

**MINUTES OF THE  
COMMUNITY IMPLEMENTATION COUNCIL**

**July 12, 2017**

The meeting of the Community Implementation Council was called to order by Chair Glenn Christenson at 1:03 p.m. at the Grant Sawyer Building, Room 4401, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada, and via videoconference at the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Room 2135, 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  
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  
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

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

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

**STAFF MEMBERS**

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

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Autumn Tampa, Itinerant Tester, Clark County School District  
Tom Skancke, President, CEO, TSC<sup>2</sup> Group  
Kellie Ballard, Director, Office of the Deputy Superintendent, Clark County School District  
Jason Goudie, Chief Financial Officer, Clark County School District  
Dr. Mike Barton, Chief Academic Officer, Clark County School District  
Rosanne Richards, Director, Instruction Unit, Clark County School District  
Nicole Rourke, Director, Community and Government Relations, Interim Associate Superintendent, Clark County School District  
Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees  
Annette Dawson Owens, Break Free CCSD

Anne Slighting, Hope for Nevada

**Glenn Christenson (Chair):**

I will now open the seventh meeting of the Community Implementation Council (CIC).

Let's then go to agenda item II, which is public comment. Is there anyone that would like to speak?

**Autumn Tampa (Itinerant Tester, Clark County School District):**

Hello, my name is Autumn Tampa, and I am currently an Itinerant Tester of English language learner (ELL) students at the Clark County School District (CCSD) (Exhibit C). I have worked at CCSD for over 18 years and have been very active in the community of CCSD.

First, I want to publicly thank the CCSD Board of Trustees for having the courage and integrity to stand up for the principles and beliefs that they have about their concerns for the reorganization. I applaud and appreciate the great effort of CCSD, the Board of Trustees, the Superintendent and other administration in the hard work of giving the parents and the employees of CCSD trainings and information. Yet I still have to say to you that many employees and community members really have no clear idea about what the reorganization is, how it will impact the children, how it will impact employees and how it will impact this community as a whole. I am deeply disappointed with the timeline of how this reorganization has unfolded. The way that Legislators, Committee and Council members have handled this situation leaves me feeling very underconfident about their judgment and intentions. I am not convinced that this reorganization will actually, really, truly make things better for the students. In fact, cutting resources to essential functions of the District seems to me to do the opposite.

I have been told by both teachers and support staff that there is a large amount of bullying, harassment and threatening of anyone who does not have the same opinion as some principals and some administrators who are implementing this reorganization. There also seems to be some miscommunication that customer service means absence of employee rights. I am sure that this Council does not want employee rights to be violated or ignored.

I am also concerned with the attitude of the consultant, Mr. Skancke, who has come across in public comments and communications as a threatening bully—and I do apologize, but of course, many people are now going to fall in line and do as they are told.

The implementation has been cumbersome and difficult, not because a few people are putting up roadblocks, but because those pushing forward have not respected the public enough to give the time needed to implement the reorganization in an effective and efficient manner. I ask, are you going to correct your error of only daytime meetings and set some evening and weekend meetings? Are you going to more adequately communicate the scheduled meetings? Are you going to more comprehensively communicate to parents, community members and employees, and listen to and consider their input? Are you going to create a process for more than just the school organizational team (SOT) parents and employees to be involved? How are you going to ensure that services to special categories of children, such

as autistic and ELL students, will be fully met when staffing is decreased? How are you going to ensure that building and playground repairs for safety are met, as well as maintenance services such as heating and air conditioning? How are you going to solve the bullying and harassment that is happening to support staff and teachers on the SOTs? How are you going to rectify the lack of compensation for support staff on SOTs when teachers are getting continuing education units? What do you have to say to the approximately 5,000 Central Services employees that may be laid off due to the CCSD budget shortfalls created by the reorganization?

“If you want to make peace with your enemy, you have to work with your enemy. Then he becomes your partner.” Good quote. So, I offer my experiences and knowledge in hopes that this Council and others involved will reach back and communicate, to work together in this process.

**Mr. Christenson:**

We'll close agenda item II, the public comment.

I'm going to take the next agenda item out of order, and I'm going to have agenda item III be the approval of the minutes from the May meeting (Exhibit D). Do I have any comments regarding the minutes from the May meeting?

MR. HUSSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 10, 2017 MEETING.

MS. LUNA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mr. Christenson:**

The next agenda item is opening remarks by the Chair. Because of the extensive work being performed with the School District last month, we opted not to have a meeting in June, so we have a very packed agenda for this month. By way of update, I do want to mention a few things. First, since we last met, the Nevada Legislature adjourned sine die, and I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the Legislature for the work that it did on the reorganization. We had a bipartisan, bicameral bill come out that codified the regulation regarding the reorganization. The bill was supported by nearly every Legislator and was signed by the Governor. After some debate, the Legislature, the School District, the Teachers Union and other stakeholders opted not to pursue a trailer bill to change the reorganization law. The Legislature also approved \$17,000,000 for a human capital management system. We've talked at length about the need for this system at the CIC, so I want to thank the Legislature and the Governor for heeding this call and setting aside funding for this critical need.

The consultant team has reported to me that they continue to be fully integrated with the top CCSD staff, who are working hard to implement the reorganization. As was reported at our last meeting, the consultant team and the District created the "I Team," a group of high level District employees dedicated to the idea, incubation and implementation. Since the consultant's very first report to the CIC, they told us that there was a need for analysts at the District. The I Team represents a cultural shift in the way that the District approaches this issue. This is not merely a team dedicated to the reorganization; this is a team that we're hoping will exist far beyond the charge of this Committee. We'll be hearing from the I Team here today a little later. The I Team's ideas are advancing the reorganization. The consultant team is fully integrated into the I Team to assist them with analysis and implementation work. Their work product will be on display today.

Before we get into the meat of the agenda, I'd like to make a few announcements. We're close to scheduling a joint meeting with the CIC and the Board of Trustees. As soon as we've set a date, we'll make sure that the public and the CIC are aware of the date. As you have no doubt heard, we'll be saying goodbye to Trustee Erin Cranor, not only from the Board of Trustees, but also from the CIC. She'll be leaving those positions to pursue a law degree at Brigham Young University. We most certainly thank her for all of her efforts. I've met with Trustee Wright in her capacity as President of the Board of Trustees, and we're conferring on her replacement. Right now, the plan is that Ms. Cranor would continue on the CIC until she leaves, shortly after our August meeting. Finally, Senator Roberson and the Legislative Counsel Bureau have scheduled a meeting of the Advisory Committee for August 7, here in the Grant Sawyer Building.

So, with that, there are several items on our agenda today. First, Tom Skancke will introduce the work of the I Team and the executive leadership of the School District. Several individuals from the School District will collectively give a presentation on the 80-20 provisions of Assembly Bill (A.B.) 469, expanding school autonomy. We'll get an update on compliance issues related to the law, and then we will receive a report on optimizing the SOT experience as well as provide a report on the SOT listening tours. Depending on the time and the number of questions, we'll take a break somewhere during that presentation, and then after we've heard from the consultant and the I Team, I'm going to ask Vice Chair Husson to take over the Committee so that I can give a presentation on the final agenda item, which is some of the challenges that lay ahead. It is my plan that we'll probably be done sometime between 4:30 p.m. and 5:00 p.m., but beyond that, are there any suggestions for changes to the agenda today? Seeing none, then we'll go ahead and get started. Agenda item V is a presentation by the CCSD personnel and the consultant team concerning an update on 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 of Education.

**Tom Skancke (President, CEO, TSC<sup>2</sup> Group):**

I am the lead consultant on the consulting team for the reorganization of CCSD. Thank you for the opportunity this afternoon to introduce the I Team and the Executive Team from the School District. The report that will be presented today is the result of work conducted jointly by our team, the TSC<sup>2</sup> Group, and the new group within the District called the I Team. You may recall that in our very first report to the CIC last fall, we identified the need for a corps of

analysts within the District. You may also recall last November that, at that time, I stated—and I have stated at every CIC meeting—that the work that we do this year really sets the stage for the real work that begins November 1, 2017. So, the work that we've done to date leads us into the second phase of the work, which is really going to be the most difficult part, which is carrying out the full implementation of A.B. 469 and the reorganization of CCSD. The I Team is the District's response to our call. The I Team is made up of very talented individuals from the Central Services Department of the District, dedicated to the idea, incubation and implementation. That's what the "I" in I Team stands for.

In late May, the Superintendent directed the I Team to perform the work necessary to get the District into compliance with the 80-20 provision of the law before July 1. I am proud to report to you today that the I Team has met that goal. In fact, I think you'll be pleasantly surprised that they have exceeded the goal when many said it couldn't be done. As you will hear in the next presentation from the I Team and the executive leadership of the District, they have developed a method not only to reach the letter of A.B. 469 but also the spirit of that law. This is a major accomplishment. Think of where we were back in November. The District said they could not reach the 80-20 provision within the regulation. Think about all of the obstacles that we've had to overcome in the last 6 months. Today, the District has fully embraced the law as a method to drive student achievement. A great deal of thanks goes to the leadership of Superintendent Pat Skorkowsky. Quite frankly, we could not have done this effort without him. His leadership has gotten us to this point. Today, Superintendent Skorkowsky is in Washington, D.C. lobbying to keep \$23,000,000 worth of federal funds in CCSD. If this administration cuts those funds, it'll have a dramatic impact on the future of CCSD, so he's in Washington today and could not be with us because of the testimony that he is giving and his meetings that he is having on Capitol Hill.

I will state to you that, on any given day, I have said publicly, and so have many people inside and outside of this room, that I'm not quite certain that Superintendent Skorkowsky is the right person to lead this effort. And I've had that conversation with him, and I will tell you that he is the right person to lead this effort. What I have discovered over the last 7 months is that Superintendent Skorkowsky's support is about 30 miles deep, 100 miles wide and 200 miles long. If this Superintendent is not in this position at this time, I will tell you that this effort will stop. It will stop, and I will also submit to you that there are many people who would still like to have this effort stopped. There are many inside and outside of this room who would like to see the reorganization completely stalled. Some of those people are still on the Board of Trustees; some of those people are leaders in the community; and some of those people are just general education activists or people who are interested in K-12 education.

What Superintendent Skorkowsky and his team have been able to overcome in the last 6 months has been remarkable, to say the least. What my team and his team have been able to do in the last 90 days is really beyond my own personal comprehension. You will see today in the presentation that this group of very talented individuals has exceeded everyone's expectations. And I'm not going to steal their thunder; I'm going to let them present it. But when a group of people said last year, "This will be impossible," that same group of people has made it possible. I want to identify those individuals, each and every one of them, separately today for the work that they have done. The individuals that you are going to hear from today are the ones who have really done the mud-rucking work necessary to make this

happen: Kim Wooden, Rick Neal, Mike Barton, Jason Goudie, my champion Kellie Ballard, Rosa Reynolds, Kori Kloberdanz, Kirsten Searer, Kristine Minnich, Kim Mangino, Rosanne Richards, Grant Hanevold, Brenda Larsen-Mitchell, Steve Osburn, Diane Bartholomew and Dillon Kay. I would also like to thank the members of my team: Brian Knudsen, Andrew Doughman and Michael Vannozi. These three gentlemen have worked side by side, hand in hand with the CCSD team. They're putting in between 16 and 18-hour days to make sure that this reorganization happens. And it's because of these people, both within the District and on my team, that this effort has exceeded the expectations that you'll hear about today. Each of these individuals has contributed to the Clark County Schools Achieve effort, and we owe them a great debt of gratitude. When many people said this couldn't happen, when many people had doubts, this group of individuals has made the first phase of the reorganization a reality.

Now, the work today is where the rubber actually hits the road. This is where we start to make good on the promise that the Legislature made to the community, that at least 80 percent of the funding it sends to CCSD will be allocated and used at the local school level. This work will no doubt generate criticism. In fact, everything the District does is criticized by someone or some group. I have never worked in an area of interest where there is more negative energy and more criticism for something than I have in K-12 education. You can find the solution to one thing, and there is another group that says it isn't right. You can find a solution to another thing, and there will be a group that tells you that's not the solution. I don't know how the Trustees and the Superintendent and his team and teachers go to work every day—I don't. Every headline in the media is something negative about K-12 education. I admire every teacher, every administrator, every support staff member that goes to school every day with the headlines that we receive in our community and the work that they have to do. I'm not certain, with some of the stuff that is written, that I could even get out of bed, but they go and they persevere. But where the rubber needs to hit the road, these people actually make it happen. There are people that just relentlessly will be negative on anything that we create because it probably wasn't their idea. I am not an education expert. But I can tell you that there are many people inside CCSD who are; and they work very, very hard to make things happen. The negativity, I would hope, would stop around K-12 education. I'm hoping that with the work that is presented to you today, people will actually have something to rally around and be supportive of, but I'm confident that there will be people both inside and outside of this room who will be critical of the work. We're prepared for that. My hope is that that doesn't happen. Just because it wasn't your idea or it wasn't your formula does not mean that it's wrong. It would be nice if we could have constructive criticism and constructive input, as opposed to attacks, but we're prepared for those things. Holes will be shot in this work, but I can tell you that the work that has been done so far has been done with amazing integrity and ethics. The I Team has worked very, very hard in consultation with many, many stakeholders in the community. Business community members have worked very hard to review this work, and I would particularly like to thank Verence Flores and Curt Anderson at Fair, Anderson & Langerman, as well as Chairman Christenson for recently reviewing the work and the accounting that has gone into the reallocation of funds. I think those three individuals' integrity, credibility and ethical standards of practice have paid off, and they are good stewards of the work that has been done, and I will tell you that their oversight has been invaluable to the work that the CCSD's I Team has done.

Today, you will hear where the District is with the 80-20 provision of the law. You'll see a lot of numbers thrown around. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this effort has never been about a number. This effort has always been about a cultural shift. We said that back in November. Eighty-twenty is a number, 85-15 is a number, but what we're really talking about here is changing a culture. Early on in this effort, everyone got themselves wrapped around a number. It created a lot of fear, a lot of concern; it created a lot of bad feelings and concern because it's always about the money. They didn't talk about the change in culture that needed to happen at CCSD. One thing I know about cultural shift and cultural change is that when you challenge people to change, change will happen. It's human nature to want to change and to improve the human condition; that's natural. If ever given the opportunity to do it, people will embrace change. We have given people a chance for change, and they have embraced it. Policy often gets in the way of change, but this time, the change and the policy at the Legislative level allowed us to change a culture and improve that human condition.

Today, you'll hear from members of the I Team and the executive leadership of CCSD. Though many CCSD staff worked on this, we'll start with Kellie Ballard, the Chair of the I Team, to give a presentation. Our respective teams have been working late into the night and early this morning on the presentation. Ms. Ballard will give a presentation on the 80-20 portion of the work. By introduction, Ms. Ballard is the Director in the Office of the Deputy Superintendent. Initially trained as a music teacher—and I can relate to that—she credits both her music education and her professional training related to business competencies to her ability to recognize and encourage the combination of many voices into one. Her experience in both instructional and operational support roles within the District has led to broad institutional knowledge and understanding. Ms. Ballard serves as a leader in the District and in her community, serving as a member of several District planning committees and review boards during her career to support innovative ideas, assessments, customer services, project management and management standards, as well as being a long-term member of the Board of Directors of the Las Vegas Brass Band, of which she is also a 20-plus year performing member. If I recall, she plays the trumpet, which, by the way, is the loudest instrument in the orchestra. That's always the group that has the glass wall in front of them. Anyway, Ms. Ballard believes that there is nothing in the world that cannot be made better, easier, or both better and easier. It is this sort of can-do attitude that will make a difference in the lives of our children in Clark County. As a former musician myself, I understand where Ms. Ballard comes from; as a former performer myself, I understand where Ms. Ballard comes from. Musicians look at things from a different point of view. For them, it's all about orchestration. For them, it's about bringing instruments and people together for one common conclusion of a piece of music. That's why Ms. Ballard is the right person to lead the I Team. She's more than a musician; she's an orchestrator. She is one person that has a vision and the direction to make sure that the entire orchestra ends on the same note at the right time. That's the type of person we need leading this effort. So, without any further introduction, I would like to introduce Ms. Ballard and the I Team and my team to make a presentation on the update of where we are today on the 80-20 provision of A.B. 469.

**Kellie Ballard (Director, Office of the Deputy Superintendent, Clark County School District):**

Mr. Chairman, I'm here with Dr. Mike Barton, Chief Academic Officer, and Jason Goudie, Chief Financial Officer for CCSD. Also joining us for one of the later segments of the presentation today will be Rosanne Richards, a Director in the Academic Unit for CCSD.

I want to make it clear that we are here, and we are always here, for the students of CCSD. They are what fuels our work. They are who fuels our work every day. That's something that we pride ourselves on, and that's actually something that we find as a benefit to being in the position that we're in. We always know why we're here, so you can kind of recognize that in our motivations for doing this work today. Over the last many months, you have heard updates on the work that has been done to support the reorganization of CCSD.

Our first task, our first focus, was on preparing schools and school communities to participate in SOTs and work through their first try, their first go through, at developing the school program planning and budgeting work for their individual school communities. We worked with the employee and parent groups as they held elections for SOT members. We provided a series of training videos and reference materials to stakeholders throughout the school year. We pushed it a lot at the beginning of the year to get that work started. We reorganized the Central Office to begin the cultural shift toward a school-centered decision-making model. We revised and completed a District-wide survey for all stakeholders and developed and implemented a new set of surveys to provide feedback on our relationship with schools at the Central Office. We continue to provide updates to municipalities, the school associate superintendents. We completed a listening tour and a survey of SOTs, which you'll hear about a little bit more in a later portion of the presentation, to receive direct feedback from SOT members about their experiences. We continue to work with the many, many employees and stakeholders involved in the work within and outside of the School District, and of course, we continue to ensure that the work is completed in such a way that we support the strategic imperatives of the Board of Trustees: academic achievement, engagement, school support, and clarity and focus. That brings us to where we are today.

