

**MINUTES OF THE 2017-2018 INTERIM
ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO MONITOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
REORGANIZATION OF LARGE SCHOOL DISTRICTS**

AUGUST 7, 2017

The meeting of the Advisory Committee to Monitor the Implementation of the Reorganization of Large School Districts was called to order by Chair Michael Roberson at 9:11 a.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 2134, 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
Senator Aaron D. Ford, Senatorial District No. 11
Senator Joseph (Joe) P. Hardy, Senatorial District No. 12
Senator Becky Harris, Senatorial District No. 9
Assemblyman Paul Anderson, Assembly District No. 13
Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Assembly District No. 7
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury, Assembly District No. 23

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT (TELECONFERENCE):

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz, Assembly District No. 11, Vice Chair

STAFF MEMBERS

Brenda Erdoes, 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
Jen Sturm, Research Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Angela Hartzler, Secretary, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Jordan Haas, Interim Secretary, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau

OTHERS PRESENT:

Fred Horvath, Executive Director of Member Benefits, Teamsters Local No. 14
Courtney Sweetin, Member, Break Free CCSD
Dr. Lindsey Dalley, Member, Moapa Valley A.B. 394 Community Education Advisory Board Task Force

Annette Dawson Owens, Member, Break Free CCSD
Frances Martin
Daniel Barber, Teacher, Durango High School
Dr. Larry Moses
Robert Hollowood, Teacher, Staton Elementary School
Tom Skancke, President, CEO, TSC² Group
Glenn Christenson, Chair, Community Implementation Council
Michael Vannozzi, Vice President of Creative Strategies, TSC² Group
Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent, Clark County School District
Brenda Larsen-Mitchell, School Associate Superintendent, Performance Zone No. 12
Grant Hanevold, School Associate Superintendent, Performance Zone No. 2
Lorna James-Cervantes, School Associate Superintendent, Performance Zone No. 5
Antonio Rael, School Associate Superintendent, Performance Zone No. 15
John Vellardita, Executive Director, Clark County Education Association
Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators
and Technical-Professional Employees
Dr. Steve Canavero, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Nevada Department of
Education
Elaine Wynn, President, Nevada State Board of Education
Angie Sullivan, Teacher, Stanford Elementary School
Jim Frazee, Teacher, Centennial High School
Anna Slighting, Honoring Our Public Education (HOPE) for Nevada
David Gomez, Nevada Peace Alliance

Chair Roberson:

I will now open the first meeting of the Advisory Committee to Monitor the Implementation of the Reorganization of Large School Districts.

I will open agenda item II, public comment.

Fred Horvath (Executive Director of Member Benefits, Teamsters Local No. 14):

I'm here today along with Larry Griffith, the Secretary-Treasurer of Teamsters Local No. 14, and Grant Davis, the Vice President of Operations. We regret that our participation in this transformational change in the Clark County School District (CCSD) remains confined to this public comment opportunity, but we know that this will soon change. When it does, we will be active partners with all involved in this critically important work. We share the core belief that the enabling legislation and subsequent implementation efforts will fundamentally improve the education results for this most important constituency, the children served by CCSD. The leadership at Teamsters Local No. 14 will bring significant expertise and collaborative problem solving, consensus decision making and communication processes required to create a lasting cultural change in the organization.

We've witnessed first-hand the incredible challenges inflicted on local government emanating from the collapse of the housing market in this country and the associated decimation of the

property and sales tax receipts. Working with Governor Sandoval and his staff in this very building, Teamsters Local No. 14 took the lead in crafting and accepting restructured terms and conditions that enabled the City of North Las Vegas to avoid receivership. Only after Teamsters Local No. 14 agreed to the settlement structure did the public safety meetings follow suit. That same collaborative relationship between Teamsters Local No. 14 and the City of Henderson allowed the city to navigate unprecedented financial pressures through numerous operational modifications and concession agreements.

In my previous role as the Assistant City Manager at the City of Henderson, Mr. Griffith and I created solutions for the greater good of the organization and therefore its employees and citizens. Additionally, we possess over 25 years of experience in developing and managing sophisticated employee benefit plans, single-employer, multi-employer, Taft-Hartley trusts and municipal governments' self-funded medical plans. We have extensive experience with numerous retirement income security plans and post-retirement medical and disability plans. We are prepared and energized to bring our years of experience and working knowledge of all of these plans and the same collaborative strategies and core values to our relationship with CCSD's leadership, its students, administrators and teachers, and most importantly, the 12,000 support staff employees.

We'd like to thank John Vellardita for inviting us to the financial consensus decision making training sessions that were the foundational steps in this process. We embrace this opportunity and continue to study the finances and operations of CCSD. Unlike Mr. Vellardita's organization, the Education Support Employees Association, I refuse to waive membership requirements as a condition to participate as a member of the school organizational team (SOT), leaving hundreds of committed support staff disenfranchised from this critical work. Quite frankly, we are still in amazement of how a group supported by only 32 percent of those represented, having lost three consecutive elections, receiving 970 votes out of 12,000 employees in the most recent election, continues to be recognized by the District. We remain confident that the State Supreme Court will affirm the Attorney General's Employee-Management Relations Board's decision later this year and recognize the Teamsters Local No. 14 as the duly elected representatives for the Support Staff.

In closing, speaking for Mr. Griffith and Mr. Davis, we would like to offer our congratulations and thanks to each of you for providing the courage and leadership required to undertake and successfully implement such an enormous organizational and cultural change initiative. The students of CCSD will be forever in your debt.

Courtney Sweetin (Member, Break Free CCSD):

I'm from Mesquite, Nevada. I sit on the SOT for Virgin Valley Elementary School. I'm also with Break Free CCSD, and we've followed this process from the very beginning. When I started with Break Free CCSD, I was just a mom with two young kids and a background in education. My kids weren't old enough for school then, but next week I have a 5-year-old that's starting kindergarten at Virgin Valley, and I have a 3-year-old who is going to be starting pre-kindergarten at Joseph L. Bowler Elementary School in a self-contained classroom with an individualized education plan (IEP).

So, I've got a lot of interest in what's going on here. I wasn't going to come today because we've got a lot going on getting ready for school, but our SOT ran into an issue that we have not been able to resolve through the appropriate channels. When our budget came out earlier this year, we were over \$100,000 underfunded at the elementary school. In the regulations, it specifically and very clearly said that rural schools would not receive less than they had for the 2016-2017 School Year, but we were underfunded. We brought this to the attention of the District and thought it would be quickly fixed. We got a lot of explanations for why that was, none very satisfactory. One was that we had projected fewer students, which doesn't make sense when Mesquite is the fastest growing city in the state. We're going to have significantly more students than we had the year before. One was that this is something the District does when the Legislature's in session and it's a way to get extra money. So we should just wait it out, and once the legislative session was over, we would see that money. But that didn't happen. One interesting suggestion came from two school associate superintendents, Grant Hanevold and Jeff Hybarger, who suggested to our principal that we borrow the money from the middle school and the high school until Count Day and then pay it back, rather than getting it from the District. Our principal asked, and they said, "No, we don't have that money. We're not in the business of lending."

So, we've kind of exhausted all our efforts. Thankfully, because of your work in the Legislature, we have these regulations so we can file a lawsuit. We've looked at that avenue through the city and the community educational advisory board (CEAB), because we are not funded to the level that we are supposed to be. That is not the way that anybody wants to go. We simply want the regulations to be followed, especially now that they are state law. We want to see our students start the year with the teachers that they need. We lost two teaching positions because of that budget shortfall. As an SOT, we were able to strategize and get money from other places and cut some programs in order to put a teacher in fourth grade where she was needed. But we are going to be starting the year without a kindergarten teacher. These kids are going to start in overcrowded classrooms. When Count Day comes, they'll get a new teacher who will have to start school in the middle of the year and the kids will have to be taken and put into a new class.

The reason why I drove down here with my two kids in the car is to see what we can do here. I understand that you guys have a lot of other things going on, and Mesquite's small. But our Trustee hangs up on our CEAB when we bring up questions that she doesn't like. Our school associate superintendent hasn't been helpful. We don't know where to go to get this resolved. So, I'm hoping that based on my past experience with this group and all of you—and thank you for your work and for what you've done. Without you, I think we'd still be dead last. Now we have the hope for something better with the reorganization, so thank you for that.

Chair Roberson:

I'd like to hear the School District address the issues and concerns raised by Ms. Sweetin when they present today. So, let's not forget that.

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

I'm from Logandale, Nevada, and I'm on our Mack Lyon Middle School SOT. I'm a community member. We are having the same issues. In section 19(3), it specifically spells out that rural schools are not to receive any less funding from the previous year, meaning last year. We have lost three of our teachers. That puts us in a position in rural schools, and Mesquite is in the same position, that you don't lose—in a large urban school, you may increase class size a little bit, but there are other teachers you can shift those students to so you don't lose programs. In a rural school, one teacher is equivalent to a program. So, when you start cutting teachers, you are at great risk of cutting a program. In our middle school, we lost an art teacher. Our SOT struggled with that last year, because we knew this was coming. On May 16, our SOT wrote a letter to Superintendent Skorkowsky about this very issue. We wanted resolution. I really appreciate the reorganization, because it has allowed transparency for the SOT, parents and teachers to see into what goes on, and that allowed this issue to be brought forth. We have not received any response. It has been kicked over to Dr. Mike Barton, who is the Chief Academic Officer. I have not heard anything as of yet. There have been a couple of appointments made, but they've been cancelled. We're already into Count Day, and I know our high school is in the same position. The District had funded a dean position for our high school since I can remember, the last 5 or 10 years. That position was cut. Even though there are just as many programs and administrative responsibilities in a small school, the position of dean was cut.

So, the question is what do we do? This transparency has allowed these issues to be brought forth, but where do we go and who do we see? That's the question I wanted to bring before you.

Annette Dawson Owens (Member, Break Free CCSD):

I'm an educator and an advocate in the community. Also, I've been part of Break Free CCSD from the very beginning. Our twofold points have been very simple since we started the process, and that was that money get to the schools and that schools decide what to do with that money. So, we want to continue to see that that happens. We're not sure that's happening as it needs to be. Also, I've been able to sit on a couple of our newly formed SOTs. As you well know, their threefold responsibility is to come up with a budget and an academic plan and to have input into principal selection. We need to keep that empowering mindset and let those members actually have input in that and not be told that that's not in that SOT's realm. Because to me, it seems like a lot of things are in their realm.

So, we're excited with the changes that are happening. We're going to continue to give support and help things move forward. We appreciate your time and effort being here for our kids.

Frances Martin:

I'm a parent at West Career and Technical Academy, and I'm also a member of the SOT. Since May, I am also the chair of the SOT. I'm here to talk about something that's a little bit different. I think a lot of attention has been on the money and legality and situations like that. However, what hasn't been really talked about are the actual operations and the power struggles that we have between the administration at the school and the SOT. I can give you one simple example. As a member of the SOT, I have asked my administration for a very simple budget item. We need the item in order for that information to help us understand the budget better and to plan for the future, instead of the framework in order for the future teams to operate in an effective way. However, that item has been put into question since the end of May. I have made dozens of calls to the District's office, the Trustee's office, the Superintendent's office and my associate superintendent's office. At this moment, not only do they all tell me that my principal has to give me that information, but my principal also told me for the last 2 1/2 months that I need to go to the Public Records Department at the District in order to get one simple item on the budget clarified. I find that appalling and unacceptable, and I wish that someone in the District would have the courage to face this situation. Because ultimately, this is about empowering the school, and it's about empowering the parents, students and teachers to do their jobs. It is not a way to actually make the principal and the administration the only people that have the power to make everything opaque and actually not transparent, because this will actually set all of us back in the progress that we'd like to make. So, I'm looking forward to hearing someone give a proper response to my question and all of my other concerns. Later on, I'll be making a written statement and sending it to the Board.

Daniel Barber (Teacher, Durango High School):

I was elected to my school's SOT in 2016. What follows is what I experienced as an SOT member last school year. The voting members of Durango High School's SOT did not contribute in the creation of our school's performance plan or the strategic budget in 2017. In fact, our principal, Nathan Miller, presented both the plan and the budget to the SOT at the February meeting with an explanation that they needed to be passed by the end of that meeting. The voting members of the SOT had 10 minutes to examine each of the documents before we voted to pass them. It was a vote cast without enough information. It was assumed that the SOT would have opportunities in subsequent meetings to review and amend, if necessary, both the plan and the budget. This did not happen. Principal Miller was apparently under the impression that once adopted, the plan of operation and strategic budget were not subject to amendment by the SOT. The Durango SOT did not alter in any way the performance plan or the strategic budget once they had adopted it in February. Thus, the SOT meetings from March until June were a fantastic waste of time.

If an impartial observer attended the Durango High School SOT meeting, they would assume that the principal was a voting member. Of course, he's not. He dominated the agenda and spent an enormous amount of time opposing motions made by voting members. Before the team voted on one particular motion, Principal Miller actually announced, "If I had a vote, I would vote yes." In my view, the principal intimidated members on the team. The most

appalling example of this was when the principal proclaimed that he would not allow a motion to be enacted even if passed. This edict from on high obviously affected the voting members on the team, who then opposed the motion that would have simply created an email list for SOT members to communicate with one another in between meetings.

Principal Miller viewed the SOT as just another advisory group that existed to confirm decisions that he had already made. At the March SOT meeting, for example, he compared the SOT to his department chairs. I attempted to correct this notion by explaining to the team and to Principal Miller that the SOT had the legal authority to create a performance plan and a strategic budget. Also, I reminded the team that we had the power to disagree with the principal in creating those documents. This information was not well received by Principal Miller. Three days after that meeting, I was informed by the administration that my class schedule would be changed next year. For nearly two decades, I have taught either U.S. History or U.S. Government at Durango High School. I have degrees in those two subjects. This year, my schedule includes three sections of something called Credit Retrieval and two sections of Psychology. These are classes that I've never taught before. I think I suffered from retribution for my actions on the SOT. To complete this punishment, in May I was informed that I had to vacate my classroom of 18 years. My new classroom for this year is located on the other side of the school, where I'll be segregated from my social studies colleagues.

If principals are not trained to work in collaboration with teachers and parents, then the SOT will fail to empower those teachers and parents.

Chair Roberson:

What you described is disappointing. At some point, we're going to have some associate superintendents up here. I'd like to know who the associate superintendent for Durango High School is, because that situation needs to be addressed.

Dr. Larry Moses:

I sit on the SOT for the high school in Moapa Valley. My concern is beyond Moapa Valley. It's the rural school district. When I was on our Technical Advisory Committee, I was assigned rural school responsibility. I'm a bit concerned about the proportional funding for the rural schools. That was our weighted program for rural schools. The problem is that we are seeing positions removed, which convert to per-pupil funding of hundreds of thousands of dollars in these schools. We're given no information of whether we're staying within the proportion as the law requires.

There are two lines of thought on the dean position at the high school. One is the proportionality. The second is that section 16(8) of Assembly Bill (A.B.) 469 says that if any authority or responsibility is passed to the schools, the funding has to be passed along to cover that responsibility. Now, the dean has been paid for by the District above the ratio of the school. The school does not, by number, rate a dean by District regulation. However, they have supported that position over the years. This year, they say they're not going to support

that position. They have said, though, that if the school wants to have a dean, they can cut other programs and pay for the dean. To me, it looks like that is a shifting of responsibility and the funding should go with it. We've been told that's not going to take place.

Now, to get an idea of what the proportion should be, you will remember that the District testified on the fact of what the proportion in rural schools would be in 2015-2016. But we are not receiving that information for 2016-2017, even after numerous requests. So when we are presented with our budget, we as an SOT don't know. We may be overfunded, we may be underfunded, but the District will not release that information. I've made numerous requests for that, but one suspects that if you pull \$180,000 out of a budget, or in some cases if it's three teachers, you're talking about over \$200,000, that the proportion may not remain the same. I would say that what this Committee really needs to do is appoint an ombudsman, somebody who's outside the District who can take a look at these issues and can make an arbitrary decision. Our school associate superintendents are under the direct responsibility of the Superintendent. We don't have someone who can go in and say to the Superintendent, "Hey, this is what the issue is" without having the jeopardy of being in a position where there could be retribution. So, I would encourage this Committee to find an individual who can look at these situations. We may be overfunded, I don't know, but we can't find that information out because the District refuses after numerous, numerous requests to provide that information.

I appreciate you listening. I appreciate the work you guys have done. It's been a long 2 years, and we as a school have decided that the law is there. We are going to function within the law. We would only ask that the District do the same.

Robert Hollowood (Teacher, Staton Elementary School):

I was at an empowerment school, which this SOT model seems to be modeled after. I'd just like to share that, so far, this SOT process is not in any way delivering the kind of empowerment that we had under the previous model. I would say that the experience of Mr. Barber, who spoke earlier, is the most extreme that I've heard of. But honestly, our SOT was completely stonewalled during the budgeting process and the making of the school performance plan. I think the principal didn't really like the people that were convened.

Chair Roberson:

What school are you referring to?

Mr. Hollowood:

Staton Elementary School in Summerlin. I don't think the principal was really in favor of the people who were elected to her SOT. And so, she convened another committee in the building of different teachers who were more favorable to write the school performance plan and develop the budget. She said that she believed this was in alignment with the process because the SOT is not supposed to function on school time. So for 3 days, what I would consider to be a tremendous team of 13 teachers was convened to hash these things out and

bring it to the SOT for a rubber stamp. I calculated the teacher time at over \$10,000 for those side committee meetings, if you were taking the typical teacher's average daily rate. Then the budget was presented to the SOT with pretty much no flexibility. We have some community members who are pretty influential, and so we got the mildest amount of traction with the budget after their influence.

But as a teacher, I would say I'm completely unempowered by this process thus far. I feel like I have very little voice, because the people who I have a voice with, or against in this case, are the people who also write my evaluations. I think the support staff people in the building are in the same situation. They feel very vulnerable. I believe they are trying to marginalize the parent group, which I don't believe was the intent of this process. I think that we are supposed to be giving our community members more voice in what's happening at their school, and I think they're the most important group. But I think the parents who've shared here have largely shared what my observations have been, which is that they are not wanting the parent groups to have the kind of voice they should have in their schools.

I would also say that my wife experienced the same kind of thing Mr. Barber did. She's a teacher at Sedway Middle School in North Las Vegas. Her experience was that the teachers on the team opposed the budget because the administrator was insisting on spending \$100,000 on an additional administrator and a secretary for that additional administrator. She had been her department's chair for years and was retaliated against by losing her department chair status in the process of having opposed the principal's plan to have this additional administrator. She would be here this morning I'm sure, but her school has started a couple of days early this year so she's at school right now.

Thanks for hearing my testimony today, and I hope there can be some kind of outcome where we are more empowered and are not subject to retaliation and have some influence in our school. But right now, I'd say the influence is pretty much that the only person who's empowered is the principal.

Chair Roberson:

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

I will now skip to agenda item IV, approval of the minutes. This Committee hasn't met for 6 months, so we want to go back and approve the minutes of the Advisory Committee to Develop a Plan to Reorganize the Clark County School District for meetings held on October 18, 2016 (Exhibit C) and February 2, 2017 (Exhibit D).

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 18, 2016 AND FEBRUARY 2, 2017 MEETINGS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO DEVELOP A PLAN TO REORGANIZE THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT.

SENATOR HARRIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Roberson:

This is the first meeting of the newly named Advisory Committee to Monitor the Implementation of the Reorganization of Large School Districts. It's a continuation of the Committee, this body, that met for almost 2 years. During the last interim, the Committee held over 10 meetings to discuss and come together with a plan to reorganize CCSD. We recommended that the State Board of Education adopt regulations to carry out the plan that we established with the assistance of our consultant, Michael Strembitsky. The State Board then adopted the regulations, and they were subsequently approved by the Legislative Commission. After that, there were various objections posed by CCSD, and the District ultimately filed a lawsuit to object to the implementation of the plan. During the legislative session, the Legislature approved A.B. 469, which codified many of the provisions of the regulations and made the requirement to reorganize applicable to any school district that reaches a certain threshold. As a body, the Legislature determined that it was necessary to require any school district which meets that threshold to reorganize in a manner that provides site-based decision making. The Advisory Committee from the last interim was continued by A.B. 469 with the same members so that we could continue to monitor the implementation of the reorganization of CCSD. In addition, the bill gave the Superintendent of Public Instruction enforcement responsibility and the State Board of Education the authority to adopt regulations.

In addition, the Community Implementation Council (CIC) which was appointed last year has continued to meet and receive reports from the consultants, TSC². Tom Skancke and the other folks at TSC² have been on the ground working directly with CCSD and they will provide us with their impressions and update on the progress that is being made in CCSD. I also look forward to hearing about the progress that has been made by the School District and the vision it has going forward. With that, I'd like to ask Tom Skancke and Glenn Christenson to come forward to give us an update of where we are, where we're not and how we're going to get to where we need to be. We also have Michael Vannozzi with TSC² coming forward.

Tom Skancke (President, CEO, TSC² Group):

I am the CEO of the TSC² Consulting Group. We are the consulting company retained to oversee the reorganization of CCSD. With me today is Andrew Doughman, and Michael Vannozzi has joined us at the table from our team. I am pleased to be alongside Glenn Christenson, the Chair of the CIC. I would also like to acknowledge Brian Knudsen, who is a member of our team who could not be here today, but who has been a critical player and member of our team in these efforts.

Since we last met, a lot of progress has been made. My team alone has put in more than 1,000 hours of work on the project, and the people at CCSD have put in many more. The work that we are doing at the District is not simply an effort to build bureaucratic structures. It is about changing a culture.

So if you will allow me a minute, I would ask us all to think back to why it is that we are all here. In 2015, the Legislature set this Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee on

a journey to investigate the organizational structure of CCSD. In the course of that work, we found that the District has gotten itself into myriad problems, problems that have contributed to us having some of the lowest rates of achievement in the country when you look statewide. Some of the issues that the District deals with are outside of its control. Some of those issues are self-inflicted. We found that some of the reforms instituted over the years, like empowerment schools, were altered significantly or abandoned over the years. Principals and parents found that many of the goals that they'd like to accomplish to pursue student achievement were stymied by what they saw as a large, unworkable bureaucracy. The culture of the School District at every level was disinclined to accept change.

As this Committee did the hard work crafting the structure in which the reorganization would move forward, the District sat in fear. It filed a lawsuit around the reorganization regulation. It brought up many objections to the way that this Committee and others in the community thought about the reorganization. It was dealing with the internal and external disagreement on whether this approach, which was codified into law by A.B. 469, was even good for students.

Enter my team and the CIC. We were hired to ensure that the District implemented the law with fidelity. In November, we began work in a District that didn't even want us to be there and didn't want anything to do with us, quite frankly. In December, we dealt with internal and external strife on the Board, with some attacking the process, attacking the means by which the team was to do its work, and attacking the very principles behind the reorganization itself. Finally in the spring, after this Committee convened to announce that a bipartisan group of lawmakers intended to codify the regulation governing this reorganization, we began to make real progress.

On Thursday, CCSD began its school year with something called the Kickoff Ceremony. This is a ceremony in which more than 1,000 people get together, including principals, Central Service administrators, teachers and community stakeholders, to set the tone for the coming year. This year, the kickoff was about the reorganization. In the Superintendent's keynote presentation, he embraced, in a full-throated manner, the type of autonomy that this law mandates. He said that one of the hardest things he learned to do this year was let go, and he was looking forward to unlocking the potential of all the educators in the room in the newly reorganized model.

Why did it take so long for the District to fully embrace the law? It's simple. The District was trying to solve the wrong problem. I'll explain. In our strategic implementation work, we focus on something that I like to call fundamental problem identification. It's a strategy that we use to help people change their consideration and change the nature of the work that they do. Lots of people come up with solutions to problems, but they neglect to ask if the solution that they've presented actually solves the fundamental problem presented. A lot of people spend a lot of time solving the wrong problems, and then that solution becomes the new problem. That is exactly what happened in this case. Assembly Bill 469 states that 80 percent of all unrestricted dollars must be allocated to the schools in the first year of the reorganization. For the District, this 80 percent provision was "the problem" in their universe that could not be solved in a meaningful way. The problem was exacerbated by the fact that their accounting

system did not allow for the meaningful tracking and distribution of funds to schools, an issue that you all helped address with the appropriation of \$17,000,000 for the human capital management system. That particular challenge aside, the District recognized that it could “solve” the 80-20 problem on paper, but to do so would not meet the spirit of the reorganization. So, we changed their consideration, and we made them see the real problem.

Last month at the CIC meeting, CCSD went through a huge presentation. In it, they said that they are using the Clark County Schools Achieve reorganization to fundamentally realign how they do business in the School District. As part of that reorganization, they did an accounting exercise, which we assisted in. This is what we found together. The general fund of the School District, the unrestricted money, accounts for almost \$2,400,000,000 in revenue. Of this \$2,400,000,000, 88 percent of it is spent on services that occur in schools or with children. But schools only have direct control over 55 percent of the money that is spent on our schools. The remaining 33 percent is spent on services that are provided to schools. But just because the District spends 88 percent of that money at schools, does that mean they are following the law? No, the law calls for local school autonomy and school-based decision making. It doesn't call for an accounting exercise. Moving money and broadening local school autonomy and decision making is the work that is going forward. Right now, 55 percent of the unrestricted dollars are allocated to schools. Another 33 percent are allocated to schools through the provision of services. The problem is that principals, now empowered with SOTs, are responsible for most of the outcomes associated with the 88 percent, but they are only able to assert real control over 55 percent of that budget. This is the fundamental problem that we helped the District identify. Some in the community mistook the budgeting exercise as a sign that the District's work was done. That is not the case, and I am sorry if the exercise caused any confusion throughout the community. The budgeting exercise was merely the display of a strategic method to get the District to solve the right problem. Now, they are solving the right problem.

Today, you'll hear from the Superintendent and his staff, including four school associate superintendents: Grant Hanevold, Lorna James-Cervantes, Brenda Larsen-Mitchell and Antonio Rael. These four individuals, in partnership with their 12 other school associate superintendent colleagues, were challenged by the Superintendent to solve the right problem. They will go through the process through which they are going to transfer the budget and responsibility to schools so that principals and the SOTs can drive student achievement. I believe that the process they are undertaking will get the District into full compliance with the law. Not just the letter of the law, but also the spirit of the law. And I will tell you, they are looking at ways to go even further than the law prescribes to give principals and SOTs the type of decision-making power they need to drive student achievement.

The school associate superintendents will also talk about another change that is happening in the organization of the District. You may have read in the paper that the School District is facing a general fund shortfall of \$45,000,000 due to myriad issues that they can explain. This kind of shortfall has been solved in the past by sweeping money from schools. But because of this law and my team's assistance, the school associate superintendents have devised a plan to help avoid doing just that. If approved by the Trustees, this plan would preserve money

as best as possible in the school strategic budgets and ensure that the general fund budget cut does the least possible harm to schools.

I urge this Committee to listen carefully to the testimony offered by CCSD today. This work is by no means done. In fact, in many cases it is really just beginning. Now I'd like to introduce Glenn Christenson, the Chair of the CIC, to offer any additional remarks.

Chair Roberson:

Before you do that, Mr. Skancke, I have one question for you. You seemed to indicate that the School District is not in compliance with the intent of the law, but that it is in compliance with the letter of the law. I just want clarification on that, because if the School District is only providing 55 percent of unrestricted general fund dollars to the school strategic budgets, the School District is not in compliance with the letter of the law. In fact, it's the opposite. They're out of compliance. So, can you clarify that please?

