

**MINUTES OF THE 2015-2016 INTERIM
ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO DEVELOP A PLAN TO
REORGANIZE THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

OCTOBER 18, 2016

The meeting of the Advisory Committee to Develop a Plan to Reorganize the Clark County School District was called to order by Chair Michael Roberson at 3:17 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 3137, 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 (LAS VEGAS):

Senator Michael Roberson, Senatorial District No. 20, Chair
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz, Assembly District No. 11, Vice Chair
Senator Moises (Mo) Denis, Senatorial District No. 2
Senator Aaron Ford, Senatorial District No. 11
Senator Joseph (Joe) P. Hardy, Senatorial District No. 12
Senator Becky Harris, Senatorial District No. 9
Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Assembly District No. 7
Assemblyman Stephen Silberkraus, Assembly District No. 29
Assemblyman Lynn Stewart, Assembly District No. 22

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Brenda Erdoes, Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Risa Lang, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Karly O'Krent, Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Julie Waller, Senior Program Analyst, Fiscal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Jaimarie Dagdagan, Program Analyst, Fiscal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Adam Drost, Program Analyst, Fiscal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Kelly Richard, Principal Research Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Angela Hartzler, Secretary, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Linda Hiller, Interim Secretary, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau

OTHERS PRESENT:

Sylvia Lazos, Policy Director, Educate Nevada Now
Lindsey Dalley, Member, Moapa Valley A.B. 394 Community Education Advisory Board
Task Force
Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent, Clark County School District
Glenn Christenson
Tom Skancke, President, CEO, TSC² Group
Michael Vannozzi, Vice President of Creative Strategies, TSC² Group

Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators
and Professional-Technical Employees
John Vellardita, Executive Director, Clark County Education Association (CCEA)
Annette Dawson Owens, Break Free CCSD

Chair Roberson:

I will now open the ninth meeting of the Advisory Committee to Develop a Plan to Reorganize the Clark County School District (CCSD). We will start with agenda item II, public comment.

Sylvia Lazos (Policy Director, Educate Nevada Now):

As we go forward in this reorganization, I think every adult in this room wants to wind up in a place that is better for kids and not worse for kids. It's our responsibility as adults to do everything that we can to make sure that children have a chance in the future. Many people have said in the process of this reorganization that things cannot get worse and that that's one reason to go forward in the reorganization with all speed ahead. But things can get worse. The pilot program that was tested in the early 2000s and the report by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas show that not all schools fared well under empowerment. In fact, some did extremely well, but some did not do very well at all, and some had kind of no change. And we also know from the research on empowerment in Oakland and New York City that in those cities, the demographic groups of special education kids and English Language Learner (ELL) kids did do worse as principals concentrated on what they knew best and not necessarily on areas they needed to learn.

As we move forward to this new consultant agreement—we don't have a copy of it to review or to necessarily comment on—we have a couple of observations, and hopefully you will keep that in mind as you review that part of today's agenda. Number one, if we do hire a consultant, let's make sure that this person is fully qualified to do whatever it is that we're hiring them for. I'm not quite sure what the task will involve, but let's be kind of lawyerly about it. Let's try to make sure that we're pretty explicit in the consultant agreement and in the resolution here of what it is that these folks are supposed to do. We're a bit chagrined that we didn't go through a request for proposal (RFP) process, and RFP processes have a reason for existing. I certainly believe in competition, in openness and having as many people compete for a spot, so if we're going to waive the RFP process, let's be clear about why we're doing it. As we go forward, let's be transparent about all of these meetings and whatever is being done by the consultant. I want to congratulate CCSD on the excellent website that they've set up and how they're proceeding to be transparent.

Finally, I think that as we have been saying all along, the voices of parents have been a little bit absent, in part according to our own research, because parents still don't quite understand the CCSD reorganization process. But let's remember that the theory of the reorganization is that community input and parent input are going to make schools more responsive to kids' needs. So, whatever structure is set up in the transition, let's be clear

that parents' voices are heard. I've been thinking about this last point a lot because I've been asked to give some comments pre-debate about the growth of democracy and how it affects our southern Nevada region. I think that to me, probably our most important challenge as a community is to get all adults to care about all kids, to finally say, "It's not just about my kids," but to say, "It's about our kids." So, I think when we hire anyone that is going to help out in the reorganization, let's make sure that that entity or those people can think about our kids in the collective and really be committed to own every single one of our kids. If we keep our eye on the ball as that being the why, then we're going to move to a better place. But if it's just about adult politics, it's not going to get better and we'll be talking about this in a year or two, hopefully with younger faces other than my own.

Lindsey Dalley (Member, Moapa Valley A.B. 394 Community Education Advisory Board Task Force):

I'm a member of the Moapa Valley Community Education Advisory Board, but my comments today are personal. The most difficult thing to deal with is a bureaucracy that drags its feet or stays just under the meaningful improvement radar. This condition cannot be diagnosed at a distance because there is too much camouflage. It is only detected up close in the trenches. My personal fear is that because the CCSD bureaucracy is accustomed to a top-down management structure, they could—even with the best intentions—confuse local autonomy with a dictate-to-the-bottom management structure. That is because all the mid-level administrative positions have been eliminated, and they can tell individual schools what to do through the new associate school superintendents. This would not be a reorganization plan. It is a camouflaged status quo. I would applaud an oversight committee to stay up close and personal and keep positive change moving.

Chair Roberson:

I will now close agenda item II.

During the last meeting, we approved our final recommendations for the reorganization of the Clark County School District. We recognized at that time that it was just the beginning and that there was much more to be done. Since then, Legislative Counsel revised the draft regulations that we had previously approved and incorporated the changes that were approved during that meeting. The State Board of Education met and adopted the regulation. The Legislative Commission then met and approved the regulation. That regulation, R142-16, has now been filed with the Secretary of State and has the force and effect of law.

Today, we will review what actions CCSD has taken to begin implementation of the plan to reorganize the School District. We will hear how that is going and what CCSD may need from this Advisory Committee. We then need to consider how the oversight contemplated in the final regulations will take place so that we can ensure that the reorganization is implemented successfully.

I will now open agenda item IV, the approval of the minutes from the August 16 meeting ([Exhibit C](#)).

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 16, 2016 MEETING.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Roberson:

I will now open agenda item V. We have asked CCSD Superintendent Pat Skorkowsky to provide a progress report on the reorganization and to suggest any assistance which the District may need in working towards implementation.

Pat Skorkowsky (Superintendent, Clark County School District):

It has been a busy, busy time since I last sat here at this table and talked to you. I'll go through an overview of everything that has taken place to date. If there are any questions, I am more than happy to go into more detail about each of these activities, but I'll give you that overview and then let you determine how much detail you want in the work that we're doing.

The focus has been twofold since our last meeting, and that is on communication and training. Specifically, as Dr. Lazos mentioned, we have launched a webpage, ab394.ccsd.net. You can get to that by just going to the ccsd.net webpage and you can see it as part of the banner, as well as one of the main buttons down below. It has extensive information on there. It includes most of the introductory information and links to the website for the Advisory Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee and all of the work that's been done there. We have a documents page that is available for all the public and anyone to be able to view, which includes links to the final plan, the recommendation, the regulation, as well as statements made by our Board at public meetings. There's a training page which includes all of the training materials that we're developing. That includes an introductory video, approximately 23 minutes long, that goes through extensively all the work that has been done to date and the work that we are looking forward to in the future. In the training materials, we have—and I'll go into a little more detail about some of the training in just a minute—but we are providing the actual video and materials that are going out to the building principals so that the public can access those as well. We've also included a families page, and that's an important piece that we've heard from the community, a page where parents can go for information, directly targeted to help them understand and engage in the process.

So, as we go forward and develop each phase of the work, we will be updating the website on an almost daily basis to include as many documents as possible. When you go to the website, you'll see that most of the documentation is in English and Spanish, available for all parents and access to those who have that need. We published a forward-looking training calendar to give stakeholders an idea of how we plan on sharing that, so let me give you an overview of the training that we've done to date and the training that is planned for the future. First, I did a series of eight central meetings where I went through a presentation in detail to all the building principals and Central Office administrators. I actually went to Vegas PBS and taped it as well so that we could provide that 23-minute training video that just gives the introduction to the entire process and the steps that we need to take to move forward. In those meetings, the presentation actually goes over in detail how we will be rolling out communication methods and next steps into each of the aspects of the phase development of this process, gearing up towards that January 15, 2017 launch date of when we will need to have all of our school organizational teams (SOTs) up and running and ready to be trained.

The next six sessions are very content-specific and each of these again includes a video training component with specific activities to be done consistently across the entire District. The rationale behind this is that we need to make sure that every school is at a minimum competency level before we implement on January 15. So, each of these trainings is designed so that the principals go through the trainings first. Currently, the assistant chiefs are going through the trainings, giving feedback on the trainings and then either the assistant chiefs or—training is being provided both in a blended environment with a video aspect to the building principals, with follow up activities that are to be done back at the school site. Each of these activities is then taken back to the school. They use the video component at the school site and do the follow up activities with their school staff and community.

The first one that was done was strategic budgeting. This was not how to complete a strategic budget, but it was more focused on how the dollars can and cannot be used that are coming down. We explained the difference between categorical dollars, federal dollars and general fund dollars so that people understand the different capacities of the money and how they can be utilized within the school when they start designing their organizational plan for the year.

The next training that is getting ready to roll out is how to form an SOT. We worked closely with our associations, both the Clark County Education Association (CCEA) and the Education Support Employees Association (ESEA), to develop a model for selection of the individuals that are supposed to be part of the team. With that, we have developed a handout that will be used with school principals, and it will be posted once that training is released, that actually goes into detail what each of the members—the constituency of the membership of the SOT, and how they are elected in the process. And so the video goes through and explains each of the election processes. All of these videos are done in conjunction with both CCEA and ESEA. We've involved various stakeholders throughout

the community in each of these videos to ensure that we are presenting the work that is being done collectively across the entire community.

The next series that will be done after forming the SOTs will be a climate and culture video. The team that is running that video series is actually a team that's been together for over a year through a National Education Association grant in a joint partnership between CCSD and CCEA. That team is producing a video that will involve different stakeholders from across the valley and explain how activities designed in the building can impact that climate and culture, and that's a major shift for some of our school cultures to move into that culture where we are open to that site-based decision-making process.

The next video will include consensus building and shared decision making, and that will be how do you build consensus and make shared decisions in the building? How do these SOTs communicate with their constituent stakeholders that they are representing on these SOTs? And so, that one will roll out later in November.

We also have a training series on how SOTs function, what their roles and responsibilities are and how they will work through the process to develop that organizational plan.

The last training that will be done prior to the January 15 start date is using data to inform planning, and so we will be teaching SOTs that are not consistently used to using data to plan for how we address these specific needs: academic needs, behavioral or social needs, or second language needs—any needs of their community. Dr. Lazos talked a little bit about second language and special education populations, and we're looking at this training as designed for how to look at your data to determine where your dollars need to go to meet the needs of the students.

All of these materials will be posted on our website for anybody in the community to view at any point in time once they are presented to the building principals.

Outside of the formal training sessions, we are continuing with extensive communications. We did talk about the introductory video which was presented and has been widely seen across not only our state, but in 23 states and a couple of outside visitors from across the pond—in Europe and in India—so to speak, so it's been an interesting process. In that video, we talk about the changes and the anticipated timelines, the principles of organization, roles and responsibilities, documentation on the organizational workflow and then a timeline for selecting the school associate superintendents, which I'll go into in a little more detail in a second.