Deputy Superintendent Kim Wooden and Chief Operating Officer Rick Neal proposed to you in May a planned approach that looked at the 80 percent requirement, and today we will update you on the progress of that approach. We'll also provide an update on how the work continues to progress through some of the structured working groups. Mr. Skancke began to speak of some of those groups. We'll provide some details on how we're approaching the challenge to meeting the 80-20 funding requirement of the law with tracking of expenditures to schools and an increased level of transparency. We will share how the work of the 80-20 challenge will help us advance into increasing autonomies for schools in a purposeful manner, and we will share how the goals of the reorganization work all tie to that work to increase autonomy. We're also not without challenges, and you'll hear that from some of us as we move through the presentation today. But first, I'd like to start with how that work is progressing and give you an update on how that work is structured.

Before we start into the work itself, I'd like to give you a little bit of insight into the way we've organized ourselves around this work, some of the people who are involved and who continue



to be instrumental in the reorganization work (Exhibit E). A series of subcommittees are working on individual pieces of the work. These subcommittees provide an opportunity for principals and Central Service administrators to provide analysis and detailed recommendations on the topic they are most knowledgeable about. In addition to these subcommittees, a daily meeting has been taking place for many, many months to operationalize the functional aspects of implementing the work going on throughout the week. These meetings are useful to support how fast paced the work is, and gradually came to be informally known as the daily functional meetings. The work of these subcommittees and the daily functional meeting is provided to the I Team. Mr. Skancke gave you a little bit of an introduction to the I Team in his remarks. The I Team serves as the primary working committee for the reorganization work and provides final recommendations to the Superintendent's reorganization workgroup, which acts as a steering committee and the ultimate mechanism for the Superintendent to make decisions regarding reorganization work.

When speaking of the subcommittees, some of them are short lived and established just to answer a small question, a single question, or work toward a single recommendation, and some of the committees are longer lasting and continually working toward recommendations for the I Team and the reorganization workgroup. Participants in those subcommittees include members of the I Team, the school associate superintendents, who often involve principals when it involves school-facing work, and department leaders involve classroom teachers. This list of folks changes frequently as we seek expertise in particular areas and we come across new problems to be solved. The subcommittees work with the I Team through the daily functional meetings, through weekly subcommittee meetings for some of these groups, or in ad hoc sessions as needed. We also keep in contact with several principals who are gracious with their time and have been very willing to share with us their perspective and participate in some of the subcommittee work. We appreciate their input and rely heavily on the feedback that they provide for us. You can see the membership of the I Team here—I won't go over it again because Mr. Skancke has gone through this list already but you can see we fashioned this little graphic that helps us remember that we are both a think tank and an implementation team; and it kind of reminds us that, at the heart of our work, is the achievement of the students in the District. The Superintendent's reorganization workgroup consists of leaders across the District, and we in the I Team provide recommendations to this group for final decision making. The Superintendent can rely on these leaders for the critical conversations that allow him to make informed decisions regarding the reorganization.

As we get into some of the details for you this afternoon, it's really important to me that we go back to the principles that are constantly guiding our work, and we are working with three main priorities in mind. Those are, number one, making sure that the reorganization work is developed with student achievement in mind while we are trying to increase opportunities for schools and ensure that we are in compliance with the law. You all know that we have recognized some challenges in facing the 80-20 requirement and that we initially believed that the requirement was impossible to meet. Over the next few minutes, I'd like to bring you through the process we went through, with the help of our thought partners in TSC<sup>2</sup> Group, to change the way that we have approached this work. First, we need to work through the compliance of the 80-20 work, but we want to make sure that it is clear that by meeting the 80-20 requirements, we are only completing the very first step in this work. That work will then allow us to then meet the spirit of the law, as Mr. Skancke stated in his opening remarks,

through increasing specific autonomies and flexibilities for schools by allowing principals to determine where they believe autonomies exist, defining where they want autonomies to be in the future, and to work with principals and Central Office department leaders to further define those relationships and implement purposeful change. We're also working towards specific strategies to increase the amount of funds in schools' strategic budgets through searching for efficiencies in budgets outside of schools and working through the process to transfer responsibilities that are required to be funded centrally in A.B. 469.

So, talking specifically about the 80-20 requirement, we know that the law requires that no less than 80 percent of the unrestricted budget is allocated to schools. We've said this. I'll continue to say it, so forgive me for repeating it. But we continue to say it because we continue to remember that this 80-20 work being reached on a spreadsheet is very different from increasing autonomy at the school level, and we are approaching those two tasks separately but in parallel. We know that we want to increase autonomy for schools; and the work to support that takes time; and it takes careful consideration of how to address consequences that can arise from making those kinds of changes. But we also know that we need to be in compliance with the law at the beginning of the school year. To that end, we are first focusing on transparency and tracking of expenditures while at the same time laying the ground work for increasing and aligning autonomy. This will involve finding differences between where division heads and department leaders believe autonomies exist and where principals believe autonomies exist, discovering where principals as a group believe autonomies should exist and bringing those three pieces of data together. Dr. Barton will talk a little bit later about an autonomy continuum that we have developed in partnership with principals to help try to collect those perspectives, and the work we will detail for you a little bit today will serve as a first step to much of the work that Dr. Barton will be speaking about in his portion of the presentation.

We took a fresh look at the specific sections of the law that require the 80-20 and 85-15 ratios and tried to remove any assumptions that we had been working under that might have been acting as barriers, and really, we tried to zero in on exactly what the law requires us to do. When we focused in on those requirements, we looked closely at two specific words that we needed to further define to allow us to remove those assumptions and really be able to do the math, so to speak. Those two words, within the language of the law, are "unrestricted" and "allocated." First, we needed to define unrestricted funds. What exactly is the total dollar figure of which 80 percent should be allocated to schools? And the law provides us some guidance here. It says that, "Money may only be identified as restricted if it is required by State or federal law, if it is proscribed by the Department, or if it has been otherwise encumbered." What that guidance means to us in the District is that we are looking at general fund dollars—that is, for our staff, funds that are indicated with a Fund 100, or in the 100s, or Fund 250. What that means is that we do not include in the calculation things like Title I funds or Victory funds, where we already see great autonomies for schools in place now. Okay, so when we look at the word "allocated" next, we initially thought it had to mean very specifically placed in schools' strategic budgets. But we know that that won't work. There are so many aspects of school driven work for which the budget is maintained in a common central budget for various reasons, like people who are assigned to more than one school or emergency preparedness. We don't know where a need is going to be at a school before the need happens—stuff like that. All of these are issues we've been seeing as barriers. We know we

can't budget for some of these things in individual school budgets right now; but we also know that this is all money being spent at schools, with students, every day; and what we needed was just a very clear way to capture that. If we actually look at what "allocated" means, when we remove our assumption that it can only mean provided to schools in the school budgets, we find that allocation can refer to both distribution and designation of items—in this case, distribution and designation of unrestricted funds. So, we interpret that to allow us to allocate funds to schools in both the funds distributed to schools in their strategic budgets and the funds designated as direct services provided to schools.

Now, you can see there is an asterisk here, and it probably aligns with all of the cautions that are going through your minds right now. We realize the need to be, and are committed to being, very careful and extremely transparent about how we are defining these things so that we are able to very objectively and conservatively designate funds in the right category. We've identified very specific criteria for this designation, and even within that, we've identified a few separate categories to help us identify what is included in the calculations. I'll come back to those designations in a little bit, but first, how we get into that conversation gets a little bit easier if we take a look at this work graphically. So, if we represent our entire CCSD budget by that circle/oval, and within that, we have our whole pot of unrestricted funds, our general fund dollars, and we know we need to get to a point where no more than 20 percent of those funds are managed centrally, and 80 percent or more of those funds are allocated to schools. But we also know from the fact that 80 percent of those unrestricted funds allocated to schools is made up of a certain percentage of funds allocated in the school strategic budgets; and that amount will change over time as we work through some of the other processes to increase dollars to schools; and we know that another certain percentage of funds is made up of funds allocated to schools through direct services to schools. Where does that leave us in terms of the work being done right now? We've been working to identify what exactly we do across Central Office right now that is a direct service to schools, and again, how we can very specifically identify what should and should not be counted here? With this information and what we know is already in the school strategic workbooks, we can find out and report on what these numbers really are, what kinds of services and dollars to support them are being allocated as direct services to schools, and how close we are to meeting the letter of the law in terms of the 80-20 requirement. Of course, as I said, we recognize that the intent of the law requires ongoing work and increasing autonomy for schools, not just aligning dollars with accounting work; and this work, as I said, is going on in parallel; and Dr. Barton, as I said, also will be talking about that work in a little bit.

The message that we developed in the I Team to identify what we should be counting and where consisted of five major steps. First, we identified criteria to really define the categories as tightly as possible. I'll go over those categories in a little bit more depth next, but they are, at the very basic level, the first category, services provided to a single school 100 percent of the time, services provided to multiple schools, services provided partially to schools, partially to the Central Office, and then finally, services provided 100 percent to support the Central Office. I promise I'll go over them in detail in a minute. Next up, we reviewed every cost center group in the general fund budget and identified those that were likely to contain services that we could relatively easily align with one of these categories. A couple of weeks ago, we asked division leaders to oversee those cost center groups, those budgets, to designate how each budget line item within aligns with each one of those categories. Now, we've heard some

speculation that the division leaders would have been unwilling to participate in this activity because of a fear of losing control of some of their budget, but in fact, what we've found was exactly the opposite. The division leaders were, number one, very willing to participate in the exercise; and in fact, several of them pointed out additional cost center groups that we had not identified, sought out the budget information on their own and provided detail for those cost centers as well; and that has been a recurring experience with the division leaders over the last couple of weeks. We've taken that work with division leaders and the budget team, led by Chief Financial Officer Jason Goudie, his team, Diane Bartholomew, Steve Osburn and Dillon Kay, and we have done the accounting work that allows us to figure out exactly what dollar amount representing those services belongs in each category and where we stand. We will be having those figures and the work we've done validated by an independent third party so that we can be confident in the work we've done, and then finally we will prepare communications with the results of that work to share with our stakeholders. We also asked division leaders to give us a little bit of a head start on additional work to increase autonomies to schools where they think autonomies already exist in those line items while they were going through their budgets so that we can align those levels with the information we're pulling from principals on those same kinds of topics.

So, I promised I'd come back to that asterisk, to where we need to be really careful, really transparent about how we define each of these categories, how we define how each service is provided and how we objectively designate the funds in the right category, and here we are. This is the heavy lift. This is not just a mechanism for our staff to go through the identification of services. It's really a testimony to the transparency that we seek to provide, and the accurate tracking of expenditures that the human capital management system will help us do. For now, this work is taking place by hand. To that point, we are aligning the information division leaders provided with this feedback from principals, which we are expecting in the coming week, to lay the groundwork for an increase in autonomies in the coming years. For each category, a very specific set of criteria was established to guide division leaders in identifying services to schools, and so within each of the division leaders' budgets, they distinguished each individual line item with one of these categories, and so I'll go over each of these with you.

The first category is, obviously, the strategic budgets that the school principals have. The next four involve budgets that are aligned with the Central Office budget line, from which we are determining services being allocated to schools. So, the first category is very simply any individual or any service who is assigned or that is assigned to any single school 100 percent of the time. The budget remains central, but the actual work is taking place with students, at a single school, every day. A very clear example of this would be some school police officers. School police officers are funded out of a central budget line item, but an individual school police officer would report to one school every day. So, those are the kinds of things we're counting in that category. Other examples could include some speech language pathologists who are assigned to a single school, yet accounting for those positions lies in a central location.

The second category is for those individuals who are 100 percent assigned to schools, but not a single school. This position or service has to be 100 percent in schools or with students and must have a direct impact on student achievement. Also, the position must be trackable

to the schools served in order for us to count it in this category. Some examples in this category include some gifted and talented teachers that are assigned to multiple schools or bus drivers that provide services to multiple schools. Their entire function is at schools with students, but their funding is located centrally. Right now, we don't have the capability to assign one-third of a budget to each individual school's strategic budget for a person who is assigned to three schools. So, that person is in schools all day, and their budget is reflected centrally.

The third category is where we get into some shared funds or shared services, and that delineation was not always clear. These are centrally funded staff, supplies and services that are provided at schools or with students less than 100 percent of the time. We call it "school-managed services" because it helps us remember that these services must be completely warranted by the needs of the principal, by the students or by the school facility to be identified in this category. These could also be services that we are able to track to schools after the service has been rendered. So, what I mean by that is, we don't know if a school is going to need some—let me do an easy one—emergency air conditioner major repair until something happens. So, at the end of the school year though, we will be able to find out, "Hey, we had to send out so many technicians to that school because of this major event." We'll be able to track how much it cost us to run that school that year at the end of the service. Some other examples of this could be direct requests for services from principals. We don't know when a principal might ask for a service from the Central Office, but after the fact, we would be able to track it to an individual school.

Finally, the last category is for those Central supports that are provided solely for the purpose of management of the District and are in compliance with District level mandates. Typically, this is what people would view as provided from a managerial setting, meaning physically located inside an office outside of a school building, and are trackable to departments or divisions, rather than trackable to a service at a school level. There are things being worked out, such as a time-tracking system that our technology team has developed, that will allow us to do some of this tracking after the fact, until we have implemented the human capital management system.

So, then the question becomes, with these categories defined, how do they align with the 80-20 requirement? The complete allocation to schools—that's the ratio on the 80 side. The ratio on the school side would include obviously the funds in the schools' strategic budgets. The items in the next two columns are direct services provided 100 percent to one school or multiple schools, and then the portion of those services or budgets from the school-managed services category that can be verified to meet the criteria for those schools' direct services to schools category, and that was where the bulk of our work has been focused over the last couple of weeks. The remainder of services, the remainder of funds, are any services that could not be verified to meet that criteria, meaning if we could not very clearly see that a service was provided to a school, we kept that on the Central side of the ratio, and then any services that very clearly meet the criteria for a Central support service. Chief Financial Officer Jason Goudie will now share with you the results of the work of his team, as I said, primarily through the assistance of Deputy Chief Financial Officer Diane Bartholomew, Budget Director Steve Osburn and Budget Coordinator Dillon Kay.

**Jason Goudie (Chief Financial Officer, Clark County School District):**

When the team worked through the details with department and division leaders and very clearly identified what activities are currently taking place in schools and with students, you can see here how we can then provide a total amount of budget allocated for services in each of these columns. The bulk of the work, then, became providing further detail for the budgets identified in this school-managed services category; that is, within the budgets that were split between schools and the Central Office, defining which portions meet the criteria for allocation to schools and which portions do not. Using the criteria established by the I Team, we divided that \$369,000,000 balance between the remaining categories, identifying another about-\$321,000,000 that is allocated to schools and a remaining \$48,000,000 that is allocated centrally. These included a lot of operational budgets, like utilities, trash, custodians and grounds keeping. The utilities budget is an example that covers the entire District, but as buildings are metered individually, we could identify what portion of that budget is allocated to maintain utilities at schools. But also included are things like the Family and Community Engagement Services (FACES) Department. A portion of the budget supports FACES liaisons who are in schools every day, but a portion of that budget supports the Central administration of the Department itself.

So, after going through all of these pieces, you can see where we arrive at the ability to calculate our total allocation to schools and our total allocation to central support, according to the criteria we established. Those totals bring us to the conclusion that 88 percent of our unrestricted budget is allocated to schools, and 12 percent of our unrestricted budget is allocated to central support. You will remember, this was an exercise in tracking and transparency, simply documenting where we are in terms of this work so that we can chart out where we need to go. Before we pause here to allow for some questions around the 80-20 work, I'll just hint at what Dr. Barton and Ms. Ballard will speak to in a minute, and that is how we will take a careful look at the services we provide and the autonomies that principals want to continue to work toward—increasing those autonomies for principals and increasing dollars in schools' strategic budgets.

**Ken Evans (President, Urban Chamber of Commerce):**

The first general question I had, and this may be for Ms. Ballard, regarding the benefits of the 80-20 implementation—I noted that the first guiding principle was student achievement. So, I wanted to find out, what are some of the metrics, or what are some of the performance measures, that you will be using for that particular guiding principle?

**Ms. Ballard:**

It's really difficult for educators to assign a gain in student achievement to one action, because we don't complete these actions in isolation. At the same time, we're implementing any number of programs from the Academic Unit, any number of programs at the school individually, so it's remarkably difficult to calculate that return. That said, we know from research that, at the very minimum, increasing engagement of parents in the school community has a very real effect on the increase in student achievement of the students in that school population. We also operate under the belief that the decisions made closest to

the students are the decisions that will have the greatest impact on those individual student populations' growth in student achievement. So, while I'm not sure we could get to a point where we could actually calculate the return in terms of achievement, we're operating under those belief systems.

**Mr. Evans:**

So, if I may kind of summarize it, what you're driving at is that if the resource allocations or decisions made of the allocation of resources are closest to the school, but more importantly student-centered, you anticipate you'll get better results in terms of student achievement?

**Ms. Ballard:**

That's correct.

**Mr. Evans:**

My other follow up question is, I know that we've made a substantial effort to comply with the 80-20 rule. What I'm also curious about is, is there a benefit to doing this in terms of access to either federal and/or State funding that would help us do even more and address some of the resource shortfalls that we have?

**Ms. Ballard:**

I don't think that we've engaged in the accounting of that question. I do know, just historically, the way we've been operating is already kind of along these lines. I remember very clearly that the Title I fund distribution methodology that we've been using over the last few years has changed drastically. I can't speak to exactly when that was. It was a couple of jobs ago for me, but we used to maintain those funds centrally, and distribute out to schools. Now, those funds are already allocated to schools; and schools are making those decisions; so it's kind of a microcosm of what we're doing here with the reorganization. We've already started to do that with some of the smaller pots of money—federal funds included.

**Mr. Evans:**

So, I guess my last follow-up question would be, I would hope that, given some of the additional fidelity and clarity that we're coming up with in compliance with this rule, we could give that information either to State and/or federal representatives and in turn get even more resources for being good stewards of the taxpayers' dollars. That's what I'm driving at.

**Ms. Ballard:**

Thank you.