Mr. Skancke:

I thought that's what I said, Mr. Chairman. I apologize.

Chair Roberson:

I thought you said that, and then you went on to contrast the spirit of the law versus the letter of the law. Can you clarify that we're on the same page here?

Mr. Skancke:

We are on the same page.

Chair Roberson:

Okay. They are not in compliance with the law?

Mr. Skancke:

That is correct.

Chair Roberson:

But we're going to get them there, right? They're going to get themselves there, right?

Mr. Skancke:

They most certainly are.

Chair Roberson:

Fabulous. Thank you.

Senator Aaron Ford (Senatorial District No. 11):

Thank you for your presentation, and I'm glad for the clarification. Maybe the next presenter's going to answer this question, but I want to cut to the chase. How much time do you need to get us where we need to be?

Mr. Skancke:

We have 85 days left in our contract, and over the next 85 days we will get them in compliance with the letter of the law.

Glenn Christenson (Chair, Community Implementation Council):

I'll keep my remarks rather short, because there's a lot of information to be presented. In my role as the Chair of the CIC, I've helped oversee and assist with the work of the reorganization. In my 45-year career in the business world, I have led and participated in several corporate restructurings and reorganizations. I must say that the reorganization of CCSD has been the most challenging, difficult and frustrating effort in my career. Having said that, it's not hyperbole to say that this effort is perhaps the most important effort of its kind in the history of our community. A successful reorganization effort should result in better student outcomes, which in turn will positively impact our work force, the quality of our college entrants, the effectiveness of our economic development effort, and improve the standard of living in our community. The stakes here are enormous. That's what really keeps me going. I'm not compensated for this work, nor are any of the members of the CIC. Our belief in the importance of this effort is why Mr. Skancke and I, in our previous roles as CEO and Chair of the Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance, respectively, went to the Legislature 2 years ago with several of our board members and other civic leaders to lobby for accepting the education reform package proposed at the time, including additional funding for these reforms. The Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance was the first business organization in the state to come out in favor of the education reform package legislation.

In my experience, reorganizations and restructurings can be very complicated and messy affairs. It takes leadership that can move through all the noise and the politics, both internal and external, to get things done. Fortunately, our community has been blessed with many leaders in this effort. Two years ago, the Legislature and the Governor recognized the importance of improving K-12 education in our community. Their vision and leadership, as well as those of others, have led us here today. Since then, the work of this Committee, the Technical Advisory Committee, the State Board of Education, the CIC, numerous community groups and the labor associations has made great contributions to this effort. The effort by the Superintendent, his leadership team and the role of the rank and file cannot be underestimated in this reorganization. They're the ones doing the work. These folks have worked around the clock. They've had to rethink practices that have been institutionalized

forever. They had to endure incredible disruption to their normal day jobs. I can't say getting to this point was a smooth ride. It wasn't. But the effort to get here has been remarkable, and there's still a lot of work to do. I think some of the public comments that you heard today will reflect that. The truth is, though, that if the Clark County Schools Achieve initiative is successful, the work will never be done as our schools make necessary changes to adapt to changing conditions in the future.

Reflecting on the last 9 months, after getting off to a rocky start which caused delays in beginning the work, once the four legislative leaders came to the table in a bipartisan way to support the codification of the reorganization into law, things began to come together. It was a remarkable demonstration of leadership and a critical inflection point in this effort.

As Chair, I've used the CIC as a forum to publicly discuss issues related to the reorganization. Members of the CIC have also engaged directly with the District on several issues, and the Superintendent has related to me on many occasions his gratitude for their help and assistance. I think the CIC has been a very useful tool to move the reorganization forward, especially in the period when this Committee was unable to meet during the session.

What we have here today is a presentation of work by the School District. It's imperative that CCSD owns this work going forward. The initial charge of the CIC and TSC² will be complete on October 31, 85 short days from now. The District leadership, with the assistance of TSC² and the CIC, has 85 days left to put this work on course to assure compliance with the law and develop an organizational structure that is sustainable in the future. I believe that what you'll hear today is a key part of the plan to get the District into compliance. As the final action of the CIC, we will receive and submit to you a report on the reorganization. This report will serve as a manual of sorts on the reorganization and provide recommendations to this Committee on steps to continue to move the reorganization forward. We expect to have a draft for your consideration by September 1.

In closing, I cannot stress enough the importance of all parties working together to make the reorganization successful, especially as we race to the end of October and the great need for continuing the work thereafter. In the future, there will be differences of opinion as to how to proceed on certain matters, but taking a collaborative approach will help to improve the probability of our success. Failure is not an option.

Chair Roberson:

I want to thank you and the entire CIC for volunteering your time over these last several months. It's been a lot of hard work, and I just want to say that I personally, and I'm sure everyone on this Committee, really appreciate your service. Thank you for taking this on.

Assemblywoman Dina Neal (Assembly District No. 7):

So, my first question is that I'm not exactly clear when you say that CCSD has failed or is not compliant, and you're saying that it's 55 percent of the budget and 33 percent services, where

are they not compliant? What are the areas, be specific, on where you ran into road blocks that caused you to be in this particular predicament today?

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

I'm the project manager for TSC² on this project. So, you're going to hear a lot from CCSD today, and I think the reason why our presentation here is short is because they really need to own this work going forward. In regards to your specific questions on the unrestricted funds, the 80-20 split of course is part of the law that CCSD needs to be in compliance with this year. The School District did an accounting exercise with our help. It's really more than an accounting exercise. The exercise looked at, line by line, what CCSD does, why it does it and how it does it. It determined that 55 percent of the money in that \$2,400,000,000 general fund is allocated directly to schools for things like general education teachers, principals and others. Thirty-three percent of that funding is allocated to Central Services departments, but then transferred to schools in the form of services. As Mr. Skancke put it in his remarks, the real issue here is how much control do the individual schools through their SOTs and the principals have over the funding that is not necessarily in their strategic budgets, but allocated to them for services. It's like in-kind services, if you've ever worked in the nonprofit world. You have these defined services that may be defined by someone else but for which you are in charge of the outcome. I think that is the fundamental issue that a lot of people are dealing with. Where's the line? There is 55 percent in the strategic budgets, 33 percent that's allocated to Central Services is then reallocated to schools, and then the 12 percent that is actual central services. That's kind of where we are. Does that answer your question?

Assemblywoman Neal:

Kind of. I'm just trying to be clear, because you're saying that they're not in compliance. I'm trying to get to the heart of, in your conversations, what are the reasons why you couldn't push them further than 55? What are the issues where they're like, "Well, I'm not so sure about this, I'm not so sure about that," and why couldn't you move the conversation along? Because you're a facilitator in this process, correct?

Mr. Vannozzi:

Correct. So, there are several specific issues. For one, the Trustees actually have to vote affirmatively to transfer responsibility, and you'll hear that in the Superintendent's and the school associate superintendents' presentation. They have not done that yet. Second, some of these services are very, very complicated to unwind, and you will also hear that in the Superintendent's and the school associate superintendents' presentations. So in direct response to your question, the Trustees of CCSD, and this is within the scope of the law, need to affirmatively vote whether or not it is in the best interest of pupils to transfer responsibility into strategic budgets, or whatever mechanism, so that the schools get that money eventually.

Senator Ford:

Just following up, I want to repeat what I think I heard you say. I want to be sure that I understand what's going on. This is for any of the three of you who want to correct me if I'm wrong. So, right now we're standing at 88 percent of all services which are taking place at the school level, but not 88 percent of all monies associated with those services are in the strategic budgets of the schools. Is that a correct statement, first off?

Mr. Vannozzi:

That is correct.

Senator Ford:

Okay. Am I hearing you also say that within the next 85 days, until the duration of your contract ends, you intend to ensure that at least 80 percent of those services, 88 percent of which are already over there at the schools, are going to be placed into the strategic budgets of those schools within the next 85 days?

Mr. Vannozzi:

That is our intent, to work on that as quickly as we possibly can. We will do our very, very best.

Senator Ford:

Do you anticipate, or maybe you're going to testify to this, barriers or burdens that we can discuss today to help alleviate any of those barriers or concerns that may come up within the next 85 days?

Mr. Vannozzi:

There are a number of barriers and burdens that I think the Superintendent and the school associate superintendents will outline. Not the least of which is that there's just a tremendous amount of work that needs to be done to unwind a lot of services that are managed by a central department today but happen at the school level. We need to determine what is the appropriate line and level of service agreement that schools can be at. The Superintendent and his staff will go through a very detailed presentation on the current thinking on that. As to the specific measures that this Committee can take to assist in that process, there's a ton of work. I don't have an answer for you today, but there's a ton of work that needs to be done. What's critical though is that the Board of Trustees vote affirmatively to transfer these services in compliance with the law.

Senator Ford:

In the latter part of your statement, you still haven't addressed the question I have. Because I specifically want to know what you need our help on. What does this Committee need to do to ensure that within the next 85 days, at least 80 percent of the monies associated with the 88 percent of those services that are already at the schools will be in those strategic budgets? If you can't answer that now, then that's fine. To the School District, as you come up, if you have some suggestions on things that we can do to help, then I would like to hear that. If not, then time remains of the essence. I'm certain that the Chair would be happy to call us in as frequently as necessary to try to solve issues, but let's not have to do that. I would really like to be able to get a delineation of what this Committee needs to do to help you achieve the goal that we have laid out before you and the School District.

Mr. Skancke:

Senator Ford, could I have until the end of the School District's presentation and that round of questioning by the members of the Committee has been deliberated? If there is something at the end of that presentation that we see that we may need from this Committee, then I would like to reserve the right if I may, Mr. Chairman, to come back and answer that question. I think at the end of the hearing today, if there are any things that we believe we may need from this Committee, I'd like to be able to come back and ask you for those things at the end of the presentations.

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

We all want the problems fixed, whatever the problems are, in the right way that fixes the right problem. So, who is it that's going to be the watch dog with enough teeth to hold CCSD accountable for the things that we're going to do? For instance, we've talked about an ombudsman. Is there somebody who's going to be accountable? Somebody who can call up and say, "Part of the law allows rural people to be held harmless, because a copy machine costs the same in the rurals as it does in the urban areas." So who is it that the rural community is going to be able to access who actually says, "Yes it's the law. We're in compliance with the law, both the intent and the letter." Is there someone in that process after 85 days who's going to be able to have the teeth necessary to do it?

Mr. Vannozzi:

That is an open question. I think you're going to hear from the Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Steve Canavero, and he is going to outline some of the responsibilities that the State Board and the Superintendent's office at the state level have over that. But I think as we move forward, just to remind you of the charge of the CIC and the consulting group, the consulting group is not empowered legally to do things that are in the purview of the Board of Trustees, or really anything. We are assisting, and we are using that soft influence and public influence and others to get people to do what they need to do to be in compliance with the law. That is what has existed to this date, but whether or not the State Department of Education or any other group has any additional powers vested in them for that purpose remains to be seen.

Senator Hardy:

So it comes down to the elected positions on the School Board?

Mr. Vannozzi:

That is correct.

Mr. Christenson:

There are a number of things that still have to get done. I talked about that in my remarks. But what you're bringing up and some of the things that we're hearing today are absolutely critical, such as there being a place to deposit concerns within the District. I think one of the other things that you heard through the public comment period today is that there's a real need for better internal communication. We are working with the District on that as well, but these complaints that we're hearing are important. When you go through a reorganization, you're not going to get it perfect. It's going to take some time to work through these problems. But the fact that they are bubbling up and that there is a place, at least today, that they can go to make these comments and have someone concerned that they're actually going to be addressed is fantastic. Nobody wants to hear the complaints. It's unfortunate, but I think that's really the essence of the reorganization, so that our community has much more influence on what's going on in our individual schools.

Senator Ford:

I just want to make it plain that you are not, and no one at least that I've heard thus far, is laying blame for us not being at a particular place, like 80-20, right now. You're not saying, for example, that the District is still stonewalling or that the District—I shouldn't stay still, some would argue that they haven't been. But in any event, you're not saying that it's the District's fault that we're not there yet? You're just saying that we need more time to work on it? Is that a fair assessment?

Mr. Skancke:

Since the four members of the leadership of the Legislature came together this past spring and the Legislature passed A.B. 469, I can tell you that the culture and the cooperation within the District have changed substantially. There are still some challenges at the Board level, but I get that. They're an elected board, and they have responsibilities as well. But I can tell you that within the organization, and at the Superintendency level and with the senior staff and senior management, the relationship that we have been able to develop since the passage of A.B. 469 has changed substantially.

So, there are still challenges. There's no question about that. I said publicly that most of the meetings that I attend in the District are probably not the best for the people at the District. They refer to me as "The Hammer," and that's okay. But I would say that there is no additional stonewalling. It's just changing the culture and getting people comfortable with that cultural

change. It's moving at a faster pace, but we do have some challenges that we have to get through. The District will outline those today. But we are not getting the, to use your term, and we've used it too, stonewalling that happened at the beginning of this work.

Senator Ford:

Yes, and I wanted to retract my statement of stonewalling, only because it's in the eye of the beholder. At the end of the day, I think what happened before the bipartisan passage this last session is open to interpretation as to what happened. What I was really getting at is, at this point, you're sitting before us not casting blame, not saying that there are problems that need to be remedied by us or because of the School District. And you don't have to respond to that, since I think I've heard you already say that. And I think the reason why I say this is because it's important for us to be able to move forward in a cooperative fashion. Us, including you and including the School District and everyone who's involved in this thing. Because some of the unfortunate problems we're hearing about from Mr. Barber and others, we don't like to hear that. Clearly that is not what we prefer to see. I will say this though. Growing pains are what we see, and we did anticipate some of these types of problems both in the rurals and in urban schools in terms of the transition. It's important to keep all of this in mind. This is a difficult process, and it's not taking us overnight to get it done. It's taking us a number of years to get it done. I want everyone to be on the same page when it comes to trying to move forward in a cooperative fashion. That's why I thought it was important to get that on the record.

Senator Becky Harris (Senatorial District No. 9):

I want to make sure I'm understanding your testimony appropriately. What I think I hear you saying is that, at this point, you've largely been looking at the CCSD budget as a whole and making sure that the money that's supposed to be directed down to the schools is being directed down to the schools, and that we're finding some challenges and some complications. We're going to work on that. Have you had an opportunity to look at any of the individual school budgets? The school organizational teams have responsibility for input over those budgets. I'm curious to know if any kind of analysis has been done district-wide with regard to how different schools are operating and spending those funds. Can you give me any insight as to if those budgets differ? And if they do, then how do they differ? Do you have any information about how much input those SOTs are actually having? Because we're hearing some testimony about how SOTs are not functioning the way that we had originally envisioned. Anecdotally I'm hearing a little bit that maybe one or two schools, a small percentage of schools, are operating or trying to operate the way that we envisioned. I think that this budget challenge is a twofold challenge. We certainly need to look at the global budget. I think we also need to start looking at the individual school budgets and, once those schools receive those funds, how they're able to manage those funds.

Mr. Vannozzi:

So, the short answer to your question is that, on an individual basis, the school associate superintendents get the budgets reviewed. They have data. All of those budgets are posted

on individual school websites along with the plans for school operations. I know that, in addition to work that CCSD is doing itself, there are a couple efforts underway to understand what exactly people are spending on in those budgets, looking at a very, very granular level.

I will say that, because of the nature of the way that money is expended at CCSD and the financial routing that happens through CCSD, there are a number of things that are discreet and different when looking at various different things. So, for example, if you were to take the 88 percent of the budget as a whole and say, "Oh, let's put it all on a per-pupil or a per-school basis. Here are all the expenditures of CCSD," you would find varying degrees of expenditures on custodial and grounds services. Why? Because there are different configurations of buildings and they are different ages. You would find varying levels of expenditures on various services. Why? Because there are different student populations and different focuses at different levels. You would find special programs that occur at one school but not at other schools. So, there are a lot of different variables when looking at that. I think there are studies about to be conducted and there is knowledge at the District level of what people are planning for and what they're focusing on. But as far as a complete study of that, that's yet to be done, as far as I know.

Senator Harris:

Is it going to be done?

Mr. Vannozzi:

I know of a couple of outside people who intend to do some studies, but I don't have details on that.

Senator Harris:

So there's nothing concrete? I'm certainly not advocating that every school spend their money exactly the same way. I understand that there are individualized needs, individualized content and individualized priorities at different school sites. Where I get concerned is when I hear parents who have spent significant amounts of time working for their SOTs saying, "Well, basically the only decision we got to make was whether or not art got an extra \$3,000 in supplies as opposed to fourth grade." I don't think that's what we intended with those SOTs. I think that as we continue to have these budget discussions, we really need to look not only at how that money's being pushed down to the schools, but what kind of autonomy those schools have, working in conjunction with their SOTs to determine maybe what content is important, what their school priorities are and where they want to spend those monies. I don't think SOTs should be restricted to just looking at \$40,000 of the entire school budget to make a decision as to who gets more money in what area.

Mr. Vannozzi:

That is the very essence of what the School District intends to present in their next presentation.

Chair Roberson:

I just want to say for the record that, while I think no one in this room should delude themselves into thinking that the School District is anywhere near where it's supposed to be based on what this law requires today, without the assistance of TSC², the CIC and Chair Christenson we would be much further away from where we need to be. So, thank you all for all the hard work, especially in the last 6 months. When we've been up in Carson City, you've been on the ground working with the School District every day, and I just want to thank you for your efforts and your continued efforts.

Next, we're going to ask Superintendent Skorkowsky and some other folks, whoever he would like to have, to come up from the School District to give us a brief update.

Pat Skorkowsky (Superintendent, Clark County School District):

I'm going to go through an overview of where we're at first, and then I'm going to step aside and let the school associate superintendents come up. I do have one quick question, procedure-wise. Would you like me to address the concerns that came out of some of the public comments first or wait until after my presentation?

Chair Roberson:

That is up to you, Superintendent Skorkowsky. However you would like to time that is fine with me. But I do want those concerns to be addressed today.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Since we're getting the presentation set up, I'll start off by answering some of the questions that came up in the public comment period. One of the things that I think Mr. Skancke, Mr. Christenson and Mr. Vannozzi alluded to was the transparency of the budget pieces that we have been dealing with over the past several months. Through the transparency process, one thing we noticed was that there were certain gifts that were given to schools that were not earned in the past, either by one administration, one administrator or the other, superintendents or other people. So, those were brought to light with the building principals for all schools a year ago at this time. We said that they would not continue because we weren't able to do that with the plan that the reorganization was following. Specifically, we talked about some of the positions that were mentioned. The dean position was a gift that was never earned in that rural school. We would then have to, for any of these reallocations, take money from another school to create that position in that rural school, because we have gone through and actually identified where literally every dollar is at this point in time. So, for us to give anything to a school that's not earned has to come out of some other pot of money, because we are now at a zero-budgeting process where we start out with zero and any "add" has to have a "take" that comes from someplace.

In regard to some of the SOTs, and specifically retaliation, in some of those situations it actually didn't have to do with the SOT or any positions taken on that. It was that some

members didn't appreciate the school decision of the team to have specific procedures in place for the entire department. When that individual didn't comply with the department for the last year, changes were made. So, there are always two sides to every story when it comes to some of these pieces.

To your question, Senator Harris, you're exactly right. It is a challenge right now to give schools flexibility with money. One of those challenges is because of the great gifts that you have also given us. The restricted dollars that come down in categoricals truly determine how much money is spent in a school and exactly what it is spent on. One of the things that we're so grateful for is the Read by Three initiative, yet that has such specific requirements. Schools do not have flexibility outside of that law in order to make decisions that would have an impact. And I've been having that conversation with the State Superintendent in order to figure out how we bring forward waivers to allow schools to make the decisions that are most important at their level while still being accountable for all the work that they are doing. So it is going to be a challenge as we go forward. We're going to have to work with Legislators to make sure that when you are in Carson City in the next legislative session and you consider a mandate that is one-size-fits-all, that basically goes against A.B. 469. We're trying to figure out how to work that balance and how to support both sides of the fence, and so we're going to need to work closely with you to make sure that when we say, "Okay, this is going to impact a school to make the decision on such and such," that we have to make that allowance.

Senator Harris:

So, are you finding those same confining strictures with regard to Zoom and Victory monies?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Not as much at this point, but it is very restrictive in that aspect. That's one of the reasons that Senate Bill (S.B.) 178, the weighted funding bill, was so important. It is the first step to saying, "Let's look at how we fund our students." Working with our associations and many members of the Legislature, we were able to start thinking differently in that way and potentially set the ground work for future legislation so that we can both give schools flexibility with money yet hold them accountable for specific populations.

Senator Harris:

So what are some of the differences in your ability to spend with the Zoom and Victory funds as opposed to Read by Three and other categoricals that we gave you in the 2015 Session?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Because of the additional monies that came through the money intended for Zoom and Victory, we are able to spread that out to one, two and some three star schools that are not Zoom or Victory to address the lowest 25 percent of their population that's not proficient. Through English as a Second Language, English Language Learners and Free and Reduced Lunch, all of these pieces can now be focused so that schools can use that targeted money

that has a very specific set of parameters for the population that they have in their school and make the adjustments as needed.

Chair Roberson:

I understand there are always two sides to a story, but Mr. Barber made some specific allegations regarding Durango High School and the lack of participation provided to the SOT. Is that something that someone has looked into or will look into? Because if that kind of scenario is accurate, that is not acceptable.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Yes, that has been looked into. Mr. Barber has met with the school associate superintendent on two separate occasions.

Chair Roberson:

And has the situation been resolved?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I can't go into details specifically about that situation. I'm not allowed to by law.

Chair Roberson:

Okay, so let me ask in a different way. Do you believe that Durango High School is now conducting its budgeting process with its SOT in compliance with the law?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

We have a long way to go with some of our SOTs. That is part of what we have to do, which is not only change the budgeting process and the plan of operation, but changing the entire climate and culture of CCSD. We have some SOTs that have moved much further along and are working in a far more collaborative capacity than some of the ones that you heard about today. The school organizational teams have only been meeting since January 15. We are in the process of retraining everybody in the way we have to do business, and it is a challenge. We did seven trainings prior to that January 15 implementation date, but we are having to go back and retrain people and work with specific cases that are coming up now. So as these come to our attention, specifically with some of the speakers that we were talking about that have spoken today, we are beginning to address those situations as they come up and trying to be able to come to some resolution that brings it to a satisfactory level, but also stay completely within the law. The function of the SOTs is to assist, advise and work through the process. They are making the recommendation for the budget that goes to the school associate for approval.

Chair Roberson:

I'm not going to push you further on this issue, but I get the sense that we still have issues on that particular front. I will just say this. This is one of the functions of the Legislature and this Committee. Anyone in the community can reach out and should reach out to this Committee with these examples, because we are going to stay on this through August 31 of 2018. I just want to put that on the record. You mentioned S.B. 178 and the weighted funding money. I think it was \$32,000,000. Have those monies been delivered to the schools?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

We are working on it with guidance coming from the State Department of Education. We have a guidance memo that is out. We are having this week—I can't remember if it was last week or this week, there are a lot of things going on—a specific meeting with all of those principals. We are creating a new tab in the strategic budgets so that we can monitor not only the spending of those funds, but then hold accountable each school for the academic progress of those students. So yes, we are following the intent and the reality of the law.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you, and I guess my question is do they have the money today? Will they have the money in a week? If not, when will they have the money?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

If the money is not in the budgets, it will be within the next week because we start school Monday. They need to be working on their plans and revising their plans to act accordingly.

Assemblywoman Neal:

So my question was in regard to, since we're doing comments from public comment, the Sedway example. I'm super curious, because when I was reading A.B. 469 and then I was reading the regulation, in section 24(5) of the regulation when it says that there's an adjustment to the budget, an SOT may—"may," as in permissive. It's not "shall," it's "may." Then it moves them through the process of if they have an objection to the budget to then go to the associate superintendent, who then gets into the discussion, deems it right or wrong, then moves them forward. So in this situation with Sedway where there was an issue with \$100,000 for an administrator, what happened in that process?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I was not aware of the Sedway issue until this morning during public comment. I don't know if any of my staff was, but I can get that information and get back to you.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Right. I appreciate that, because I think there needs to be clarity on the interpretations of those powers. I think we need to be really clear on what is a “may” and what is a “shall” and how you can get involved in the budget. Because I remember early on having those conversations about how deeply involved folks will be in the budget discussion at the school. Being able to stop a budget is a real power. So I think for sure we need clarification around whether or not we need to revisit certain sections of the law, such as section 28 of A.B. 469 or sections 23 and 34 of the regulations. We need to have that conversation about the interpretations, because I think people are walking into this with expectations. But expectations are not legislative intent. Interpretation is not legislative intent. There are communities and constituencies who believe in a certain power, but we need clarity around what that is.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

It is managing that expectation that is the biggest challenge, and that is coming through our revised and adapted communication plan with this. So, it is that managing of expectations that is going to be important.

Chair Roberson:

And Assemblywoman Neal, I’m looking at section 28. I believe the “may” that you’re referring to says, “The organizational team may provide input regarding the principal of the local school precinct to the school associate superintendent” in section 28(2). Because subsection 1 lists out, under the heading “An Organizational Team Shall:” and then it goes through (a), (b) and (c). I think the “may” refers to, if there’s a problem, they may go speak with the associate superintendent about issues with the principal. Correct me if I’m wrong, but that’s the way I read it.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Yeah, so in section 28, there is a “shall” and that lays it out. What I didn’t see in section 28 was a specific budget, and so what I wrote down was the definition of the operational plan. But the same “may” language, which takes them through the process if there’s any adjustment or any opposition—the powers of the SOT are further down in the document, and I think it’s section 29 or 30, but I will clarify that. But I know that in section 28 I was talking about what’s a “shall,” which is a mandated power. And then I was comparing it to what the regulation was that we adopted, which was comparing sections 23 and 24, because I was trying to get clear on what the powers of the SOT are and when they kick in regarding the budget. So in A.B. 469, the “may” language is not in section 28. You are accurate in that. But I wasn’t trying to say it was.

Chair Roberson:

Okay, just trying to make sure we’re on the same page, that’s all.

Senator Hardy:

I was heartened by the fact that you now know where every dollar is and where it goes. So, it should be easy to press the button and let the people know who have requests on the budget, right?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Yes, I will make sure that information gets out to them.

Senator Hardy:

All right. And then I may be a little slow on this, but if a gift is given, it had to come from somewhere. Regarding the somewhere that it came from, did that somewhere go away, or is that somewhere now in a different pot and going somewhere else so it can no longer be considered a gift, but with people having never understood that it was a gift? But the art teacher and the dean were necessary components for education. Is that gift now being taken away and used somewhere else? Because if it was being used before, it wasn't going somewhere else.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

One of the things that has to change, and that I'm going to talk a little bit about in my presentation, is specifically the way that we have to budget now. In the last several years, actually since 1967 when we started the Nevada Plan, we had to budget based on a district-wide budget. Now with A.B. 469, we are literally having to break down our entire budget into school components. So, there is no other pot of money from which to pull things. With A.B. 469, attrition dollars will go directly back to schools. That could have been where we've taken the dean and the art teacher from. Those pots of money are no longer available to us.

Senator Hardy:

Thank you for that clarity.

Chair Roberson:

If there are no other questions, Mr. Skorkowsky, and you'd like to go through your presentation, that would be appreciated.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I'm sure there will be many more questions after I'm done, but I'm good with that.