Each week or every 2 weeks, we will be publishing what we call an "update for principals." If you look in the handouts that we provided to you, it is the only portrait page ([Exhibit D](#)). On this page, it talks about what they should be participating in at this particular time. This happens to be the September 29 version of this. This is the first of three versions, and the other two are actually on our website. But it tells them what they should be doing and what they should be participating in as they go forward. Then, it also goes to the green box of

what they should be sharing with their school communities. In this particular situation that we're viewing, it's the principles of organization and roles and responsibilities. Then, we required every school to share the Assembly Bill (A.B.) 394 introductory and overview video with their staff so that everybody heard the same consistent message along the way. We also worked on providing that video access to all of our central departments and divisions as well, getting that information out so that all of our stakeholders and employees could view that information. And then, the purple box is what to expect, and so you can see the plan to share the developing strategic budget sections, which was prior to our training piece, and then plan on attending upcoming training sessions. There are some things that are good to know as we go forward and then some frequently asked questions, and again this is updated every week or two depending upon how fast the work is moving as we go forward.

The second handout that I want to call your attention to is a family guide to the reorganization of CCSD. It talks a little bit about how we got here, what changes will we see in the future, what happens now, a timeline for how we move forward and then a specific section on how we get involved ([Exhibit D](#)). There's a family guide on the back to talk a little bit about the SOTs. It explains the purpose, operation, training and then selection and membership. One of the important pieces that I didn't call to your attention, and some of you have heard this if you watched the video, is what I call the "pretty page." This is a specific one-page document that actually talks about the plan to reorganize CCSD. It talks about how we got here with a timeline, what we need to be doing to support our schools and students, and then it talks about changes to anticipate. You'll see a very central theme in the format: here's what schools and Central Services will see change-wise, here's what schools can see and here's what Central Services will be aligned to do. And then on the back, we explain how this is a cyclical process.

Right now, we are in the first few months of the development of 2016-2017. All this pre-work is being done for the January 15, 2017 launch of the SOTs and their work on the development of their operational plans. We immediately began work on the 2018-2019 school year. This first year, we are required by the regulation to have 80 percent of the dollars from central funds and Central Services going out into schools. The next year, we are required to increase that amount to 85 percent, and so we have to begin immediately on that work, 1 year ahead of time, to start working with our building principals and with our constituent stakeholder groups to start determining what goods and services can be pushed out into the schools for those decision-making factors to get to that 85 percent. While schools are working on the pink line underneath the 2016-2017, they are developing that plan for organization. They will be taking that to their first public stakeholder group where they are expected to present that to the entire community. We know that they will be working on implementation throughout the summer months and that plan will start for implementation in August 2017-2018. Then, we begin the work of that year and we start training and retraining all of our teams to get ready for that next set of SOT work in 2018 starting in January. Again, all of these documents are in English and Spanish and are posted on our website.

By far, the biggest challenge with this work—and this is very hard work. This is not easy at all. I just can't tell you how difficult this work is right now. The most challenging part is to get to the 80 percent of the resources and to determine what actually is school-based versus non-school-based. The biggest challenge—and I've said this over and over again—with transparency and making sure that we're responsible for taxpayer dollars is the capacities of our current Information Technology systems. We have to go in literally by hand to each one of our department and division budgets and decide which line items or which portions of line items are actually school-based resources that need to go out to schools. Without a human capital management system that can actually align to the framework, this 25-year-old system can't handle it. It is extremely time consuming and difficult and is going to be very difficult in the process to get to that 85 percent. We are literally going in by hand and sitting down and meeting with every department and division head to try to figure out how we can do this better in the future. The first year's going to be the most difficult, but once we're able to do that, then we're able to have the system set up. But it is still going to be a by-hand task for every year from here on out until we get that human capital management system.

Staff is committed to working towards making sure we provide data to the schools, through both accountability data and other data that's important for the development of the plan of operation. We are looking at a revision to our school surveys for staff, students and parents. We're also looking at school accountability reports and dashboards for each school so that we can have the SOTs use a dashboard that can do comparisons from school to school, as well as eventually rolling that out to the public so that the public can see and manipulate that and look at some school-to-school operations as well.

Our school associate superintendent position has closed. We have done a pre-screening level at this point in time. We're working on setting up the interviews. Those got a little delayed due to my being out of the office for a period of time, but we're catching back up to the appropriate timeline. We are accelerating and anticipate that those interviews will take place in the next 2 weeks for the internal process. Then we will be moving forward to the next phase of the process, which will include a separate level of interviews for those finalists that are going forward for those performance zones, and then moving forward to the municipal meetings as required by the regulation at that point in time.

So with that, the last phase that I want to talk to you about is the weighted student funding formula. This is going to be the second most difficult task, if not the first most difficult task. Right now, we're working under the premise that there are no additional monies. The State Department of Education is required to put forth that funding formula. We're having meetings with them, trying to help them understand what we know from this piece, as well as trying to get them to understand the capacity of what we're able to do and our timelines that we're under. So, we will continue working closely with the State Department of Education. My deadline for them has to be December 1. If I don't have a weighted funding formula from them by December 1, I cannot build the strategic budget workbooks in time to get those rolled out by the January 15 date. Because we have to go in and adjust each one of those 351 strategic workbooks by hand, that is a firm deadline that I have to get that

information by. Otherwise, we may miss that January 15 implementation deadline. I'm not willing to do that.

With that, I'm more than willing to take any concerns. I will tell you again, it's been a difficult process trying to work through this. We do regular update meetings at our Board of Trustees meetings, and so at every Board meeting there's an update to the Board of what we're doing in the process. Some of the work is presented to them in that fashion so that they can see what's going on, and we're trying to make sure that we take that input from the Trustees as we move forward with this.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you, Superintendent Skorkowsky, for all your hard work.

Senator Aaron Ford (Senatorial District No. 11):

I do apologize, I have daddy duty today and I'll be leaving literally when I finish these questions. I'm going to ask a series of questions in anticipation of the next presentation, and I'll go back and read the minutes and I'll try to get some answers and follow up with other individuals as well.

First off, let me commend you on the work you've been able to do so far as a District in trying to implement the A.B. 394 reorganization. Again, these questions are more anticipatory than anything, so to the extent you can answer them now, or if I need to wait until others present, that's fine. Let me back up and remind everybody that I am persuadable. I didn't like the bill, but I ended up voting on the plan and I'm all for that, as a caveat to what I'm about to say, because I'm not entirely persuaded by the presentation given to me thus far from individuals who are going to be commenting on the next agenda item. And in fact, I'm a little concerned and perturbed about it. The reason why is because, Mr. Skorkowsky, I think I've asked you probably at every meeting since the beginning of these committee meetings how much more is this going to cost? Can the District do it with its current resources? Does it have the personnel needed in order to implement these plans? And under every circumstance you've assured me that there won't be any need for extra monies before February, that was one of the things you stated to me, and that you can do everything internally. That's something else that I recall you said to me, and maybe I wasn't clear with the way I was asking that question. But the impression I took away was that we would not be entertaining, for example, what is supposedly next on the agenda. So that bothers me, especially in view of the fact that we're talking about contracting with someone and paying them money when, as I understand it, just last Friday and probably tomorrow you're going into arbitration with ESEA about not being able to give them raises. And so, I'm concerned about spending money for a consultant when we're not able to even take care of the ESEA issues right now, especially when I've asked time and time and time again so that we could be ready for what money would be required.

So, speaking to that, here are a series of questions. First off, I thought it was this Committee's job to oversee the reorganization, not some new, extra-statutory or extra-

regulatory organization or committee. And in fact, I'm a little concerned about the bureaucracy that it adds. One of the purposes of this reorganization was to remove bureaucracy and to allow more monies to flow towards the students and not towards consultants if you will. So maybe someone can speak to me at some point as to how the next item comports with this notion of us being able to oversee it as a Committee and how it removes bureaucracy.

Chair Roberson:

Because you've mentioned the next agenda item, let me just briefly explain so that everyone understands what's next on the agenda, and then I'll come back to you. Since our last meeting, as Chair of this Committee I have met several times with Superintendent Skorkowsky, John Vellardita representing the teachers, Stephen Augspurger representing the principals, Glenn Christenson and Tom Skancke to discuss and identify the necessary steps which must be taken to ensure the success of the reorganization. I will remind everyone that the regulations we approved contemplated a transition team or committee and a transition consultant. Subject to this Committee's approval, I have asked Glenn Christenson to chair the transition committee, otherwise known, as you will see soon enough, as the Community Implementation Council, which is contemplated in the regulations that have been approved. And I have asked Tom Skancke to submit a proposal on behalf of the TSC² Group to serve as the management consultant. We're going to hear from both of them today, but I just want to put that on the record as context. Please proceed, Senator Ford.

Senator Ford:

I appreciate the context, and I will say this: I may be persuadable. At the end of the day, I'm going to go back and look at the hearings on this and the minutes on this and ascertain the answers to these questions. And to be sure, Mr. Vellardita came and spoke to me last week. As much as I'd like to say I'm a good multi-tasker, I must say that I was focused more on the Special Session than I was on anything else and didn't recognize the import of what he was talking about. Mr. Christenson did come see me today to talk about this, but timing is a concern for me as well. I don't like being rushed, but sometimes you have to get rushed as we know from the special session. But in any event, I'm interested in understanding how that's supposed to drive our Committee's oversight. I mentioned understanding why now you're indicating you need assistance when I've asked several times about whether the District could do it itself, and you said yes. I'm also interested in understanding why, as Dr. Lazos indicated, there was no RFP in this situation. Maybe there's a carve-out somewhere that I missed, but I would be interested in understanding why no RFP was associated with that. I think that kind of ends my questions for now. I'll probably have more as I review the minutes of this meeting and talk to others offline, but I did want to take the time to get my questions and concerns on the record before I have to leave.

Chair Roberson:

Sure, Senator Ford, and I'll answer the last question you had. There was not an RFP when we hired Mike Strembitsky either. We are already behind schedule, as the Superintendent's already acknowledged. We have to get this right. We have to make this reorganization effective. We simply cannot wait weeks or months for an RFP. That may not be a satisfactory answer, but that's my answer in this case.

Senator Ford:

A clarifying question, and again this is because this is anticipatory. My understanding was that the committee that we're talking about, or the contract, is not with this Committee but with the District, which is different.

Chair Roberson:

No, it is with this Committee, with the State, with the Legislature.

Senator Ford:

That's helpful. Okay, great. I have to run, but I look forward to hearing these answers and reading them further.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

One of the pieces that I talked about was the cost of the training and the personnel for the training. You're exactly right, I did say that we could handle that piece. One of the pieces that we're doing at this point in time is working on that training. After February, I have no idea of the anticipated training costs that are going to be required to move this forward to the next level. We are doing basic, common-level training so that we can ensure that every SOT is up to a basic level of functioning prior to jumping into the development of their operational plan. With that, I also can tell you that I don't think I fully anticipated the scope of work that was going to be required to do all this. As we keep getting into each step of this, there are things that keep popping up that we haven't thought about or hadn't thought about in the past. Unfortunately, I'm afraid that I'm missing some things as we go forward and that there are going to be some gaps if we're not careful. I have an amazing team that has been working closely with me. Mike Strembitsky has been an amazing asset to help us through this. There are some community partners who have stepped up to the plate to really come to the table, including all of our associations, who are really working together to ensure that we are putting this together and thinking through every aspect. But I will tell you that we don't know what we don't know sometimes, and in this situation there are things that are going to be a challenge that we struggle with.