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

Thank you for the presentation. I really appreciate it. I'd like to ask a couple of questions, not focused on the particulars of the presentation but focused on the process that got you there. To me, it's very important for the work of this Committee to understand where the shift came from, or to understand if you all internally believe there was a shift, or if you think you were already doing it that way. But the first question along those lines is, how does the structure of the I Team and the subcommittees differ from how you all went about your work before that existed? And I understand, that's fairly broad, and the I Team is specifically about this work; but have you worked in this way within the District before, and if you had, can you provide me with some examples, or is this totally new, and can you give me your feelings about it?

**Ms. Ballard:**

It's not uncommon for us to establish project-specific committees or project-specific workgroups. The scale of this project, however, is so dramatically different than anything else we engage in, the closest thing I can come to in my memory is the implementation of the student management system a couple years ago when we switched to Infinite Campus, but what the I Team does a little bit differently is it relies on a layer of folks who are in the work every day and have very real experiences from which to pull, to allow us to hash out some of the problems with some of the ideas that we come up with before it gets to the level where the executive leadership of the District needs to tackle the decisions. So it's allowed us to move much more quickly than we typically do. We meet weekly, in addition to that daily meeting that we have with many members of the I Team and anybody else who I call and say, "Hey, I need you at the daily meeting tomorrow," so I think just allowing us to move this huge amount of change at this very fast pace primarily is the benefit that I see.

**Mr. Husson:**

So, what I'm hearing is, there was a shift, if you will, in the organizational structure for this particular project. The authority was delegated down, if you will, the chain of command, to you and your team to make certain level decisions, and then you brought that information to the executive management team, where they were then to be the final stamp of approval or disapproval. And to me, for this Committee, that is a significant shift in the way the School District operates, and one that everybody in this room should not underestimate. It matters in a big way, and I think your explanation for this in particular, that I'll get to, is you took an issue, the 80-20 issue, that up until this meeting, those of us external to the conversation didn't know that it was getting worked through. The last we heard was, "It's going to be impossible, there's no way to do it," and that was from the folks that you report to that have intimate knowledge of the budgets and everything else and have worked in the District for a long time. So, the change in structure amounted to success versus failure, and that's critical. How did it do that, in your estimation, and what did it mean to the folks who are the management to make that decision to allow for that autonomy? A lot of questions—sorry.



**Ms. Ballard:**

A lot of questions, and deep. I'm not sure I could speak to what it meant to them, but it became very clear to us from them that we needed to solve the problem; so it's not as if we went rogue and said, "We're going to fix this," and they said, "But you can't!" It was a challenge that was given to us by the leadership and by the Board to be able to make sure that we're in compliance, so I think just the expectation that we could look at something that we had all understood one way and try to tackle it from another way, I think, is what allowed us to actually get going, and it happened very quickly once we were given the challenge. It materialized very quickly into a set of goals that we tried to reach, so that we could structure some of that work and actually delve down into just the little pieces of the challenges that sort of got us into the shift that we were able to go through that gives a little bit of a light at the end of the tunnel, and then of course, now, realizing that we truly are allocating most of our budget to schools, and when we got there, the most interesting part was realizing, "Oh, we knew this, we know that's why we're here, I don't know why we're arguing so hard," because we know the reason that we have programs that are funded centrally or funded in schools is purely to provide experience for students. And so kind of aligning the challenge and the work we went through to meet that challenge with the realization that, "Oh yeah, that's why we're here," like I said at the very beginning, kind of helps bring it all together for us right now.

**Mr. Husson:**

So, thank you for that, and it's always interesting to hear from the people who went through the change what it was that triggered the different conversations, and I would just like to make this statement, if I hadn't made it clear already: it's this work, this seemingly small change, which was basically the leadership saying, "We challenge you to fix this," that is making all the difference in the conversation we're having today versus the conversation we were having 4, 5 or 6 months ago. Essentially, CCSD is acknowledging the fact that they have an abundance of human talent in the form of you and your I Team that they need to tap into in order to solve these problems, and that is a fundamental shift.

Last question: do you think that that practice will sustain itself? The I Team exists today to implement the reorganization. Is there any talk about the need for this to be a permanent piece of the leadership structure of this School District?

**Ms. Ballard:**

If there is conversation along those lines, we've been too buried in the work of reaching the 80-20 to be a part of it. I would like to share, though, that in our reorganization—I mentioned really quickly, at the beginning, the structure of the Central Office. You've probably seen our organization chart. We literally flipped our organization chart upside down, but we also kind of changed the way Central Office departments and divisions interact with each other, so we've already put in a layer of communication between department leaders where some of the problems and some of the ideas, similar to what we do with the I Team, get hashed out amongst those division and department leaders before it gets to a level where a decision is ready to be made, so it's a little bit broader of a team because it encompasses both instructional and operational sides of the house; and part of it is to make sure we're including

all the considerations we need to consider when we're looking at a problem to be solved, or an opportunity to take advantage of, but I think it's a very similar kind of structure in that the ideas are hashed out there first before they move forward to decision making with the executive leadership.

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

Member Husson, just to maybe get to your point, a simple answer to that—and kudos to Ms. Ballard and the I Team. I've got to tell you, the I Team, with that being in existence—I'm a member of the Superintendent's Reorganization Workgroup. Per that level, if you will, the short answer is that a structure like this has to be part of our organization because when you think about the I Team introduction, it's aligned in the spirit of the reorganization. Those closest to the work helping things move rapidly is what this is all about, so—just my experience being on that group after this team was implemented—things did move fast, and so, that was refreshing and obviously something that I think leadership will look at supporting in the future.

**Mr. Husson:**

Sorry, you introduced one more thing, so last follow up then. Dr. Barton, in your experience, you've been with the District for a long time, in high level leadership for a while now, too, so you've seen prior to and now this—just give me your 30 seconds of the value of operating this way and allowing leaders to lead versus the more micromanagement approach that I've seen in the past and tell me what you think about that moving forward.

**Dr. Barton:**

I think that you have to trust the people closest to the work to make decisions, think through complex problems, value their input and ideas, and when you do that, I think magical things happen, and real change and progress can happen in a very short period of time. So definitely, something that this reorganization—creating even this I Team—it's exciting, because then it creates other discussions that I'm going to get to in my later part of the presentation; then you start talking to principals, helping out with this idea of levels of autonomy; and then they help identify what they're looking for in comparison to Central Office; so you're able to silo-bust and really start connecting dots in an organization.

**Vikki Courtney (President, Clark County Education Association):**

Thanks for the report. I just have a question, because I'm still not sure; budgets are not my area of expertise at all. So, when you're looking at this—direct services to multiple schools, and the school-managed services—does that mean that the money goes to the school, and they get to choose to do with it what they want, or is it that you're choosing what it is that—because I still don't know if all of the money—if 80 percent is in a school, and the school gets to choose what they get to do with the money, because that's what it was supposed to be about.

**Ms. Ballard:**

It's a great question. It's the same question we ask ourselves every time we talk about this work, but I want to allow Dr. Barton maybe to touch on the work to strengthen that position in just a minute, but in order to move forward with the work that will allow us to increase flexibilities for schools, increase autonomy to schools, our first way to attack it was to first write it down, where we're at, track where we're at. What we're finding is, not only the ability that Dr. Barton will speak to in a minute to discuss with principals using a common language, a common kind of scale, we're also finding areas that we maybe didn't think to look at before. It's allowing us a whole new level of transparency, even amongst ourselves, who could have just picked up the phone and asked someone, but we wouldn't have known the question to ask. So, the work right now has not been to change any of the ways decisions are being made so far. That said, the majority of these items are items that are provided to schools because of the demand at the school level. It may not necessarily be the principal saying, "I want to hire so and so to do such and such," but it is, for example, an individualized education plan (IEP) team saying, "This student needs services x, y and z," and so this service x, y and z comes out of the Central budget. It is building, saying the roof is leaking and it needs x, y and z repair, and the x, y and z repair comes out of Central funds. So, while it may not necessarily be a principal decision, engaging these funds or engaging these services, it is, for the vast majority, a demand base from the school or the school community at this point.

**Ms. Courtney:**

I still think, though, that that doesn't make each school have 80 percent of the money. I think it's still money sitting in the Central Office, so I'm not sure if that's where the money is. And then the decisions are coming up instead of going down, so that's—I guess I'll have to wait to hear what Dr. Barton says, and maybe my question will be answered, but that's not what I'm hearing. It's still sounding like it's coming from the top instead of coming from the bottom up.

**Mr. Christenson:**

I would agree, Member Courtney. I think we should hear from Dr. Barton on the autonomy piece, because the initial reaction a lot of times for people is, well, we're just kind of moving the money around. That's basically the letter of the law. The spirit of the law is exactly what you said, that we'll have more access, more flexibility, more autonomy over the budgets going forward, and today what they're presenting is essentially the first step. Let's see where this budget goes, and how we can actually budget to get it there. So, now we know that that's possible, the next step is how much autonomy do they really have, and I think Dr. Barton can help us with the process we're going through so far.

**Ms. Ballard:**

Does that mean continue?

**Mr. Christenson:**

Unless there are some other questions.

**Ryan Woodward (Area Manager, JPMorgan Chase; Member, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce):**

Maybe this is outside the scope, but I'm just curious—what percent of the budget is restricted? So, we're talking about what's unrestricted and how you allocated that. What percentage of the budget is restricted, and with that, are any of those restricted funds used for compensation from a Central standpoint? Are there employees at Central who are working to implement the programs that are restricted but also working with unrestricted funds as well or programs that are unrestricted? Do those employees get paid from both funds? Does that make sense? Am I being clear with that? Has that been taken into consideration as you're examining these numbers? I see the numbers are pretty specific, down to the dollar, which I appreciate, so I'm just curious if that has been taken into consideration.

**Ms. Ballard:**

I can speak only superficially, not being a member of the Budget Team myself, and then perhaps Mr. Goudie can chime in. I don't know the percentage personally of what the unrestricted funds are against the entire CCSD budget. I'm sure one of these guys in the back can probably text it to me if they have my cellphone number. Outside of that, there is a possibility that a staff member could be funded both with restricted funds and with unrestricted funds. We didn't look at it per staff member, but when the Budget Team was pulling the funds, those funds would be represented as a dollar amount. That dollar amount might be one portion of a person's salary. So, it's possible. I don't know how many individuals fit into that category. It's not uncommon for an individual, particularly in the Central Office, to fulfill two roles. A grant might provide for one-half of a support staff member or something like that, for example, so it's possible. I would have to do some more research to get specific answers for you, though.

**Dr. Barton:**

Member Woodward, I think another thing to consider, also—what Ms. Ballard talked about earlier was the time-tracking software we actually built, and I want to give great credit to Dan Wray, our Chief Technology Officer, who with his team, and Rick Neal obviously as well, the Chief Operating Officer—building a time-tracking mechanism where Central workers will start tracking their time in a system, and we'll be able to answer and address those questions in a much better way. So that time-tracking system I talked about earlier, how things get moving fast, that was built in a period of 48 hours, I believe, from our team internally, and so that will be a tool that will help address that point you brought up.

**Mr. Woodward:**

Just a quick comment, to follow up on Member Husson's. So, I work for a large organization and recognize culture is very hard to change, and I recognize that egos get in the way a lot

with people wanting to put their stamp on things. I commend you guys for what you're doing, for, as you're saying, moving the power from the top and putting it into the people who actually—I don't mean to say that derogatorily, but those who do the work every day, the feet on the street, as we say. I'm just impressed by what I'm hearing today, and I commend you in your efforts.

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

Thank you, first of all, for all your hard work. I just had a question about the categories. So, are we waiting on the principals' feedback to be able to move some of the funds from, I don't know, the direct services to the strategic budget category? Because since we're able to identify the school, it seems like we can move it to the strategic budget category.

**Dr. Barton:**

Great question, really a question pertinent to the autonomy continuum that we're setting out, and just so everyone knows, there's a survey that was sent out to the principals, probably about 3 weeks ago. We have about 150 respondents on that survey from the principal level, and that's also considering many of them are on summer break right now. We are giving 2 more weeks, until July 19, for principals to get back to us on their feelings, but I think that the short answer is that that unrestricted dollar amount, if there are opportunities for other items to be in the strategic budget, that's what we hope to glean from principals as they complete this survey, and really, it's a comparison of what the principals are feeling in comparison to what our division leaders did in the exercise, probably about a month ago, and identifying whether they believe those services are school support or Central support. So, the short answer is yes, that tool, that instrument, will help us drive additional services and dollars to the schools.

**Mr. Christenson:**

I think this will be a little clearer if we can get to the autonomy piece. Are you finished, Ms. Ballard? Dr. Barton, if you'd help us with—because this is really the next step, and it really kind of goes to your question, Member Courtney, about how much flexibility and autonomy will the principals have at the school level.

**Ms. Ballard:**

Before Dr. Barton gets started, I want to take you back to this slide that I showed you at the beginning of the 80-20 conversation, because it's really not a new conversation we're starting here; it is a continuation of the work. What we said first was that we needed to define existing school allocations and be able to report on individual school allocations in order to reach the 80-20 and 85-15 requirements of the bill. We recognize that our next step, which has been going concurrently, is to begin the work to increase autonomies and flexibilities, and so Dr. Barton will now share with you some of the activity that is going on in this area.

**Dr. Barton:**

I think that we've started to go here a little bit this afternoon, as far as autonomy, and we know the spirit of this legislation is about building autonomy for those closest to the work, and what we did is—I want to give a shout out, obviously to TSC<sup>2</sup> because they helped to be thought partners with this activity but also I want to name out loud the principals who really came to the table on multiple occasions in June at the tail end of graduation season to start talking about what they would want to look for in an autonomy continuum, and really the idea came from them. The idea of looking at these dollars and services on an autonomy continuum, that idea really came from our principals, again, those closest to the work. So, the first identifying factor was looking at autonomy and having principals really identify the definition. What does autonomy mean for them, and so before I do that, again I promised, Trent Day, principal at Centennial, Keith Wipperman, principal at Leavitt, Ariel Villalobos, principal at Hewetson, and Ryan Lewis, who is a principal at Garehime Elementary. These are all lead principals. They were the ones that came to the table and really gave us some great insight about how to think about autonomy and the autonomy continuum.

So, the definition is the first thing they said that needed to be defined, and what was decided was that we wanted to look at the opportunity for the principal, with input from the SOT, to make decisions about what the desired outcome should be for an activity. That's like the most autonomy that can be provided to a school, with a principal working side by side with the SOT to look at the dollars and make a decision on how they're going to use those. The other definition, the opportunity for the principal with input from the SOT to determine the mechanism to achieve those outcomes—maybe they don't have the ultimate flexibility for spending the dollars. Custodial, maybe, is an example that I could give to this Council today. They may have, as a principal and SOT, at this time, a manner to provide input into the evaluation for a custodian, maybe they can determine what kind of cleaning schedule will be used, will it be team cleaning, or will there be another kind of way that the cleaning of the building can happen. So again, what's the mechanism to achieve those outcomes? And finally, although we perceive autonomy separately from funding, we recognize that, if funds are available for an outcome, how principals access those funds has an effect on how autonomous the decision making is around it, so I think that's where we're getting to your point, Member Courtney. How many of these dollars can be used to really enact this decision, and that aligns to our definition of autonomy.

I'm going to go now to the tiers of autonomy. When you look at tier one, that principal, that SOT, has the most discretion. They have ultimate autonomy in making decisions, using that dollar amount to make things happen on their campus. I'll go to the opposite end of the autonomy continuum. Tier five means that it's total Central Office. There is zero autonomy really for that school, that principal, that SOT, and Central Services has full discretion. Tiers two through four—again, the great work of the principals and our consulting partners—we looked at tier two through tier four in defining some things that are in the strategic budget, and the principal has full discretion with guidance and support provided by Central Services. So, tier two, it's not carte blanche—you know, do what you want—there are still maybe some parameters from the Central Office or from State law that guide that decision making, and that would be categorized as a tier two on the autonomy spectrum. For tier three, principals and SOTs choose from a predetermined set of options, perhaps. It's, again, not taking all of

those dollars, but maybe they can identify certain things that are pre-established to do at their school, and then tier four, again, is getting to that higher level of management from the Central Office, but again there's still some autonomy that's being identified at the school level.

So, why do I review this spectrum with you? Because here's what we're doing right now, we're asking principals these two questions: "Which level of autonomy best defines your current experience with the services?" So right now, our principals are getting a listing of all the services that are provided centrally and principals are going to answer, on that autonomy spectrum, where that level currently exists, and then as they do that work, they're also going to be asked, "What level of autonomy would you prefer in the future to help you accomplish your goals for the school?" So, we're going to glean some really powerful information on what the current status is as far as perception of autonomy with Central Services, but then we want to know from our principals—again, and we've had about 150 that have already completed this survey—where they'd want it to be with this reorganization.

So, an example on the level of the autonomy spectrum, again with five meaning the least amount, one where it's ultimate autonomy with strategic budgets, we are going to ask those two questions and get an understanding from the triangle symbol where they think it is now (Exhibit E). So, principals may believe that, for instance, service one, not identified in this chart, but they may believe that it's at tier five right now; Central is really driving the decisions on that service. Principals may come back to us with that second question on the survey and let us know, loud and clear, the level of autonomy that they desire. They may want it to be a tier two or a tier three, we don't know, but we want to get this information so we can get some things going with action.

The next slide gives you a couple of examples where, instead of putting the service, we've actually named some things out. I want to be clear that this is not real data, but this is showing you what—if we come back at future meetings after we get this information from principals, we'll be able to provide to you what the perception was, the triangle symbol, and where they want to be, the circle symbol, in the next couple of months, years, as we get this work going and move along with the reorganization. So, for instance, we may find that maintenance, they believe, is at tier five, but they want it to be tier four.

I think some people think that principals are going to say outright that they want everything to be in tier one. We've done some informal anecdotal work with principals, talking to them, do they want this, do they want that, and some of them have made it very clear that they don't want this complete control because—and I'm using quotes from people that I've talked to—they're not in the landscaping business, so they may not want that ultimate level one, they may want a level four. As another example, food service staff may be at a tier four, but they may want it at a tier two in the future. So that's just an illustration of how this data will come in and how, as we see patterns, we can create action to take that unrestricted money and put it closer to the schools.