Just 12 weeks ago, A.B. 469 was passed. But I want to take you back to actually 365 days ago. If you will remember, at this time last year we were still in the community input phase with the Clark County Commissioners.

THE CHAIR CALLED FOR A BRIEF RECESS

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Jokingly, a member of my team asked me if I was going to continue on with my method of presentation from the kickoff last Thursday, which was to speak and then interject songs throughout the presentation. But I think I'll just stick to words today. But if we get the chance, we'll get you a copy of that presentation, because the message was very important. It was one that sets the tone for the work that we are going to do this year in CCSD.

Right before the break, I reminded you that just a year ago today we were in the public input phase with the Clark County Commission. So we have all come a long way in the past year. Just 12 weeks ago, A.B. 469 was passed. We are working towards compliance with the law and working towards the vision the Legislators have, which is giving autonomy to each individual school. Autonomy with accountability, and then managing the expectations of how schools are going to be allowed to work within this new structure.

Our first focus was on changes that supported the concept that local schools drive student achievement (Exhibit E). Work began after September 9, 2016 and is ongoing. Changing the CCSD culture is important. It is essential. It is the only way that the reorganization is going to work. So, we began by flipping our organizational chart so that schools are on the top. They are the focus. Our schools are supported by our 16 school associate superintendents and central departments that provide services to schools. We actually have a team that we call the Superintendency that meets every week. It is made up of all the chiefs of each of the areas of the work streams, and also of the school associate superintendents in order to involve them in all of the specific decisions made in CCSD. Every Central Service employee has received initial training on how schools' needs need to be the top focus for our work. We've actually conducted surveys of school-based staff telling us how we're doing in each one of those departments and divisions. We operate under new guiding principles that move all decisions as close as possible to the employees and schools that are affected by these decisions.

The second area that we focused on was families and the community giving input on the decisions. More than 2,300 families, employees, community members and students are trained and now participating in monthly SOT meetings at 328 schools. The reason it's 328 is that some of our schools do not have a population that is continuous that qualifies them. Their students are in and out the door, so an SOT wouldn't be functional under the law. Each SOT has collaborated on a school performance plan and strategic budget. As you've heard, we are at various levels of collaboration within our District, but a significant majority of our schools have gone through this process in a truly collaborative method and have been able to work through the development of their plan of operation and school budget. Senator Harris, I'm going to show you how you can go online and access each of those things in just a second. A recent poll found that the majority of the SOT members who completed the survey feel like their input is valued. There are specific comments in there that we are addressing as much as possible. We are using those to update our training materials when there are concerns so that we can better help people understand the roles and responsibilities of the SOTs and their

members. School associate superintendents provide quarterly achievement updates to each local municipality. The City of Las Vegas just had theirs last Wednesday morning. We are working within a quarterly presentation to get that information out to the municipalities, and that is done through our school associate superintendents.

Chair Roberson:

How are those quarterly meetings going? Any feedback?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Well, I'm sure Mayor Goodman, who is in the audience, can probably give you feedback on the City of Las Vegas. But we are evolving those so that we are breaking down their data at different points and being able to help them understand where they're at. Unfortunately, they don't always fall right when data is released, and so we're having to work through our timing to make sure. I think that they've been very well received. I think that it has been an opportunity for the community to get to know the school associate superintendents, as well as for them to get connected with all the elected officials at the various levels of meetings.

The third part that we've been working on is giving SOTs more independence over how they operate their schools. Under the new school-based decision-making model, our SOTs are working in a collaborative fashion. They have been making decisions where they are changing the number of periods offered each day. For example, at one of our high schools they had to look at their allocation of money and make decisions based upon adding an additional period in. At another school, they are making decisions to help select programs to improve the culture. Those are just two small examples of decisions that are made by the SOTs at the schools within their strategic budget processes. School organizational teams will have more flexibility, and I'm going to get into that a little bit, but then I'm going to let our school associates talk about more flexibility over their budgets and more autonomy to make decisions in the very near future.

The results of those decisions, as I said, can be found in the school plans of operation, and they are easy to find. So, let's take a look at one of our schools. This is Legacy High School, and let's take a look at it. You can find Legacy's webpage by going to the District website at ccsd.net, clicking on "Students" and then clicking on the list of school websites so you can actually find their website. From there, on Legacy's homepage I found the link to their page dedicated to the SOT under the "About Us" link. On that page is posted Legacy's plan of operation. It actually includes the specific format that is required by the District. It shows how they are going to be addressing the goals and objectives that not only the State Department of Education and the District have identified, but that have been identified at the school level as areas of concern for their specific community.

The next thing we focused on was budget transparency and tracking, and this has been the biggest challenge by far. Work began in March of 2017, but actually it began long before that. One of the challenges that we are trying to address is how to allow some of the work that is being done in our schools to really focus in on the change in the culture with how they set

their goals and objectives and address specific populations within their schools. So, we had to determine our specific populations at the central level and how those funds were being allocated to schools to make a difference. So, the first thing was to ensure that at least 85 percent of the unrestricted District money directly served schools. The second was to better track our Central Office services.

So with our first task, which was ensuring at least 85 percent was in school strategic budgets, State law requires 80 percent of the unrestricted funds by the 2017-2018 School Year and 85 percent by the 2018-2019 School Year. The District verified that we had 55 percent in our strategic budgets and 33 percent which are services that are directly sent to schools from our Central dollars. We have 12 percent that makes up our Central dollar expenditure.

So as we go forward looking at these budgets, when we talk about the services that go directly to schools I'm going to give you some examples, but this is in no way—

Chair Roberson:

Again, I think there's a lack of clarity on what the law requires. The law doesn't only require that 80 or 85 percent of unrestricted money serves the schools. It requires that those monies go to the schools so that the schools can determine how to spend those monies in their strategic budgets. So, will you please clarify that?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I'd like to wait, because in a different part of my presentation I talk specifically about that.

Chair Roberson:

Sure. Thank you.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Here are some examples of people that are direct services that are provided to schools. There are special education direct services, and some of it can and some of it cannot be changed and given freedom because of federal laws. Transportation is another service we provide from Central dollars to schools. Also, school nurses that go to work every day, and custodians and police officers that work on school campuses. Those are Central dollars that we have provided to schools that make up that 33 percent.

We have to have better tracking of our Central Office services, and this is the area that we have to really focus in on. Thanks to the funds allocated in the 2017 Session, CCSD is implementing our human capital management system that will provide even more transparency and better track the services that our departments provide directly to schools from Central. We have developed a time journal to help employees who provide direct services to schools track what percentage of their time is spent supporting each school in the 2017-2018 School Year. With the implementation of these two structures, the District will be

able to better measure the true cost of running each individual school, and principals will have a better picture of how funds are allocated to their school so that we can better provide the autonomy that is expected in the law.

Finally, we are now focusing very closely on school autonomy and decision making, and I'm going to spend a little bit of time on the developing of a process to transfer more authority and decision making to our local schools. On one of the pieces that you asked about specifically, what this legislative group can do to assist us with this is making sure that we understand the (a) through (t) process in section 14 of the old regulation. When you look at that specific piece, 37 percent of our unrestricted funds are protected under (a) through (t) and must go through an actual transfer of responsibility process so that the autonomy can be given to the schools. And you're going to hear more about that process in a minute and more about the 37 percent later in my presentation.

But the Central Office has an efficiency challenge to really determine how we can transfer more dollars to our schools and how we can free up the money that is in those things that have just rolled over from year to year, and how that money can now be either reallocated to schools for the same purpose or if that practice is needed to continue in the future. But one of the pieces that I do want to make sure we understand is how we got to where we are. So specifically, we're going to talk about trying to comply with the A.B. 469 80-20 piece. I want to talk about how we got to where we're at. We're really proud. I know that you think we're not in compliance, but I will tell you that from where we started and the conversations that I had with some of you during the legislative session where I kept saying, "We're not going to get there, we're not going to get there," we had to have basically a reevaluation of the way we think about our budgets and the way that we do the work. It came with help from TSC² and from other outside people who had dipped their toe in this process of how we might better be able to account for our money. So as we go forward, the Central Office departments are aligning their deliverables with what principals tell us they want. They are also funding the efficiencies of how they provide services to redirect funds from the Central Office and put them directly in school budgets.

So as we do that, I want to talk to you about how we are dealing with the unrestricted funds directly to schools. So, please look at this chart (Exhibit E). First, we know that as of today we have identified that 55 percent of our general unrestricted budget is in our school strategic budgets. The remaining 33 percent is in services that directly support our schools. So, I'm going to pull up the piece that is 12 percent. That is Central Services. We have brought that down and are continuing to look at efficiencies within CCSD of how we can still allocate even more dollars potentially out of that 12 percent Central Services budget. The fifty-five percent is the school strategic budgets. For the 33 percent, I'm going to break this down a little bit and bring up this chart, which is a very important chart. For those non-math people, I'm going to get a little detailed with this. Keep in mind that all of this chart is dealing with the 33 percent that are services directly to schools. Forty-four percent of those are subsidized special education funds. This last year, we spent \$381,000,000 from the CCSD general fund to subsidize what is required under State and federal law in special education. There are pieces that may have flexibility within those allocations, but there are also pieces that will not have flexibility due to the mandates of federal and State laws.

Chair Roberson:

To the extent that they are restricted, then they don't go into the calculation of the 80 percent of unrestricted funds. So, I'm trying to understand, because we're not talking about restricted funds. We know that there are certain funds restricted by State and federal law that don't go into the denominator that is used to calculate the 80-20. So, you're saying that 44 percent of the 33 percent of central services that go to the benefit of schools consists of special education. But is all of that 44 percent unrestricted?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Of that 44 percent, yes, \$381,000,000 that we put into special education are unrestricted dollars.

Chair Roberson:

So if it's unrestricted, why can't it be transferred or decentralized?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Because we are not funded at the full extent from the federal government on our special education pieces, and we have to make that up as required by law. So, there are positions in here that are determined by an individual student's individual education plan (IEP). I have to provide those services whether they are paid for or not.

Chair Roberson:

Then I think it's almost a semantics game. It may very well be restricted, and then maybe that shouldn't be in the denominator of the 80-20 calculation. If you're required by federal law to spend it in a certain way, I would argue maybe that's not unrestricted.

Mr. Skorkowsky

I think you're right, and we have battled with that internally over and over again. We are trying to be clear, though. One of the things that was required was the transparency of all unrestricted funds. I am being very transparent and telling you that, even though it's \$381,000,000, there are things that I can and cannot do within those dollars. So, I can't break out separate pots. The law states that I have to look at all unrestricted funds. And so, even though there are things that I'm required to do in other areas of this as well, either by State law or by—and I'm going to get to that in just a second.

Chair Roberson:

I do think at some point we need to drill down to that, because I doubt there's anyone on this Committee or anyone in the Legislature who passed A.B. 469 that expects you to take money

that you're required by law to spend in a certain way and move it to the schools in a way that would potentially put you in violation of State or federal law.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Correct. If you'll look at the 38 percent column, that is transportation, school police, itinerant specialists and other services to schools. Those are areas where we are required to provide certain things by District policy, which would be transportation. For school police, itinerant specialists and other services, we are looking at the transfer of responsibility process as to how we may be able to free up more dollars to allow schools to make individual decisions on what services they need from that area. If you'll look at the 9 percent, that is school custodians. That is an area that we have talked about, specifically about giving flexibility and freedom. We are looking at a policy change internally so that those dollars can flow out. As you're going to hear from the school associate superintendents, the challenge is that we are required to go through a request for proposal (RFP) process for any outside services to come through schools. You're going to see the timeline so that we can move to that and have a different set of rules and guidelines for our schools in their strategic budgets, with potentially more funds in January of 2018. The other piece is school utilities. One of the things that we're looking at is how school utilities are paid for, so we're going to be looking at that piece as well.

Assemblywoman Neal:

So, what are the "other services" that are in the 38 percent?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Numerous things fit into that. So, some examples are school nurses, itinerant custodians, custodial substitutes, school police officers and truancy officers that the District has. All of these things are listed. I don't have an exhaustive list, but I'll show you some more examples once we get to a different slide in the presentation. Again, one of the challenges is trying to figure out how to free up that flexibility from the 37 percent that was listed in (a) through (t) and get those dollars with choices out to schools. So, that's what we've been working on.

Now that we've identified some of the pieces, that gives you an idea of how we are setting up our structure and how we have accounted for those unrestricted dollars. We actually have gone through our budget line by line with each division and department head and our consultants to work through this process. That's how we got to the numbers that we got to. Now that we have identified the unrestricted funds that are either in the school budgets or directly serve schools, we're taking steps to give principals more of a say in how they receive central services, which we believe was your intent as we went forward. In June, about half of our principals filled out a survey about services they would like to see more control over. We're going to continue getting more input on the 16th and 17th of this month now that administrators are back at work. We believe that much of the \$481,000,000 that directly services individual schools, which is the 33 percent number, can be transferred to strategic

budgets by January. I'm happy to open up our books to you guys and show you how that is. If you'd like to set up meetings with me, we'd be more than happy to.

Chair Roberson:

I think this is important. So, you're stating that you believe the School District can get to 80 percent by January. Is that correct?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I believe that we can get there. We may get beyond that.

Chair Roberson:

Okay, so that's in January. But I know, and forgive me if you're going to get to this at some point, that that's going to require a vote in the meantime by the School Board, maybe more than one vote by the School Board, to move the services and the monies over. How soon can we get to that? Because I think we'd all feel a lot better if that vote happened in the next several weeks. Then we would know that maybe the School District's not in compliance, but the School Board has voted so that they will be in compliance by January. And that's a lot better than waiting and hoping that at some point action is taken, right?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Yes, and that timeline will be gone through with you by the school associates as they talk about that piece. So, you'll be able to see that timeline and projected target dates for each of those actions.

Chair Roberson:

Great, thank you.

Senator Ford:

Let me follow up with that question, because one of the presumptions we're making here is that the School Board is actually going to agree to do what's necessary to get us from the 55 percent of that 88 percent up to 80 percent. And I know they have open meeting rules and they have a tough time deliberating and discussing, but is there any insight you can offer, or anyone in the audience, as to the likelihood, unlikelihood, possibility or probability that we might be able to get cooperation from the School Board on this issue?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

We are working directly with our principals, and then we'll begin work with SOTs in August and with our school associates. You're going to see that process. But once it actually gets to the Board for decision, they will be briefed on all of the work that has been done prior to that

so they have the opportunity to make an informed decision about all of the individuals who have been involved in the process and are requesting this transfer of authority.

Senator Ford:

So, the answer is really no? We don't have anyone who can, at this juncture, give us an indication as to how the Board may perceive what we're doing now and how they may proceed at a Board meeting on the vote?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I do not know the mindset of seven individuals, but I can tell you that with this work, we are working very hard so they understand that this is not only the law of A.B. 469, but it is the will of their constituents who are in our schools. So, those two pieces hopefully will help us carry forward.

Senator Ford:

Your response is well received, and it's also further to a point you made earlier about managing expectations. Everyone in this room, everyone listening, everyone needs to understand that some of these decisions are continuing and depend upon other folks. So, we need to manage expectations and understand that while we are optimistic that we are going to proceed and hopefully have done what we talked about today within 85 days, it may not happen. And if it doesn't happen, again, it's an eye-of-the-beholder type of issue as to who's making the right decision. But the ultimate decision makers will be the School Board on determining what can be changed relative to the percentage of stuff that's passed on to the school. Is that right?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

That is correct. I'm going to tell you that it will probably take more than just the 85 days because our timeline extends up until the time the strategic budgets are released. So, we have to continue the work even though our consultants have set this process in place. The process that they're going to describe is a yearly process. This process will be done every year to determine what flexibilities and autonomies schools want to have. As we move forward and we work with you more closely in the 2019 Legislative Session, there may be the opportunity for more flexibilities and autonomies to be given to schools at that point in time.

Senator Ford:

Well, let me try to reconcile your statement with the consultant's statement about the 85 days. You're saying it may take more than 85 days. I'm trying to get an understanding of what exactly that means. Are you saying, for example, that within 85 days you will know how you're going to do it but it may take longer to implement it, or are you saying something different?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

My timeline is the January 15, 2018 date. That is how long it takes. Now, there are several steps along the way, but I have to go through the purchasing guidelines and several different things to get through that. The consultants may or may not be part of that. So when you see the timeline, we can reconcile the differences and I can come back up and answer any questions you might have at that point in time.

Senator Ford:

Okay. I'm going to preview a question I have, and this may be answered already. I'm hearing a couple things. Again, I'm just trying to reconcile them. I'm hearing from the consultants that within 85 days we will know how you're going to do it, but you're saying that between the 85 days and January 15 is when we know that it will be done?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Senator Ford, you are correct. And just for the record, the 85 days is what the consultants that have worked with us have set out. We will have identified all of the areas before their 85 days are up so that we have to move forward. That's in our timeline, so we were both correct. It's just that I have to take the ball from the handoff and give it across the goal line.

Senator Harris:

So, we've heard that you anticipate you'll have the plan for implementation by January. How long do you estimate that implementation is actually going to take?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Once we get the information into the strategic budgets and out to the SOTs in January, they must develop their new plans of operation and their strategic budgets by the end of February of 2018. That's all for implementation in August of 2018. So, for the implementation time when they get their budgets done, they will tell us what services they are either going to choose to purchase from CCSD or what services they will choose to go through an approved vendor that has gone through our purchasing process.

Senator Harris:

So if we wanted to have you report back to us in September of 2018, you'd be prepared to do that and talk about the success of the implementation at that point in time?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Actually, you only have through August 31, so we could do that in previous months.

Senator Harris:

Sure. And I was just trying to be generous, knowing that school starts in August. But since we have a hard deadline, then August.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Senator Harris, one of the challenges that we are going to face as the SOTs determine how their dollars are spent in their schools is one that requires compliance with both our contract bargaining agreements as well as our human resources policies. So I can't tell you at this point in time exactly how that's going to pan out, because we haven't gotten the choices in front of them. There may be some reduction in force that has to take place in the spring before we get to the implementation pieces. If we take any particular service and transfer that responsibility to schools and they choose to go outside CCSD to purchase that, then I would have to subsequently reduce my Central Services department or division the exact same amount. So, with the transfer of responsibility, there is the potential for jobs at this point in time.

Senator Harris:

Well, I understand that this is going to be a process. But I think it's important, just like we're doing a status check today, to see where we are with regard to the budget. I want some comfort that we're going to be significantly down the path with regard to implementation so that there is some satisfaction, not only for the Legislature but for the public and the families that attend these schools as well, that this reorganization and the monitoring process has had a real impact.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

You will have some of that in the spring after February. You will be able to see in March and April how those flexibilities were accessed by the schools.

Chair Roberson:

Mr. Skorkowsky, listening to all of this and this dialogue, it's clear that when you say January we're really talking about budgets for the next school year. So, I guess it's important to point out that this is why Michael Strembitsky wanted us to accelerate this. Because he was concerned that if you gave the School District 2 years, they'd wait until the second year to start focusing on this. So I'm just saying that I think he was right to ask us to push this the way we have because, even in a best case scenario, what you're telling us is that you're going to be at 80 percent by the next school year, not this school year. We're at 55 percent this year, then we'll be at 80. But frankly, under the law, we're supposed to be at 85 for next year. And maybe we will be. I'm not pointing fingers today. I'm just trying to make sure everybody understands where we're at, where we're talking about going and how long that's going to take.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Senator Roberson, your point is well made in the fact that when we started the work on September 9 of last year, that's when the Legislative Commission implemented the regulation. We were working hard to literally look at what we could transfer the first year, but unfortunately because of the way the regulation was written and now the subsequent law, I could not take a transfer of responsibility path at that point in time because I had to go through the school associate superintendents and the SOTs, which were actually not in place until January. So, we are working hard to get into compliance extensively.

Chair Roberson:

In all fairness, let's be candid here. Just as important was the fact that you were instructed not to participate and that the School District decided to sue the State over this. I think that played more of a role than not having the SOTs in place. But we're looking forward, not backward, right?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Senator Roberson, I have my blinders on. We are looking forward, and we have a lot to accomplish this year.

Assemblywoman Neal:

So, in this chart that you're showing right now, and I don't know if this is appropriate or not, what would be the services that were complicated to unwind?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

For some examples, look in the two columns that make up that 33 percent. So, if you look at this graphic, it breaks it down into the 12 percent that is Central, and again we're looking for efficiencies in this area where we still may be able to transfer some funds. Looking at the remaining 88 percent, 55 percent is in the strategic budgets, and you see that that's general education teachers, principals, registrars, office managers, first aid safety assistants the and supply budget. All of those things are in that first column, which are services directly to schools over which they have decision-making power. In addition to that, we have the on-site services provided to one school, and that amount is \$481,322,626. So, those are our special education teachers that go directly and stay at the school. They're not shared with anyone else. Also, our special education aides and our student physical therapist assistants, which again are from the general fund that we allocate to those schools for use. And our specialists, library, physical education and art programs are paid for centrally and allocated to schools. Rather, we are working towards allocation to schools. There are also special programs, such as our self-contained programs and special magnet programs. We provide a different per-pupil amount for our magnet students than we do for our general education students or our comprehensive schools, or it's provided within the magnet program, which is a school within

a school. And then there are school counselors, and we're looking at how we get flexibilities with those.

The services provided to multiple schools, which again we are doing the time-tracking on this year, make up \$313,703,865. Those are our itinerant testers for English Language Learners and our itinerant specialists who go out and help cover schools that are not able to cover their teachers' preps under the collective bargaining agreement. Our itinerant special education facilitators are individuals who work on compliance with the special education law. There are school utilities and curriculum programs, which we've been talking about. I just had a conversation with the State Superintendent. We have to, under A.B. 469, look at what flexibilities schools may ask for outside of State Department of Education regulations or State Board of Education regulations so that waivers could be potentially received to allow schools to make the decisions that are best for their schools instead of one size fits all. And then we're looking at certain technology aspects of it. Again, in trying to push those things, those are a few of the examples. They're not all of the examples of that 33 percent. So again, with the 12 percent, efficiencies—

Assemblywoman Neal:

So, when I look at columns for on-site services provided to one school and then services provided to multiple schools with students, I would say that special education teachers, special education aides and itinerant specialists fall within your 44 percent, which we find out is not really interchangeable. So, I guess to me those should be taken out because you're not actually trying to unwind them because you technically can't, because you'll either fall out of State law or federal law. So, I guess what's not clear is what it is that you can't unwind about it. What is it that's the unknown breakdown? Let's say it's school counselors. What is it that we cannot break down to show how that service will be provided to schools?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

That is exactly the discussion that we're having with our principals right now. In cases of school counselors, we provide the service to schools. We give them the school counselor, not the dollars. We are looking at freeing up those school counselor dollars so that those dollars go into the strategic budget and then schools determine how they're going to provide those services to the students, whether it be through a school counselor or whether it be some other method, like some other staff member who maybe takes a period a day and has a counseling degree who's able to do some of the procedures. We have to work through that with our building principals. What's going to be discussed in our transfer of responsibilities is how we look at these centrally-allocated dollars. For example, special education facilitators are not required by law. They are a service that we have provided based upon compliance issues in the past. If schools would rather have the dollars for that special education itinerant facilitator, then they would still be required to comply with all federal and State guidelines when it comes to IEPs, such as conducting those IEP meetings. So they have the flexibility of saying, "Yeah, we're going to use those dollars, but we're going to maybe pay a preparation period for a special education teacher to go sit and conduct this IEP and pay them extra duty pay." They have lots of flexibilities that they might want to use. Now, I can't tell you that our

principals actually want that flexibility yet. But we will give them the dollars. If they choose to purchase them all back from us, then so be it.

Senator Hardy:

So what I'm hearing is that for this school year that starts next week, we're not going to have an art teacher, we're not going to have another teacher and we're not going to have a dean. But we may next year.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Again, it all depends on the dollars that are allocated to the schools and how the SOTs decide to allocate those. So in the future, they may say, "We are going to take the dollars from this and we're going to add in an art program," or something else. As long as we stay in compliance with the federal and State laws, that's perfectly allowable.

Senator Hardy:

So we're not going to have it this year, even though the rurals were promised that they would be held harmless?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

That promise was based on proportionality, and again those were gifts in the past.

Assemblywoman Neal, I saw you rubbing your forehead. I do that daily and nightly. I can't sleep because all of these things run through my mind about how we get to full compliance with the law.

With that, I'm really excited that our school associate superintendents are here today, because they're going to go through an extensive presentation about their roles and responsibilities, the transfer of responsibilities and some additional things that they've been given the opportunity to work on within our District. We have to put decisions closer to schools. That is the requirement of the law. It's the intent of the law. And so to do that, we have to work closely with this key position to help be the bridge. When we meet with them in our Superintendency, they are the voice of the schools. They are there to represent the schools. When they meet with their schools, they are the voice of Central and there to represent Central. They are a key part of this process, as Mr. Strembitsky said over and over again.

I know you want this work to happen faster. I do too. But I'm proud of the work that we have done at this point in time. We are nowhere near finished with anything. We will never be finished, because every time we get to one step, we start the cycle over year after year after year to try to figure out what flexibilities and autonomies we can give to our schools. This work is never going to be done, but right now we are setting up the systems and structures to make sure that we get them right for future years, to make sure we're not only in compliance with

the law but that we manage our expectations with procedures for purchasing and State and federal laws when it comes to utilization of money.

But I'd like to make one point to you today, and this is a point that is very important. We have seen some challenges that are truly going to make a difference. Under the direction of our Governor and the leadership, we have seen a vast amount of categorical dollars that are truly changing the way we do business. Tomorrow we're having our summer graduation at the Orleans Arena at 1:30 p.m. and you're all invited to attend if you choose. We had over 19,000 graduates walk across the stage in June. That is a record in CCSD, and that number is going to go up significantly with tomorrow's graduation. We are seeing great efforts made by our schools to get more kids across the finish line. Those programs that you put in place as the Legislature in 2015 and again in 2017 are making a difference for our students. But I want to point out one thing. We are grateful for the work you did with the human capital management system. But I want to talk a little bit about some of the misconceptions that are out there when it comes to our bargaining situations. When you create a budget for the State, it operates on a biennium, and so we have to budget based upon the biennium. And you, in approving the Governor's budget, and I can't remember the specific bill number, included specific raises for State employees. Teachers and administrators, public employees, are not part of that group that was allocated. What we're looking at is the challenge of how we bargain in the future. If we gave our employees, all five of our employee bargaining groups, just a 1 percent cost of living adjustment, their actual roll-ups and steps and an additional \$1 per employee on their insurance contribution, it would cost us \$159.14 per student in the Distributive School Account (DSA). We received \$126 per student for that fiscal year. We're already having to look at how we can cut to provide anything additional to our employees for this fiscal year. If we look at the future, we're only receiving an additional \$79. When you talk about steps and you talk about adding that cost of living increase and adding that insurance piece, we are then looking at a difference between \$159 and \$79 that we are still short for this year. So, the simple fact is that our employees are costing us more as we go forward.

I will tell you that I was extremely disappointed in the way that the pot tax was put into the DSA, because what we continued to do, through the plan that was developed in 1967, was to take money that was revenue collected in Clark County and send it out across the State. We need to find a better way to utilize those dollars where they are collected, here in our county. That is your charge as Legislators, to protect southern Nevada. That could have filled up some of these opportunities for our collective bargaining pieces. I know it was regulated that the money had to go to education, but it did not say in the vote that it had to go into the DSA. We need to rethink that, because I can't grow silver and gold in Clark County. That is done in other places. But that revenue collected here could have impacted our students in this State.