We are good at the school-based business. We can handle the school-based business. We've seen some excellent results. Our graduation rate went up over 2 percentage points. We're up to 74.22 percent, which is outstanding compared to where we were just 5 years ago, 15 percent lower than that. But the challenge is, we don't completely understand the

major shift that is going to have to occur at the Central Office level, and that's where we struggle. We know how to do business, but we don't know how to necessarily shift our focus so that it is more of the customer service model that we have to move to, as opposed to the current service delivery model which we operate. So, that is one of the pieces that we are struggling with. I think we've been extremely effective at breaking the surface level of the school-based operations, and I think we are going to see some great information as we go forward with that monitoring of the school associate superintendent in the process. But the challenges are going to be the oversight and understanding of how we have to shift our central services as we go forward. And so, the work is changing as we go forward, sometimes literally daily with new tasks that pop up that we hadn't thought about, or new aspects of a specific task that we have to redevelop and rethink about. With that, I can tell you that while I may have been confident in saying, "Oh yeah, we have the personnel to do this," we all still have a day job to of increasing student achievement as we go forward. We have to make sure that the system is running effectively and that we are being transparent and responsible with taxpayer dollars. So, as we go forward, it is going to be a challenge to do everything at once and do it effectively.

Assemblywoman Dina Neal (Assembly District No. 7):

So, I need you to super-break this out. So, you said you're having trouble in regard to the shift to become a customer service based model versus customer service delivery. Break out what exactly you mean. There's two parts to that. You said there were things that popped up that were unexpected and they were falling out of the expertise or capability, so I want to know more about specifically what those are.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Currently, our service delivery model is that schools put in work orders or they request assistance from a specific department or division, and that is provided on a first come, first serve basis. When it comes to work orders, we use a priority ranking of what is the most essential to the safety of students and work all the way down. That is our current model. It is run on a system that allows for people who have access to the system or know the system well to be able to sometimes navigate the system better than others. As we go forward, especially with the 85 percent requirement, we have to determine which departments and divisions—and our work with our school return on investment committee that we've already done, and Glenn Christenson was the co-chair of that committee. In the work that we did with departments and divisions, programs and school-based expenditures we've already begun to see where we might be able to make changes in the way that we deliver.

An example that has been used over and over again is landscaping. Right now, we have a landscaping crew that goes around and does landscaping in each one of our schools. They show up on a periodic basis and they are only able to do what they are able to do at that specific school. No additional work is done at that point in time, unless something is broken and then they go in and fix that, which sometimes delays the regular landscaping work that is done. We have to look and potentially understand how we might be able to do an RFP

process for potential landscaping services, if that was a service that was to go to schools. So, utilizing the available dollars that we have, we develop a system so that schools get the money and can either purchase back landscaping services from our own CCSD landscaping, which would be a 1-year commitment, or choose to go outside and use a certified landscaping company that has gone through an RFP process that can then do the work and make sure that it's at a guaranteed level so that again we're being responsible for the taxpayer dollars. So that's just one example.

The other has to do with different departments and divisions. Let's say that a school needs professional development expertise. We have already put a large amount of dollars, over \$5,000,000, out into schools for them to determine how they want to do their professional development. Yet we still maintain a core group of professionals in our Instructional Design and Professional Learning Division (IDPL) to assist the State Department of Education when it comes to curriculum standards and to develop task forces for textbook adoptions and things like that. But there may come a time when we need to have an expert team in IDPL again so that schools may purchase services to help align with the Read by Grade Three initiative or to help align with specific standards that are being taught or rolled out when it comes to social studies standards that may be developed in the near future or next generation science standards. So, schools would then have those dollars to be able to purchase the services, but we're not set up on any model remotely close to that. Right now, it's just first come, first serve. Right, now no services are being done through IDPL because all the money went out to the schools at this particular time. So, it is changing that mindset.

Assemblywoman Neal:

What is your Procurement Division currently doing? I know they've handled RFPs. You've had contracts out there. I don't know if you have somebody from the Procurement Division here, but what is happening that your Procurement Division no longer has the wisdom or expertise to handle an RFP related to school-based expenditures? That was a pop up. I was just writing down some of the things that you said. You said "school-based expenditures that may pop up because of this new transition." If I'm wrong, say that. You also said "work orders," so I'm trying to figure it out. If they've been landscaping the schools and they've been doing these various things for a while, what is all the sudden occurring where you now no longer have those persons? The request for proposal requires an outside entity to come in and then tell you how to do it better?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Our Purchasing Department actually receives national awards yearly. They have the capacity, but they have never done this work when it comes to a fee for service model. It is not the model that we have used consistently in the District. So, once we determine through the building principals and the school associate superintendents, as the regulation requires, which services they would like to control at the school-based level, we would then have to determine—if we don't change our system and we're just saying, "Okay, we're going to give you the money and you have to buy back the services from us," that is not local control.

That is just a shell game, and we're not going to do a shell game. What we're going to do is actually go out to the community to see if there are services that can be done by other entities that are licensed and contracted and meet all the guidelines through the State and District purchasing laws to see if they may be able to choose whether they purchase it from the District or they purchase it from an outside entity and may be able to negotiate a price within a range. So, our Purchasing Department has the capability, but we have not run RFPs like this. This is not something that we have done. The closest thing that we have done to this is an instructional supplementary programs RFP where we take title dollars that have been pushed out to schools and we go through a research-based program where they are allowed to choose from a menu of where they spend those dollars. That's the closest thing we've done. I have personally been in contact with executives at MGM and Caesars because they do this process within all of their properties. They negotiate a range of services and let the individual properties then negotiate with that individual vendor.

Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart (Assembly District No. 22):

I'm impressed with what you've done and the speed with which you've done it. As you interview these associate superintendents, are you personally, with two or three people, doing the interviewing?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

There are several phases to the process. We had an initial screening phase that took place. There's a three-part interview process that will be coming up in the next 2 weeks that will have three different components to it. One of those components is the interview, where it's myself, representatives from the municipality and representatives from the performance zone principals. That will be going forward as part of the process in the next 2 weeks. Then, at that point in time those finalists that come forward from those interviews will have a separate interview with myself and potentially one or two other people. Those recommendations would then be identified so that I would notify the municipalities that they need to hold their public input meeting, saying, "Here are the finalists for each of the performance zones."

Assemblyman Stewart:

What is the timeframe for them to be selected?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I don't have that. I believe that we're looking at having the interview process done and, don't quote me since I'm approximating, trying to get all the interview processes done by November 2 and then notifying the entities at that point in time and having all of those entities hold their meetings within 10 days, which is the requirement in the regulation, and then making the announcement approximately November 16.

Assemblyman Stewart:

And then will the associate superintendents make recommendations for principals to you? Is that correct?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

That is a different process that's identified in the regulation as well. Once the principal position opens up and the SOTs are in place, there is a separate process that will be done to conduct interviews at the central level to determine three to five finalists that will be recommended by me to the SOT. That SOT will interview those three to five finalists and then make their recommendation back to me of the principal that they would most like to see hired for that school.

Assemblyman Stewart:

It seems we are having a struggle here as to the responsibilities. In my opinion, it'll be kind of a trial and error. You might say, "Okay, the Central Office is going to handle this," or they might put it to the schools and the schools might say, "Well, we don't like this," and shift it back. Is that your perception, that there might be a shifting of responsibilities as we go along and as we learn more and as the principals find out what they have the ability to do, rather than what they have the authority to do?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

That is exactly right. There is a process identified in the regulation that outlines that anything to be moved from a central service to a school-based service has to be worked on and initiated by the building principals and the school associate superintendents. They work directly with me on how that might happen. The reverse is also true though. If there is something that is given out to them and they feel like it can be done better at the central level and they choose not to, they can do that as long as I'm meeting that 85 percent of those general dollars being pushed out to schools.

Assemblyman Stephen Silberkraus (Assembly District No. 29):

Thank you, Superintendent Skorkowsky, for everything you've been doing. You've been working with us above and beyond and I really appreciate that. Just touching on a couple of things you brought up, it's fantastic to hear that the SOTs have got a fantastic amount of training materials, and I know you're working on what's happening with Central Services. Is there an eye towards training materials as far as the new philosophies and expectations? Do we have a timeline on when those might be put in those people's hands so we can start teaching the ethos as well as the actual technical procedures?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Yes, there is. One of the challenges though is that we had to get this series of trainings for school-based services up and running and ready to go. We're still in the process of developing some of those modules. There will be training that will need to be done at the central level as well to rethink and revisit some of the service models that we currently have in place. We know that there's some expertise that is out there, looking at the overall customer service model and how we might be able to do that. We haven't begun. We know that that work will probably start as soon as we finish putting these training modules in the can and they're working. Then, we'll begin on that central training module. That will have to begin in the spring so that we get people trained up and ready for that August implementation date where this shift of control moves from a central to a school base.

Assemblyman Silberkraus:

Thank you. Building on that last comment, I know obviously next year you have to transition to 80 percent and the following year 85 percent. Is there going to be a mindset going forward to continue to review those services and potentially pass on beyond the 85 percent? Or, if 85 percent ends up being the right number, staying there?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Yes, I think that has to be revisited every year, and that is one of the conversations with the building principals and the school associates. We're sitting down and working through what is working, what is not working and what controls they would like to see. I think the biggest fear of our principals initially was, "Oh my goodness, I'm going to have to start doing all of this on top of the instructional work that I do in the building on a regular basis," and as we are rolling this out and training and communicating, they're seeing that this will come in phases and there will be different steps that we'll be taking with their input as we go forward. So, it has kind of alleviated some of the fear. But I do know that when talking with Mr. Strembitsky there are sometimes services that revert back to central, just because it is more feasible economically and can provide a greater level of service to the schools if it is done at a central level. So, it will be some ebb and flow, knowing that within the regulation as it currently stands I always have to meet that 80 percent this first year and 85 the year after that. So, it could go higher, but unless the regulation changes, it can't go lower.

Assemblyman Silberkraus:

It's my understanding that you have an A.B. 394 working group that meets every Monday. Can you tell us a little bit about that, the structure and what you're dealing with?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

The Assembly Bill 394 workgroup that we have currently established is literally a group of key players to help develop this work. We have representatives from Budget and Finance, Human Resources, Community and Government Relations, Family and Community Engagement Services, the Instruction Unit and the Educational Support Unit. Everybody sits

around the table, it's a pretty crowded room, and we literally go through each step of the project plans that we have developed for this work so we can see where we're on track, where we're off track and where additional support needs to happen. It's where many of these things come up that we're like, "We didn't think about this, we need to look at this." That group meets on a regular basis. They meet once a week as a required meeting and then as needed as well.

We also have been doing extensive work with focus groups, building principals and other teams to get the message out to our stakeholders and then gather input for the processes that we're developing. So, this group is kind of the lead group that is working with that. They are doing a huge amount of work in a very short time to be able to make sure that we're meeting these timelines. It is one of those things where we keep thinking that, "Okay, we get to a great place and then we learn even more than we anticipated learning from that exercise." It's been a very eye-opening and exciting group to work with.