**Mr. Christenson:**

But the principals will be the ones making the decision? If I'm a principal and I decide I really don't want much to do with landscaping, I've made that decision. You haven't, as a Central Office, imposed that decision? So that's where the autonomy comes in. That Central service

may be provided by Central, and you're going to have to figure out how to price for that, but I've made that decision. Is that correct?

**Dr. Barton:**

You're right on, absolutely. I think that—in consultation, obviously, with the SOT, though. I think it's not just the principal exclusively saying that, "This is my decision," but again, we're in an environment now, we're working with shared governance, and our principals—again, this goes back to the cultural shift that Mr. Skancke talked about, that our principals realize and are cognizant that the future of this reorganization relies on not just a solo decision by one person but working with the governance body at that school level.

**Mr. Christenson:**

So, each one of the 350-plus schools will be going through this?

**Dr. Barton:**

That's correct.

**Ms. Courtney:**

So, Dr. Barton, I guess your words are important, and on the previous slide, I think it should reflect that the principal has full discretion; and yet you say "principal and SOT," so I think it's important that it's in writing, that it is not just a principal's decision. But the second part I'm concerned about, this next page that you're on, this level of autonomy, because—so, "What level of autonomy would you prefer in the future to help you accomplish your goals for the school?" So, teachers and principals at a school site are responsible for students achieving. That's the goal of this whole thing. And you ask them what level they would prefer, and they said—I don't know, what's the most important level? One is the one where they prefer the most autonomy, so they say five, and so when the school isn't successful, then whose responsibility is it? Because now they haven't taken on the ownership of it, and are they giving it back to Central? Is Central responsible for it, then? I think the spirit and the intent of the law is that there's 80 percent of funds in the building for the school to determine what best is going to solve the issue, and then that's what they do. I know as a teacher, when we work with students and you find the person who might be the most helpful in your school, sometimes the custodian or the food service worker or another colleague, another educator is that most important person, and so schools know who does that work best. So it sounds like, even though you're sharing this autonomy thing, it still sounds like it's coming from above, instead of schools making decisions. They have all of the money they need that's been required by the law, and they get to choose, and it's making sure that that school is the community, that small community of their neighborhood, so they can impact what's going on there. So, I guess this really scares me, this level of autonomy, because then it's saying well, I'm a five so it's really Central Services and you're responsible for the school. And I chose not to be autonomous. I chose to let other folks do that, and maybe I'm misunderstanding, or misreading, but I don't think that there's—I think it is to empower people to do the work who are closest to the schools.



**Dr. Barton:**

Member Courtney, I think it's a great point. I think that one of our principals said it best, if I could just maybe go to your point. Trent Day, in our dialogue, we talked about landscaping, for instance, so let's say landscaping is something that comes back as a level five—I'm not saying it's going to, but let's say it does, and that's Central. The reality is this, and all of our principals know that while it may be on the tier five on the level of autonomy, the person who's ultimately still on the hook for the landscaping to look presentable on that campus is the principal, so while those central autonomies—it doesn't remove the responsibility. Our principals know that. I think that it may be something that they, working with our SOTs, they just don't want to manage the day to day of bringing in that outside person or managing that, but ultimately, our principals are held accountable, even if it is that level five.

**Mr. Christenson:**

So, as I understand, as a principal, I have a choice: I can go out and hire the landscaping crew, and I'm going to spend x amount of dollars on that. Or, I have the choice of buying that same service through Central Services. I may choose to do that, so I don't have to oversee the daily work that the landscaper's doing, an outside person. My level of autonomy is, I'd just as soon have you guys do it. I'm going to be paying for it. Now, if I decide that the services don't meet my requirements, or that I can find someone that'll do it for less and do a better job, then as a principal, I'll have the ability to do that. So that's where that autonomy piece comes in.

**Erin Cranor (Member, Clark County School District Board of School Trustees, District G):**

We had quite a conversation, not specifically about landscaping, but about this concept in the Board meeting. This was presented to us, and this is an area that needs work, and that needs structure, and that we don't know exactly what the structure needs to be yet. Landscaping actually is a great case in point, because in the past, this has been a place where it has broken down. We had empowerment previously. The recession hit; there was a Central decision made to not water the grass as much. There were a lot of very gravelly football fields, until a Central Office decision was made to water the football fields more. That's just one example of a piece of this reorganization that still needs work and still needs solutions that we have not landed on yet. We don't know what they are yet, and there's still going to have to be work, and I think one of the critical things will be, as we move forward on this sort of crux of autonomy or not, documenting and being transparent about when autonomy is granted and pulled back, and if a principal is dissatisfied with the landscaping service, for instance, that's being provided as a tier five, what happens? Are they quieted down, are they responded to, do they have an influence? What if there's an SOT 50-50 split on whether more resources should go into that, for instance? At the very least, there needs to be a way to document what's happening because I bet you nobody in this room except the people who happened to be at the executive level during the recession knew about the football fields thing that happened during the recession. That kind of stuff isn't documented, it's day to day work that people deal with, make the decision and move on. So, on the one hand, that could be seen as, well, if we're going to put a structure in place and document these things, we're going to

create a lot of red tape and it's going to be kind of unmanageable, and that's one end of the spectrum we don't want to get to, and the other end of the spectrum is a free for all.

**Ms. Courtney:**

So, it's about landscaping, but if the money is not there and somebody else gets to make the decision that we're not going to water the lawn, how is that impacting the kids at the school? If the SOT and the principal determine that they aren't going to water the lawn, what impact does that have on student achievement? Does that mean you can't go out and play in the grass? Does that mean you can't do the science experiments? What does that mean, and who's accountable for that? The intent was that the money goes there, people decide what you want to do and why you want to do it. You can explain to your community, you should be talking with your community at that school and empowering them to make those decisions so they can explain to the rest of the community there, so you're not saying, "Oh, Central decided that, they made that decision," because then it takes it away and then it's less ownership of what the issues are. At a school site, the site determines this is what they want to do. This is what it's supposed to be about, because then they have ownership of it. If they don't water the grass, well, there's probably a good reason for it and they will tell you what that is, and it could just be plain, "Well, there's not enough money because we want to have paper in the school," another very real decision in schools besides watering the grass. So, I guess it still goes back to the whole idea that the money isn't there at the school site, the unrestricted money isn't there for the folks who are there to make decisions based on what they really need, and I have a hard time feeling like this is solving the issue, that it is not out there, and that schools don't get to choose.

**Mr. Christenson:**

So, maybe a way to think about this, rather than calling it Central, just call it another vendor. The vendor happens to be the folks that are in the School District providing that piece. There's no requirement to use them; they're just another vendor. But the responsibility is the principal's to determine what happens to the outside grounds at his or her school.

**Ms. Courtney:**

I understand that part, but I guess it's been that the money isn't there at the school site for the school to use. The money is sitting with Central Services, as opposed to that.

**Mr. Christenson:**

But now the budget is at the school level. They have control of that, they're going to use—and you tell me if I'm wrong—those dollars. They're going to send it to Central; they're making those decisions. That piece of the budget doesn't go away, it's at the school.

**Ms. Courtney:**

If it's at the school. Okay.

**Mr. Christenson:**

You tell me if I'm wrong.

**Dr. Barton:**

Chair Christenson, Member Courtney, I think that there's a couple things to consider with all of this work, related to Trustee Cranor's point. As we go through this exercise, transparency is going to be key at every step of the way as the data's coming in, because we need to work with many people in the organization on where this does fall from the principal and the SOT perspective. We also have to do this, and—again, it's not my shop, but I'll do my best to answer—we're costing out the cost of service, like Chair Christenson talked about with landscaping. We are still at a stage where we have to cost out each service provided centrally, and then as a result of that, the schools will then be charged what they would pay for a service, whether it's landscaping or something else, at the Central Office, or if it's another vendor perhaps down the road. The other thing to consider with all of this work, too—it's in the legislation, it's a requirement, and we've already done it. And again, it's looking at that Central Services survey that has gone out to our principals and getting that data from the field, as far as how they're perceiving that service happening to what level of standard. So, that's another thing that we'll continue to look at, and frankly, it'll make our Central Service departments work more efficiently, smarter, be more customer service oriented, and hopefully be a tool that can help overall student achievement, like you said.

**Ms. Cranor:**

I do think we need to state very clearly that we are not at a point right now where the Central Office is in a vendor relationship with schools. We're not there.

**Mr. Husson:**

So, hearing the conversation go back and forth, I'd like to clarify a little bit, or have you help me clarify a little bit. I'm looking at slide 27 (Exhibit E), which talks about the unrestricted funds being allocated 88-12, as far as what they're accounting for, basically the whole first half of the presentation. And then it highlights the 88 percent, and it talks in the green about what percent of the 88 percent is actually part of the strategic budget, versus what percent is direct services to schools. Am I right that the 55 percent of the 88 percent is directed by the SOT and the principal, and the 33 percent of the 88 percent at this point is not? Is that a true statement?

**Ms. Ballard:**

It's not entirely true. The 55 percent is directed by the principal, with requirements that the principal would have to meet, obviously. A portion of the 33 percent, the darker green, is determined by the reality of the school. So, where I was speaking before about how it's not necessarily a principal making a decision. It is about a very real need at the school that neither the principal nor the School District has the capability of deciding not to provide. For example, special education services come to mind. It's the easiest, and it's a big chunk of these dollars

here. Another piece is transportation, making sure that kids are getting to school. It's not that the principal has the ability to say this kid needs audiology services, but the IEP team has the ability to say this kid needs audiology services. For that same kid, the Central Office does not have the ability to say this kid needs audiology services, nor does the Central Office have the ability to say this kid does not need audiology services, so the need is determined by the reality at the school level, though it's not particularly 100 percent of the time with a decision that the principal is able to make with the SOT.

**Mr. Husson:**

Okay, thank you for that clarification. So, that does make a difference, but I think that the clarification that I'm seeking is still valid. So, I think what Member Courtney is getting to, she expressed it pretty clearly, the intent of this law from its inception was to get to a point where principals and school communities had the autonomy to do what's necessary at the school level to educate kids the way they believe needs to happen and take the responsibility for that education. At this point, it doesn't look like that's going to be true tomorrow, but what it does look like to me is that it's giving us the information and the common language to actually have a discussion about how to get to that point. The problem I'm hearing is that I don't know that the community does have the confidence that that's where we're going to continue on to. What are the major hurdles that still exist today that will stop us from getting those schools the autonomy they need, and one of them is one you just presented. On one hand, we need to ask principals what they want, in order to make it something that can actually be done, but on the other hand, as a community, can we really say it's up to you whether you want to be autonomous or not? I don't think that's the spirit of the law. So, can you address that particular issue? Based on what you're presenting, are we going to say at some point that if a principal decides they don't want autonomy, that that's going to be an okay thing?

**Mr. Skancke:**

Mr. Chairman, if I could just interject a couple of thoughts here at this point in the presentation—I'm not certain if Dr. Barton has finished his presentation. We might be asking questions that he's going to answer in the remainder of his presentation, but I want to put some context here where we are. This is July. We have until October 31 to get the next phase of this work done, and I want to keep everything in perspective. The first 6 months of our work was, to say the least, challenging. Ninety-nine-point nine percent of this has been done since A.B. 469 was passed and the cultural shift and change in attitude and direction occurred, so I think what most of you are looking at is an October outcome in July. And what I'd like you to keep in mind as you look at this work today, while it's probably overwhelming, because 3 months ago, we were at 54 percent, and 3 months later we are presenting that we're way beyond the expectation. And I think it has startled a lot of us that we could actually get there, so I'm going to suggest that you keep things in perspective that there's still 3 more months of work that needs to be done. I'm confident that, as we get closer to October 31, our scope requires us to write a manual, if you will, for the District to follow, and after our work is complete, as I've said for the last 7 1/2 to 8 months, the real work has to begin. That is when the most challenging decisions are going to have to be made by principals, by teachers, by parents, by students, by support staff and the District as a whole. We are still working on finding efficiencies, we are still working on finding opportunities for financial reallocations of

funds. There's a lot that has to be done yet. But, the work that has been done, primarily has been really done in the last 90 days, maybe 100 days. So, don't look at this as the final report, please, and for those of you that are Tweeting and putting out stories in the media, etc., this is not the final work. This is actually the beginning of phase two, which probably should have been done in March, in all honesty. But we are where we are today, and I'm fairly confident that we will get where we need to be by October 31, primarily because, 8 months ago, no one said we would get to where we are today. It is a process. Your input and your questions are critical to the success of this program, and your questions that you are asking today help us drive the right narrative and the right conversation to where we have to be on October 31, but by no means is this work done on October 31. It's not.

So, I'd like to put that into perspective for everyone who's wondering and questioning where we are today. This is an update and a report. This is not a final document. This is the work that has gone on since we started, but the majority of this work has been done, as I said, over the last 100 days. So your questions are welcome, your comments are important, but as you start again, if you notice everyone went right to the numbers because it's about numbers. It's about numbers, but it's really about getting people to think differently about how they make their decisions. So, Member Courtney, you're spot on, which is that we have to move the money, but we also now have to work on the autonomy within that school and give those principals and those SOTs the confidence and really the authority to actually be able to do that. And there are a lot of people that are, quite frankly, scared to death of having to make those decisions. And so, we have to give them the opportunity to overcome that fear and also know that they're going to make mistakes, but everyone is so afraid of making a mistake and being criticized for that mistake that it's slow. It's slow because we live in a time where everyone is into blame, and so give us a chance, please, over the next 3 months to really drill down on the autonomy piece. I will agree with you that this should have been done in March. There's no question. But we are where we are today, and given the opportunity over the next 3 months to now begin that next phase of the cultural shift, I believe it will happen. It won't be easy, but I believe it will happen.

My final comment is this: the more input we get from you now that you've seen this presentation—Digest it. Call us. Ask us questions. I don't care if it's in a public forum or if it's in a private or personal forum or collectively as a group because the next 90 days are going to be the most critical piece of this work. So, I'm not certain, Dr. Barton, if you were finished, but I wanted to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your indulgence to allow us to kind of put this into context of where we are and where we have to go. To your point, Member Husson, there are a lot of stoppers that we have to overcome, and I think the Chairman is going to address that later. There are lots of things that need to be done, and he'll go through those and we'll continue to bring those things up over the next 3 months, but I think we've come a long way from where we were 3 months ago, which was, "We're not going to get there," to, "We're close." And so I appreciate the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to interject those comments. So, Dr. Barton, if you were not finished, I'll step away from the podium.

**Dr. Barton:**

Thank you, Mr. Skancke. Chair Christenson, I think that the long and the short of it with this survey data—and I think to Mr. Husson's point, while direct services to schools is 33 percent,

is not, as you say, exclusively decided in the strategic budgets, we may learn much information from this survey. So we may learn many things from our principals as far as how they're viewing autonomy with these services; and tier twos may bubble up through these surveys; and that may be something that is in fact something that could be brought to the SOT. So, I think that's the focus of my part of the presentation, is that we have a lot of information to gather from our principals and working with SOTs on what their feeling is, as far as autonomy now, and where they'd like it to be in the future. And we may learn that now, principals view some of these Central Services as they do have a lot of autonomy now, and they can make some decisions with SOTs collectively. But again, I think that we need to get the data captured. We've got 2 more weeks. On July 19, we should have a better picture as far as how the autonomy is looking from the field, but I'm happy to address any other questions you may have today.

**Ms. Cranor:**

I want to add a little bit to Mr. Skancke's contextualizing this as, we're only at the beginning of a really important part of the work, and I also want to be really clear about where the Board is right now. The Board's in a dramatically different place than it was as well. It's in a stance of support, but I think it would be accurate to say that, as a Board of Trustees, the approach remains, "What could go wrong?" The change is, "What could go wrong so the reorganization doesn't work?" There's an attitude and a collective hope for this to succeed and to be great for kids, and yet there's still the tendency that we have, I think, as Trustees who have seen things go wrong in the past to issue warnings; and I think that's what we were trying to do in our meeting the other day; and that's what I want to make sure that we get across here, is the importance of very clearly and openly talking about what happens as this process goes along. If half of the room at any given time thinks that the School District is in a vendor relationship with schools right now, we need to correct it. We need to be very clear about where we are at any given point, and one of the things that I think makes the Board a resource that the community can turn to is the historical experiences that most of the people on this Board have already had. One that keeps coming to mind is that we had empowerment. When I came onto the Board, when I was elected in 2010, empowerment was going on, which was an autonomy model. Empowerment was functionally dismantled in 2011, and the Board and the public became aware that that had occurred in 2013. There's going to have to be a change in the way communication happens if this part of the work is going to go well, and we talked about that extensively in our Board meeting. And we did, I think, interact very functionally and made a good plan with Superintendent Skorkowsky and his team as to how to be transparent. I think this body as well needs to be very committed to—we need to know exactly what's happening, and if there's a misconception obviously occurring, the District needs to be committed to making things clear. CIC members need to be committed to making things clear, and we need to be committed to communicating about what's actually happening, not letting people think that what they want has already happened when it hasn't.

**Ms. Courtney:**

So, I just want to be clear that the law says that autonomy is not discretionary, it is the law, and so we just can't parcel it out. It has to be direct, and I know you're saying people are concerned. They're scared. They're afraid. But the system was put in place so they had

support, and that was the idea, that they got the money, they got the autonomy, now we support them. That's what the associate superintendents are supposed to do that, that's the idea behind how you change the culture, and if we don't do that, then it's not going to work because that was why empowerment didn't get widespread, is we just did it in little parcels. This is what the law says and this is what we're supposed to do, so I see that differently.

**Mr. Evans:**

I just wanted to put some questions or thoughts into the space, given the conversation we're having. First of all, I applaud the idea that you're asking the principals the question of current state versus desired state. I think that's an excellent move to make. I think many organizations would benefit from that. I think the first question that comes to mind is, given that, what impact will that have on the Superintendent and the Board of Trustee governance model? I know that's something that's been talked about before, so I just want to put that question out into the space, and then let me be quiet and maybe give you a chance to give initial thoughts, if any, on that one.