The other piece is that, while I greatly appreciated the \$17,000,000, you bailed out Washoe when they were going to have a lower DSA than the previous year. You didn't do that for me in 2015. We went down \$15 per student. Yet, I have the highest class sizes in the entire State of Nevada, and Washoe got to stay at 28-1 class sizes. Now, I'm not picking on my counterpart up north, but I'm telling you that as southern Nevada Legislators we have to take care of southern Nevada. My class sizes range from 21-1 in kindergarten as the State

mandates, but my fourth and fifth grade class sizes are at 33.5-1. Washoe's are at 28-1. When you look at my middle school class sizes, they are 36-1, but 28-1 in Washoe. And in high school, my class sizes are 35.5-1, and Washoe is 28-1. I'm not picking on my counterparts, but I'm saying we need to take care of southern Nevada. The only way that we were able to account for a majority of our shortfalls after the recession was to increase class sizes. We know that we can no longer do that. Right now, it would cost us \$125,000,000, 1,860 teachers, to bring our class sizes down to the level of Washoe's. So, I'm just saying as we go forward, you have to remember how we have to do business differently than the rest of the State. When it comes to cost of living, when it comes to roll-ups and when it comes to insurance, we have to think differently. If we're going to push 85 percent out to schools, that money has to come from the Legislature, because we're going to have no other places to cut, unless it is in the per-pupil amount that we give to schools.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you for that, Mr. Skorkowsky. There's a lot to unpack there, but I would just make two points. Number one, I was disappointed to read in the paper that someone, I'm not sure who, representing the School District said that the reorganization actually contributed to the fiscal woes of the School District. I'd like to hear how that is. But also, irrespective of how much money is appropriated by the Legislature for CCSD, and I can tell you we've invested a lot more in 2015 and 2017 than we had in the past, to me that's all the more reason that every available dollar we do have goes to the schools, not to Central, but to the strategic budgets so the schools can determine how to spend those monies.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I couldn't agree more with you on that situation. As we go forward, it's important. And I didn't account the shortfall in our District's budget to the reorganization.

Chair Roberson:

But the School District did, in a story that the *Las Vegas Review-Journal* printed, or maybe that other publication that's out there. But it was in the press.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I understand that, sir. Again, what we are doing is trying to struggle to fill the \$45,000,000 shortfall that came about through various things. We had things that impacted us at the very end of the year that we could not make cuts for, because you can't make cuts in June to balance a budget. And so we recognize the fact that we are trying to balance our budget for Fiscal Year 2018 and have the least amount of impact to schools. You're going to hear from our school associates how they were engaged in a process that will go forward with potential recommendations to our School Board at that point in time. Again, that was not me personally, nor did I attribute that. That is not the message that we want to send. I understand that. We have to look at how we budget differently from here on out. So every time we budget for anything that has to do with more monies to schools, any time we want to add any program

which can only come about necessarily through school-based decisions, unless it is something that revises the work we do in Central, it has to go through our schools and be determined at the school level for us to have a program. I have to change my role. I am no longer a top-down benevolent dictator, so to speak. I, as the Superintendent, or any Superintendent subsequently, can't come in and say, "This is how we're going to teach such-and-such in all of our schools." That is not the Superintendent's decision any more. That decision is made down at the school level. I have to rethink the way that I do business and rethink the culture that I set up so that decisions are made closest to the school when it comes to curriculum and to the allocations of how they do their staffing, as well as programs that they bring into the District. So, we have to change our budgeting position from district-wide to an individual school, and there will not be an addition to the budget without there being a cut of the same amount.

Chair Roberson:

You did ask for \$17,000,000 for the human capital management system. We did appropriate \$17,000,000 for that, which was the request. How is that working out? Can you give us a status on the \$17,000,000 for the human capital management system?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

We are moving along the timeline for an approval of an RFP. We will have that done in the very near future, and then the actual work for implementation based upon that approval will start in January as we promised. Full implementation will be in January of 2019.

Senator Ford:

Thank you for those comments. I'm going to offer sympathy on one hand and I'll probably sound argumentative on another. I understand this notion of you not being the benevolent dictator and not being able to make the decisions on what's cut. In fact, I think local schools and parents are going to see now the difficulties of making tough choices. We as Legislators have to make those all the time in terms of what's going to get cut versus what's not going to get cut. So that's going to be a tough decision, and I think it's a good learning experience for everybody to be participating in. The somewhat argumentative point may be inappropriate for this venue, but I'm just curious. You were just in an arbitration, and you may have other arbitrations pending, and you lost an arbitration and are going to be required to pay some money. Where is that money coming from? How are you able to handle the judgments associated with arbitrations and lawsuits if you say every dime is accounted for?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

That's an excellent question, and as we go through the budget process—and I can't speak specifically because it hasn't been fully approved by the Board—we are looking at any time that an employee group receives an arbitration or settles a contract, the average cost of that employee goes up because of dollars that are having to support their new salary or any new benefits that are offered. In that, we have to increase our school strategic budgets to those

new average salary amounts. So, the cost goes into the strategic budgets to pay for the employee that now has an average salary at a higher rate. That's part of it. The other is that if they're Central Office employees, then I have to make cuts at the Central Office to reflect that new amount, or look at greater efficiencies to be able to account for that amount in the Central Office.

Senator Ford:

I understood the last part that you said, about making cuts at the Central Office. But I don't know if I heard that same response about what happens at the local precinct level.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

To clarify, each year we look at the average employee cost for principals, assistant principals and deans of students at both the elementary and secondary levels. We look at the cost for teachers at the school level. We look at the cost for support staff that work in schools. Each of those receives the average amount. That's what we take, and also the dollar amounts that we put into the strategic budget for them to utilize. So, we take the average of all the high school principals, middle school principals and elementary school principals. That is what is put in as the cost for those individuals.

Senator Ford:

This is the average versus actual cost debate that we had a while back?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

It is. So, every time the average salary of those individuals goes up, that average cost to a school goes up as well.

Senator Ford:

Sure, I get that, but my question remains. Pre-arbitration you had budgeted x, and post-arbitration defeat, x is increased. So how are you making up that delta? Where is that money coming from?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Schools will be opening their strategic budgets in the very near future because they have to deal with the S.B. 178 dollars, and they have to look at the new average salaries for administrators, which was part of that arbitration. They'll have to make decisions based at the school level. We have to use average salaries, that's required in the law. So, every time the average salary changes, we have to change that in the strategic budget.

Senator Ford:

So when you said “make decisions,” you mean those decisions may contemplate cuts at the local school levels?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

They could.

Chair Roberson:

Just to follow up on what Senator Ford said, if teacher salaries are increasing because of a collective bargaining dispute or agreement, then that actually is more money in the schools' budgets, because one of the primary and largest components of a school's strategic budget is teacher salaries. So, if you're paying teachers more, as far as getting to 80-20, that's more money towards that goal in the school strategic budgets, is it not?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

No, it is not. The per-pupil dollar is fixed. We have the same pot that we are using, so there are no more dollars that actually are increased in the per-pupil expenditure.

Chair Roberson:

I don't think I framed that very articulately. The money spent in strategic budgets in large part goes to funding teacher salaries. That's not a Central expense, that's a school strategic budget expense.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Correct.

Chair Roberson:

For example, if you've got a pie, and the teachers' salaries make up a certain portion of the pie, that part of the pie is in the school's strategic budget. So when those teachers' salaries increase, that's a larger portion of the overall school budget that's going into school strategic budgets. I'm not saying more money magically appears. What I'm saying is that when you're trying to get to 80 percent, when you're being forced through collective bargaining to pay more for teachers, you're actually being forced to spend more of your overall pie in the school strategic budgets. Does that make sense?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Senator Roberson, let me see if I can explain this a different way. Right now, our per-pupil that we give to schools directly is about \$3,500. That per-pupil will not change when they

reopen their strategic budgets. Yet the average costs of the salaries will increase. I don't get to change that per-pupil, because there's no more money.

Chair Roberson:

And I agree with that. But again, there's a challenge right now. Maybe this point is really not that relevant, but as we're trying to get to 80-20, the more we pay for school teachers' salaries, the more money is being spent in the schools as we're trying to get to 80-20, right?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Senator Roberson, you're correct, and I understand your point now. So yes, that increases the overall percentage of money going to schools.

Chair Roberson:

So it's not a bad thing from your perspective as you're trying to get to 80-20 that we're paying teachers more?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Well, I don't think it's a bad thing at all to pay teachers more. It's just being able to continue running the District—

Chair Roberson:

Understood.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

So with that, I would like to turn it over to my school associates.

Chair Roberson:

I know you're going to explain this to us, but you are four of the new school associate superintendents. I've been hearing about all the great work you've been doing, so I hope the Committee gets a chance to hear about that today.

Brenda Larsen-Mitchell (School Associate Superintendent, Performance Zone No. 12):

At this time, we would like to proudly recognize our fellow school associate superintendents and the Chief Academic Officer, Mike Barton.

Assembly Bill 469 articulates that the Superintendent must assign school associate superintendents to supervise local school precincts, of which each school associate superintendent must not be assigned to supervise more than 25 local school precincts

(Exhibit E). As a collective team of school associate superintendents, we have embraced the meaningful and purposeful work in serving and supporting our school communities to support site-based decision making, in which decisions are made as close to the school as possible. As leaders within the District, supporting and serving our schools to promote student achievement is the center and focus of our work. School associate superintendents work alongside the stakeholders at each local school precinct within their performance zones. We are responsible for the training and supervision of principals. We review and approve each school's plan of operation, which includes the school performance plan and the strategic budget. We ensure that each school is in compliance with all applicable federal, State and local laws. In addition, we provide quarterly reports to the governing body of each city and county to articulate information regarding the schools that reside within these governing bodies. We are also charged with carrying out any other duties assigned by the Superintendent. As school associate superintendents, we are accountable for the performance of each school that we serve, including school community satisfaction and school performance.

The role of the school associate superintendent is extremely important within the school-centered organizational model. We are directly held accountable for the performance and success of every school that we serve. The center of our work is student achievement. School associate superintendents serve as the bridge and the conduit within the organization. We represent both the Principalship and the Superintendency. The Superintendency includes the Superintendent, chiefs representing Central Services, the Chief Academic Officer and the school associate superintendents. As we work alongside principals in schools, we represent the Superintendency, and as we interface with the Superintendency, we work collaboratively with leaders in Central Services to advocate for high quality customer service supports provided to our schools. We have firsthand knowledge of what is occurring in schools related to Central Services supports. We strive to eliminate systemic barriers facing principals. We advocate for coherence of a school-centered organizational model and maintain structures that have successfully supported schools. In addition, we advance change in a complex system that continuously enhances the performance of schools, sustains high quality educational programs and provides opportunities for students across all sectors of our District.

As members of the Superintendency, we have been more involved in the decision-making process to make decisions closer to the school. For example, the Superintendent recently charged the school associate superintendents—this goes under “other duties as assigned”—as a collective group to make recommendations regarding our current budget shortfall. The center of our thinking was always student achievement. This was a collaborative process. Division and department leads in Central Services and principals provided very thoughtful and meaningful feedback and input, and ultimately the school associate superintendents made recommendations to the Superintendent. As we did this work, our goal was to keep the impact of the budget shortfall as far away from students in schools as possible. Our starting point was to review budget line items within our organization. Through this initial step, school associate superintendents identified areas for consideration and input that needed to be gathered and considered from department and division leads. The school associate superintendents and a group of principals met with division and department leads to gather

input on specific budget items within their areas. School associate superintendents and principals reviewed the information. Principals were then asked to use a ranking system for each potential cut for recommendation to the Superintendent. After receiving input from the principals, the school associate superintendents went through the exact same ranking process. Based on the collaborative process with meaningful input from division and department leads, principals and school associate superintendents, the school associates made a recommendation to Superintendent Skorkowsky. This is an example of how we have been more involved in decisions to support a school-centered organizational model.

As school associate superintendents, we work directly with schools and with all stakeholders in the school community. We engage with principals and team members, focusing on instruction and education experiences, and the positive, supportive climate and culture that is necessary for student achievement to excel. We serve as coaches and mentors for principals and engage in reflective, collaborative and growth-oriented practices to build positive, trustworthy relationships with school principals to provide a climate and culture that promotes professional growth and builds the capacity to improve student success. We believe in the people we work alongside in the District and the students, parents and community that we serve. We believe in Clark County Schools Achieve.

To begin to articulate how our work is being integrated into the operations of the District, my peers Grant Hanevold, Lorna James-Cervantes and Antonio Rael will share with you how our team is working to increase autonomy for principals and to move dollars from Central Services to school strategic budgets.

Grant Hanevold (School Associate Superintendent, Performance Zone No. 2):

I am here to discuss the District's plan for increasing and expanding school autonomy and to update you on the work done thus far. First, we need to work through the compliance with 80-20 and 85-15. By defining allocations to schools that exist now, we will build our capacity to account and report on those allocations at an individual school level after the services have been rendered each year. We are also working towards increasing specific autonomies and flexibilities for schools by allowing principals to define where they believe autonomies exist, identifying where principals wish for increased autonomy and flexibility, and by working with principals and department leaders to define those individual relationships and implement purposeful change. And finally, we are working towards increasing the amount of funds available to schools to support the increased autonomy in their decision making through searching for inefficiencies in budgets outside the schools and working through the process to transfer responsibilities to schools and move dollars ultimately into school budgets.

This next slide is a lengthy and fairly involved one (Exhibit E), so I will do my best. We are defining autonomy in terms of the opportunity for the principal, with input from the SOT, to make decisions about what the desired outcomes should be for an activity, and the opportunity for the principal, with input from the SOT, to determine the mechanism to achieve those outcomes. We recognize that if funds are available for an outcome, how principals access those funds also has an effect on how autonomous the decision making is around it.

So, if we look at autonomy on a continuum based on these three factors, we get a table that allows principals to report their perception of autonomy in a way that we can use it to analyze and compare the responses. We have a continuum of five tiers here, with tier one reflecting the highest level of autonomy for principals and tier five reflecting the lowest level of autonomy. In tier one, principals would have full discretion over setting the desired outcome and determining the mechanism to achieve it. Any available funds to support this work are allocated in the school strategic budget. In tier two, the desired outcome is set by either the Central Office or by some sort of mandate, but principals have full discretion on how to achieve the outcome. Any available funds to support the work are allocated through the school strategic budget. In tier three, the desired outcome is set either by the Central Office or by some sort of mandate. Principals choose from a predetermined set of options when determining how to achieve the outcomes. Available funds to support the work may be allocated to school strategic budgets or may sit with Central Services departments. In tier four, the desired outcome is set by Central Services or a mandate, and the means to achieve the outcome are determined by Central Services with consultation from the building principal. Funds to support this work are within Central Services departments and reside in their budgets. Finally, in tier five, principals have no discretion over the desired outcome, the mechanism to achieve that outcome or the funds to support it. So, consider those five tiers of autonomy as we move into this next slide.

Senator Harris:

Will you repeat your definition of autonomy for me?

Mr. Hanevold:

There are three parts. The first one is the opportunity for the principal, with input from the SOT, to make decisions about what the desired outcomes should be for an activity. The second one is the opportunity for the principal, with input from the SOT, to determine the mechanism to achieve those outcomes. The third one is to recognize that if funds are available for an outcome, how principals access those funds also has an effect on how autonomous the decision making is. Did that clarify?

Senator Harris:

Yes. I do want to look at your slide where you talk about increasing autonomy for schools. As I read the green slide, your view is that every school will have a different level of autonomy then. If principals are defining what those autonomies are, and they're defining what their autonomy goals are, every single school within the School District is going to have a different level of autonomy, correct?

Mr. Hanevold:

In my opinion, that's essentially the beauty of the law. If we're moving toward site-based decision making, it is exactly what you just described, that each site would have the ability to

make decisions based on their level of experience and expertise within the building. Ultimately, it comes down to the amount of funds that they have access to.

Senator Harris:

Okay. I just wanted to make sure that I'm understanding your perspective correctly, because I think that that's got a direct impact on SOTs and how much autonomy and influence they're actually going to have as they're participating in this collaborative environment with the principal, teachers and other members of SOTs. So essentially, rather than seeing some kind of uniformity with regard to how SOTs are actually going to operate, what we're going to have is a continuum along a spectrum with some SOTs being more fully engaged and having more autonomy than others?

Mr. Hanevoid:

Absolutely, and I think that leads right into the next slide in which I define the tiers and levels of autonomy. We have 300-plus principals, and they may all be at a different place. And that's okay, because we know that as time moves on, they will gradually take on more and more of those transfers of responsibility.

Senator Harris:

So you actually envision an environment where, as school principals and SOTs are being more collaborative with autonomy, you're going to see an increase in autonomy rather than a reduction? I would argue that with a lot of fluidity comes a large sliding scale, and you actually may see some schools that are fairly autonomous scale back and become less autonomous based on the principal and how he defines and implements what should be autonomous and what should not.

Mr. Hanevoid:

I think you're right. I think there will be levels all over the place. Some people will run and some people will walk. That's just the nature of dealing with autonomies. I can only say that, as a former empowerment principal, when you turn over decision making and you make truly site-based decisions and it becomes a collaborative process and more people are engaged in the decision making, it's really hard to pull back. The pressure from the SOT will likely drive a lot of those decisions.

Senator Harris:

But based on what you just said, it's the principal that determines that autonomy. So a principal could pull back and actually give less autonomy, even though the parents and the teachers may crave more autonomy. According to what I'm hearing you say, it's the principal that's the gatekeeper of that autonomy.

Mr. Hanevold:

I wouldn't necessarily say they are the gatekeeper. We are certainly working side by side with our principals to establish a collaborative process, but ultimately in the law right now, the SOTs are limited to an advise-and-assist model.

Chair Roberson:

I want to interject here for a moment, because this came up at the CIC meeting about a month ago. I know Vikki Courtney, who's a member of the CIC, pushed back on this issue of whether autonomy is discretionary. I don't believe it is, and I don't think she believes it is, under the law. Now from my perspective, the way I see this is that a principal and an SOT are going to have the autonomy contemplated under the law. But if a particular school wants to continue to have Central provide a service, then that is in effect a level of autonomy. They got the autonomy, but they said, "You know what, we're happy with the way Central is providing this service. They're going to continue to be our vendor on this service." For instance, maybe a particular principal doesn't want to think really hard about landscaping. There are a lot of other things that he or she is focused on. But yet, when we get to where we need to be on this, that principal and that SOT are going to have money allocated in their strategic budget for landscaping. The way I envision this is that the principal and the SOT can say, "You know what, Central has been doing a great job on the landscaping. We're going to reallocate back to Central the money needed to have Central perform landscaping for the school." That's perfectly fine, but I still think that principal and that SOT have an equal amount of autonomy with every other school to make that decision. And so I hope we're talking about the same thing.

Mr. Hanevold:

We are talking about exactly the same thing. Because in fact, your example is spot on. You are right. Schools will have options, but they can certainly choose to remain with the option that is being provided by the School District.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I've kind of skipped ahead, but I've always envisioned this like the principal having a shopping cart, and then they pick services. So when I was looking at the tiers, because I skipped ahead, it looked like in regards to tier two that the principal, more often for particular services, wanted full discretion with guidance and support, but when it came down to specialists and other very specific things around teachers, they wanted the full discretion. Based on the diamond and the circle, because the circle is what they want, what the end result of all of that data is, how did you guys then take that information back? What ended up being clear definitions, because apparently there'll be a broad viewpoint and then there'll be subsets? So, what was the outcome there?

Mr. Hanevold:

For the context of the whole Committee, would it be okay if I went through those couple of slides? Because I know you went ahead and I'm ready for those answers, but I'm afraid that might generate more answers after everybody's had that context.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Sure.

Senator Ford:

So, I want to be sure we're not conflating autonomies though, because the real autonomy is to the school principal, not to the SOTs. As you've indicated, the SOTs have an advisory role to the school principal. The principal gets to make an ultimate determination on whether he or she wants to accept the recommendation from the SOT. As we envisioned it, the regulations are such that if the SOTs disagree on certain things, then they can appeal to the associate superintendents. So, I think it's important that we differentiate when we talk about autonomies and not imply that the SOTs have the ultimate decision-making authority or that they have the ultimate autonomy to make decisions. Because they don't, unless I'm mistaking that. I'd like for you to verbally acknowledge that that's accurate.

Mr. Hanevold:

And I think in my clarifying question about identifying what autonomy is, I believe in all of it, was the opportunity for the principal, with input from the SOT. So I hope we were clear in that.

Senator Ford:

I heard it, and I just wanted to be sure. Because I'm a lawyer and I parse words. Words matter, and I want to be certain that everybody else understands when we're talking about autonomy. Because we have some people here who are concerned about SOTs, their input and their ability to influence and affect decisions. It's important to know that this Committee, in the regulations that were passed, gave the autonomy to the principals with input from the SOTs. So, the SOTs are operating in an advisory capacity, and I think that's an important concept that people need to keep in mind and not misunderstand or confuse with what their duties or responsibilities are.

Mr. Hanevold:

That's a fair statement.

In our next slide (Exhibit E), we provided a survey to principals with a list of services and asked that they answer two questions. The first one was which level of autonomy best defines their current experience with services. The second was what level of autonomy would they prefer in the future to help accomplish their goals. I believe this survey was given at the end

of May and into June, and approximately 50 percent of our principals responded to this survey. As a reminder, principals were asked to identify where on the continuum these activities exist and where they would like them to be. So the diamond is where they think the autonomy currently resides, and the circle is where they would like it to be.

Based on these survey responses from principals, we can now report on how great the gap is. The data has allowed us to identify where we should be looking in terms of making changes to the way services are provided and where in the organization decisions are made. So these next two slides we have to look at together, so let me explain what you're looking at on this slide. Overall and on average, principals wanted increased autonomy in every service. They did not, however, all respond that they wished for the highest level of autonomy for every service. This reflects what we already know about how different individuals approach the Principalship. Some wish to focus on instructional leadership, while others truly believe that taking over responsibilities for operational and support services will allow them to increase achievement for students. I think that ties right into Chair Roberson's response. What we're looking at here is a weighted average of responses from principals for each service according to a tiered accountability curriculum. The list of services included on the survey was established through a collaboration of many people, including TSC², school associate superintendents and two groups of principals who all came together to work towards developing this survey.

I will share this data in two ways. First, on this particular slide and the next one, are the results ranked by the size of the gap between where principals perceived being in terms of the level of autonomy and where they wished to be. It's important to point out that there is by no means a consensus on any of these ratings. This information being shared is a weighted average. We know we will need to dig deeper into services that this data allows us to select. By ranking the responses in this manner, by size of the gap, and not necessarily taking into account what level of autonomy the principal wants for each service, we can begin to zero in on some opportunities to increase autonomies for principals without having to necessarily transfer the entire responsibility to them. These are the kinds of details we will need to work out in our partnership with the Central Office. So, if you look at this slide and the next slide, you will see that these are ranked by the largest gap. Where the principals perceive their level is now, and where would they like it to be. So this is just one way of looking at the data.

The next slide is actually broken down in a different way, and this way is almost more meaningful in some ways to look at what principals really want to have control over. Since these are weighted averages, there may be principals that are thinking outside of these averages, and that may be okay as well. Because the autonomy continuum revealed that principals did not necessarily wish for full autonomy and responsibility for all of these services, it's important that we look to those services for which it is relatively clear that they do. The data represented on this slide and the next is the exact same data as the last two slides, but it is ranked by the desired end state, or how much autonomy principals want for each of these services regardless of how much autonomy they believe they currently have. As you can see, some of the things at the top of the list here don't necessarily show that we are too far off in terms of the gap, but these are opportunities for us to focus on items that principals believe should be funded in the strategic budget. So the more principals responded that they would

like to have level one or level two autonomy, the more likely we are going to get some quick wins when we move services and dollars in the direction of those areas in general.

We have taken it even one step further. So, what you see on this slide is that we are combining those rankings to identify services for which principals want the greatest level of autonomy and for which their perception of their current level of autonomy was the furthest away. So, this is some hybrid information taken from the previous two sets of graphs. These are the items that are top-ranked both in terms of gap and the desired level of autonomy. Of course, not all of these items are things that we will be able to address immediately. And as you can see in terms of the very first responses, teacher-student ratio and class size, we have very little control as a District over these requirements as they come from State law. While we may not be able to increase autonomy in those areas now, information like this certainly informs and supports our class size reduction waiver requests and any future legislative work related to class size. The other services on this slide are places where we need to start looking at the serious work of transferring responsibilities and increasing school autonomy. And we are going to take that one step further and walk you through this process, and my colleague Lorna James-Cervantes is going to take us down that road.

Lorna James-Cervantes (School Associate Superintendent, Performance Zone No. 5):

As Mr. Hanevold said, we now have the ability to focus in on some very specific items for which the level of autonomy can be examined and increased for school leaders, which is the work related to the transfer of responsibilities. This is the work that will allow us to move dollars from central budgets into school strategic budgets. And again, this work is the next step in the progression that began with surpassing 80-20 and will continue through increasing autonomies and flexibilities to where some very specific, concrete and easily observable changes will begin to take shape.

When we look at the law, in order for additional responsibilities to be transferred to schools, there are four main requirements. The Superintendent must form his recommendations with the consultation of principals, school associate superintendents and SOTs. The recommendations must be made in the best interest of students. Recommendations must be approved by the Board of Trustees. If approved, the District is required to transfer the funds to schools that would otherwise have been spent to support the responsibility. Of course, to meet these four items a great deal of detail is involved. We have additional responsibility to consider risk, consequences to the District as a whole, ensuring that the principals are provided with the right information for transferred responsibilities, and other details that led to the development of a process that is a little more complex and detailed, while still meeting the needs of the law. The process identifies how we plan to do several things. We will develop the recommendations with the right information at hand, provide adequate information to the Trustees so that they may review the recommendations and make truly informed decisions, and finally we will implement the Board's decisions in time for schools to develop school plans of operation and for Central Services to adjust. The major steps of this process are listed on this slide. For a truly detailed look at how we are engaging in this work, I'd like to walk you through the process itself in detail. I know that this slide is a little difficult to read, but in the

backup material there is included a version of the process that is larger and clearer (Exhibit E). You may wish to turn to that page as we go through this process together.

Also, before we get into the details of each step in the process, I'll just share with you a little bit about how this document is organized so that you have a better idea of what we are looking at as we go through. You see, there are eight major steps represented by tall rectangles with a dark blue label at the top. Within those are activities that can also be broken down further that describe how we might go about completing each step. At the bottom of each step, you will see a symbol that represents the development of an actual document. This is to provide a documentation of the outcomes of the work at each step and to inform work in future steps. You'll also see some representations of repeated opportunities to ensure that the Board is provided information throughout the work in terms of progress and activities. The arrows illustrate how some pieces of the work are dependent on other pieces and how some documents inform future action steps. For example, you can see that the documents in the first four steps all point toward approval in the middle. These documents will contain the information that will allow us to prepare the Board to be able to review the recommendations and to make informed decisions. I'm going to walk through each of these steps so that you get an idea of the work at hand, and then Mr. Rael will speak to where we are currently working and how the school associate superintendents are engaging in this process.

