be a taking away of authority from that team, and so in December, we had a norm with the group, agreed upon that their interaction with the SOT would be limited at that point in time. We're revisiting that. Actually, as Mr. Neal indicated, we have a meeting Friday. We're talking about the role, the interaction, with the SOT. We thought that it was critically important to have that initial norm, because we didn't want to impact the autonomy factor. But we are finding, based on the listening tour feedback, that that interaction, that there may be a need for that, so we're definitely revisiting that norm.

Mr. Evans:

I just wanted to highlight two things that I was glad to see on here: as far as great things, the "better understanding of budgeting process, building relationships with the school community," and even though it was listed as how the SOT experience can be improved, I still think it's a step in the right direction that someone said "better explanation of how decisions are made (especially when they go against the SOT recommendation)." All of this,

again to the point I think Mr. Skancke made earlier, even when people are angry, or not as pleased, the fact that they're involved, informed and engaged is a good thing, so just wanted to publicly state that as well. So, thank you for doing this and following up on this, and look forward to getting more information or more feedback as we go along.

Mr. Husson:

Thank you all for the presentation today. The work that you did in the SOT listening tour, I think, was really important, and I'm glad to hear it's going the way it's going. Mr. Chairman, in the spirit of that getting feedback from folks, I'm wondering if it might not make sense for this panel to hear from the CCEA or the administrators' union about if they've collected any information from their membership on thoughts about changes that could be made, maybe in one of our next meetings.

Mr. Christenson:

Perhaps, Ms. Courtney, you can take care of that for us?

Mr. Evans:

Are we going to move forward with the suggestion about having a joint meeting with the CIC and the Trustees? I know we have to pay attention to the Open Meeting Law, but I just wanted to find out if we're going to attempt to move forward with that?

Mr. Christenson:

We are planning to do that, yes. We kind of need to work out the logistics of it, but this, today, in my mind, was kind of a first step, with the Trustees coming, and then we'll go see them, and we want to continue this dialogue, because I think it'll be important. Getting on the same team and having a common vision is going to be really helpful in this process.

I had one question that's maybe a little off-topic, and I know, Mr. Knudsen, you've been very involved with the training aspects. We didn't talk much about it today, just maybe you could give us kind of a brief synopsis of where we are in that process.

Mr. Knudsen:

I mentioned to you, Chair Christenson, that over the last month or so we have been much more engaged with CCSD, especially through the daily functional team meetings. Every single day there's a component of training discussed. In the last CIC meeting, we discussed how we're tracking efficacy of trainings, and so within that, we started talking about efficacy in these daily morning meetings. For three of the trainings on SOT organization, consensus building, and climate and culture; on the SOT organization they had 100 percent satisfaction rate; on consensus building, an 85 percent satisfaction rate; and climate and culture they had an 81 percent satisfaction rate. I think that's a good first step. Today, I was incredibly happy to hear that they're talking about customer service training, which is something that was brought up. Ms. Luna, we talked about that with them several months ago. And so,

within that, they have developed scripts and options for customer service training at the central level. Coupled with that, the Deputy Superintendent mentioned a District-wide survey on satisfaction levels with central-based services. And so, part of the process is narrowing down where there is great service, and where there's service that can be improved, and tailoring some of that customer service training to those departments and tracking progress over time. But, the commitment to CCSD is definitely there, and every single day they're talking about how they can provide training and improve upon training and track the effectiveness of that training.

Ms. Ortiz:

Mr. Knudsen, if I could follow up on that just a little bit, is that—I love the idea of customer service training. What a concept. I'm being facetious, but is that training going to filter on down to the schools? I've visited several schools recently, and there are some schools where the front office staff are fabulous, and then there are others where they just completely ignore you, or don't even recognize that you're standing there, so I think that is—I heard this gentleman speak at the family engagement conference last fall, I think it was at Northwest Technical Academy, and he said when he became a principal, one of the first things he did was literally tear down the wall that was between the people sitting at the front office and the people walking in, and that it made such a dramatic difference in the culture of the school. And, so that's something I've thought about every time I walk into a school, and sometimes even though there's not a physical barrier, there's a very obvious barrier, so I think that that would just help the culture overall as well, so I'm curious just to know if that's a plan, just to trickle on down to the school level.

Ms. Wooden:

Yes, it is a plan. It's meant for all staff. It started with this idea of finding a way to "yes," making sure that we are very, very positive, especially in Central Services, when schools call for assistance, how do we get to yes, and if you don't know the answer, provide the response and tell them why, if there is a reason. So, it started with that, and it will be part of every school community.

Verenice Flores (Senior Accountant, Fair, Anderson & Langerman):

I was just wondering, I know we had some issues forming the SOTs for at-risk schools. What's the participation like, right now?

Ms. Wooden:

The participation is going well. I haven't heard anything to the contrary, except for, I think that there is still some struggling when people exit or leave, and we do have people that either leave their positions, or they move, and then they have to fill that vacancy, so there is that happening continuously throughout the year. It just doesn't stop. So, that has to happen, not only with our teachers and our support staff, but with our parents and sometimes with our students.

Mr. Vannozzi:

And I should say that we are planning multiple more SOT listening sessions in all parts of the valley. So, we had the first couple, they happened to be in Henderson. I think we're going to have one on Monday evening, and it's open to everyone, so if you happen to be around on Monday evening at about 4:30 p.m., I don't know that we have a specific—oh, at Goolsby Elementary School. That will be Trustee Edwards' meeting, and Trustee Brooks' meeting. So, Goolsby Elementary School. And we will have more in Trustee Young's district, Trustee Child's district, Trustee Garvey's district, and another one in the rurals, I believe. So, there will be several of these opportunities that, if CIC members wish to kind of come in and listen in, they are welcome to do so.