**Ms. Ballard:**

The governance model between the Board and the Superintendent is becoming clearer and clearer to all of us. The Board has recently adopted a balanced governance model. The ability for principals to make decisions will not change that relationship between the Board and the Superintendent and the Superintendent's staff. That said, there are sections of the law that require that responsibilities that the School District has, in order for those to be completely converted into school responsibilities, the Board would be involved in approving those decisions, and so we've developed a process to transfer those, I can't remember if it's authority or responsibility, something like that. We've not engaged any specific work into that process until we hear back from where the principals shine the light on the things that we need to engage in first, what's most important to them, where the biggest gaps are, things like that. I hope that answers your question.

**Mr. Evans:**

Yes, it does. In fact, it gives me comfort. I'm going to borrow a military term here. We have something that we call delegation of authority, and it sounds like you're going through the evolution necessary to get to that end state, which I think is a good thing. And then the other thing that you suggested is happening, which I was going to ask about is, I would anticipate—will there be future meetings or an integration effort made between the Superintendent's working group, which I recognize is already engaged, but then once again the Board of Trustees? Because if there aren't meetings along the way or efforts made along the way to create a tie between the Board of Trustees, the Superintendent and then the principals—and I recognize there's staff in between there—things potentially could fall apart.

**Ms. Ballard:**

There are kind of two ways to answer this question. Number one, the Board's guidance is very clear with what their strategic imperatives are. All of the work that we engage in should

support those strategic imperatives. Number two, though, the communication—we have been providing an update to the Board at every Board meeting for several, several months. Over the last 2 months, though, we've provided this level of detail that you're seeing today, also to the Board during Board work sessions which allows for some very real kind of conversations and feedback between the Board members and the Superintendent and his staff.

**Mr. Evans:**

And my last comment, Mr. Chair, is I hope that that would continue. Candor, transparency, tough conversations—that's what it will take to get to a successful end state, but please continue to do so.

**Mr. Christenson:**

Have you concluded, Dr. Barton?

**Ms. Ballard:**

We've got two more slides in this segment. Mainly, the slides try to illustrate the work that we're just embarking upon that will very specifically increase dollars to school strategic workbooks, and there are two areas that we're looking at. One of them I just talked about, the transfer of responsibility—that's the process that we've developed to take a look at some of those things. We call it the (a) through (t) list. I can't remember which section of the law it's in—section 16, I think—where the District is required to remain responsible for and pay for certain activities. We recognize that a lot of that work is already happening in schools now, but for us to fully transfer that responsibility, we have developed a process that we estimate will take anywhere from 12 to 18 months to implement. If it's at the longest, if we need to engage in requests for proposal and purchasing, stuff like that—that includes things like examining the consequences for making changes, how are the stakeholders affected by that, allowing the Budget Team to make decisions on how to cost out those services, allowing us to determine which part of those services might want to remain Central. Do we have a responsibility at Central level that we need to maintain while the schools would have a responsibility for the rest of it? All those kind of decisions we would want to very purposefully go through for each individual service that we would consider a change. So that process, like I said, we've developed, but we haven't run anything through yet. When we identify the areas that we want to target to work on based on the feedback from the principals through Dr. Barton's office, we will be able to run that process through, and actually that will be a continual, forever, so depending on what the item is that we're pushing through, depending on the scope of capacity of the teams involved, the purchasing limitations or the purchasing staff come into mind, we will push all those decisions through to Board approval as required by the law.

The other thing, and I think this is what really starts to resonate with a lot of our stakeholders, is our determination to find efficiencies within budgets outside of the school. We've been receiving information from Central department leaders. Like I said, when they engaged in that budget activity, they were forthcoming about more information. Well, they've been calling us and saying, "Hey, I keep hearing about efficiency finding, and I've got one. What do I do?"



So, they're calling us and asking us for a system to allow us to work through those changes, and so that's the work that we are engaging upon here very shortly. Those efficiencies will also help us redefine our relationship with schools, where we will start to have a vendor relationship with schools based on what we say we provide as a service provider, what the schools say, "I don't really want that as a service. I really want this," and then we kind of negotiate those terms at a service level. That's the work that we're talking about focusing on in finding efficiencies, in addition to one idea that you'll probably hear within the coming weeks, something that came out of the Transportation Department, actually, that we're stealing from Shannon Evans to take and move district-wide, is the idea of an idea depot, where staff members are able to collect ideas, engage their peers to support their ideas and submit an idea for increased efficiency, whether or not that efficiency idea is within their shop or under their responsibility, so we would have a method to collect those ideas. They'd be examined by an outside party member of the TSC<sup>2</sup> Group, and then pushed through some sort of a body, who we haven't identified yet, to see what it would take to influence such an idea, what the benefits would be, what the costs would be, stuff like that. So, these are some of our first kind of attempts to make a very real change in identifying specific dollars to be added into schools' strategic budgets. So, that, with Dr. Barton's comments and mine, kind of sums up our work that we're beginning on how to not just meet the letter of the law, but really, truly start to meet the intent of the law.

**Mr. Christenson:**

This may be too much in the weeds, but if I understand this, right now we have our strategic budgets. The goal is that, within the not too distant future, especially after we have the human capital management system, we'll start to be able to move direct services to single school budgets, into the strategic budgets, as well as direct multiple schools over, and presumably at some point in time, the managed services. Within each of those categories, though, as a principal, I would have some flexibility, presumably who's on my staff, of the kind of services that are out there. If I take all these things and I add them up, and we'll use an example of, just to throw out a number, say \$1,000,000, at the school. Who's going to determine that the right number for that school was \$1,000,000? I mean, it comes from some place. Will that be based on the number of students we have and some multiple of funding for those students? And then the question is, once you determine that you've got \$1,000,000 coming in, you've got \$1,000,000 coming out, in terms of budget, what influence, then, will Central Services, or Central, have on that? If I'm a principal, once I have my \$1,000,000 budget, is anybody else going to be playing with that?

**Dr. Barton:**

Again, the spirit of the law, building and creating the most autonomy—I think the short answer to that is, if there's \$1,000,000 going into the strategic budget, that school and that SOT is then able to make decisions around that funding. That's the long game, making sure that we build the most autonomy, building up those strategic budgets where that SOT, that principal, can make decisions around that \$1,000,000.

**Mr. Christenson:**

Okay. Any other questions?

**Mr. Woodward:**

A key piece to this whole thing, in my opinion, when we started was the mentor program for the principals. We haven't talked about that at all. When it comes to autonomy, and their hesitation potentially—I guess we haven't gotten the results back, but a potential hesitation to run the school on their own. I thought the mentor program was a key piece to that, having members of the community who have experience running businesses, organizations, mentoring the principals through this process along with the SOTs, but again, I haven't heard anything about that. Is there any update on that? Where are we at in organizing the mentors to come in to work with the principals?

**Dr. Barton:**

Great question. I think the way that it started was the training for—and we're working in conjunction, obviously, with the Public Education Foundation—other partners in the community have been viable to help with this partnership program. It really started with the cabinet level and the associate superintendent level. I'll just give you a personal example. I've had a partner, Raymond Specht with Toyota Banking, and he's been a thought partner in this work as far as how to think about District business in different ways, and I'll just put on the record that it's been a most valuable experience. And I could tell you right now that, in working with the Public Education Foundation and Jeremy Hauser particularly, I think that there's been a different kind of thinking at the cabinet level and the associate superintendent level. The next step is the principal level, so we've already submitted recommendations to the Public Education Foundation, Jeremy Hauser particularly, as far as the next phase of the principal partnership with the business community. We're also right now working with the Public Education Foundation where it's a joint session, where there are our school-based people, but also now Central Service people in a room to think about how business can be different. But I think that the principal part is about to really get going with full support, but I think that we were all pleasantly surprised in our debriefs about how critical this program has been because I think that business has been very respectful. They've not come in saying, "This is how you should teach things," or how a classroom environment should be. They built an awareness of public education and provided sound advice on how things should be thought out. Mr. Specht, for instance, has taught me how to think about the management-up concept within the organization, how teachers can be a vital voice to that principal without this defensive nature kicking in, and so I think that the business partnership has been critical. But to your point Mr. Woodward, the principal piece is about to really get going.

**Ms. Cranor:**

I just think it would be helpful as we wrap this part up to bring us back to something Chair Christenson actually said. First, we comply with the letter of the law, and now we fulfill the spirit of the law. That's the work we're really tackling now, and I think it's been a real

conversation at both our Board meeting the other day and here. That's not easy work. The spirit of the law is a very lofty and worthy objective, and we're going to get there.

THE CHAIR CALLED FOR A RECESS.

**Ms. Ballard:**

I think our conversation before the break leads perfectly into the next segment, which is a time for me to take the opportunity to let you know where we are in terms of the letter of the law by section of the law (Exhibit E). These positions, if you will, are fairly general, so what I'd like to do is give you a general idea of where we are in terms of meeting the expectations of the law by section. So, what you see here on this slide is a kind of loose, informal scale of where we are in terms of the work—are we just beginning the work, working on it, are we compliant right now, or have we moved where we believe is beyond compliance.

Sections 1 through 14 of A.B. 469 are declarations and definitions and don't have any expectations of compliance on our part.

Section 15 requires site-based decision making and that we not reduce the size of the specialty schools, and we have implemented site-based decision making and are continuing to increase that, as you heard with Dr. Barton's comments.

Section 16, you can see, is kind of split up, because we're in compliance with some pieces. We are almost there with other pieces of section 16. That section requires that the authority to select staff, supervise staff, procure equipment and supplies and develop a balanced budget is transferred to schools. It also requires that the School District itself remain responsible for paying for and carrying out a list of items. That's the (a) through (t) list. It requires that principals select licensed teachers before a substitute teacher, if at all possible. It requires that the District provide timely maintenance when maintenance is necessary and if we are unable to do so that we hire and pay for an outside representative to provide that timely, necessary maintenance. It requires that principals are consulted when Central Services departments assign staff to provide services to schools, and it outlines the need for a process to transfer authority from that (a) through (t) list to schools. Part of that work that we're closing in on in terms of compliance, but aren't quite there yet, are things that we're working out with the help of one of the members of the TSC<sup>2</sup> Group and some of our staff across the District, across different divisions. Those are making sure that principals select licensed teachers before substitute teachers, making sure that we provide timely maintenance when it is necessary and ensuring that principals are consulted when we assign central staff to schools, and that work is really ensuring that we have processes in place to ensure those behaviors, to make sure that we're in compliance with that law. So those processes are in the works right now.

Section 17 is when we are required to provide to principals on January 15 the cost of each staff type at their school—a list and cost of equipment or supplies available at Central Services, and requires carry forward. So, you can see we're close to compliance with all of those pieces as well.

Section 18 requires that on January 15, we determine the total dollar amount received and the percent of the unrestricted funds allocated to schools, the estimated amount of categorical funding, and that those pieces of information are posted to the internet.

Section 19 is the part of the law that requires that we fund on a weighted per-pupil basis. That, you can see, we have back in the “in the works” section, because we’re still engaging with some of the results of the Legislative Session and weighted student funding coming out with the last work of the Legislature.

Section 20 of the bill requires that we provide the amount of money to schools on January 15. We did that last year, actually, and on January 15 for this upcoming school year.

Section 21, you can see, we’re just beginning because it is to do with determining the finances after the fact, after the school year, and that we post that information to the internet. And of course that will happen after the school year in November.

Section 22 requires the assignment of school associate superintendents, and obviously you know that we’ve assigned those school associate superintendents. One of them is in the audience this afternoon.

Section 23 outlines the process for the school associate superintendent and the role of the school associate superintendents, and those individuals are engaging in that role and engaging in those processes now.

Section 24 requires that the principal establish an SOT, develop a plan of operation with the SOT, select staff for their school and utilize average unit cost in their school strategic budget, and all of those things are in place and have been in place since January.

Section 25 outlines the process for developing a school plan of operation. Section 26 outlines the makeup and the election processes for SOTs. Section 27 outlines the processes for SOT meetings. Section 28 outlines the role of the SOT, including the role of the SOT in the case of a principal vacancy, and Section 29 outlines a process for the appeal of a plan of operation. And I read those all together because, as you can see on the slide here, we’re in compliance with all of these sections. All of these processes were in place for the beginning of the SOTs’ terms in January or December, whenever that started.

Section 30 allows for communities to form community education advisory boards, and that doesn’t require any action on our part.

Section 31 requires the implementation of a District-wide survey by May 1 and implementation of surveys to measure the ability of Central Services to provide services to schools and that the summary of the results of those two surveys is posted online by the beginning of the next school year. Both of those surveys were completed, and the results will be posted online by the time school starts.

Section 32 requires a report, sort of a summary report, to be completed by October 1. That includes a list of responsibilities transferred per Section 16, a summary of the survey results

required by Section 31, an assessment of school performance, an assessment of the effectiveness of operating in the manner set forth in the law, an assessment for recommendation for regulations or legislation. Obviously, some of the work is already complete because it overlaps with some of the requirements of previous sections, but then the TSC<sup>2</sup> Group is also engaged in assisting with the development of that report as we get closer to October.

Section 33 requires that we cooperate with the State Superintendent and provide information when asked, and we are in compliance with that section.

Section 34 has to do with the State Board's ability to adopt regulations. It doesn't require any action on our part. The next one that requires action on our part is section 38, which states that the action taken by a school is not an action taken by the District. We have that listed as "in the works" because we are conferring with our purchasing staff and our legal team to make sure that we are in compliance with that section by the beginning of the school year.

And then finally, though not listed on the slide, the only other section that requires activity on our part is that we cooperate with the Advisory Committee, and we fully intend to do so. That is the quick and dirty version of the very specific compliance levels within A.B. 469. Thank you.

**Mr. Evans:**

Just a quick, loaded question: do you have any items or areas of concern regarding compliance?

**Ms. Ballard:**

That is loaded. Like I said, we're trying to nail down some of the items that we are not quite sure we can document that we're in compliance, and has to do with guiding some of the behaviors at Central Office and stuff like that, and then of course we have some concerns about how our budget situation, our deficit that we're facing—how the way we need to change the way we're budgeting to schools will play out. And our team is just beginning to work on those tasks, and I promise I don't have any answers to those questions if they're forming in your minds right now. Those are some of the things that we're beginning to work on now, in addition to making sure that principals are feeling the change in terms of the culture shift, and it's not just happening between the relationship of the principals and the SOTs, and the Central Services and each other. We want to make sure that that change is felt between Central Services and principals because I think that will be critical. So, those are the main ones that come to mind.

**Ms. Courtney:**

So, now that the State's budget has been adopted and there have been changes, will school budgets change, for instance with Senate Bill (S.B.) 178, the weighted funding formula, so schools should have more money going into them?

**Ms. Ballard:**

I would have to rely on our budget staff to answer that question. We have not engaged in that work from the I Team perspective. We've been working with the final Fiscal Year 2018 budget at the District level, and I don't believe those changes have been reflected in our work quite yet.

**Ms. Courtney:**

Does anyone know when they will be?

**Mr. Goudie:**

In response to your question, we are starting to look at the S.B. 178 funds and how they will flow into the budget, and ultimately, they will be included in the final amended version, which is due in November; but we will have information on that prior to that date. But we're just starting to look at that, so I don't have a firm date for you at this point.

**Mr. Evans:**

I'll just give a quick compliment once again to Ms. Ballard. The good thing is, you know what you know. You know what you still need to investigate. You're moving forward, so I just wanted to put that on the record.

**Ms. Ballard:**

Thank you very much.

**Mr. Christenson:**

Okay, are we moving on to SOTs? Very good.

**Ms. Ballard:**

I'd like to ask Rosanne Richards, a director in the Academic Unit, to join me for this section. The school organizational team implementation was, as you know, pretty fast and furious. We're lucky to have had some really close relationships with the Teachers Union and the union representing support staff members when they were implementing the election processes for the SOTs in the winter, and we also are lucky that those two groups of people agreed to participate with us in the listening tour that we established to gather specific feedback from SOT members about their experience as a member on an SOT, how they perceived the work that we were pushing out, so that we could drive some changes or improvements in the work that we wanted to push out for the next round of SOT members. The listening tour was held between May 4 and June 1 just this last spring. We included 10 stops, 126 participants from SOTs from 85 schools across all seven of our Trustee districts that participated in the listening tour. And across the different sites, we had some larger groups and some very small groups, and there was value in both of those. When we had a

larger group, we got a really broad kind of perspective of what some of the major themes were that people were experiencing in their time on the SOT, but when we got down to some smaller groups, we had the opportunity to go really deeper into what those experiences were. We did find some common themes across most of our meetings, and I'll share those with you in just a minute, and then some of those folks have volunteered to provide us with further detail. We got a lot of detail back from them through emails and phone calls afterwards, so I think continuing to build those relationships with those people who are now engaged in their school communities is something that we have to look forward to as we continue.

Some of the positive things that we found across all of those different 10 locations, those different 10 meetings, across the valley were, number one, the members expressed that the SOT experience was a learning opportunity for them, and they appreciated having the opportunity to learn about how school budgets work, kind of the ins and outs of how decisions are made at the schools, and the challenges of providing more to students with the restricted amount of resources became eye opening for a lot of them. They expressed a greater understanding across the field for some of the challenges that we've faced, and some of the challenges that our principals have been reporting for many years. The second positive thing that was universal is that they expressed an appreciation for the process itself, for the opportunity to express their voice and their thoughts about how the school environment is managed at their individual school. While they didn't always feel like they had enough information to weigh in substantively on decision making at the school, they did believe that the more information that they provided, they would become more and more valuable. Continuing with the theme of their voices being valued, they want to have an impact. That's one of the very first things that all of the members, particularly the parents on the SOTs, shared with us, is that they were appreciative of the opportunity to make an impact in the community at their school level, and they believe that this is a model to allow them to make a difference. That leads me to the final positive thing that we heard from SOT members. They believe that the mix of parents, teachers, licensed and support staff, principals and community that the SOT is made up of now is the right mix to create positive and lasting change. They expressed this at every single meeting, large or small, rural or urban. That message was throughout. The team approach to managing the school, from the perspective of SOT members, is the right approach.

