

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

September 14, 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 8:22 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
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz, Assembly District No. 11, Vice Chair
Senator Moises (Mo) Denis, Senatorial District No. 2
Senator Aaron D. Ford, Senatorial District No. 11
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 ABSENT:

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

STAFF MEMBERS

Brenda Erdoes, Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Risa Lang, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Julie Waller, Senior Program Analyst, Fiscal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Jaimarie Dagdagan, Program Analyst, Fiscal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Adam Drost, Program Analyst, Fiscal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Kelly Richard, 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:

Jonathan Synold, Principal, Advanced Technologies Academy
Anquionetta Springer-Eagles, Administrative School Secretary, Advanced Technologies Academy
Richard Knoeppel, Teacher, Advanced Technologies Academy
Bill Hanlon

Advisory Committee to Monitor the Implementation
of the Reorganization of Large School Districts
September 14, 2017
Page 2

Karl Armstrong
Kathryn Nelligan-Green
Alexis Calin, Student, Advanced Technologies Academy
Greg Cole, Principal, Mojave High School
Kerry Pope, Principal, Southeast Career Technical Academy
Steven Cook
Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent, Clark County School District
Dr. Mike Barton, Chief Academic Officer, Clark County School District
Katie Decker, Principal, Walter Bracken Elementary School, Walter Long Elementary School, Howard Hollingsworth Elementary School
Lee Douglass, Principal, Kitty Ward Elementary School
Glenn Christenson, Chair, Community Implementation Council
Caryne Shea, Vice President, HOPE (Honoring Our Public Education) for Nevada
Anna Slighting, Member, HOPE (Honoring Our Public Education) for Nevada
Dr. Larry Moses
Dr. Lindsey Dalley, Member, Moapa Valley A.B. 394 Community Education Advisory Board Task Force
Bob Sweetin, City Attorney, City of Mesquite
Tom Skancke, President, CEO, TSC² Group
Michael Vannozzi, Vice President of Creative Strategies, TSC² Group
Andrew Doughman, Vice President of Policy and Communication, TSC² Group
Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees
Annette Dawson Owens, Member, Break Free CCSD
Vikki Courtney, President, Clark County Education Association
Frances Martin

Chair Roberson:

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

I will open agenda item II, public comment.

Jonathan Synold (Principal, Advanced Technologies Academy):

I am the principal at Advanced Technologies Academy. We are rated as the number one high school in Nevada. I'm here with my school organizational team (SOT) to talk about the SOT process. I'd like to introduce Anquionetta Springer-Eagles, our support staff representative, and Richard Knoepfel, our teacher representative. We also have two parents and one student representative. We have found the SOT to be successful, and it allows for the flexibility necessary to accomplish goals. The school organizational team has forced me to justify some of my decisions, but in a very respectful manner. Many of our early meetings were spent trying to understand the SOT process and the basics of school budgeting under union contracts and staffing requirements. I have appreciated the SOT tremendously, and they're going to provide their perspective.

I do have a few recommendations for this Committee. The first is to continue to allow for flexibility in the parent representative voting process. We don't have a zip code, so the ability to do online voting has been very beneficial. The second recommendation is to increase the term of each voting member from 1 to 2 years so we're not spending every few meetings at the beginning of the year just teaching the processes of budgeting, union contracts and everything else that goes into a school budget. Finally, I would not have a monthly meeting requirement for SOTs. You should have enough faith in the SOTs that we should be able to determine the necessity of the meetings. This will save time, energy and also encourage more candidates for the SOTs because they know their time will be respected ([Exhibit C](#)).

Anquionetta Springer-Eagles (Administrative School Secretary, Advanced Technologies Academy):

I am the support staff member on the SOT. I just wanted to give my input. As a participant, I feel that the SOT has been a positive model for the support staff. For me to speak on behalf of the support staff gives them a voice to go forth in organizing what goes on with the school and the students. Support staff are not only involved with the school building and with the students, but also have relationships with all the students. Sometimes the students have questions and they come just to support staff. It gives us an opportunity to have a voice to give answers when students have problems with school situations and programs.

Richard Knoeppel (Teacher, Advanced Technologies Academy):

I am currently serving as the chair of the SOT at Advanced Technologies Academy. As a teacher of 31 years, I want to impress upon you the positive mechanism that the SOT has become in our school. During the last 9 months, I've experienced what it's like for a school to feel autonomy and have the ability to make decisions that affect our school and students in a way that we believe is appropriate and not prescriptive. I have witnessed a joint partnership between the administration, licensed personnel, support staff, parents and students with a common goal, where the decisions that are made are agreed upon by representation from all stakeholders. Everybody is engaged and has worked to establish a governance process that is both transparent and genuine. As a result of our SOT's efforts this year, we've been able to work with the budget. We were able to provide goods, services and capital improvements to our building. We have seen increased community engagement. We've seen concrete data of that during our open house and freshmen orientation events where parents, students and the school community actually feel very welcome on our campus. Somewhere in the middle of all this, we actually rebranded our school, which has created a lot more pride in what we do. I was recently reelected, and I'm looking forward to another year of serving on the SOT. I just wanted to say that, if I could find anything that I'd like to see changed, I'd like to see the term limits extended so there's some continuity between the people that are serving on the SOT. I believe they should overlap so there's not a mass exodus, like we're probably going to see at the end of this month. Another thing that's been really positive in our building, especially for non-Clark County School District (CCSD) personnel, is the idea that everybody who wishes to run for

a position should provide a statement as to why they want to serve on the SOT. We make sure the people who are actually putting their names out there are doing it for the right reason ([Exhibit D](#)).

Chair Roberson:

Thank you all. We appreciate those comments, and it's encouraging that you're all happy and satisfied with the direction we're going with the SOTs.

Bill Hanlon:

You're talking about the reorganization because you want to increase student achievement. I just want to remind this group that 10 years ago, CCSD was recognized nationally by multiple organizations as the fastest improving school district in the nation. Under this Governor and this administration, adults' needs have grown greater than the needs of the students. We have seen the results of that. Nevada is ranked dead last in the nation by four or five national organizations. We just got our ACT scores. For God's sake, Mississippi beat us out. We are last in the nation. That should give you some suggestion that some of these things are not working. Some of you talk about a \$500,000,000 increase in taxes last year and what a great accomplishment that was because of all the programs you'd have. Well, programs are only as good as the teachers. The fact of the matter is that those programs were developed at a time when we had a teacher shortage of 1,000 teachers. Not one dime of that money went to attract and retain teachers. So, you're talking about wanting to improve education. You force a school district into making one of two bad choices. By logic, you know that if you only have two choices, increasing class size and having these shortages, and they're both bad, then we have a problem. That problem originated in Carson City. What I would tell you now is that we have so many teachers coming in and teaching to the standards. Teaching to the standard is like teaching to the contract. If you just teach standards, you undermine students' education. So, while the school reorganization doesn't matter to me, it matters to me that we do not have experienced, qualified teachers who have the content knowledge and the knowledge of strategies and resources to support them. Then it doesn't matter what you do or how many times you arrange the chairs on the Titanic. This state is last. Not because of what local school districts have done, but because of what the Legislature has done in terms of putting money in categoricals and not allowing the school districts to have the control they need to ensure they have the personnel to make sure the students' learning experience is positive.

Karl Armstrong:

I serve on the Advanced Technologies Academy SOT. I've served for the last 9 months, and to a certain extent it's been a positive experience. We've gotten to know both the administration of the school and the students in doing what we do, in terms of trying to operate the system that presently exists. It's not perfect. We had a truncated amount of time in which to do what we did, but I think we accomplished a lot during that timeframe. But what we need is for you to give us more time to do the job. It's just a start. We need to understand that we need to keep going forward and not backward. One of the things that

we might really need is more training on the budget and how to do the budget, because a lot of us don't know the exact ins and outs of how CCSD operates. If you give us that and the tools, we can do a good job, since it should be run on a local level because we know our students and our communities.

Kathryn Nelligan-Green:

I also serve on the Advanced Technologies Academy SOT. I think it has gone beautifully. We have done what we had to do in a short amount of time, but it went well. I do agree that a 2-year term might be better, because now we're going to finish and somebody else has to come in and spend a few months training. That just seems like the best approach. At the same time, I can see that term limits could be the length of time your kids are at the school. Overall, it's been a really good experience. I think it's a great plan and one to continue, since it allows the community to interact with the staff.

Alexis Calin (Student, Advanced Technologies Academy):

I'm a senior at Advanced Technologies Academy. I'm heavily involved in Student Council, National Honor Society, Mock Trial and a variety of other extracurricular activities. Therefore, I naturally jumped at the opportunity to serve as the student member on the SOT. I originally joined the SOT in an effort to enact change and involve students in the decisions that directly affect their education and success. My life mantra is, "The opposite of love is indifference," and my position on the SOT has brought me one step closer to curing the indifference in my school. I would describe my time on the SOT as a lesson in professionalism and group decision making, beyond posters and homecoming themes. However, the most important lesson I have learned is one about the unique circumstances of CCSD. We have schools as large as Coronado and as small and charming as Sandy Valley. From my experience, I can see SOTs having equal success in the two drastically different environments. On the note of successes, I have a few that I'd like to quickly mention. This year alone, we've been able to work together to approve the budget for the school year, discuss subsidizing Advanced Placement (AP) tests to make them more accessible to students and undergo a major rebranding that students really seem to enjoy. I think we can attribute our success to the shared spirit of involvement among the student body, faculty, administration and parents. The change has been welcomed with open arms by the Advanced Technologies Academy student body, and I'm pleasantly surprised by the volume of students who have taken an interest in the affairs of the SOT.

Despite the sentiment of success, I see room for improvement, especially from the perspective of a student who has served on the SOT. Whoever the student member may be, they should be required or at least strongly encouraged to participate in Student Council. I've had the opportunity to learn about the success of other organizational teams and discuss shared challenges through my involvement with the Nevada Association of Student Councils. I view this as an invaluable asset. I cannot imagine reaching the goals that we have without my experience in Student Council. Overall, I see a very bright future for the SOTs in Clark County.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you very much. Our future's bright if you're any indication of the children in CCSD. I want to thank all the people from Advanced Technologies Academy who are here. I'm very familiar with Advanced Technologies Academy and their wonderful school, staff and students. Thank you for being so involved and engaged in this process.

Greg Cole (Principal, Mojave High School):

Rather than have all 20 or so of my colleagues come up for public comment, we have prepared a statement, if we'd be allowed to read that in its entirety ([Exhibit E](#)).

Chair Roberson:

How long is the statement?

Mr. Cole:

About 5 minutes.

Chair Roberson:

No, we can't do that.

Mr. Cole:

So, you want us to all come up individually and keep reading from it? It's not going to take 20 minutes. It's quicker to do it this way.

Chair Roberson:

You make a good point. Go ahead.

Kerry Pope (Principal, Southeast Career Technical Academy):

I'm here representing the high school principals of CCSD. We are not here representing the District, but instead representing those on the front lines who will be most affected by the possibly damaging implementation of Assembly Bill (A.B.) 469. At first glance, the theory and intent behind A.B. 469 sounded like a great gift to schools, which would not only gain autonomy but also funds to better serve our students. Greater parent and staff engagement expectations should all lead to better things for what we value most, our students. We want greater successes for them, greater opportunities for 21st Century Learning and greater options for both college and career pathways. Truly, there was excitement for those initial ideas in our ranks to some extent because, as you well know, the current and antiquated DSA (Distributive School Account) is not just inadequate. Quite frankly, it is embarrassing and negligent for responsible funding, comparable to just about every state in the country

that faces the challenges we do in Clark County. With the implementation of A.B. 469, the initial discussions seemed to imply that there would not only be adequate funding in the next session, with Legislators committed to true and responsible funding, but funding that would go directly to schools and all students. But then the details came. The implementation of A.B. 469 does nothing more than create a funding shell game. For instance, if a principal chooses to pay for services outside of the District rather than serving as an instructional leader and focusing on students, they are bargain shopping for services—which, by the way, will likely require a request for proposal (RFP) because it will trigger the legislative threshold for public fund expenditures. Now, rather than focusing on those students, our focus will be on getting through more red tape to save money. This is simply robbing Peter and hoping there's enough money to pay Paul. Let's say there is a savings of \$10,000 for a service. Does this now mean that everyone pats themselves on the back and says, "Look, we funded education and they have extra money now"? The shell game is not won by any means. The Distributive School Account still does not meet the needs of students. The bottom line is that an abysmal funding formula has nothing to do with how much services cost in the District. For instance, saving \$10,000 on custodial services sounds great, until a chiller goes down, which now costs upwards of \$30,000. Those kinds of repairs are not uncommon when there are no funds to maintain schools that are over 20 years old, of which there are literally hundreds in CCSD. If I were to save \$10,000, then I would not necessarily spend it to reduce class sizes. I may just try to save it for a rainy day, of which there are many. Computers break, chillers need repairs, printers die and students need books. What exactly has been saved by this school community if I then need to save for those things rather than spending it on meeting the needs of kids? In reality, choosing outside vendors on many items could eventually cost schools more.

However, the budget impact will be, as it always is, on the backs of our students. Class sizes of over 30 are rarely heard of at any grade level nationwide. Let me say that again. Class sizes of over 30 are rarely heard of nationwide, and yet our high school classes regularly start at around 40-plus students. Do you really wonder why student achievement is so challenging? Do you know what it's like to try to recruit teachers from other states when they have never had more than 25 students in a classroom? When they ask us, we tell them our numbers. They start off with pure shock on their faces, then ask if we're joking. Then they leave for just about every other state represented at that particular college or recruitment fair. I daresay anyone in this room went to high school and had classes over 30. I daresay anyone in this room went to an urban school where the challenges faced even come close to what our amazing teachers and staff deal with on a daily basis. Make no mistake, our teachers are amazing.

During Education Week in 2016, data from the U.S. Census Bureau outlined funding for all school districts in the United States. Clark County was the only underfunded district in Nevada, and it was underfunded by 33 percent compared to the national average for per-pupil expenditures. Unless you graduated from Clark County in the past 10 years, I would bet that not one of you went to a school where you were underfunded by 33 percent. The most grossly underfunded district in the state is the one you have targeted to reorganize. Perhaps the focus could have been on bridging that gap, rather than expecting principals to bridge it for you. Let's be clear, that's what wasn't mentioned in theory, but what's about to

happen in reality. We are underfunded, so we have to find new ways to cut corners. We are underfunded, so now we have to take our focus off of our jobs to manage more outside entities, paperwork and bureaucracy to try to scrape together funds that, if we weren't 33 percent below the national average, would be available to accomplish the greatest needs we have: lowering class sizes and having a high-quality educator in every classroom where they can focus on teaching and learning. You are not doing your job, and because of that you are asking that we no longer do ours. Again, that will make us, the principals, teachers and parents, the scapegoats in the continued flat-lining of our school data and progress. We need champions of public education, not people who seem focused on its demise.

Just how far off the mark are you in relation to funding? Just what do the largest urban districts get? Across the U.S., states' education spending averaged \$10,700 per pupil in 2013, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. But that average masked a wide variation, ranging from \$6,555 per pupil in Utah to \$19,818 in New York. According to recent U.S. Census Bureau data, in the largest school district, New York City, the per-pupil funding is \$25,000, with \$20,000 going to a per-pupil expenditure. In Clark County, the estimate puts us at \$9,100 allocated, with \$7,800 as a per-pupil expenditure. Los Angeles Unified gets \$10,600 per pupil and Chicago gets \$11,900. As a state, we are way off. If you knew this during the legislative session, would you have focused differently? The only thing agreed upon for funding students in Clark County during that session was to essentially decrease funding and then take what was left and make them "find the cuts" and call it "increasing autonomy." Let's do some math. What if our per-pupil expenditure was raised to that of the next urban district's that we are closest to, which is L.A. Unified? Remember, they get \$10,600. If our principals received an additional \$2,000 per pupil, still lower than L.A. Unified by \$800, at a school of 2,000 students, which is a small number for a CCSD high school, then it would add \$4,000,000 to a school budget. So, if we were funded below the national average but closer to L.A. Unified, it would essentially add 46 teachers to a school and would get class size ranges in the low thirties. That's still above the national average of, depending on the source, between 24.1 and 27.3. If you have us choose custodians and services with a computer-based technician, we still have those costs. At best, a high school might save \$100,000. That will get them one additional teaching position and possibly some money for a few prep buyouts. It won't reduce average class sizes at any school by any noticeable amount.

When you don't create an environment conducive to learning, you don't grow. When you don't support teachers and give them class sizes where they can reach every student, you don't grow. Our teachers are superstars. The way they are vilified is so unjust, because they work miracles day in and day out in an environment that should make you shudder. They are the reason graduation rates have increased. We do what we can to support them. Now it's your turn. No, it's your obligation to do the same. You've created nothing short of a hostile work environment where high school teachers cram into classrooms with outdated resources, facility neglect and 40-plus students. And yet the most amazing people show up every day to teach, mentor, protect, guide and nurture.

We believe that you love kids and believe in them, and you believe in teachers and schools where amazing things happen every single day. Those of us here today believe the intent

was genuine and meant to better our system. What we believe, though, is not congruent with reality. Nowhere does this kind of work increase community and parent involvement, teacher support, autonomy or student engagement and success. It's simply moving the shells once we hit this stage of implementation. It got twisted and political, and didn't fulfill any of those original tenets we kept hearing about when this started. And that is truly a shame.

What you ask of us is not acceptable. You should want us to focus on our students, teachers, parents and community. You should focus on a 33 percent deficit. Once you fix it, Nevada will make even bigger moves than we have in the past few years, despite efforts to divide and undermine our duty to best serve our kids. Our students deserve your attention. Our businesses deserve a solid workforce. Our colleges deserve the best and brightest. Assembly Bill 469 is not going to get us there without proper DSA funding. Instead, it is an obstacle that takes our focus off of what matters most. As you gear up for another legislative session, focus on our students. Focus on our teachers and our community. Enough with the shells. Focus on substantive financial reform that will positively change the trajectory of our economy and the lives of our most important resource, our kids ([Exhibit E](#)).

Steven Cook:

I'm a parent on Legacy High School's SOT. I just wanted to say that the SOT is awesome. It's a diverse group of parents and education professionals. We have done a lot of great things over the past year. Most of what I'd like to say would just be parroting everybody else. They only started in January, so saying a year isn't really true. As a parent, I've learned to speak the language. When I say that, it's important because I can speak to my fellow parents and provide a better understanding of how the school is moving forward and what some of these things we see on television actually mean to our kids. That's been golden. So, an increase of the term would be good because of the learning curve. We need all of our principals to focus on our students and the education professionals, probably not so much building custodians, maintenance and stuff like that. We really, really want them to focus on the students and use their expertise as they've been trained to use it.

Chair Roberson:

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

I will now open agenda item IV, approval of the minutes from the August 7, 2017 meeting ([Exhibit F](#)).

