

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

**December 13, 2017**

The meeting of the Advisory Committee to Monitor the Implementation of the Reorganization of Large School Districts was called to order by Chair Michael Roberson at 9:21 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 3137, Carson City, Nevada. Exhibit A is the Agenda, and Exhibit B is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT (LAS VEGAS):**

Senator Michael Roberson, Senatorial District No. 20, Chair  
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz, Assembly District No. 11, Vice Chair  
Senator Moises (Mo) Denis, Senatorial District No. 2  
Senator Joseph (Joe) P. Hardy, Senatorial District No. 12  
Senator Becky Harris, Senatorial District No. 9  
Assemblyman Chris Edwards, Assembly District No. 19  
Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Assembly District No. 7

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Senator Aaron D. Ford, Senatorial District No. 11  
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury, Assembly District No. 23

**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:**

Dr. Larry Moses  
Glenn Christenson, Chair, Community Implementation Council  
Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent, Clark County School District  
Kevin Child, Trustee, District D, Clark County School District Board of Trustees  
Jason Goudie, Chief Financial Officer, Clark County School District

Dr. Mike Barton, Chief Academic Officer, Clark County School District  
Rick Neal, Chief Operating Officer, Clark County School District  
Misti Taton, Principal, Cashman Middle School  
Shelsea Contreras  
Omega Gdeye  
Estrella Gomez  
John Vellardita, Executive Director, Clark County Education Association  
Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators  
and Professional-Technical Employees  
Dr. Steve Canavero, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Nevada Department of  
Education  
Michael Vannozzi, Vice President of Creative Strategies, TSC<sup>2</sup> Group  
Brian Knudsen, Senior Associate for Analysis, BP2 Solutions  
Guillermo Vasquez, Executive Director, Education Support Employees Association  
Frances Martin

**Chair Roberson:**

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

I will open agenda item II, public comment.

**Dr. Larry Moses:**

I would like to take a very brief time to ask that this Committee considers trying to  
encourage the silhouette of some type of a mediation group or person within the  
Superintendent of Public Instruction's department that would be someone we could go to  
when we feel the District is out of compliance with Assembly Bill (A.B.) 469. This would not  
be for an internal issue, it would be for a law issue. I have outlined it, and I will give a  
program to the Committee (Exhibit C). I'm not going to read those to you. I'm sure you all  
can read. But according to section 33(1) of A.B. 469, the State Superintendent of Public  
Instruction has a responsibility to ensure the establishment of the enforcement of A.B. 469.  
When we present issues that we felt were outside of the law or not being complied with, the  
general reply we get from the District is, "We interpret that law differently," which they may,  
and we may be right or we may be wrong, but what that leaves one to believe that, "We  
have a load of lawyers and \$1,000,000 and a \$3,000,000 budget. If you people want to go  
find somebody, you can sue us." I don't think that's good. I don't think that's good for the  
program. I don't think that's good for the ideas that we have involved in this reorganization.  
We have no desire to do that, but we would like to have someone outside the District  
identified that we can go to that we can get an outside opinion from as to what the law is  
and the enforcement of that law, whether it's for us or against us.

**Chair Roberson:**

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

I will now open agenda item III, approval of the minutes from the September 14, 2017 meeting (Exhibit D).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 14, 2017 MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO MONITOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REORGANIZATION OF LARGE SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

SENATOR HARRIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Chair Roberson:**

During the last meeting, we received an update on what had been happening with the reorganization of the Clark County School District (CCSD). We received a report from the consultant to the Community Implementation Council (CIC). It's been a few months now, so today, I hope to get caught up with where things are now with the reorganization. We had been scheduled to meet in October, but we delayed that meeting because of meetings held by the Board of Trustees. I hope to receive an update from the Board regarding their meetings and progress, as well as from the Superintendent. First, however, we're going to hear from Glenn Christenson, who acted as the chair of the CIC on a volunteer basis for the past year or so. I want to thank him for all the tremendous work he's done. It helped the children of Clark County. I'd like him to come on up and give his perspective and observations regarding the reorganization.

**Glenn Christenson (Chair, Community Implementation Council):**

I'm the managing director of Velstand Investments. With your indulgence, I'm going to make a number of comments today regarding the CIC, and I've invited the Council to be here today, and I wanted to provide them with a gift in terms of appreciation for all the work they've done this last year. Is that alright with the Chair?

**Chair Roberson:**

Yes, as long as the gifts aren't to legislators, because that is not allowed.

**Mr. Christenson:**

There were nine members of the CIC. Each one of these people were recommended to this post because they had a particular skillset that I thought would be important to the reorganization effort, and they also all have connections with some constituency in our

community whose support we would need for the reorganization to be successful. I'd like to call them up, but first let me tell you a little bit about the gift. We were trying to come up with something that would be a token of appreciation. My wife came up with the idea that we should get a piece of art from students in our community. So, you can see that each piece of art has been put together in a nice little frame with their name and their participation in the CIC. On the back, each one has the name of the artist, the grade they're in and the school they came from. I would first like to bring up my co-vice chairmen, Felicia Ortiz and Brent Husson. One of the members of the Council is Ken Evans, who heads the Urban Chamber. The next one is Nora Luna, who also serves on the State Charter Board. Ryan Woodward is the area manager for JPMorgan Chase. Verenice Flores is a certified public accountant (CPA) with Fair, Anderson and Langerman. Vikki Courtney needs no introduction. Erin Cranor, as you know, has left the District, but we'll see that she gets this. I didn't see Carolyn Edwards, but we'll see that she gets it. We also wanted to thank the TSC<sup>2</sup> Group. I can't tell you how many hours these guys put in and the amount of work. I think the quality of their work speaks for itself as you look at the reports they've given. Unfortunately, Tom Skancke is out of the country and can't be here today. Andrew Doughman is not here either. Michael Vannozzi is here. Last but not least is Brian Knudsen. I can't express my appreciation to all of you for all of the hard work that you did. You put in a year to this effort. I'll talk a little more about it in my presentation, but thank you very much. I can assure you, Chair Roberson, that we didn't exceed any gift limitations.

**Chair Roberson:**

Thank you, Mr. Christenson, and on behalf of the Committee, thank you to the entire CIC for your year of volunteer public service for the betterment of the fifth-largest school district in the country, and all the hard work, all the meetings, all the grief I'm sure you had to take in this process, so thank you.

**Mr. Christenson:**

With that, I want to thank you all for the opportunity to share with you some of my thoughts and observations having served as the chairman of the CIC over this last year, all the work around the implementation of A.B. 469 (Exhibit E). I think it's important to establish my bona fides for the comments and observations that I'll have for you today. Over the course of the last 4 years, I helped to found the Las Vegas Education Council through the Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance (LVGEA). We essentially took leaders in both the business and education communities and provided some recommendations for education reform to the Governor. All of those recommendations were included in the Governor's education reform package in 2015. Along with others from the LVGEA Board, we not only lobbied to have those reforms put into law, but we also lobbied to increase taxes to pay for some of those reforms through the business commerce tax. I served as co-chairman on the Superintendent's Executive Advisory Committee. I've worked with the Clark County Education Association (CCEA) on several matters, including attending the National Education Association Foundation conference in Washington, D.C. I chaired the SAGE Commission. I chaired the CIC. I'm currently chairing the Superintendent's budget taskforce. I am not simply a passive observer in what's going on in K-12 education. I also

think it's important to reinforce that I haven't taken any compensation for this work, and I haven't even asked to be reimbursed for expenses. The only thing that I want to do is be part of the solution to help literally hundreds of thousands of young people in our community obtain educational equity and have the opportunity for a good education so they can realize their dreams.

My goal today is to talk with you and provide some perspective on the reorganization, the CIC and the status of the Clark County Schools Achieve initiative, and provide for you some observations as you go forward. I think with an effort like this, and particularly with the CIC, it's important to do a post-mortem. By way of background, in September of 2016, I met with Senator Roberson and offered a solution to the challenge of how we ensure that then-A.B. 394 was implemented with fidelity. When I think back about that offer now, I think it goes under the rule of "no good deed goes unpunished." Based on my experience with CCSD in the previous 3 years, it was obvious to me that the District would need some help, not only because there were not a lot of resources within the organization that had turnaround experience, but perhaps even more important, the people responsible for the implementation already had a very full day job, and to add and layer on additional responsibilities for this implementation was going to be a very heavy lift. The recommendation was really only about providing some additional hands to help. Working closely with the Senator and others, we came up with the idea to create the CIC and to appoint TSC<sup>2</sup> as consultants to the Advisory Committee. I committed to Senator Roberson at that time that I would spend between 10 and 20 hours a week on this project working with the TSC<sup>2</sup>, and I have kept that commitment. As I mentioned earlier, the concept around the CIC members was to bring expertise to the table, and also allow them the opportunity to hear some of the challenges that we have in our community. Each one of these people have very real connections with important constituencies here. Unfortunately, because of the initial significant pushback from the District in wanting them to implement A.B. 394, we really weren't able to use the expertise of these individuals nearly as much as I would have liked. Frankly, I think that was a lost opportunity by the District. Not only do these people have something to bring to the table from the standpoint of expertise, but they also could have served as strong ambassadors to CCSD, not only to explain the great things that are happening in CCSD, but also to explain to their constituencies some of the challenges that are facing the District as well.

The selection of TSC<sup>2</sup> was controversial for some, but I insisted on their involvement because of their track record in turnaround situations. I worked with TSC<sup>2</sup> at what was initially then known as the Nevada Development Authority, an agency that was on the verge of extinction. Through their work, the Nevada Development Authority evolved into the LVGEA, arguably the most influential business organization in the State. Some criticized the TSC<sup>2</sup> selection because they're not educators. Exactly. This was never an assignment around education, it was around reorganizing the institution. We hired them to facilitate the transformation of CCSD's educational delivery system and to provide management consulting and support for this massive undertaking. I think the quality of their work speaks for itself.

In hindsight, I was wrong about several things with respect to this project. While I didn't expect the District to throw rose petals at us as we started this project, I was surprised at the veracity of the pushback. I get it. At some level, the District didn't ask for A.B. 394, they didn't want A.B. 394, and they'll have to speak for themselves as to why. But I also underestimated the number of personal agendas in this effort, both inside as well as outside the District, and the impact those agendas would have on the effort. I think, by and large, we overcame most of these challenges, but there was a huge amount of time wasted fighting and justifying and brainstorming how to get around this roadblock or this problem. I would estimate that we probably lost as many as 2 to 3 months in the effort, and I really wish we had that time back.

I think when we do a post-mortem, we should glean as much as we can from the experience, both on the positive as well as the negative side in order to do a fair evaluation. Let me first say that over the course of the last year, I have really come to believe that the decision to reorganize CCSD was the right one. Ultimately, by implementing the reorganization, we'll meet or exceed our goals of meaningfully improving student outcomes in our community. We have that potential, we just haven't achieved it yet. To me, perhaps one of the most remarkable things that I saw over the course of this last year is that the District really can move relatively quickly on major projects when given the right catalyst. When we first started, a number of people doubted that we could get this far in the first year. I know one of you asked in one of the previous meetings about whether we could get this done in a year, and I said it wouldn't be for a lack of effort. Let me tell you, District personnel, along with TSC<sup>2</sup>, worked nights and weekends and holidays. The amount of effort in this project by those folks was incredible. We now have what I would describe as a skeleton in place of the reorganization. We need to put some meat on that bone, and we also need to get some maturity, some time for the reorganization to be put in place.

I think another very real positive is that literally thousands of parents and community leaders are involved now on school organizational teams (SOTs), and I think their support going forward is going to be absolutely critical if we're going to reach the goal of meaningfully improving student outcomes in our community. We were able to demonstrate that disparate parties can actually work together, and I think another very important piece of this effort was that new leaders were identified within CCSD. The 16 associate superintendents are very important, for not only the future growth of the District, but also in succession planning. Any major organization like this should have succession plans in place for key roles. I think another positive is that the vast majority of the people I worked with at CCSD were incredibly talented, very passionate about education and incredibly hardworking. Meanwhile, the budget process has been incredibly painful for everyone. I do think that essentially breaking out the budget and understanding much more thoroughly what it costs to run a school district is incredibly important and will be informative as we go forward. Lastly from the positive perspective, the community interest in this effort and K-12 education in general is incredible. Over the course of this last year, not one person turned me down when I asked them to do something around this effort.