So, the first step is all about gathering information from stakeholders and resources to begin to form a list of responsibilities that might be considered as a recommendation to the Board to be transferred to schools. Mr. Hanevold shared with you how the District has already started this work by surveying principals on their current and requested levels of autonomy. Further information gathering could include focus groups at the school community and Central Office levels, surveys of various stakeholders, including the survey that Mr. Hanevold spoke to, results of other information collected throughout the year, reviewing vendor relationships that are already in place through our purchasing team, and finally assessing the risk of those items to be transferred so that we might consider whether to recommend a change district-wide at one time or as a gradual roll-out over time.

Assemblywoman Neal:

So, when you talk about reviewing vendors, what do you mean by that? And then when assessing the risk, because you guys have that white box at the end, "Preliminary List of High Risk and Low Risk Responsibilities to be Transferred," if it's high risk and yet it is a desired service of a principal, what do you do?

Ms. James-Cervantes:

That's a great question. So, as we're looking at the risk levels, we need to make sure that the principals and the SOTs understand fully what the risk is that might be involved with transferring a service, what the outcomes must be and making sure that everyone is well-informed of what the law is. So that's part of the work that would come as part of this. Also, in a few minutes Mr. Rael is going to explain exactly what that looks like on an item-by-item basis. But we want to make sure that schools are well-informed of what the risks may be and

what level of service must be maintained, because if we turn over a certain service to an outside vendor, they must still comply with the laws and provide schools with the same level of service that is already expected.

Senator Ford:

One of the nagging questions on my mind is, and maybe you or Mr. Rael will get to this, are we talking about a mass transfer for all 300-plus schools, or are we talking about each of them having to go to the School Board for a vote on services that they want to transfer? What are we talking about here?

Ms. James-Cervantes:

What we're talking about is a process where we would have the input from schools and from principals as to the areas that they would like to look at having transferred. Then, we as a group and staff at the School District would work through making sure that we take those items to the School Board. So that would be done in one process at the School Board level. So, each individual school doesn't have to go to the Board as an individual precinct, but that would be done so that schools would then decide, "Okay, we have the ability to have more autonomy in this area. Do we want to take that or not?"

Senator Ford:

Sure. Okay, so it goes back to the whole autonomy discussion we had a minute ago, because it sounds as though there may be instances where the principal, though he or she has the autonomy, will be overruled because he or she may not, as my colleague indicated, want a particular responsibility. But absent unanimity, somebody's going to not be able to get their way if you go and ask the School Board to transfer responsibilities. Is that right?

Ms. James-Cervantes:

That's possible. And also, remember that all of the work that we're bringing forward with the transfer of responsibilities is first a recommendation to the Superintendent, who then takes those requests to the Board for their approval.

So, the second step is how we move from developing a list of items to consider into actually beginning to gather information that will narrow the focus. A review of related requirements or standards from policy, law or negotiated agreements might make the process of transferring a particular responsibility more difficult or clearer. We recognize the need to document all requirements and standards and cite the source of those requirements so that it is clear what is being considered and, if transferred, clear as to what leaders are responsible for. And I think this goes back the last question. If required or desired, an RFP process could take place. This is a decision that would need to occur on a case-by-case basis, and CCSD would need to respond to the RFP as a vendor so the schools would be able to choose between the usage of the District for services or an outside vendor. We recognize that even within responsibilities that may be transferred to schools, there may still be components that

remain a central responsibility. We need to be clear about where that line is so that school and Central Office leaders are very clear about what they are responsible for and to what standards their work should be upheld. As you see, this step concludes with a set of documented requirements, standards and potentially bids from vendors.

The next step is to work through the process of assigning a monetary value to services. It would be difficult for school leaders to understand how they should approach meeting requirements without understanding how much money would be transferred to support them. This could not be accomplished unless Central Office departments first determine the amount of money spent on the work to support this responsibility. At this stage, department leaders can also begin to develop budget and staffing scenarios to provide some insight on some of the possible budgeting and staffing consequences of changing how services are provided. Finally, once we know what a service currently costs and how a Central department might be able to function, we can then determine how we might allocate the funds to schools.

I hinted already at the very real possibility of significant consequences that could take place as a result of a change in how a service is provided to schools. It is important that we document District-level impacts, the need for changing internal processes and operations at the District and department level, and the potential for the need to revise related policies and regulations. This step will result in documentation of consequences that should be considered as the Superintendent forms recommendations and as the Board makes the final decision. By the time we get to the point where recommendations are being provided to the Board, they will have had multiple opportunities to be informed about the work. The idea is that we are best able to support their decision making. Once the Board makes a final decision, we will have a Board-approved list of responsibilities to be transferred to schools. We can then spring into action and update strategic budgeting formulas and include the newly documented requirements and standards for transferred responsibilities in the school program planning and budgeting guide. With that information, principals and SOTs can work through their processes for developing the plans of operation. Schools will determine which services will be purchased from Central Services through their strategic budgets. With that information, departments will be able to finalize budgeting and staffing plans. We will also be able to engage the finalization of changes in processes or operations at the District or department level, and any potential changes needed to policy or regulation that we identified in an earlier step.

Mr. Rael will now guide us through the next phase of this process.

Antonio Rael (School Associate Superintendent, Performance Zone No. 15):

Assemblywoman Neal, I believe I will answer some of your questions from earlier about what we're doing with the data that Mr. Hanevold showed before. So, hopefully this will address some of those concerns.

As we turn back to this big picture of the transfer of responsibilities process, it is important to note that this is not a chronological map. Thus, we won't have necessarily completed one step or activity before we move on to the next. Much of this work can take place in overlap.

However, this process map will help us to ensure that action steps are informed by the appropriate information. This brings us to today. We are in the beginning stages of this work. As noted earlier, we have begun the process of gathering information from stakeholders which will inform the initial recommendation list of potential transfers to our Board. As we continue to gather information, some advanced work in monetizing services is taking place simply for the sake of speed, and some Central Services department leaders are already working through potential budgets and staffing scenarios, consequences and organizational impacts.

As we dive into this piece a little bit further, it's appropriate to again align this work with the work that showed that 88 percent of unrestricted funds are spent at the schools or with students. When we speak to the ability to increase funds to the school budgets, we speak to even moving funds from the 12 percent, which are Central Services funds, and/or the 33 percent, which are those items designated as school-allocated services. Again, those services are taking place 100 percent of the time at schools and with students. We are talking about moving funds from both of those pots, the 12 percent and the 33 percent, to the 55 percent in the strategic school budgets.

So as you heard from my colleague Ms. Larson-Mitchell earlier, we as the school associate superintendents find ourselves in this really interesting situation. When we interact with Central Office colleagues, we have the hat on of building principals. We represent schools. When we interact with our building leaders, we represent the Central Office. Thus, we are uniquely situated to become the bridge for the transfer of responsibilities. That phrase is key here, that we "become the bridge," which will allow the real change to take place and for our principals and our school communities to feel the effects of this reorganization.

In that capacity, the Superintendent charged us, the school associates, with determining how to move the funds from the designated services, the 33 percent, into the school strategic workbooks. The graphics you see there show the breakdown of the 55, 33 and 12 percent. With the survey results that Mr. Hanevold just spoke to, we have a starting point to identify how and where to move dollars from Central Services and from direct services into strategic budgets. We've taken that initial data, the principals' recommendations, and asked our Central Service leaders to create executive summaries. Again, I think this will answer some of the questions you had about high-risk areas. In these, you'll have requirements, standards, monetary values and possible consequences, documents known as "orange and whites," for the areas in which schools have the greatest interest of increased autonomy. Again, these orange and whites will include the dollar amounts for services transferred, legal implications and potential unintended consequences of moving these dollars and services to schools.

During the principal-level meetings, which are the high school, middle school and elementary school-level meetings 2 weeks from now, principals will see the itemized \$2,400,000,000 budget, along with these orange and white documents, and will begin the partnership work with their SOTs and their full school communities to determine what slice of that 33 percent for which they want autonomy. This will allow them to refine their responses to the survey and will turn broad, quantitative information into specific recommendations and qualitative feedback. Principals will then have a couple of weeks, and will then bring those

recommendations back to the school associates in the performance zone meetings that will occur in the first week of September. So in that 2-week time period from the level meetings to the performance zone meetings, principals will work with their SOTs and school communities to determine which of the areas of interest to move from the 33 percent. Those principal recommendations will then be synthesized collectively by the school associates and submitted to the Superintendent for consideration for potential recommendation to the Board.

This work with the school associate superintendents and the principals is the next step in working towards moving dollars to school budgets. Over the coming weeks, I hope you see the depth and the power of this work to transfer responsibilities and effect real change. With that, we collectively thank you for the opportunity to present today. I'm sure that there are questions, and we are excited to continue the dialogue with you.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you all for being here and the work you're doing and for presenting today.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I want to go back to one of the examples. When you were talking about how CCSD or Central will act as a vendor and then you'll have outside vendors, what I'm not clear on is the outside vendor piece. Because earlier, we heard that CCSD would have preapproved vendors, which means that Central is still engaged in the process of vetting those vendors. But in your example, it sounded like an outside entity. I'll be very basic in my example. I hope this isn't realistic, but let's say someone said, "I want to go with Home Depot to fix a lock at the school." Is that a possibility?

Mr. Rael:

So the key piece here is that vendors that go onto the approved list, once approved by the School Board, will go through an RFP process to make sure they meet all of those requirements from a legal standpoint. Obviously, one of our responsibilities, or one of the Superintendent's responsibilities, is to ensure that building maintenance is kept to a certain level of criteria and code. So if indeed Home Depot bid on the RFP process and they were one of the approved vendors, then a school could determine that instead of using District maintenance as the vendor choice, they could solicit the work from Home Depot.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Which leads me to the second question I've been wondering about, which is the maintenance that is already hired and has been working at CCSD. What then happens to them? Are they displaced? Where do they go?

Mr. Rael:

I think this is a question where we're all looking into the crystal ball to some extent to see how that plays out based on the reality of supply and demand. So certainly, if the demand shifts from the District being the default vendor, that would obviously create a difference in the amount of employees we'd need in that particular area.

Assemblywoman Neal:

This is a second topic, but I haven't seen much discussion around this. In regards to curriculum, if a school site is deciding textbooks or whatever they're going to engage in, how is that working in terms of, let's say a school wants to pick a certain math textbook, but yet it's in the same attendance zone as another school. What are we doing there? Is there a conversation around how that will work, considering the academic fragmentation when we have high transiency areas where students are constantly moving between schools, such as West Prep Academy, Wendell P. Williams Elementary School and Matt Kelly Elementary School? What's the plan there?

Mr. Rael:

So, I think that's a really strong question to consider, and we had a great dialogue about what articulation in feeder schools aligning us geographically looks like in this new model. Certainly there will be a lot of conversations with principals about how we create that stability for a very highly transient population, which is around the valley. The key piece here is that, although textbooks could potentially be different, the curriculum itself is not. We are under the guidelines of Common Core across the country, so what we teach is going to be consistent. The methodologies may be different from place to place, which is certainly the case even now, but the textbook is just the tool. The content that is delivered will be consistent amongst schools.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Because I've seen this more often than not. Let's say we're talking about fifth grade. They walk from Matt Kelly Elementary School, and let's say they read *Esperanza Rising*. Now, all of a sudden they're back over at Booker Elementary School, which is now reading *Esperanza Rising*. There's no pacing, because I haven't recalled that we went back to pacing. So if a school's on a different schedule, then what happens to student x, who's like, "I'm not rereading *Esperanza Rising*. I just read it." What are we doing? What's the stop gap or the safety net for those children? Because it happens, it's happening now and it's been happening for years.

Mr. Rael:

I'll open the door to any of my colleagues who want to jump in on this particular question as well. I don't know that we've fixed every issue inside CCSD. I think your point is very well made. We do have that challenge right now. The best answer I can give you is that that

becomes the work of autonomous school precincts to figure out how they can best serve that individual child. Obviously, we can't create a structure that is going to fix every individual, unique situation. But what we in our role as school associates need to do is figure out how we coach and develop principals in a way that they can meet those needs of individual kids at the individual level of precincts overall. So, I'm not answering your question directly on that specific child, but I think the work is really unique in those situations.

Ms. James-Cervantes:

I think the other piece of our work is to make sure that we are providing opportunities for principals within buildings to collaborate with one another to work to make sure that the work being done from school to school is done in a more collaborative approach, so that we can help in those current situations. Also, in looking at schools and groups currently, many of the schools that you mentioned are within the Prime 6 group of schools, and those schools are currently under one supervisor. And that helps us to provide really specific opportunities for those principals to collaborate, and also for teachers within those groups of schools to really look at opportunities to collaborate with one another. So that's something that, as a school supervisor, I would strongly encourage my principals to engage in and to really look at different opportunities that they could allow through professional development and through collaboration opportunities for their teachers to work together, even in a mini-conference type of setting. So I think the things you mentioned are part of the consequences that could come from such autonomy in our schools, but I think that there are ways to work with the principals to help alleviate, or at least minimize, those consequences.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Well I'm glad you said that, and I want that to be a part of the plan. There needs to be alignment, point blank. There is no, "Oh my God, we thought that would be a consequence and there it is!" You already know it exists, so you should already be driving that train of collaboration between schools so that there is connectivity and context within the curriculum so that no child, none, not one, is all of the sudden left out, or their education is somehow broken or fragmented because they're switching schools or moving from apartment x to apartment y. We already know this to be true. It was in a study. We paid for the study and it told us what was happening. So, to ignore that existence is just insane to me. I was just wondering why I didn't see it in all of the little blocks, because it should be a block. We're focused on money, but we need to be focused on academic achievement, because that's the point, right?

Senator Ford:

So, in the process that you guys have laid out for us, you are undertaking that right now because the law requires the transfer of monies of 80 percent to the schools, and in a couple of years 85 percent to the schools. I don't think this is too far off of a hypothetical, but what happens if the services that the principals want to take over do not amount to the 80 percent or the 85 percent that is required by law to now go to the schools? Have we contemplated this? And the reason why I ask that question is because you're doing this right now to meet

the next deadline, which I suspect is January 15, aligned with what Superintendent Skorkowsky mentioned, but you have to go through this process every year. It seems to me that there may come a time when principals say, "I thought I used to want to be a custodian, and I thought I wanted to take over landscaping, and I thought I wanted to take over x, y and z, but I have determined that I do not." In the next 5 years, we may see that they don't want 80 or 85 percent of the monies associated with services that they are now required to undertake coming to their schools. What do we do in that circumstance?

Chair Roberson:

Senator Ford, before any of the associate superintendents answer that, I'd like to give you my perspective on that. I contemplate that in most cases, schools will continue to use Central as their vendor. And there's nothing wrong with that. I think part of this process is transforming Central into a more customer service-oriented organization. I expect that most services will still be provided by Central, but schools will be able to make those decisions. So that's my perspective.

Senator Ford:

Okay. So, they'll get the money and they'll just basically... Yeah, okay. I think that actually alleviates the rest of the questions I had. Thank you.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you for the great work. I know you're in the trenches. You are the bridge to make this successful, and we all are just very happy that you all are in the positions that you are in. If we can be helpful in this process, please let us know.

THE CHAIR CALLED FOR A BRIEF RECESS.

Chair Roberson:

Before we get into our next couple of presenters, I wanted to ask Superintendent Skorkowsky if he could come up and answer a question by Assemblyman Anderson.

Assemblyman Paul Anderson (Assembly District No. 13):

I appreciate the opportunity to come back and revisit something. Earlier in public comment, we'd heard from the rurals and some of their concerns about the hold harmless piece of that. I guess I just wanted some clarification on the record as to how we're defining hold harmless. The other piece of that is, I'm concerned because obviously we don't have the economies of scale once we leave the valley, and we see that whether it's Logandale, Overton or up into Mesquite and Sandy Valley, some of those areas. So, how do we balance the hold harmless piece with their inability to really manage in a scalable way? You mentioned gifts. I'd like you to just retouch on those two pieces of how we're handling the hold harmless and the definition of what the gift piece was.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

The piece I think that is important to remember is that when we talked about the gifts, those were things that were apportioned out earlier. Section 19(3) talks about proportionality with the rurals, meaning that it should be proportionate to the rest of the District. With that concern about proportionality, they were receiving proportionally higher services than any of our schools in the valley, even with their small school adjustment which we give them to account for some of those pieces. One of the most difficult pieces is trying to figure out the economies of scale and how we look at it differently, especially in a situation like our rural schools where they may or may not have vendors that come forward when it comes to the transfer of responsibilities. And so we are struggling with that piece, because the minute that we put this out, we potentially lose economies of scale. It may even hurt our Central piece to a certain extent because we're not looking at purchasing for 358 schools, and it'll be 359 in January. In Central Office buildings, we're now looking at it a little bit differently with the individual school sites having flexibility to make decisions, so I may not be able get certain things at the same level as I was able to in the past. We don't know. We're in the process. So, regarding the gifts, again that's where we are looking at that proportionality piece, making sure that it is fair and equitable not only for them, but for anybody else. If I were to take the money for a dean of students or the money for an additional teacher that they haven't earned, it would have to come from some other place. There's no central pot of money from which to pull from anymore.

Assemblyman Anderson:

So if I'm looking at that proportionality piece, certainly that seems like it was written in a way that if we have to make cuts, then those are equal cuts across the board. If I'd been working in a school that had those extra allocations, as you put it, for years on end, those are really integral in my operations at that school, even though I don't know how that over-allocation came through. It may have been just because I knew somebody at Central or because somehow there was a justification at whatever level, whether it was a connection or a justification of a need. I'm sure you're better aware of it than I am, but when you start cutting a teacher, and again it's not a matter of just increasing a class size, then you're reducing a program. That is very different than if you come out to one of my schools in my district, where we could probably deal with a little larger of a class size but not have to eliminate entire programs because we lose a teacher or two. And so I am concerned about that. I think it is important to say it's in the works, because all of this is in the works. But there's not much of an assurance, especially for those folks out there, that their voice is being heard. I think often they feel that they don't have a seat at the table. While that may or may not be true, I think their voices may not be as strong as those in the valley. Again that just comes to economies of scale in many respects there. So I just wanted to make sure that we're clear, whether they were gifts or however they were allocated, that the allocations obviously had some sort of justification attached to them at some level, and now they're dependent upon those allocations.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Let me put it into a little bit of a different perspective. I have schools in the valley that are the same size as the schools out there, but they don't get those additional pieces. So how do I justify to a school that has the same number of kids any additional piece that they are not going to get because of the location of the school? So, I have schools that don't get allocated those deans of students. And yet, a gift was made. I do call it a gift, because that's what it was. An off-ratio position was given. How do I justify it both internally and externally? There's not enough money to deal with that and make it equitable.

Assemblyman Anderson:

So, I recognize that, if it's on a dean level versus a teacher or some other direct student contact in that respect, I would hope and request that we're making that adjustment as well, that if we're thinking of balancing a dean versus a teacher in the classroom that that teacher would carry a much heavier weight in the classroom. And again, I don't know the exact situation. I don't represent that area, but I am cognizant and familiar with some of the struggles that our rurals go through just because of my relationships that I've been able to have out there. So I just wanted to make sure we understood what the clarification of a gift was. This is only my second meeting here, so I'm trying to get caught up, but I also understand the critical nature of economies of scale. And I recognize that if you spend a dollar here then you can't spend a dollar somewhere else. There's a scarcity of resources. I sit on a money committee and we're very familiar with that piece of the puzzle. I appreciate your comments and look forward to working with you on these issues.

Senator Hardy:

I do represent that area. I had an interesting experience way back when. I went to a track meet out in Moapa Valley, and I noticed that the lights in the stadium weren't as bright as the lights in Las Vegas. So, I asked about the lights. Apparently, the kids in the rural areas can see better in the dark than they can in Las Vegas, so they weren't allocated as much money, as many lights, for the football stadium as they were in central Las Vegas. And that's the difference. There's a difference between a small school and a large school, and I'm not sure how many schools you have in Las Vegas in the way of high schools that have 500 to 700 kids enrolled, but the copier still costs the same. You still have to have the copier and you still have to have the positions. So, that's where I'm coming from. A gift is a gift is a gift, but the reality is that it's still a program, it's still a person, it's still a class, and all of those kinds of things. That's where that parity of education comes in. Let's just pretend that we're interested in a proportionality of education as opposed to a proportionality of money. So, does the student in rural Nevada not deserve the same kind of thing? That's where the courts have said in other places that the Nevada Plan works. So, we take from your schools and we send it up to different places in the State, and we do that largely because the Supreme Court has said everybody deserves the same kind of education. So in essence, we have a Nevada Plan within Clark County that allows every kid to have an education. So we're talking about money, but the reality is that it's a parity of education that the children need and want, and that's where I represent and that's where I'm coming from.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I understand your point very clearly, and one of the challenges not only with the education piece is the equity piece when it comes to infrastructure and facilities and those types of things. We have to understand that, and I guess this is where I will leave you unless this makes more questions. For every piece that we give someone, it's got to come from somewhere else. So I don't know if, to make this happen, I would literally have to take some position or some dollars from somewhere else. We are down to 12 percent in Central, and that's pushing it. We're going to have to find more efficiencies. But if I do that, then the dollars have to come from somewhere. There are no more pots of money anymore, and so if I do that then I have to take from somewhere, whether it be another school or a program that we support district-wide. I have to take the money from somewhere.

Assemblywoman Neal:

So, you cited to 19(3), and I believe that's in A.B. 469, right? So, this is what I need clarity around. So in 19(3), it says, "ensure that any specialty or rural school that exists on the effective date of this act or before the school district becomes a large school district continues to receive not less than the proportionally larger amount of the money that was used to fund the specialty school or rural school before those dates." So I'm thinking that before the effective date of A.B. 469, they'll still continue to get the proportionally larger amount of money. Yes, we're going to reset the base, but it's still going to be proportionally larger. Because what I'm trying to get my mind around is when it says, "continues to receive not less than," what was the interpretation of that? Because that sounds like they were supposed to still get something close to a much larger amount. It may not be exact, but something definitely larger than before.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Each one of those individual principals were told that this would no longer be coming to them. They were actually told way before this time last year, before A.B. 394 regulations were in place, long before. The conversation was had that they would no longer receive that after this year. It would stay in place 1 year. So that was the determination we made. I understand. If you guys want to pony up a school to take it from and give to, we can do that. But that's the point we're at. Don't get frustrated with me, because that's how frustrated I am in the sense that I don't have the flexibility to just give money anymore. There is no more money to give anybody else without cutting somewhere.

Chair Roberson:

I'm looking at this language too, and I'm just trying to understand. So, I think you used the term "gifts" before. Can you explain, just so we understand what you're talking about, what funding was given to certain rural schools that was considered a gift before the implementation and the passage of this law? And maybe the rationale behind that would be helpful.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I don't necessarily know the rationale, because many of these were prior to my time. There were additional teaching units that were given to schools, and I can't justify any rationale as to how that was.

Chair Roberson:

Do you think it was because they're a smaller school?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Some of them may date back to the region pieces when they allocated additional pieces, and that may have come from the northeast region at that point in time. I know that there was discussion when I was in the southeast region about them having flexibility to make determinations on that. It may have come through that method or some other method even in the areas for some reason. Case in point: Boulder City. Boulder City does not receive this additional position. They don't qualify for it and they don't receive it. Yet, a school in the northeast does receive that position.

Chair Roberson:

Is the school in the northeast a smaller school than in Boulder City?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Number-wise, I don't know this year.

Chair Roberson:

I'm just wondering if the decision was made because of economies of scale. As Senator Hardy mentioned, we have a Nevada Plan that funds a higher per-pupil amount for schools in other parts of the State, partly because of efficiency and scale. Do you think maybe that was contemplated at some point in the past for some of these schools in rural Clark County by the same rationale?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

We actually have small school allocations, which are our version of the Nevada Plan.

Chair Roberson:

And that's not going away, then? Because that's important to know. So they still have the same small school allocation?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Yes sir, they do.

Chair Roberson:

What we're talking about is something different than that?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Yes, we're talking about something on top of that. And so, the small school allocations make allowances for that rural piece, but it also makes an allowance for Boulder City and any of the outlying rural areas. We actually do not give that small school allocation to our people in the valley at a small school. We don't give them that allocation. I've got schools in the valley that are smaller elementary schools than some of the ones in our rural areas, and they don't receive that small school allocation.

Chair Roberson:

And again, what specifically are we talking about? What gifted units were given to which schools? What are we talking about specifically?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Right offhand, I can tell you the position that was a dean of students position, and there may have been teacher allocations. I don't know. I can get back to you. I don't know them right offhand.

Chair Roberson:

Yeah, we're just trying to understand. Because again, we look at the language and it's pretty straightforward. It says in 19(3) that, "except if a specialty school is proportionally reduced in size in the manner authorized pursuant to section 15 of this act," which is not relevant right now, "the weights and categories assigned pursuant to this section must ensure that any specialty school or rural school that exists on the effective date of this act or before the school district becomes a large school district continues to receive not less than the proportionally larger amount of money that was used to fund the specialty school or rural school before those dates." And I take it that your interpretation is that that relates solely to the small school increase that they get because they're a small school? That would not include these other positions?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Yes.

Chair Roberson:

Well, we'd like to learn more. We'd like to know specifically what positions those were and how the lack of those positions is affecting that school in particular. We've heard a little bit today, but we just need to learn more.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Yes, sir.

Chair Roberson:

I appreciate you coming up for a second time. Now, we're going to move on to representatives of principals and teachers. We're going to ask Stephen Augspurger and John Vellardita as representatives of principals' and teachers' organizations to come forward and give their perspective on where we're at. Then, we're going to wrap up with State Superintendent Dr. Canavero.

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

I represent the Clark County Education Association (CCEA), 18,000 licensed professionals. We have a handout that I have for you (Exhibit G). It lists 10 things that we're recommending moving forward. But before your eyes wander onto that, I'd like to say a few things. First, I'd like to respond to some earlier comments that were made in public comment. That was around the type of climate that exists in these SOTs, the level of functionality in these SOTs and in general the direction we're going in these SOTs. When the law was passed, we were charged with setting up elections for the SOTs. We had over 1,600 different educators that were nominated in over 350-some odd buildings, and 10,000-plus voted. Over 840 were elected to sit on these teams. I can tell you that without exception the experience has been very uneven. You have experiences that have been exceptional where there is shared decision making, there's a real effort on the part of the principal to involve all the stakeholders, the parents, the teachers, the support staff, et cetera. And then the other extreme is part of what you heard described in public comment, an experience where they say, "Here's what the organizational plan is going to be, here's what the budget is going to be and you need to accept it." And there are growing pains when you embark on a new system, so we're not criticizing the system. We think that just begs for a system of ongoing training where there is shared responsibility, consensus building and the understanding of the budget. I can tell you that when we did the training, our doors were open to everybody. A number of the trainings were done in conjunction with the School District. At those trainings, whether we had parents, support staff or educators, we tried to involve as many people as possible. Earlier you heard Local No. 14 representatives from the Teamsters, who had over 4,000 support staff members vote for them. They'd been wanting to get involved and felt that they were disenfranchised. We invited them to our training as well and will continue to do so, because we think that the true representatives of every bargaining unit should be at the table. So I just wanted to respond in part to that.