SENATOR HARRIS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 7, 2017 MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO MONITOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REORGANIZATION OF LARGE SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Roberson:

During the last meeting, we received an update on what has been happening with the reorganization of CCSD. We'll continue to receive updates. Today, we will also receive the final report from the consultant and the Community Implementation Council (CIC). I just wanted to say a few words about what's been going on. We've all been reading the paper, and there was a CIC meeting yesterday. First of all, if I hear one more time that this reorganization is not about achievement, I'm going to become exasperated. Everything we did in 2015, everything, was about student achievement. That's what this implementation of the reorganization is about. I don't know if it would help to set a timer and say "achievement" every 15 minutes, if that would make some people feel better. But the heart of this reorganization is about moving the maximum amount of money possible to school strategic budgets so schools, teachers, principals and parents can make decisions on how to spend money in their schools to improve students' academic achievement. That's what this is about, in a very transparent way.

We could talk all day about what we've been hearing lately about this budget deficit. I don't want to do that. I don't think that's going to be productive. There's been a lot of finger pointing about why there's a budget deficit with CCSD all of the sudden. We have a mission on this Committee, and that's to see through the implementation of this reorganization. From my perspective, if we implement this reorganization, what's happening right now with the budget deficit and the finger pointing as to why there's a budget deficit will be very unlikely, because there will be much greater transparency. Everyone will see where the money's going. It's going to the schools' strategic budgets. In a public process through the SOTs, through collaboration with principals, teachers, support staff and parents, we're going to see how those decisions were made to spend those dollars to help our students achieve. So, I know there'll probably be questions today. Issues will come up with regard to the budget deficit. I want to remind everyone to focus on this Committee's purpose, to monitor to implementation of the reorganization. To the extent there are questions regarding how this budget deficit is going to affect the amount of money going to schools and how this budget deficit is going to affect the implementation of the reorganization, I think those questions are appropriate. But I would ask everyone to look forward, not backward. We are where we are today. It's not productive to start throwing around blame. I certainly have strong opinions about why we have the budget deficit, but again, that's not the mission today. Maybe there'll be another day where we'll have that kind of exchange. But that kind

of exchange could go on all day without any resolution or any improvement going forward with regard to the implementation of the reorganization.

Right now, CCSD is providing 55 percent of the unrestricted general fund moneys to schools through strategic budgets. The law requires 80 percent this school year and 85 percent next school year. Right now, CCSD is not in compliance with state law. The mission of this Committee is to work with CCSD to try to help the District get on track so they are in compliance with the law as soon as feasibly possible. So, as we have this discussion today and as we learn more from CCSD and other interested stakeholders, I hope everyone will focus on our mission going forward, which is the implementation of this reorganization.

I will now ask Superintendent Pat Skorkowsky to come forward.

Pat Skorkowsky (Superintendent, Clark County School District):

It is our pleasure to be here today to give you another update on the implementation of the Clark County Schools Achieve reorganization effort. My team has continued to work diligently with the assistance of the TSC² group, and we are maintaining a concentrated effort on this work. Today, Dr. Mike Barton, a few principals and I will give you an update on the work that has been continuing since we last presented to you and how the work will continue in our preparation for the 2018-2019 School Year with the upcoming January 15, 2018, deadline.

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

I just wanted to take us through a couple of review slides ([Exhibit G](#)). Before I do that, I want to give some thanks. Obviously, in the work to get us to this point, it has been insightful to learn from our school associate superintendents, other central departments and principals. As we've looked at the transfer of responsibilities, we've framed all of our work in some of these factors that are on the slide in front of you. I'll just review them quickly. With the transfer of responsibilities, each local school precinct shall receive funds based on prescribed allocations. Secondly, as we consider all of these transfers, we need to scrub all of the federal, state and local laws to ensure we're not violating any federal or state legislation. Thirdly, it's important that there are requirements with prescribed curricular guidelines and licensure requirements that must be met. So, as we consider transfers, we need to ensure that the "what" of teaching, which is the curriculum, has been considered. Finally, Mike Strembitsky helped us with principles of organization in the beginning of this work. Those are the "what" to think about as you do a big organizational shift. We need to ensure that, as local school precincts consider these decisions, the principles of organization for the entire organization are considered. One of the principles that is most important, and I think I've heard this loud and clear from many of my colleagues and from principals in the field, is that as these transfers of responsibility are considered, the one principle that comes to mind is, "Do no harm." So, I think many of our principals are cognizant and they want to make sure they do no harm to the overall system. So, for instance, they have worries for their colleague down the street at another school.

So, these areas are being considered for transfer at this point, and I'll talk us through these and how this will get us into compliance with the law by January 15 ([Exhibit G](#)). These are put into phrases, some of which are attached to positions. So, one area that is being considered is school guidance and counseling services, which are positions. That is something that is in the strategic budgets already for principals. There is an issue of inconsistency with autonomies. Secondary schools have more autonomy now than their elementary colleagues, so that's an area we're looking at as far as more autonomy. Next is school technical support and compliance, which are site-based technicians. Those are support staff positions in schools that provide support for hardware and the infrastructure on a campus to keep the technology going. The next three boxes are related to special education. For special education, whether it's the resource positions, self-contained teaching units, assistants or aides, those have all been a centrally-funded dollar amount. With the plan for the transfer of responsibilities, if approved by the Board, those dollars would then be shown in the strategic budget. However, considering the federal requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), there may be limited flexibility there. Physical education instruction is another one. There's also safety in physical education instruction. Again, that's thinking about the autonomy secondary schools have compared to elementary schools. Our elementary schools have physical education assistants, so we're looking at that as an autonomy, or a dollar amount, being in the strategic budget where flexibility is offered to the principal. Ensuring a clean and well-maintained school facility involves site-based custodians. So, what is the appetite from our principals regarding the transfer of responsibilities and potential vendor service? I'll go over some data points in a minute about how our principals are feeling about that. Last on this slide is instruction for gifted and talented students. That is a dollar amount that would go in strategic budgets. So, with everything shown to you today, that would provide another \$470,000,000 of unrestricted general fund dollars that would be placed in school budgets. That represents roughly 20 percent of the general fund budget. This is what I want to illustrate for you today. Those dollars go in the budget. I think what we're hearing is, then what are the flexibilities for principals and SOTs?

We're also looking at utilities as a potential transfer to the strategic budgets. Here's the thing, though. We want to make sure we do this carefully, working with building principals. If the utility dollar amounts are transferred into strategic budgets for 2018 by this January, there may not be a lot of flexibility. We need to shore up the numbers and look at the utility cost for buildings longitudinally. Some principals may have an older facility. We want to make sure this is a reciprocal process, where we're working together to determine that an appropriate utility dollar amount is going to the school. Then we go to January 2019, when the utility cost is going to that strategic budget. That's when, after we shore up those numbers, the principals and SOTs will have some flexibility if they come in under the utility amount that's been self-determined through the interaction. Then, there could be substantial savings through energy savings and initiatives that may occur on the campus to save dollars. So, that is where we are with the transfer of responsibilities and the buckets that are being considered.

The next slide shows you where we are right now as far as those recommendations I just reviewed. I think you've seen this slide before, but I just want to make sure you recall that

we have a process that's been developed through a logic flowchart. It's pretty detailed. It talks about the potential consequences of a transfer and the monetary amounts attached to those transfers going to the schools. But the long and the short of it is that we are still at the recommendation stage. We've had associate superintendents run meetings with principals to get feedback on some of these transfers. We've had informal conversations where principals are talking to SOT members individually about these recommendations. We envision that, in the next several weeks as we get through this budget crisis situation we're in, September and October SOT meetings will be devoted to this very topic on the transfer of responsibilities. After we get feedback from the field and those closest to the work, a recommendation will go to our School Board in November. That will determine whether all of those items that were discussed previously will be transferred into the school budgets. So, we're still in the blue ([Exhibit G](#)), moving quickly to the green by that November timeline, and then yellow is all about implementation and getting those dollars into the January strategic budgets for the schools. Some of those things, like special education as I said before, will show the schools what they have as far as dollar amounts. But again, there are federal requirements where there may be limited autonomy because of federal guidelines.

So, the reality of this is that as we've had these meetings, talking to principals—I know that the last time we met with this group and other groups, we talked about the autonomy continuum survey that's been provided to principals on two occasions. We wanted to continue to drill down on that data. Of course our principals want greater autonomy. They want greater decision making regarding their school plans of operation and staff coming into their buildings to work with them. They want to make sure that customer service is at an optimal level. So, those are things we're finding from our principals as we're continuing to ask these questions through surveys and in-person meetings.

So, the next couple slides are pretty compelling ([Exhibit G](#)). I just want to put that out there. We asked particularly about school-based custodial staff. Many of these responses may be aligned to the previous testimony about additional dollars. But I want to share this custodial slide with you and what our principals are feeling about that as a transfer of responsibility, particularly looking at it from an outside vendor standpoint. Two hundred and forty-two of our principals really don't want that outside vendor. What they want is increased autonomy regarding staff selection or the supervision of that personnel. They want to be able to have a custodian of their choice to work with them in their buildings. Additionally, the blue figure indicates that our principals are continuously saying that customer service has to be improved with our Central Office supports, including custodial or any other service. So, that's what we're doing. From that end count of 267, 25 of our principals said they want to explore an outside vendor. So right now, our recommendation, if approved by our Board, is that we're going to pursue a potential RFP for those individual schools.

The next slide gives you additional data regarding site-based technicians, the other area that came up pretty high on the continuum survey with our principals. Again, what we're hearing from principals is that they want more selection authority to be able to determine who comes into their building to work in that position. But we do have 17 principals who would like to pursue an outside vendor of some kind. As I said with the school-based

custodians, after approval from our Board, we as a District are willing to pursue an RFP for an outside vendor for that pocket of schools, if this is a transfer of responsibility.

The next slide is pretty compelling as well. As we asked questions of our principals, it kept coming back to greater money, greater autonomy and greater customer service. Another question we asked was, "What are your interests in greater input on staff selection and supervision?" We can learn a lot from this slide. I want to explain this program that we used. At performance zone meetings with our principals, we had a live survey on the two data sets I just shared with you. This data set gets put into a "wordle." The principals provided on-the-spot feedback on their smartphones about what they have a greater interest in regarding staff selection and supervision. If the word is bigger in this menti.com survey, it means that that had the most responses. We can still learn a lot from this survey as far as what our principals are feeling, but they answered many of the questions with "none." But again, we can learn a lot from this.

With your permission, Chair Roberson, I have two principals here. They probably had different answers on the survey that I just shared, but they can provide some insight on their thinking regarding customer service, perhaps from the central standpoint and maybe the outside-vendor standpoint as well. But they can talk a little bit about some of that data from the entirety of the principals that was just shared with you.

Chair Roberson:

That'd be great. Thank you, Dr. Barton.

Katie Decker (Principal, Walter Bracken Elementary School, Walter Long Elementary School, Howard Hollingsworth Elementary School):

One of the things that being an empowerment principal many years ago allowed us was the flexibility to really dig into our budget, really look at every penny that we were spending and maximize those resources for students. When it comes to custodial services, the night services are what I'm most interested in contracting out. By having responsibility of an employee, it's a whole other ball of wax. I have to supervise, monitor and have meetings all the time with them. I would like a service that I would be able to call. I would like the service to start after all of our after-school activities. So, if a company could bring in 5 people, clean the building in 5 hours and have it all done outside of the school day—not interrupting, not tripping around, not having custodial cuts during our stories and snacks or events—that would be a preference on my part, not to mention if it's saving money. If it's more expensive, then I'll keep what I've got. But if it's cheaper and if it works out better for our school and for the systems we've put into place, I would like the opportunity to consider that. Also, it will take off busy work that I don't need to be dealing with. The same thing comes with a site-based technician. That's an employee with a daily schedule that I have to manage. At the beginning of the year, we might have tons of things that need to get done that one person can't possibly accomplish. But if I were able to outsource that to a company that could send in 10 people for the first month, then I don't need anybody for a few months. Maybe I'd call in once or twice or have a work order, something like that. So, managing somebody over a

long period of time is a challenge. It's also a challenge when they're out. I've got one now that's out for 2 months, so I'm having to call in. I actually like the service I'm getting better from calling in, so I definitely would like to consider that. So, it just comes down to the fact that we've got really big budgets, and if there's a way to save money and be more efficient or a way to get those resources to our kids—with three schools, if I could leverage those resources between the three, that's even better. So, we would just appreciate more flexibility.

Lee Douglass (Principal, Kitty Ward Elementary School):

I was at one of the former empowerment schools about 7 seven years ago. We had in-depth training. I'm probably one of the eldest principals in the District. I've been in education for 47 years as a teacher, an administrator in the Central Office, a building principal and a national consultant. So, I've had a very varied background. I came from a school district 23 years ago that had empowerment, and we received our entire budgets. I greatly caution the decisions. Every principal here is not thoroughly trained in empowerment, and every principal is not ready for the responsibility to transfer those responsibilities. Every principal wants more money. We need more money to run our schools. I know you said not to bring up the budget, but the budget is the issue. We need money to be able to fund our schools to increase student achievement and for our kids and teachers to be successful. But what I warn is that we're asking people to judge what responsibilities they want to transfer, but they don't realize that. They're thinking, "I want more money," and they're not looking at the situation. When you transfer that responsibility into your budget, then you're responsible for replacing that, because you have to have the service. So, it may end up costing you more. I was warning principals at the last principals' meeting, "Be careful what you're asking for without really knowing what you're asking for." For instance, in Virginia Beach, I was plotting bus routes. They gave us that. I was ordering food. I was ordering my cafeteria manager. That takes your focus as a principal off of what you're supposed to be focused on. We're focused on student achievement.

I feel that we have to be very careful in this process and not go so quickly that we destroy all the good things that have been put in place for this reorganization. For instance, our associate superintendents only have 25 schools now. My associate superintendent has already been in my building three times in the 3 weeks since school started. I believe in the steps we're taking right now as a District to open communication. To me, empowerment is collaboration. It's speaking with all stakeholders. I feel that we have taken a very positive step towards opening those communications and building a better rapport between the different departments. We have a great system, but everything needs work, such as my building, for instance. I'm very proud of it, but there's always more that we can do to become better. In the last 2 years, I've seen the greatest improvement in communication between our departments and our schools. There's a willingness to be a partner with us, instead of just another outside department. So, I just caution that we go through this carefully and we look at the developmental levels of each principal. Everyone is not well trained in this process.

It's a great improvement to see the SOTs come onboard and the beautiful work that we're doing as communities. Last year I received two different business partners, and they're on our SOT. It's just building a community of support, dialogue and collaboration around us. That's the power of empowerment, being able to all have a voice and being able to work together collaboratively to help your school become better and your students achieve more.

I'm not at an English Language Learner (ELL) school. I was ELL all the way until I opened my last two schools. When I was ELL, I would be voting for more ELL services. I would never give that up, and the District has a wonderful program of support for our ELL students. This year, I have 10 students who are qualified as ELL at my school. I've never heard of only 10 ELL students in Las Vegas, but here I am. For me as a principal, I would like that to be one of my pieces that I could say, "I really don't need that ELL help. I think we have the resources within our building to accommodate those 10 students." But if I were still at Gragson Elementary School, I'd say, "No way, I'm not giving that up." So, we need to be able to look at individual schools' needs, where they are, what services they need and what services they would be willing to take that responsibility for. But as far as what we've done in the last 2 years, it's been amazing to watch the growth, and I'm very proud to be a CCSD principal. It's a great community and a great district.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you, Ms. Douglass, and I appreciate your comments as well as Ms. Decker's. I'd like to make a couple points. First of all, we can certainly talk about the budget. That's an integral part of what we're doing. My only point was that I don't want this Committee getting in food fights with the witnesses over who's to blame for the budget deficit, because that could distract us from what we have to focus on, which is the reorganization and implementation. Second, you're absolutely correct. Not every principal has an ability level today to take on many of the services that are currently provided by Central Services. That's why the beauty of this reorganization is that every principal gets to decide, in collaboration with their SOTs, whether they want to continue to purchase the same services they're receiving now from Central. So, not everybody has to be like you, Ms. Douglass, or you, Ms. Decker. Every school is individualized and they will make that decision for themselves. I don't want any principal to think, "I can't do this. How am I going to do this going forward if I can't continue to use the services I've been receiving from Central Services?" Of course they can. That's a decision they make in collaboration with their SOT. So, every school will be different, and I think that's the way this was designed by Mr. Strembitsky and this Committee. By the way, Mr. Strembitsky's here. We're very glad to see you here today. That's the beauty of how this is supposed to work. If a principal wants to continue to receive the same services he or she has been receiving from Central Services, he or she can do that.

Assemblywoman Dina Neal (Assembly District No. 7):

Since you are on the blue space for recommendations ([Exhibit G](#)), where is the District in regard to doing the cost-benefit analysis around utilities? Because I don't see how pushing that forward serves the functionality of the principal in his instructional leader role. Also, if

we're going to do the outside vendor, and the idea that 25 principals would like an outside vendor, how are we going to determine whether or not these are good or bad choices? Because it seems like you're going to have to remove a custodian and place them somewhere, and I want to know what the outcome of that is.

Dr. Barton:

Regarding utilities, we're still at a stage where we're costing out that dollar amount. As I said before, considering the varying ages of the facilities, this is a number that we don't just want to toss out there, because we want feedback from principals. We've got to work with our facility people, because we know that if we put a number out there in their budgets that may be off, and then it becomes actionable next year—it won't be actionable this year, because we want to make sure there's a truing-up process with the principals and the departments to make sure the number they're getting is accurate, because the worst scenario we could be in with utilities is if a number goes out and then it does become actionable in 2019. Let's say the building is off and they go over by \$30,000. Where does that money come from? In theory, the answer is that it comes out of the school-based budget. So, calculating the utility cost won't be 100 percent accurate because of utility price fluctuations, but we need to make sure that we continue to work on that. So, the short answer is that we're still getting those numbers identified.

On the vendor piece, 25 principals are interested in the outsourcing, more or less, of school-based custodial staff. That's going to require sitting down with those 25 principals as an RFP is built. What are the specifications in that RFP? Ms. Decker made it clear that she has a need for night custodians. We don't know yet what the 24 other principals' needs or specifications may be. So, it's going to be important that we build this RFP with that group as a starting point to see what the cost-benefit may be. That's going to be after the RFP is put out to see which companies express interest after the specifications are built. But to your point, I think there are some complexities with this, and we're very well aware of that.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I disagree with utilities being transferred. Number one, because of the facility-equity issue. If we're at Matt Kelly Elementary School, where you have a super old building, and you transfer that cost to the principal and they have to then somehow shift their money from something else because they have an astronomical energy bill, and now they can't pay for something that students need, that is not a conversation we should even anticipate for the future. That's just being smart off the top and saying, "I'm not going to go there."

Then, with the custodian piece, the thing that comes to my mind is the contract that you'll have, whether or not that's an RFP. You get a custodian, and let's say you don't like them. There are checks that have to happen for the individual who goes in there, like renegotiating the contract. What's the termination of that individual after 3 weeks or 6 months? There are costs when you have to keep getting someone back into place because you don't like them or they aren't doing a service. Then, we're changing a salary component to a profit component for a business. That is an entirely different conversation, because a wage that

you pay to somebody hourly is much different than the cost overhead I'm going to give you for the six employees I need to walk into your building.