Assemblyman Silberkraus:

You were talking about working with sub-groups there, and I imagine those will be groups like you said that are dealing with principals, support staff, teachers and all of the principal departments inside of the actual campuses to make sure that we're getting their voices heard at the central level.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

That is correct. One of the things that I didn't mention that's coming up is on November 8. There is a training day that CCEA and ESEA are doing with the employees on those dates where they are training teachers and support staff and helping them to understand that piece. We're working closely in collaboration with them. As we go forward, we are actually bringing those groups to the table to help us with each of these training modules as we're rolling them out. We'll be continuing to meet with them on a regular basis as we go forward. That helps with the associations. The communication pieces that we are doing on a regular basis and the principals' updates are important pieces. They're expected to share that update with their faculty staff at the school base and then those are also shared at the central level as well.

Assemblywoman Oliva Diaz (Assembly District No. 11):

Mr. Skorkowsky, first and foremost, I might have missed it when you said it the first time, but can you clarify for the record and for myself what an HCM system is?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

That is a human capital management system, our Human Resources system that does not speak. It's a 25-year-old, COBOL programming system, and we literally have five programmers in a room that keep it afloat.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

Okay. How long does an RFP process normally take through the School District?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

It depends on the scope of the RFP. If it is a local RFP sometimes they can be done anywhere between 6 and 12 weeks to meet the requirements. If it is a national level RFP, which we have done on occasions for instructional materials and things like that, it runs on a little bit longer of a schedule. We do run those through our Procurement Department, and again they have been able to do that. The challenge is making sure that we have the right language and evaluation skills in understanding these new types of RFPs that we would have to be working with. We don't have that scope currently.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

Following up there, do you see it as unreasonable to go through an RFP process? Since I'm looking at the timeline, I don't know exactly when this new group needs to jump in to do their work. I'm trying to figure out what month that is, as laid out in this timeline that you gave us about the 3-year reorganization. So, at what point is it absolutely necessary that you have the Advisory Committee or whatever this body is going to be called there to help you sort through decision-making processes?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I can tell you the challenge is that I don't know what I don't know, and my team doesn't know what we don't know. That's my biggest fear right now. But I also want to make sure that we are doing this with the intent of increasing student achievement, supporting schools, making sure that we're modifying and changing our practices centrally as well as making sure that we're complying with all civil rights laws and the aspects that we have for protection of our students. Any help is help that is needed at any point in time. I'll tell you, we don't have the business acumen to shift as quickly as we're going to need to shift to make this change. We could do it, but we've got to do this right. We've got one shot at this, and I can't tell you a timeline because again, with each week different things pop up that we're not aware of or that we truly didn't anticipate, so we're trying to constantly stay on the forefront and move forward. A consultant team or an oversight committee may be able to help us anticipate and look at realistic timelines as to how we go forward.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

My last question is kind of along the lines of my colleague, Senator Ford. Part of the reason some of us had concerns with moving forward with the reorganization first and foremost was jobs, like those of our support staff members. As I'm hearing you talk about maintenance of buildings and how do we get to all the buildings and other essential services

that need to be provided, I was almost assured that nothing would happen to our support staff members and that they would keep their positions and that they did not need to worry. But if I was in their shoes at this point, I'd be very concerned given that this seems like you might have to do away with—if someone comes in with a business lens and tells you as the Superintendent that it's not cost effective to have your own maintenance crew and that you should just do it all through the outside, that means jobs. That means positions. That means where are these folks going to go. I think we need to have that honest conversation of where we are at, because that's why we needed to know if giving you 20 percent of a central operating budget was that going to suffice and if that was going to hold some folks harmless. At this point, it casts a lot of doubt in my mind as to where we are.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I will tell you that at the 80 percent, there is no impact whatsoever on any jobs. I can't begin to anticipate what will happen in 2018-2019 at this point in time because, as the regulation identifies, I have to work with the building principals and the school associate superintendents to determine what may be moved from a central to a school-based function. There are still opportunities for us to look into our current budget but as I said, without that human capital management system talking to our budget and finance system, we're having to literally go through line by line with each division head to determine where we can go. We may be able to get to that 85 percent without any of that worry whatsoever. I don't know at this point in time, because we're just now beginning that process. But I can tell you that at the 80 percent, there are no worries at this point in time.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you for presenting today, Superintendent Skorkowsky. We're going to move on to our next presenter. At this point, I want to bring up Glenn Christenson. For those of you who don't know him, I just wanted to mention a few things. Mr. Christenson was the Deloitte Nevada Audit Practice Partner-in-Charge; former Chief Financial Officer of Stations Casinos; on the Board of Directors for Stewart Information Services; past Chair for the Nevada State College Foundation; Chair Emeritus of the Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance (LVGEA); Vice Chair of the Education SAGE Commission; and co-Chair of the CCSD Superintendent's Executive Advisory Group. I understand you have a presentation for us.

Glenn Christenson:

I am here today to provide a proposal to you of how I believe that we can improve the prospects for a very successful A.B. 394 implementation ([Exhibit E](#)). Let me assure you that this is an incredibly daunting task. You heard Superintendent Skorkowsky just now; a lot of things keep coming up. There's a lot of work to be done here. Ultimately, the only reason to go through all this is if we end up with dramatically improved student outcomes for our kids. I agree with you that one very good way of improving those prospects is by moving the

decision making closer to the end user, that being the principals, teachers, parents and students. It has to be done in a very fair and equitable way, and I really like the concept of the principals and teachers being able to address particular problems with their school population and yet still having the accountability related to those decisions.

We've got a situation where the legislation has passed and this Committee has now provided some vision and life to that legislation. What I want to know is, if I were in your chair, how do I give comfort that the implementation of A.B. 394 will be done well, especially now that we're coming up to another Legislative Session and you have other things that you're working on? Based on my experience over the last 3 years, it's my opinion that the District needs assistance to complete the implementation of A.B. 394 by next fall, if for no other reason than that their primary job is ensuring increased student achievement. Tom Skancke and I have a lot of experience working with organizations that need restructuring and reorganization in order to be more effective. I think that's certainly the situation we have here. Our goal is to be constructive and to work shoulder to shoulder with the CCSD leadership in trying to bring this important legislation to fruition.

Let me make something very clear up front. There are two pieces to the education delivery system. One is what goes on in the classroom. We're not talking about that at all. We are not educators. The other piece of the education delivery system is how do you make the second largest organization in the State in terms of number of employees, after MGM, become much more operationally efficient? That's where we want to focus.

Our proposal includes two main phases. The first is that we believe we should create what we're calling the Community Implementation Council (CIC), to be composed primarily of business community members to oversee this process. It would be much like the Board of Directors in a public company. We certainly intend to leverage off the talent base of these individuals. The members of this Council need to be smart, critical thinkers who are able to demonstrate collaboration in working with others. It needs to be a diverse group ethnically, from a gender perspective and also from a political ideology perspective. Each one of the individuals on this Council needs to have a specific skillset that will be important in the transition process from being a centralized organization to an empowerment school district. Finally, each one of these members needs to have a specific, direct contact with an important constituency in our community. The second step would be to hire a consultant to work on a day-to-day basis to essentially partner with CCSD leadership and be part of the transition team.

Let's go back and talk about this Council. I've described for you what we're looking for. If this proposal is acceptable to you, I would agree to chair the CIC. I know some of you much better than others, but it might be helpful to get a little bit more in depth in terms of my qualifications to serve in this important role, and also to lay them out for the record. As Senator Roberson mentioned, I'm a long time Las Vegas, and I've lived here roughly 44 years. When I started to work in Las Vegas, I worked for a company that's now known as Deloitte and Touche. Ultimately, I became the national hospitality industry partner and I also became the Nevada Partner-in-Charge of our audit practice. When I started with the firm,

we had 16 professionals. By the time I left we, had over 70 professionals with an office that we opened up in Reno. The team that we put together allowed us to be the fastest-growing Deloitte and Touche office in the country.

I left Deloitte to become the Chief Financial Officer of Station Casinos. When I started there, the only property that we had in our portfolio was Palace Station and it was about half the size that it is today. I helped take that company public. Over the course of my tenure, our management team there was able to grow the company to 16 different properties that we have here in Las Vegas, along with management contracts in California and Michigan that came to fruition after I left. In the last five years of my tenure at Station Casinos, that management team was able to generate the tenth best performance in terms of stock performance in the entire stock market.

I have experience with several boards of directors. I was with Station Casinos. I was also on the Board of Directors of NV Energy at the time that we sold the company to Berkshire Hathaway. I was their audit committee chairman. During my last 10 years at that company, prior to the time that it was sold to Berkshire Hathaway, that management team and the Board working together were able to create the best performing utility in the utilities sector, an incredible accomplishment.

I have a long-standing relationship with the education community here in southern Nevada. I was one of the original founders of the Nevada State College Foundation back in 2002. I'm the longest serving chairman to date, with over 4 years that I served as Chair until I stepped down. my wife and I are incredible supporters of Nevada State College because of the students that are there. The vast majority of these kids are the first in their families ever to go to college. It's a very diverse population there, and the vast majority of these students are also on some form of financial aid. These are kids that understand the importance of an education. If they can get a good education, develop a marketable skill and insert their passion, then they have an opportunity to not only get to the middle class, but beyond and live the American dream. What's not to love there?

My interaction with K-12 education started a little over 3 years ago. In 2009, I was named Chairman of what was then known as the Nevada Development Authority. You will recall very well that that was a terrible time for the economy in our community. I call it the blame game phase of our history here. People looked around and were pointing fingers at each other, asking, "Why don't we have more diverse economy? Why don't we have a more sustainable economy?" And the truth of the matter is that there was a lot of blame to go around. It was very obvious that as an organization we had to fundamentally change the way that we think about economic development. We engaged in a national search and hired Tom Skancke to come in as our Chief Executive Officer. We started thinking about how to structure and reorganize this organization to dramatically affect what we're doing in terms of economic development.

The mission of the Nevada Development Authority was very limited. It was to bring non-gaming related businesses to southern Nevada. We started thinking much more broadly. It's

the attraction, expansion, retention and diversification of businesses, which is a much more thoughtful way to approach it. We know that economic development is a team sport. We reached out to the municipalities and worked much more closely with them. We reached out to trade organizations and individual businesses, and we've seen incredible success at the LVGEA. I'm the longest serving Chair there, as well being named the Chair Emeritus, but it occurred to me 3 1/2 years ago that someone else should take on that role.

I sat down with Tom and we got to talking about what more the LVGEA should be doing, and we both agreed that we should be focused on education. The reason for that is we knew from our research that economic development and education are inextricably linked. We also knew that 35 percent of the companies that aren't coming to southern Nevada aren't coming because either our education system didn't meet their needs or we don't have the workforce. So, we started thinking how we could be more effective. So, we developed what came to be known as the Las Vegas Education Council. We invited seven business leaders and seven education leaders and asked them to sit down at the table and talk about what we could be doing together to improve the education system in our community. We asked everybody to check their egos at the door and to check their political ideology at the door. What we found was that there was a number of things that we felt that we could do together, and we developed an education reform package. This might all sound familiar to you. We knew from the research that the best predictor of good outcomes in the classroom is a highly qualified teacher, so we wanted to put more money towards that. We know that a child that doesn't read by the third grade has a high probability of dropping out of school, so let's put some money towards Read by Three programs. We know that every student in Nevada would benefit with full-day kindergarten, so let's put money towards that. We also know that there are populations that cost more to educate: our English Language Learners, our free and reduced lunch kids, kids in poverty and special education. We need to put more monies toward those as well.