While I'd much rather talk about the positives that happened, there were some challenges that were highlighted during the course of our work. Despite a lot of progress that was made

over the year, not everyone still has bought into the concept of the reorganization, and some continue to actively undermine it. We have to get to the point where we get these nonbelievers to become believers. At the same time, there's a significant amount of fear within the culture of CCSD. The TSC<sup>2</sup> Group talked with us about that during the course of our work: fear of losing your job, fear of losing influence and a fear of losing relationships within the organization. We're going to have to overcome these things if we're going to realize our full potential in the reorganization. While I'm not in the schools every day, my understanding is that there's still a number of people that don't believe the reorganization is real. In fairness, I think we have to understand that only the skeleton of the reorganization is in place. It has only been in place since the beginning of the school year, so there have only been a few months. But I think there continues to be concerns at the school level that they're going to be held responsible for what goes on at that school but they're not going to have either the authority or the budget to do the things they need to do for their students. I continue to be concerned about the dispute resolution process. The reorganization is not going to work unless concerns at the school level have the ability to work their way up through a food chain where they can be adjudicated fairly, and that process has to be one that everyone comes away from the table feeling that it was a fair process. Finally, as you well know, the transfer of responsibilities and the 80-20 requirement are not in place.

Here's the bottom line, with respect to the CIC and the things we saw: The District effort over this last year has been amazing. There are some outstanding educators in CCSD. But I think a lot more resources are needed in terms of how you manage an organization of this size. We saw that the District actually can move very quickly with the right catalyst. The community is very much engaged in this process, but there's still a lot more work to be done to realize our end goals.

I'd like to turn now to some observations, having spent a good bit of time now over the last 4 years on how we can enhance K-12 education. I want to emphasize that these are my own observations. They weren't approved by the CIC or anyone else, but I am highly confident that there are a lot of people who would agree with these observations. My first observation is that no one comes to the table in K-12 education reform with clean hands. In July, I made a presentation to the CIC on what I called stoppers to K-12 education reform. I'm not going to repeat that presentation today, but in summary, I picked out a number of things that were challenges for education reform, like District governance. There's still a question as to where the line of demarcation is between what the Superintendent's responsibility is and what the responsibility of the Trustees is. Frankly, the Legislature causes some problems. It seems like every 2 years the Legislature wants to come up with an idea to fix K-12 education, and before the District's really had an opportunity to determine whether those mandates were effective or not. There's another term that comes, and they change those mandates, and then many times these mandates aren't funded, which causes a lot of turmoil for the District in trying to manage this very large organization. I talked a bit already about the cultural challenges there.

You are very well aware of the financial obstacles in education reform. There are actually some disincentives in the way the Nevada Plan is put together, whereby the Distributive School Account (DSA) is actually a cost reimbursement program, and so to the extent that

districts reduce costs, they'd run the risk of perhaps lowering the amount of revenues they get. I'll talk about that a little more in a second. I think internal and external communication has improved since July when I talked about it, but that's still a major problem. At that time, I was talking about management tools. Thank you, thank you, thank you approving the human capital management system (HCMS). It's going to take a while before it's fully implemented, but that is absolutely key in being able to manage the organization going forward. I think that success in improving K-12 education has to be viewed in a more holistic and strategic way. I'm really excited about what Superintendent Canavero is doing in terms of positioning Nevada as the fastest improving state in the country in terms of education. But there are literally hundreds of other challenges around that strategy that have to be addressed. For example, yesterday I was in Superintendent Skorkowsky's office and we were talking about budgets and some of the inefficiencies in budgeting education at the State level. That in turn causes inefficiencies in budgeting at the district level. Once funds are appropriated by the State, there are inefficiencies in how it ultimately gets to the district. Those things need to be thought of in a more holistic and strategic way.

Ultimately, as with any challenge, it starts with leadership. I consider Pat Skorkowsky to be a friend of mine, even though we've disagreed at times over the last few years. Now, with Superintendent Skorkowsky leaving, I think, as we look at choosing his successor, we have the opportunity to build on what he has done. I think we can focus on selecting someone who has certain skillsets and characteristics, someone with fresh ideas focused on building relationships amongst the various constituencies and focused on building trust in the community. We need a leader who has an understanding of how to manage a large organization like this, and if he or she doesn't have that skill, that they know the types of people to hire so the District can be better managed. We need someone who will warmly embrace the reorganization and is willing to make the necessary changes to the institution. This is such an important role. I'm concerned that the selection process will not include the community to the extent necessary. To me, if we don't include in a meaningful way the business and community leaders in the selection process, many of whom have extensive experience in hiring key personnel, that would be a big mistake. I think a great template for selecting a new leader is the one that was used at Nevada State to select now-president Bart Patterson. What the Board of Regents did is constitute a selection committee made of leaders of various constituencies, all of which were important to the State college. We were allowed to work shoulder-to-shoulder with the regents. We got to ask questions of the candidates and ultimately were asked our opinion about who should be selected. The final decision, and there was no doubt in anybody's mind, was by the regents, and they ultimately decided to hire President Patterson. I think that, without including the community in a meaningful way, the Trustees run the risk of not having the full support of the community in their selection.

I think the education reform process has to be less political going forward. I understand the politics of this, but the Clark County Schools Achieve initiative really took off when the four leaders, Frierson, Anderson, Ford and Roberson, came to the table and pounded the table and said, "We're going to do this." That's when things started to move. There are great ideas around education reform on both sides of the aisle, and in some cases, those ideas actually overlap. There are ways that you guys can work together to make that happen. I



think we'd greatly appreciate it, and it's really critical going forward in this effort. I think we need to identify civic and other leaders who are willing to collaborate to develop reasonable solutions to some of the challenging problems that we have. If the goal is really to do it for the kids, then the unions, the parents, the Legislators, the Trustees, the business community and the community at large all have to work together. We need to stop pointing fingers at each other, because as I said earlier, no one comes to the table with clean hands. I think it's past time to give up the, "My position, my budget, my influence, my constituency," and work towards the collective goal of improving student outcomes. I wish over the course of this last year I'd heard more language along the lines of, "If we do this or that, it will improve student outcomes," and sadly, I didn't hear as much of that as I think we need.

I also think it's important that we need to do more than talk about education reform at all levels. I chaired the Governor's SAGE Commission on education, and 11 people spent a year working on developing recommendations for the Governor. We submitted our report in January. I don't think the Governor's done anything with it. The Legislature didn't do anything with it. I'm not even sure if the District has read the report. Now, in fairness, because of when the SAGE Commission was constituted and the timing of everything, the earliest we could get our report was in January, and frankly, that's much too late for the work you folks needed to do. But there are some really good recommendations in that SAGE report that are worthy of consideration. I also was the co-chair of the Superintendent's Advisory Committee, and we broke down into subcommittees and we looked at things like return on investment. Brent Husson on the CIC did a great job with the District folks on that. We looked at programs in the District and how you could evaluate those programs. Then we looked at the purchasing function. Hugh Anderson from the Metro Chamber headed up a group of District folks and they did a great job as well. But to my knowledge, a lot of those great recommendations haven't been broadly adopted across the District. We're now looking at the budget through a budget taskforce. I am hopeful that the District will take these recommendations into consideration. We have what I have described as an initial draft, but there are some pretty controversial things in there. Like I said, I'm hopeful the Trustees will look at that.

I also submit that the most important problem in our State today is improving K-12 education, for a number of reasons. And yet, within that challenge, I think the biggest challenge is filling the teacher pipeline. We know that the best predictor of great outcomes in a classroom is a highly qualified teacher. We have trouble attracting teachers. I think a strategic approach would be to essentially grow our own. I was hoping to see in the last session funds set aside for an aspirational teacher preparation program, most likely at the Nevada State College. I am thrilled that there were some development moneys set aside for a building on campus, but I hope during the next legislative session that you guys will focus on, again, what I think is the biggest problem that we have.

Of course, in any conversation regarding education, you have to discuss funding, and I think it's time we had an uncomfortable conversation about funding K-12 education. Personally, I don't believe that throwing money at the issue is the answer, unless we demand accountability from a lot of different sources, and more accountability from CCSD leaders to demonstrate that when they do get additional funds that we see improved student

outcomes. I'm really excited to see what this categorical funding did for improving student outcomes for English Language Learner (ELL) kids, free and reduced lunch (FRL) kids, special education kids and Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) kids. I know that there are those in the District that have a real problem with categorical funding, that it doesn't provide the flexibility they need. In addition, it also creates a situation of haves and have nots within the District. I really believe that when we demonstrate that there are improved outcomes with these various programs, there'll be more less-restricted funds available for the District. I think more funding accountability should also include the parents. The parents have to ensure that their kids are coming to school. They need to be actively involved in the SOT process and do everything they can to help their school be the best that it can be for their students. I think we need more fiscal accountability. I'm really concerned about this ending fund balance only being \$18,000,000 to \$19,000,000 on \$2,400,000,000 to \$2,500,000,000 expenditures. That's not very much, and certainly not sustainable. I think we need more accountability in prioritizing expenditures so the public can see where the District is actually spending its money and that they're spending that money wisely. Last week at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) education summit, some very well-intentioned educators and community leaders called for more funding for K-12 education. What I didn't hear was what we would use the funding for, how we would define success, what were the metrics for that success and who would be responsible for the success or failure of that project. I think when we can get those two things linked, you'll see more in the way of funding for K-12 education.

I think we should have an honest discussion on the topic of how we fund K-12 education. The vast majority of the states in our country fund K-12 education through property taxes. You want to see a Nevada politician turn catatonic? Start talking about increasing property taxes for education. In fairness, talk to the voters and see what happens. Watch them scramble if you're talking about increasing property taxes. In this last election, four very qualified legislators lost their seats because they voted for what I would describe as a modest business tax. We have to be honest about how we fund education, and it's important where the source comes from, because property taxes are the most stable, predictable and consistent cash flow stream. That's why it needs to fund K-12 education. I also talked about the Nevada Plan earlier. You know, everyone knows, it's not working. We have to look at the DSA. Basic school funding needs to be viewed as fair. I'm going to guess that most of the people in this audience will tell you that the DSA as currently constituted is unfair to Southern Nevada. I doubt that there are very many people in the State that really understand all the complications around the DSA. Those things are in your court.

When I talk about leadership, I think we also need to look at the role of the Trustees. I have come to know the Trustees over the last 4 years. I think they're good people, and I admire their commitment to K-12 education. But I don't think the role of oversight of the District should be a political one. I think a better template is to look at oversight in major publicly traded companies. When you look at boards of directors of major public companies the size of the District, you'll see people with expertise in financial matters, human resources, labor negotiations, the law, technology, management and communication. All of these skills were required before they got there. There's no on-the-job training. I know some of the folks will

have difficulty with for-profit organizations. If you want a not-for-profit template, take a look at the kinds of people that are on the LVGEA and the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority (LVCVA) boards. I think once we have redefined or better defined the skillset requirements for trustees, I would encourage that some, if not all, of the Trustees be appointed. Then, we need to pay these people. In a publicly traded company the size of CCSD, directors like that would make \$100,000 or more. I think that would be worth every penny, and I think we would find some people who'd be very interested in that role, especially at that level of compensation and if they didn't have to run for office.