There were also some challenges, opportunities for improvement, that were brought to our attention from the experience of the SOT members through the listening tour. One of those was, primarily, the length of the term of SOT members and time to prepare, and those kind of go hand in hand. I'm not sure whether or not it's because their first term here has been truncated, because we didn't start until December or January; but they all felt like they'd want more time, that they had only had a few months at this point to learn about the decisions that they were being asked to advise on; and they wanted more time to learn and more time to get engaged in that process. They didn't have enough time to prepare. The training came out at them very, very quickly. We were struggling to push the training out quickly and trying to keep in mind that they were struggling to take it all in quickly, and we know that some of that came in at differing rates for differing members of SOTs. We did try to make it clear to them, though, that the length of the term is set by statute, and that's not something we had the ability to change, but Ms. Richards will talk to you a little bit about how many of them intend

to run again for election next year, and we did encourage them to do so. We want them to stay engaged for sure.

The second opportunity for improvement that we gathered from those members was that the role and responsibility of the SOT was not always clear. We recognize that there are some differing expectations about what an SOT is supposed to be doing and what they have the authority to do, and so participants wanted more clarity about expectations in their new role. There are different levels of engagement with the SOTs on the part of principals, which is fine, and the SOTs wanted to know kind of what was okay and what was kind of not okay so that is something that we'll be looking toward in the future.

Next up is something that was a little bit hard to hear; but it came from all levels; and that was a fear of retaliation. And their fear was that, if they were a staff member at the school and they disagreed with the principal, there would be some sort of retaliation, purposeful or not; if they were a parent at the school and they expressed some differing opinion, that there would be some sort of retaliation against the experience for their student, purposeful or not. So, that was definitely difficult for us to hear, and something definitely we'll want to work toward in those relationships with the SOT members as we continue.

The final opportunity for improvement that we heard loud and clear from almost every single person at all of these meetings is that they expressed an interest in connecting with members of other SOTs. I think solving this issue for them might help solve the other issues for them because they'll be able to answer some of these questions for themselves. I can talk to you a little bit about some of the work we're trying to do to engage SOT members from this year in an event that will thank them for their service, and then another event that we're planning for SOT members elected in October that will allow us to make sure they are all provided with some understanding of what the District's kind of goals are in terms of the pledge of achievement, what school goals might be and how they tie those goals to this pledge of achievement, while at the same time allowing them, in maybe some sort of convention type setting, to break off into subsets of SOT members. Maybe the students have a room to talk about their role and how they engage in decision making at school. Maybe secondary SOTs have a chance to get together and talk about their role. We're not too detailed at that level yet, but those are the kinds of things we're talking about to be able to address some of these issues. What we also did, recognizing that we did not get feedback from every SOT member in these tours—it was a real short window of time, within one month that we engaged with these folks, and so we wanted to provide another opportunity for those who could not come, or chose not to come out, to provide us with some feedback. And Rosanne Richards, through the Academic Unit, put out a survey to all the SOT members, and I'll allow Ms. Richards to give you a little summary of that work.

**Rosanne Richards (Director, Instruction Unit, Clark County School District):**

So, as the listening tours were happening at the same time as the survey was happening, as Ms. Ballard stated, for members that could not attend the listening tours, they were able to participate in a survey. What I'd like to tell you today is a little bit about how we got to the survey, what we found out, and then where we're going to move from there. The original date the survey went out was on May 24, to the SOTs' individual members, but in March of 2017,



the school associate superintendents worked together collaboratively to begin drafting potential questions. Once they worked through some questions, we worked with principals, the Central Office, District leaders, our TSC<sup>2</sup> Group, as well as our bargaining units. So, what was really helpful was that the survey was going out to principals, parents, students, and licensed and support staff, so we made sure that when we were drafting the questions, they were equitable, fair and that we would be able to get responses that were able to give us the opportunity to move forward and address everyone's needs. So, the questions were vetted thoroughly before they went out.

On May 24, we did release the survey, and how we did it so that the SOTs could feel that their voices were being heard—the school associate superintendents sent it directly to them. So, with the 16 zones, there are approximately 2,000 SOT members, give or take, because, once again, performance zone 16 is a rural zone; so it does not have as many members; but in any given zone, there are about 130-150 SOT members. So, the survey did go out to every single individual. We ensured that it was translated into Spanish as well as ensuring that anyone who did not have a computer would have a hard copy, and we worked with them directly through the Academic Unit. We also sent out reminders because, once again, we wanted their voice to be heard, and we wanted to give them the opportunity. With that being said, we had 1,038 responses. Being that it was closer to the end of the year, and as we mentioned earlier, it was short notice in terms of going from January to May, they didn't have a lot of time to do their work. We're really comfortable with the results. Because—I'm actually delighted to say that they were quite positive as a whole; and we will go through some of them; but it really gave us insight as to where we need to go.

So, we did have some underlying themes as well, when you go through them, and I will tell you that, while I will give you some data points today. There was a narrative section as well, and we're still analyzing that data, so we don't have the narratives. But if we go through the positive themes, overall in terms of opinions, we had 92 percent positive results, that they felt that they were heard at the table. They like the work. They want to be involved in the work. Coming into it, we did develop trainings, but they were short and they were overview trainings. And now that we know that, we realize that, if 92 percent of the opinions were valued and they were being heard at the table, now we know that we can actually take it to the next step. In terms of consensus and collaboration, out of 1,038 individuals who responded, and once again, we're including students as well, 1,000 individuals felt that the SOT was a collaborate project. They felt that they came to the meetings they knew what was going on; they were informed; they wanted to do the work; and they wanted to actually hear more about what was happening at the school. In terms of collaboration, we had 93 percent positive responses that they thought it was collaborative, which is really an important role here because when you think about the SOT, there are voting members and there are nonvoting members so to ensure that the school leader is running the meeting appropriately where everyone can be heard as well as actually getting to the heart of the work. Availability of information was an overall 91 percent. I will tell you, in the past 6 months, we have had meetings between Central Office and our office as well as Ms. Ballard's office. Any SOT member can call directly to the office or send an email with a question. We ensured that customer service was there because once again, it was so brand new to everyone. We didn't want them to feel that they started a committee; they're on a committee; and they were not actually going to be understood, heard or that there was confusion. We wanted to ensure that, whatever the law said, we were doing

it for them as well as with them in building it. Preparation for school planning: what we did on this one, we were really trying to look at because their role was to advise about the school operation plan, we wanted to ensure that they felt informed enough to answer and to vote and to decide where the money should be going and approving of the budgets, and with that we had 91 percent of the members who felt that they were well prepared, informed and ready to move forward with the school budgets.

At this time, as we continue to learn the positive things, we felt that, as always, there's always room for improvement. As we take the information that we recently just started to go through, and like I said there are some narratives that we are going through, the key component was the understanding of the budget process, the knowledge of the law and the plans to participate next year. All that is umbrellaed under one big area of improvement that we feel that we need to hit. That is the marketing of the SOTs. So yes, it's an open forum, and they're teams, they go there and vote. But we need to ensure that all members at the school know that they can go to those meetings, that they can speak at public comment, that they can attend the meetings even if they're not part of the SOT. So, we really feel like that's the umbrella where these three areas of improvement will fall under, because once it's marketed correctly and they understand that, even if they're not a member of the team, we want to hear what they have to say as well as the members of the team. So we really want to work with our Communications Department, as well as internally with schools, to ensure that that is happening. How are we getting it out there, are we announcing it at sporting events? Besides it being posted for 3 days, does the entire school understand that it's posted 3 days in advance and really getting more of the community at the meetings?

With that being said, for the first year of doing this and beginning it in January 2017, the results were positive. But the area of understanding the budget process was the one area that we feel we will work on because, as a whole, 762 individuals felt that they understood the budget process, but 292 didn't, and that is—we originally had an overview training, and it went fast, but now we need to build the tier two training. We need to move on the budget training so those 292 people feel that they can actually make decisions that will benefit themselves, as well as the school, as well as everyone in the community. That is definitely a goal the Academic Unit is working towards because, once again, we can't expect them to be successful in the role if we didn't give the tools and the resources to be successful in the role. So it is our job to find those 292 people and ensure that they feel comfortable in the budgeting process.

With that, and I will say this is based on feedback from the Clark County Education Association (CCEA), the knowledge of the law, so when we were vetting the questions, CCEA had brought to the attention of the Academic Unit that—does everyone understand the law? And we assumed that everyone understood the law. But I will tell you that 91 percent did. So we did our job in getting the message out there, but now we need to once again work on that additional 9 percent to understand what their role is. When they're in an SOT meeting, we want to make sure that everyone understands their roles; because, once again, there is a voting process involved. So that was an area that also went to, in alignment with what we found on the listening tours, like I said, the budgeting and knowledge of the law, and more importantly, the plans to participate next year. So, as this is brand new, we weren't really quite sure how people would feel about it, because, once again, 6 months into it and they have to

run again if they want to. But the great number that I'd like to share with you is that 860 participants out of the 1,038 want to participate in election processes. So they want to run again and participate, and hopefully be elected by October 1, which is a 94 percent retention rate. I will state that some of the narratives have mentioned that they would like to see this as a 2-year term, possibly, or at least longer on it to ensure that they feel that they're doing the right work for the school. Because the positive comments that we're seeing is that they started, they felt right when they were getting into the heart of the work, and then their term was over. Once again, we know it was short, but we realize that if people want to come back, then we are doing the right things at the sites.

I would like to once again just reflect on what Mr. Skancke said earlier, the real work has to get done, so we now know that there is a face to the SOT. The good thing is that we have built the foundation, and we realize what's happening at schools is the right work, what's happening with the community is the right work, but now we really need to hone in on the specific work, which is getting everyone to the same playing field. We don't want 9 percent not feeling comfortable with the work, so that is the area that we really will engage in for the future. With that being said, I think overall SOT members now feel comfortable. And knowing that, with the retention rate, they feel comfortable knowing that there's someone there to answer their question, as well as listening to their voice and when we talk to principals, and all school leaders for that matter, not just principals. They feel that it's a sounding board for them as well, too, in terms of suggestion for their school site. Sometimes when you're a leader, you don't want to make the decision all alone, so it's also nice to hear from other avenues. So, the collaboration is really there. It's effective and it's working, and we've even received comments from students about how they were unsure, they just got picked, they weren't sure if they could do it and they can't wait to hopefully do it again. So we realize that at the student level too the SOT is the best method.

**Ms. Ballard:**

With that, before I close, I don't want to miss the opportunity to share some of this work with those who are engaged in it just as deeply as Rosanne and I are. First of all, the Superintendent, Deputy Wooden and the District leadership team have been remarkably supportive. The Board of Trustees has provided us with very real feedback, in terms of ensuring that we are focusing on the students and focusing on the imperatives of the Board of Trustees, and we appreciate that encouragement. The consulting team, TSC<sup>2</sup> Group, Mr. Skancke, Michael Vannozzi, Brian Knudsen and Andrew Doughman are with us every day, and their work is throughout this report to you today so I wanted to express our appreciation for all their support and their teamwork in this as well. And actually, that concludes our remarks, unless you have any further questions for us.

**Mr. Evans:**

Just a couple of quick follow up questions, in the spirit of what we've talked about as far as making sure certain things move forward. First of all, I want to say thank you for the SOT effort, as well as thank you for doing the survey. It gives us both empirical as well as anecdotal information we need to continue that valuable effort. So, to that end, the first question is, you mentioned the fact that the team composition appears to be correct, so what are we doing to

ensure that the team composition is institutionalized, meaning documented, so that we make sure that we continue that practice?

**Ms. Ballard:**

Luckily, that is documented for us. The requirements of the makeup of the SOT are very specific in the law. It's been a long time, half are required to be parents, there's a very specific requirement of the number of licensed staff, also the number of support staff, the principal's role as a nonvoting member so that this SOT can serve as an advisory committee to the principal. The specificity in the law is not something that we have taken, or even attempted to take, any liberties with, and the work that CCEA and the Education Support Employees Association did to ensure those elections took place last year, and again coming this fall, also support us in maintaining that kind of level. I should also mention the Parent Teacher Association doing the elections for parents at schools with Parent Teacher Associations. So, the members of the SOT as a whole hold us accountable for those ratios, as laid out very specifically in the law, and the processes in place are built in to support that as well.

**Mr. Evans:**

And then my other follow up question would be, you made mention of the 2-year terms, is that something that's open for discussion? Would that have to go back to a Legislative Session, or how could that potentially be addressed?

**Ms. Ballard:**

It would have to go back through the Legislature because the term length is also very clearly spelled out in the law, but, like I said during the compliance portion, when we create a report on October 1, part of that report is recommendations for regulations or future legislation, and I predict that that will probably be a part of those recommendations.

**Mr. Evans:**

And then my last one is just, in terms of documenting and, again, institutionalizing the roles and responsibilities for engagement, I assume, but I'd like to ask the question and get it on the record, that the TSC<sup>2</sup> Group will be involved in the manual you mentioned in getting the documentation of the roles and responsibilities for engagement to move forward?

**Ms. Ballard:**

I would assume the same. We also documented quite a bit of those roles and responsibilities and some of those processes for the SOTs in January, before January, December really. They are all posted, and here's another opportunity for me to market our website, at [reorg.ccsd.net](http://reorg.ccsd.net), where we house all of our information. Based on some of the feedback from the SOT tour, we are actually creating a page within that website specifically geared toward providing information for SOT members. They asked us for an SOT page, and that also actually came from the recommendation of Member/Trustee Cranor, so it's nice that those

recommendations align, and those are in the works right now. It should be up within a couple of weeks or so.

**Mr. Evans:**

Thank you very much.

**Ms. Courtney:**

I just wanted to go back to S.B. 178, for Mr. Goudie. My concern is that, because I went and checked, the school year's going to start 2 weeks early, and then that money won't be there for schools to use. That's for our neediest kids, so I would hope that we could do something sooner for those kids in the bottom 25 percent, so I just want to see how the budget will reflect that, because it's important to get that money there so folks can use it, and that was the intention of it, for the weighted funding formula.

**Nicole Rourke (Director, Community and Government Relations, Interim Associate Superintendent, Clark County School District):**

I haven't been in front of this group before; I've been a little busy up north for 4 months. So, with S.B. 178, we were involved in the discussion during the Session, and I did want to give you a brief update. We did just get guidance from Superintendent Canavero, there will be a regulation hearing July 31 on the use of those funds, so we're kind of waiting for the State to give us some guidance in that area before we commit to processes and rules of our own, so we did want to let you know that. The funds are going to be distributed later this month, is my understanding, but again, we're waiting for guidance, so I did want to let you know that. Certainly our intent, I think, and Mr. Goudie can speak to this, is to get it off to schools as soon as possible, but every time we go through a Session, and new bills and new funding are authorized, we go through a little bit of a delay just trying to get things set up and stood up properly, so we wanted to let you know that.

**Mr. Goudie:**

And yes, just to confirm, that's when we're actually going to have it in the official budget itself, because that's for the next date that the budgets are due, but we are working as quickly as possible to get it administratively processed.

**Ms. Courtney:**

Thank you so much because it's important to get those funds there for those kids. I mean, we worked hard to get that there, so I appreciate it. I had one more question about S.B. 369, the school climate bill, and that's also important in terms of people having concerns who are on the SOT, or even staff members who have concerns or parents, about the climate at schools, so how will that be implemented and what does that look like?

**Ms. Ballard:**

The bill's on our radar. Having been so tightly focused over the last couple of weeks on the 80-20 work, we've not laid out a plan of action to make sure that the processes we have in place allow for the requirements of that bill, but I can assure you that it will be.

**Ms. Cranor:**

I have a question from the audience that they Tweeted to us, wondering if the respondents were disaggregated at all and do we know how many parents responded to the SOT survey?

**Ms. Richards:**

I may have it with me.

**Mr. Christenson:**

And while you're at it, do you know what the total response as a percentage of the total SOT members is?

**Ms. Richards:**

So, I will tell you what I do have with me. There is quite a bit of data that we have not gone through, but 27.5 percent of parents have responded, 13.1 percent with principals, students was 1.2 percent, support staff was 12.3, community members was 2.5, and licensed personnel were 43.4 percent. So overall, just under 50 percent was the staff, the licensed teachers at the school. Like I said, we are going through quite a bit of data. We're trying to break it down by individual zone, by school, as much as we can, but that is what I have overall here now.

**Ms. Cranor:**

So, just to clarify, of the 1,038, 27.5 percent of those were parents?

**Ms. Richards:**

Yes.

**Ms. Cranor:**

Thank you.

**Mr. Husson:**

I would just like to go back to the 80-20 discussion and put one last thing on the record, and then I'll be done with it. And I just want to make it clear for anybody listening today that I personally was an advocate for the exercise that you all went through, the accounting

exercise of determining where dollars are being spent today and whether or not they're affected at the school, so I don't want anybody to misinterpret my goal here. I do believe that you're following the processes correctly. I do think that you're doing it in a manner that you have to do it. I don't think that we could get to the true autonomy we needed to get to without first determining where we are today. That being said, I think the questions offered up in the panel today and questions from people in the community about where we will end up are valid. I take Mr. Skancke's comments to heart. I know that we're not there yet, but I think that there needs to be some clarity in the discussion around the notion that, if a principal or anybody in the building decides that they don't want autonomy, that's going to be okay. I think that impression was left in the presentation today. I don't know if it was intended to be, and I'll leave that up to you to answer, but ultimately, and we do know this, that the intent of the law, not just the spirit, but the intent of the law, was to have autonomy at those schools and to have the decisions made, and for them to have the resources to be able to make those decisions. So to just say that the money is being spent on kids in the school, or resources in the school, is not good enough, ultimately. It's what we need to know now, but it can't be the end place for this discussion. And I just wanted that on the record.

**Ms. Ballard:**

I can assure you that we are along the same line of thinking, and that the leadership of the District, which I think I can speak to pretty confidently, is in agreement as well, and we are committed on the I Team to recognizing, number one, that we're not finished, we have just begun. We realize we finally have a place to start, not that we have achieved a goal at this point, so I'm looking forward to the work that comes in alignment with what you all have said today, and the questions I'm trying to capture so that I can make sure that we're considering all of your questions as we move forward in the work that we're just beginning with.

**Mr. Husson:**

Excellent, thank you.