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

I share similar concerns with my colleague Assemblywoman Neal. But where I'm most concerned is when we look at programming, especially for our kids who are most in need or special education students. Recently, there was an article highlighting how there has been increasing litigation over special education students and their families. Maybe we're not meeting the needs of the children, and therefore these things happen. So, I'm really, really concerned, because I think that is a very important and sensitive area that we should pay extra special attention to. So, first and foremost, I want you to spell out what assistance to students with disabilities per Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) requirements means. Because I think a layperson who's not in a school, like some of us who are not breathing and living this, doesn't know what that means. So, can you give us more depth as to what that means? Also, can you spell things out as far as instructional support, technical support and compliance monitoring?

Dr. Barton:

I want to be clear with that, because I think you bring up a very good point. As far as how much autonomy will really exist when the special education dollars are transferred into the strategic budgets, federally speaking, I would say minimal, because there are those federal requirements that need to be followed. So for a resource teacher or self-contained units that are in the budget of a principal, there are going to be limited changes that can occur, because there are requirements for class size with self-contained units, for instance, or in a resource room, the number of aides that need to be provided per student or caseload for IEP (individualized education plan) students. So, when you look at the dollars for special education, it's a transfer into the strategic budgets, but as far as principals and SOTs being able to maneuver things, it's very limited because of the laws. Again, with the first slide I shared regarding the federal laws and the state laws, that is all being considered with these transfers of responsibility. If anything, it is showing how much they're getting for special education requirements and services on a school-by-school basis. But again, as far as autonomy, to just be 100 percent transparent, it's not like a principal's going to be able to go in there and say, "I'm going to reduce this resource room teacher and do something else," because they won't be allowed to do that.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

Okay. I guess my major concern is that not all principals are special education experts. Not all principals are gifted and talented education (GATE) experts. So, if we start delegating those responsibilities onto the school, I'm already hearing from the administrators that have come to speak before us today that their plates are pretty full. Adding one more thing onto that plate that's already full means they're overwhelmed. So, they're going to be prioritizing, and sometimes maybe our GATE students might be the least of their priorities because they have more pressing priorities to get to. So, I guess the point being made is that we need to

be very strategic as to the supports we leave in place so principals can seek those experts to come and help their staff with those areas. I think special education and GATE are areas where—maybe I was a physical education coach all of my teaching career and I know very little about these two areas, so I as an instructional leader cannot give them that support. So, where am I going to seek that help and support when they come with questions I don't know the answers to? So, I just think we need to try to strike a careful balance with as many of these areas as possible. I know we don't want to talk about the dollars, but when the dollars are pressing, sometimes we rush in to make some of these decisions that I think, later, we're going to be having to revisit.

Dr. Barton:

Great points. I think principals have made it loud and clear through this dialogue and through our interactions in surveys and meetings that they want to make sure instruction remains their focus. They know that's a priority, being the principal, or the principal-teacher on a campus, if you will. Knowing that these services or dollars are going to be highlighted in the strategic budgets doesn't mean that the Central Service support for that goes away, for instance with special education or even ELL. We are challenged right now with some reductions from a budget standpoint, but we know that the central services for those federal requirements are paramount. But I think it goes back to the point that we've been hearing from principals all along, that they want stellar service from a Central standpoint. So, I think we're learning that with the transfer of responsibility, we'll learn what individual principals want. But, I think we'll also put a microscope on those central services to make sure they're providing the best services to principals.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

There's the elephant in the room ([Exhibit G](#)). There are a lot of elephants in the room right now. I think one of the things that we need your assistance with the most is staffing. When it comes to the selection of staff, support staff, teachers and principals, right now they can be placed in schools according to the collective bargaining agreements, yet that's in direct conflict with the language in [A.B. 469](#). We actually need some clarification. We would request that you ask the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) for some clarification so we can ensure that we can work together. Right now, we would have to negotiate any changes in that placement piece. So, we're willing to do that, but it really behooves us to have an opinion from LCB so that we can use that to guide the process as we go forward.

Chair Roberson:

We'll work on that, absolutely. I do want to make the point, though, that this is a state law, so any future collective bargaining agreements need to be in compliance with state law. As to the question of which prevails right now, an existing collective bargaining agreement and its provisions or [A.B. 469](#), I will simply say that both the Clark County Education Association and the Clark County Association of School Administrators have said multiple times on the record that they're not going to let their collective bargaining agreements get in the way of this law. I can't speak for the support staff. If I've misspoken, I see representatives from

those two unions here. Please come up and correct me. But, we should be able to address these issues even if the existing collective bargaining agreements override A.B. 469 from a legal perspective. We should be able to come to an agreement on those issues, because both unions have been part of this process and said repeatedly that they're willing to work through those with CCSD to ensure that A.B. 469 is implemented as intended.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Thank you for that. I think our principals are most happy to hear that, because the upcoming teacher surplus means that people will be shifting in buildings. With teacher surplus, the administrator has no control over that. It is a teacher selection process where they go in and select a position they are qualified for. So, the important thing is that we get these pieces worked out. I'm willing to work with the associations and make sure that that happens.

We are working hard on the next piece. One of the pieces that I just wanted to remind the Committee members about is being able to get to the 85 percent. The challenge will be that we have to put utilities into the budget. That doesn't mean they have flexibility with utilities. Ms. Decker just said to me a few minutes ago, "If I could turn up the temperature in our building one or two degrees, I would save money and be able to use that somewhere else." Now that's a building principal who's thinking about the process. I know we have challenges with that in our system, but if there are things that we can work on, then she potentially may be able to keep the savings and use those dollars in other capacities. So, it makes our buildings greener. She is in an older building at Walter Bracken Elementary School. Long Elementary School is an older building, but Hollingsworth Elementary School is a newer building that may have better structures. She can adjust accordingly and make that work for her.

Chair Roberson:

To that point again, because we've heard a bit about this today, I want to clarify what the law provides. If a principal and an SOT determine, in a collaborative way, that they want to continue to purchase their utility services from Central, they're able to do that. In effect, they're receiving the same service tomorrow that they received yesterday, and CCSD has to provide the amount of money that it previously provided for the service. So, there should not be a situation where Matt Kelly Elementary School or another school decides to continue to procure utility services from CCSD and is out a penny. Would you agree with that, Superintendent Skorkowsky?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I would, unless they're leaving the lights on at Matt Kelly all night long. Then there's a problem. So yes, I agree with you. We have to be willing to work with all of our schools in this process. We can't afford to put the utility cost onto a school. We understand that completely.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

We will be transferring the money, because that's one of the only ways we're going to get to the 88 percent, which we anticipate we will be at by January 15. Again, that doesn't mean they're going to have complete flexibility with the money, as you've heard with special education and other pieces.

Chair Roberson:

But the important thing is that the schools that want the flexibility will have it.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

In the areas that the law allows, they will have flexibility. The challenge is going to be making sure we can do this in a timely manner. It has to happen each year, opening up that flexibility for schools to choose more or less autonomy, and that is the structure we are putting in place right now and working so hard to get in place by the January 15 date. One of the challenges we're a little bit concerned about is with our support staff, who may or may not be in the room, I haven't checked yet. The challenge is making sure we are giving them that voice as well. We know that sometimes our schools have to make very tough decisions, and sometimes it is their support staff that unfortunately loses out in the process.

So as you know, we talked about the budget shortfall. We're not going to get into that, but our goal is to get back up. The most important things on this slide ([Exhibit G](#)) are the last two dots on the graph. That is the gap we are trying to fill right now between our money that is coming in and our expenditures. You will see that by "amended final budget for Fiscal Year 2018," we will be back in alignment. The next slide is nothing that you haven't seen before. It is the number of cuts that we've had in the District in the past. One of the things that is not on there is that, unfortunately, the State went through an extreme crisis and \$85,000,000 was taken from our debt reserves for capital programs over a 4-year period. That is money that is not reflected in here. So, let's look at some of the things we are challenged with, and I think you guys are all aware of the unfunded mandate piece. Right now, this talks about just the special education funding. This is not the extent of it, just one piece of it. I think I got the number this morning. It's \$351 [sic] in the Fiscal Year 2017 budget that we had to take from general funds to supply the necessary services for all of our students that are identified with an IEP. One of the things that is a bit of a struggle for us is that we are required to pay for the English proficiency assessments, which are required by state law. That's another \$5,300,000. The reading proficiency assessments that are now required for kindergarten through third grade are \$1,700,000. With Breakfast After the Bell, it's an additional \$920,000 that we have to put into the budget. There are also elevator inspections and other unfunded mandates that we are struggling to fill as we go forward.

Let's look at the budget challenges. I had some conversations the other day with Assemblywoman Carlton from the Assembly Ways and Means Committee about the timing of our legislative calendar and the Department of Taxation's requirements for budget deadlines. Based upon the State's estimations, we anticipated that we would be receiving \$152 per student during the legislative session. Our budgets in April and May were based upon that estimation from the State Department of Education. Yet when the funding bill dropped, that decreased to \$126. So, we had two budgets approved prior to getting an actual number that we were able to build our budget on. I know that, in any family, if you don't know the expenses that are coming in, it's hard to make a budget that is going to cover the mortgage, food and everything else. We're struggling with that process, and we would ask the Legislature to look at that in 2019. It doesn't impact municipalities nearly as much as it impacts us, because we are dependent on two funding sources: the local services tax and the DSA. Not knowing a specific DSA and not really, truly following the intent of Education First, which was to fund education early so we could make those decisions for our budgets in time, has not been beneficial for us. The categorical versus base funding is always a struggle for us, because we can only use categoricals for specific things. I understand the need, but I think we took an important step forward with Senate Bill (S.B.) 178 in the weighted funding piece, and we need to continue that step next session. Modernizing the funding formula is also of the utmost importance. We know that the State Department is putting out an RFP. We would ask that that also include a transition of how we would move from the current Nevada Plan into a weighted funding formula, so they can help guide the work in future legislative sessions. At the district level, we're dealing with some other pieces, such as manual payroll processes, which we are going to be able to get in place very soon with the money from the Legislature, which we're most appreciative of. With risk management, we've had a number of lawsuits. Our actuarial costs went up significantly, so much that state law required us to put an additional \$3,800,000 into an account that cannot be touched. We're shifting our current payroll programs. Then, as always, collective bargaining and arbitration decisions have an impact on our budget.

This slide just goes over our budget shortfall. You have seen this. It's been in the newspaper. I'm not going to go into it in detail. But it does explain how we got here. We have to come together as a community to figure out how we can push forward and build the understanding of Southern Nevada and the way it is funded and the opportunities that we have in the 2019 Legislative Session to make sure that you as Southern Nevada Legislators and us as Southern Nevada constituents are able to change the formula to benefit our Southern Nevada students in the process. It's important because we need to change the way we budget. We have a budget taskforce being led by many accounting and financial members of the community. We are creating another taskforce that includes how we prepare for the legislative session to make sure these things get changed, because our budgeting process changes significantly with A.B. 469. This will impact how we get funds from the Legislature as well if it doesn't fit into our new budgeting process as we go forward. So, we'll be talking about that in more detail.

There's the rural school funding piece, and I know that's going to come up. We are talking about the local school precincts in a geographic area and defining those as our rural schools. One of the challenges we face is that our rural schools vary in number significantly.

We have Goodsprings Elementary School, which may have anywhere from 8 to 11 students. There may be up to 16 students this year, and that's a boom for that school. We also have large elementary schools of 300 or 400 students in our rural community. So, as we are going forward, we are looking at the law very carefully. The strategic budgets will represent what is in the law. Those will come out on Monday. There are some challenges, though. Proportionality is an important one. If a rural community were to decrease in population, the per-pupil funding would then decrease as well, because we aren't allowed to add funds to a school other than what they have earned in that process. So, we have to be very careful about this in the future, because if we have a community that drops significantly, we're not able to give them the per-pupil funding explicitly. The next piece is that we have to look at very low enrollment. When enrollment grows, how do we accommodate for that? It may be able to be built into the system. But if we go from 16 students to 32 students at Goodsprings, it may not mean that their budget necessarily doubles because of all the ancillary services that are provided as a small school allocation.

I'm going to turn it over to Dr. Barton. He's going to talk a little bit about addressing SOT conflicts, and I think that's important to note.

Dr. Barton:

AS you heard this morning in public testimony, the SOTs have been a powerful structure where those closest to the work are involved in decisions, collaboration and really the improvement of our schools. While many of our SOT stories are successes across the board, there are some rare occasions—and I want to say that again, rare occasions—where there may be ongoing potential conflicts within an SOT. So, we are looking at addressing those conflicts, potentially through a structure. We want to do this collaboratively with many of the people in this room or outside organizations. I know that parent organizations have a strong connection with this work. What we want to do is propose a process for potential mediation at the SOT level. That may be for worst case scenarios because, again, our principals are fabulous in overseeing this governance. We're also looking at an appeal process that would go to a potential central body to provide a final level of appeal, if an ongoing issue just can't be resolved. I know there are many in the community who are interested in this. I give great credit to Senator Harris. I know she's expressed many ideas around this work, and HOPE (Honoring Our Public Education) has been involved as well in brainstorming on this. But what we want to do is continue the brainstorming and finalize a process that will help with these issues that just can't be resolved at the school level.

I want to end today's presentation on a high note and reiterate the great work of SOTs again. Elections have just ended, and the new representatives will be starting their terms here shortly. With our bargaining units and parents, the elections are taking place and finishing up. We're also hosting two events. The outgoing SOT members have done exceptional work, and they did it in a year's time with this new reform. We want to make sure that we recognize those SOT members centrally, because we view them as a powerful advocacy force for public education. So, we anticipate holding an event for that outgoing SOT group. For the election that's going to occur with the incoming SOT members, we want to do some onboarding events with training regarding budgeting and the things you need to

know to be an SOT member. Based on feedback from SOT members during our listening tour last year, we heard that they want to have some direct communication from the District. So, we are going to start a correspondence called the "SOT Spot," which will be a direct communication to SOT members. We plan to do that quarterly or as needed when there are hot topics that SOT members need to know about.

When you think about the reorganization and those closest to the work making decisions and being involved in the work, the SOT rollout has been a highlight of this work. They've really done exceptional work. My hat's off to our principals, teachers, support staff, parents and community members who've been serving on those SOTs. It's been a great, great thing. If we view this in the future, one of the things that I'd like to see is many more people in the community attending those meetings and being observers of what's going on at that local school precinct, because the power of this is that those closest to the work are involved in many of these decisions.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I do want to add something as we're talking about working through some of these challenges. We also have S.B. 369, which is the culture and climate bill. If there is substantial SOT conflict, S.B. 369 gives the opportunity for the Superintendent to bring in culture and climate training to that school, so we can help address that complex situation as well.

You're going to hear about some great SOT stories. One example is Sierra Vista High School, whose students came up with the idea of having a greener school. They went in and actually sold the District on changing their entire lighting structure in the school and saved over \$10,000 a year on utility costs. We need to figure out how we can get every SOT to work together at that level, just like Mr. Synold said with Advanced Technologies Academy and Bonanza High School that you're going to hear about. It is the opportunity for us to really allow that flexibility and freedom for every school with all the programming, but still ensure that we are meeting the state and local guidelines, as well as federal guidelines.

Assemblywoman Neal:

You mentioned that you guys are starting a new budgeting process. The thing that I'm curious about is how are you guys going forward in regard to your fixed costs? You talked about your actuarial cost and said that you need to set aside \$3,500,000. Was that just recently?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Yes, that came late in June.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Okay, because I know that was one of my largest concerns. When you know you have ongoing liabilities or claims, that's a fixed cost. It's ongoing business. So in the future, how are you going to plan for those losses and set aside funds? It's good that that conversation is happening. Also, you stated, "...lower than projected full-day kindergarten funding for \$14,000,000." It was my understanding that that was a categorical grant and there was no belief that you guys were going to get that in the future. So why was it placed into your expenditures?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

In the funding bill for the 2015 Session, it stated specifically that there was going to be \$96,000,000-plus put into full-day kindergarten. When it actually came out for the school year, all that was allocated was \$75,000,000-plus for full-day kindergarten. It said "must" in the bill, so we assumed that a "must" is a "must" at the legislative level. We've been trying to work with the State to find out where that \$20,000,000 is. Is it in transition from the grant? Where did that go? So, that's why we put it in there, because it said it "must" be funded at this level. We calculated our expenditures based on estimates, and that's the best we can do when it comes to those types of funding bills.

So, we put it in our budget, and that's what we're working with the State on. They have said there are some transition things, but even up until late May we were led to believe that that was going to be rectified.

Assemblywoman Neal:

The Chair may find this next question appropriate or not appropriate. Since you guys are going to be at this phase of the implementation in November, I think it's appropriate to at least try to figure out going forward—have you even calculated what your actual revenues are for Fiscal Year 2017, so that when you plan for 2018 we know what the real baseline is? Not the projected expenditures, the actual money.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

That's a little bit difficult, because most of our DSA is now based on average daily enrollment. With the average daily enrollment not being based on the one count day that the State has used in the past, the amount we are being paid fluctuates. We grew from 304,000 or 305,000 students on the first day of school to 321,000 at the end of last week. So for our average daily enrollment, those calculations will then be based upon the swing from 304,000 kids to 321,000, so we will lose revenue on our first quarterly payment because all the kids were not in the building on the first day of school. So, it's extremely hard to get to actuals when we are fluctuating that much because of the way the law now reads.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I remember that bill distinctly. My issue is future planning for what we know are consequences or probabilities. The fact is that somehow, in the mystical universe of budgeting, that's not happening. So, if you knew that this bill allows for periodic fluctuation quarterly, how did you guys think about this in the past to try to plan for this? I don't even know what the legislative minutes said when this bill was passed, but that would have been a really good conversation to have in committee, to say, "Hey, this is going to be a problem come the beginning of the school year." So, I'm wondering, did that conversation happen, or should I go back and look for minutes?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

The conversations were happening. When the legislative intent was put into law, we anticipated that the population would be carried over from the end of one school year and built into that average daily enrollment so there wouldn't be the significant drop in attendance. That is not the case or the way it is calculated. So, that was one of the unintended consequences of the bill. Yes, as our population grows throughout the school year, as it has in the past couple of years, we have received more money in the middle of the school year. But as we go to the end of the school year, our population decreases because families move, and we also see that at the beginning of the year. If we can't get them in the first day of school, then we lose that revenue in the first quarterly payment.

Assemblywoman Neal:

So, we're passing things down to the schools. Our expenditures are higher than our resources. So, we're talking about money dropping in the middle. How are we going to appropriately plan and give money to school sites when there is no certainty in the allocation? I don't understand how this is getting ready to work.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I'm right there with you, and that's why we're struggling with right now with trying to figure it out. That's why we brought in the experts, because nobody budgets in this manner across the United States or in any school district, because we are unique with this reorganization bill. So, we are having to build systems and structures without an example to follow. We do have Mr. Strembitsky, but his experience was not done at this level. He had 80,000 students. His expertise is extremely valuable, but there is no other guru or somebody who is doing this now in the way that we are expected to do it. So unfortunately, we're building the structures as we go along. There are days when we are literally working hours and hours to get something ready to roll out by the next deadline. So, it is a challenge.