In the future, if the Legislature decides that they want to put together a committee and a consultant to work on implementation of some legislation, I would strongly encourage one of two things. Make sure that the receiving institution actually wants that help, or if not, much better define the roles, the responsibilities and the authority of the committee and the consultants. I want to encourage you to strongly support Superintendent Canavero in his work. He has to be very involved in the continuing evolution of this reorganization. If not, the "we-bes" win. Part of the culture in the District is to wait out any involvement by the outside, so the model internally is, "We be here, you be gone." So, I would ask you to continue monitoring this very closely. Finally, again, I want to really focus on District finances and the amount of the ending fund balance.

In conclusion, after working on this for over a year, I've come to the conclusion that we're at an important inflection point. I sincerely believe that the reorganization is not only doable, but in fact, it's critical for the success of hundreds of thousands of young people in our community who deserve educational equity, not to mention the impact on our community and economic development here in Southern Nevada. I want to thank the Trustees, senior leadership and employees at the District, the bargaining units, the State Board of Education, the community voices, the CIC, TSC<sup>2</sup> and this Committee for all the hard work that's been put in place. We still have a lot more to do, and I sincerely appreciate your efforts, even if, at times, we don't always agree on things.

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

First and foremost, I'd be remiss if we didn't extend our appreciation to you, Mr. Christenson, for taking charge of the CIC, which was not a very easy task, as you have elaborated upon and discussed with us. So, thank you for your time, energy and effort into this project. I know we have many things that we share in common when we talk about making sure education is continually improved for the benefit of the child, and as long as we don't forget about the center of our work and that everything needs to come back to the children and how we are doing our best to meet their needs, we should hopefully stay on this path to improve over a time. So, thank you so much.

**Senator Becky Harris (Senatorial District No. 9):**

Mr. Christenson, I want to go back to some of the comments you made with regard to more community involvement with regard to our schools and the selection of how important that new school superintendent is. One of the things that we've been able to do with the

reorganization, I believe, is involve our community to a lot greater extent through the SOTs. In my senate district, I have schools that have very well-functioning SOTs, and they've gone through some of the processes and some of the powers that have been afforded them in terms of filling the position of the principal. When I visit those schools, those schools are highly functioning, the parents are happy, they're four-star schools, they're highly-rated schools in Nevada and children seem to be getting a high-quality level of education. I'm curious about what your opinion would be: Is there a role for SOTs in terms of establishing a list of criteria or qualifications for the new superintendent, since we're now doing a search, since those parents have had an opportunity to be involved in the SOT community for at least a year? We're now on our second year, but those parents and community members who've been elected to SOTs really are in tune with what the necessary needs are for their students. Since we are at what you called an important inflection point, I believe one of those pieces at this point would be finding a new superintendent who understands what we're trying to accomplish with the reorganization. In your opinion, is there a role for SOTs to give input?

**Mr. Christenson:**

Absolutely. The most important thing that's going to happen over the next few months is the selection of the superintendent. I mentioned that Pat Skorkowsky has done some really great things. He's decided to retire. I think this gives us an opportunity to look at things in a slightly different way. The answer to your question is absolutely, I think the SOT should be involved in the process. In my perfect world, they would be representing one of the constituencies in this selection process. I think it's absolutely critical that they have a voice in it. To me, that's the exciting part about the whole reorganization effort is people on the ground who are actually working in the schools having a voice that maybe they haven't had in the past.

**Assemblywoman Dina Neal (Assembly District No. 7):**

For my first question, I wanted to travel back to your comment about dispute resolution. I wasn't clear on what you meant by that, because what I've noticed and what I've seen—help me understand what you meant, and then I'll ask my question, because I have some comments on that.

**Mr. Christenson:**

Let me give you an example. There are some schools where the principals are much more engaged than others with the SOT. They have to have a very good working relationship, or they'll sub-optimize what goes on at that school. There needs to be a way for the SOTs to essentially get up far enough in the food chain that they can express their concerns about that relationship and what can be done to improve it. Those are the kinds of things that I'm talking about.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

Thank you for that, because I guess I spent too much time following certain SOTs, but what has come up more often than not are the expectations that folks walked into the door with. I went back and I was reading minutes, either from February of 2016 or October, when Dr. Ochi said that one of the main points that we needed to make sure we got control of in this organism was the expectations of the individuals who got on the SOT, what that meant and what they were going to be able to do. What I've seen is a huge concern over the money, but not necessarily an understanding of parents understanding the programs that are going on in the school, the pedagogy that's happening in the schools and actually being able to have the right questions being asked about how the students are actually performing in that school or why there is a high turnover of teachers that are constantly moving every semester. Those are the things that matter in regard to the children, because I'm always focusing on what the academic achievement is and what the culture of the school is. Do you even know as a parent what's happening in the hallways every day? Half the time, the answer is no. So, when we talk about dispute resolution, I feel like sometimes we, or us, since this is now a community effort, need to kind of pull back and start to reframe what it is that you should be involved in at the school level. Yes, the money matters, but it doesn't matter if the school gets \$6,000,000 and they can't keep a teacher. There's another issue going on that the parents are not educated on, and I've heard more often than not, "When do we continue our training? When do we get more training on what we do, and how can we go deeper?" So, I just thought it was interesting that you brought that up, because I had a chance to spend 2 weeks with a teacher who served on an SOT, and I probably learned too many things, and it really upset me. So, I'll leave that alone. My next question is about the inefficiencies conversation you said you had with Superintendent Skorkowsky, and you guys discussed the many inefficiencies. But I want the detail. What did you come up with?

**Mr. Christenson:**

Let me first respond to your previous comment. At the end of the day, I'm a business guy. I think about it like stores. It's about leadership and management of those stores, managing people and people's expectations, and how we get the most. It's about communication. It's all those things that we have to do in a business. All I'm saying is that great leaders can get people to understand their roles and how it all works, and you can build a team. If you don't have that, there needs to be a process to get up the food chain. That doesn't mean that in every case the SOTs are right. That's not what I'm saying. I just think we need to ensure that there is a process for a fair hearing when there are disagreements as to where things are going. With respect to inefficiencies, this was a conversation I literally had yesterday with them. But we have talked about some of the challenges. With the number of times that the District has to bring to the State Legislature their budget, at least one of the times could actually be thrown out. Streamlining and making the process more efficient is something that we're talking about now, and I hope to include some recommendations to the budget taskforce addressing those specific issues.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

For my final question, when you talked about the composition of the Board of Trustees, we passed a bill this session which required training. You get on the Board, now you'll have to do some training. What do you feel about that piece of legislation? How is that going to impact any new trustee that comes on board with regard to the knowledge requirement? Clearly the appointment versus election has been a debate probably in this State for over 20 years, probably when I was a baby. The political influence is not diminished when you have an appointee versus an elected, because Vegas is still small. We still have a group of people, I call it sometimes the "invisible hand," who are deciding for everyone what it's going to be, and that's not always fair to all groups or constituencies that want to be a part of this process. So, I really want to understand a little bit more, if we were to bring a bill, what would be some of the things to strengthen that group, outside of the training bill that we brought this past session?

**Mr. Christenson:**

I fully support training. I've sat on a number of boards of directors. I'm on the board of a public company right now, and we're constantly getting training. As a CPA, I still get 40 hours of training every year. I'm all about that, and I think that would be incredibly helpful for a board of trustees, whether they are appointed or not. My point was that I went through a series of skillsets that I think are needed in a major organization like that to provide proper oversight. Somehow or other, we have to make sure that those skillsets are there. I understand the challenges of the budget and the budget shortfall we had this last year, but when you're down literally—back to the enveloping conversation, there's \$2,500,000,000 worth of expenditures, roughly, annually in the District. Divide that by 365, it'll get you about \$6,000,000-plus in expenditures every day. We have 3 or 4 days of cushion there. There's no room for air. So, that didn't happen overnight. Look, I understand the challenges, they don't have enough money and those sorts of things, but I think if there'd been more financial expertise that some of these concerns could have been flushed out maybe a little earlier. That's my opinion. I'm sure they probably disagree with that. But that's an area that I know something about that I think would be important. With all of the challenges we have in labor relations, wouldn't it be nice to have somebody at the oversight level that really understood that and could work with the other members of the Board? It's not that they don't. I'm talking about real, significant expertise where that's their day job, their career, those kinds of things. Now, how we do that, you guys are the experts on how to go about it. I'm just saying that those skillsets need to be on an oversight board of an organization this important to the community and of this magnitude.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

Mr. Christenson, I think that in all of your remarks and all of your findings, it came up that change is difficult, and a change in culture especially is difficult. So, the thing that I am most nervous about in this whole process is leadership basically having a lot of responsibilities on their shoulders and ensuring that we have the best leadership at the helm in each school. So, I don't know if, as the CIC, there were conversations about how we ensure that we

identify the levels of leadership we currently have in the schools and how we address maybe the shortcomings of certain leaders, because I don't think it's fair to the SOTs, to the communities, to continue to have a leader that isn't going to embrace the empowerment model by which we are saying, "This school is a community school, and we want to make sure that we're meeting the community's needs, so please feel free to come and convey what your needs are, what you visualize for your kids and what you want to see done with your students." I think we still have a lot of work to be done in that area and ensuring that every leader at every school feels that this should be a position that we all take, because at the end of the day, we're here to teach our children, to make them amazing citizens in our State so they can be productive and they can in turn come and teach or be the next generation of administrators or whatever they choose to be in life. So, I just want to know if, as the CIC or via conversations with the District, you've touched on this super important point about the leadership we currently have and how we improve it. I think what I'm hearing from a lot of administrators is that they have greater responsibility on their shoulders. Great leaders step up to the challenge, but we know that. Again, have we identified where our leaders are and how we can help them get there? Sometimes when I come across new teachers, they're awesome new teachers who just need mentoring and love and support. Then there are other teachers that you're just like, "Maybe you need to reconsider if this is truly your vocation. If this is really hard work day in and day out and you don't have the heart to put in the 120 percent that your kids need, then maybe this isn't the right area for you." So, to make it short and simple, what have the CIC or the District discussions been about leadership, which we know will basically change the culture and how that school operates and functions?

**Mr. Christenson:**

Leadership always starts at the top. I keep coming back to this. The selection of the next superintendent is maybe the most important hire in our community in the last 15 or 20 years, maybe longer. At the school level, I think it's important to reinforce that there are some incredible leaders out there. I've had the opportunity over the last year to really go into some of the schools and talk to some of these people. They're remarkable. There are two practicalities to be considered. First of all, there is a bargaining unit, and they need to be involved in the conversations and concerns that you were talking about, obviously, in depth. The other thing is that we have a shortage of people who can do this right now. We have a shortage of teachers, and we have a shortage of principals. So, I would follow what I did in my own business career. If someone wasn't meeting my expectations, the first thing I did was do everything I could to shore up what they were doing and train them. Assemblywoman Neal was talking about training. I am all about that. But that needs to be managed really well. That's a part of when I talk about managing the organization. One of the things is identifying and making sure that the people who need help actually get it. Beyond that, if, like you say, they can't make it, then something needs to happen. They may have to take on some other possibilities, or in fact leave the District.

One of the things that's a real pet peeve of mine, especially when I talk to educators, is they say, "You can't run a school district like a business." There are two pieces of the education delivery system: what goes in the classroom and managing this massive organization. The

only people who tell me that are people who haven't been in business before. But it's things like defining success, evaluating people, paying for performance, getting proper training, getting proper finances in place and spending money in the right ways. All of those things I would like to see more people in the District with those skills, because I think it would pay dividends for the District and better student outcomes at the end of the day. It's complicated but it's doable, and it all comes down to leadership.

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

Mr. Christenson, you used the terminology, "Throwing money at education." Are we throwing money at education currently here in Nevada in Clark County, from what you've seen?

**Mr. Christenson:**

I was very supportive of the categorical funding. It's unfortunate, because there were some unintended consequences created by that. No, I don't think that we are, but when I hear comments like, "We need to increase funding for education," in my heart of hearts, I know that's true, but I want to know where those dollars are going. We have increased funding significantly over the years. You guys know that. We're starting to see some modest improvement in student outcomes, but I just think it needs to be managed and thought about strategically. I believe that as the District continues to see improved student outcomes, just keep feeding that beast so we can get from 49th, which I guess is where we are now, up to 35th in 10 or 15 years. We need a strategic approach to this. How are we going to do it?