The second thing I want to respond to before we go through this list is that it's very clear to us that when this discussion occurred of how we can improve education in CCSD, it started out with a discussion of, "Let's break up," then it moved to, "Let's deconsolidate," whatever that meant, and there was no national experience that spoke to that. Then it ultimately got around to a discussion of what an effective delivery system in an urban core school district is that has a blended format with rurals. And what came out, and particularly when we brought consultants in, was a structure. The architecture was set in place for a decentralized delivery system where the hub of that delivery would be the SOTs. So, part one of the structure was the SOT, and there was a lot of discussion around what makes up the SOT. There were the stakeholders, and then there was the question of what the balance of power was, the balance of shared decision making, that takes place on those SOTs. The principal had a voice, but was non-voting, because the principal could ultimately decide on the budget and the organizational plan. The balance was the stakeholders' advise-and-assist model in the development of the plans, as well as the execution of the plans. That was one piece of architecture. That was at the ground level, the front line, and it was based on money following the student, because money was the game changer. The second piece was the amount of money, which was 80-20. It was not arbitrary in terms of how that figure was determined. It literally is a game changer. The more dollars you put into the frontline, outcomes follow. And we heard examples of empowerment zones in New York, the largest school district in the country, that literally transferred 90 percent of unrestricted money. The third piece of the architecture was the Superintendency, the creation of these associate superintendents. We just heard from four of the better ones that presented today, as well as the others that were in the audience. And the architect who was recommending all of this, Strembitsky, said that the associate superintendents should have a model of one superintendent to 25 buildings. That was not arbitrary either. It was based on whether an associate superintendent could manage that many buildings, given that they were charged with ultimately approving the organizational plans as well as the budget. Then there was the Superintendent who oversaw the associate superintendents. Finally, there was some input on the part of the community, particularly local municipalities that would have a say in this.

That was the architecture. The one thing that got discussed was converting Central Administration to a service agency. What's been missing in this whole process is a proposal. That's the architectural piece that's missing. What is the proposal of conversion from service administration to a service model? We've heard discussions about a process in terms of identifying what principals, what SOTs and what associate superintendents would like to do and trying to effectuate good student outcomes with additional resources, but we haven't seen a proposed model. We think that's missing.

Another thing that's missing and I think has contributed to the political problem we had in moving this forward—and I'll be the first to say that I've thrown punches at CCSD's Board of Trustees for not being cooperative, for being obstructive and for being luddites. But I can tell you in fairness to them now, they are owed a proposal so that they can make a decision. One of the things that's been missing out of this whole process is what the role of the Trustees is moving forward. Right now, the role of the Trustees is defined as the School District under the Constitution and law, but there's been no discussion about what role they have. So there's

been a natural reaction of giving up authority and responsibility, particularly to the Superintendent, which is what this model is based on, even though it's based on the sites.

So, I offer those comments because I want to walk you through these 10 things that we think should take place in the next 90 days. Number one that you see on the list, and it was discussed earlier, is immediate implementation of S.B. 178. All the school precincts that are supposed to get that money should get that money. Now, we've heard a lot about, "I've got to change the way I think," and "We've got to change the way we do business." But I've got to tell you, 2 to 3 weeks ago when the School District was asked about what they were doing with the S.B. 178 funds, the Finance Director said, "We'll know in November," and then that was corrected later by the Government Relations Director who said, "Oh, we've got to talk to the Department of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Canavero." I talked to Dr. Canavero last week, and he said, "There's nothing that I'm holding up." Today you heard that they're going to get going on it in a week. I will tell you this. That is an example of a non-responsive top-down centralized mentality. Those dollars should be in those buildings now. Those SOTs, with the principals, should be convened now so that that money and those services that go with that money can start on day one when school starts. And we're not ready. So, that's number one, and I say that because—and Senator Ford, you led on this, and Senator Roberson, you and I had lengthy discussions when we passed this bill about how we could not have an unfunded mandate when it came to the weights. So we came up with S.B. 178 in a bipartisan fashion, and this was one of the reasons why the Trustees resisted implementation of the reorganization, because we didn't have funding for the weights. Well, we have funding for the weights and these teams haven't been convened, nor have these principals been asked, nor has a plan for those services been developed so that those kids could get it. And these are the lowest 25 percent proficient kids, the kids with the greatest need. This literally is an example of money following the students.

The second thing on our list is that there should be a 3 percent cut to all non-instructional services that are part of Central Administration, with an assessment of what departments and programs can be eliminated, streamlined and reorganized, any savings should be repurposed to the schools. This should be done no later than September 30, 2017. The final product will be the service agencies supporting school precincts.

The third thing that we're proposing is that the School Board of Trustees should move to decide and vote on transferring central services listed in section 16(3) of the law to school precincts no later than October 1.

Senator Ford:

I don't want to mess up your flow, but I do have questions about some of the things you've already said. So, I'm having a hard time understanding why CCSD hasn't been able to implement S.B. 178. I did hear the Superintendent say they're going to get that done next week. So I share your concern on that issue. I don't know if the Chair's going to have the Superintendent explain why you got a couple of different responses on the delay in implementing the weighted student funding formula approach there, but that's a big issue.

Number two, though, have you shown this list or shared this list or had a discussion about this list with CCSD already so that they know what your suggestions are on how to get to an end point?

Mr. Vellardita:

Not the list as it appears. Some of the items on the list, yes, but not the list as it appears, as well as with the consultants that have been charged with helping to do the transition.

Senator Ford:

So everything on the list, although not at one time, you contend that you've shared with the consultants and the District?

Mr. Vellardita:

Not everything on this list, but a significant portion.

Senator Ford:

Okay. And how'd you come up with three percent on number two here?

Mr. Vellardita:

So in 2011, Dwight Jones, the Superintendent of CCSD, was charged with filling shortfalls due to State budget cuts to public education, and the School District in particular. He challenged the District to find \$100,000,000 of savings in their budget, and they did. He also commissioned a report called the Gibson Report that came out with a number of changes that the School District could make for efficiency savings, and those are there to this day. Most of them have never been acted upon. Three percent of the Central Administration, depending on what slide you look at, is either \$13,000,000 on the low end or \$33,000,000 on the high end. So 3 percent is an exercise to determine whether or not Central Administration can be streamlined and made more efficient. That's what the proposal is.

Senator Ford:

Well, sure, I get that. But the question is why not one percent, or why not five percent? Where'd you get three percent from? Is there a magic to the three percent number?

Mr. Vellardita:

The Gibson report had indicated varying degrees of efficiencies, and we landed on the three percent that was in there.

Senator Ford:

Okay, so this three percent is attached to the Gibson Report?

Mr. Vellardita:

You'd have to read the Gibson Report in its entirety, but yes, you can find it.

Number three is about having the Board of Trustees act on section 16(3) of the law no later than October 1 to determine what central services should be transferred to the schools. Then there should be an immediate adjustment to current school budgets in each SOT and precinct where appropriate to increase the budget for that school during this year, as well as any modifications to that organizational plan that the additional revenue would create. And then moving forward for the 2018-2019 budget planning process, the baseline should be 80 percent in planning.

Number four is that during the months of October, November and December of this year, SOT meetings should revisit the current school budget and assess what additional services and needs a building will need to better achieve student outcomes as they plan for the 2018-2019 year. We proposed that for this reason. The budget process as it stands now is almost after the fact. So, in other words, these teams that are going into the school year with their principal should be able to start assessing the needs that they're going to need for next year now, during these coming months, so that when they sit down to develop a budget in January or February, they have a firm idea based on their experience of this year as well as what they anticipate next year for their student population, rather than convening the meeting in January given a baseline budget and making decisions on that.

Number five is about the architecture for conversion of Central Administration to a service agency. We're suggesting that the associate superintendents have an expanded role. They should have an operational business model that should be developed, in which transferred services to school precincts are coordinated at the associate superintendent level, including, if necessary, increasing the operational capacity of that associate superintendent to implement that coordination. So, when we talk about transferring custodial services, for example, and giving choice to a building to either do it in their building or to let Central do it, or bifurcate it, for example, "I'll do night custodial services but not day custodial services," what are we creating? To your point, Assemblywoman Neal, if you're going to have a service that's going to be set up to provide custodial services to buildings, where's the tipping point in operational efficiency where Central can no longer provide those services because it doesn't have enough of an ask in the marketplace among the other school precincts? What kind of system do you build? We're suggesting, absent a proposal to convert Central Administration to a service agency that the associate superintendents should build up a capacity around an operational model where they can coordinate services with the schools, where the schools either take it on directly or they're a go-between in getting those services for them.

Number six is that the School Board Trustees should work directly with the performance zones within their districts to aid and assist associate superintendents and school precincts in getting the support they need to carry out the schools' organization plans. We believe that the Trustees should have a role in this beyond sitting and making a budget in the aggregate of the entire District. They should have a role with their respective schools in their zones, and we're proposing that they work with the performance zones within their districts with the associate superintendents.

Number seven is that we believe the Department of Education, either the Office of the Superintendent or the Board of Education, should have oversight, including rapid intervention when it comes to funding issues. Specifically, we believe that if there are expert consultants that are needed, they should be brought in. We believe that if the Legislative Commission or the Interim Finance Committee needs to be asked for resources to help carry this out, they should. And then finally, we believe that either the Department of Education or the Superintendent of Public Instruction should perform a forensic audit on the School District's budget. We do not say that lightly. We've heard that we are \$45,000,000 in the red. I would just ask everybody and remind you that when we had this discussion 2 years ago, 23 days after the 2015 Legislative Session ended, the School District passed a budget that showed they were \$67,000,000 in the red. In November that year when the Comprehensive Annual Budget Report was issued, the District had an ending fund balance of over \$50,000,000. Something is wrong here. We're hearing today that we're underfunded again. We're not saying that we don't need more money, but we'll be the first to tell you that it should be not just any money and not just anywhere. But something is wrong. There's a disconnect, and so that's why we would suggest that kind of an audit.

Number eight is that we believe CCSD needs to have the following systems of training. The first training is around A.B. 451, which is training for School Board Trustees. I have no idea where that's at, but those Trustees deserve to have the type of training and support so that they can effectively govern, and one of the key elements of that training is understanding finance and the budget. I am convinced that these Trustees make decisions on these budgets based on the facts that are presented to them. That is not their core competency, and without a knowledge or understanding of what those facts are, these Trustees will make decisions as they're framed for them. The second thing is that we think there should be a training system set up, as well as a rapid response system, as a result of S.B. 369. Senator Ford, you know that bill. It's your bill about school climate. You heard parents and you heard teachers earlier. This bill allows for professional development and training to take place in these buildings so that you do have good collaborative school climate and a mechanism for intervention if it's not occurring, for parents, for educators, for the SOTs, et cetera.

Number nine has to do with the human resources system and the current system that exists alongside of it, the Employee-Management Relations Department. This is one of the departments that we feel strongly about. We believe that the Employee-Management Relations Department should be eliminated and that there should be an audit performed on the human resource system with the outlook of reorganizing that department into a more high performing human capital system whose mission is to invest in employees. I do not say this lightly. The second highest paid salary in CCSD is the person that leads this department,

second only to the Superintendent. We have had 10 years of dealing with every bargaining unit in this District, and this is a new system that relies on frontline educators, frontline support staff, administrators, et cetera, to make it successful, and there's no strategic investment of that human capital.

And then finally and lastly, number 10 is that we believe you as a Committee should explore whether or not the Governor, the Attorney General or any other governing body in the State can take action if need be to force the School District to comply with A.B. 469. Otherwise, we don't know whether or not we're going to have the same discussion a year from now, except that if it occurs, as Superintendent Skorkowsky pointed out, after August 31, 2018, then this body sunsets and there is no oversight.

Assemblywoman Neal:

You talked about S.B. 178 and the lag in the implementation by CCSD, and I'm just curious because I don't know how long it takes, but in the memo, which was the guidance memo by the Department of Education, they didn't even have that meeting until July 13 of 2017. Now it's August 7. So, how long should it have taken them after the guidance memo on July 13 to implement S.B. 178?

Mr. Vellardita:

So, the math is simple. I was a firsthand active participant in not only the drafting of that law but also working with the School District in terms of the specific buildings and the student populations that would be eligible. Notwithstanding what the Department of Education may or may not have had to have done to implement this, the money is clear: \$32,000,000. It goes to Title I, tier one and tier two kids, the bottom 25 percent proficient until it runs out. The list is there. Nothing prevents convening discussions with the buildings that have already been identified that have these students in them about, "Guess what, we're going to get additional resources." The law's prescriptive around the type of services of intervention these kids are going to need. Nothing prevents those conversations from beginning the planning for that to take place, and that's the concern we're raising.

Assemblywoman Neal:

You mentioned the \$45,000,000. They lost two arbitrations, one of which was with the administrators, and that was a lot of money because they have to go back and pay 3 years of increases? So that's 2 years of increases? I thought that was reflected in the \$45,000,000 that they claim that they're down. And then there was a second arbitration that they lost, potentially, and some of that money that they're saying is a negative balance is coming from what they now have to pay forward? Do you understand that to be true, or not?

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

I know what they said. All I can tell you is that when they did the final budget on July 5, it indicated that it had been covered by internal transfers. So if it's covered by internal transfers, I'm not sure that it creates the deficit that's being reported, but we'll have to sort through all of that. You can identify anything and call it a deficit. If you've got \$5,000,000 worth of paper, that can be your reason for a deficit.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Okay, point taken. And then on number seven, the Department of Education having oversight when it comes to funding, why would we do that? That just sounds like we're shifting authority. Isn't that typically the Interim Finance Committee?

Mr. Vellardita:

No, it's meant for compliance. If there is not any movement towards the 80-20, or I should say oversight towards movement to the 80-20, at least for this year and then 85-15 in the second year, it's merely complying with that portion of the law. That's what that means.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Okay. Do they currently have oversight over funding issues in this manner?

Chair Roberson:

Let me just answer. In A.B. 469, we provide for oversight by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. It's in the bill, section 33.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Okay, I appreciate that.

Mr. Augspurger:

Today specifically, I am here on behalf of principals and indirectly those members of SOTs, and the purpose of my comments will be to give you a bottom-up view of where we are at right now with the reorganization of CCSD. Before I begin those comments, I would like to say, so I am not misunderstood, that I am not a naysayer. I am not a critic. I'm not one who wants to see this go away. But I am going to say some things that will be sensitive to some, I'm sure. It's not my intent to make anybody angry. I think we need to have a candid conversation that's transparent, with everything right out on the table. Having said that, I am very appreciative of the consulting group for the work that they've done, and for CCSD too. It's obvious that there have been hours and hours and hours devoted to where we are right now. Unfortunately, if you're a principal or a member of an SOT in those 338 or 348 schools,

they have not seen any evidence of change, nothing tangible to say that there has been a cultural shift or that there has been a reorganization that will allow them to have three things: greater autonomy, greater authority and more money to spend on meeting the needs of kids.

I have two items that I want to discuss (Exhibit H). One is really what I'm going to call the illusion of a cultural shift, and I offer this because I think that it's important to recognize these things so that we can fix them. We heard some of those things even mentioned an hour ago as we talked about the rural schools and if there is a dean that is allocated to a rural school. The solution today that was offered was that we have to take it away from another school. And I think if we truly have a cultural shift that says schools are the very most important places in CCSD, then we will do everything we can to make sure that they get the resources they need and that we protect the resources that they have. I think that's part of the growing pains right now with CCSD. While our intent is to have a cultural shift, we're not there yet. The other topic I'm going to talk about are autonomies granted by the law but not yet given to schools. So, those are the two that I've prepared. I want to just add a third before I start on those. In our own budgets, we have a couple of pots of money that get replenished frequently. It gives us the ability to slip and slide across everywhere we want to go, because we know we've got that reoccurring financial resource that we can always count on. That's the way CCSD has been until A.B. 469. So, those two pots of money are class size and teacher attrition. Those are millions of dollars that if CCSD needed money, they just had to go to the bank. They raised class sizes. A single kid would be millions of dollars across the system. If they didn't hire 1,000 teachers, multiply that by 83,000 and you see the money that became available to spend. That has gone, and so we're now seeing this behemoth bureaucracy struggle because it doesn't have the financial resources that it had to have, and at the same time it's being required to spend more of that dollar at the school site, which is what they should be doing to make sure that we get the kind of product that we want to get out of our teachers and principals working with their children.

So, I'm going to talk a little bit about this cultural shift, because I don't believe that teachers and principals have really seen any tangible evidence that this large bureaucracy is shedding those bureaucratic tendencies. I'm going to offer 10 or 11 things to you that wouldn't be present if that cultural shift had really occurred, because it's easy to talk about what you want to do. The proof in the pudding is what happens where the rubber meets the road. In this instance, the rubber meets the road in schools and in classrooms. So if there was truly a cultural shift, schools and SOTs and principals would no longer see CCSD viewing them as the cash cow that they have for decades. That is, when there was a shortage of money, the first thing that was done was to increase student-teacher ratios. Today you heard a brief reference made to a reduction in force. That will have exactly the same effect if it's a reduction in force in schools. You can either raise class size or you can eliminate teachers and you're going to have more kids back in those classrooms.

Item number two is that, if there was a culture that said schools are the most important places, then schools having teacher vacancies would receive the total dollar amount between the cost of a substitute teacher, which is right now about \$23,000, and the cost of the teacher, which is \$83,000. But as we saw earlier with CCSD choosing to interpret the regulation one way with respect to whether or not the outlying school maintained its dean, we are also seeing

them interpret the regulation in a way that will benefit them, because we have a new definition now of what it means to be a teacher, and that's the average cost of a new teacher's salary, which is \$62,000, not \$83,000. So in my mind, that means that \$21,000 that should be going to that school where the vacancy exists will now be going to Central.

Chair Roberson:

That's news to me.

Mr. Augspurger:

I have a copy of the attrition tutorial that I can leave with you, unless that's been changed, but that was presented to the Trustees recently.

Chair Roberson:

Okay. I assume that's news to everyone on this Committee. That's not what we signed up for. I think we were all very clear that it was average teacher salary, not average new teacher salary, and we spent a lot of time last year and the year before, in this last interim before the 2017 Legislative Session, talking about the inherent disparity and unfairness to primarily Title I schools. They have the largest number of teacher vacancies, and that money, that differential, between what the average teacher makes and what a permanent teacher makes is on average about \$30,000 per classroom that, under the old system, did not stay with those schools. It went back to Central, and Central determined how to spend that. And we specifically all as a group agreed that that had to end, and we put that in the law. So, what you're telling me is news. And it's not good news.

Mr. Augspurger:

Let me just read to you the third bullet on page three of this attrition tutorial. It says, "owners of vacant positions erroneously believe that they control the corresponding attrition." That would be savings. So, if we're thinking in terms of a cultural shift, moving from a large bureaucracy to a central services organization, we're not there yet. We have a long way to go. And again, I understand how hard it is for an organization as large as CCSD to change. It's not going to happen overnight. But there are many, many, many changes which still need to occur. I'm happy to leave this document with you at the end of the meeting.

Chair Roberson:

And I will just say this. We need follow-up from the School District on this specific issue that Mr. Augspurger has brought to our attention. I think we're all in agreement on this issue.

Mr. Augspurger:

Item three is that if the culture in CCSD had really changed, schools would no longer be victimized by poorly performing employees being assigned to the school by Central

Administration against the wishes of the principal and the SOT. This practice was referred to recently by the *Las Vegas Review-Journal* in an article called "Passing the Trash." It happens with regularity with employees in all employees groups, and frankly this practice is in violation of section 16(2) of the law. It cannot continue to happen.

Number four is that in a culture that values schools as the most important places, SOTs would have real influence and authority in the selection of a new principal, not just lip-service like what happened at a recent elementary school principal selection process. That authority is vested in those SOTs in section 28 of the law.

Number five is that if there'd been a cultural shift, then why are administrators and support staff employees routinely reassigned to other school locations without the agreement of the principal? This practice also is in violation of section 16.

In a culture that valued schools, the District would protect them and shield them from budget cuts. The District would no longer look at schools as a pot of available money. Rather than looking outward towards schools to save money, as Mr. Vellardita has said, the Central Administration would look inward to the central services to achieve the savings that they need.

If a cultural shift had really occurred, principals would not have received an August 1, 2017 memorandum from Central Administration that said, "First, some good news. A determination has been made to roll over carry-over funds into your 2017-2018 strategic budgets." That is a requirement of the law. Section 17 requires that, and principals discovered early in August that those carry-over funds were gone from their budget. Now, the District explained that the funds were just not visible on the screen, but nevertheless they were not there. It created a lot of anxiety. There was no communication from the District to principals that this was going to happen. And again, in this kind of cultural shift, enhanced communication is absolutely necessary.

Number eight is that if a cultural shift had really occurred that said we protect schools at all cost, then principals would not have received an August 1, 2017 memorandum from Central Administration that put forth two contradictory positions. One you heard today, that school associate superintendents are going to work their hardest to make sure that schools are protected and that cuts will be made as far away from the schools as they possibly can be. But that memorandum went on to say that, "The reorganization has changed the way we implement our budgets, and therefore we must change the way we implement budget cuts. Although 88 percent of funds are allocated to schools and programs that directly service schools, approximately 80 percent of budget cuts will be applied to schools and programs that directly service schools." If that's a cultural shift, I don't understand it.

Number nine is that if a cultural shift really occurred as part of the District's effort to meet the requirements of the reorganization, broad-based meaningful participation from principals would have occurred. But it did not. Only one principal was included on the two large committees that made all of the decisions related to the District organization, which would be the "I Team" and the Superintendent's Workgroup, in the process with the school associate superintendents, and I appreciate their efforts there. But there were five schools named as

principals participating in that process. We have over 300 principals. On the survey that went out in July when more than half of our principals were not under contract, only 148 of those surveys were returned. We are not getting enough input from the people who will be the end recipients of this process: teachers, SOTs and building administrators.

I think the most revealing sign that a cultural shift has not occurred is on the same August 1 memorandum talking about potential budget cuts with this statement: "Moving forward, and when time permits, we will work out methods to get more input from principals when we face the budget deficit." So here we're talking about the end-users of a decision not even being involved in that decision making, and the District saying if they have time then they'll involve them in the future. That is not a sign of a cultural shift in my mind.

Senator Ford:

First off, I would love to have a copy of what you're reading from (Exhibit H). It's kind of hard to keep up. So, I don't know if you have it such that we could get a copy of that, because I have a lot of questions about what you're talking about. Let me ask a couple of questions, and then I'm going to let you finish because I'm going to have some more to ask. I'm wondering how many of the items you've detailed, many of which technically sound problematic, especially the one about, as Senator Roberson said, the actual cost versus average cost and new teachers, things of that nature. But tell me which of the items that you've delineated are related to a collective bargaining agreement. I would suspect that some of these items that are problematic in your eyes are constrained by agreements elsewhere, like collective bargaining agreements. Am I right? The transfer of teachers and things of that sort. Maybe Mr. Vellardita has to speak to that issue.

Mr. Augspurger:

I can speak to it first, and certainly Mr. Vellardita can speak to it. I think that with teachers and support staff, there are collective bargaining restraints. But the fact of the matter is that we have a new bill, A.B. 469, which creates authority for principals and SOTs to staff their buildings. Every contract has a general savings clause, and what that general savings clause says is, "If there is something in this agreement that's not consistent with State law, it needs to conform to the State law." It's not going to happen overnight, but there has been a complete reluctance on the part of this process to address that issue of staffing, and I'll talk about that a little bit more later. But that is one of the key pieces that schools need to have, because if you continually have poorly performing employees assigned or reassigned to your building, and you as a teacher and a principal have the bottom line accountability for student achievement, that just can't continue to happen.

Senator Ford:

Well, I think I remember over the course of last year's conversations about operative collective bargaining not being able to be affected by statutory changes under most circumstances. I understand your argument and I hear you about the savings clause, and I would love to be a fly on the wall of a court hearing determining whether we can negatively affect a contract

that's already been consummated, but I think that's part of the discussion. I think it's somewhat unfair to argue some of these points, because the collective bargaining agreements have statements in them and restrictions based on agreements that already preceded the statute. We don't have to argue the point back and forth. I guess at the end of the day, a lawsuit could determine who's right on that issue. But I think that's important to note. I also want to ask you the same question that I asked Mr. Vellardita. Have you shared with the District your list of items that are problematic?

Mr. Augspurger:

I have not.

Senator Ford:

So this is the first they're hearing of them?

Mr. Augspurger:

Yes. So let me say one thing. I can simplify the staffing issue for you. Let's just make it apply to administrators. We have nothing in our contract. In fact, it is expressly stated in the statute that transfer is not a mandatory subject of bargaining for administrators. But yet we have administrators who are continually transferred. And sometimes the union requests for those transfers to occur. We don't do it anymore, and we've certainly curtailed that process over the years. But ultimately, if you really want schools to be places where teachers can teach and kids can learn, we have to collectively address this issue of employees who are poor performers, because we cannot continue to put them in front of kids.

Senator Ford:

Absolutely, and I'm not disagreeing with you on that at all. But I'm also trying to ensure that we look at the totality of the circumstances, which is that you have operative agreements right now that are legally enforceable, hence the reason why you win in arbitration awards here and there. So I think it's important to give the full context so that we can talk about what we as a Committee can do. It goes back to what I said at the very beginning. I'm interested in knowing what you need us for, such that we can assist, because if it's something that you have to work out with the District that you couldn't do on your own, I'd much rather that happen as opposed to me deciding one way or the other. I don't mind oversight, but when it comes to some of these issues, I think you've got to keep that in the back of your mind. I think there are a few other questions I'm going to have, but I want to hear what else you have to say.

Chair Roberson:

And Senator Ford, I just want to reiterate Mr. Augspurger's point. The administrators' union doesn't have that in their collective bargaining. So, when we talk about the issue of nonperformance or underperformance of administrators, there's nothing in the collective bargaining agreements which prevents the School District from following the law, A.B. 469.

Senator Ford:

Absolutely. And by the way, I'm not suggesting that. I'm just saying that we want the full context. We can't use a broad brush to make it as though no cultural shift is taking place. It may not be where we want it to go, but the mere fact that we have these SOTs in existence is a part of a shift. And with these SOTs, I think you would have to agree with me on this, Mr. Augspurger, that the autonomy lies with your clientele, with your constituency. The autonomy lies with the principals and not the SOTs. So in the discussions we had earlier, it's been conflated that the school itself has the autonomy. Not really. We're talking about the principals, with advice from the SOTs, and we should probably be very particular with our statements so as to not send mixed messages out there to people who are participating. And the reason why I mention that is because we have given immunity to the SOTs. Why? Because ultimate liability still remains with the District for decisions that are made. Not with the SOTs. We don't want the SOTs being able to make decisions that are ultimately going to subject the District to liability. That's why they are advisory. So we have to just keep in mind where the roles are and how we can assist. The last thing I'll ask before I give you an opportunity to finish your presentation is that you talked about this notion of consulting with you when time permits. I could understand how at first blush that sounds very much like a slap in the face, but I would suspect that in an organization like this, sometimes things like that have to happen pretty quickly. So, might that just be a statement indicating that, generally speaking, we're going to consult, but sometimes we've got to make an immediate decision and can't convene all of the principals and all of the SOTs in order to make a decision to move something forward? I'm just trying to figure out if there's a way to move this thing forward.

Mr. Augspurger:

I appreciate your effort to defend—

Senator Ford:

I'm not defending, I'm just trying to find a way to be cooperative with it and see the cup as half-full, if you will. Because it sounds as though the good news that I've been hearing up to this point is being entirely belied by statements being made right now.