We sent that reform package to the Governor. I don't know what he did with it. All I know is at the end of the day, every one of those reforms was included in the education reform package that you all voted on. We then went out and talked to the business community to build support for this, not only for the reforms that we felt were so important, but also to raise the money for it. We were very instrumental in getting over 40 businesses, organizations and individuals that sat on the steps of the Capitol Building and asked you all to pass that legislation, both the reform as well as the revenues required to do it. The thread that binds all these experiences is that when you get people working together tearing down the silos with a common goal of supporting things that can happen, that's what needs to happen here with A.B. 394.

I'm also currently the Vice Chair of the Education SAGE commission, and I co-Chair Superintendent Skorkowsky's Executive Advisory Committee. I'll talk with you more about that in a minute.

Let's get back to this Implementation Council that we think we need. Again, reviewing the requirements, they need to be smart. They need to be critical thinkers. They need to be

collaborative. It needs to be a diverse group. We need to have folks who have a particular skillset that will be helpful in the transition. They need to have a direct link to important constituencies. These are the folks that we would recommend you put on this Council. Brent Husson needs no introduction if you do anything around education in our community. He's Executive Director of Nevada Succeeds. Perhaps more importantly, he has three kids in CCSD. Ken Evans is President and CEO of the Urban Chamber of Commerce here. He's also a retired lieutenant colonel in the United States Air Force. I got to know Mr. Evans during the lobbying phase in the last Legislative Session and came to have a great deal of respect for him. Nora Luna is the Director of Diversity and Education at Nathan Adelson Hospice. She's also a member of the State Board of Public Charter Schools. Personally, I'm agnostic. I don't care whether a child gets a quality education from the District or a charter school or a private school. They just need a quality education. The other thing that Nora brings to the table is she's highly respected in the hispanic community. A relatively new face to the education business relationship is a gentleman named Ryan Woodward. Mr. Woodward is the area manager for JP Morgan Chase. In my mind, it's always good to have a banker on a committee like this because they're critical thinkers. In addition, Mr. Woodward is a member of the Board of Directors of the Las Vegas Metro Chamber. It's going to be very important that we not only build support in the business community but also build momentum. The Metro Chamber can be very helpful in that area. We also felt it was important to bring a millennial on board. I think as a community we should be starting to think about building leadership for the future. We were looking for a young, very smart, critically thinking Certified Public Accountant (CPA) and we found one in Verenice Flores. She's a CPA at Fair, Anderson and Langerman. We sat down with Curt Anderson and told him about what we wanted to do. Curt very generously said that his firm would essentially treat Ms. Flores' appointment to this Council as though it were a client engagement. He's going to assign specific managers and partners to work with her to ensure her success on this Council. Not only that, but he's agreed to provide whatever services his firm can offer to the Implementation Council in a kind and incredibly generous offer. Another person that needs no introduction is Vicki Courtney. She's the President of the Teachers Association. It's been my privilege to work with her over the last 3 years on many different items, and I found her to be a very trusted partner. Felicia Ortiz is a Board Member of the State Board of Education. There may be instances where we need help in that liaison with the State Board. More importantly actually, from my perspective, she's President of a company called Project Management Solutions. She is an Information Technology consultant and she consults with major businesses. You heard Superintendent Skorkowsky talk about some of the challenges with the computer system. They are real. I have experienced them first-hand. Finally we've asked Erin Cranor to be on this Implementation Council as well. Obviously she's on the Board of Trustees for CCSD. We think having them involved in this process is very important and having that connection. I recognize, and I think it's very fair to say, that they've had some reservations about this process. We think bringing them to the table makes sense.

The way we have described the ask for all of these individuals will probably be about 10 hours a month. Roughly half of that time being in meetings. As we've talked with each one of these people, they enthusiastically said, "Yes, we'd like to be part of it."

The next step then is to determine who would actually do all of the day-to-day work in helping the CCSD leadership. For that, our recommendation is that you would engage Tom Skancke. There's a number of reasons why I think Mr. Skancke is an ideal candidate for this particular assignment. First of all, Mr. Skancke has a track record of working on reorganizations and restructurings. We just did it together at the LVGEA, and he's done it with other organizations over the course of his 35-year career. Second, he knows all the issues, not only through the Education Council but he's provided services and advice not only to CCSD but other folks that surround the School District as well. He certainly knows all the players so it's not going to be a learning curve here. We're not going to have to train somebody up on what some of the challenges are. In addition, through his advisory practice Mr. Skancke knows a lot of people who can be very helpful technically to the extent that we need those people in this assignment.

So, what would we be doing? The very first thing is that we need to start an examination or a review of the organization's policies, practices, and procedures. A little over a year ago, I was asked to be a guest lecturer at UNLV to talk about how businesses and the education system could work together. I was invited with Dr. Eva White, who's in the audience today, and I gave her some examples: the concept of return on investment, establishing metrics, defining success, establishing budgets, goals, accountability, change in changing circumstances, what are centralized versus decentralized functions. All of these are things that are going to be important for this transition to work.

We would be prepared to start immediately. Some of the things that we would work on over the next 80 days would be working with the Superintendent and his team in identifying the 80 percent of the operating budget that should be transferred to the local school level. We would take a look at the organizational structure and make sure that it meets up with the requirements of A.B. 394. We would review and assist in the process of identifying the school associate superintendents. We'd look at how the weighted funding formula would work with respect to the upcoming budgets. We would work with them on the formation of the SOTs. Finally, one of the things I think is most important in this process is developing a communication plan both internally as well as externally. We need to tell people when there are successes and by the same token when there are challenges. We need to define what those challenges are and what we're going to be doing about them.

By January 15, there are a number of things that need to happen. The individuals for the SOTs need to be in place. We need to work on the training aspect of helping those teams. We need to start looking at the next year's budget and how the weighted funding formula will impact that. We need to define some specific performance metrics for success. We need to oversee and help in whatever way that we can. We need to make sure that both the school associate superintendents are hired as well as anyone in the cabinet that needs to be hired. We will continue with communications and outreach. In terms of the Superintendent's cabinet, I'm sure that one of the things that we're going to be recommending very early on is that we need a Chief Operating Officer. This is a major

business and we should have someone responsible for the operational function of that business. And of course, the Chief Financial Officer position is still open.

One of the good things about this whole process is that there's a lot of work that has been done. I mentioned the Superintendent's Executive Advisory Group before. We started together about 2 years ago and broke up into three subgroups. Brent Husson and other senior leaders from CCSD have created a model that they call the return-on-investment model such that they took all of the 300-plus schools in the District and fully weighted them for all the different costs associated with the school. They then started looking at what the outcomes were. So, we now have the ability to see which schools have relatively lower costs but relatively higher outcomes, and just the opposite. So, we can compare schools. This will be an incredible management tool. We do need to do some tweaking to it, but I think it will be very helpful through this A.B. 394 process.

I actually co-chaired the program evaluation committee with a member of the school leaders. If you'd gone into the school district a couple years ago you would have found page after page after page of programs, but nobody knew whether those programs really worked or not. What our committee has done is give them a way to evaluate programs relative to outcomes, as well as develop a process for both on-board as well as off-board programs. This advisory group made up of a number of business leaders and other community leaders has been helpful, but we could put this in turbo drive, I think.

I am also currently the Vice Chair of the SAGE Commission. We have one more meeting in November to consider various recommendations. We'll be looking at our report in December and providing that report some time in January to the Governor, the Legislative Counsel Bureau and the State Board of Education.

There are a lot of other things that are being done out there that all need to be coordinated. For example, over a year ago, CCEA started their Culture and Climate Committee. We have a real need in terms of the number of teachers in our community. One way to reduce that need is to retain great teachers. The purpose of this committee is to provide a culture and climate that will do that. After the last legislative session, Nevada Succeeds asked what's next, and for the last year they've been looking at recommendations for the District to improve operations and improve District effectiveness. This organization is being chaired by Lieutenant Governor Hutchinson as well as former Secretary of State Ross Miller. It's intended to be a bipartisan organization. The Clark County Education Association has stepped up and is going to provide \$2,000,000 for leadership training, which is an incredible opportunity. The Public Education Foundation is willing to step up and help train as well.

But let me give you a perfect example of some of the challenges we have. In terms of leadership training, the CCEA has leadership training, the Public Education Foundation wants to do leadership training and the District itself has leadership training. But nobody's overseeing or providing a strategic plan to make sure that we're effective with the resources that we have. This is a place where I think an organization like the TSC² Group could be very helpful to you. There is also a number of nonprofit organizations that have some great

ideas: HOPE for Nevada, Communities in Schools, Teach for America, Nevada PEP. Right now, there's no way to get a lot of these great ideas into the reorganization because they keep bumping up against this massive organization. I think one of the things that this Implementation Council can do is be a repository for great ideas, and maybe we can help sort out ones that can be effective and particularly helpful.

This is intended to be a 1-year assignment. By the time we get to October 31 of next year, our goal is that all of the necessary policies and organizations will be in place working with the CCSD leadership. The school organizational teams need to be in place. The weighted funding formula needs to be in place according to the regulation. We want a robust communications plan. Finally, I think maybe most importantly, once this process is done and once this transition team has left, we need to have a sustainable organization. It doesn't do any good for us to come in, help and then leave and not be part of the culture.

In conclusion, there are a couple things that I'd like to say. First of all, I don't have a dog in this fight. I have been very engaged with the education issues. I've put a lot of time in. I've accepted no compensation. I'm not running for office. The only thing that I'm trying to do here is, based on the observations that I have had over the last 3 years, I really believe that there is a need for a group to come in and help implement A.B. 394.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you, Mr. Christenson. I want to personally thank you. You mentioned stepping up. You don't need to be doing this. You're doing this because you care about our community. We are very lucky to have someone of your caliber willing to step forward and do this, so I want to personally thank you for that.

We will take questions, but I don't want to do it just yet. I want to have Tom Skancke come up and present, and then the Committee can ask questions of both of you at the same time.

THE CHAIR CALLED FOR A BRIEF RECESS.

We now have Tom Skancke at the table. Please proceed.

Tom Skancke (President, CEO, TSC² Group):

This is a very exciting time in our community and specifically around K-12 education. Assembly Bill 394 represents one of the most important reforms that the Nevada Legislature, the School District and the State Board of Education have ever embarked upon. And that's all thanks to the leadership of this body and your colleagues in the State Legislature. It is critically important that we, as a State, get a major policy change like A.B. 394 right. That's why we all need to work together to ensure that this law is implemented with equity and fidelity. In order to do that, we need we need a group of people who are implementers, who can bring skill sets to the table to change what needs to be changed and manage the change effectively. I've had the great opportunity to work with Glenn

Christenson for the past 25 years, in a previous life for both of us at Station Casinos and most recently as the Chair and now Chair Emeritus of the LVGEA. What Mr. Christenson neglected to tell you earlier today about his wife is that she's also a school teacher. In working together, Mr. Christenson and our Board and my team collectively and fundamentally changed the course of economic development for all of southern Nevada. In that change, we embraced the idea that education and economic development were inextricably linked and that we couldn't have an effective economic development effort without a high-quality K-12 and higher education system.

So, as we changed the direction of economic development in southern Nevada, we started working very closely with the School District. Mr. Christenson, Brent Husson, Sylvia Lazos, Dr. Beverly Mathis, Punam Mathur, Vicki Courtney and many other people started to work together. The key word there is work together to see how they could help the Clark County School District. We called that effort the LVGEA Education Council. Our job there was not to tell teachers what to do, not to turn our schools into businesses, but rather to see where we could all help as a community and how we could partner together in education. As Mr. Christenson mentioned and you may recall, it was the LVGEA that was the first business organization in the State to step up in support of the K-12 funding proposal that you all passed in 2015.