**Senator Denis:**

The only reason I bring it up is because I hear a lot of people say that. Frankly, I'm just tired of people saying that we throw money at education. I agree with you in that I think we underfund education, and I'm not one to say that we need to put more money into education and have no requirements for that. We need to have requirements. We need to improve student achievement. But as long as we continue to say, "Throw money at education," we'll never increase funding for education because everybody in the public thinks that we just throw a bunch of money out there and we're not getting results. And yet I see some really positive things going on in this State and in CCSD, some real positive things, some of the best things in the country, but we never talk about that. We only talk about throwing money at education, and the reality is that we've never thrown money at education. We've put money there, but we just have never put enough to really help those results.

**Mr. Christenson:**

That's why I think it was a great first step to go to this categorical funding, because I think it allows the District the opportunity to say, "Hey, we got more money for this. This is what we did with it. Look at the improved student outcomes." It's a progression. I think if the District continues to demonstrate the great things that it is doing, there'll be a lot more money.



There'll be a groundswell of support from the community to do better. Again, one of the things that I noted as a stopper for education is internal and external communication. I've had many conversations with the Superintendent about this. I think we're doing better explaining the great things we're doing, but there's still a lot more to be done.

**Senator Denis:**

I agree with you. And I agree with you that I think there will be a groundswell, as long as we don't focus on what we keep hearing, that people are assuming that we're just struggling at education and that's not the case. So, if we were focused on the positive things, and I'm sure you saw and I heard in your report a lot of positive things that are going on, so I just want to make sure that we had that discussion.

**Mr. Christenson:**

I'm not disagreeing with you. I'm just saying that I agree there are people out there who say, "Don't throw money at it," and I'm there with you.

**Senator Denis:**

Thank you.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I just want to know your opinion on something. It's a piggyback on what Senator Denis was talking about, throwing money at the problem. I've been thinking a lot about this since I've been spending some time in some elementary, middle and high schools. I want to know, have you seen actual, consistent behavior? Because one of the things that I keep noticing in regard to academic achievement is that we keep changing the endgame, and when you listed in one of your slides that people don't really believe the reorganization is real, there's a fear and all these other things, we've done so many experiments to schools that I haven't seen a consistent concept travel through the school. I haven't seen it implemented for teachers. I see principals who are good leaders pushing it, driving it down. I love teachers, but then I see 20-year teachers push back consistently. One of the things that really threw me off was just the simple issue of cross-curricular, which is a 10-year concept in the District, probably even older. It had not been implemented in a school because there was high turnover and then there were 20-year teachers who just didn't want to do it anymore. So, it's like we talk about money, and I agree with how it's spent, but I don't think we're really getting into the details and the dirt of what is happening at the programmatic level and the conceptual level with the teachers. Why is it that we can bring in a concept and pay for a program, but yet it's only implemented for 1 or 2 years? But the student population and the body that you have, that is probably the most constant in terms of demographics. It's probably the most constant in regard to behaviors, yet there is no consistent pattern of use or a concept, an idea. It is a constant flip, and so I want to deal with that. We can do categorical spending, but one of the Zoom schools didn't fare well in an end-of-year exam, so there is an issue. We talk about money, but we really need to bring this conversation

right back to the ground, the nuts and bolts. What is going on at the schools? How are we making these programs work? Stop changing what we do. Our biggest problem is that we're never consistent in our behavior. We're never consistent in our policies. We do 15 different experiments, and if you look at what we've done, we could see 25 or 30 different things that we've forced teachers and this organization to do, but without fidelity.

**Mr. Christenson:**

It's absolutely true. As part of the Superintendent's Advisory Committee, I head up a committee on program evaluation. So, I took my favorite educator, my wife, and we got a focus group of teachers together and we talked about exactly that. They said, "They give us these new programs, and before we can get proficient in them, and that usually takes 2 to 3 years, they change the program and we never see whether they worked out or not." That again comes down to management and how things are put together. I couldn't agree with you more. There needs to be a strategy put around how we implement programs, a strategy around what we expect to see. Those are what I would describe—and I hate to use the word "business" with people, they get turned off by that—as organizational, structural strategies that can work. I couldn't agree with you more. I was amazed. These ladies and gentlemen were telling me about the challenges they have. A kid isn't like a widget. You can put a marketing program together and sell more or sell less. It takes time for these kids to develop these concepts, and generally that's probably 2 or 3 years. I'm not an educator, I'm just telling you things that I heard and things that really make sense to me.

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

I'm going to ask some very naïve questions. Is there another model of boards and/or the hiring of boards or board members? And if there is another model, of the Superintendent, for instance, can we hire her and get her away so she can come here to Las Vegas and implement something that you envision may be a reality somewhere?

**Mr. Christenson:**

I don't know the answer to that, but I'm sure there are folks out there who can tell you that.

**Senator Hardy:**

When we look at changing a board, the Board of Trustees, for instance, is that naively a Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) change, or do we need to look at the whole Constitution and allow every board in the State to do that same kind of thing?

**Mr. Christenson:**

You guys are the experts on that. I don't know the answer. I'm looking for outcomes. Exactly how you get there, I'll leave to your expertise.

**Senator Hardy:**

Further, when we look at the tax that was passed, for instance, and this \$1,500,000,000 tax, and then we are \$45,000,000 short in the School District, what went where and why didn't it go there?

**Mr. Christenson:**

I think that question should be directed to the financial folks at the District. But it's clear that some things aren't lining up. I might be able to guess, but I'd hate to hazard that in a public meeting. Mr. Goudie is here today. You can certainly direct that question to him. I have to tell you, in the time that I've had to work with him over the last few months, I've been impressed with his expertise. I think he's a real benefit to the District and will be helpful as we go forward looking at financial matters in the District.

**Chair Roberson:**

I hadn't mentioned, but Assemblyman Edwards, welcome to our Committee.

**Assemblyman Chris Edwards (Assembly District No. 19):**

I was intrigued by your comments about the SAGE Commission and how not too many of those ideas were actually implemented. Which of those ideas do you think would be the most helpful to advancing this process?

**Mr. Christenson:**

There are some ideas that are better in the SAGE Commission's report than others. You can decide which ones are more important than others. But there are a lot of great ideas out there. For how we get around all these ideas and get them implemented, I keep coming back to this concept of management. Chief executive officers of major organizations have to deal with a lot of different constituencies and challenges and problems, and they put an organization in place that's able to handle those things. It's a government organization. It's not the same as a private company. I get all that, but I do think there's a great need there. Offhand, I don't know that I have necessarily one in particular that I would describe for you, but the report's certainly worthy of consideration. I know I've talked with a couple candidates and encouraged them to look at the SAGE report, but that's in your court.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

I totally agree with your concept of training and leadership in order to get people trained up to be leaders, because we'd always say, "You don't make an admiral overnight. It takes a long time." But I do wonder about the logistics side of the house too, because there is a duality. It sounds as though we're just not doing enough strategic thinking about the logistics side and how to implement that in an efficient, effective way. Would that be accurate? What would you recommend on that front?

**Mr. Christenson:**

I'm not sure I would describe it using the term "logistic" or not. It might be a good one, but the way I'm thinking about this is that it's just how we efficiently deliver education to our kids. It's the management side of the business. I just believe there are more resources that are needed there. Start looking at people with business backgrounds or large organization backgrounds. There are certainly some there, not as much as I would like to see. We have a lot of educators who are in positions of management, but they're different skillsets.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

I just wanted to touch back on the Zoom funding, which I think was an amazing, bipartisan-supported program that has been in effect for 5 years, going maybe potentially on 6. There are other things that, through this empowerment model or this reorganization or research right now in the School District, we've been able to shed light on. I just want to make sure we know that just because we haven't seen the academic achievement gains yet, the investment in those students at those Zoom schools—we do need to remind ourselves that these are schools that are being made whole, because for one, they usually have high levels—not all of them, but some of them—of vacancies. So, year after year, there's a revolving door. You have new teachers or long-term substitutes serving as teachers for our kids that already need a teacher from the get-go. They're already coming in behind academically. So, that whole point of not having those vacancies filled is one of the things that's hindering the ability of us, and especially administrators, to show results.

Second, transiency is huge. When I am looking at students, I'm scratching my head wondering, "Why are these children in second grade and reading 2 years behind?" You start looking at their enrollment history, you'll find out quickly that some of those children have already been to eight schools in their short career of being in second grade. Some of my fifth graders sometimes have been in 11 to 12 different schools in their short elementary school career. So, it's not just a matter of saying, "The Zoom moneys aren't hitting it." I think we have other challenges that have been impeding, and I feel that at least with Zoom, a lot of that money the schools have gotten has enabled those schools to be able to provide some supports to their students, whether it be a longer school day, whether it be an extended school year or whether it be reading help that they can get while at school. Because we know that when they go home, they're not going to get that assistance at home. So, we need to do what we can within the confines of our school day to ensure that our children are successful, and we can't also think that, "Oh, I'm going to catch up this child who's been behind and moving and there's no continuity in their educational career overnight." It takes time, but it starts with that parent feeling like that school is a good fit and they're going to make every sacrifice they can because their child is happy and they're advancing. Maybe we can finally have that conversation about how important it is to keep your child at that same school without having to move again. So, I just wanted to clarify that. I think there's amazing work being done by different additional moneys that schools are receiving, but there are still many challenges. I don't know if there's anything that you want to speak to, but you don't necessarily have to answer.

**Mr. Christenson:**

The only thing I would suggest to you is, and this goes back to communication, setting a realistic expectation up front. The challenges that you talk about are all very real, and in some ways delay where we ultimately want to get. It's just the way it is. But let's recognize that that situation exists and set goals for ourselves as to what we want to do. I don't want to come away from testifying today without really believing that the District has the ability to do all this. I really believe that. There are some phenomenal people there. Getting our arms around the problem, thinking more strategically and more holistically about how we go about capturing the full potential is important.

**Senator Harris:**

You have spoken a lot about the different qualifications of training that you think need to happen at the District level. I am curious, within the scope of your work, have you considered the types of training and how much training the SOT members would benefit if you drilled down on that micro-unit to determine how they can best be successful?

**Mr. Christenson:**

Not really. But there's no end to the things we could have done in this last year. Like I said, I really wish we had those two or three months back. But the skeleton is in place. People know about training, and now it's a matter of prioritizing training within that budget and making sure that there is a system of thought around how we go about training. Who needs to be trained, are they getting it and what kind of results are we seeing from all this? I keep going back to the same word. It's management. They're doing training. I'm not suggesting they're not doing training. I'm just trying to highlight areas that I think could use more attention.

**Senator Harris:**

And I appreciate that. I know the District has done a lot of training, and I know parents who've commented on the training and how appreciative they are of that training. I'm just simply trying to have more eyes on that particular unit within the School District so we're making sure, as parents are stepping up and community leaders are stepping up and wanting to be involved in our kids' schools, that they understand their roles on the SOT and that they're getting the training they need to be able to understand the challenges that are going to be placed before them. I'm an advocate of training, but I want to be careful that we don't over-train, but that we're providing the right type of training. So, that's a question that I'm continually asking, whether we're providing the right resources for those volunteers that are stepping up, wanting to get involved in education and wanting to move that needle with regard to their children's education, because they've put in tens and probably hundreds of hours as they're going through their child's school career, being involved with the principal and being involved with the management of the school. They need some training. They need some tools so they can magnify their efforts.

**Mr. Christenson:**

I'd like to thank Grant Hanevold, one of the associate superintendents, for securing the artwork for these gifts.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

Thank you so much, Mr. Christenson, for your work and for your testimony this morning.

THE VICE CHAIR CALLED FOR A BRIEF RECESS.

**Chair Roberson:**

I want to again thank Mr. Christenson and the entire CIC for the truly great public service you provided for the past year. Thank you for your presentation today, Mr. Christenson. It was very informative, and I appreciate all the questions from the Committee.