Chair Roberson:

But let's not confuse these two issues. Yes, there's the reorganization, but that's separate from the count days and when the funds fluctuate based on the number of pupils in CCSD.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I wasn't, sir. I apologize if that was the statement that was made. That's not the case. On Monday, our strategic budgets will go out to our schools. They will reflect the number of students that are in their schools at this point in time so that we can true-up based on projections that were done in January to where we are at right now and allow schools to receive additional funds if they met their projections. If they didn't, those funds will be reduced based upon their enrollment in the school.

Chair Roberson:

And just as a refresher, before the law was changed, when was the count day?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

The official State Count Day was the last Friday in September. We did ours one week earlier so we could make sure that we met our contractual surplusing deadlines.

Chair Roberson:

So, there was a count day, but then there wasn't another count day for the rest of the year. So now with the law change, aren't you receiving more money in many cases as the school year goes progresses and the population increases because you do have the multiple count days? Wasn't that the rationale for why the law was changed?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

That was the rationale for the law. I can't talk to the specifics, but I can get that information for you.

Chair Roberson:

I'm hearing a lot of complaining because the law was changed for multiple count days, but the point of it was so that schools receive more money when they have an influx of students after October 1.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

You are correct.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Okay, this is what I'm confused about. So, we have the CIC and we have Glenn Christenson, who's a super accounting guru. How has he helped you in these decisions? To me, this is a budgeting and accounting decision, and there are fixed costs that are not being accounted for. So, how are you taking in his advice and what is he offering? After I got over

the money that was spent, I said, "That's one of the benefits." So, what is that relationship to help you get through these current decisions?

Chair Roberson:

I just want to say again for the record that Mr. Christenson works for free. He has volunteered his time for months and years for the School District. He is not paid a dime for the service he provides the community. I just want that to be clear.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Okay. I was referring to the contract. So, the volunteer who is assisting you that is a part of the CIC, how is he helping you?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I think he can probably answer that question far better than I can. But, let me tell you what he is doing for us. He is helping us to understand where the fixed numbers are and where we have to estimate better. He is helping us to understand where we're at in the budgeting cycle and what recommendations we need to make to the Legislature to change the budgeting cycle that is currently in NAC so that we have actual numbers to base our budgets on, as opposed to estimates. The Clark County School District has always had to estimate our numbers. Unfortunately, we're having to estimate based on a biennium because you are working on a 2-year cycle for the legislative session, which is extremely difficult. On Tuesday, we sat down and talked with the LCB Fiscal Division about the challenges of some of these pieces and what may need to be changed in the 2019 Legislative Session, because the reorganization does change the way we have to do business and provide dollars to schools in January, way before the beginning of a legislative session in a legislative year. We have to provide them with estimates of what their budget is going to be for August so they can plan for the school year that begins after the legislative session is over. So, we have a very difficult time now because by law we have to put our strategic budgets out on January 15, yet the session hasn't started. We haven't had economic indicators that have come forward before that date, and so we struggle with those estimates. So, that's where we are going to need help. That's what Mr. Christenson is helping us with, figuring out how we can work underneath these cycles and still come up with a budget that is close to where it needs to be, as opposed to being so far off in our calculations.

Glenn Christenson (Chair, Community Implementation Council):

I think we have to keep different projects in mind here. The Community Implementation Council was created, and this Advisory Committee put the consultant in place for the reorganization. At that time, it wasn't a discussion about the budget or how these things work. As part of the process of the reorganization and the shifting of monies to the schools, this whole issue with the budget shortfall has now come up. Separately from that, looking at the shortfall in the budget, Superintendent Skorkowsky has asked myself and others to

come in and view the process and what happened, gain an understanding and make recommendations. We have now had two meetings, yesterday being the second one, and I was pleased to see that my understanding of the budget process and how unbelievable it is was shared by my colleagues. This is not the way to finance public education, or anything else for that matter. It's something that I think this body, the Legislature and others need to work with over time so we can do it in a much better way. Them coming up with budgets two or three times before the final number is actually put in place by the Legislature, generally at the end of June, creates an incredible amount of work that ultimately ends up not being useful at all. Superintendent Skorkowsky made mention of the fact that they had thought a certain number was coming in for a per-pupil allocation and it ended up being different than that. Nobody did anything wrong, but the fact of the matter is that from their budgeting perspective, they had been told one thing and it came back to be something else. We're looking at this, and our goal is to come back with some suggestions and recommendations for the District. But I didn't want you to confuse what the CIC and the consultant you engaged are working on with the reorganization and how that then relates to the budget matter, because they're separate matters.

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

I know we've been talking a lot about all the different challenges that we have here. As a side note, we got a report on the SOTs, and I just happened to be at my son's open house at Rancho High School and noticed that there was an SOT meeting coming up. So, I just showed up unannounced and sat in the back. What I saw was what we had envisioned: parents, teachers and administrators all having a discussion. A lot of their frustrations have been heard here, but they were having a frank discussion until it was pointed out later in the meeting that I was there. They weren't tainting their discussion because they knew I was there. But I know that's got to be happening in other schools. I know last time we heard some challenges on a different side of that, where some teachers felt they couldn't speak freely. I know we're going to talk about a lot of challenges we have, but I just wanted to point out that there are some bright things. I appreciate Dr. James Kuzma and the SOT at Rancho for allowing me to look and see what's going on. So, there are some good things going on. I think other things can be worked out. That's the frustrating part of all these challenges that we have, but at least we have some good things going on.

Chair Roberson:

That's really great to hear, Senator Denis. Thank you, Superintendent Skorkowsky and Dr. Barton. We will be having another meeting next month. We're going to expect more specifics on the implementation of this reorganization, moving toward a vote of the School Board Trustees as far as transferring these services and the funding. So again, this is an ongoing process, but we'll be meeting again very soon.

THE CHAIR CALLED FOR A BRIEF RECESS.

Next, we'll have some parents speak to the SOT process. We're now going to hear from representatives of HOPE for Nevada.

Caryne Shea (Vice President, HOPE (Honoring Our Public Education) for Nevada):

Our organization has a membership of nearly 1,000 families, and our mission is to connect the families here in Southern Nevada with legislative efforts to improve education. Thank you for allowing us to present our findings on the SOT aspect of the reorganization of CCSD. We wrote our own survey and we received a total of 355 responses. We'd like to thank Chair Roberson for helping distribute our survey to his Twitter followers, as well as School Board President Deanna Wright, Trustee Edwards, Michael Vannozzi, Brian Knudsen, Sylvia Lazos, Yvette Williams, Amelia Pak-Harvey, the Peace Alliance and others who retweeted and shared with their groups on Facebook, next door and social media platforms. We are truly a grassroots effort at HOPE. The attached map ([Exhibit H](#)) illustrates participants by zip code, and we are grateful that we had participants from 50 zip codes in Clark County. The survey's 355 participants are broken down as follows: 83 percent of the participants do not serve on an SOT, while 17 percent do; 52 percent of the participants are parents, and 43 percent of the participants are teachers; the remainder of participants were administrators and community members.

First, we would like to start with the positive results. On questions three and four, a majority of the respondents, 70 percent, were aware of their SOT elections, and over half know when their SOT meetings are held ([Exhibit I](#)). Even better, on question eight, of those serving on an SOT, three-fourths of them are planning to run for reelection. We were a little bit worried about how overwhelming the first year would be, and we are inspired to know that three-fourths of those members are planning to run again. While we've all heard anecdotal evidence regarding concerns about expressing opinions at SOT meetings, we're happy that this may be an issue for a minority of people. On questions 11 and 12, 81 percent of our respondents felt comfortable voicing their opinions, and 68 percent did not fear retaliation. We appreciate the comments of Advanced Technologies Academy's SOT this morning in echoing most people's level of satisfaction with the SOT process. So, this is all good. There were many stories on the street that spoke to the fears of serving on SOTs, but we are encouraged by the results. At the same time, we don't want to minimize the real concerns of the few who have faced intimidation and retaliation. We feel that should be addressed.

We also feel that proper training for principals and SOT members is critical to success. Flipping back to questions 9 and 10, we are encouraged to see that only 21 percent of SOT members responded that they didn't receive any training, and 52 percent of respondents felt that the training was helpful. The District must continue to increase the amount of people who receive support and make sure it's high quality and consistent support. From our own experiences, some trainings from entities we attended taught that the SOTs act as advisors to the principal, while other trainings taught that if the SOT votes for something, they can override the principal's decision. One school currently has on their website that their SOT doesn't vote at all, and it's just for consensus building. So, continued clarity will eliminate the mixed messages. The District's idea for the SOT Spot might solve some of these clarity issues.

Next, we'd like to present what we felt were areas of concern. On question 14, 69 percent stated that they did not attend meetings. You will see in the attached 181 responses ([Exhibit I](#)) that a few reasons were repeated often: scheduling conflicts for both teachers and parents, a lack of awareness that the meetings were taking place due to late or no postings, and a feeling of exclusion that only SOT members are meant to attend. It makes sense that because 69 percent didn't attend meetings, a large percentage of respondents answered, "I don't know" to questions 13 and 15 through 18, which were asking if they felt the election process was effective at engaging leaders and about their knowledge of the make-up of the SOT members at their school. Mr. Strembitsky's plan relies on a successful relationship with the school associate superintendent acting as an SOT ombudsman, in essence. Questions 19 and 20 show that there's a disconnect, because 61 percent of respondents don't know who the school associate superintendent is, and 71 percent don't know if their school associate superintendent has attended any of their SOT meetings. With regard to SOT decision making on question 21, 46 percent don't know if they like the decisions made by the SOT, 20 percent were in agreement that they liked what happened, 19 percent didn't like what happened and 15 percent of people had mixed feelings. We know the culture at each school is a predictor of SOT success. For question 22, two-thirds of the respondents stated that their school culture was already fine or that it got better. The principal is instrumental to a positive culture on campus, and we recommend continued, quality training and that school associate superintendent mentorship be provided to struggling principals. You can see the 119 comments on culture for question 23.

On question 24, one-quarter had a handle on the budget, and 12 percent stated that they had an increased understanding. So, we think we're heading in the right direction for community awareness at the school. However, in light of our current budget crisis, which we won't discuss, we're seeing a troubling increase of parents who are giving up wanting to know more information. They're confused, so they have checked out, which is concerning to us as a parent group. Starting at question 25, people were asked about funding as it pertains to the reorganization, and 81 percent believe the reorganization will not deliver more money to schools. We appreciate Senator Roberson's comments about how, going forward, there will be increased transparency. But for now, the 148 comments mostly referred to the need to fund the base better and to be more in line with the national per-pupil average of \$12,000. They spoke about budget cuts, mismanagement, federal and state unfunded mandates, the Nevada Plan not keeping up with growth and being dinged by faulty economies of scale, taxes in the name of education not staying in education and restrictions on how the money is to be spent.

I think it's because there's a lack of information in school communities, but on question 26, 66 percent believed the reorganization would not lead to higher achievement. They referenced that teacher morale is at an all-time low, classes sizes are exploding, parental engagement in their child's success is still quite low, there's a failure to make decisions for the benefit of all students and not just special interests, and the fact that in some schools, people feel that autonomy means a dictatorship. So, we felt that those are all the things that are hopefully in the process of being addressed. Then, people will begin to see that achievement will increase. For question 27, 59 percent said the reorganization will lead to more decision making at school sites, and 41 percent said that it wouldn't. They attributed

this to a lack of available funds, SOTs being only advisory in nature and restrictions on how money can be spent. Question 28 was upsetting to HOPE as a parent group, because 61 percent said that the reorganization will not lead to more parent and community engagement, which is why we do this every day.

Chair Roberson:

On that point in particular, everything you just said belies that. My point is, look at the increased parent engagement that's going on. Largely what I've heard from you today is very positive about what's going on with the parents, so it's interesting that on that question they say this will not lead to more parent engagement. Clearly, all the evidence is to the contrary. It is increasing parent engagement.

Ms. Shea:

It is, and I think maybe the disconnect is that a lot of parents commented that the same parents who are involved will always remain involved, and it won't necessarily increase or encourage others or even allow the opportunity for others who are working parents. There were so many reasons why other parents can't.

Chair Roberson:

And that makes sense, but wouldn't you agree that the parents who want to be engaged have a greater opportunity to be engaged through this process now? That's the way it appears to me, anyway.

Ms. Shea:

I do agree, and that's why the answer to that question was concerning to us. There were 111 comments. Basically, they put the impetus on the parents. They felt that there was still a lack of awareness by the parents. They felt like the parents still had apathy towards what their kids were facing in school and their teachers. They also cited scheduling, parent cliques at certain schools, language barriers and the actions of the school's principal. The answers to question 29, whether the reorganization was worthwhile, were nearly split down the middle, with 49 percent saying yes and 51 percent saying no. My personal feeling is that, with so many legislative actions in the last two sessions, like Zoom, Victory and Read by Three, the reorganization is also new. We look forward to getting as much data as we can and really sharing that information so people know that we are moving the needle. Probably to no one's surprise, question 30 reveals that 91 percent think the Nevada Legislature has not prioritized enough funding. There are 109 comments attached, stating gratitude for the increases in the last two sessions, but also stating that the special session stadium and tax credits show them that there were other more immediate priorities. We appreciate the principals who presented today in asking for an increased DSA, and we agree. We also add a plea to revise the Nevada Plan. Of the 179 comments to CCSD on question 32, most referenced familiar buzz words that we've all heard, including the need for transparency and accountability, prioritizing all decisions around students, a lack of

support for education professionals and an overall mismanagement of funds. This is nothing that any of us haven't heard before, but it was inspiring to hear that the parents are getting clued into these things as well.

Chair Roberson:

What was roughly the percentage of your respondents who were actually members of SOTs?

Ms. Shea:

Seventeen percent.

Chair Roberson:

Okay. I don't expect you to have this information, but my guess is that those 17 percent of respondents were more positive in their answers to these questions than the other 83 percent, because they're more engaged. Is that your sense?

Ms. Shea

Yes, I get that sense. We had a large percentage of respondents who were teachers too, so we wanted to see that information. The survey closed last night at midnight, so we weren't able to dissect that information based on how many were parents and how many were teachers who felt that way. But we can always pull that information.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I was looking at the dates of the responses, and I'm wondering if the influencers on the responses and the big "no" on the legislative question—this survey was going on when the newspapers were talking about the budget shortfall. You had the parent survey that went out from CCSD saying, "If you hear about the cuts or pre-selected cuts that are a part of a choice for you," and those didn't even make me happy. If you're someone else, you would be very angry and upset, thinking about what happened to this and what happened to that. I just want to know, did any of them cite to the parent survey that went out? I haven't read all the comments.

Ms. Shea:

Yes. We had to work hard to clarify that our survey was not the CCSD budget survey. People thought that we were retweeting their budget survey, and they didn't want to take that survey. We had to clarify, "No, this is information that you have the opportunity to share with your Legislature on your experience with the SOT and the reorganization." I would agree with you that the respondents are upset about what's happening with CCSD's budget. If you look at the comments where the question specifically is, "What do you want CCSD to know about how you feel about the budget," you will see those reflected. But I also think the

answers to this question were very specific to the Legislature. They talked about revising the Nevada Plan and the state school supplemental support tax being supplemental. There are informed parents who really know the pockets of money and where they're coming from.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Did you feel that any of the parents really understood the level of local dollars that actually goes to support the schools versus the state allocation?

Ms. Shea:

Only in a few of the comments did they bring up property taxes, and only in the general sense that they're lower.

Assemblywoman Neal:

The local money is lower?

Ms. Shea:

Our property taxes.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Okay, got it.

Senator Denis:

How did the parents find out about this survey?

Ms. Shea:

We tried to blast it through every means necessary. We have 1,000 members, so we put it out to our membership. We also went to social media. We tweeted at every one of you on the Committee to hopefully retweet. Again, we appreciate your doing that, Senator Roberson. But we are also lucky to have a working relationship with CCSD in that we have permission from the Superintendent and the Trustees to be on campuses and speak to parent groups, whether it's a parent teacher organization (PTO) or a parent teacher association (PTA), to continue this dialogue about education in our state. We also emailed this to our list of PTO and PTA presidents, and principals posted our survey to their website. So, it was a variety of efforts to try to gain respondents.

Senator Denis:

The only reason I ask is because I noticed some of my zip codes had zero respondents. It sounds like you had to have some kind of technology to do it, and some of my folks in these particular zip codes have that challenge, so I don't know that their voices will be heard.

Ms. Shea:

That is always our challenge through HOPE. While we have 1,000 members that we count, we have a much smaller group that actually goes to each school and really takes the temperature at those schools. With as many schools as there are in CCSD, it's very difficult to have access to everyone at all times, and we lack in that department.

Senator Denis:

I realize that it's a challenge. It's a challenge that we all have, especially in some of these schools where you're trying to communicate with parents but you can't always do it by just sending an email or tweeting, because they may not have access to that. I just want to make sure that somehow, as we do these in the future, we have a way to also go and verbally talk to parents so those voices can be heard also, and it's not just the folks who are technology literate.

Ms. Shea:

I agree. Absolutely.

Chair Roberson:

I know you still have more survey results to go through. I'm sorry we interrupted. We're just very interested in all of this.

Ms. Shea:

I appreciate that. Common in the 141 responses for question 31 was that principals need training to match their level of authority and autonomy, which we've already addressed here today and are appreciative of. We need more clarity for SOT members to know what is within their purview and more money. They also expressed that they'd like oversight over the elections. The recurring phrase, "a waste of time," was a little disheartening, but what it means is that we need to continue demonstrating how this makes a difference, and you have a promise from HOPE that we will continue to do that. There were 169 answers to question 33, which was focused on expanding the DSA pie and actually linking per-pupil dollars with the cost of what Nevada academic standards and the ESSA (Every Student Succeeds Act) Plan now require education to be. We're one of five states in the United States that has not had an education lawsuit. As I was researching what those other states' lawsuits entailed, it was that the per-pupil costs were not adequate funding. A lot of it was centered around Common Core. So, they increased the rigor in the state, which we have.

We've also increased it through our new ESSA Plan. We need to show that we are also increasing our commitment financially to be able to accomplish what we want with the Nevada academic standards and what we want with a great ESSA Plan. We need to keep money in education that is designed to be in education and stop reverting tax dollars back to the general fund. There were also several comments made that linked our per-pupil spending to our ballooning class sizes.

Lastly, we have question 36. The comments reiterated the lack of funding to support the implementation of the reorganization. There was disappointment that it wasn't an actual breakup. Some people really still think that CCSD is going to be broken up into cities or towns. They also wanted to continue to see that Legislators are involved. We know that you are. We know that you keep these meetings going. At the school sites, they don't necessarily see that. Senator Denis, I applaud you for having attended Rancho's SOT meeting. In the responses to question 36, there were a number of invitations to Legislators to attend an SOT meeting and see what it looks like for those members that attend at the school site.