Mr. Augspurger:

I think there is a shortage and a lack of appropriate and effective communication, and it's a pattern that happens oftentimes. It's an isolated incident. It was one I chose because it happened just the other day, and there were other things in that memorandum that, when you put it in the context of a shifting culture in CCSD, we still have a long way to go. And I get it. It's going to be a tough thing to change, and sometimes we change because we change our thinking first. Our actions and behaviors then follow that change of thinking, and so sometimes there's a large space in between those two events. So, all I'm pointing out is that we still have a lot of work to do with this.

Senator Ford:

Absolutely, and I agree with that general statement.

Mr. Augspurger:

I think two other things, and my better judgment says I'm probably better off not saying them, but I'm going to because I think that in being as transparent as we can be, we need to be looking at all available sources of revenue. Schools are important places. They're underfunded. Until we get more money from the Legislature, that money is going to have to come from within, and I think to Assemblyman Anderson's point earlier and Senator Hardy's point about the outlying area, I would offer these two things. And again, my colleagues in the back are not going to want to hear this, but I think no one should be immune from determining who is providing services that schools need. And I tie this again back to a cultural shift, because if we really had a cultural shift that said schools are protected, that they're hallowed places, then we're going to do everything we can to find the resources for those schools. In CCSD, we have 52 administrators above the rank of a principal. I'm not saying they don't work hard, that they're not effective with their work, but do we need 52 administrators? Some of them are in work that was made up, so if we're looking for \$100,000 to replace a dean at an outlying school, there's a place where that money can be found.

And finally, number twelve is that it's my belief when this cultural shift finally happens that there will not be a firm of 11 attorneys on West Sahara and a legal department that doled out hourly compensation to outside counsel in 2015-2016 for \$3,800,000. If you took 50 schools and divided that into the \$3,800,000, everybody gets \$75,000. That would make an SOT a happy place to be. Are there any questions on that list? Otherwise I'm going to move on with my presentation.

Assemblywoman Neal:

So, I want to be super careful, number one about making blanket statements, because you're saying the legal division and the District or the Board has a history of outside consulting and paying out contracts. But the question is, you presented this information without any context of whether or not what they put out there was needed? Was there a legal decision that needed expertise? If there's waste, then we need to get to that, but you can't just say, "I think there's waste, I think there are 52 or 53 administrators, and hey, why don't we cut their salary or get them to do an early retirement so we can get that money and put it at a school." I understand what has probably been a longstanding viewpoint that there is waste at CCSD, but we're not doing blanket accusations. I want specific "I know to be true, this is what's going on" things. You're saying the *Las Vegas Review-Journal* did the article "Passing the Trash," but what Senator Ford kept talking about was the collective bargaining agreements. The fact that it's hard to fire a teacher or it's hard to fire a person who's under a collective bargaining agreement. But nobody's talking about how the union may be protecting those individuals. If it's poor performance for real, then why is it so hard to get rid of somebody who's not serving children? Why is this a constant conversation? Why can a person who sits at a desk and doesn't actually do any instruction still be in the school? But I didn't hear Mr. Vellardita chime

in at all, and he supports the teachers. That's his group. So instead of throwing blanket terms, let's get to the dirt. You want to throw dirt, then get to actual dirt. I want to hear specific facts.

Mr. Augspurger:

I would respond this way. All I said was, in a time when we're looking for dollars and the District's looking for efficiencies, no one should be immune from that process. So the factual statement I made was that we have 52 administrators above the rank of principal. They are hardworking, many of them contribute great things to schools. But in a time when we're dollar-scarce and looking for resources, we cannot allow that group to go unexamined, and then maybe the questions you posed would be answered. And I think the same thing with the Legal Department. I'm just saying we have 11 attorneys on West Sahara. We spent \$3,800,000 on outside counsel. That was more than the entire salary and benefit package for every one of those attorneys. So maybe when we do that analysis, and someone like you who has lots of expertise in work like that, we might look and say, "Maybe we'd be better off just hiring one more attorney and not doing anything else with outside counsel." I just think it's worth looking at, and that's why I put it on the table and that's why I prefaced my comments by saying I'd probably be better off not putting these last two in this discussion. But again, as we go through this process, I think we deserve, and everybody deserves, to have that kind of examination of where money goes in this District.

Mr. Vellardita:

So, I want to cite a section of A.B. 469, section 16(4), and it refers to the placement of teachers in buildings when there are vacancies. So the first sentence says, "To the greatest extent possible, the principal of a local school precinct shall select teachers who are licensed and in good standing before selecting substitutes to teach at the local school precincts." Now that was put in there after significant discussion. I was part of drafting this piece. The idea was to really go above and beyond to make sure you had a good teacher in there instead of defaulting to a substitute because it's cheaper.

The second part of this speaks to what you raise, and I'm going to speak to the collective bargaining agreement. It says, "The principal, in consultation with the organizational teams, shall make every effort to ensure that effective, licensed teachers are employed at the local school precincts." Now, I authored part of that sentence in conjunction with others. In our collective bargaining agreement, transfers are voluntary and involuntary. Voluntary means an administrator has to approve whether that teacher comes into that building or not. Involuntary, which is a management provision in our collective bargaining agreement, is where the District can place a teacher in a building. We want good, effective teachers in these buildings, more so under this new system than ever before. I don't think the collective bargaining agreement as it stands now is in the way of what Mr. Augspurger was speaking to, which is that there's this certain culture that exists, and it comes into practice and shuffles people around.

To the point about the number of top-paid administrators, I think it's fair game. Those were created under a top-down Central Administration. I think it's fair game for a review, hence why we advocated for a budget review, in particular a forensic audit on the budget, because

it might very well be that some of those positions aren't needed. I'll give you a case in point. Senate Bill 300 got passed out of this session. It was an extension of a Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) program that started last time. Senator Roberson, you sponsored it, and you co-sponsored it, Senator Ford. And it was a program designed to help first-year teachers in the most at-risk buildings. This year we got less money, \$1,000,000-plus each year, and we had to cut back the number of PAR teachers that we wanted to expand the program on. We had to eliminate at least three. And at the same time those PAR consulting teachers were eliminated, and they would have served anywhere from 45 to 60 first-year teachers, there was the hiring at \$200,000 of a lawyer in the Legal Department. Now, you tell me why that shouldn't be reviewed? Instruction goes down, support for instructional services goes down, while there's an increase in legal services. Now, there might be a very good reason, but from our perspective representing people on the frontline, something doesn't make sense when that happens.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I appreciate those comments, but one thing that hasn't been answered. You said that these teachers are shuffled around. Why are they shuffled around and not fired? That's the question. You know they're performing poorly, and they've clearly not performed more than once, so why are they still working with children?

Mr. Vellardita:

So, if there are grounds for termination, nothing prevents the District from taking action. We protect people around due process. There's no doubt about it, and rightfully so. But if there is cause for termination and they're terminated, then more than likely that's the end of the story. They may have their due process to determine whether or not there was cause for termination, but that's there. Listen, I'll give you another parallel. Evaluations, and you need to hear me on this one, Assemblywoman Neal, because this is really important. In 2011, laws were passed around evaluations. In 2013 they got adjusted, and in 2015 they got adjusted again, and they are up again in 2017. And the whole idea is to raise the standard of performance to have effective or highly effective educators in the classroom. There were two schools of thought this time around about how you tackle evaluations. One school of thought said to strip out all accountability. In other words, water down the law as it is and have no standard upon which you can measure the effectiveness of a teacher. Then the other was, "No, we don't want State testing, but we do want measurements of accountability that are solely aligned with students' growth," and that was A.B. 320, and we supported that bill. Why? We want effective educators in the building. We don't want to have people hiding behind due process that maybe shouldn't be in this profession. That's all I'll say for the record.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I just feel like we're going around and around, because the key word in your statement was "cause." How come we haven't strengthened in the law the cause on what rises to the level that is a justified cause to get rid of a teacher? What's in the collective bargaining agreement that clearly is keeping the shuffling going? The second issue of you comparing what they paid

out for a lawyer versus what they're paying for something else is apples and oranges. We have always been underfunded as a system, point blank. Clark County has been getting the short end of the stick for a long time sending that money up there. Now all of the sudden we're looking for other pots and under couch cushions for money, and now you want to go into other areas and other divisions and point fingers and say, "Maybe we ought to take from here, maybe we ought to take from there," but the basic foundation piece of this whole argument is we've never had enough money. We've never been able to take care of the needs of the students, point blank. Now you want to do the ultimate thing, which is go in and say, "Well, how about somebody just misses \$30,000 out of their salary this year? Regardless of whether they earned it over 35 years or not, let's get it, let's take it, let's pool it all together and let's fund this other need." That's not the game. I just strongly believe we shouldn't be trying to do that method or that process to fund education. We've been doing that forever. We have. Taking from somewhere else to fund the need, but not just actually funding the need legitimately. Where'd the property tax go this session? Nowhere. So, we want to talk about stuff, but we don't ever want to deal with the root cause of why the money may not be there. We did a little bit this session. We made gains, but let's be honest. I don't think that's an appropriate or fair process for what you're putting at the table. That's just my personal opinion.

Mr. Vellardita:

I think it is, and I think it's fair game to look at every dollar that the School District gets and how it's utilized. There's no disagreement or argument that there couldn't be more funding. There's no disagreement there. And everybody up there knows where I have been the last few sessions in advocating for more funding for the School District and for specific programs. I'll take second fiddle to nobody on that issue. So, because every dollar is valuable, I think it's fair game to look at how it's being spent.

Mr. Augspurger:

Assemblywoman Neal, I think too, just for your consideration, we are looking at a remarkably different mechanism for delivering education, very different than it's been for the last 5 or 6 decades. I don't know how long CCSD has been here, but it has largely been unchanged during that period of time. It was a top-down, direction-giving organization. Schools, teachers and principals took what they heard. They tried to do the best they could with it. This process is turning things upside down. For the first time, people are beginning to look more closely at, "What am I spending on this service in a school? What else could I do with this money if I don't have this service, and can I go someplace other than this large school district who's bound with rules, routines, processes and procedures to get something cheaper?" And so, in the Board meeting last week, one of the Trustees said, and it was just an example but I think it's worthy of repeating, "What happens when schools no longer want to buy pencils from CCSD?" And you even heard today the statement that we have to give central services time to adjust. But when McDonald's builds right next to Burger King, Burger King doesn't get any time to adjust. This is a different way of looking at the business of education. It needs to be quicker, more nimble, and more responsive. That's what these SOTs will do. And you read the article on the front page of the paper this morning that talked about the SOT at Bonanza, and that was exactly the quotation about the decision they made to go to a seven-period day.

And it was added with, "Had we still been in the old way of doing things, it would have taken the School District a year to help make that decision for our high school." So, as complex and painful as it is sometimes, I think it's a natural part of what we have to do as we move to really creating this metamorphosis, really turning the School District into a central services organization. It is not going to be easy and it's not going to be without some pain.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I just have one suggestion, Chair Roberson, because I think this issue is going to keep coming up. Maybe we should take a look at those consulting contracts. I want to know if it's fair. I want to know if what you're saying is accurate. Let's get in the mud, since apparently we've got 85 days to be fooling around and throwing out dirt, so let's look at the consultation contracts, what they put out there. Let's look at legal services, because I want to know if there is actually waste. I'm tired of the accusations. I want to know if there's truth.

Mr. Augspurger:

I just want to clarify that I didn't make an accusation, I just simply stated a fact. They spent this amount of money in 2015-2016 on outside counsel. I think that statement is worthy of the kind of follow-up that you want to do, and I think looking for efficiencies would be important to this entire process, not only there but across our system. We've heard the District say they are looking for efficiencies. They have to look everywhere.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Okay. It's the Chair's decision, but I want to know if they're wasting money on consultants.

Mr. Vellardita:

They have an outside counsel here in this hearing today, to monitor this hearing.

Chair Roberson:

So, there's a lot here. For now, Mr. Augspurger, why don't you finish your list? And we would like a copy of that, because I think there's a lot of good information that frankly as I mentioned before is news to us. So we'd like to be able to research some of this.

Mr. Augspurger:

Okay. The next segment of my presentation deals with what I call autonomies that have been granted under the law but not yet received by schools. Again, to paraphrase a statement that was made at the Board meeting the other day by Trustee Garvey, why don't we focus our time on economies that matter most to schools? Now she didn't finish that statement, but I think her saying that gave me pause. What schools want to have are things that will help them make a difference right now. We're spending a lot of time on those future autonomies, the ones that exist in section 16(7), and I think that's important work that has to be done because

that's part of that 80 percent of unrestricted funds getting to schools. But if you go to section 16 of the law, there are four things there that have been granted to schools that need to be implemented immediately. If you look in section 16(2), you can see those autonomies that should go to the local school precinct, which would be to the principal and the SOT, are that they will be selecting teachers, administrators other than the principal and other staff who work under the direct supervision of the principal. Second, they would direct the supervision of the staff, including without limitation any disciplinary action that does not involve a violation of law or which does not require an investigation to comply with the law. And the third one, an important one, is that they should be able to procure such equipment, services and supplies as the local school precinct deems necessary. So, as we go back to section 41 of A.B. 469, it talks about how CCSD, "shall comply with the provisions of this act. Any failure to have performed or completed any such duty or act is not excused as a result of the enactment of the act." They've got to get the work done. They don't have the right to pick and choose. And unfortunately, there has been no discussion of how we work through that staffing economy. I don't want to belabor this issue, but I think there are a lot of things that can be done in this regard. To go from where we are now to what this law contemplates, which is SOTs and principals having complete control over staffing, is going to be tough to achieve. But I think something that would be simple to do is to change the process by which we assign staff to those schools. So if I'm a school associate superintendent, Senator Roberson, and you are a principal, I don't just have the right to assign that person to your building. I approach you and say, "Senator, would you be willing to take Mr. Vellardita?" You might say yes, or you might say no. And if you say no, there are 320 other schools that that school associate superintendent can go have that conversation with. I think we have to honor the intent of this legislation, the spirit of this legislation. And that is that staffing can no longer be a unilateral decision by Central to a school. Let's find a way to do something on a less intrusive basis as we work towards full autonomy by the school principal and SOT, so again, section 16 needs to be attended to.

I know that the District is working on the authority to purchase things, but again, I was in Mesquite at a meeting with principals this last week. This is another outlying area issue, Senator Hardy, and one of the principals said that they have purchased notebooks every year for each one of their students. This year, they got a special deal for 50 cents a copy from Walmart, but the District would not let them purchase those notebooks from Walmart. There was a cost of \$2.50 a notebook from the District. That's ridiculous.

So, in closing, what I would suggest moving forward is that the CIC finishes its work on October 31. I would like to think one of the additional duties that could be assigned, and I know that they probably have plenty of work right now and one more thing is not possible, but we have to find a way to deal with those autonomies that currently exist under that law that still have not gone to schools. We are not in compliance with that section of the law, and I think I would offer these suggestions, then. That would be the first one, that we ask the CIC to work with the District on those autonomies that have still not been addressed. Number two is that the Advisory Committee give consideration to invoking the provisions of section 33 and 34, which require additional oversight by the Nevada Department of Education and provides them with the authority to write additional regulations if needed. And finally, I would ask that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, under the authority of section 33, request

information from CCSD with respect to the cost of the reorganization being a factor in the purported \$45,000,000 deficit.

THE CHAIR CALLED FOR A BRIEF RECESS.

Chair Roberson:

I will now call up the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Canavero, and I think he wants to bring up some folks from the State Board of Education as well.

Dr. Steve Canavero (State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Nevada Department of Education):

Thank you for your continued support of the reorganization and this effort, and we're certainly here today in deep appreciation. We really enjoyed the discussion and the great democratic exchange that was evident today. I'm joined here by members of the State Board of Education: President Wynn, Vice President Newburn and Member Ortiz, who is also a member of the CIC. I think their presence here all day is a clear signal of their continued desire to support this work, both at the State Board and at the Department level, and to be responsive to the field as this work unfolds. I'd be remiss if I didn't recognize a continued effort by Superintendent Skorkowsky and his team, Mr. Christenson and the CIC, Mr. Skancke and TSC² and the many principals, teachers and parents dedicating the time and effort to see this work come to life at the elementary, middle and high schools across this valley. Just seeing the piece over the weekend in the *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, folks are beginning to see what this could actually look like.

The agenda today asks about my role and the State Board in the reorganization efforts under A.B. 469, so let me begin quickly with the State Board. I think it's been clear since the passage of A.B. 394 that the State Board's interest in the reorganization is piqued, and it continues under A.B. 469. The State Board has a formal role in A.B. 469 and an informal one. Formally, the language of the bill provides for the State Board to adopt, as it sees fit, regulations, and specifically section 34 says, "The State Board shall adopt such regulations as it deems necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of sections 2 through 34 together." Just listening to the public comment reinforced a few areas of potential regulatory work. I'm sure that there could be more in the future, and the State Board has been very clear as it worked through the regulations under the prior law that upon evidence and in the face of clear evidence of a problem that could be solved through the regulatory function, they indeed would pursue that. Perhaps not as formal as the regulatory process, the State Board always hears updates on key legislative priorities. The updates serve as a critical role in ensuring public accountability, and they allow members of the State Board to keep abreast of the work and remain aware of challenges that may be remedied perhaps by regulation. Additionally, I will continue to work with the State Board if more formal action is required, or other actions are initiated by me. Specifically with regard to my role as your State Superintendent, first and I think very importantly is that I have a principal role of support. The Department has been working to strike a balanced role of support and compliance, rather than deference to solely compliance. In this role, the Department is poised to support CCSD and the State with

implementation. For example, there are myriad laws and regulations to consider as we navigate the questions of autonomy and the limits thereof in each precinct. I received one request already and I anticipate more along these lines. Clear and consistent communication between CCSD and the Department needs to continue, and you have my commitment to seize opportunities to expand and to better our communications.

With regard to compliance, I have a general authority to monitor and enforce the statutes and regulations governing education. The Department takes this responsibility seriously, as do I, and there are a number of dates and actions specifically related to this bill that will be closely monitored. In addition to my general authority, the recently-enacted A.B. 469 includes a very specific authority for the State Superintendent, and this is in section 33. It was referenced at the outset of the meeting by the Chair. Section 33(1) states, "The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall take such actions as deemed necessary and appropriate to ensure that each large school district carries out the reorganization of the school district in accordance with," and then it goes on to talk about the law. Fortunately, there's a commensurate responsibility for cooperation, and this is also in section 33, where, "each large school district shall cooperate with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in carrying out the provisions of the law." Additionally, it provides for cooperation related to information requests, and it includes a number of items which I could request, and the District shall cooperate related to budgets, expenditures, the amounts for paid general administrative services and detailed information regarding other budgetary items as well. Given that the State Board of Education and I have been sued on this matter before, I'm not going to delve into specifics about what I will or will not do with this newly granted authority. But I can say that I fully intend, as I have since the passage of the initial bill a couple years ago, to see through the reorganization in a manner consistent with law and regulation, and I will use the granted authority to the full extent of the law, should it be necessary.

The State Board of Education should be a source of pride to all of Nevada, and I have enjoyed a productive and respectful relationship with the members of the State Board. That's actually a statement that I don't know if many of my colleagues across this country could say. We, the State Board and I, will continue to work productively and in concert, utilizing our complementary authority granted in statute to support this work going forward. I'll conclude my remarks with just two quick and brief points. The first is that it's absolutely necessary to launch this work. Only when principals, teachers and SOTs are granted the autonomy afforded to them under the law and the commensurate funding to act will we know, will I know, and will the State Board know specifically the challenges that they face. We look forward to that. Second, I appreciate the challenge before us and CCSD, the operational shifts and the change in culture within CCSD. This work takes time and sustained effort. Shifting organizational culture is not an easy task. I've found this body, now appropriately suited to the monitoring of the implementation, the CIC and the reports thereof, and the consultant TSC² to be infinitely valuable to this effort. Broadly, you and the CIC provide public accountability for all of us, but also the CIC and the consultant provide oversight at a detailed level, providing transparency and recommendations frankly upon which I and the State Board may act. It's my desire that these bodies will continue their work until such time as they become unnecessary, a moment I don't see in this biennium, certainly not before October, a short 85 days away. I highly encourage all of us to consider ways of keeping them engaged

beyond October. Chairman Roberson, I look forward to working with you through August of 2018, and I'll conclude where I started. The State Board and I support this work and stand ready to assist.

Senator Ford:

It's not a question really, it's just because people keep doing the same thing, and I think it's important that we continue to correct it. The autonomies are to the principal, not to the SOTs or to anybody else. Leading up to all of this, we heard a lot of expert testimony, and some of that expert testimony said that the number one key to the success of a school was the principal. Not a good teacher, which is what most folks would say, but the principal. That's a reason why we placed the autonomy with the principal. And I want to continue to reiterate that. The autonomy the SOT has is to make a recommendation. It's to give advice. And I want to ensure that we continue to drive that home, because it creates confusion and it makes people think they have more authority than they really have. So, you're doing the same thing in conflating them all, and I want to be certain that we continue to distinguish between those.

Dr. Canavero:

Duly noted, and I mentioned it in concert knowing that if we deeply engaged the SOTs in this thoughtful work and they make smart and thoughtful recommendations to the principal, ultimately the principal makes those decisions and they can be adjudicated through the system all the way up to the Superintendent should it be necessary. But duly noted.

Chair Roberson:

And just to address that, while I don't disagree with you, Senator Ford, I do think that a big part of what we did in the past 2 years and why we're here today is about empowerment and empowering communities and empowering teachers and support staff and parents and families to get engaged. And yes, you are correct. The buck stops at the principal level. While the principal doesn't have a vote, he or she is the person who submits the school plan of operation and the budget. But I don't want to minimize the role that we want SOTs to play. Otherwise, why have them? The whole point is to get the community engaged, and not only to make them feel like they have a role, but to really empower them. Because we've all experienced a certain level of apathy with some parents, with some communities, and rightfully so. Many families have looked at this School District over the years, because we've all heard it, they're our constituents, and they lament the fact that they don't have a say. They don't feel like they have any role in their child's education. They lament the fact that the CCSD bureaucracy seems like an impenetrable wall. They don't know who to talk to. They can never get an answer. They want to be engaged. We want them to be engaged with their children's education. So while I agree this is about principals being able to have more autonomy over their schools, the reason we have these SOTs is so that the principal will listen to that school community, to take input and make ultimate decisions based on the input of families and of school personnel who care about the education of the children in those communities. I think that's really important.

Assemblywoman Neal:

In section 33, you're collecting a lot of information. It doesn't say what you're supposed to do with it. Then there's the section you cited, which is the necessary and proper clause, which gives you this super broad authority. I know you said you don't want to say what you want to do or not do, but I really want to know, how broadly do you see that going and how deeply do you plan on using that power? Because that's a really strong sentence, and if I had been paying attention to that particular line, I probably would have been struggling to strike those words out.

Dr. Canavero:

What I will say is that the language around cooperation came from some frustration during the last biennium to ensure that if we're going to request information at the State level that there is a respectful and responsible cooperation by the School District in order to comply with such requests. Related to the autonomy and the authority, I believe it's quite broad. I only see this type of authority provided to the State Superintendent in this particular section of the statute. I have general authority over others. So here, I think it's a very clear direction from the Legislature that I am to ensure that the law is followed. It's not optional, at least when last I checked, and that I have the authority to ensure that the law is followed.

Senator Hardy:

Along that same line, when I look at Moapa Valley High School for instance, that has lost up to 10 teachers in the last 10 years, so an average of a teacher a year. And I'm looking at a rural school being significantly different than a small school in an urban area where you can change schools and go other places. In a rural school, you really don't have a chance to change schools. Do you have any authority over the education of a child in a rural area that would be commensurate in quality and opportunity as it would be in an urban area?

Dr. Canavero:

If I understand your question correctly, I might narrow it specifically to this particular bill. There's no distinction in terms of the authority granted to me to oversee the implementation of this law as to rural or urban. So that would include those provisions in law which do distinguish a specialty school or rural school from others to ensure that they are implemented consistently with the law. Generally speaking of course, I have responsibility across the whole state, from all the corners and hinterlands of the state to our urban centers. But in some cases, limited authority.

Senator Hardy:

So you can determine perhaps what a gift was, and it probably wasn't 10 teachers, but it was probably something?

Dr. Canavero:

I would have to, of course, ask some more questions from CCSD and engage with the particular section of law. But yeah, I think that question could ultimately arrive at my desk in order to refer back to the law to see if it's inconsistent.

Elaine Wynn (President, Nevada State Board of Education):

I think I speak on behalf of my colleagues at the State Board in saying that we have been enjoying a remarkable period of time in the last two biennia of witnessing the extraordinary, dynamic direction in changing education in the State of Nevada, certainly under the leadership of Governor Sandoval. And part of our concern was with the very ambitious program that was passed in both sessions and funded with taxpayer increases, and the knowledge that in addition to the things we did with Read by Three and Zoom and Victory schools that we were now going to reorganize CCSD, the largest district in this State, and the fifth largest in the country, that it would be a shame if the reorganization effort would somehow detract from all the other excellent things that we have focused on in this realm of education reform. So, this has become a very critical piece for all of us, because the whole thing is tied up together in one very complex package. It has been frustrating for everyone, but I'm delighted to see how passionate we all are in achieving the same objective. It took, however, several hours this morning before we got to hear anyone say "student academic achievement," and I think if we continue to think of this as an operational issue and we forget that we're still focused on having our kids achieve, despite lofty labels and titles, that we get sidetracked. So, we are here making a commitment to do whatever is possible and necessary to advance this very ambitious effort and keep it on a timeframe that is going to be most productive, whatever that requires. And since the mandate has been handed over to the State Superintendent to move forward in that direction, we would like to confirm that our support will be there for whatever action is required and that you direct us to take.

Chair Roberson:

Before I go to public comment, I just want to say that I know this Committee can be kind of tough on the School District at times, if not all the time. I want to applaud all of the work that's being done right now in Central by a lot of folks who are working with the CIC and the TSC² Group. I know this is tough work, but I see progress being made, and I am encouraged by that. Yes, we have a long way to go. I want to thank you all for your public service and all the hard work and the days and nights you're putting into this. I also want to acknowledge Trustee Child, who's been here all day long. I really appreciate you being here and listening to this. I've had my issues with the School Board in the past, but I want you to know that going forward we've got to be a team. We've got to work as partners for this to be successful for the 320,000 kids in Clark County. I'm looking forward to working with you and the rest of the School Board to make that happen.

Senator Ford:

I'm glad that you'll open public comment that way, because it's important to note that our questioning and our conversation is always, as President Wynn said, for the advancement of the child. We're interested in student success, and while sometimes it's not said, it should go without saying that we are interested in that and that's what we're pursuing. Some of our questions may come across, as the Chair indicated, as being harsh or difficult or accusatory, and some are purposefully misconstruing, I would say, statements made oftentimes and taking pot shots here and there, and I think it's important that I call that out as well. Because everyone on this dais, I believe, has the best interests of the child in mind, and we should respect one another enough to understand that just because we ask a question that may be counter to your position, that doesn't mean that we are counter to you. We just have an opposite viewpoint. We are looking to disagree agreeably and try to find a way forward. So to all of those out there who may have construed the way we approach these issues as being, for example, a way to hush down parents, that's clearly not the case. I have been one of the main ones advocating for parental involvement, ever since I've been in the Legislature, and so the notion that because SOTs are advisory meetings that you're being neutered I think is faulty, and what we're trying to do is ensure that the responsibility is placed where it's supposed to be, which is on the School District. What we know from the research is that the principals, the leaders of the schools, are those who have the most ability to be effective and affect student performance. So, thank you again Mr. Chair for ending on that note, and I just wanted to make that point known.