**Mr. Skancke:**

If I could, just again for context, I can assure the CIC and everyone inside and outside of the room that the work that we will do will be in complete compliance with A.B. 469. To your point, Mr. Husson, this is the first phase of this, and we have a long way to go. To use a musical term, the conductor has not stepped off the podium just yet, and so I think, Mr. Husson, your point was well taken, that we have to go through this exercise to get to the next phase. I took this out of my testimony earlier, but I do want to share this with you. I can assure you all that the meetings that we have between the I Team and the division heads and our team are not the most pleasurable experiences for everyone. Those meetings can be very contentious; those meetings can be very difficult. The Superintendent and I do not agree on everything, trust me. In fact, I think if Superintendent Skorkowsky were here, he'd probably say we don't agree on anything. But there's one thing that we all do agree on; this work has to get done. It has to be in a position by October 31 that it can move on past this, that we have to get to more autonomy in the schools; that principals, teachers, parents and support staff and even the kids need to be making these decisions. And the money will move and follow the student

and go to the schools. It will not happen today. I'm sorry, I'm going to report to you all today—this is the sad news portion—it's not happening today. But I'm confident that we will be there by the end of the term of our contract. These individuals in my team work long hours, and we battle each other. It's not a pleasurable experience some days, but at the end of the day, I want you to keep in perspective that we've gained a lot of ground in the last 100 days, and with your comments and your input; and we want you to stay on us and make us accountable, and keep us accountable to the work that needs to get done to the letter of the law. If we are not doing that, please call me. Pick up the phone, call myself, a member of our team, and let us know, but we will be in compliance with A.B. 469, both in the spirit and the letter of the law, and the work that we need to get done will get done. It will be challenging, but we'll get there. So, your input today is valuable, and it's been very helpful and very beneficial, so with that, I'll conclude my remarks.

**Ms. Flores:**

How are you going to be able to deal with that fear of retaliation that some of the SOT members have?

**Ms. Ballard:**

I'm not sure I have a final answer to that yet. It's a question we keep asking. I think the primary way that we are hoping to address that is through just encouraging the climate changes going on in the schools, the relationships between the SOTs and the principals, encouraging to engage the principals with the partners Dr. Barton talked about, making sure that we are together when we speak about leading with teams, things along those lines. It's not something that we have a project planned out quite yet, but we're looking forward to tackling it for sure.

**Ms. Courtney:**

So, the retaliation piece can be addressed in the bill that I spoke about earlier, and I think that really has to be looked at, and the plan addressed so that we can move forward, because it's important. There are too many people who have told us, and my concern with the survey was that we had half the people answer it and I know statistically how things work, but I also know people didn't answer things because they were afraid to answer things, or they had concerns, and so, we need to make sure retaliation doesn't happen based on what folks do on the SOTs, for anyone.

**Ms. Ballard:**

Thank you very much.

**Mr. Christenson:**

I'd like to turn over this portion of the meeting over to Vice Chair Husson to monitor. I wanted to offer some comments today about challenges that I'm seeing as we go forward in the reorganization, not just with the reorganization, but for what I hope will be better outcomes for students in our community based on some of the experiences that I've seen so far.



**Mr. Husson:**

Thank you, Chairman Christenson. We're moving now to item V(E) of the agenda, challenges ahead regarding the reorganization of large school districts.

**Mr. Christenson:**

While I chair the CIC, I am here testifying today in my capacity as an active participant in the K-12 education reform in our community (Exhibit F). I began this journey 4 years ago when Tom Skancke, his team and I created the Las Vegas Education Council through the Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance (LVGEA). The Las Vegas Education Council is a group of business and education leaders formed to provide recommendations to the Legislature to improve K-12 education in our community. I co-chaired that group with Terri Janison, a long-time advocate for K-12 education. Vice Chair Husson was also part of that group. Our recommendations were submitted to the Governor, and all of them were included in the education reform package passed by the Legislature in 2015, which ultimately resulted in A.B. 394 and the Clark County Schools Achieve initiative. Through that work, Mr. Skancke, others and I on the LVGEA Board successfully lobbied to get the business commerce tax passed, which was to be used for education funding. Unfortunately, the four Assemblymen who were able to move to yes all lost their next election, but they did the right thing, which was to lead. Subsequently, Superintendent Skorkowsky asked me to co-chair the Executive Advisory Committee at the District, which was a team made up of District and business leaders. Through our work, our Committee came up with recommendations to improve purchasing practices at the District, which Kim Wooden co-chaired along with Hugh Anderson, a wealth manager in town. We developed a process for evaluating the efficacy of programs used in the classroom, which I co-chaired with Kristine Minnich. In addition, a management tool was created to analyze student outcomes in various schools, compared to the budget at those schools, commonly known as the return on investment project, which was co-chaired by our Vice Chair, Brent Husson. I've traveled with the Clark County Teachers Association to attend the National Education Association annual meeting in Washington, D.C., and I have a positive relationship working with them on many education issues in Southern Nevada. I chaired the SAGE Commission on K-12 education, and our report was submitted to the Governor in January. And finally, I was appointed to be Chair of the CIC by the Legislative Advisory Committee on Education last fall. I should also mention that I'm married to a teacher, and the best educator I know.

The point of going through these bona fides is to establish that I'm not just a businessman casually observing K-12 education, but rather a passionate advocate to ensure that kids in our community get the education they deserve. There are others who are working hard on this effort outside of CCSD, some are even in this room, and many have done as much or more than I have.

My comments today are not intended to be critical, but more to begin to explore other avenues, some outside the purview of the CIC, which are going to be problems going forward for the Clark County Schools Achieve initiative to attain its full potential. It's hard to believe that the CIC has been at this for 8 months now. The consultant's contract expires on October 31. I believe that the CIC will be abandoned at or around that time, and my thoughts are

starting to turn to how to ensure the sustainability of this effort. I have to tell you that in my nearly 45-year career, I've never encountered a more difficult, more frustrating or more challenging task than working to reorganize CCSD. I choose not to look back, but rather to focus on what lies ahead. There's been real movement in this effort over the last couple months with the passage of A.B. 469, which now codifies the requirements for the reorganization into law. As presented today by the District, it now looks like the reorganization will meet its initial requirements under A.B. 469 for the upcoming school year. Strategic budgets are in place; the letter of the 80-20 requirement has been met; the SOTs are in place; significant training is in process for this effort. We're not in an ideal place, but much work has been done.

My concerns have begun to revolve around what happens next. For the last 8 months, I've had multiple daily conversations with people in the community about the reorganization. One of the challenges facing K-12 education reform is that everyone is an expert. Everyone knows how to fix K-12 education, and they feel free to share those opinions without necessarily feeling the burden of having a full picture of the current status, challenges or facts around the Clark County Schools Achieve initiative. That's not to say there aren't some good ideas out there, there are.

Last week, while I was talking with a well-respected businessman in town, who was sharing his ideas around K-12 education reform. With nearly every idea he threw out, I explained what was stopping the District from implementing his suggestion. After a while he said, "Glenn, do you have a list of these stoppers, so that we can all focus on how to free up the changes that need to be made?" It was a great idea. I'll share many of these stoppers with you today, with the understanding that, at this point, my goal is to provide an objective list, not take sides or necessarily defend or recommend any position. While I hate using this phrase, to solve these challenges, it will take a village. And it will take leadership to bring all the parties to the table to create sustainable reform that we're looking for the achieve better student outcomes. Without prioritizing any of these stoppers, here are some examples: District governance, the Legislature, CCSD cultural challenges, financial obstacles, disincentives for finding financial efficiencies, internal and external communication, and a lack of management tools needed to do the job. In making these comments, it's important to note up front that substantial progress has been made in many of these areas. To use a development analogy, we have built a good foundation, but we still need to finish building the house.

Let's take a look at some of these stoppers. As in any effort of this magnitude, it starts with leadership. While the Clark County Schools Achieve effort got off to a very rocky start with the Trustees, the tone at the top has improved significantly over time. This is critical if the effort is to be successful. However, the initial negative response by the Trustees sent the wrong signal throughout the organization. The Board of Trustees has a responsibility to voice their concerns, but unfortunately, there are still some who consistently talk about why things can't get done with the reorganization, which is counterproductive. The Trustees are passionate, informed and committed to the institution. They have one of the hardest jobs in local government. But we need more skill sets on the Board to provide oversight for the second largest organization in the State, after MGM Resorts, beyond their respected experience on the Board of Trustees, like members with complex financial management backgrounds, members with firsthand experience with managing large organizations,

members with crisis management experience, members with experience in public communications. These are skills that typically exist on boards of major organizations. The District is bigger than Boyd Gaming, and if you look at their Board, the skills necessary for the trusteeship of CCSD are at least equal to, and perhaps even go beyond, the responsibilities of board members in publicly traded companies. I say this with great respect for the Trustees. Through this process, I've come to know and appreciate many of them. Theirs is a tough job, and they need help to do it, but when reaching out for advice on these and other matters, the Trustees have at times received bad counsel. Suing the State around A.B. 394, for example, was bad counsel.

Because of term limits, a new generation of Trustees will soon be taking their place on the Board. Trustee Cranor is stepping down, Trustee Edwards is term limited, and Trustees Garvey, Wright and Young will be term limited in 3 years. Losing their experience will be a challenge, but looking forward, the community needs to find candidates who possess these necessary skill sets. Ultimately, I believe this will mean compensating the trustee position in a way that is reflective of their contributions to our community.

There continues to be a lack of clear delineation of responsibilities between the Board and senior leadership. The delineation of responsibilities must be resolved to ensure everyone's on the same page and working to achieve the same goals. There have been several matters where the senior leadership at the District has not been transparent with the community. Given the nature of the empowerment model, more transparency will be a natural and welcome result. And given the propensity to focus on compliance, there have been times when the District leadership has been slow to act. The time taken to approve the Chief Operating Officer position and filling the Chief Financial Officer position are good examples. The empowerment model will require timely decisions to be made, with changing conditions. Finally, the lynchpin for the empowerment model is to have strong leadership in both the assistant superintendent and principal roles. Any ineffective leaders in these roles must be developed to improve their performance, or they must be replaced.

Partisan politics has been a real challenge in this effort. Somehow, we have to get past the partisanship. The initial concept of the CIC and hiring the consultant was very controversial, and the original approval by the Advisory Committee was split down party lines. That fact sent a message, and was one of the things that delayed the timing for beginning the reorganization effort in earnest. That said, the bipartisan effort to pass A.B. 469 and the visual of all the senior leadership in the Legislature appearing together at the table to endorse the bill was incredible, and frankly, may be the single catalyst that allowed the reorganization to get to this point today. We need more of that cooperation. There are good ideas on both sides of the aisle, and our State needs leadership from both parties for true education reform.

It seems every 2 years the Legislators get together and decide how to "fix" K-12 education and set down new mandates. This causes the District to be in constant turmoil. New mandates are required before the efficacy of the old mandates has been determined. It appears many of these ideas are generated from the constituents who are frustrated with poor results at the District. In a perfect world, the District would drive the agenda with a goal of improving student outcomes, as well as take responsibility for the agenda. In addition, there are times when the Legislature sets new requirements on the District without providing

necessary funding for those mandates. For example, the State passed a law a few years ago mandating fire extinguishers in school buses—a worthy cause. But this caused the District hundreds of thousands of dollars in extra expenditures. Another example is the law that requires schools to maintain a supply of EpiPens in case of student emergencies. Again, a very worthy cause, but the cost is in hundreds of thousands of dollars a year to the District.

Culture is a crucial part, a critical part, of any successful organization. Over the course of the last 8 months, we've emphasized a critical requirement for changing the culture in the District. Ultimately, it's not sufficient that the District has met the letter of the law in A.B. 469; It must embrace the spirit of the law as well. We're seeing more and more evidence of this happening every day. This is not a completely new concept. When I attended the National Education Association meeting with the Clark County Education Association, the theme was around improving climate and culture. There's been some progress, but there's a lot more to do. In a recent op-ed piece, I talked about the climate of fear in the District: fear of losing jobs, fear of losing relationships and the inability to influence decisions. One of the goals of the reorganization is to reduce fear and empower employees to do what is best for students. Some have embraced this new culture of empowerment, but some have not. I think the opportunity exists to get past a compliance culture and to embrace the empowerment culture, which I believe will unlock a great deal of pent up intellectual capital in the District. After all, the District has the most educated work force in the entire State. Those great minds have a lot of great ideas stored in them. Implicit in the empowerment model is a need to develop a customer service mentality: customer service at the school level by considering the needs of the SOTs, customer service at the assistant superintendent level by helping solve challenges at the school level, and customer service at the senior leadership level and Trustee level.

As I mentioned earlier, the empowerment model will need to embrace the concept of transparency much more readily. That includes working with the bargaining units to find a way to stop the dance of the lemons, or the reassignment of inadequate teachers, and passing the trash, or how to address personnel accused of improper behavior. Again, there's movement to transparency, but the District has a long way to go. I believe that the reorganization will help that process.

When I say financial obstacles, most people will jump to the conclusion that I'm talking about money for K-12 education. I'm not. That's a discussion for another day. One big financial obstacle to education reform is that the District seems to consistently have challenges with labor relations. As a consequence, the District frequently loses when it goes to arbitration with its bargaining units. This is an observation, not a comment on the propriety of the arbitration process. I'm not interested in getting between management and labor; that's between the two parties. What it does go to is a need for better working relationships so that labor and/or management do not feel forced to go to arbitration. Last year alone, the District lost another \$30,000,000 in arbitration awards. This may mean reexamining who's doing the negotiation for the District, and who's responsible for the labor relations. I'm not saying that better labor relations are solely the District's responsibility. I'm saying that 85 percent or more of the cost of K-12 education revolves around compensation. Both sides need to do a better job around what our kids get for those dollars, and need to consider the impact on the District of these negotiations on a more holistic basis.

A ticking time bomb was flushed out last week when it was noted that the unassigned ending general fund balance of the District was only 1.25 percent of general fund revenues. The goal is two percent, but that goal hasn't been met since 2009. This percentage directly impacts the District's credit outlook, and potentially its credit rating, which in turn impacts the cost of borrowing for the District. Driving up the cost of borrowing means fewer dollars available for the classroom. There already is another \$34,000,000 deficit identified, which is projected to impact the 2017-2018 budget. Roughly half of that is from a recent arbitration loss. Again, I'm not making a value judgment, but the fact of the matter is that last year's ending unassigned general fund balance is only about \$38,000,000, and it's only budgeted to increase to \$40,000,000 next year. Even at that level, the unassigned ending general fund balance is only 1.75 percent of the general fund revenues, not the 2 percent goal. Let's put this in perspective. The District has huge capital needs—\$8,000,000,000 in new schools alone. Sooner or later these needs must be addressed. If the District's cost of capital goes up by 1 percent, or 100 basis points, each \$1,000,000,000 borrowed means \$10,000,000 annually in higher interest costs to the District. None of that money goes to students.

Which leads me to the next stopper, which is built-in disincentives to find financial efficiencies in the District. Again, I'm not making any value judgments at this point. One major perception within the District is that whenever savings may be found, the bargaining units simply grab the money in the next arbitration, and the money never gets to the schools, so why bother? The second challenge is that the base State funding per student, or the Distributive School Account, relates to costs at the various Districts, so conceivably, lower costs could mean lower funding from the State, so there's no incentive to lower costs. Third is a perception that the State may determine that the District doesn't need the money if they find cost efficiencies, a "use it or lose it" mentality. And finally, the culture has historically been focused on compliance, not empowerment, so no one's really asked the department leadership to reduce costs in any meaningful ways.

A major concern for the empowerment effort is around external and internal communication. My hope is that having Kirsten Searer back on board will help this situation. Like so many things in this effort, there's been substantial improvement in external communication, but there's still a long way to go. The information must be credible, objective and with a lot more transparency. The internal communication effort also needs to be enhanced. Again, despite significant improvement, many in the District don't have a full awareness of the reorganization and what the empowerment model means to them or their students.

So much of the success of the District going forward, in terms of student outcomes, will be determined by the ability to take data and turn it into information needed for good and timely decision making. Unfortunately, the new human capital management system will not be fully functional for 18 to 24 months. It's critical that this special allocation by the Legislature be viewed as a good investment on their part. This was a one-time shot, and if the District can demonstrate a strong return on investment, they may find a more sympathetic ear at the Legislature the next time. Today, the District told us they have technically achieved the 80-20 mandate for the allocation of funds to the individual schools versus Central Services. This is a big accomplishment, but the next step is to develop an autonomy model at the individual school level, and then wring out inefficiencies in the system to push those savings to the school level. There's a lot to do to be in compliance with the spirit of the law.

And finally, I've avoided talking about running the District like a business. One of my pet peeves is when people who have never worked in a business tell me, "You can't run an academic institution like a business." I'm not sure I know what that means, but there are policies, practices and procedures that work in all successful organizations, including schools, things like defining success, establishing metrics, establishing financial budgets, goals and accountability, pay for performance, peer review, return on investment, developing a sense of urgency with changing circumstances. Embracing these concepts, developing tools to measure them and communicating the results will help improve our student outcomes.

The Clark County Schools Achieves initiative has several derivatives. There's a big interest in the community to participate in improving K-12 education. The formation of 350-plus SOTs with thousands of representatives on these teams is one example. The business mentorship program, where business people are helping to mentor leaders in the District to navigate this huge change, is another one. The District employees are moving mountains to make the Clark County Schools Achieve initiative happen. Those naysayers who said there was no way the District could make this happen for the upcoming school year were wrong. There still is much to do, and the nature of the empowerment model is that the District will never be done. Each year, there'll be changing circumstances at each school, and the District will have to adapt to those changing conditions. At least now, a credible foundation is in place to continue improving student outcomes.