Next up on the agenda, we'll bring up Pat Skorkowsky. I was informed that Deanna Wright cannot be here. I know we've got Trustee Child here as well. At some point, you might have some thoughts as well. I'd like to get the Board's perspective from someone on the Board about what's going on. Primarily, though, the point of the conversation with the Superintendent is an update. It's been a while since we've met. The last time we spoke, we talked about the fact that, currently, the School District is not in compliance with the law, but the plan was, and I hope still is, that the School District will be in compliance with the law by January 1. We've all read a lot in the newspaper over the last few months about fiscal issues with the School District. A lot of that has happened since our last meeting of this Committee. I know the School Board has met a couple times. There were discussions about transfers of services, which didn't really appear to come to fruition. I think the Committee would like to hear more about what happened at those School Board meetings and the status of transferring the services.

Another thing that I'd like to see discussed today, and I think it'll probably be discussed by several witnesses, but I personally, and I think a lot of the other members of the Committee, would like to hear about the issue of attrition savings and what's happening with that. As everyone probably recalls, when we started out this process, very early on in the process, and as a Committee, we were discussing issues with the School District. Frankly, one issue that came as news to I think every single member of this Committee was that we learned—we all know there's a teacher vacancy issue in the School District, and there has been for years. We also know that many of those vacancies, the vast majority of those vacancies, are in Title I schools. But what came as news to this Committee was that the savings from those vacancies in those Title I schools don't stay with the schools. They get spent by the administration on other items outside the school. Of all the issues we discussed, that one stands out to me as something that everyone on this Committee felt passionately about that needed to be changed. They thought the law needed to be changed to make sure that if the School District is having trouble filling those teacher vacancies in predominantly Title I schools, that at the very least the salary savings because of those vacancies should stay

with those schools and be spent by those schools. So, we changed the law. We did that twice. We did that with the regulations, and we did it by statute last session. So, I heard from others that either there's a different interpretation by the School District or, for whatever reason, those attrition savings are not staying with the schools. So, I'd like a discussion at some point today, Superintendent, when we get to that topic, because I'm quite sure that would be concerning to the other members of this Committee. I'd also like to get a general update on compliance with the law. I'd like to hear about the issue of attrition savings. I'd like to hear a little bit about the fiscal issues that you've been dealing with and the School Board's been dealing with through these meetings, and the issue of the transfer of services.

Finally, I'd like to hear your perspective on the process for selecting your successor. If you can give us some detail on how that's looking, what the criteria is and how that decision's going to be arrived at. The most important thing to me is, will the criterion for the selection of your successor be that this person embraces the reorganization? I think that's pretty important to this Committee. We will listen to you for as long as you'd like to talk. Thank you for joining us today.

**Pat Skorkowsky (Superintendent, Clark County School District):**

It's not just me today. Actually, I'm bringing up some people who are heavily engaged in the work who will be doing some of the presentation as well. In September, we brought to you an update of where we were at that point in time. We focused in on some of the transfers of responsibility work, which you'll hear about a little bit later, including the process for gathering feedback from principals and SOTs. We saw some challenges to do with conflicts between A.B. 469 and some collective bargaining agreements that we talked about at that time. Then, we talked about progress with work related to SOTs. So, those are the three main topics we talked about in September.

So, I've got several members of my team to join me today to provide you with updates on these topics. You'll hear from Dr. Mike Barton, Rick Neal, Jason Goudie, Dr. Celese Rayford and Kirstin Searer, and then we've also asked three individuals to share their firsthand experiences with you at the school level: Misti Taton, the principal at Cashman Middle School, Estrella Gomez, the SOT chair at Garside Junior High, and then we have a special guest who we had to excuse from school today. We'll wait and let you see about that.

I apologize again, Trustee Wright sent me a text this morning saying she was ill and would not be able to be here, so I'm going to read this statement from her. If you want to bring up Trustee Child for any questions, you might be able to do that. She was pleased to be here to speak a little bit about the Board of Trustees and how they are functioning with A.B. 469.

"All members of the Board have publicly stated support for the work required under A.B. 469. The Board approved both responsibilities brought forward for the transfer to schools, and Dr. Barton will give you a little more of an update. As a result, the District is moving

towards greater flexibility and autonomy for schools, and also budgeting to support the work in two areas.

“Alongside our support for the reorganization, we also have some remaining challenges. Discussions have taken place that show a concern for the opportunity, cost of staff time and energy. Much of our top administration has spent many hours focusing on the challenges related to A.B. 469 compliance. With the increased focus on this operational work on top of the work we are already doing, we still have concerns, and it’s difficult to see what the impacts of this shift in focus will be. In 2014, the Board and the Superintendent rolled out the pledge of achievement. This work has resulted in some remarkable achievement gains. These reforms have led to an increase in magnet schools and magnet school successes, two blue-ribbon schools this year alone, two Title I distinguished schools, award winning success in advanced placement across the United States in comparison to other large urban districts and an all-time-high graduation rate. You’ll hear about some of the successes of our schools tomorrow when the State releases more information, and again on Friday. We’re proud of our employees for being able to carry this load and move the work forward.

“Before I turn it over to Dr. Barton and Mr. Neal to discuss the transfer of responsibility work, I’d like to address what I presume this body will want to talk about: the decision of the Board of Trustees not to act on the request for proposal (RFP) to outsource custodial services. We feel very deeply, as you do, our responsibility due from the constituents we represent. It is on their behalf that we balance the decisions put in front of us. Our Board did not take action on the recommendation to release an RFP that could put many jobs at risk and result in unknown economic impacts. The Board discussed the additional risk to employees’ livelihoods. As you know, CCSD is in the midst of addressing a major budget shortfall already affecting many jobs and the environment for students due to staff changes. The Board carefully and thoughtfully takes into consideration multiple levels of benefits versus the risks, like these, when making these decisions. At this point in time, the risks of an RFP outweigh the benefits from the perspective of the Board of Trustees. However, we did transfer the responsibilities to the school. This allows us to work through opportunities for more and more flexibility for principals, and staff is continuing that work.”

I’ll go ahead and first address some of the budget responsibilities that we are dealing with. Mr. Goudie will back me up if you have any specific questions, but initially we were dealing with an approximate \$60,000,000 shortfall from various issues, revenue sources, etc. When we made the first rounds of cuts in the fall, we actually cut \$60,000,000 on paper, but only actualized \$40,000,000 in actual savings, because at the time of those cuts, it was at the end of October, and that is 3 months into the fiscal year. We then went back and made additional cuts at our meeting on November 30 that will bring us to the balanced budget that we will present tomorrow night. Senator Hardy, to your question about the \$1,500,000,000 in the session, those moneys were identified as categorical dollars, which cannot be used to fill any general budget holes. They must be used for the intent by the Legislature, so we aren’t able to deal with salaries. We aren’t able to actually use those dollars to fill any of our budget holes, because they are specifically identified by the Legislature to focus in on Zoom, which we are beginning to see great results in. Two of our schools that you’re going



to hear about tomorrow, Fay Harron Elementary and Lewis Rowe Elementary, are both Zoom schools, and you're going to see tomorrow that the efforts are paying off in the area of Zoom. It is happening in some Zoom schools, but not all of them, and we've got to figure out how to replicate the successes of those two specific schools across the District and see the same growth in student achievement. So, as we go forward, it's very difficult for us to use any other money except for the general fund, and when we don't have general fund dollars available to us from other sources, we have to make the cuts. So, that's how we got to where we're at. But at this point in time, I'm going to have Dr. Mike Barton, Rick Neal and Misti Taton, who is the principal of Cashman Middle School, come up.

**Chair Roberson:**

I would like to give the Committee the opportunity to ask questions. Specifically, I raised some issues I'd like answers to. I appreciate that other folks are going to be making different presentations, but I would like to hear answers to some of the issues that I raised.

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

I'm going to talk a little about the transfer of responsibilities more with Mr. Goudie, but one of the challenges we face is the way that section 19 of the law was written. We have to go through a specific process for the transfer of responsibilities. It starts with the building principals, then it goes to the school associate superintendents, the SOTs and then to the Trustees for the final decision. So, in that process, we have to follow those four steps to be able to take it to the Board for a decision. We worked hard with building principals who wanted flexibility to try to provide them that opportunity in the transfer. We put forward two different pieces, and you're going to hear about that here in a second. Certain portions of both of them were approved, but one portion, which was the issuance of an RFP for specific schools in a pilot situation to go out to bid for custodial services, was not passed. It actually wasn't considered by the Board.

**Chair Roberson:**

I get that. I'm used to having meetings where people come up and give reasons for why they're not in compliance with the law. Okay, I get that. I say that respectfully. So, we will hear the different individuals come up and tell us what they're doing and why, again, this law is not being implemented with fidelity. But my question is, if the Board is not going to approve a process where schools can make a decision about the vendor they want to use for a service, how are we going to get to 80 percent? How are we going to get to 85 percent of unrestricted general fund dollars being in strategic budgets, being spent by principals and SOTs in the manner in which they think is most appropriate for their students?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

With the implementation of the next round of strategic budgets, that is the actual piece that we are working on right now. Once we get the budget finalized tomorrow night, then we go back and calculate the numbers of where we're at to get to 85-15, which is our goal, by

January 15 when those strategic budgets work out. The flexibility piece is difficult, because it is not just the Superintendent that is making that decision. The Board of Trustees is included in that process. I can put forward to the Board the recommendations from the Superintendent on what should be happening in accordance with the law, but I can't tell the Board how to vote.

**Chair Roberson:**

And I understand that. I understand one person alone cannot make this happen. But again, we have a Trustee here. Maybe Trustee Child would like to come up and speak. I'm happy to have him present. But how does the Board expect to comply with this law if we are not transferring these services to the schools and transferring the money to the strategic budgets and then giving that discretion to the schools? I understand, a lot of people at the School District don't like the law. I wish the speed limit was higher, but it is what it is. It's the law. So, I'm looking for an answer from someone as to, okay, if the Board doesn't want to do the transfer of services or they didn't want to do it in November, I'd like to hear the reasons for that and what will happen between now and January 15 to get us to 85 percent. I think that's a fair question to ask. I think the other members of the Committee would like to see how that's going to happen, frankly in the next 30 days.

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

That is our intent. After we get the budget finalized, they have to go back and submit the documents. They then rerun the numbers for the percentages. So, my goal was to have it before January 8 so we could get that information publicly ready for everyone to see where we're at. I've been working closely with the State Superintendent. Dr. Canavero has been a true partner in the past few months, helping us to understand and work through some of these challenges. He and his team have been meeting with us on a regular basis. We have either regular, face-to-face meetings or phone call meetings every other week, working towards compliance with the law. They've been great partners to be able to help us move certain aspects forward and make sure we're in compliance. I know he's going to talk to you a little bit about that himself, but I just need to tell you that it has been a great collaboration working with him and trying to make sure that he is able to do his job as the overseer of the implementation as required by law and that we are able to work with the State Department of Education to better understand their perspective on the law and implement it so that it meets the compliance of A.B. 469 and the intent.

**Chair Roberson:**

What about attrition savings?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

Mr. Goudie is working on that piece now. One of the things that we have to do and one of the recommendations that Mr. Christenson is alluding to is a different budgeting process for Fiscal Year 2019 so we can work on how that money gets transferred to the schools. Right

now, we pay for all the substitutes from a central fund, and so we understand that those costs for the substitutes will have to be backed out. We have not budgeted that way at this point in time, but it will be budgeted in Fiscal Year 2019 in a completely different way. We're starting with a modified method of zero-base budgeting in our instructional services and our operational services so we can then provide the level of service that needs to be provided at each school. So, right now, we're working towards that budgeting piece allowing for the carryover of funds and the additional dollars to be working towards that attrition savings.

**Chair Roberson:**

Okay, let me ask a couple questions with regard to the attrition savings. How many teacher vacancies are there, 550 or so?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

Approximately 350.