Mr. Christenson:

Could you put out a schedule, so that we can start to plan some of those?

Mr. Vannozzi:

Yes, sir.

Ms. Courtney:

I just wanted to clarify that you wanted me to reach out to the administrators' union to do a presentation, as well as CCEA?

Mr. Christenson:

That would be great.

Ms. Courtney:

Okay, so we will make sure that we are here alongside of them to do that at the next meeting.

Mr. Christenson:

Very good. Anything else on this agenda item? Then we'll move to public comment.

Lisa Mayo-Deriso:

I am an SOT member at Bonanza High School. I came here today—I try to make these meetings all the time, because I have to say, the information that's shared and given, the documentation and so forth, is excellent. I want to say thank you to everybody that presented today, and there was a lot of information. I actually came to talk about one topic, but I'm going to switch and talk about another. I do want to say that my experience as an SOT member has been enlightening, educational and extremely rewarding, and if you're a

parent and you even can come to an SOT meeting, you really do learn a lot, and it's just invaluable, I think, what we're learning and what we're experiencing.

But today, after listening to all this and we're talking about the 80-20, and I have been involved as a business person in several mergers, acquisitions and a major decentralization in the oil industry back in the 1980s, where we reorganized and then recentralized, so I understand how difficult this is. But I just am looking at the math, and I know we talked a lot today about how do we get to this 80-20, which I am in support of, because I think we all know that, in the school system especially, money is power. I hate to put it that way, but it is. Where the money is, and—when we got our budget at Bonanza High School, and immediately 80 percent of it went to teachers and labor, that's just how it is. But when I do the math, and I look at a \$2,400,000,000 budget, and 85 percent of that budget is labor, currently in the school budget, and if I take out and I look, and I say, "Well, 80 percent of that's going to go to teachers, so the central administration is left with still a large number," and let's just say that 60 percent—and I don't know what this number is and I would love for, in this meeting to do an analysis of what is the labor component of the central committee. Of those 30 departments, how much is labor and how much is hard costs, because you know what? At the end of the day, I've seen Mr. Skancke speak and everybody speak, and I think we're sort of dancing around the big issue in the room, and that is to get to 80 percent, and then 85 percent, you're going to have to cut labor, and it's a big number, regardless of what that number is. And I think you can be entrepreneurial and you can look at shortcuts and so forth, but when labor is 85 percent of your budget, and then whatever it is at the administration—I'm sure it's very high—you will never get to 80-20 unless you address that labor issue. Now, I'm not an advocate of anybody losing their job and things like that, but in a reorganization, the first thing in a merger and acquisition—and I know that our Chairman here certainly has experience with all of that—the first thing you sit around a table and do is look at economies of scale, because the reason for mergers, acquisition and decentralization is to be more efficient, and we're doing this, and then the big component of this is that schools and parents and teachers and so forth are responsible for those budgets, and they get to decide how we're going to spend that money. So, I just wanted to—I was going to speak on training, but I'm here to say we have to be perfectly crystal clear and put those numbers out there, and realize that labor is part of this, and I'm sure that that's why Mr. Skancke is experiencing some of the pushback that he is. It's never an easy thing, but I would like for this committee to maybe ask for an analysis of that, what is that breakdown, and that's going to help us calculate the big gorilla question in the room, is how do we get to 80-20? But again I want to thank you all for this, and I'm excited, I get to go to a listening tour on Monday, because I have lots of positive things to say about this whole experience, and this was a great meeting. I want to thank you.

Cheryl Rambaran:

I'm a parent of Bass Elementary. First of all, I want to say thank you. These folks are amazing. I attend the community engagement meetings. I'm involved that way as a parent, and the transition that we're trying to achieve as a whole—we talk about culture, we're coming together from all diversities, and sir, you were asking for a particular goal? I think the first step is everybody having to work together. I see it at a parent level, and if there's not enough parent involvement, or understanding of what you're proposing, the success

rate is going to be slow, and a lot of the questions that the committee has had, I wanted to raise my hand and say “Oh, oh, pick me, I know the answer to that.” Unfortunately, I don’t want to offend anyone, but I do believe that this plan is working. You have various different personalities, you have various different powers, different ethnic backgrounds, so unless you come down to where I’m at—not in a derogatory term, but just to get it from the inside perspective. Ms. Wooden’s got an amazing plan. Her entire team has an amazing plan, and all through the meeting, cultural differences, or—that was the main topic, and the main topic, really, it’s all about the children. I know it’s about the budget, the powers. Power in the wrong hands, people can go crazy, to put it mildly, but it’s about the children, and I think it’s an amazing, amazing step forward to be able to involve—have amazing involvement. Have everybody involved, they feel important. Yes, it’s going to work. So thank you for your time. I appreciate it.

Mr. Christenson:

Is there anyone else that would wish to speak in public comment? How about in Carson City?

Angela Hartzler (Secretary, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

There is no public comment in Carson City.

Mr. Evans:

Hopefully they’re getting us our \$17,000,000 at the State Legislature.

Mr. Christenson:

Seeing no further public comment, we are now adjourned.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 4:42 P.M.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jordan Haas, Interim Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Glenn Christenson, Chair

Date: _____

Exhibit	Witness/Agency	Description
A		Agenda
B		Attendance Roster
C	Jordan Haas, Interim Secretary	Draft Minutes of the April 12, 2017 Meeting
D	Andrew Doughman, TSC ² Group	Changes to the Reorganization Under A.B. 469
E	Kim Wooden, CCSD	Expanding School Autonomy
F	Glenn Christenson, Chair	Statement from the Chair