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

I'm going to present some of our suggestions for solutions. First, we want to reiterate the words of Jeremy Aguero at the recent CCSD Kickoff. "Any initiative that we do today in this District is going to take 10 years to fully realize the results in student achievement." He said this in regard to funding, but we feel that the message is the same for the rollout of any new program of this magnitude. Any solution that has been or will be developed is going to take time. From the beginning of the reorganization, Ms. Shea and Jenn Blackhurst, our HOPE president, sat in several meetings with parents and realized the need for an impartial and permanent solution to address concerns, outside of the principal-to-school-associate-superintendent appeals process. Last December, I conducted a colleague circle during a professional conference of local educators to discuss SOTs. The same concern arose in this group of teacher leaders. Basically, the school associate superintendent is the evaluator of the principal, and therein lies the certain relationship that is viewed as protective of one another and may not be entirely impartial. I'm not sure how it is in evaluator-evaluated business relationships, but that is the perception here at CCSD. The solution could be a third-party objective mediation process, much like what Dr. Barton has already discussed. At HOPE, we agreed on and developed a plan that we presented to CCSD officials. It would create a School Board committee with the same makeup as an SOT and provide an appeals process beyond the CCSD line of authority, where the principals first address the concerns, then the school associate superintendent and finally the Superintendency. We also pushed for legislation for this through A.B. 469 and the trailer bill that ended up not being written. We wanted that trailer bill to again discuss a third-party objective process. We'll use a phrase that representatives from TSC² used yesterday at the CIC meeting, and we'll talk about "going beyond legislation." What are we going to do to move forward? Dr. Barton from CCSD spoke yesterday and today about the need to address the small minority of concerned SOT members who haven't been able to resolve problems through the current appeals process. Based on those survey results we just gave you, 81 percent of the participants on the SOTs do feel comfortable in voicing their opinions,

and we agree that the number of unresolved issues is small and a minority. However, based on the open-ended responses that we received, the perceptions of those who don't feel comfortable primarily deal with fears of retaliation. We are glad to hear that CCSD is considering a way to rectify this, and any other anomalies, through a formal process. Our suggestion remains to have a third-party objective committee. We go back to our original suggestion of creating a CCSD Board-appointed committee made up of 50 percent parents, 50 percent teachers and staff, and a nonvoting CCSD administrator, just like an SOT is organized. We also suggest that this Board-appointed committee act as an advisor to the Superintendent, the same way an SOT acts as an advisor to the principal's final decisions. In addition to creating a formal mediation process, we suggest that this Board-appointed committee also take on the responsibilities outlined by TSC² at the CIC yesterday, acting as a Board taskforce to study SOT best practices, as well as barriers to participation, much like Senator Denis touched on, especially in our urban-core schools. As a former member of the Attendance and Zoning Commission, which is a Board-appointed committee, I know firsthand that these volunteer appointees have an opportunity to work at grassroots levels to engage communities in finding solutions that both support the local needs of the school and the mandated initiatives. We would like to continue working with CCSD in developing a permanent process to address SOT meetings beyond the basics.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you, Ms. Slighting. This is very helpful, and we're glad to hear from parents and about the survey results. I know this is a snapshot in time. As Assemblywoman Neal pointed out, it just so happened that there was a lot going on in the press regarding the CCSD budget woes that probably made a lot of people feel pretty negative about the School District at the time. That may or may not have had an impact on the results. We'd love it if you'd continue to do this survey work and we could continue to hear results of how parents, teachers and community members are feeling about this process. Thank you very much for being here.

Next on our agenda, we're going to discuss how the reorganization is affecting rural schools within Clark County. I'd like to ask Dr. Larry Moses, Dr. Lindsey Dalley and Bob Sweetin to come forward.

Dr. Larry Moses

Thank you very much for this opportunity to bring some rural concerns before you. There are two funding issues within the reorganization of CCSD that directly affect rural schools ([Exhibit J](#)). Funding issue number one is the rural school weighted funding provided by A.B. 469. Funding issue number two is the 85-15 funding split between the local school precincts and the Central Office that is required under A.B. 469. That is common to all schools. Before addressing those two issues, one must understand two principles embedded in A.B. 469's organizational plan.

The first organizing principle focuses on the responsibilities and funding. If the Central Office transfers any responsibility to a school precinct, the Central Office must fund that

responsibility with the equivalent funding originally expended by the Central Office. This means that the CCSD Central Administration cannot arbitrarily determine individual rural school precincts' funding and responsibility as they have in the past. Section 16 of the bill provides the initial context necessary for understanding the transfer of authority. Subsection 8 of that bill clearly describes the responsibility of the Central Office to provide equivalent funding. "If the authority to carry out any responsibility is transferred to the local school precinct pursuant to subsection 7, the large school district must allocate additional money to the local school precinct in an amount equal to the amount that would otherwise be paid by the large school district to carry out the responsibility." This statute clearly states that responsibility and funding are inextricably connected. The funding is based on the previous cost of the same responsibility by the large school district, and the district must allocate that same money to the school and let them determine the best use.

The second organizing principle embedded in Nevada's current state educational plan, commonly referred to as the "Nevada Plan," and consistent with A.B. 469 requires educational equity among rural schools compared to metropolitan schools. Rural schools suffer from a lack of economies of scale and a lack of diverse educational options resulting from the remote location. These are the two reasons Nevada reallocates its education resources into rural areas from the metropolitan area in order to maintain educational equity throughout the state.

That brings us to funding issue number one, the rural school weighted funding as provided under A.B. 469. This is broken down into two concerns under A.B. 469. The Clark County School District Central Administration has, at its own expense and responsibility, identified positions and programs necessary to establish educational equity for rural school students. The Clark County School District Central Administration appropriately supplied rural schools with off-ratio administrative and teaching positions to address rural school educational equity, even though the student numbers did not meet the currently established student ratio criteria for the Las Vegas metropolitan schools. The Clark County School District Central Administration has traditionally assumed responsibility for funding these positions that are critical to rural educational equity. Within the 2017-2018 school budget, however, the CCSD Central Office arbitrarily removed the funding for some of those positions from rural school budgets. Removing the funding from these positions effectively transferred the responsibility of these positions to the rural school precincts. This is an unfunded transfer of responsibility. Section 16(8) clearly prohibits this action. During public testimony before the State Education Advisory Committee, the Superintendent stated that those off-ratio positions were merely gifts, and CCSD would not fund them. If we accept this explanation, then CCSD is guilty of arbitrarily and capriciously breaching the core objective of providing all students, including rural students, within CCSD with an equitable education. The responsibility represented by those administrative and teaching positions previously funded by the Central Office is now left unfunded. This breaches both the spirit and the letter of A.B. 469.

The second part of funding issue number one is more direct. The arbitrary funding reduction of rural school precincts directly violates A.B. 469 section 9(3), which states, "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." That date would be May 8, 2017. This section of A.B. 469 deals with weighted funding for rural schools. For the most part, weighting for rural schools is based on staffing. Any reduction in staffing will affect the weighted funding for rural schools. To figure out the weight for rural schools, one must know the District's base per-pupil funding in relation to the per-pupil funding in the specific rural school in the 2016-2017 School Year. One must convert the staffing to a per-pupil funding so a comparison of the funding for the current school year can be made with the 2016-2017 funding. This proportional difference in 2017-2018 must not be less than 2016-2017. The District is presently in violation of section 18(2) of A.B. 469, which states, "The Superintendent shall post the information pursuant to subsection 1 on the internet website of the large school district and make it available to any person upon request." The District refuses to release this information. Numerous requests addressed to various Central Office personnel have been made, and the information is not forthcoming. As a result of this refusal, the rural schools have no way of knowing whether proportional funding is being maintained. To fulfill the transparency implicit in A.B. 469 reform and ensure adequate checks and balances, this information must be publicly available to rural schools' SOTs before they finalize their budgets. During the testimony to the Technical Advisory Committee, CCSD's Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Jim McIntosh provided the 2015-2016 weighted rural school funding. He stated that the 2015-2016 base funding was calculated on the general and special education budget and came to an average of \$8,337 per pupil. The Clark County School District's CFO then produced a chart showing the proportional rural school funding, which started at a low of 9 percent above the base and ended at a high of 389 percent above the base. Again, section 9(3) states that a rural school receive not less than the proportionally larger amount of money that was used to fund the rural school before those dates. "Proportionally larger amount" refers to the specific amount over the base funding for the CCSD schools. For example, using \$8,337 as your per-pupil base in the previous year, if CCSD were to fund the school at 10 percent over the base, then one would add 10 percent to the \$8,337, which is \$834. The rural school would be funded at \$9,172 per pupil to maintain equity. The District has not provided the figures for the base funding for rural schools in 2016-2017, which was last year's funding. This is critical, because the law requires this year's funding to remain proportional. While the District provided per-pupil information for 2015-2016 when they testified before the Advisory Committee to Reorganize CCSD and the Technical Advisory Committee, they have refused to release that information for 2016-2017. Using the District's rationale for determining the district-wide base per-pupil funding, our best speculation would be that in 2016-2017, the per-pupil base would be \$8,358. Our best guess for 2017-2018 would be \$8,672. But this is only one-half of the equation. To figure out the proportional funding for the

rural schools, one must know the total funding per pupil for each rural school in 2016-2017. The District has repeatedly refused to provide the other half of this equation.

This weighting compensates for the school sizes and lack of diverse educational opportunities that are available in large metropolitan schools, such as credit retrieval and other proficiency programs. The question should be asked, if this year's 2017-2018 budget can be increased by no less than 5 percent, how can a rural school budget not increase in the same proportion? Rural communities understand that there has been an over-projection on the part of those responsible for developing the CCSD budget for 2017-2018. It is now necessary to adjust the budget to actual rather than desired funding. However, that reduction has to remain proportional by law.

I had a presentation on the 85-15. I have shortened it, because the Committee obviously understands that the current situation does not meet the state law, but I would like to mention a couple things. First of all, on funding issue two, categories two and three within the budget chart that was presented to us at our last meeting obviously do not belong on the schools' side. They belong on the District side, which leaves a 45-55 split. Ironically, the headline of the CCSD chart stated, "Breaking It Down: Where Does the Money Go?" It is a smokescreen for the old strategic budget system where only 55 percent of the unrestricted funding from the general operating budget, rather than the required 85 percent, flows to the school precinct. This chart indicated that there has been no change in financial allocation or responsibility within CCSD. This chart is merely an affirmation of the status quo. In earlier testimony, there were a number of concerns about whether Central is going to have the money to operate if they send the money to the schools. Using 15 percent of the budget leaves \$359,308,275 in the Central Office. The other money coming to the District to run the Central Office is very simple. As you saw in the surveys of principals, the vast majority of the principals will buy services back from the District, and that's kind of the plan. The money goes into the schools, and they buy the services back.

In conclusion, at the August 7 meeting of this Committee, the District showed a total disregard for the rural school weighted funding as required by law. The Superintendent depicted himself as a benevolent dictator who merely gave away gifts of teaching and administrative positions to rural schools. He showed a willingness to ignore section 19(3) of A.B. 469 and felt that it was his prerogative to reduce funding to the rural schools at his whim of the moment. Further, the District's confusion between services and money, intentional or not, merely intensifies the need for an independent enforcement agent. This oversight agent needs to be independent from CCSD. The school associate superintendents cannot fill this role because they represent the District when dealing with the school precincts. The Trustees have already shown their inability to control the large bureaucracy. The school precincts need a neutral party to ensure that CCSD complies with A.B. 469. Section 33 indicates that this is to be the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. It is imperative that the Superintendent of Public Instruction appoint an individual to oversee this reorganization. This would be a person

SOTs, citizens, county commissioners, city councils, parents and community education advisory boards (CEABs) could turn to when they suspect the District has not complied with the law.

I'll turn it over to my colleagues, who will speak specifically about rural communities.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you, Dr. Moses. Before we do that, I'd like someone from the School District to come up and respond, because this is a concern that many of us have. We also heard on August 7 that this is arguably in conflict with A.B. 469, since certain schools in rural portions of Clark County are not receiving the funds they received previously. It's a real concern. I know there's been communication with the State Superintendent of Schools. I know he's looking into this. But I'd like to give the opportunity for Dr. Barton to respond, specifically with the concerns Dr. Moses presented, especially so with regard to the lack of responsiveness of the District to provide information.

Dr. Barton:

The Superintendent did have to depart, so I'm filling in. Mr. Jason Goudie, our new CFO, is unable to be here as well today. I'm hopeful that I can provide some answers, but again, I want to make sure that I'm accurately hearing what was stated today. I know that we've been in conversations since the last meeting when these concerns were addressed. We've been in direct communication with Dr. Canavero, so we are working directly on how to solve this. We had a productive meeting, from my vantage point, again, not being the CFO. I was in on those meetings, hearing the dialogue, and there are plans to address this. Jason Goudie particularly has been digging into this matter and looking at what can be done. The plan is that when the budgets roll out to the schools on September 18, that's when the per-pupil amounts will be provided to all schools, including those being represented today in the rurals. I can find out the answer on Dr. Moses' request for 2015-2016 data to see if we have that information to provide, but I think there will be clarity provided on September 18. I just want to be clear that I'm on the academic side of the house, but I've been very open and willing to meet with people. I met with a principal from the rural community, and he's a strong advocate for his community. I've heard him out. I know our school associate superintendent, Jeff Hybarger, has done the same thing. But I think that we'll have some better answers, and hopefully answers that address the concerns, on September 18 when those per-pupils are punched into the budgets.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you, Dr. Barton. I know there were lots of questions on this topic on August 7. I see Assemblywoman Neal has a question. I'd like to commend her for taking such an active role on this Committee.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Dr. Moses, I want to know how many times you've asked for the budget information. What year was it for?

Dr. Moses:

The information on 2016-2017 is the issue. The numbers for 2015-2016 are the only figures I had to work with. Those really are irrelevant to the issue, other than the fact that it gives us some idea of what the percentage difference was in 2015-2016 and projecting that it probably didn't change much proportionally over the next year. As far as how many times I've asked, I guess we could ask Mr. Hybarger how tired he is of hearing me ask. I've asked Dr. Barton a number of times. I think he can tell you that. I would say at least five, six or seven times, to different people.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Okay. So, Dr. Barton, what's the difficulty in giving it to him, if it's been five or six times?

Dr. Barton:

The requests have been there. I don't want to shy away from accountability on this. I think there were some unknowns from a legal standpoint as we were working through this. I know our legal office was trying to determine, through NAC and NRS, what the definition of rural was. To be quite honest, with our new CFO Jason Goudie in place since early July, in my opinion, that's where we started making progress on that. I don't think there was an ignoring of this, but at the time when we had a vacancy in the CFO position, frankly, some of this work that needed to be done on the proportional stance required some expertise. I'll be honest with you, you would not want me sitting down in front of the books doing that. I'm the academic officer. So, having the expertise that Mr. Goudie is providing at this time, we've made a lot of progress. We've had great conversations with Dr. Canavero up to last week. Again, I think there will be great clarity provided on this, and the numbers Dr. Moses is requesting today will obviously be included as reference points in the strategic budget.

Assemblywoman Neal:

So, is there going to be great clarity around the projections that may be operating in how he's seeing the budget? Because, clearly, there was an over-projection, and now there is a decrease in money. So now there's the question of what's proportional, and of course he wants to look backwards to see what the allocation was then. We're moving, moving, moving, and everybody is trying to make decisions, but what's not clear is how much of an over-projection there was that we now need to address and have clearly written on the table. What's the number?

Dr. Barton:

He will have that data. I think his request is fair. I think that should have been provided a while back, frankly. Having the dollar amount, the per-pupil, is a fair ask. But again, not knowing how that number came to be with a previous CFO, we now have a CFO who's understanding how this is calculated proportionally, and he will have that number.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I guess I'm confused, because this is 2016. I know you guys have had gaps in the CFO position. There's no standard for how it's calculated, or how it was calculated in the past, that someone can draw up? Isn't there a standard that someone is applying to the number?

Dr. Barton:

I think the clarity point on that, which I probably didn't say in my first response, the thing that was described—I don't want to call it a gift, that's not what I'm saying publicly. There were "positions" that were advocated for from the community and previous principals that were added into the schools' budgets. That had to be accounted for and maybe reduced as a per-pupil, or an accurate per-pupil was calculated. So, that's my correction point on my previous statement. You're right, the per-pupil can be determined, but I think that when we looked at some of the rural schools, some of those advocacy positions that were there in the past were off-ratio, frankly. So, that's where the adjustment had to occur.

Dr. Moses:

According to A.B. 469, the proportion has to be based on the funding the school received in 2016 and 2017. It does not state where that funding came from, whether it was an off-ratio, whether it was an on-ratio or however it arrived there. We had a budget in 2016 and 2017. That budget was our total funding for the school. Now, that is to be the base. Whatever percentage we were over, or whatever percentage a rural school is over, has to be the base and cannot be lessened in the budget in 2017 and 2018. It really doesn't matter whether that was Title I money. It doesn't matter where that money came from. The budget was there, and according to the law, that budget cannot be proportionally reduced when you move to the next budget. That's the law.

Chair Roberson:

Dr. Barton, I appreciate you coming up and responding to the issues raised by Dr. Moses. Now we'll proceed with Dr. Dalley and Mr. Sweetin.

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

I am a nonvoting member of our middle school's SOT. I've also been a CEAB member for probably 10 to 15 years. I've met with Dr. Barton and Superintendent Skorkowsky, and I'm familiar with school district issues.

At our last CEAB meeting, we asked our four principals to bring their concerns to the table about the new budget specifically, not lofty ideals, but what is happening in their budget so we can give you an idea of what's happening on the ground. I want to say that I'm positive about the reorganization. We're going to poke a few holes here and there, but no work ever gets done without friction. But I want to preface my remarks by saying that we are positive. This is what change looks like. This is the process, and we're just positive about it. I also want to point out that transparency is improving. Two of our principals, and I'm not going to name names, came today, and I think a third was going to try to make it. That is a huge plus. They would never have dared to set foot in a meeting like this, but they're here to listen and hear, and that's a positive. So, things are out on the table so they can take back what you guys are saying to the SOTs and not run it through the filter of the Central Office.

My goal is to give you a bird's-eye view of what's happening on the ground as we begin implementing this sweeping legislation. To do that, I'm going to use a metaphor that I learned at Moapa Valley High School called the ladder of abstraction. I learned it from my father, who was an English teacher there. At the very bottom of the ladder, you have very specific things, dirt-under-the-fingernails issues. At the top of the ladder, you have theories and overarching concepts. One has to make sure they know what they're discussing and when. The reason I bring this up is because, when we're in a meeting like this and I hear CCSD make a presentation, I'm looking at it from the bottom of the ladder, where I'm seeing what's actually happening on the ground, and I hear what their perception is at the top of the ladder. Yes, there are going to be discrepancies, but we just need to know what rung of the ladder we're on. As I say that, there are definitely some fundamental differences between CCSD's presentation and our rural experience. I'm going to highlight some of those. Moapa Valley and Virgin Valley have advocated for this reform for over 2 years. We are intimately involved. We know what could happen, and we've had a great opportunity to participate in this process.