**Chair Roberson:**

Okay, 350. That's what, maybe \$25,000,000 worth of salary and benefits, ballpark? Then you back out what the substitutes would be paid. What would you guess that is, ballpark?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

I don't know, but Mr. Goudie may be able to answer that question.

**Chair Roberson:**

Maybe \$10,000,000?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

I don't know right offhand.

**Chair Roberson:**

What I'm trying to get to is how much money that should be going into Title I classrooms right now is not because the School District is not in compliance with the law. Is it \$10,000,000? Is it \$15,000,000? Is it \$20,000,000? Is it more?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

I will defer to Mr. Goudie. I don't know if he has those numbers at his fingertips. If he doesn't have them, we will work to get that quickly by the time we're done with this presentation.

**Chair Roberson:**

Yeah, I think this is really important. We were all very clear throughout this process that once we passed this law, we want the savings to stay with those Title I schools. To the extent they're not, and clearly they're not, it's egregious, from my perspective. So, I want everyone to understand before we leave today the dollar amounts we're talking about, where that money's going if it's not staying with the schools, and to the extent it's not staying with the schools, when will it start staying with the schools?

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I just need clarity on two points. So, you said that the money is being paid from a central fund for the substitutes, but what I'm not clear on is, what is the difficulty that you guys had in transferring that and why is it still in this particular funding category? Why is it still being dealt with this way? I need to know, was there a difficulty? Was there a problem? Why couldn't it be dealt with at the beginning of the year?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

Each school does not know what substitutes they're going to need for the full year, because as required by the law, principals are expected to be filling those positions throughout. So, we can't guess what amount is going to need to go into each of the schools' strategic budgets based on openings, because if we give them that money at the beginning of the year for the substitutes for the long term, they're going to spend that money, and then when that person is hired, we're not able to pull that money back at that particular time. So, that piece, the clearing up of the substitutes, will have to be done at the end of the year after we know what the actual dollars are so they can be transferred to the school.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

So then, let me ask you this question. So, in the prior year, the school year that came before, there were certain schools that had a high vacancy. How are we estimating, because I know before we had that your prior budget should play a role in your future budget and that whatever your carry-forward, there were supposed to be some restricted funds. If you're estimating that you're probably going to have 20 vacancies, these are now your restricted funds that you need to keep and carry forward for 2018-2019 to make sure that you have that substitute money in your budget. Was that ever a conversation?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

No, it was not.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

Why?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

I'm going to tell you bluntly. We are working out tail-ends off trying to get the bigger pieces of this worked out. We have to get the systems and structures in place to be able to do this fairly. We can't do everything at once, and if we do it poorly, then our kids are going to suffer. So, right now, it is about how we put these systems and structures, the skeleton that Mr. Christenson talked about, in place so that we can ensure that every year after this, we're going to be successful. You don't build an engine of a plane while it's flying. You have to build the engine and then let it take off. We are working hard to share the success. And yet, every time we get called on the carpet, nobody talks about the successes that we continue to have in the academic field. So, while we are working to comply with the law, you've got to understand that it is not going to happen in a \$2,400,000,000, 41,000-person corporation immediately. And if you think it is, then you're sadly mistaken.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

Okay. I appreciate that, but that's not what I'm thinking. What I'm trying to understand, and I'm assuming the accusation that's on the table, whatever it is, hearsay or not, was that people are trying to figure out, if there was an attrition that you're holding onto, is it restricted in your budget, or is it being used in a different way?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

The question is clear now. It was and has been in the past used for other sources of support for schools or Central. So, that's the piece that has to change in our budgeting process.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

So, if I'm hearing you accurately, it's still being used in a different way. What, then, is the replacement money once you pass it down to the schools?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

That is what we are working towards in our Fiscal Year 2019 budget, making sure we take those allocated dollars out for attrition and making sure those moneys are then passed on after we have the actual dollars at the end of the year of what each school would get. Remember, we have to base our entire budget on estimates. If we base it on estimates and we estimate wrong, which happened partially with some of our funding sources this last year, it gets us into the same boat of not being fiscally sound. So, we have to work on the actuals. So, the intent is to work on the actual dollars spent and make sure that money is then given to the schools to go forward for how they're going to better support their teachers. It is going to be extremely difficult when, at the beginning of the year, yes, we do know that some schools are going to have openings. But there is no guarantee that opening is going to be there. So, my understanding is that your perspective is that that money should go into a restricted strategic budget column that they can't touch to be able to be

there, but either way, they can't touch it until the end of the year because we don't know what the actual dollars will be.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

Okay. So, this issue came up. Clearly, some principal or person brought it up. What is the problem that is occurring at the school site because they do not have access to those funds? What are they encountering or running into which made them raise this issue to the top and they are seeking resolution? What is the problem that is occurring? They can't find a substitute? They can't figure out how to use the attrition savings that would go to the school site to find a qualified teacher? What are they trying to do with the money? Because I'm trying to figure out, what did the principal, or whoever made the accusation, say? What is the problem they're facing because they do not have those dollars or have control of that money? Other than the fact that they're missing a teacher, which is real and significant, but I want to know what else is going on, because I'm trying to figure it out. Let's say I'm over at Canyon Springs, the principal has 15 vacancies, and they're saying, "If I had control of these attrition dollars, I would be able to do x." What would that be? Are they trying to use it just for the subs? I'm trying to figure out what the problem is that's happening. I know if it's at Canyon Springs, they're going to fill it, regardless of your substitute money or not, but they want the flexibility to do something extra is what I'm trying to get at.

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

I think I understand where you're going. Each individual principal will have to determine what they need those dollars for. So, the challenge for them will be to get those dollars and not go over what they anticipate their openings for substitutes will be for the teacher openings. So, I think the challenge is that we have to work from actual dollars for attrition at the school level and back out the substitute dollars that it's costing for the District to be able to give them that money in the future. So, our intent is to work on the premise that we're going to have to back out the attrition dollars. We're going to have to pull out the cost of the substitutes from those dollars, and then work towards how we get those dollars into the schools to make a difference. So, that is the challenge that Mr. Goudie is facing right now, and that is something that he's working on and working closely with the Deputy Superintendent of Finance at the State Department of Education to make sure we're doing it in compliance.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

Is he going to come to the table with the actual numbers that you guys are working with?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

I don't know. I can't see him behind me right now, so I don't know what he's doing at this point in time, but I sure hope he's finding those numbers.

**Chair Roberson:**

Are you contemplating a true-up for the 2018 budget once you determine what the attrition savings actually were for these schools?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

At this time, no, because we are already starting on the strategic budgets for Fiscal Year 2019 now. So, it's required by law that those roll out on January 15. If we open up the Fiscal Year 2018 budgets, we don't have the staff in that department to be able to do both at the same time.

**Chair Roberson:**

So, that means that money is just lost for this school year and those schools are not going to receive those moneys that, under the law, they're entitled to. Is that an accurate statement?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

Not necessarily, because the true-up will come at the beginning of Fiscal Year 2019 after we know what the actuals are for 2018. That's when the true-up will come, in the next year.

**Chair Roberson:**

That's what I'm asking. Is there going to be a true-up?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

There will be some sort of reconciliation, yes. That's what we're working on.

**Chair Roberson:**

So, we're on the same page?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

Yes. It's just not going to happen now. It will be after we get the actuals. That's when the true-up comes.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

One of my questions is going to be about the statement you read, but it might be more appropriate for Trustee Child if he can come up later. I've talked with the SOT members, my principals and many of the members of their teaching staff and so on. They have two major complaints. One is that they haven't received the 80 percent and 85 percent they were

supposed to under the law, and it's simply been a matter that Central just doesn't give them the money, even though they can show that they had \$10,000,000 last year and they should be getting \$8,000,000 this year. They're constantly just told no. I don't understand why that's happening. The second thing is, when they go to Central, they ask for certain little approvals of things, and they're constantly told no. In particular, they have an HVAC (heating, ventilation and air conditioning system) that is going to be replaced at one of the schools, and they asked, "Why can't we control the thermostat at the school? You're putting in new thermostats and you're putting in a new HVAC. Why is it that you're going to charge us for the use of the HVAC but we don't get to control it?" That should be a simple thing that should just be a yes. They don't understand why they're constantly told, "No, no, no." What am I supposed to tell my teachers, my principals and my SOTs?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

First and foremost, when A.B. 469 was approved, 37 percent of the general dollars were in section 14. So, you do the math. Thirty-seven percent is protected in Central Services. To get that out, we have to transfer the responsibilities.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

Okay, but that's not happening. It's been 2 1/2 years now.

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

It has not been 2 1/2 years.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

We passed it in the 2015 Session.

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

April of 2017. You were there.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

I'm talking about the bill itself. You guys knew pretty much what was coming in 2015.

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

No, the regulations had to be developed. You have to develop the regulations so the guidelines are in place.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

I understand that part. It's still not happening, though.



**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

The answer to the “No” is about the utilities of this piece. We budget for utilities based on each school’s use. We don’t actually charge them utilities. So, if they were to turn up the thermostat or turn down the thermostat and exceed what our budget is, we have no way now to cover any additional cost centrally.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

Okay, that makes no sense to me, because I’ve worked at military bases around the entire world. If one of the buildings decides to be cooler or hotter, you simply figure it out by the thermostat and you charge them. It’s done on a monthly basis, and you’re telling me it can’t be done on a yearly basis?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

No, because here’s the thing: you’ve got Nevada Energy that’s getting ready to hit us with a 33 percent increase in rates. I can’t account for what a school is going to do based on the usage when they are going to fluctuate that much. We have over 400 buildings in CCSD. So yes, we are working towards that, but that is not the priority. Our priority is getting to the 85-15.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

I understand that. It’s not necessarily a priority. I’m saying that’s just one example of the controls that the schools are not given, and there’s no real, good reason for it. They’re not given the reason, they’re simply given a no, and that’s not really acceptable. Your staff should be able to give them a good explanation of why something might not be done or can’t be done, but all they get is a, “No, too bad.” That’s one of the major problems that I’ve run into. The other thing I wanted to find out is, we’re trying to fix the budget deficit. How many of the folks at Central had to pay a similar price to what some of my teachers did by either being furloughed or laid off? What kind of a share did you guys have at Central, because my teachers and my principals are saying they’ve gotten cut, they’ve gotten reduced and they can’t have certain things they were supposed to have. So, how did you share the hurt?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

The Central Office actually took over 10 percent of their budgets that were unrestricted in cuts. Some of them took even more than that. This last round of budget cuts was made to protect schools. No teachers were furloughed. No teacher lost their job, so I don’t know where you’re getting your information.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

I’m kind of getting it from the principals.

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

If you go back and look at our records on the Board and all the Board minutes, no teacher lost their job and no teacher was furloughed.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

My question for Trustee Child is, in the statement from Deanna Wright, it sounded as though they didn't want to put out this RFP for custodial services out of fear that they might find out that some people may lose their jobs or things might not be as rosy. I don't understand how you can operate just out of fear. Again, when I say "you," I mean the Board itself. How can they operate out of fear of not knowing what's going to happen, based on not knowing what's going to happen, without finding out what might happen? They might actually be surprised that the result of the RFP could be in their favor or not. I know it's not your letter or your statement, but perhaps you can give us some insight as to why the Board seems to be operating out of a fear and reluctance to see what might actually be possible.

**Kevin Child (Trustee, District D, Clark County School District Board of Trustees):**

We looked at the law, and the law doesn't say that we have to outsource. We just have to return the money to the schools so they make the decision. Remember, we have Central Services that provide those services to those schools.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

I understand that, but what I'm asking about is the RFP. It sounded to me in the statement from Deanna Wright that they just didn't want to put the RFP out because they were afraid some people might lose their jobs. They were afraid things wouldn't go well.