I have been in this community for nearly three decades and I have seen time and time again where educators have asked for help from the business community and the business community was not there. Well, in the past couple of years the business community has been there and it is largely thanks to Glenn Christenson.

Let's fast-forward to today and the matter that is before us. You all developed and unanimously passed A.B. 394 regulations, the State Board of Education unanimously approved them and the Legislative Commission unanimously ratified them. They prescribe that CCSD and the State do many things in a very fast timeline. Those things include 1) recruiting, hiring and appointing new school associate superintendents; 2) setting up a new administrative structure based upon the decentralized model; 3) implementing the budgeting and administrative mechanisms necessary to ensure that 357 school precincts have the data and the budgeting authority they need to comply with the regulations; 4) that means that CCSD has to figure out in a very short order how to reallocate 80 percent of their operating budget to local school precincts and what actual budgeting authority those local school precincts will have; 5) CCSD and the Nevada Department of Education also need to figure out how they are going to address the transition to the weighted funding formula under A.B. 394 regulations, because according to number five, the budgets at each local school precinct need to be determined by the number of kids at the school and the type of education that those kids need to achieve; 6) CCSD also needs to set up a customer service model for their Central Services Department. This is a fundamental realignment that is essential to the success of the decentralized school governance model you all have developed and there are many, many, many more things that need to be done over the next 30, 90 and 180 days and over the next year to get these regulations implemented.

Educators across the State are working hard to ensure that all of our children achieve their highest potential, and many of the things prescribed in the A.B. 394 regulations are directly related to the delivery of education at the local school level. But many of the changes prescribed in the A.B. 394 regulations are changes to business practices and organizational structures. Personally, I think it's inappropriate for business people to tell a teacher how he or she should teach a class, or a school nurse how he or she should administer therapy. But I do think it is appropriate for business people to help develop budgeting and purchasing systems which provide more fiscal accountability, responsibility and transparency. I think it is appropriate for us to draw on the resources of the business community to help set up a customer service system for the District's Central Services Department to ensure that our schools get high quality services delivered to them in a timely fashion. That's what we're talking about here in this proposal.

The proposal itself is split up into three phases ([Exhibit F](#)). Phase one is the information-gathering phase and the initial setup of the A.B. 394 Community implementation Council. That will take us about 60 days. It will wrap up around the beginning of the holidays. We will do an initial analysis and assessment of all of the systems and processes around the A.B. 394 implementation. Phase two will begin around the holidays and cover the first part of the deployment of the A.B. 394 transition. This is where those budgeting systems and organizational systems will need to be developed. It is also the start of the transition from a central administration model to a customer service-based Central Services Department. Throughout this phase we'll need to communicate effectively and continue to earn the trust of all of the stakeholders. This phase will end just as the 2017 Legislature is beginning, so we'll need to effectively communicate to all of you what has happened and what still needs to be done to keep us in a successful transition. Phase three will be what we call the transition management phase. During this phase we will employ the strategies laid out in the strategic plan around the transition. We'll measure outcomes. We'll deploy more systems and work to ensure that any changes needed will be done transparently with equity and fidelity to the regulations.

Our work will conclude 1 year from now when CCSD will be developing the budget books for precincts in the 2018-2019 school year and 85 percent of the CCSD operating funds will be required to be allocated to local schools. Our goal is to lay out a strong foundation for a long-term sustainable and successful implementation of the A.B. 394 regulations. This is a limited appointment. Our work will primarily be around the transition of administrative and business functions. And you will know we're doing our work because we'll measure it every step of the way. The budget we've developed for this program is inclusive of all the costs we currently anticipate throughout the year. The costs include transition management and outreach services, strategic plan development, project management, both internal and external Communications and all of the services related to community outreach. The second part of this is the employment of one or more education policy consultants that will be added to the team. Thirdly, in the event that there is a need for financial consultants to help us with this overall effort, we will reach out to those individuals as well. And the final costs are administrative items related to the Community Implementation Council itself.

As a company, the TSC² Group will commit all of the necessary resources it needs to this effort and will put the necessary team in place to get this work done on time, on budget and in a very timely manner. There is a lot of work ahead, and that work needs to be done for the children of this community. When, not if, we are successful, we will transform the way K-12 education is delivered in this community. Clark County will be known for something besides gaming and tourism. We will be known for transforming our school system into something that our State, our children, our families, our teachers, our community and our country can be proud of.

Ms. Lazos was correct. It can get worse. But I think it can get better. This should not be political nor should it be personal. It should be about what is best for the children of our community. That's why I'm here. That's why Mr. Christenson is here. That's why Superintendent Skorkowsky is here. That's why we're all here. That's why you all undertook this amazing piece of legislation and regulation. You see, it's about the kids and the environment in which they learn. It's the environment in which teachers teach. And it's about setting up processes and procedures that allow these professionals to do their job. Our kids will be sitting in our chairs, in your chairs, one day. If we implement this policy correctly, those future senators, assemblymen and assemblywomen can be talking about how we keep the best schools in the nation, not talking about how we can fix the poorest performing schools in the nation. I believe we can do this: the business community in conjunction with the education community, working together, stepping up. I think this can be done. In fact, I know it can be done. We just need the chance to step up and lead and make sure that this is done on time and on budget for the future of our community and our State.

Chair Roberson:

I will now entertain questions for Mr. Skancke and Mr. Christenson.

Assemblyman Lynn Stewart (Assembly District No. 22):

In the time that I have been in the Legislature, I've always advocated that we need to have more cooperation between government, business and education. One of the challenges that we've always had is that when business gets involved, they really don't understand education for the most part. I think if we conducted a nationwide search we couldn't have come up with a better man than Glenn Christenson to lead this. Both of you are not only great businessmen, but you know education, and that's a great comfort to me. So, I've spent a lot of time in the last 2 days going over this. I've looked at this team that you've put together. We could have taken weeks to try to find individuals that could do this, and we've come up with the individuals that can do this probably better than anyone else. So, I'm very supportive of this. I forgot my question, but I just wanted to say I'm supportive of what's going on here.

Senator Joseph (Joe) P. Hardy (Senatorial District No. 12):

I guess I should probably have somebody from the School District come up and say yes, they agree to the sharing of the costs that are being proposed, but it's my understanding that we are asking for the money to be out of the Clark County School District. Somebody must be in favor of that because we've talked about it or somebody's talked about it and said so, right?

Chair Roberson:

I will say for the record that the regulations provide that the cost of this contract will be borne by the School District.

Senator Hardy:

I guess that's still my question. Does the School District have an opinion on this? Do they want to accept all of this free work on behalf of this small investment?

Chair Roberson:

Well, whether anyone comes up or not, it is the law.

Senator Hardy:

I'm a law-abiding citizen.

Senator Moises (Mo) Denis (Senatorial District No. 2):

So, a lot of work has been put into this. How long has this been in development?

Mr. Christenson:

I probably started thinking about this 6 to 8 weeks ago. I was seeing that your work was coming to a conclusion, and the thing that I could not figure out was how this was going to actually get done. I talked with Mr. Skancke about it and we came up with this proposal. We shared it with Senator Roberson, John Vellardita and with some other business people to get their ideas about it. But it's probably been 6 to 8 weeks.

Senator Denis:

I appreciate that, because I know that you've talked to some of these individuals over the last month or so. I got to see this for the first time yesterday. I didn't get to give any input or anything on it, and now I've got the proposal before me and I feel like it's already been done and somebody wants me to rubber-stamp it or something. I know you've got some great individuals on here, which I think is great. But in this whole implementation, half of these

SOTs will be made up of parents. I understand that probably most of these people you have on here are parents, but they're not individuals who on a day-to-day basis are working with parents and trying to get input from parents and understand that process. All of these individuals are coming from different aspects, which is great, but I think that having that parent participation—I come from a Parent Teacher Association (PTA) background where we spent a lot of time going into classrooms and talking with the parents, working with parents, and I just don't see this succeeding without having that input there. People can say, and I've seen this from many educational things not just here but across the country, that oh, you know, they're a parent and they have kids so that qualifies them to give that input. I think we need to have someone on here who does that and have that parent participation on there.

Mr. Christenson:

My wife is a former PTA president, so I'm very familiar with the work that they do. The purpose of this Committee really is as I mentioned earlier, we want to be very clear that we're talking about the management and the operation of the organization. The educational piece of what's going on in the classroom and the interaction with those parents, teachers and principals is really kind of a different situation. We need to understand and make sure that they're set up. I don't know that we necessarily need to get involved in that actual interaction. That was the thought process.

Senator Denis:

I thought somewhere in here I read that there was going to be some coordination, or maybe it was in the budget, services related to community outreach. Isn't that a piece of this?

Mr. Christenson:

Yes. I touched on that a little bit when I talked about all of these different groups who are working on something around K-12 education. The problem is that it's been so hard to break through. I think having this Implementation Council in place will allow for a repository for those ideas and help us to sort those out and put the ones in that we think could be most effective in the near-term.

Senator Denis:

So, is it only implementing the logistical pieces of this happening? Is that what you're saying that this Implementation Council would do? How do you put together finances for this? How do you organize meetings? I'm trying to get my mind around how that would work.

Mr. Skancke:

Part of the first 60 to 90 days of this is actually putting all of that together. This is a very heavy, heavy lift. We've actually had lots of conversations, and I've personally had

conversations with people in the community about this A.B. 394 implementation. There's a whole process that has to happen over the next 90 days. We will identify those individuals. Regarding the structure of the Council, it will meet on a monthly basis. It has to meet in a public hearing forum because those meetings will be held here. Public testimony and input will be taken. We will supply information to the Council, which will then supply information back to this Advisory Committee. It will be a very, very transparent process so that the community has as much input as they want into the process. The community will have as much opportunity to testify.

The goal here is to do what we did with economic development. That framework worked extremely well. The more people you have participating in the process—when we were doing economic development here, and I've done this in other parts of the country, we had over 400 people sitting around the table talking about the future of economic development. In my mind, that's the goal we should have here. So, I'm really impressed with the number of people that are actually here today for this meeting to talk about implementation of this. So as I said, the first 60 to 90 days is to start identifying who those people are, laying out the process by which we this. Should the Committee approve this today, Mr. Christenson has suggested that the first meeting be October 2 here at the Grant Sawyer Building. That will be a public hearing where we will set up the organizational structure and begin to move the process forward.

Senator Denis:

I appreciate that, but as I look at the list here and in talking about this discussion we're having, we have teachers and the community groups represented. I'm just saying once again, I think there needs to be a parent representative looking out for the parents. That's something that I've always thought for over the last 30 years because I think it's important to have that voice. Those voices are out there. If somebody had asked me about it, I probably would have given that input before, but nobody gave me a call or anything. I didn't know anything about what you've been working on for 6 weeks. I understand that you did try to call some of the folks, but I didn't get a phone call. I think that we definitely need to have some type of Implementation Council. I don't disagree with that. I think that for this to really succeed, there has to be something there in place. I guess I'm giving more of a reaction because it's the first time I'm really seeing this and trying to understand and grasp it.

Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz (Assembly District No. 11, Vice Chair):

Thank you gentlemen for wanting to improve our School District as much as every single person on this side of the dais has. I know that Senator Denis and a lot of my colleagues got involved in the political process because they wanted a better outcome for kids in their districts. That's why we are here making sure we show that we can do better by them. One thing that keeps coming to mind is, I think that the scope of the work that you're putting together is too broad. I think it needs to be focused and finite. I keep replaying the scenarios of No Child Left Behind in my head. When I was in the trenches, we gave it a whirl and said schools need to be more like businesses. They need to show that they are meeting the

targets. We need to have all of our kids performing at the same percentage. This needs to happen now. The thing was that the metrics helped us see where we were missing the mark, but we never actually did anything to improve the quality and practices of our teaching in the trenches. We were constantly scrutinizing our school, saying, "Shame on you, your Latino ELL subgroup fails. You're failing your African-American subgroup. Look at these numbers, they're atrocious." But we never got to the root of the problem.

What I'm seeing here is that there's a lot of dabbling in many different areas. I think your expertise would be greatly used if we look at strictly Central Office operations and how in this new system we can fine-tune, improve and make them better. But I really don't think we need to go anywhere beneath the Central Services at this point. If we truly are talking about reorganization and giving the power back to those administrators, teachers and parents to ensure that we have schools that are building a sense of community, I think we should empower them, embolden them and let's give them that support that they need to make that vision come true. But in my head as I'm reading the changes that you seek, I think it would behoove everyone if we just focused on Central Services because that's going to be a huge shift. Currently, the structure is everything top-down, but now we're inverting it and everything is going to be bottom-up. So how is the District going to do that huge paradigm shift. I think that the best way to use your experience and your background would be in that area. And then after we've figured out the logistics with maintenance and all of those other numerous things in terms of purchasing, and there are so many. There are so many. How do you provide professional development? How do you ensure that everything is ready on call in the queue for when a school requests it? I think that's a big enough project. I don't think we need to necessarily go—because I know that the School District has a pretty darn good communications team. They're everywhere. They're spreading the word. We have a Family and Community Engagement Services Department that engages families. So I'm thinking, if we can be intentional and purposeful and strictly keep the scope of this work to central services, I think it will do light-years and wonders for how it's going to have this effect which everyone is panicking about at the school level.

Just like my colleague Senator Denis, we would have appreciated receiving the information before yesterday and then seeing it all before us. Because we could have helped fine-tune and give you perspectives from some of us who have been in the trenches teaching, who have had the State representatives walk into our buildings. But I think the most effective use of your time would be at the Central Offices, and I hope that you guys can really think about that because I think that there's a huge shift that's going to be happening now.

Mr. Christenson:

One of the first things that Mr. Skancke his team are going to do is come in and evaluate exactly where we are on all of these things, and it may well be that you're right. We haven't been in there yet. We've got some pretty good ideas about things we think that should happen. If we come in, do an assessment and develop a strategic plan around what we want to do, after 30 days we'll have a better idea of exactly what we think we can accomplish.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

So then, another question is what are the metrics to measure the efficiency of the work? Because I see that we kind of lay out there what we want to do, but teachers' effectiveness is measured through their evaluation tools, so do the administrators have an evaluation process? What is the evaluation process that's before us here to make sure that this investment is going to be a good investment? I think that if you start with the end in mind and you know what you're shooting for—I'm preaching to the choir because you guys are business folks and I'm just a teacher. But I think we need to know what are we trying to accomplish from the outset, and then how do we measure the effectiveness of that? When we come back and say, "Maybe we want to continue this, and this is why. Because we showed that we complied or that we reached our goal," or whatever the evaluation tool will be. So what do you envision that being?

Mr. Christenson:

I envision that being a process of talking with the school leaders and the senior leadership at the District. You're exactly right. What is it that we're trying to accomplish here? What is it that we're trying to develop? Right now, there are a lot of different metrics but nobody knows exactly what they are. Maybe we could provide some structure around that. We would want to talk with these folks and together develop something that actually is important in terms of determining what success really means. I think that's a process that I've seen lacking at times. How do you define success at the end of the day? What are the metrics that we should put in place? I think having that discussion will be very important for A.B. 394 to be successful. Sitting here today, I don't know what they are. Working closely with Mr. Skancke's team, that's one of the first things that we need to look at. What is it that we're measuring and are we following the right things for the outcomes that we want to see?

Assemblywoman Diaz:

My last point is that as we see the progress that's being made towards identifying those schools that are on the list for Achievement School Districts, they have defined exactly what that process is, what they're looking for and what the categories are. One of the criticisms that I have gotten back about the scope of work on the reorganization is that we haven't been very clear as far as what we're looking to accomplish. What is the endgame going to be about? What are those finite bullets that we will know we did our job on this Committee because we held these meetings? But it's still very fuzzy in a lot of people's minds. They don't understand what this reorganization means and it's very confusing. But I think that if we already have notions, ideas and concepts and know what's good for kids, then we should already have a frame of reference by which we keep ourselves in check.

Mr. Christenson:

I agree. I think that we will be able to help structure those kinds of things. You're thinking like a business person. That's good. I live with an educator so I have the benefit of understanding the way that educators think. What I have found is that they do think differently about things. When you get them together, good things happen because they look at things from a different perspective. For this effort to be successful, it's got to be very collaborative. Our proposal is not intended at all to come in and say, "This is what it is. We're running the place now." That won't work. We have to work collaboratively to get an outcome. We saw that happen at the Education Council. We know that business people and educators can work together, and that's the goal here.

Senator Becky Harris (Senatorial District No. 9):

I have some questions for you around your budget. I'm looking at the educational policy development budget and the financial consultant services budget ([Exhibit F](#)). Together those are almost a third of the budget that you've put together. In the footnotes down below that the budget, a lot of those monies are designated as an hourly rate to a consultant for \$350 an hour. As I calculate the number of hours that that equals and the long-term ramifications of this project being a year, I'm a little curious. I'd like a little more explanation about first of all why the consultant services have to be on-call. Second, who it is that you anticipate will be hired to provide these consulting services. Third, how it is that you arrived at an hourly rate of \$350 an hour. Is there another way perhaps that you could hire a consultant? Are you anticipating these will be office hours 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.? Are they attending going to be attending after-hours meetings of the Committee? I'm just very confused as I look at your budget and that dollar amount of \$350 an hour and then the on-call, so I'd just like a little more explanation about what your vision is. How do you anticipate you're actually going to use these dollars and who is it you're anticipating you're going to hire?

Chair Roberson:

That's from Mike Strembitsky.

Senator Harris:

So, he would be the sole consultant on both the education policy development and the financial consultant services?

Mr. Skancke:

The way we put that together is that in the event we need on-call services, or if we need financial consultants for example, to come in and take a look at something, it's just as Mr. Christenson pointed out earlier. Since we put this budget together, the accounting firm of Fair, Anderson and Langerman stepped forward with Ms. Flores. They wanted to be a part of this process and we were trying to get some millennials and CPAs involved in the process. They agreed to provide that service. So, that is listed as on-call in the event that

we have to hire any outside financial consultants, in the event that we need to bring Mr. Strembitsky back to participate in this, or if we have to bring in another education consultant. They would be on-call. In my opinion, that's not 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. Those would be individuals that we might need for a month, 6 weeks or 2 months. For the budget that we prepared, we're hoping that we don't have to spend the whole amount. That's the goal, but what we've prepared for you is what we think this effort is going to take. That's what you have before you today. As a fiscal conservative, my goal is to tell you that we would not spend all the money that is in that budget. That's why we put in there specifically "as needed" and "on- call."

Senator Harris:

I appreciate that. I just wondered if there's any thought that's been put into hiring somebody, maybe on a project basis, once you have a better idea as to what the scope of the work is so that we're not just looking at a \$350 per hour rate for a consultant. Maybe as you're identifying what the challenges are or you find that maybe the District needs some financial consultant you could hire somebody to sit down and work on it on a project basis where the hours are a little more flexible but we have a sum certain and we're not just paying \$350 an hour for as long as it takes that consultant to do whatever they're doing. It's more of a scope of work bound by contract so that there's some fiscal management there with regard to use of the consultant.

Mr. Skancke:

I couldn't agree with you more. I have hired and fired a lot of consultants in my day. I am one, and I've been hired and fired a lot. It comes down to that fiscal responsibility. So, I don't look at having someone there full-time. We may need to bring someone in to work on an education piece for 2 months. We may have to bring in a financial person for 2 months. It would be an on-call, project-by-project basis. We're not looking at spending all of that money in that category right from the beginning. I don't run my company that way. When I hire consultants to work on projects with me, I hire them on a project-by-project basis.

Senator Harris:

Then at least for my sake, I would like to see that if you do have to go to outside consultants because it's beyond the expertise of the Council that's been put together, perhaps the use of many consultants on a limited basis where there's a scope of work and a contract around what it is that they're going to accomplish, so that it's not just a run-on of expenses.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Like Senator Harris, I have some questions on the budget. So on the budget page, you guys said "development of policy documents." I want clarity on that because I want to know

what kind of policy documents will you be doing? Number one, how is that power delineated to you? Shouldn't that be in the hands of somebody else, such as CCSD, the Board of Trustees or even the Legislature in and of itself? So I needed an explanation on what that meant.

Mr. Skancke:

I'd like to introduce Michael Vannozzi from my office. He will be administering a significant portion of this. Michael has spent the better part of his career working in education policy and implementation. It's a passion for him. He's the one who created the Education Council for us at the LVGEA, and he will be the lead project manager for us on this effort.

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

So, echoing what Senator Harris said, we will probably have to do a number of project-based policy initiatives. So, Dr. Strembitsky for example would be doing a project-based initiative or just on-call consulting. Other organizations that we could bring in include potentially Cornell or Harvard University, which has a great relationship with the School District. They could be really helpful in the development of certain policy documents in the way that they look at these things. I think that between the expertise at TSC² and the expertise that will be brought on from an outside perspective, a lot of the documentation and the thought that will be brought forward will be included in that portion of the budget.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Let me ask the question a different way. The scope of the policy you intend to get involved in, because that's really broad, I want to know if you're somehow entrenching or stepping into areas that have not been delegated to you. Do you have the authority to do it, because it should be something that is being done by the Trustees? Don't they do policy governance already? Don't they have staff create policy documents which they will then implement and push forward?

Mr. Vannozzi:

That's a great question. I think what we would be doing is drafting and proposing those policies if they become necessary, and then going through the appropriate due process for all of those policies. This is a public body that oversees and is giving direction for the development of regulations for the reorganization of the Clark County School District. Clearly the CCSD Board of Trustees has had certain roles. I think that we would be developing and proposing, and we would go through that due process as necessary.

Assemblywoman Neal:

In the presentation ([Exhibit F](#)), you guys said that what needs to happen, and I'm not clear on if you will be doing it, include projections for the individual school enrollment and the method of approaching the weighted funding formula. Isn't that already being done by somebody? Why does that need to be done by you?

Mr. Vannozzi:

That is an accounting of what all needs to be done through the regulation. Maybe we didn't word it exactly correctly, but the intent was to show what all needs to happen as far as this regulation goes. Our role is to generally assist in several different aspects, primarily related to business administration at the Central Administration level.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Maybe this is just your future foretelling of what needs to happen, but it says one of the things that needs to be done in the next 30 days includes resolving how CCSD and the Nevada Department of Education are going to treat the weighted funding formula until it is fully implemented by the Nevada Legislature. So, it's not clear here what your role is. What is the scope of that role and where did you get the expertise to get engaged in that policy discussion?

Mr. Vannozzi:

Again, that is an accounting of what needs to take place. There is a lot of facilitation and things that need to happen between now and then. But as the Superintendent remarked in his earlier testimony, that issue is unresolved at this time.