Today, we're advocating for the implementation of A.B. 469 with fidelity that will maintain rural equity. That is already built into A.B. 469. We're not asking for any changes in the law. We're just saying that if you implement A.B. 469 with fidelity—and I use that term specifically because the Central Office administration uses that term when talking to principals. If a policy that they're following isn't working, they came back and say, "Well you didn't implement it with fidelity. It would have worked, had you implemented it with fidelity." I'm here to tell you that I want to see A.B. 469 implemented with fidelity. My theme is that rural schools must be dealt with as a distinct group, not lumped in with metropolitan schools. I'll give you examples as to why. A northern Nevada school district has more rural students than CCSD. Because of the remote disconnect, I would propose that you evaluate our comments and concerns as if looking at a separate school district, because we just

don't have the same things. The remote disconnect is real. I'm not here to persuade any change, other than that CCSD needs to comply with the law. We've already hit the Superintendent's comment about the gifts, which really stuck in my craw.

I would like to illustrate what rural equity looks like and that it is not a gift. I will do this by moving up and down the ladder of abstraction using examples from Moapa Valley, because that's what I know best. But the principles will benefit all rural schools, and I would submit schools in the metropolitan area as well, because every school has unique challenges. That's really what we're discussing here. First of all, I want to point out some information. There are 145 schools in CCSD that are currently funded above the per-pupil base. So, our 17 rural schools are not outliers or one-offs. When you look at the per-pupil funding, there are 145 schools, and I'm not saying they don't deserve that funding. I'm just saying that's the reality. In the past, it hasn't been a blanket across-the-board. It varies. The students in the rural areas, at least in Moapa Valley, don't have access to Zoom or Victory schools and we don't get Title I monies. We advocated heavily to get money from S.B. 178, but they set the standard so high or low, however you want to look at it, that we don't qualify. We don't get money for magnet schools. We don't have access to those magnet schools because our students cannot come into Las Vegas. It's physically too far. We also don't have any career and technical (CT) schools. We don't have access to the ones in Vegas, and they have some good ones here. The District has done a good job of that.

We only have two major sources of funding for Moapa Valley schools. One is the base funding, and the other is the rural school allotment, the portion above the base that allows us to function and have some sort of equity for the students there. I want to talk about that equity. What that equity entails is not the bare minimum required for education requirements for graduation. That is one of our arguments, that the District is trying to push rural schools into that category, that we have enough funding to supply graduation requirements. We'll explain why that isn't equity. At our middle school this year, we don't have credit retrieval programs. We've had those in the past. When those students fail those classes, we don't have any ability in our middle school to bring those students back up to grade level. We don't have tutoring or proficiency assistance any more. All of that comes from the rural school allotment. That's what we use it for. Our base funding is the bare minimum, and then we use the rural school allotment to begin to supply these other programs that we do not have access to since we're out in the rural area without all those other funding sources. Again, we don't qualify for any Title I wrap-around services in Moapa Valley. The District's social worker never makes it out to our schools. The State supplied funding for two social workers at the high school, and that ends this year. Now, we share one social worker among three schools. That was a grant that came from the State, and that's over. Again, we don't qualify for S.B. 178. The only credit retrieval program left in our high school is for half of a teacher. With the class size we have now because of the demand for that credit retrieval, there is not enough room in that class for all the students to take credit retrieval. As that moves down the pipeline, it's going to be a problem, likewise in the middle school. This year, the sixth graders coming in won't have that credit retrieval, so the high school won't see the result of that until 3 years from now when they get into ninth grade. We don't have funding for afterschool behavioral programs like the metropolitan schools do. Our kids just drift off and disappear, if they're that disturbed.

A high school principal related some information that I did not know that surprised me. This is one of the things the principals just keep bottled up to themselves because they can't do anything about it other than try to get people at the school to go on their own time or just as a good Samaritan to help. We're often characterized as this elite area where everybody has a silver spoon and we've got more money than we deserve and excess funding and so forth. But when we don't get that rural school allotment, it hurts the bottom quintile of our students. As an example of how that looks, we actually have homeless students in our community. The principal told me this, and it was in a private conversation. I had never heard this before. We have one student who lives in an abandoned trailer without windows or doors next to Cooper Crossing. That student comes to school, and whenever there are little parties or get-togethers, the staff makes sure that student gets to take home the extra food. We have one student who lives behind the public library in the marsh. We have a couple who live down next to the muddy river adjacent to the sewer ponds. There are six homeless kids who live on the Indian reservation. The community watches out for them and won't let them starve. But we don't have the educational resources to provide an equitable education. Again, our rural school allocation is used like Title I and CT money for these disadvantaged students. These kids aren't college bound, and they need CT and proficiency programs, tutoring and social workers. The food bank doesn't deliver to the high school. We have to make special arrangements to pick up that food. Rural schools need full A.B. 469 implementation so we don't damage these kids further, like cutting programs just to maintain minimum graduation curriculum that they can't access because they're falling away. We know these kids by their individual names. These kids need a reason to come to school, and those programs funded by our rural allocation give us those programs. I just found out 2 days ago that the Moapa Educational Service Center has no tutoring services available at the current time. The local tribe is livid. It's tied up in bureaucracy and funding, and it's complex with Indian money and so forth. But that facility is critical, because our community is 26 miles long, which is probably the distance from Henderson to Summerlin. When you have a student who needs help, tutoring or proficiency services, they don't have the resources to drive 26 miles to the other end of the valley at the middle school to receive that. So that facility is critical. But there are no more tutors left at that facility, and there's all sorts of controversy about how that should be funded. I don't want to get into that because I don't understand all the legalities there, but that's an example.

Our Central Office cut \$103,000 out of our high school's budget by eliminating a dean position that CCSD has funded for years, but they deny that it's a cut and say we received more money than we did last year. I don't understand that math. Central denies that that was a budget cut because they don't list that position as budget money. Nevertheless, we lost the position so we lost the money. Only an accountant could understand this thinking. Over the last 10 years, our high school has lost 25 percent of its teacher rural allotment. You've got to understand that when you lose a teacher in a rural school, you don't just go and take those children out of that class and readjust them to the other four classes and bump up the class size by five pupils. You lose programs. If you've got two teachers who teach English and you lose a teaching position, you've lost 50 percent of that department. In a rural school, teachers mean entire programs, not class sizes.

That brings me to our middle school. Because we've been cut every year and that rural allotment has gone down, we lost our art teacher, so we don't have an art program. Fifty percent of our students at that middle school took that art class. I'd like to show you some pictures, because I think we need to bring it into perspective. This is the middle school art room that is now vacant. We had lots of art students, and a lot of Native American students took art and enjoyed that. I want you to notice that in the center, there's a trashcan and a bucket sitting there. When we walked into that room, it was raining, and there was water dripping out of the ceiling into that bucket. I couldn't have scripted a more pathetic situation. Here's the empty room. You can see the ceramic spin table sitting there. No students are using it, and that's because of a rural allocation teacher being cut, just a single cut. This is a conference room that used to have 13 piano keyboards in it that we would teach music with. We don't have access to the academies in Vegas. That was a woodshop classroom in the middle school. Now, it's just used as an overflow room. This is a picture of the paint booth where you could paint vehicles. When I went to the high school, I took auto shop, and a lot of my classmates took auto shop. There have been families raised on the education that they received while taking auto shop in high school. One of them ran Friendly Ford's maintenance division for 10 years, and all he had was a high school education that he got from Moapa Valley's auto shop program. Now we have a paint booth that is perfectly functional that is used for storage because we don't have a single teacher for an auto shop program. Here's a picture of the inside of the auto shop, fully equipped with lifts. Here's a picture from the other direction. We've got welders, and they just sit there because we don't have a teacher. We lost a counselor, so this is a picture of an empty room that we had a counselor in to help with some of the problems I mentioned. This is the room where the dean we lost provided assistance. This is a picture of the room in our high school where we had orchestra. You can see the cellos and violins sitting there because we don't have a single teacher to fulfill that need.

I want to note that we've been proactively trying to get attention from CCSD. This is a picture of the budget guide from this year. On the very first page, Superintendent Skorkowsky wrote a great piece on how this is going to change and we're going to move the reorganization forward. I believe he has good intentions there. But what we're talking about here is high on the level of abstraction. Then turn to page 36. It's small, but it talks about small school subsidies. Since February, our principal has been having conversations with the various levels within the District that this is too narrow. First off, it says "small school subsidy." There is no reference in the law to a small school subsidy, other than a specialty school. We're talking about rural schools. So, we couldn't even get them to say, "Look, we're talking about rural schools here." It talks about the per-unit allocation funding. Without reading the details, the point was that he wrote emails and met with administrative levels that had the ability to change that, and either they were too busy or they weren't listening. I don't know the reason, but there have been ample opportunities to say, "You know what, we need to look at this." Just recently, we finally did get some attention, but I fully feel that it's because we started bringing these issues up to you and to other people. That's the reason why we got the attention. What we were asking for with regard to this policy change about small school subsidies is that we need to have a discussion about what rural school funding means, and you need to include the rural schools. That was our request. Let's sit down and

have a discussion with the rural schools about this. We didn't even get a discussion. Now we're having it, but we've been asking for 6 months.

To finish, implementing A.B. 469 with fidelity would produce equity for rural schools. It could be a good pilot project to help the District adjust from a top-down management style to a bottom-up service, because we're used to not being able to have all the services out there. We're not complaining, and the parents realize that that's what you give up. We don't expect the equivalent, but we would like some equity so we can supply at least a little bit of a taste of what's available in the metropolitan area.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you for your testimony, Dr. Dalley. Dr. Barton, I know you're still here in the room. You mentioned that you would have more information on September 18. The language in A.B. 469 is clear to me and many others on this Committee. Based on my opinion, CCSD is not implementing the specific provision of A.B. 469 regarding rural schools with fidelity. I'd like you to contact me and the Committee directly no later than Monday, September 18 with the resolution on this.

Dr. Barton:

I'm appreciative of the opportunity to come up here again. That request is appropriate. We anticipate getting a full report to this Committee on this matter. We want to make sure that there's a resolution for this. I'm empathetic to these issues. I want to continue to personally work through this. I know I've met with several principals. I go back to Mr. Dalley's point previously that principals feel welcome to come into a setting like this, and I told them point blank to continue to advocate as leaders in their buildings so there isn't a stifling approach from an upper-Central Administration hand. But your request is definitely something we can respond to, and we'll give you that information.

Chair Roberson:

On Monday, September 18?

Dr. Barton:

If you're okay with this, I want to talk to our CFO Jason Goudie, out of fairness to him.

Chair Roberson:

We need a response on Monday, September 18.

Dr. Barton:

We will have a response on Monday, then. I just want to make sure it's thorough for your request.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you, Dr. Barton.

Bob Sweetin (City Attorney, City of Mesquite):

I don't want to belabor these points, but I just want to make a couple clarifications. There are a lot of similarities between Mesquite and Moapa Valley and other rural areas, and there are some differences. Mesquite is a city of over 20,000. We do not get the small school allotment, also known as the rural school allotment. Our schools are large enough out there. We are the fastest-growing community in the State of Nevada right now. Our population is roughly 50 percent Latino or Hispanic between Bunkerville and Mesquite, so we have an extreme need for ELL services. I'm just going to give you these straight numbers.

On Tuesday night, the City of Mesquite authorized me to bring suit against CCSD. We have been working on this since February. When R142-16 and the Advisory Committee were established, our SOTs were hard at work to make sure our schools got funded. We were really excited about finally getting some ELL programs up there, because we've had none and we have such a need for that in our community. When the SOTs that serve the Mesquite community submitted their budgets, they were rejected by the school associate superintendent. They were kicked back as too high, that "Hey, your projections aren't showing that." I would note that there was no reasoning, as the regulations and A.B. 469 require. There was no reasoning put on the school's website. Nothing. We didn't even get an answer. We were simply told by the principal, "We can't submit this budget," and that's it. That's when we started the process. We just want some answers, and we want to figure this out. Bless his heart, I think he means well and he tries very hard, but every time we've come to him, it's "I don't have the answer, that's not my wheelhouse. I can't answer that." The question then is who can answer that? We don't get answers. I'm very grateful to the Committee for taking time to hear from our rural communities today and from us in Mesquite.

With Virgin Valley Elementary School, we've got \$127,000 less in this year's budget than the 2016-2017 budget. At J. Bowler Elementary School, which is actually located in Bunkerville but 30 percent of their students are Mesquite residents, they've got \$141,000 less than their 2016-2017 budget. Looking at Virgin Valley High School recently, we found some financial gymnastics. I'm not a finance guy, but for lack of a better term, that's what I'll call it. It looks like we have about \$40,000 less in that budget, even though it would appear that there's actually more funding. From a practical standpoint, there isn't. These are issues we've raised. I just want to highlight again that section 19(3) in A.B. 469 does not allow for a proportional decrease. It doesn't. That's been said over and over by the District, or that it's a per-pupil basis. It isn't. It's all monies that were used to fund the school in 2016 and 2017. That's our baseline funding. There can be a proportional increase, if that's needed to run the school. We may need to wade into those waters. We haven't even needed to, because we can't even get the baseline funding from the District. That's all we want, and that's the point we're at. Everyone's in overcrowded classrooms right now, so we can't really complain about that. We're looking at losing reading programs. Our kids don't have the ELL programs

we wanted to get them. Our special education programs are suffering. We don't have the services. There's this talk about the 33 percent, that those are Central Office dollars but they go directly to schools. We don't get them in Mesquite. We don't. That's the bottom line. We get 55 percent. That's where we're at. So, part of our lawsuit seeks to force the School District to do that. We had planned to file on Monday, but I will advise the city council to allow me to wait until Tuesday, based on Senator Roberson's request to CCSD. I know that the CIC and TSC² have done just tremendous work in doing this as quickly as possible. But in the rurals, we just can't wait any longer.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you all for being here and testifying. I will just say this. There was powerful testimony today from all of you. I really appreciate that. I'm not pointing fingers at anyone in this room, but when I hear at every meeting that someone doesn't like something about the reorganization, of course it's messy, we always said it would be. This is monumental change in the fifth-largest school district in the country. Testimony like today's reminds me of one of the key motivations for the Legislature to pass this law in 2015 and again in 2017: the historic lack of responsiveness by this school district bureaucracy to the community. We've all heard from our constituents, and again, I'm not blaming anyone in this room, but it is a fact. We've all heard it from our constituents for years that members of the community, whether they're in North Las Vegas, Summerlin, Henderson or Moapa Valley, can't get the bureaucracy to respond to their needs and concerns. One of the things we're doing with this reorganization, as painful as it may be at times, is changing that. This School District will respond to the community. That's my little editorial, but it's important because this testimony right now illustrates the concern that we all share with past practices of the bureaucracy.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

I've been a staunch advocate in my tenure here in the Assembly, saying at every opportunity that we need to increase funding for education systems as a state in order for us to get better. So, your plight doesn't fall on deaf ears. I think there are many children in our state that are suffering, not just the rural communities near Southern Nevada. I've heard about a lot of rural communities in northern Nevada and what they are going through as well, having to do more with less. So, your comments, your plight, the children that you speak of and the needs that you have do not fall on deaf ears.

Now, I'm trying to understand this proportional funding. How did we conceive it? How was it calculated? How did it come into place? Has it been consistent? When we had a surplus of money, was this when the Superintendent said, "We have this money, let's put it to good use where it's needed"? Because unfortunately, with the reorganization and having to see real numbers and actually sending the money to the schools, it's going to give us a reality check, like the Chair just said. Maybe we were purchasing things on credit that we didn't have money to then go back and pay for. So, I'm trying to wrap my brain around this proportional funding. What does that look like? Will it be consistent? Does it look the same for Mojave as it looks for Mesquite and Sandy Valley? From a fiscal perspective, what does proportional funding mean?

Dr. Moses:

That's like trying to answer the mythical question of where the Yeti is. The proportional difference was established by the ex-CFO based on the per-pupil funding for the entire general and special education budgets. Where did these extra positions come from before? Maybe I can clarify a little bit of that. I was with the District for 31 years. I have been hanging around the District for 50 years. I was a principal of a rural school in Clark County. This was 25 years ago, but I'm not going to try to go back and talk about the good old days. Back then, I had nine teachers above the ratio. That was not based on a gift, that was based on sitting down with what at the time was called an associate superintendent and explaining to him what my educational problems were. How was I going to maintain my auto shop that took care of 150 kids a day? How was I going to maintain my choir that took care of another 150 kids a day? How was I going to maintain my woodshop? All of those programs are gone now. We decided that to do that and to give our kids that kind of an education, I needed nine extra teachers on staff. Well, over the years, that began to disintegrate. When we went down to six extra while I was there, our staff got together and sat down. I went to the staff and told them, "We need to do something to alleviate the fact that I've lost three or four teachers here," and the staff agreed to go to a different schedule. Now, I didn't go to the District and say to them, "I would like to do this" and have an associate superintendent tell me, "No you can't." I went to my staff and I said, "Look, I'm 1 to 600 no matter what we do, but how would you like to look at a program where we can go to an eight-period situation and create five teachers out of the sky?" That's how we alleviated the problem. But you're now to a point where you've lost so much staffing that you can't even alleviate the problem by changing scheduling. So, these were positions given to us to provide equity for our kids. We have seen that equity fall by the wayside as we go. By the way, it's not an unusual situation in CCSD. The only data I had to work with, because it's the only thing available, was the accountability report for 2016. It showed that in the 2014-2015 School Year, 160-some schools, including our rural schools, were funded above the average funding for a school in Clark County. There are various reasons for that. I have no problem with that. I'm just saying that's the case. Sometimes we have a mistaken thought that there is a per-pupil funding that is a base in Clark County. There isn't one. Every school has a different per-pupil funding. The lowest is \$5,333, and again this is from the 2016 report. The highest was a behavioral school with over \$54,000 per kid. All schools fall in between there. If we are going to get to a per-pupil base, we're going to have to figure out some way to determine what a standard per-pupil is and what that kid takes with him wherever he goes in the District. Right now, it's whatever school you're in, that's what you're funded for.