In closing, for just a second, can we all step back and appreciate the work that's been done thus far? Let's step away from all the challenges we've had to get here, the big challenges still ahead, and take a minute to understand that we're in the middle of making history in our community. We're doing things that no one has ever done to this magnitude. We're daring to be bold and attempt to improve our K-12 education system and outcomes for our students. Through this effort, we have the potential to meaningfully change the lives of our students. To the Board of Trustees, this process has been difficult for them, but recent comments by some of you in support of the effort are welcome and needed. Thank you. To the senior leadership and the employees at the District who have worked literally around the clock, weekends and holidays to make this reorganization happen, thank you. To the community voices who have been invaluable in this effort, the voices here, at the Legislature, our SOTs, the parent groups, these voices have and will lead us to a better product, thank you. Thanks to this Council. Your participation has been invaluable to the Clark County Schools Achieve initiative. Now that the effort has picked up momentum as a result of the passing of [A.B. 469](#), I plan to engage each of you more fully. I try to be respectful of your time, and now that we are at a point where we have been able to overcome many obstacles, your expertise can be even more impactful in this effort. Finally, I want to thank Tom Skancke and his team at TSC<sup>2</sup>, Michael Vannozzi, Andrew Doughman, Brian Knudsen. These guys have been in the trenches every day. They have a passion to make this effort work. They've been great partners in the effort, and if I had to choose one word to describe them, it would be "relentless." They've overcome a lot, they've hung in there when they could have quit, and our community will benefit from their work. Thank you, Mr. Vice Chairman, I am able to respond to questions.

**Mr. Husson:**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your comments. I would like to just take a minute to then say thank you. Your bona fides in the beginning of the presentation only scratched the surface of that which you have done for our community, so just in general, you deserve a round of applause. For the work you've done here, I think it's really clear the leadership that you provide and the fact that we probably wouldn't be getting any of this done if not for you, so personally I want to say thanks. In addition, though, I had some thoughts about a few of the comments you made. I don't want to go into them because I think maybe some of the members might do that for me, so before I make my comments, I'll ask any members of the committee if they have anything to say or ask of Chairman Christenson.

**Ms. Cranor:**

I want to say thank you, and I think I do have the authority to thank you on behalf of the Board of Trustees. There's an experience that happens once you get involved enough in K-12 education, in which people start to view you as part of the problem. That's part of the risk of getting involved and trying to help kids succeed, and we have seen you shoulder that well, and actually in an inspiring way, and we thank you for not backing off once that started to happen. You are an asset to us as a Board, and you are an asset to our community that just won't ever be felt, I think, and I think that part of the fact that you've had that experience and what it's like to start to really be involved enough in K-12 to start experiencing the difficulties and complexities of it. I think you'll agree with me that there is something that we could add as possibly a stopper. Maybe not quite a stopper, but something that we could call upon our community to contribute to this effort of reform in general. And that is, that any time we start to talk about K-12 and start to forward our ideas about what can be better, we need to ask ourselves a question. In the comments that I'm making, am I either directly or indirectly telling someone who is devoting themselves to children's lives that they are hurting kids? If we can stop implying that and stop causing people who are devoting themselves to kids the kind of pain that occurs with that, we can stop interfering with the kind of cognition and strategic thinking that is needed in order to move forward. People who roll up their sleeves and put their lives into helping young people reach their potential; put themselves into a situation that cannot be understood by people who don't do it, and the kind of clear thinking and strategic thinking and joining in on reform efforts that are authentically positive and that will lead to something good. That kind of thinking is made more possible if our community will avoid creating pain in the minds of the people who are devoting themselves to this work, and so, if I could, I would add that to the things that you're calling for here, that we ask for a change in our community's cultural approach to K-12 education. And thank you for shouldering well the difficulty and the complexity that happens once you roll up your sleeves far enough and get far enough into this work to experience that yourself. Thank you for it.

**Mr. Husson:**

Thank you, Member Cranor. Anybody else from the Committee?

**Mr. Woodward:**

Chair Christenson, where do we go from here, in your opinion? The contract is up October 31. Will we have people's boots on the ground every day in the offices working towards this? As a committed member of the community, and not as the Chair of this Council, where do we go from here?

**Mr. Christenson:**

That's why I think it's important to outline what some of these obstacles are. In my business career, I found it very helpful if I had a problem to just list all the things that I needed to help do to solve those problems. I firmly believe that we can achieve much greater, much better outcomes for our students, but it is going to take everybody being engaged. I recognize some of my comments could be controversial to certain folks in the room and otherwise, but I think, if you don't recognize the problem, you can't solve it. I am concerned, post-October 31, that there has been enough enculturation of the empowerment model within the District. I see every day where there are improvements in that area. I'm really impressed with what these folks have been able to do. Criticisms that I might have had a year or two ago about the District, a lot of those things are being addressed. I'm very excited about it. But here's where the whole thing hits the—we need to keep the end goal in place, and it's important for student outcomes that, today, for example, I read that CNBC listed the best places to do business in the country, and Nevada came in 38. I guess that's okay, but there's a number of ways and criteria and metrics that were used. One of them was workforce, and they ranked us 50. One of them was education, and they ranked us 50. The other one had to do with technology and innovation, I don't know. We're doing a lot in that area between Tesla and the drone programs and other things that we're doing here, but to build the state that we really want, we're going to have to have a very solid K-12 education. That's how I got involved in this through the Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance. Mr. Skancke and I felt that this was a critical part because 35 percent of the companies that aren't coming here, aren't coming here because of our education system; K-12 all the way up through our highest graduate level programs.

So, while we're fighting, and to your point, Trustee Cranor, we feel it necessary from time to time to say bad things about other folks who have good intentions, we need to get over that; we need to be able to sit down at the table and thoughtfully go through things. There are a lot of great ideas out there; we just have to get over where the ideas came from. If you're a Democrat, just because a Republican suggested it doesn't mean it's a bad idea, and vice versa. I'm dead serious, I don't know what would have happened if those four leaders hadn't come to the table. We might still be fighting about A.B. 469. So, at any rate, that's a lot longer than you wanted, but I am optimistic that we can do things, but it's going to take a lot broader thinking than many folks have expressed thus far.

**Mr. Evans:**

I'll be as succinct as possible. First of all, thank you, Vice Chair, and thank you, Chair Christenson. I appreciate the ability and the opportunity to serve on this Council. In addition to that, I also appreciate the fact that you engaged our Chamber for two reasons. First of all, education is something that's very important to me personally, and many of my members. It's



the great equalizer, is what I was taught coming up in some challenging social economic environments. What I also appreciate, and our members appreciate, is the fact that there's a direct tie and correlation between education and economic development and achievement, so again, I applaud you for your leadership, and welcome the opportunity to be part of the solution and what's next.

**Mr. Husson:**

Anyone else? Seeing nobody else, I just have a couple, maybe one question. I'm curious, I wasn't expecting to start to think beyond the October 31 deadline today, but now that you've brought it up, I do have some thoughts about that and I'm curious what yours are. The reorganization is seen, I think, by a lot of us in the work as "the work," but outside of this, my organization, Nevada Succeeds, we see the reorganization as part of the work that needs to be done to solve the issues that plague us in Nevada around education. We see it as a beginning of creating the platform, or the foundation, for things to change that need to change. We don't see it as the end in and of itself. What are your thoughts on that, as far as, if we get to the end goal of the reorganization itself, how far along the line of actually getting all the things done that we need to do to change the level of student achievement do you think we'll be?

**Mr. Christenson:**

Maybe I'm spending too much time with you; I completely agree with your position. This is just the very beginning and we will start the A.B. 469 process with this school year. But that's just the beginning and it's going to take time to incorporate this new culture, and there are going to be bumps along the way, a lot of bumps, but I think if we keep focused on the end goal, which is improving the outcomes in the schools, what I'm hopeful of is that these SOTs are driving these principals, and that the principals are driving the associate superintendents, and in turn driving the Trustees and the Superintendent. I believe in the effort, but it's going to take making some really tough decisions along the way. I mentioned in there, if these associate superintendents or principals aren't getting the results that they need to, we have to have a way to get folks in there that can get those results. That's going to take working with the bargaining units and making sure that everybody's on the same page with that. The other thing we have to keep in perspective, I don't know how long the School District's been in existence, 50 years, maybe more, so we're into this thing 8 months, and I'm going to argue that the first 4 months was spent arguing about the reorganization, but the last 3 months or so, we're really starting to make some momentum. If we can keep that kind of acceleration rate, I think we can see some good things, but we have to monitor. If schools aren't getting the kind of results that they need after certain benchmarks have been set, then we'll have to get different leadership.

**Mr. Husson:**

Thank you, Chair Christenson. If there are no other comments from the panel, I'll close this agenda item and ask the Chairman to come back and resume his duties.

**Mr. Christenson:**

Thank you for serving, again, and thank you for your comments; they were very generous.

So, I think that brings us to public comment.

**Ms. Tampa:**

I sure wish I had as much time to speak as the rest of the people who were before this microphone, but that's why I'm coming up a second time. I did submit written testimony, and I really hope that you all take the time to read it, because I wrote it in the spirit of hoping that you would look at the things that I thought were concerns and actually serious consider them as a Council. As I sat here listening and as I looked around the room, I think I'm one of the very few people here that is not here in an official capacity. I'm here simply as a CCSD employee and member of the community who took her day, and took many, many hours reading the documents to be here, because I care. I care about children. I quit a job to take this position that would have put me in a leadership role and owning my own business, in order to work with children. I also care about adults. Having worked with my labor organization, I've developed a care for labor rights and for the people working in these jobs, and the biggest thing that is my concern that I still have not heard addressed is the fact that you have 5,000 Central Service employees, and I think CCSD has done a really excellent job of correlating and doing the tiers, but the Committee and the people talking about this implementation allude to efficiencies, allude to inefficiencies, we talk about the 80-20, and I wonder how you're going to get there, and then, Mr. Christenson, I believe it was you who mentioned, you know, well if somebody doesn't want to use an employee, they'll just get somebody else, and they won't use them, and I have great concerns about that. I really, really do. I think that there are some safeguards in the law about that, but I hear a general disregard, and maybe I'm wrong, and if I am, I apologize, for collectively bargained agreements for employee rights and those 5,000 Central Service employees who are not being asked what they think, who are not being asked what they feel overall. There's nothing in this process for those 5,000 Central Service employees. Now, my particular department has allowed a little bit for that, but I don't see it, and you're talking about culture, how can you leave 5,000 people out? That's not good culture, I don't feel valued by CCSD, and I don't feel valued by this reorganization effort. In fact, it seems like it's a backdoor to privatize, and a backdoor to ignore collectively bargained rights, and if I'm wrong, as I say, I apologize, but that's how it looks to me, and so I am bringing this concern to you publicly, honestly and truly from my heart. That's why I'm here. I have left my number and contact information on this document that I gave as testimony. I am very easy to get ahold of. But those are my concerns, and I don't hear them being addressed, at least not by this committee, and I hadn't heard them by the Legislators either, so I'm disappointed and I'm scared. I am scared for myself and for others. So, this is not making me feel good, and so I'm telling that to you, and I'm grateful for the opportunity, but I wish that more people had this opportunity.

**Stephen Augspurger (Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees)**

I am pleased to be here to comment briefly this afternoon on what has been said today. I appreciate, Chair, your comments at the end of the meeting. I think you're right on point with those obstacles. They're important; they need to be addressed. I think it's important to keep track of the simplicity of this, because it's easy to be consumed by its complexities, and if we go back to October of 2015 when we had the first meeting to begin talking about the reorganization of CCSD, it was clear then that the law was designed to achieve three primary goals. Number one, to create additional autonomy for principals and SOTs; number two, to provide additional financial resources to those SOTs so they can better meet the needs of the children that they're responsible for in schools; and three, to create a mechanism by which additional layers of leadership and participation could be developed so that we create greater opportunities for participation in what goes on in schools by school staff, by parents and by interested community members. Interestingly enough, at the conclusion of Mr. Skancke's comments, he said we are not there yet today, and I agree with that. We're near those three things. Mr. Woodward your question was where do we go from here, and I think it's important to keep in mind the simplicity of what we have to focus on to get now to what is the prize? The prize is, how do we make sure that every one of our 351 schools has greater autonomy, how do we make sure that every single one of those schools has the financial resources that they, as a school team, believe they need—not CCSD. The school organizational team makes that determination of the financial resources they need, and how do we ensure that that broader level of participation and leadership is created?

So, in closing, I would bring just four or five things to your attention. They're all really simple, and I'm not a critic of this process. We have been outspoken advocates of this process since it was passed in the 2015 Session. I think, over the course of this meeting, we've seen a lot of work that has been completed by CCSD, and I applaud them for that, but this is their work. This work doesn't impact what is currently happening or should happen in schools. It's preparatory to that, but trust me, school people—teachers, administrators, parents and students—they're waiting for this work to get done so they can see the results of that work.

Number two, it's clear to me that autonomies for principals and SOTs have not yet been defined. Even to the extent where the law stipulates that staffing autonomies is one of those things that's been transferred to the schools, that has not been defined sufficiently yet. And to your point, Mr. Christenson, we still have far too many employees that should not be working in schools that continue to be passed from one work assignment to another. We have far too many SOT decisions that have been denied this year for no apparent reason. These are decisions that a principal made working with a group of parents and teachers and support staff employees that would be best for their school. They were not violations of law, they were not violations of regulation, but yet those decisions were denied.

Item number three, no new spendable money has been provided to schools. There are lots of things in schools and all of them cost money. But to simply identify the things in schools that cost money and say that we have now met the intent of the law because schools have 88 percent of our unrestricted funds, I believe, does not come close to complying with the

intent of the law. The intent of that law was to create additional monies that school teams could use to better serve the needs of kids in our School District and we have not done that.

Number four, I'd like to think that that cultural shift is well under way, but the only way to determine that is to look at the outward manifestations of what goes on in CCSD to determine if we really are in a cultural shift, and frankly, while we might be headed in that direction, we're not there. One of the most important pieces, I think, is something we saw beginning in April of this year, nearly 2 years after this law was passed. The District began its budget process for next year, and guess what? That budget process in April and May and continuing to today and through the rest of this year will look exactly like it's looked for the last 4 decades. It hasn't reflected the intent of this new legislation, and that is to find additional monies to send to schools for them to for them to do their work.

**Mr. Christenson:**

Mr. Augspurger, I sincerely apologize.

**Mr. Augspurger:**

Last one, and I will sit down quickly. And the last one, again, another manifestation, or the lack of a manifestation, of a cultural shift we saw today. Two very important committees, the I Team and the Superintendent's direct report committee, I'm not discouraging their work, it's important work, it's work that needs to be done, but this is work that impacts schools, and there is not a single person who works in the schools on either one of those two committees, so how can we ever say that we're in the midst of a cultural shift? We are still making top-down decisions, and then letting people know, certainly we're getting input, no question about that, but not a single chair is occupied by a principal.

**Annette Dawson Owens (Break Free CCSD):**

I shouldn't have to follow my principal; he was my principal. I would be remiss if I didn't say thank you today, for all you've done. We are doing impossible things and I want to thank you for the opportunity to sit on two SOTs and the community education advisory boards, and, sorry, I wasn't planning on getting emotional, but I want to thank all of you, our Legislators, our TSC<sup>2</sup> Group, our CIC, our Board of Trustees; I feel like we're going in a great direction, and all of our District workers. I can speak a little bit to the SOTs and some of the things that were said today. I really think we do need to connect those SOT members. We need to connect them with each other. We need to make sure that we are hiring and putting people in as principals that are empowered. They want number one. They want number one on landscape, they want to be empowered to decide, "Do I want the District to do it, or do I want one of my community members?" We need those empowered people. We have a school associate superintendent opening right now, and the District is hopefully looking at people like Hauser and hiring those sorts of empowered people.

There really is a fear of retaliation. I feel it, and if I feel it, I know everyone feels it. That's a common theme. We've had people on our, and I have three kids in the District at great schools, but we have people that feel like they've been told, "Why am I going to sign up for

this SOT, I've been told that's not in my role, I don't make a difference," so we need to make sure so that they can drive the District and drive our school associate superintendents. Everyone needs to feel empowered, and as we have said, the research shows, that as a community is involved, as parents are involved, our achievement will continue to increase. As we put that money into schools and they can decide what to do with their money, we're going to see that achievement increase, and we're going to be ranked better in our education and everything else.

Again, I appreciate you and all the differences that you have made. One more thing about the survey—we do need to be open and be able to talk about these things. That survey that went out, it needs to not just say what's going right, it needs to say what also didn't go well in the narrative, and if that survey is going out in the summer, I guarantee you that's the principal's opinion right now. It's not being generated from the SOTs. We need to keep that in mind.

**Anne Slighting (Hope for Nevada):**

We just wanted to take a minute and thank you guys for your work today. We particularly appreciated Chair Christenson's remarks. I think that there have been not a lot of times when I agree 100 percent with you. I can say that I did today, so thank you for that, and we do look forward to the increase of work and change in school climate.

**Mr. Christenson:**

Are there any other folks who would like to speak under public comment? Is there anything else that the CIC would like to bring to the Committee?

**Mr. Cranor:**

Something that Mr. Augspurger's comments brought to mind, he said we need to know where we're going when we get there. I think, if there's anything that we could offer as Trustees, based on past experiences, we need to know if anything, if any part of our progress, is evaporating as we go. There need be transparency triggers, so that if any of the progress forward goes away, there are structures and triggers in place so that we automatically know. I remember many years ago, 5 or 6 years ago, I received a call from a community member who was worried that a person who had been put in the District to keep an eye on things was being let go, and it occurred to me how utterly dysfunctional it is to try to make sure that the District operates well by having somebody in there to keep an eye on things. What we need is the kinds of structures that a large organization needs, they're not there yet and they've got to be put in place, fiscal structures and transparency triggers that will allow us to understand if any of what's already been done evaporates so we know ahead of time.

**Mr. Evans:**

Along those lines, I guess what I'd like to ask to be considered is, can we have an agenda item within the next meeting or two where we talk about what's next and what kind of mechanisms, to my colleague's point here, we need to consider putting in place to make sure,

whether it's an internal mechanism in CCSD or an external mechanism, similar to what we're serving on right now, what do we need to do to make sure that things move forward?

**Mr. Christenson:**

Thank you. Any other comments? Very good. Thank you all for your participation today; we appreciate it.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 5:04 P.M.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jordan Haas, Interim Secretary

APPROVED BY:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Glenn Christenson, Chair

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness/Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
A		Agenda
B		Attendance Roster
C	Autumn Tampa	Public Comment
D	Jordan Haas, Interim Secretary	Draft Minutes of the May 10, 2017 Meeting
E	Clark County School District	Reorganization Update
F	Glenn Christenson, Chair	Chair's Presentation
G	Glenn Christenson, Chair	Communication to CIC Members

DRAFT