Assemblywoman Neal:

So, just for clarify for the record, you will not be in the business of this particular discussion, or will you?

Mr. Christenson:

It's not our decision to make. We would like to be helpful to the extent that we can be in that process, but ultimately those are decisions made by others. We know that those things are coming down the line. For example, I talked with Superintendent Canavero about this exact topic and getting this to the point where it's available to the District no later than December 1 or earlier, as Superintendent Skorkowsky mentioned. He can't get his budget books done, so we'll be assisting in whatever way we can to make sure that information gets there in a timely basis.

Assemblywoman Neal:

So just for my clarity, because I'm not clear on who "others" are because I thought there was an Legislative Interim Committee that had been dealing with the weighted funding formula. Senator Denis was a part of that committee. It's been an ongoing issue for several years in the Legislature. So, who are "others" for the record, so we can be clear?

Mr. Christenson:

Someone's ultimately going to tell the District what the weighted funding formula is. All we're saying here is that we need to get that plugged into the system so the District can get it into the budget books so that they can be prepared by January 15. We're not making those decisions. We are not involved in the policy. That's your folks' job. We're trying to be implementers and transition assistants. In this case, that's all we're talking about doing.

Assemblywoman Neal:

The Superintendent came to the table and mentioned, because I wrote it down, that professional development expertise was an area that he needed potential help. He also mentioned curriculum and textbooks allotments. So, what I'm trying to figure out is how do you fit into any of those three categories? What will be the manner in which you would fit into those categories? Or was he not even speaking about this organization at all?

Mr. Christenson:

I don't know specifically what he had in mind with respect to those. Coming back and doing an assessment of the first 30 days will help is determine exactly what we can be working on and what we should be working on. It may include helping to identify resources, but those are not areas that we necessarily would have expertise ourselves.

Chair Roberson:

I just want to reiterate a couple things that have been mentioned previously. The primary focus of this Community Implementation Council and the management consultant will be to assist in the transition of the Central Administration to a customer service oriented organization. This Community Implementation Council will answer to this Committee. So, I just want you and everyone to make sure of that. This Community Implementation Council reports back to this Committee, of which you are a member.

If there are no other questions, I want to thank you gentlemen for your presentations.

I want John Vellardita and Steven Augspurger to come up. They've been involved in these discussions and I think their input on this process as representatives of the teachers and principals of the School District very important.

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

There have been lots of discussions since last summer about the necessity of a transition team. I think that is an important piece that still needs to happen to provide clarity as this issue goes forward. I would like to make one request. When this process started last October, administrators were absent on any committee that was working with this process, and we are absent again today. As Senator Denis spoke about the parent component, I would like to request that we have some kind of administrative input directly into that process. Senator Roberson, I know as this thing unfolded last summer we were certainly involved, but I think it will speak well to our membership to have that kind of involvement at the ground level, particularly as we look at making Central Administration more of a service organization to schools. I think that dialogue needs to be there with people that are practitioners receiving that service. So again, I would speak to the necessity of having a transition team, but I would like to add that one request for your consideration.

Chair Roberson:

I'll certainly make the commitment to you, Mr. Augspurger, that we'll have an opportunity to have your membership and you be very involved in this process all along the way.

John Vellardita (Executive Director, Clark County Education Association):

I just want to address a few things that I heard. But I want to put this in context. We have a law, and we're at that point now where the law has to be implemented. Just to give people a sense of the timeline we're operating on, today's October 18. I think you heard the Superintendent refer to what regulations are out there that drive the calendar now. The calendar is controlled by the law. So by January 15, over 356 schools have to make a decision with \$2,000,000,000 to develop a budget and to develop a plan. The plan is around student achievement and the budget is the resources to move that plan. This is October 18. That's less than 12 weeks away, and in that 12 weeks there are at least 3 weeks where people aren't even around. So, we're effectively dealing with 9-plus weeks.

In that time frame, here are the things that have to be done. To your point Assemblywoman Diaz, I think the primary focus of the implementation is to manage the conversion of Central Administration to a service agency. I think what's critical to begin with is the building of a system for training all of these people: administrators, educators, parents, support staff and even students. That is a huge undertaking and I think what people have to understand is that there is a culture. You know that there is a culture inside the District that when things

get rolled out, there is skepticism as to whether or not it's going to be successful. So, building systems first and foremost around leadership, development and training is absolutely critical and that starts with Central. That's not being developed at the buildings yet. We have about 12 weeks to accomplish that. So, the first order of business per the law is essentially to develop plans and handle \$2,000,000,000 of public money. That is nothing to take lightly, and I know nobody here takes that lightly.

So, the necessity to have a transition team to assist the District is absolutely paramount. I think the Superintendent has outlined that need consistently throughout these proceedings. I know we've advocated for it. This is an organizational undertaking on a scale not done ever. The last time there was an effort to make organizational changes in the Clark County School District was in 2011. The organizational change agent that had an education background who also brought somebody else with an education background was Dwight Jones and Ken Turner. I think history speaks for itself in terms of the outcome of those changes. So, we're now at the point where we need assistance to help drive this transition and so, from CCEA's perspective, we are okay with the Committee as it has been formed. We're okay with the scope of their responsibilities. They're not about developing policy. They're not about developing instruction. They're about building systems and making the appropriate organizational changes, and I think they are great partners with the staff of the Clark County School District. I can tell you that I've been impressed with the leadership that has been emerging from the Clark County School District to move this ball down the court. That has not always been there.

Senator Denis, regarding your concern, there was no plan 6 weeks ago. You didn't even adopt this 6 weeks ago. September 1 was the first time the Board of Education adopted it. Then you had a subsequent meeting and the Legislative Commission ultimately adopted it. So, I think there have been discussions. The discussion really reflected in this presentation was the interest on the part of community stakeholders, in this case led by business leader Glenn Christenson, to ask what can we do to contribute. You've all had some other very important business the last week or more dealing with another issue that affects the State. So, I want to just share the excitement.

I want to end with this. Not too long ago after this became law, CCEA essentially began some education efforts to try to inform all educators what this opportunity meant, along with the challenges. And so, working with the Superintendent, we said, "You know what? We want to put a call out to leaders in the building and ask folks, 'Who wants to step up and take charge and be in the leadership of these SOTs?'" So again, working with the School District, we said, "If we put that call out, we should try to frame some criteria of leadership that people should be looking at." The first thing we said is that you've got to be an effective educator. You've got to be somebody who's a good practitioner and a resource for others and colleagues to look up to. The second thing was you've got to be able to work with your administrator. The third thing is you've got to be able to look at everybody, not just you or your classroom, but all stakeholders in that building. Finally, you've got to be able to foster a collaborative approach to the team. In the matter of 4 days, we had 1,340 educators that were nominated by their colleagues who said, "You know what, they fit this criteria. They

should be in it.” This was a very short time frame and we said, “Listen, per the law, the next thing we’ve got to do is, come January 15, these people have got to be trained and they have to be in a position to take the responsibility the law has given them and make the appropriate changes.”

But then we had to figure out an election system, which we now have figured out. Again, we worked with the School District on that. And we’re not the only ones. The support staff have to do the same thing. The parental engagement is a huge undertaking. All of this stuff has to be done in less than 12 weeks, and we have a winter break and holidays in there. I just want to stress to folks that having the assistance to come on board to work with the School District, not to be authorities on policy or instruction, but to be experts to assist in partnership with the School District’s team the organizational changes that have to take place and the systems that have to be built. So we support this, and I would ask that each and every one of you support it too. This Committee’s had a track record of voting in a bipartisan way and has found consensus each step of the way. I would ask that you do that today.

The final thought I want to leave everyone with, and we’ve been really consistent about this, is once we’ve launched this, we think the next most important act on the part of Legislative leaders is in the 2017 Session to address the weighted funding formula. Because even though the law mandates that the Department of Education work with the School District now and come up with those weights by December 1 so that on January 15 these organizational teams have some kind of parameters to develop budgets, they still have to be funded. It still has to be funded, and I would ask each and every one of you to also keep that in mind moving forward in the 2017 Session.

THE CHAIR CALLED FOR A BRIEF RECESS.

Chair Roberson:

So, I would like to ask the Committee to entertain two motions. The first motion would be to approve the formation of the Community Implementation Council with Glenn Christenson as Chair and the membership of the Council as outlined by Mr. Christenson in his presentation today.

ASSEMBLYMAN SILBERKRAUS MOVED TO APPROVE THE FORMATION OF THE COMMUNITY IMPLEMENTATION COUNCIL WITH GLENN CHRISTENSON AS CHAIR AND THE ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL AS OUTLINED BY MR. CHRISTENSON IN HIS PRESENTATION.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED (ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ AND ASSEMBLYWOMAN NEAL VOTED NO; SENATOR FORD AND SENATOR DENIS WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE).

The second motion I would ask is for a motion to approve the hiring of the TSC² Group as the management consultant and authorize the Legislative Council Bureau to enter into a contract with the TSC² Group based on the proposal outlined today with a cap on the dollar amount being \$1,188,000.

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART MOVED TO APPROVE THE HIRING OF THE TSC² GROUP AS THE MANAGEMENT CONSULTANT AND AUTHORIZE THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU (LCB) TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH THE TSC² GROUP BASED UPON THE PROPOSAL OUTLINED TODAY WITH A CAP ON THE DOLLAR AMOUNT AT \$1,188,000.00.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED (ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ AND ASSEMBLYWOMAN NEAL VOTED NO; SENATOR FORD AND SENATOR DENIS WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE).

Chair Roberson:

I will now open public comment.

Annette Dawson Owens (Break Free CCSD):

I love what we heard here tonight about vision and that we want to be known for having the best schools in the nation. I love that concept. We will know that we have succeeded when we have the very best schools here, when we can keep our teachers and when we produce students locally that are ready to be employed by the companies we are bringing here with our ever-changing 21st century jobs. I just want to thank everyone here. I realize how much I love this community. The members of this Committee, the members of the District, the members of the charter: we're all together. I love that we're coming together as a community. We are so excited to hear who our new associate superintendents are. We're excited to hear about our school organizational teams that are forming. We're excited about this improved culture and climate and the quality of teachers. Most importantly, we are looking forward to our schools being empowered, our principals and teachers soaring and

flying, doing what they do best, and even more importantly our kids. It's all about our kids learning and loving school.

Chair Roberson:

Seeing no one else, I will now close public comment.

I have some final administrative matters. We will not schedule another meeting at this time. We will allow the Community Implementation Council to get organized and then we will determine the best time to meet again to receive a report from the Council.

This is most likely the last Committee meeting for Assemblyman Stewart. I want to thank you for your great service to the State over these many years you've been serving Assembly District 22. You are my Assemblyman. I'm going to miss you in that capacity. I still expect to see you a lot, and I expect you to continue your wonderful public service in many other ways going forward. Thank you for your service on this Committee. It's been invaluable.

Chair Roberson:

Will now adjourn this meeting at 6:14 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jordan Haas, Interim Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Michael Roberson, Chair

Date: _____

Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
A		Agenda
B		Attendance Roster
C	Linda Hiller, Interim Secretary	Draft Minutes from the August 16, 2016 Meeting
D	Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent, CCSD	Update on the A.B. 394 Reorganization
E	Glenn Christenson	Implementing A.B. 394 Presentation
F	Tom Skancke, President, CEO, TSC ² Group	TSC ² Group Scope of Work