Mr. Sweetin:

Hopefully this will help answer your question as well. The City of Mesquite's position is that, for a rural school under A.B. 469, section 19(3), there is a base level of funding that's not proportional, it's just what you got in 2016-2017. That's the position we've arrived at. That's what we've communicated to the State Superintendent's office. There can be what's called a proportional increase over that. The statute of A.B. 469, and the regulations did this as well, had the requirement that the School District or the State Board of Education set up

weights and measures to be allocated to each student, which is kind of what Dr. Moses is talking about. Our position would be that the proportional funding only kicks in for us once we have more students proportionally or we need that proportional extra amount once we hit that base level. Now, I know one of the arguments we've gotten back from the District is, "Well hey, listen, it can't be a flat baseline of 2016-2017, because what if you have fewer students?" I understand their argument and what they're saying, but that's the old way of looking at things. There are policy reasons that were made by, in my opinion, very good legislators. who are all up here now, on why that was voted into effect the way it was. But then what I say from a practical standpoint is that, in Mesquite, don't worry about it. That's not our problem. We don't have fewer students. We've got less money and more students. So, that's not a problem on our end. I hope that kind of answers where proportionality comes in for us.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

Thank you. I'm trying to wrap my brain around all these moving parts and pieces, and it's not an easy task at all. But I just think we need to have a very thorough, robust discussion about the DSA, how it's structured and how we need to fund our students moving forward so we know that it's fair and equitable and that we're reaching all children across our state in a manner that can keep with their educational needs as the years go by. So, I do think that we need to have a discussion. We need to see how we fund the rural students versus Clark County students, because sometimes I think we're fighting over the same money. I can tell you that, in the urban core, we have high vacancy rates. So, I know that in the past, we've also given more funds to other schools at the expense of those urban schools, because they have less tenured staff and vacancies in the staff, so that money has also shifted elsewhere. Moving forward in this reorganization where we're supposed to make sure the dollars follow students, how do we make sure we're doing that across everybody's school community so we all get our fair share? So, I just wanted to wrap my brain around where we were and where we had come up with the proportional funding. But I think we need to have more dialogue and discussion on that. Hopefully our education interim committee will take a deep dive.

Mr. Sweetin:

Thank you for that. We have no objection to that. We think that'd be very good. But I just want to reaffirm that this doesn't affect our argument now, which is that there's a base level of funding that is statutorily required which we simply aren't getting.

Assemblywoman Neal:

My question is to Mesquite. Are you getting anything from S.B. 178?

Mr. Sweetin:

No.

Assemblywoman Neal:

What about federal money or Title I funds?

Mr. Sweetin:

They've been reduced across the board.

Assemblywoman Neal:

So you're not getting any federal money?

Mr. Sweetin:

We're getting some Title I funds. I didn't want to get too much into the lawsuit we're preparing to file. We're going to make it available to the District today so they can look at it and try to answer our questions. But the way they apply Title I funding makes very little sense to the people in our community, because our schools just flip flop every year. Every year we get a little more or a little less, and sometimes it's a lot more or a lot less, like our school in Bunkerville that took a huge cut this year that was completely unexpected. Our argument is about all of the money. That's what the statute says, that all money provided to the school in 2016-2017 needs to be provided again. That's the base level. So, we do get a little bit of Title I funding. It's not much. It's not enough to offset what's happening up there.

THE CHAIR CALLED FOR A BRIEF RECESS.

Chair Roberson:

The next agenda item is a presentation by the TSC² Group. We will hear from Tom Skancke and Michael Vannozzi. They have a report that they have submitted to the Committee. They also submitted it to the CIC at their meeting yesterday, but we'd like to hear an overview of their findings.

Tom Skancke (President, CEO, TSC² Group):

I would like to introduce Michael Vannozzi, the project manager on this effort for the past 11 months. Andrew Doughman, a member of our team, is with us today, and Brian Knudsen was here earlier, but he had to leave.

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

First, I'd like to thank you all for helping with this tremendous effort that's been taking place over the last couple of years. To set the stage for this, it's important to recognize where we've been ([Exhibit K](#)). For 2 years now, this Committee and the previous committee have been working on this. The original regulation that governed the reorganization was actually just passed 1 year and a couple days ago. This Committee voted on us in October of 2016.

In November, we actually started our work. By December 15, we submitted our first 45-day report on this reorganization. That report included an evaluation of what CCSD needed to implement this reorganization, including the need for a weighted funding formula policy and several other elements to ensure the reorganization's success, including the human capital management system, the development of a process to facilitate the decentralization of resources managed by Central, a better external and internal communication, creation and coordination of training, the implementation of strategies to optimize the way SOTs operate and a significant analysis capacity. A couple months later, we came back to the CIC with a report on phase two, and we detailed the ways in which CCSD was not implementing the statutory requirements at that time, namely by only transferring a portion of the required unrestricted resources to the local school level. As you know, a lawsuit commenced shortly after we came on the scene in December of 2016. That lawsuit was not ended until May of 2017, but we managed to work cooperatively with CCSD in that time. On March 20, 2017, a memorandum was issued from the Superintendent to the Trustees and others that allowed us to really start working cooperatively with the District. Then, the Legislature took action to codify the regulation by introducing A.B. 469 on March 27, 2017, and that bill was passed during the session. After that bill was introduced, work started to occur in earnest. You and the CIC have seen this work over the past 6 months. Internal structures were built to help implement the reorganization. We developed a process to facilitate the decentralization of resources managed by Central. We stepped up the internal and external communication training efforts. Fundamentally, however, CCSD has yet to meaningfully transfer the budget and site-based decision making as required by law to schools. That being said, they have the tools they need to do so. Now, it's up to the CCSD Central Administration and the Board of Trustees to take the necessary steps to come into compliance.

This report we submitted to you is segmented into two main parts ([Exhibit L](#)). First, we basically laid out everything that CCSD is poised to do over the 2017-2018 School Year to come into compliance with the law. Second, we'll offer recommendations in the context of Mike Strembitsky's plan. Some of those recommendations go beyond the law, but they conform with the plan that the law is based upon. Mr. Strembitsky is in the audience today. We've asked him to be here, and it's really been a pleasure to work with him over the course of this project.

So, what is CCSD poised to do in 2017-2018? I'm going to go through this quickly, because you've heard a lot of this from the Superintendent. We agree with many of the things they are poised to do. This year, one of the things they are doing is distributing weighted funding formula dollars. If you recall, A.B. 469 section 19(1) has to do with the weighted funding formula. The Legislature passed S.B. 178, which allocated funds that are now going out. But funding for special education and GATE still remains outside of the school strategic budgets. To come into compliance with sections 16(2) and 19(1) of the law, this must change. In our report, we say these changes must be initiated in fall of 2017, and from CCSD's presentation earlier, it does appear they are taking steps to make this a reality.

What else is CCSD poised to do in 2017-2018? They are poised to transfer more budget and responsibilities to the local school level. They just talked about this at length earlier in the meeting, but they've developed a process to transfer budget and authority for duties

currently managed at the local school level. You may recall that a process map existed, and they are going through it at this time. The Advisory Committee and the CIC heard about this last month. Notably, many of the responsibilities that CCSD implements with unrestricted money are also enumerated in section 16(3), (a) through (t), of A.B. 469. Collectively, these responsibilities account for about 37 percent of CCSD's unrestricted budget. According to section 16(7), the Board of Trustees must affirmatively vote to transfer these responsibilities. Without transferring, CCSD will not be able to meet the requirements of section 18 of A.B. 469, which is the 85-15 provision. This transfer of responsibility process is designed to analyze and collect information necessary to transfer budget and responsibilities. This will ensure that the principals get the resources available to perform these responsibilities and that Central Services documents the considerations. The District must vote to transfer budgeting responsibilities in the fall of 2017. We intend to work as quickly as we can during the length of our contract to get them as prepared for that vote as possible. They have indicated today that they're looking at an early November vote on that.

What else is CCSD poised to do? They'll begin the implementation of the human capital management system. As has been detailed in nearly every report from the consultant, the reorganization would be greatly aided by an updated human capital management system. The Legislature concurred, and you all appropriated \$17,000,000 for this purpose. Where is this at? The District has created an implementation plan. They presented this plan just last week to the Board of Trustees. They have not yet picked a vendor for that plan, but it is moving forward. They anticipate starting the project early next year, January of 2018, and concluding the project at the end of 2019.

What else is CCSD poised to do? They'll find efficiencies at Central. This is tied into the budget conversation that has weaved in and out of this. Suffice it to say that a lot of the work of the consultant has been focused on moving Central to a more efficient way of doing things. I want to say that there are two ideas on the table that are caught up in the budget cut considerations. One is an Idea Depot and the other is an efficiency challenge. If you want to read more about what we think they can do to promote efficiencies, you can read the report ([Exhibit L](#)).

Finally, CCSD must implement changes in its operating procedure to come into compliance with various provisions of the statute. They are poised to do many of these things in 2017-2018. One that is not listed here but was a topic of discussion in the last section was the rural issue. I'll go through six different requirements that the law places on CCSD. Section 16(2) prescribes that the Superintendent must transfer authority to each local school precinct to select their staff, including teachers, administrators other than the principal, and other staff that work in direct supervision. The District has already transferred authority for many of these staff, but they will need to complete the process by transferring authority for other staff, namely the special education teachers and other people who actually report to the principal and come to school on a daily basis. The District has asserted that there are implications with collective bargaining agreements regarding this portion of the law. Similarly, CCSD has asserted that the assignment and reassignment of staff provision has collective bargaining implications. The consultant team has worked with CCSD to develop preliminary standard operating procedures around these provisions, but they have yet to be

fully implemented. The law also mandates that local school precincts make every attempt to hire licensed teachers before substitutes. The standard operating procedure has been drafted, and it's just going to ensure ongoing monitoring. There are more requirements in the law. A standard operating procedure has been developed for the provision of the law that mandated necessary and timely maintenance, and guidance has been released on issues related to purchasing. These are two very important requirements of A.B. 469. But, the final requirement that we're going to talk about is the requirement that local schools keep their carryover. This will need to be monitored in the future. Essentially, this provision mandates that schools keep the budget they don't use as restricted carryover. What is this budget? It's basically un-hired employees and unused supply money. When CCSD releases their strategic budgets in 2018-2019, they will, upon the approval of the Trustees, allocate the money for all staff that are regularly employed in schools. In previous years, CCSD has relied to a certain extent on the attrition and vacancies in these positions to balance their budget. Because of A.B. 469, money budgeted for school-based positions that remains unused at the end of the year is restricted to local school precinct budgets. In effect, this provision will require CCSD to fully fund the local school precincts. They will be unable to balance their budget using attrition and vacancy savings. This may result in CCSD cutting Central Services' budget significantly if they did not previously plan to do this. I'll give you one example. On the table and as required by law, special education teachers are required to be transferred into local school precinct budgets. According to a news report, CCSD had around 400 vacancies in special education teaching positions last year. That means CCSD did not employ special education teachers to the tune of probably more than \$30,000,000 in salaries and benefits. If the current budget does not take this into account, this transfer of responsibilities process may have further budget implications for 2018-2019. So in broad strokes, that's what CCSD is poised to do to come into compliance. They have all the tools they need to do this work, and it really is up to the CCSD administration and the Board of Trustees to make it happen. We would reiterate that the State Superintendent has the power to take any action he deems necessary and appropriate to ensure compliance.

This next section has to do with our recommendations beyond the law. This section is organized around Mr. Strembitsky's plan to reorganize CCSD. What we did was pull out four pertinent quotes that really talk about how a school district should look. Some of the recommendations we make go beyond what the four corners of the statute say, but recognizing that the charge of this Committee is also to ensure the monitoring of the plan and the statute to reorganize CCSD, we thought we'd take you there. If CCSD takes the steps required by statute to transfer the budget and responsibility, we'll be much closer to the full implementation. But, here's something to keep in mind. Strembitsky describes a reorganized school district as one where "parent and community involvement becomes intertwined with the culture of the local school precinct and integral to its operation." I don't think anyone can argue that we've seen a lot of that here today in this hearing. The District has taken many steps towards this end, facilitating the creation of SOTs at more than 300 local school precincts. But the consultant team recommends we go further. We recommend that CCSD take action to energize SOT participation in higher-poverty areas. It should be noted that energizing SOT participation is the responsibility of local school precincts. But from our listening tour and from accounts that we've heard across the District, there is a lower level of participation in higher-poverty areas. The District has the ability, perhaps

through a Board community taskforce, to examine this issue and energize participation to assist the schools. Second, CCSD already energizes participation in some of the schools through things they do centrally, like preparing SOT stories of success. If you haven't seen them, I encourage you to go to reorg.ccsd.net. I think that CCSD, with Vegas PBS and others in the Leadership and Development Department, has really picked out some great stories of things that are going on right now at CCSD. These things can be shared between peers, and they can really, really help the situation going forward. Third, as the Advisory Committee and CCSD have heard on many occasions, CCSD should take action to ensure the resolution of disputes at local school precincts, and we'll come back to that. Fourth, as brought up by Vikki Courtney at the last CIC meeting and by John Vellardita, the Executive Director of the Clark County Education Association (CCEA), at this last meeting, we agree that CCSD should create structures to respond rapidly to climate and culture concerns at local school precincts. This should be done through the Superintendency, and we'll bring this up again with our plan for the Superintendency. Fifth, we recommend that CCSD continue to enhance training, as they plan to do through the SOT conference coming up this fall that the Superintendent and Dr. Barton mentioned. Finally, CCSD should not be shy about asking for help. This reorganization asks the community for a great deal. It asks them to be actively involved in schools through SOTs and other means. Rotary clubs can help serve on SOTs. Chambers of commerce can help staff SOTs. We don't need to go through the PTAs or PTOs. We can go to the outside and really, really ask the community for their help and input.

The second quote from Strembitsky's plan that we'll highlight today is related to the organization of the District itself. It says, "The superintendent and his immediate staff share a common interest in the successful operation of the school district. Staff members who are most likely to share this interest are those most directly responsible for schools." The reorganization calls for the central structure of CCSD to change. The District has made many of the necessary hires for the changes in this area. This picture here is of the Superintendency ([Exhibit K](#)). Thirty-five percent of these people in the picture are new to their jobs and new to their roles. That's a large change that's happened at the very, very top of the School District. These are the people at the top of CCSD who are most responsible for making this happen. There will be a few more changes, not the least of which is that the leader of the Superintendency, the Superintendent, just announced his retirement. We really thank him for his service. Superintendent Skorkowsky has led the District to new heights in student achievement. The next superintendent will have big shoes to fill. That superintendent will be responsible for more than 300 schools that operate under autonomous school-based decision making. They will have more than 20 direct reports. They will be responsible for ensuring that this reorganization moves forward. The management of this organization requires a different skillset than what was probably contemplated when Superintendent Skorkowsky was hired 4 years ago. So, we are really in favor of the Trustees taking their time and asking these questions and getting input from the community on these things.

Next, organizationally, the School District runs on what are called the principles of organization. Dr. Barton mentioned these at the top of his presentation. These are the tenets of the new school system. They were not well understood by all parties. Therefore,

we recommend that CCSD articulate these principles of organization into what we call covenants. These covenants would be between schools and Central Services. These covenants would serve as basic service-level agreements between schools and Central. In that manner, schools can know what they can expect, and Central can be clear about the services they're able to provide. We also recommend that CCSD adopt metrics to measure site-based decision making. We recommended this back in December, but those metrics include tracking the amount of discretionary budgeting authority allocated to schools, tracking the rate of instruction spending district wide and the resulting participation with parent, student and employee surveys. These recommendations are fleshed out a bit more in our report.

The one recommendation we want to spend a little bit of time on is this one. This is going beyond the law as well, but we wanted to put it out there because it's been the subject of discussion at many Superintendency meetings internally. I think it needs to be fleshed out more. But we wanted to put it on the record because this is our final report, and this is something that I think is appropriate to talk about. It's called the school-centered support network. What is that? It's an idea that was really devised by the Superintendency. We'll go into detail on the recommendation, and I know they're still considering this. To assist with customer service around Central Services, the transfer of responsibilities and SOT dispute resolution, it is recommended that the Superintendent realign the responsibilities of the school associate superintendents to be more responsive to the particularized, specialized and localized circumstances, needs and concerns of local school precincts. Here's how you do it. In fall of 2017, the Superintendent should order the Superintendency to be reorganized into a school support network, which will include the school associate superintendents and their staff, which is usually just one person. The school associate superintendents should be charged with assisting schools and getting the resources they need from Central Services to implement the school plans of operation. Right now, no meaningful aggregate customer service data appears to exist at the District. Therefore, the school support network should also include a customer service call center to handle and document the requests made of Central Services by schools. It is suggested that school associate superintendents repurpose their existing staff to create the call center. The school support network will be responsible for overseeing the rollout, operations and compliance related to responsibilities transferred from Central Services to schools, as defined in section 16(3). The school support network would oversee customer service by acting as a facilitator of schools, and they would facilitate the transfer of responsibilities process on an annual basis. Acting as a first responder to the school for relations to Central Services divisions and departments, the school support network can really amass valuable aggregate data on the performance of Central departments in delivering quality service to schools. School support network staff would further be responsible for fielding parent and community concerns, with a focus on documenting and mediating complaints that arrive among principals.

So, this is the basic frame of the school support network. To go further, in the winter, it is suggested that the Superintendent facilitate the creation of school support networks by splitting the District into administrative quadrants. The quadrants would contain three or four school associates superintendents, with staff distributed accordingly. Under this framework,

the centrally prescribed performance zone model would cease to exist. In its place, schools would be afforded the opportunity to express preferences for choosing their supervisory school associate superintendent in their quadrant. School associate superintendents will, with the input of principals, design a process through which most of these preferences can be accommodated within the construct of A.B. 469. In this way, school support networks would also serve as the clearinghouse for dispute resolution. Through the customer service call center, we can document where concerns take place and respond. If SOT concerns are not addressed in this manner, school associate superintendents would meet with both parties in the dispute simultaneously and act as an arbitrator for the dispute. If a dispute is not rectified through the school associate superintendent, principals and SOTs may appeal to the Superintendent in a way similar to that outlined in section 29 of the law. The consultants really feel that the establishment of school support networks will be a positive step towards ensuring the long-term sustainability of this decentralized model.

Moving onto the next quote in Strembitsky's plan, he calls for "the authority to carry out certain responsibilities to be transferred to the local school precincts." We heard about this in the Superintendent's plan earlier, and we really think that we can now move forward quickly with the transfer of responsibilities. I think it's encouraging that they are moving towards transferring responsibilities for people who show up at school every day, utilities and other things like that. Those things will be fleshed out over the next month. They should move as quickly as possible on that. In addition, we recommend that CCSD create central services reports for those services that CCSD delivers to local schools currently but that are not in the strategic budget, like athletics, extra-duty pay and EpiPen administration. These things will eventually be in school strategic budgets, but for right now, principals need information to make decisions with, such as, "Okay, well maybe I can have our first aid safety assistant (FASA) administer EpiPens and save \$5,000 doing this, that and the other." Those things can really inform the transfer of responsibilities process. I know they've got a lot on their plate, but in my opinion, CCSD could do this now.

The final recommendation is that CCSD embrace Strembitsky's recommendation and move to a modified zero-based budget for Central Services. This is recommended, but it is not a requirement of the law. If you care to know about modified zero-based budgets and what that means, it could make Central Services far more responsive on a budgetary and annual basis to things that are demanded by schools. They could change services accordingly based on data they collect. We go into detail on this later in the report.