**Mr. Child:**

Again, I can't answer for her, but I appreciate the question.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

Okay, and I understand that it's not your statement. I just didn't know if you had any other insights into that.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

I just think we need to bring it back to the fact that this has been a process. The School District has existed as one unit running all of the schools for a long time. Now we're going through a restructuring and a reorganization, and there has obviously been a process by which we have to determine with the delineation of the law what percentages are going to stay in Central and the moneys that then go to the schools. But we're still navigating, and I think some of the Committee members have lost sight that we're transitioning. It's kind of

like teaching your toddler how to walk. They're crawling, but they can't get up and walk and run yet. But hopefully that's our end goal, that they'll be running as soon as they learn how to walk. So, first, I want to hear, what have we done so far for this transition, because I agree with my colleagues that continuing to operate in the manner that we have using that attrition money and the places that we've been putting it is not benefitting our children, and that definitely needs to be the heart of the matter. The money should stay with the child, and make sure that we're doing our best on our end to give them the best academic environment possible. Second, what impact would it have if we say, "You need to surrender the attrition money now to the schools"? What impact would it have on the CCSD budget?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

In regard to surrendering the money now, I would then have to make whatever amount is being used in additional cuts to actually do that. If I surrender the money now and they hire a teacher, then that money then has to come back to Central because I have to pull the substitute money back. So, the challenge is trying to figure out how we can budget accordingly with the school intent and change the way, so they are paying the actual cost of a teacher, and then the substitute money would then be reimbursed later, taken out of that, and the remaining savings would stay there.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

So, I'm hearing that we're moving from an average cost of a teacher to an actual cost. Is that correct? I just heard actual cost.

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

No. I mean, actual at the end of the year of how much money was spent on substitutes versus what that teacher cost in the strategic budgets. So, what I meant by "actuals" is the actual dollars that were spent, not on the teacher per se, but the amount of teacher that is allocated in the strategic budget, the difference between that and the substitute cost.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

It's a process, but eventually, we do need to get to actuals, because then that school would use the moneys that the children need.

**Chair Roberson:**

Trustee Child, we still haven't gotten to some of the fiscal issues, but one of the issues that you've been very vocal about is an audit of the School District. Can you talk to us about your reasoning behind why you think the School District—not that I disagree, I'm just curious about the issue of an audit and why you're pushing for that.

**Mr. Child:**

This is getting the house in order, because we can't come to our Legislators not being transparent, and it's not saying we're not transparent, because we've done many things to show good graces to the people who give us the money. What we're looking at is that we need to change how we fund education in Nevada. The reasoning I'll go back to again is that we need to clean up the house so we can go to somebody else's house and ask for what we need. If I can't be honest with you, then how can I be honest with the taxpayers who ask for more money? When I hear people say top heavy—and I've been in the School District for 3 years, and one of the reasons why I asked to be a School Board Trustee is because I live here, I play here, I work here. I was tired of people saying we're ranked 30th. We're actually ranked 38th right now, after 4 years. We're the lowest funded in the United States, with a national average of \$12,500. We have 63 percent poverty in CCSD. Chicago, New York, Miami and Los Angeles are the top five. We're all about the same when it comes to poverty. I always say, "Why is it that we get chastised and we look like villains to the public? Our teachers should be valued and our administrators should be valued." So again, I'll go back to cleaning the house. We have to value teachers if you want better education. You have to value the people that run it, but we also have to be accountable for the dollars we spend.

**Chair Roberson:**

I know that one member of the Committee asked if Mr. Goudie could come forward as well, as we're discussing some of the fiscal issues.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

It's probably a mistake, but I'm going to ask this. Trustee Child, when you say, "Clean the house," and I'm taking out your teacher value statement, and you're talking about, I'm assuming, the fiscal responsibility or the accountability, I need to know specifically what you mean. Do you know of some buried bodies that we need to be aware of? What dirt do you know of that you need to put on the record right now to help me understand what you mean by, "Clean your own house"?

**Mr. Child:**

I just want to make sure that our dollars are being spent in every categorical department so that we can get to a zero-based budget, so we know that every dollar is spent wisely and it's spent with integrity.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

But that makes the assumption that it's not being spent with integrity. Where is it not being spent with integrity? We've been going around and around on this issue forever. With the Advisory Budget Committee that was happening a couple months ago, there was no meat to be told. It was circles. So, you're putting a statement out there, but I still want to know,

what really is the lack of integrity? Where is it? I also wanted to know how much money was actually in the budget, like the true dollar amount versus what we gave and what you didn't receive. But we keep going in circles. I don't want to hear taglines anymore. I want to know, what is the problem with CCSD? If you're saying as a Trustee there's no wisdom and there's no integrity around the money, what is the problem? Does that make sense?

**Mr. Child:**

I run my own business, and we used to have franchising stores. So, we used to have an audit all the time to find out where we're going to be and what we can put our money to. And that'll catch some improprieties, maybe, but I'm not saying anybody's done anything wrong. We need to be clean with our budget. A lot of big companies go through a budget process, and they go and make sure that every dollar's spent so they get to be accountable for that dollar, and that's why you have these audits. You can go back and forth, but if we just did a surface audit, and Chief Financial Officer Goudie can speak to that, and they gave us findings, you can go deeper into those audits. I'm just asking for a deeper audit to find out if there are any improprieties, which again, there might not be, but it's just to clean the house so that we can be honest with other houses how we're losing money. Because again, when it comes down to the end of the day, we have to educate our kids, and if we don't have enough money and we're not being good stewards with our money, then how can I come to you as Legislators to ask for more money?

**Chair Roberson:**

We have the chief financial officer (CFO) of the School District here, Jason Goudie. We were discussing the topic of, generally amongst a few issues, the fiscal issues.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I had asked the question earlier to Superintendent Skorkowsky about the attrition dollars and how much is actually there. Do you know?

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

So, out of the 350 or so open positions that Superintendent Skorkowsky mentioned, a large number of those are special education teachers that are actually funded through Central Services, so they are not in the strategic budget component of it. So, there are approximately 150 or so open positions within the strategic budget component, which is between \$13,000,000 and \$15,000,000 on an annualized basis. If you then utilize \$110 per day for 180 days throughout the year to fill those with substitute costs, that's about \$3,000,000, which would net a delta of approximately \$10,000,000. So, that's the rough number, based off of estimates and forecasts, of where we are now.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

And are those 150 positions concentrated in certain schools or certain areas of town?

**Mr. Goudie:**

I would be unable to address that question.

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

There are certain areas of town, our Title I schools, which are the areas that have the greatest number of openings, our most at-risk students.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

This is my third question. Mr. Goudie, in your problem solving that Superintendent Skorkowsky discussed about trying to figure out how to basically back out the money, how close are you to coming to a solution on being able to do that? Because when I was reading the legislation last night, this attrition issue is being balanced against serving the best interest of the pupils. So, when we have these high vacancies in those schools, we're not serving the best interest of the pupils. I understand that we're in a huge transition, but that was the same category of children who had been a part of this policy before the law told you to stop it. So, there has been a consistent non-serving of their interests for years. Now we're at this impasse, so I want to know how long those children are going to stay in this particular status of not having a qualified teacher. When are you going to come up with a solution that financially works?

**Mr. Goudie:**

First and foremost, I'll address that in a couple different ways. The first question was related to how close we are to having a solution. We're very close for 2019. We are ultimately changing the way that we budget for attrition, and we will account for those dollars to be available to be carried forward, and then not spend those in other areas. That'll be part of our plan for the 2019 budget as we roll forward. So, when I say we're there, we're there with a plan, but we're still working on that budget. That is what will happen this year. I want to clarify and discuss a little bit about attrition overall. So, there have been a lot of comments about, "These are dollars that should stay in schools, and then they get sent to Central and Central uses them or houses them and keeps them." That's not the case. The case is that the way that we budget is we look at the overall expenditures for the entire District, all \$2,400,000,000, and we budget for those expenses. We then go through and look at the additional revenues that are then able to cover those. In the past, that has netted a deficit, meaning that we are spending more in our first round of budgets than we have allocated to us through revenues. That does not work in a balanced budget situation. However, the way that we do budget—which is not unique to this District, other districts do it, as well as other governmental agencies—is that we budget assuming a 100 percent personnel base for the entire year. From a practicality perspective, we understand that we will not have 100 percent staffing in any department, let alone all of our departments in the entire district. So, we then estimate what that variance is, which is our budgeted attrition, and we then apply that to the delta between our revenues and expenditures. So long as that amount is sufficient, we are able to balance our budget with estimated attrition dollars. That's the way

it's always been done in the past. It causes challenges now under A.B. 469, as we have to allocate specific carry-forward amounts on a local school precinct level. So, we are now adjusting how we address that overall attrition piece, and specifically allocating either budget cuts or changes in our methodology to ensure that money is accounted for and able to be carried forward if not used. The key component is that the best way to serve the best interest of the children is to fill those positions. The secondary piece is to use those dollars to somehow make up for that, but that's the best way, to get those teachers in those positions.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

So, if I'm understanding you correctly, you're kind of counting on having vacancies and having the long-term substitutes, which I believe in our calculations amounted to about \$100,000,000 a year. That's kind of expected, that that kind of money is going to be left out rather than accounting for having a full teacher in every position. That's going to cost probably about \$100,000,000 in addition to what the schools have been given this year. So, how are we going to financially move from having vacancies and using long-term substitutes when we know that the cost of that is going to be about \$100,000,000? What is the thought on that? How do we absorb that and what should the Legislature expect in the future budgets?

**Chair Roberson:**

Where are you getting this \$100,000,000 figure?

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

We had talked about, if there are 450 vacancies at about \$80,000 a pop, we worked out about \$40,000,000, and then there are about 950-odd long-term substitutes, which saves the School District about \$50,000 a pop. So, when we talked, it was about \$90,000,000 to \$100,000,000.

**Chair Roberson:**

Okay.

**Mr. Goudie:**

So, I'm a little confused. I know that we had a conversation. I don't remember specifically how we got to that piece, so I think I'll walk through how I think we got there, and then hopefully that will clarify it. So, when we went through and did our calculation for attrition for the 2018 budget, which is the 2017 and 2018 Fiscal Year, the amount that the finance group put together was about \$69,000,000 in totality. That's for the entire District, which means we had anticipated that, based off averages over the years, the number of open positions, the types of positions, etc., primarily being teachers, would result in a net difference in the total budget at 100 percent to what actualized, about \$69,000,000. When

we built the budget, and I talked about how we had expenditures that exceeded our revenues on a first-round basis, expenditures exceeded revenues to the tune of about \$65,000,000, so we had sufficient estimated attrition to cover that, and we did use that. That's the base \$65,000,000 that I think you and I had previously discussed. The substitute costs do not add to that deficit. They are housed and budgeted within a Central Services department separately, and what we discussed is that those costs ultimately are used to offset the open positions for when teachers are not hired. So, we budget for a large number, I think it's \$20,000,000 or so, I don't remember off the top of my head, I apologize, for substitute costs to cover those as well, and those are the costs where we go and figure out how much attrition should carry forward to the schools. We have to take that into consideration. So, it kind of becomes a subtraction and not an addition. Does that help clarify?

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

A little bit. Let me just try it quickly in reverse. If we had all positions filled across the board as a fulltime teacher, I think the numbers we were looking at were between \$90,000,000 and \$100,000,000 in addition to what's actually being spent now. So, if we actually had the School District full up with 100 percent teachers and 100 percent positions, the additional cost would be about \$100,000,000, or thereabouts. Are we going to be faced with that kind of a bill as we reduce vacancies in the future and start filling long-term substitute positions with fulltime teachers? Does that make it easier?