Chair Roberson:

I will now re-open public comment.

Angie Sullivan (Teacher, Stanford Elementary School):

I'm a second grade teacher. Teachers are really the only group actively organizing to implement the SOTs. It is implied that teachers who are speaking up about real issues and concerns at the school-level SOTs are bad teachers. I'm not surprised that some remind everyone SOTs are only advisory. I have to frankly ask why any teacher would want to participate if their voice is not heard and it could affect their personal working conditions and their career. Retaliation is unacceptable. The school organizational teams will become a rubber stamp instead of an empowered, accountable and efficient unit if no one listens to teachers. Retaliation will kill the SOTs. More training is obviously needed to combat this. Empowerment is a goal, not submission to unjust authority.

At this point, not much has really changed when you look at it from my point of view, because some groups are not participating appropriately. Frankly, the Central Office had a single flyer, and that is the effort I have seen. Very limited training if any at all has been given by the District. I'm also hopeful SOTs will eventually be given real power for decision making and control of money. Stating it is about kids is not enough. The actual money needs to move. All talk, no action. This is not cool. Nothing has really changed because different groups are being scapegoated or held up as a show to delay a change or prevent real discussions. The

decision making and money are not moving. I have attended many a CCSD Trustee meeting, where money is still actively being spent by the Central Office on the Central Office ideas, and where there are open discussions and Trustee meetings whenever they spend money outside the budget. Acknowledging that they are spending money they do not have has been what I have observed. I have listened to many discussions about loopholes and language which the Central Office can exploit to not implement the intent of the law, and open talk about assigning money spent by the Central Office to a school instead of actually moving money or without any real input from the school. This is not empowerment. Again, this is just top-down directives. It appears to be an accounting sleight of hand instead of real movement of dollars to the places where kids are served. I've heard Trustees speak frankly about not wanting to appear to manufacture numbers, probably because the audience reacted in disbelief when they did just that. I have watched crazy PowerPoints with numerous different percentages, money numbers, et cetera, all produced with various groups and administrators for review by the Trustees. In all of this, nothing seems to match, unless you consider it is just playing political maneuvering instead of actual work for kids to implement the law. Even this very week, I got whiplashed by the Trustee and CCSD talking points changing daily. The reorganization is a problem. Kindergarten is a problem. Arbitration is a problem. Today it seems that special education is a problem. The money amounts and deficits change monthly, weekly, daily. Surprise, another problem and another reason we cannot honor labor contracts or the law. I believe there is a serious lack of honesty. I hear rumors of another lawsuit to prevent reorganization. I hope that is only a rumor, but in my experience, delay by lawyer seems to be the only tool the Central Office uses on a regular basis as a weapon against labor or Nevada Legislators. Delays are happening. Delay by blame is used on a regular basis. The only thing consistent in my career in CCSD has been classroom labor being asked to fill the gaps in the budget which we doubt even exist. Again, we circle back to retaliation. We've been in arbitration and we are immediately told who will suffer because we selfishly ask for our contract to be honored. Usually teachers are the large group asked to bend the knee. Teachers are obedient, and we do what we are told unless it is something we simply are not able to do.

I will state this frankly and clearly. I am aware that rubber meets the road. I am managing up as best I can. I do not have a box of paper or a working copier to produce the books my second grade classroom needs. Books are not provided, so they're necessary to make. The basic needs in the classroom are not being met. My school budget is tight. I do not know of any school that does not have a tight budget. Watching the Trustees behave in a manner where they spend money they do not have is a slap in my face. I teach in a place where kids need veteran, skilled staff. I teach in a place where we need supplies. What is happening is not serving kids where I see them every day in my classroom. There is an urgency to implement the law. There's an urgency to move the money to where the kids have access to it. Teachers should be empowered to have a voice in this process, not be punished for speaking out about the problems. If we are to improve every classroom in this District and effect real change for kids like mine, we have to listen to teachers and we have to acknowledge the problems that are happening.

Jim Frazee (Teacher, Centennial High School):

I am a high school teacher in Clark County. I happen to have the pleasure of serving on the CCEA Executive Board, where I represent 85 schools in the northwest and 4,000 teachers. I've been humbled by my peers to be elected to the State Board of Directors for the Nevada State Education Association (NSEA). Senator Roberson, when you retire your voice will be missed. You have been a friend, and we have faith in you. And I have great relationships also with Senator Ford, and of course with Senator Harris. I waited around 5 hours to speak, and I appreciate your time, because I was disturbed by Superintendent Skorkowsky's comments about Dan Barber in a roundabout way. My experience on the SOT has been good. At my high school, it works. We have very active parents. We have parents who want to have a say in the building. Now, Senator Ford, I always appreciate you. You are direct and you are definitely straightforward. We've had several discussions about this and I understand that the principal is the ultimate authority in the school. But this is an empowerment model for the school community. Parents, educators and support staff have bought into this model with a chance to go out and actually have a conversation. When I got the pleasure to testify in Carson City about this, I quoted a colleague's father. His Master's dissertation was about incompetence in the business place, and his saying was that 100,000 incompetent people go to work every day and never get in trouble and do fine. It's not incompetent people who get fired, it's the people who speak out. It's the people who don't fit into the organization. This model asks us as educators to stand up and speak about best practices for our profession, to speak out for our kids that one size doesn't fit all.

My own experience is that half of my classes are co-ops, special education kids trying to fit in. I happen to get any child in Centennial High School who comes from juvenile hall or behavior school, because that's what I'm really good at. I have empathy. I get out at 2 p.m. I drive across town to teach in the inner city from 3 p.m. to 6:05 p.m. I leave my house right before 6 a.m. every single day and I get home at about 6:45 p.m. I understand this valley. I understand this process. And educators need a voice to safely speak up for the kids in their classroom. We are the last line to say, "You know what, one size doesn't fit all."

Assemblywoman Neal, you mentioned one book about changing schools. I don't have an approved textbook for World History. I can't buy books. I texted my colleague to make sure I got that. The District doesn't have an approved list for World History textbooks. These are things that we need to have addressed so that we can actually speak up, instead of hearing, "Well, don't make any waves." Yeah, I would like to make some waves. My kids are counting on me making waves. We have some of the highest class sizes in the country. I have 37 kids per class, and I know it's going to increase. And I have 37 sets of parents who have dreams for their children, and they count on me to be able to speak. And I count on you helping me get some protection so I don't get retribution. I have a principal that I count on my calendar, and I can get kicked out of his office twice a year, because we have disagreements but they don't last. I get great evaluations because I'm a pretty good teacher and he appreciates my efforts. And this is what we need.

The Dan Barber situation is absurd, and it's not the worst one. Mr. Barber is an exceptional academic. I appreciate his work. I've read his work. He deserved better. And we count on

you. And I don't hold his principal as accountable as much as I do his associate superintendent who oversees that area. Because this is what we need. We need to no longer have people who just check the box that they're going to blankly cover the principal regardless. We count on our associate superintendents to step up to this challenge. Superintendent Canavero, you are an important part of this. We need someone who can continue to hold the system accountable for these changes. Educators don't expect to get their way. Educators don't want to run the schools. Everybody comes into this process with fear and trying to protect their turf. We simply want a say at the table. Educators are leaving Clark County for so many reasons. Let us not let this failed SOT model be another reason. We're excited to be partners with the District, honest partners.

Ms. Dawson Owens:

Speaking for those in the trenches, I think as we've heard here—and I want to thank everyone who's been here, and for all the work that's been done. Why we empower our schools is to increase student achievement, and this is a cultural change for us. It's a big change for this District. I don't want to hear people on SOTs coming and saying, "What's the point of me being on this team? Why am I here wasting my time if I don't have any input or say?" We have amazing people in the community coming forward, and yet those are the comments we've heard, as well as we've heard before about fear of retaliation. We don't want a board that's a bunch of yes-men, but we do want a board that gives ideas to their principal that are best for that community so that those kids can succeed and have the things that they need. So, that's a good thing for our SOTs going forward. Also, in regard to the principals, I heard today, "what level of autonomy would you prefer?" Well, you've got it, you're the principal. My thought is step up and do what you need to do. I get that you might want to order out landscaping, and that's great. It's a concern to me with 50 percent of returned surveys that we're not getting a full report. I know it's summer, but again, those surveys are also the desire of the principal. Is that survey really the desire of the SOT or that community, or is that the desire of the principal? That principal may leave, and that community will still go on there as they often do. So, that's a concern. The money is a huge concern. We talked a lot about curriculum, and teachers are often scrambling. Teachers pay teachers, trying to get the things they need. I know there are schools that are struggling to get their math and language arts curriculum, schools with kids that are really in need, but yet due to purchasing timelines and rules and regulations, they can't get what they need. So, we need to have that money to flow to our schools so that they can do that. Again, it's all with the desire to increase student achievement and get what they need. We need our School Board to come together and vote for funds to get to those schools this year to comply with the law. Do it at the next meeting. I don't want to hear that we're going to research this and go on and on. Let's vote on it at the next meeting, get it done and get that money to the schools where we need it. I also want to say thank you for the reorganization and for the CEABs. I think those are a great thing that has been brought about with this reorganization somewhat, and that helps us get into neighborhood schools with our community and helps us also to make a difference that way. So again, I think it's a really exciting time. I think it's amazing, some of the things that have been happening, and I think we just need to keep pushing forward on that cultural change, and we're going to get there. It's just a process.

Anna Slighting (Honoring Our Public Education (HOPE) for Nevada):

Obviously, there are so many working parts in the reorganization that we would like to thank this body and everyone involved for making this successful for our children. Parent involvement is a big part of what we're trying to change and improve with the reorganization. Yet we are disappointed that no parent groups were asked to present today. Children are the end users of all the decisions today. Parents are the partners in their kids' educations, partners in SOTs, and should be partners in these meetings. Our board members serve on their SOTs, and many HOPE members do as well. Honoring Our Public Education has been a recipient of a multitude of experiences across the School District and would have been happy to have shared some of those experiences with you. Parents are the boots on the ground with administrators, teachers and support staff, and we're not the only organization that represents families. There are several out there who could have been asked.

Thank you for your collective clarification on autonomy, especially how it pertains to SOTs. From our perspective, there continue to be mismanaged expectations on the role of SOTs, in large part due to mixed messages from several sources of trainings. We look forward to the SOTs being fully accepted as advisory, included in collaborative decisions.

Finally, I would like to touch on some of Glenn Christenson's end remarks in the last CIC meeting. They can be found in the minute drafts for their August 9 meeting. We feel that they were spot-on regarding the real challenges that CCSD faces. In fact, many of his comments apply to education challenges across the nation. Rather than entities taking digs at each other, we would rather focus on collaborative solutions to those stoppers to education reform. And I think the reorganization is a great venue to have some of those conversations to find some of those solutions. We thank you for your time, all day today, and all the time that you put into all of the many meetings for refining student achievement.

Chair Roberson:

Any time HOPE or any other parent group wants to speak to this Committee and they want to be put on the agenda, just let me know ahead of time. This meeting has been on the calendar for quite a while. I didn't hear from any parent groups, but I'm very happy to have parent groups come and make a presentation. Because I want to hear how the parents are experiencing these SOTs.

Ms. Slighting:

We will take you up on that offer.

Dr. Moses:

I was not going to speak again, except I took great offense to talking about a gift given to schools to put them in equity with the rest of the District. We spent a lot of time in our committee talking about equity. It's not an issue of gifting, it's a question of equity. Some of our rural schools are funded at four times what the base is, according to the figures of the

District from 2015, which are the latest figures we have. The lowest is at nine percent. That is not a gift. That is an educational decision made that those extra funds per pupil are necessary to give those kids an equitable education. And if we're making decisions at an administrative level on who we're going to give a gift to, we're making very poor administrative decisions. Those decisions have to be made on an equity issue. Do we need to have the extra funds in those schools to make sure those youngsters get the education that is equitable?

Now, we are not asking for new funding. We are asking for funding that is already there. And I think Senator Harris can tell you that one of the reasons why we put that proportional issue in the budget was to ensure equity for the rural schools. I am confused about the fact that we are talking about budget figures that are cutting budgets. The Legislature gave the District, according to their documents, almost \$200,000,000 more for this school year than they had for last school year. Therefore, I'm confused about how we have to cut positions that were already in the budget. The budget has increased, but we're cutting positions. I understand that costs have gone up, but I don't believe they've gone up an extra \$200,000,000. And again, those are not my figures, those are the figures of the two budgets from 2016-2017, which are online with the District. What I would ask is that we continue to work on equity and understand that these are not gifts. They're an opportunity to keep equity within the educational system for rural schools across the District.

Chair Roberson:

Before Assemblyman Anderson left, he pointed out to me that A.B. 469 was making a distinction between small schools and rural schools. The section in the law speaks to rural schools, irrespective of size, so just keep that in mind with regard to no money being reduced from what rural schools received previously. So I think that's something that, again, we need to have more conversations about going forward.

Dr. Moses:

The difference between the small schools—and there's no provision in the law for small school, you're right. But the small schools that they talk about that are 500 or so are specialty schools, and they are covered in this. If they did not have those provisions before, they would not be proportional. So, small schools are not necessarily rural schools, and rural schools are not necessarily small schools. We're talking about comprehensive high schools, and I may be wrong, but I don't know of any comprehensive high school that is not a specialty school in the inner city that is 500 or less.

David Gomez (Nevada Peace Alliance):

I'm kind of dismayed at how I hear some of these things, and how people actually portray some of the information which they receive. I actually sit as a vice chair on one of the SOTs for an actually outstanding school that people send their children to from all around the valley. My son actually goes there. There are people in this room which I love, but at times I disagree with. And it's like family. When you look at your family, sometimes you look at your son and

say, "No, I'm not going to agree with you, regardless of how much you want to tell me what your point is." My son is a Marine, thanks to a gentleman sitting behind me named Dr. Michael Barton. He has been a big influence in his life. And my son made it all the way to that point on Martin Luther King and Lake Mead, in that area where there's a high saturation of drugs, gangs and different things. He could have got involved with some of his friends, but he didn't.

So when I hear someone tell me that SOTs don't matter and that they're just advisory, they do matter. I have been fighting for West Prep for 10 long years, to get that school built, and they finally built us an elementary school. And they know that, and I've been in that board room and it's on record. I know some people don't like me and they don't agree with me. I don't care how they feel about me, because I'm not here for them. I'm here for my family, and I'm here for the people I represent. If they're here for any other reason, then they're in the wrong place. When I look at these things and I listen to SOTs and I sit there as a vice chair, the person who's in charge of the SOT is always a teacher or some kind of legal representative for the School District, whether they're a support staff member or someone else. But they never allow a parent to be the actual chair of the SOT.

When we talk about certain things in these SOT meetings, which are public, some of these meetings are just talking. We're just having a bunch of delegation and nothing actually gets done. When we talk about what we need to do about fixing student achievement and making things better in the budgets that are going to help these children to achieve to get where they need to go, it just goes to deaf ears at times. I look at them and I say, "How do we do this?" Now, we do have a saying, and it's called CTR, which means "choose the right." That's where I come from. When we say CTR, we mean CTR. We have a proclamation, and when we stand by our proclamation, we stand by our proclamation to the world and to the people. I have a duty and a right to every single parent out there who stands with me.

As I look upon all the different numbers and data input, I can sit here and tell you about how English Language Learners (ELL) doesn't work, and we have 87 percent, and 13 percent goes to this and that, and how we have a deteriorating rate of information that's going in, and the money and this and that. But I'm not going to sit here and do that because I don't want to waste anybody's time with that information. I want to tell you about SOTs, and SOTs are what it is. If it wasn't for parents, we wouldn't have a school district. We wouldn't have teachers, we wouldn't have support staff, we wouldn't have anyone. Who would they teach, themselves? That would defeat the whole purpose. If we didn't have children and we didn't have those people involved, how can you tell someone that their voice is just advice and then a principal's going to make the decision?

We fought very long to make sure that we had a voice. I fought very long, alone, against all opposition, against the Hispanic and the black community. And they stood there against me, and they beat me down. They made fun of me because I was Mormon, saying, "Oh, Mormons, this and that, look what you guys are. How can you do anything or how can you say anything?" So, as I sit here and I look a room full of people and educators, some of these educators were at that meeting where we had. And I don't even understand how you guys even listen at times. But some of these educators were at the meeting where we were protecting children from sexual predators, and I was the only one who got up and stood up and talked. The only one

in a room full of educators. Mo Denis was a Senator at the time. I said, “We need to protect these children at all costs.” And then they turned around and gave teachers the ability to text for emergency situations. What’s the point in having Infinite Campus and all these other things? Just wasting money in different avenues, and we’re just trying to figure out ways to say, “Oh, yeah, well we’re going to make this work or make that work.” Isn’t that a communication device to get in contact with that parent? But that’s neither here nor there.

As a parent of three more children going through CCSD, I will remain and stand here, and I will remain and I will be vigilant. I will be the one who stands in between the gap and the wall. I will be here, and I will not stop coming, regardless of how people break the car windows of my car, pop my tires and do different things to me on my street. I know, and I have an assumption about who’s behind it. But I don’t really care, because I’m not from Las Vegas. I am a Las Vegan. I’m originally from California. Maybe they have the homies from the hood from back in the days that they all hung out with, and they do things to me. And I don’t really care, because I’m going to stand here for my children and everybody’s children who need my help, and for the voice of the Latinos who don’t have a voice.

Just to let Senator Aaron Ford know, the rededication of the school, West Prep, will be on August 8 or 9 at 8 a.m., so I would appreciate it if you do show up.

Senator Ford:

My wife’s birthday is August 8. We’re out of town, and I can’t make it. Thanks for the notice though. Listen, let’s be clear. The school organizational teams are advisory, and that’s the law. That’s how we drafted the law. Everyone who has been participating in the last 2 years understood that. I’m not saying anything that is contrary to what was agreed to by this Committee. It’s important that people have expectations, and that expectations are accurate and real so they don’t think that they have extra authority than they do, and then they’re disappointed when certain things aren’t happening. So, my intent, and my intent will always remain—because I sponsored a bill in 2013 that tried to give parents all kinds of authority and I was castigated and it was called a “parent trigger bill.” So, I’ve always been active and involved on parent involvement. So, with these attacks at me specifically, I felt that I would take an opportunity to address it and clear the record up.

Ms. Martin:

I would like to clarify one thing. I’m here today because I feel optimistic about this whole process. I’m not here today to bash it or to make sure that it doesn’t happen. Because as a parent, I think about what people continue to talk about with student achievement. There are a lot of different approaches to student achievement. But one sure thing that you have to study is that greater parental or family and community involvement will guarantee student achievement. That is why I’m here, not only to speak for my children, but also all of the children in Clark County and in Nevada. I know that the reorganization is going to be a long and arduous process. I don’t have any naiveté about this being done in the first year. However, after personally experiencing, as the chair of an SOT, bullying, threatening, intimidation and isolation, I will make a separate written statement and send it to the Board.

Because I have a limited amount of time, I would rather take the time here to talk about the possibility of making certain suggestions for your future consideration. The Committee and the Board and the Senators are all subject to very stringent and rigorous professional and legal standards. However, if the current model continues, all the principals will not be subject to the kind of rigorous standards and oversight that you all have to be under. And that's where I see the possible danger that can come in. Because there's no oversight, this is ethically wrong, and I think it will be nonsensical in the future. It could also be a catalyst for possible district-wide operational chaos, because you're basically going to have 336 schools that begin to go dark. My personal experience is that there's intimidation by filtering information and blocking communication between the District and the SOTs by the principal. There's also misinformation that's being presented.

So, I'm going to switch gears and talk about the possibility of things that could be done. Number one, I was prevented from recording my meeting. Because of the absence of my secretary, the minutes wouldn't be made and records wouldn't be kept. These all contribute to even more opacity that is very, very difficult to break through for members of the SOT. So, I would like to suggest adopting perhaps a modified version of the Nevada Open Meeting Law to apply to SOT meetings. Number two, processes such as the balanced government policies that are adopted by CCSD could also be modified and utilized to facilitate smooth communication between the SOT and the principal regarding the District in the future. Number three, there also need to be very clear and thorough procedures in place to address areas such as increased conflict resolution, noncompliance and perhaps even disciplinary actions. Only then can the kind of abuse of power that's happening in my SOT by my principal be adequately addressed. Number four, I would propose creating an organization for all the parents on the SOT, perhaps even with all the teachers. Just all of the SOT members, because at my school, there's not a Parent Teacher Association. It's very, very difficult for parents in these schools to have an organized voice and to not be treated as expendable. Number five, there also needs to be a direct line of communication from the District to the SOTs, perhaps even from the Legislature to the SOTs, since the SOTs are centralized with their chair. They should be able to have an organization or a communication system so that any pertinent information or policy changes can be directly sent to the SOT without the filtering of the principal. This way, we can minimize misinformation or lack of information.

I don't want to sound as if I'm giving up on the process. I am still very enthusiastic and passionate about what's going on here, and I would like to have the Board notice that. However, I would like to see if there's some way that members of the SOT can address their concerns outside of this kind of meeting, because this is only once a month. Perhaps there could be a system that would allow us to address these situations.

Chair Roberson:

Before we go on, I just want to point this out. I don't want a misperception out there about the role of SOTs. I think it's really important that we refer back to the law. I want to make clear the real importance of these SOTs. I don't disagree with Senator Ford, as I said before. But the buck stops with the principal, and the SOTs serve in an advisory capacity. Just to give you some examples of how far that goes, I just want to make a reference to the law. "The

organizational team shall provide assistance and advice to the principal regarding the development of the plan of operation in a local school precinct." Not "may," "shall." "The organizational team shall provide continued assistance and advice to the principal in carrying out the plan of operation for the school precinct. The organizational team shall, whenever a vacancy occurs in the position of principal, assist with the selection of the next principal." This is all about investing the community with real say in the process. "The organizational team may," they don't have to, but they may, "provide input to the associate superintendent regarding the principal two times a year." So, if they have a problem with the principal they can go to the associate superintendent and report that. "Whenever a vacancy occurs in the position of principal, the organizational team shall establish a list of qualifications that the organizational team determines are desirable for the next principal. The Superintendent shall post notice of the vacancy. The Superintendent shall interview qualified candidates and establish a list of at least three but not more than five candidates to submit to the organizational team, and one member of the organizational team must be allowed to participate in interviewing candidates with the Superintendent." I think these are real responsibilities. "From the list of candidates submitted by the Superintendent, the organizational team shall recommend one candidate for the position within 15 school days after receipt of the recommendation." I know there's been an issue here with the Superintendent not selecting the individual recommended by the SOT. But I will say with emphasis that that recommendation should have real import. "The Superintendent in consultation with the associate superintendent must, in his or her sole discretion, determine the person who's hired." They do have legal responsibility. But they're supposed to really pay attention to what the SOT wants in that regard. "If an organizational team objects to any part of the plan of operation for the school precinct, the organizational team may," and they don't have to, "submit a request to the associate superintendent to consider revising the plan in accordance with the recommendations of the organizational team." And then, if they don't get satisfaction from the associate superintendent, they can go to the Superintendent.

So again, I just outlined some of the provisions of the law. We intend parents and teachers and other members of the SOT to have a real impact on the governance of these schools, and maybe that's where Senator Ford and I are using different language. Maybe we're on the same page, maybe we're not, but that's my perspective. I don't want anyone to walk away from here thinking that parents shouldn't be really excited to be part of these SOTs. We really want your input. We value your input. I just want to put that on the record. The role of the SOT is critical to the success of this reorganization.

Ms. Martin:

However, as a member of the SOT so far, I can't even compel my associate superintendent or the CCSD Board to even give me one line item on my budget that I made requests to my principal, who has been making sure to limit not only our ability to operate but our knowledge of anything that's happening. All of the information that I have learned in the past 2 or 3 months came from me going out to get it. We have received nothing that is of any substantial meaning from our principal. I can't even compel her to understand, "Okay, there's this line item. How much is it. How is the vendor selected? Why are we spending any of this money? Is this service effective or not?" If I can't even compel my associate superintendent to do that,

how are we going to move forward? That is why I'm here today. I feel like I wasn't going anywhere.

Chair Roberson:

What school do you serve at?

Ms. Martin:

West Career and Technical Academy.

Chair Roberson:

Okay. Do you have at least monthly meetings? Because that's what's required under the law.

Ms. Martin:

Yes, we do.

Chair Roberson:

Have you talked to the other members of your SOT?

Ms. Martin:

Yes.

Chair Roberson:

Do you have a working majority that agrees with you on that SOT? Do the majority of the members of the SOT feel the way you do on the issue you're talking about, the line item?

Ms. Martin:

This particular item is what I would like to get the number for before I present it to the team.

Chair Roberson:

So you're not even there yet?

Ms. Martin:

Yeah. I don't even have the number yet in order to present to my team. I can't even give them that information for them to consider. That's how dysfunctional this thing is. It took me a long time to be here.

Chair Roberson:

If you send an email to us, we'll get that information for you. Talk to our legal counsel here. We will deal with this after the meeting. But again, you haven't even presented this to the SOT, so I don't know how your principal would respond to that.

Ms. Martin:

My principal refused to give me that information. She told me to go look for it. After 2 1/2 months of asking for this information, she told me to go to the Public Records Office. I don't think that's the way it's supposed to be. If we need a particular item or we need to understand an issue that we posed to her, it would be our job to get that information and advise her, not for her to stonewall us.

Chair Roberson:

Have you spoken to the associate superintendent?

Ms. Martin:

I have. This is what happened. Even after I had a meeting with my associate superintendent, after that is when my principal told me to go look for the Public Records Office, even though during the meeting that I had with the associate superintendent she said, "Oh yeah, sure, no problem, I have that information on my computer. I'll give it to you any time." Then she turned around and she wouldn't give it to me.

Chair Roberson:

I want you to talk to Michael Vannozzi, and he's going to work with you on this and we're going to get the information.

Ms. Martin:

I have also spoken with Mr. Vannozzi.

Chair Roberson:

And you can speak with him again. And we'll get it worked out, I promise you. At the next meeting, you come back and we'll see where this is at, because we'll have another meeting very soon. So, we will continue to resolve this, and I'm glad you're here. I don't want to take up everyone's time, but I will work with you to get this resolved.

Ms. Martin:

Thank you. I appreciate that very much.

Dr. Dalley:

I thought today's meeting was great. No work ever gets done without friction. So if that's the gauge, then today's meeting was good. It is important to note that A.B. 469 does not provide exemptions for gifts, but it does specifically provide exemptions for rural schools to provide equity. We got this provision inserted to protect us against this exact situation. It is a slippery slope to let CCSD determine which laws they will follow by reclassifying expenses such as gifts. Because if that's the case, then we're all in danger.

Chair Roberson:

We will be meeting again soon. I will now adjourn this meeting at 4:07 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jordan Haas, Interim Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Michael Roberson, Chair

Date: _____

Exhibit	Witness/Agency	Description
A		Agenda
B		Attendance Roster
C	Jordan Haas, Interim Secretary	Draft Minutes from the October 18, 2016 Meeting of the A.B. 394 Advisory Committee
D	Jordan Haas, Interim Secretary	Draft Minutes from the February 2, 2017 Meeting of the A.B. 394 Advisory Committee
E	Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent, Clark County School District	Reorganization Update Presentation
F	Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent, Clark County School District	Alignment of Responsibilities
G	John Vellardita, Executive Director, Clark County Education Association	Necessary Steps for the Reorganization
H	Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees	Presentation to the Advisory Committee from CCASAP