These are our final conclusions. Over a very short period of time, as this regulation has only been in effect for a little over 1 year, and since the legislative session, we have really put our foot on the gas pedal. The District has reoriented itself toward site-based decision making, but it's not there yet. Today, the full implementation of the reorganization depends on the will of the Superintendent and the Board of School Trustees. Absent the assistance of the consulting team, members of the Superintendency will be the individuals most responsible for the day-to-day implementation of this law. The Nevada Department of Education has new responsibilities to monitor the reorganization along with this Committee. As a reminder, if necessary, the Nevada Department of Education can promulgate additional regulations. The community has a responsibility to continue to be engaged in

local schools. This is the very, very heart of this reorganization. We're almost there. We're at the cusp of this reorganization. It's up to us to ensure that all Clark County schools achieve. With that, I'd invite my colleagues to come up and help answer questions.

Senator Becky Harris (Senatorial District No. 9):

We may just want to have a conversation offline, because my questions really deal with your "Beyond the Law" section. Those plans would be discretionary, something that people may or may not want to take on themselves, but it's not within the actual requirements. When you talk about how CCSD should create structures to respond rapidly to climate and culture concerns at local school precincts, I'm really unclear what you mean by that.

Mr. Vannozzi:

The Legislature passed S.B. 369 in the 2017 Session. The recommendation was made at this last Advisory Committee meeting. I believe it was made by CCEA, so maybe this is an opportunity for us to come together offline and figure out what all of that means. Basically, we agree that, at times, we need to respond very, very quickly to climate and culture concerns when they occur. We don't necessarily know what that looks like, so we want to make it an open-ended recommendation so that others can come behind us and figure out what that means.

Senator Harris:

So, what kind of culture and climate changes are we talking about?

Mr. Vannozzi:

The law that I'm referring to is one in which teachers, support staff or others feel that they are being intimidated or retaliated against for particular stances they may take on an SOT or through other means of engagement.

Senator Harris:

So, we're talking a lot about dispute resolution and some of the ongoing conversations we'll be having with regard to that? Because when I look at it in the context of your slides, it almost looks like it would be student climate and culture concerns, not necessarily teachers' and administrators' climate and culture concerns. I just want to be really clear about what exactly it is that we're talking about here, because I would agree that there's no place for retaliation for participation on an SOT. I think the SOTs are critical to the success of the reorganization, and care needs to be taken. Another concern that I had while listening to your remarks is that you're now starting to talk an awful lot about conflict and the need for conflict resolution. Are we seeing a lot of conflict and problems that are not being resolved with the current methods that we have available?

Mr. Vannozzi:

The answer is no, not a lot. But when they do occur, it is important that things get resolved in a customer service setting. The old customer service adage is that for every one complaint, there are 10 people who are silent who don't say anything. It is important that we address these going forward, for the sake of confidence in the system and so the community members know they're getting an adequate educational delivery service.

Senator Harris:

So, are you talking more in terms of customer service, or are you talking more along the lines of an actual dispute resolution process that needs to be created?

Mr. Vannozzi:

In our recommendation on the school-centered support network, we recognized while going through this that there are several different types of disputes that arise. Sometimes there are disputes between SOT members. Sometimes there are disputes between SOT members and their principals. Sometimes there are disputes that are completely offline. Sometimes there are disputes between the local school precinct and Central Services. Those sorts of things all have different ways you could possibly look at them. What we suggest is that, through the school-centered support network, we have a single place to document these disputes, that somebody's job is to essentially track down what's going on. If it rises to a level of the school associate superintendent getting involved, the school associate superintendent will serve as the one arbitrator who hears both sides at the same time.

Senator Harris:

So, I'd be interested in having a conversation with you about how we tease all this out. You're talking about a confluence of a variety of different types of conflicts, and not every conflict is going to need to go through a dispute resolution process, per say in the case of the local school precinct that may disagree with Central Services over an issue. That's completely different than talking about a concern on an SOT that may need to go through a dispute resolution process based on the dynamic that's taking place with regard to that SOT. So, I'm not going to belabor the point, but I really think that more thought needs to go into what kind of model and what kind of dispute resolution process it is that you're going to create, and how that's ultimately going to be effective. Because I just think it's a little unclear and there's not a lot of context. You can't muddle all conflict into one process. I think more thought needs to continue to occur around that concept.

Mr. Vannozzi:

We certainly agree.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I had a question on the actual report, on pages 16 and 17 ([Exhibit L](#)). I was confused. You're discussing the assignment and reassignment of central staff to local school precincts. I wasn't clear, because in your examples, you included bus drivers, CCSD police officers and how those may be assigned to specific local school precincts. I'm not clear on why, and I don't even know if that's the discussion. Is there a discussion to assign bus drivers and police officers to a school site?

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

These are examples of employees who work for central service divisions or departments, which use a variety of methods to essentially assign people to serve different local school precincts.

Mr. Vannozzi:

Section 16(6) of the law says that for any member of Central Services that is assigned to a local school precinct to do work, whether it's on a temporary or permanent basis, the decision must be made in consultation with the principal. There are police officers who are stationed at local schools. They report to the local school. They may service a particular area, but they report to a local school every day. That is a central service right now, but how do you make that work?

Assemblywoman Neal:

I just thought that we had a conversation at the last meeting around what was effective and efficient. I thought we had already squashed the idea of bus drivers being allocated, that that should not occur? In the first couple months that we met, when we were laying out services, I was confused when I saw it as an example, because I don't see how that realistically would work. I thought we were trying to make sure we don't set people up for failure to take on a service that you know is hard to manage. That's just a basic, rational way of thinking.

Mr. Doughman:

I think this section really contemplates the assignment of staff from a central division. This is not necessarily regarding the transfer of responsibilities process that's outlined elsewhere. So, in the instance of bus drivers, they have their own method. I believe there's some kind of lottery or preference system whereby bus drivers have some say in choosing what type of route they'd like to select over other routes that they might not prefer. So, in this case with this clause, it's saying that principals must be consulted on those matters as to how they end up with, say, John and not Suzie as the bus driver.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I'll leave that alone, because that's odd to me. I shouldn't be able to pick Joe or John because of personality conflicts. So, you brought up breaking things into quadrants. The first thing that came into my mind was how is this different than area superintendents who are over areas? Are we traveling into the past?

Mr. Vannozzi:

That has been brought up. This is a different conception of it, and I would leave it to the school associate superintendents to flesh out exactly what the Superintendency would like to see going forward. This is a customer-service-based data aggregation method. The idea is still being fleshed out, and it has not been presented to the School Board or anything like that. We just thought that, given our charge here, this is something we'd put on the table because it has been brought up.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

In your final conclusions ([Exhibit L](#)), you state, "The community has a responsibility to continue to be engaged in local schools to ensure that they are responsive to the unique needs of our community," with "they" being the schools, I'm assuming. However, I think it's a chicken and egg game sometimes, because if I then go to the slide ([Exhibit K](#)) that states, "CCSD should take action to energize SOT participation in higher poverty areas," how are we going to achieve that goal of having community engagement if we're not even getting them engaged in our SOTs at our school sites and we're not creating that environment? So, first and foremost, I want any information you have about why we're having challenges in higher-poverty areas and engaging parents into the SOT structure. I think that if we're seeking that final conclusion, we need to make sure we're addressing this problem area. So, can you give me any information on that?

Mr. Vannozzi:

I think you bring up a really good point. The idea behind this reorganization is that the notion of the duties of the School District has to change. We cannot just be responsive to people who have the opportunity to sit in School Board meetings and parent advisory committee (PAC) meetings all the time. We've opened up opportunities for people to become engaged at the local school level with SOTs. With the recommendation that we made to take action to energize SOT participation in higher-poverty areas, maybe through a Board community taskforce, one of the things we thought would be good is to get some good data on the levels of participation. We know that people work odd hours. We know that there's a lot of shift work in this town. My family members, and I'm sure many of your family members and everyone's on this dais, work shifts. How can we come together as a community in a collaborative manner to say, "We want everyone to become involved. We want the doors of our schools to be open and we want people to be able to participate in a lot of different things"? How do we best do that? I think that's a conversation best left to CCSD, this body and members of the community.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

So, in your conversations with community members and parents, did you get any information that shed any kind of light as to why there's a lack of participation? I'm just trying to drill down and see. Maybe it's not a good match in terms of the leadership style at that school with high-poverty community members, so how do we address that issue if it's not a good fit? Maybe it might be the workload and having to work two or three jobs where you're on call. You don't have a stable schedule so you can then be on the SOT and say, "I can be here on the days you're going to meet." You're not going to raise your hand, because you don't know what hours you have to work. So, I'm just trying to get an idea. I don't know if there was any kind of input that you received through surveys at this point in your scope of work. I'm just trying to see if you have any information.

Mr. Doughman:

One thing this law does is mandate several surveys that the District needs to do every year in surveying school communities. As CCSD carried those out, we saw that they collect them by school. You see a lot of participation in certain schools and not a lot of participation in other schools. So, we do get some good aggregate data back that can be viewed district wide as to how school communities perceive their school culture and how they believe the reorganization is going. But when you drill down into the results of those surveys, you find massive disproportionality as to who's actually responding to those. In conjunction with CCSD, we have conducted some SOT listening tours to try to take a look at these survey results. That's why we're recommending that that's what needs to be done to really drill down and find out how we increase participation. Just because this first year rolled out and there was massive democratic participation in voting for SOTs, and they appeared to pretty much be 100 percent full, it doesn't mean that will be the case 5 years down the road. So, attention should be paid to finding out ways to sustain that momentum.

Senator Denis:

So, in your final conclusions, you mention that CCSD has the tools to implement the law, and you highlighted today that the full implementation of the reorganization depends on the will of the Superintendent and the Board of Trustees. Is there anything in your interaction with the District that would indicate they don't have the desire to do that?

Mr. Vannozzi:

We've worked very, very closely over the last 10 months with CCSD, and we've had the great fortune to work with the Trustees as well. We're going to work as hard as we can through this portion of our contract to get this done. The way that it's going right now, I think there is sincere movement towards this. I think it's going to be up to this Committee, the Nevada State Board of Education and the State Superintendent to ensure that that momentum continues.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you for this report. We will be having another meeting next month, and we'll be talking with you one final time before your contract ends at the end of October. Thank you for all the great work you've put into this. We'll talk more big-picture overview at the next meeting. We're making progress. That's what I heard today, and I'm sure you agree. We're making progress. There's a lot of work still to do, but we're getting there, so thank you.

I will now open our final agenda item. Last interim, we had a technical advisory committee chaired by Senator Harris. It was a really large committee, with over 25 individuals. In response to the real need I'm hearing at every one of these meetings from parents and teachers regarding the SOT process and the issues around community involvement in this reorganization, I've talked to Senator Harris about reinstituting the technical advisory committee, but not exactly. Not with such a large committee, but a committee that I think Senator Harris would be interested in chairing, with a working group of individuals from the community to focus on a lot of these issues on a regular basis that we hear come up again and again with the SOTs and other areas around community engagement with the reorganization. With the CIC having their last meeting next month and the consultant's contract expiring at the end of next month, it is a task that I think needs to be addressed over this interim. Frankly, it's a lot for this Committee to take on in our meetings, because our meetings are pretty full with other aspects of the reorganization. So, again, I've spoken to Senator Harris about this. If there are no objections, I would like to be able to have this taskforce or working group started back up in a different form, of course, but chaired by Senator Harris. We would let her decide who should be on that committee, who she can recruit to be on that committee to continue to work on these issues that we hear in public comment at every one of our meetings, dealing with the SOTs and community involvement with the reorganization. Are there any concerns from members of the Committee? No. So, we'll go forward with that.

I will now open public comment.

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

I would like to address Senator Denis' last question of whether the District has the will to do this. I would frame my comments to that question this way: A.B. 394 from 2 years ago and A.B. 469 now contain two promises for principals. You heard principals speak of these things this morning. Those promises are greater autonomy and more money. Let's talk about autonomy first. Under the law, specific to section 16, to be implemented immediately, not requiring a vote of the Trustees, is greater autonomy for principals over staffing, the purchasing of goods and services, and employee supervision, including greater control over discipline. Those have not been addressed under this process. They have not been implemented. Principals do not have greater autonomy over staffing, meaning who comes to their school. You saw a slide this morning on this screen that said 232 of those who responded felt that that was an autonomy they had to have ([Exhibit I](#)). So, I believe we've not made significant or sufficient progress on those autonomies the law requires to be

implemented right now. The second piece deals with money. There was much discussion with this group over the last 2 years that money should follow the child. I don't think there's disagreement on that. Again, getting back to the will of the District, I think for money to follow the child, we're going to have to have greater efficiencies, because putting things in schools that have monies attached to them does not give principals and SOTs more money to make decisions about the children. However, we did talk about the money following the child in the sense that this District has been unable to staff their bargaining groups completely for many years, like many districts. This year, we still have 400 teacher vacancies. There are about 500 support staff vacancies. If you use the average teacher cost, those 400 teacher vacancies are worth about \$32,000,000. When you pull the substitute cost out of that, there's probably \$24,000,000 left. If the District had a will to implement this bill with fidelity, that \$24,000,000 would have gone to those schools this year. There would have been real change occurring in many of those schools with SOTs and principals having that kind of financial resource. But the District did not devote that money to schools. They simply kept it, as they always have, and never changed their budget process. That money has stayed in Central Services. I'm not saying it's been spent for bad purposes. All I'm saying is that it wasn't directly under the control of the schools. So, while we have accomplished a lot and we are headed in the right direction, the money issue needs to be resolved with crystal-clear clarity. The staffing autonomy needs to be resolved in the same method.

Annette Dawson Owens (Member, Break Free CCSD):

Break Free CCSD is confident that A.B. 469 will get us where we need to be, and we want to thank you for that. We will continue to push to see that money gets to the schools and that schools are truly empowered to make those site-based decisions. We are confident that we will see student achievement increase as schools make those decisions that are best for their students and as our community is engaged. We are grateful to be able to be serving on some CEABs and SOTs to see that our schools' and students' needs are met. The school organizational teams are an interesting thing. In the past, the role has been a little unclear. People are a little afraid, perhaps, to come on now and take over the crazy budget that we've got. Some individuals felt they didn't make a difference. Individuals also have to put their names out there to run, and they worry that they might not be elected. Some people feel that they're just a rubberstamp. So, we're at an interesting time with the SOTs, but they can be a great positive resource. We've seen some great things happen in our schools, and we're excited about that. Another problem with the SOTs has been that sometimes we have PTAs. At one of my schools, we looked at that and combined some of those meetings together so we aren't as limited by the bylaws and things like that. So, we can get more community involvement and get that united. Other things are putting the budgets online, posting the chair's number online and all that transparency and openness so they don't have to go right to the principal. They can reach out to the community, which is a great thing. We plan to host a Facebook Live event to help our communities stay engaged and positively involved and know that we're moving forward together. Moving forward, we would hope for increased transparency and openness, as we've seen recently here. It's a great thing. We would advise that we continue to look outside our state to see

what things have been effective and bring those in to work with the great town and staff here. Thank you for your time and all of your efforts for education.

Vikki Courtney (President, Clark County Education Association):

We represent the 18,000 educators working in schools right now. We shared yesterday with the CIC that there were originally 10,000 folks who voted to put educators on SOTs. This year, we had 6,000 folks vote. Since we're talking about people being involved and wanting to participate, those numbers are interesting. We're not sure if this indicates that folks are feeling that they don't really have a real say in what happens, but it's something that makes us take pause. Honoring Our Public Education (HOPE) for Nevada shared that there were 68 percent of folks who said they felt they could speak up at meetings, so that's at least 32 percent of people who are not feeling that they are very empowered to speak up and have a conversation ([Exhibit I](#)). They didn't indicate whether it was just educators or parents who answered that question. But I think the idea of being able to say what you think without there being an issue is important. As Senator Harris discussed, mediation for all these different pieces is huge. How do you feel confident that the intention behind all of this is that you have robust discussion and come up with solutions together that impact our students so they can be successful? So, I think it's important to think about that and put those ideas before the idea of money. What do we want to accomplish? How are we going to accomplish it? Then, what's the money that's there and how do we use that wisely to succeed? Thank you for your time, and I appreciate all the work you're doing.

Frances Martin:

First of all, I would like to thank Senator Roberson for asking Mr. Vannozzi to assist me with getting some pertinent information from my school at the last meeting. I finally got that report on September 5, so I'd like to extend my thanks to Mr. Vannozzi from TSC² and Diane Bartholomew and Cynthia Smith-Johnson from CCSD. However, I still want to stress the fact that I wish this wasn't the way it happened. I would like to see transparency play a bigger part at my own school and with other SOTs. There's a lot of talk about the bigger ideas about transparency, but when it comes down to the individual schools, then we're talking about having information posted on the website, having information when required and delivered in a timely manner from the administration and things like that. I would like to see CCSD and perhaps a legislative committee take on the responsibility. Actually, I just heard that there's an actual committee that could be put together that Senator Roberson and Senator Harris mentioned. We could direct these SOT situations that come later, especially after TSC² leaves. I'm happy to hear that. Hopefully, that will be a venue for us to come to find more solutions. So, I really, really appreciate that. I would like to mention something regarding the election process. The election process is done either by the principal or the PTA. We don't have a PTA on our campus. Despite all the directions from CCSD, the principal still has the sole responsibility of conducting elections if you don't have a PTA. So, I would like to see that perhaps being changed into something a little more democratic and a little bit more transparent, perhaps having the election of the parents done by teachers or a third party or the staff, other than the administration. So, that would be my recommendation. Last, my principal and associate superintendent are here today. I'm very

encouraged to see that they're willing to come here, and they were at yesterday's CIC meeting too. I'm glad to see them come to take part at these meetings, perhaps to get a little more information about the scope of the reorganization and move beyond a lot of the personal factors and begin to respect the sanctity of the SOT. I think that's really important, so they will allow the SOT to perform the functions that are needed. They're also beginning to understand the freedom of the SOTs as an advisory committee. Just for your information, I'm not running for my next term on the SOT. It's not because I was intimidated, even though I was, and it's not because I was retaliated against, even though I was. I'd just like to spend my time pursuing more policy changes and spending more time here. I'll still be attending all my SOT meetings. I'd just like to see if, without a target to attack, we'll be able to spend our time more productively to actually make a change in our community. Thank you once again for the opportunity to come here and speak my mind, and I appreciate all of your help to not only answer questions and make things happen, but also for explaining the situation to the public.

Chair Roberson:

Seeing no further public comment, I will now adjourn this meeting at 1:07 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jordan Haas, Interim Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Michael Roberson, Chair

Date: _____

Exhibit	Witness/Agency	Description
A		Agenda
B		Attendance Roster
C	Jonathan Synold, Principal, Advanced Technologies Academy	Public Comment
D	Richard Knoeppel, Teacher, Advanced Technologies Academy	Public Comment
E	Kerry Pope, Principal, Southeast Career Technical Academy	Public Comment
F	Jordan Haas, Interim Secretary	Draft Minutes from the August 7, 2017 Meeting
G	Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent, Clark County School District	Reorganization Update Presentation
H	Caryne Shea, Vice President, HOPE for Nevada	Zip Code Reference
I	Caryne Shea, Vice President, HOPE for Nevada	Survey Results
J	Dr. Larry Moses	A.B. 469 Rural School Funding Executive Summary
K	TSC ² Group	Presentation by the Consultants
L	TSC ² Group	Draft of the Consultant's Final Report