**Mr. Goudie:**

The \$100,000,000 that we talked about was in the past. So, this number from attrition was significantly higher in the past because there was a significantly higher number of open teacher positions. I know that the State Legislature, as well as other bodies, had some funding mechanisms to decrease that number of open positions, and therefore we were able to hire a lot more teachers. That has brought that number down, so the number that was \$100,000,000 or so was 2 or 3 years ago. I know that it was in excess of \$100,000,000 at that point. As of 2018, that number was, in fact, \$69,000,000. So, to answer your first question, if in the best-case scenario, and I call it best case because that means we have all teachers, and that's not just teachers, that's all open positions were hired, yes, we would have been over budget by \$69,000,000. But, in reality, and I've been in finance a long time, never, ever has anybody ever achieved anywhere close to 100 percent, and you can basically layer out and forecast out the estimates of how much vacancy savings you'll have, and that's what we do.

The second piece of it is to address the future. We are changing how we budget. We are looking at the specific components of attrition in the different buckets, one being the strategic budget school components, to being in the Central Services bucket. We are budgeting differently and ensuring that, if we were going to budget for the number of teachers, because we have to budget for the maximum number of teachers because we want to fill those positions, we have to then set aside funds within our budget to allow for us



to carry those forward and not spend those on day one for our budget process. That's exactly how we're going to do it.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

I just want to make sure we're understand that, currently, the way that we've been balancing our budget has been basically using that \$69,000,000 in attrition. So, I want to make it clear for people to understand that it has been a practice where we have School A, somewhere in the School District, with highly tenured staff. Of course, that means higher wages, salaries, benefits and all of that. They are 100 percent whole. You have School B, inner-city, Title I, high turnover, lots of long-term substitutes and kids with great needs already in that deficit. So, currently, our practice as a District has been to take from School B, because they don't have the tenured staff and they don't have the high salaries. So, they have extra money in our eyes, and we take that money and somehow make the School As whole. Am I understanding that accurately?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

In the past, that has been the practice. The average salary has been used to accommodate for the fluctuations in actual teacher costs at one school versus another. So, yes.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

Okay. I'm glad that we're shifting away from that practice, because those children are the ones who need these resources that we speak of the most. How soon are we making School Bs, the high turnover, high vacancy, highest-need schools, whole? How soon are we going to be able to transition and change our budgeting practice so the schools get those resources that they need desperately to put into their teachers' hands and the students' hands?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

One of the things that is required in A.B. 469 is for us to work with the State Department of Education to work towards actual teacher salaries. So, that is work that will be done in accordance with the State so that we can get to the actuals for every building, which is the work that is required in A.B. 469. We will begin that process of working closely with the State Department of Education and looking at how we might be able to transition from the strategic budget practice that we have now, using average teacher salaries for every school across the District, to the practice of using the actual teacher salaries in the future.

**Senator Denis:**

My question is not specifically on the attrition, but just generally, we've been talking about things that you're having challenges with, but can you talk a little bit about the things that you are in compliance with?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

Yes. We actually have a number of things that we are in compliance with, and right now, we are working on a compliance document with the State Department of Education. We anticipate that we will have information on January 15 when we roll out our strategic budgets and all the final planning has been done. At that point in time, we're going to be working closely with the State Superintendent, and I believe he's going to talk about this a little later as to, if we're not in compliance with something, what the corrective action plan to get in compliance is.

**Senator Harris:**

I am devastated to hear that it's been a District practice to balance our budget on the backs of our Title I, vulnerable, at risk, most needy students. So, I just want to say unequivocally for the record that for me, that's not okay. You need to fix it, and you need to fix it quickly.

**Chair Roberson:**

Because I've got the three gentlemen up here, I want to move to the issue of the process for selecting the next superintendent. I'd like to hear a little bit about how that process is going. I'd like to hear from Trustee Child on that, and I'd like to hear from the Superintendent on that.

**Mr. Child:**

So, we did put out an RFP for a search firm, and we discussed how we would do the funding (Exhibit G). We already picked a search firm, and tomorrow night we're going to go over the contract. Again, we're going to look into that search firm. The second thing, if we hire them, and we vote tomorrow night, then it goes to January 2018 and we have public input meetings. So, the public will be involved and able to voice their opinion. Then in February of 2018, we finalize the criteria for the superintendent qualities and the requirements. So again, we'll take everything we've heard from the public and we'll formulate that and get it from the Trustees and start discussing. In March of 2018, top candidates will be presented to the Board. So, we'll look at the top candidates, which I believe there'll be a top five. Then in May, we extend an offer to the candidates, and then in June we'll be hiring a new superintendent.

**Chair Roberson:**

From your perspective, will it be a requirement that the person you support for that position will vocally embrace the reorganization of the School District?

**Mr. Child:**

Absolutely.

**Chair Roberson:**

Okay. Is it your sense that your colleagues on the Board of Trustees feel the same way?

**Mr. Child:**

I can't talk for them.

**Chair Roberson:**

But your sense? I'm just asking.

**Mr. Child:**

Again, we've all said we want to move forward with the reorganization. We want better.

**Chair Roberson:**

That's fair.

**Mr. Child:**

And we voted for it. So, again, there's got to be a lot of flexibility that I'm going to ask of the Legislators, because again, it's great work. We've done so many great strides with doing what we're doing, working with each other, and we need to always say "collaborative efforts" and that we're working to make sure our children are getting the best education," because I have statistics here. In 2014, our graduation rate was 70.91 percent. Then in 2015, 72.07 percent. Then 2016 was 74.22 percent. This year, we went up to 82.71 percent, so we're matching the national average, right below it at 83 percent. This gentleman next to us is one of the reasons why, and his staff and the teachers and the administration and the support staff are where we've gotten this. Again, we want better, but again, we need to start talking with each other. And there's got to be equity in this whole thing, and equality. Again, I appreciate you reaching out to a lot of the Trustees to talk about that, and I'll put that back to you.

**Chair Roberson:**

Thank you. It's very good news about the graduation rate.

**Senator Harris:**

I appreciate your timeline and see that you've taken care to have some public input for your meetings (Exhibit G). Throughout this process and this timeline, has there been any consideration of asking your SOTs for their input?

**Mr. Child:**

That will be addressed and we will ask for that input, and that's the whole public.

**Senator Harris:**

So, I just want to make sure I'm understanding you correctly then. Your process will be simply to invite your SOTs to the public input meetings in January, as opposed to perhaps having a separate process where they can give input prior to that? I'd love to talk to you about that and set up a process to get some ideas from them.

**Mr. Child:**

I'm sure the Board would be amicable about that.

**Senator Harris:**

And then the public can come and have conversations, because those individuals on those SOTs are closest to what the needs of their particular communities are, and I think it would be important for them to have a process for input.

**Mr. Child:**

We hear you. Thank you.

**Chair Roberson:**

Superintendent Skorkowsky, on the topic of the transition and the selection for your successor, do you have anything to add to what Trustee Child said?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

One of the most important things is to make sure that the structures and processes are in place prior to my departure, making sure that we have all these systems and structures, as Mr. Christenson said, the "meat on the bones" so that it is set up for success for the next person. We have to work with our instructional services, our operational services and our academic unit to make sure these practices are in place so we can move forward successfully. So, it is imperative that this next person be able to walk into the system and be able to have these individuals sit down with them and explain how this works within A.B. 469 and how we do things to stay compliant with the law as required.

**Chair Roberson:**

Okay, great. Thank you. Is there anything else either of you would like to add before you call up other individuals from the School District?

**Mr. Child:**

You and I discussed this before, how to move the needle of education even further. We have the shortest day, with 6 hours and 11 minutes. We're the shortest in the United States. We need more hours in these days to teach our children where they need to go, and I think you agree with me on that, and you're nodding your head and I appreciate that. Again, that costs money. We don't want to waste your money, but we want to spend it wisely, and that's why we're doing the reorganization, so everybody's accountable for the dollars and making sure they're going into those classrooms to pay quality teachers to educate our children. So again, I just wanted to add that to the record. Again, I appreciate all the work that you guys do, and I'm always here for you guys to ask questions.

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

At this time, I'd like to bring up Dr. Mike Barton, Rick Neal and Misti Taton.

**Chair Roberson:**

Dr. Barton, how long do you expect this presentation's going to be?

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

This could be very brief. I'll keep my comments brief, and I think the most important part of this presentation is hearing from our principal involved in the pilot for site-based technicians.

**Chair Roberson:**

Okay. Superintendent Skorkowsky, what's the aggregate duration of the presentations you would like to see here from your School District? We just have some scheduling issues, because a lot of this was not on the agenda. I'm sensitive to everyone's time today. On the agenda was you, Mr. Skorkowsky, and Trustee Wright. So, if we're having a lot of additional presentations that weren't on the agenda, I need to factor that in for our scheduling for the rest of the day.

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

We were just trying to make sure we were updating you on the procedures and processes. So, there is the transfer of responsibilities piece, which is very brief. We want to talk a little bit, if we can, or we can push it to the next time, about service-level agreements. We can push any of this forward to the next meeting that you would like.

**Chair Roberson:**

I think Dr. Canavero is going to speak to service-level agreements, so I don't think we need to do that twice today.

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

That's great. We will adjust as needed.

**Chair Roberson:**

I need to let the members know when we're going to break, so how much time do you need?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

I think we have probably 15 to 20 minutes, at the most. Then we'll regroup during lunchtime to be ready to come back and shorten the rest of the pieces or push them forward to the next time.

**Chair Roberson:**

Okay, and what will those other presentations entail?

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

It was members of the SOTs. We have the chair from the SOT at Garside and the chair from the SOT at Valley High School. So, it was to give their perspective on how things are working. So, we can only do that piece, because they're here today, after lunch, and then we'll push the rest of it forward for the future.

**Chair Roberson:**

Okay, and you and I can talk offline during the lunch break. Again, this wasn't scheduled, so I'm sensitive to time. I don't want to keep people here until 7:00 p.m., that's all.

**Mr. Skorkowsky:**

I understand completely, and we'll readjust.

**Chair Roberson:**

Thank you.

**Dr. Barton:**

Just to talk about some of the organizational structures that are in place, the Academic Unit and the school associate superintendents were really tasked with gathering feedback from principals and SOT members regarding potential transfers of responsibility. You may recall this slide, you've seen it before (Exhibit F). This talks about the recommendations. Again, those come to the Academic Unit via the principals. You may recall some of the data we

shared previously with the autonomy surveys, where principals completed what they felt the autonomy should be. The Board review process has occurred, and now we're at the yellow stage, which is more or less the implementation of the transfer of responsibility. But I think the bottom line with this is that there is a structure built now for transferring responsibility. As far as the data gathering, we have used Google Docs to incorporate the voice from the SOTs and, again, the surveys that we used with the principals. This is a process that will, of course, be used annually, and we expect, as this has been built and refined, that after the January 15 deployment of strategic budgets, thereafter we can probably start moving again on transfer of responsibility feedback.

You may recall as well that, as we consider autonomy for schools and principals and SOTs, autonomy is viewed in many ways. We had principals who responded that they wanted to keep Central Services as their main deliverer of a service. So, when we did the survey, the word "none" was something that was pretty compelling. We heard from principals loud and clear that they want to stay focused on the instructional core and classrooms. But then again, there were pockets of principals and SOTs that wanted to pursue some other options. So, after this data-gathering process with the principals and SOTs, that data is captured, and there is sort of a passing of the baton with that, where those recommendations, that feedback, then goes to the Operations Unit to the Chief Operating Officer, Rick Neal, and he'll describe some of the next steps, what was gathered from that feedback, how that went into play as far as transfer of responsibility and some of the potential outcomes for this upcoming fiscal year.

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

So, Dr. Barton already covered much of the background. I'll just walk you through a little bit of the timeline of how we got through the consultation, and then we'll step through what occurred with the two areas that we brought forward, which are listed at the bottom in blue, for the transfer of responsibility (Exhibit F). So, as Dr. Barton spoke about, throughout August and September, the results of a survey were shared with SOTs in formal principal meetings as well as in meetings of the Superintendency and Central Services, which includes the key leaders, the school associate superintendents and the executive cabinet of CCSD. Those meetings culminated in transfer of responsibility-specific meetings with those pockets of principals who were interested in pursuing other options. Two of these meetings were held, one in late September and one in early October. The first one was to discuss the process of moving forward, what it would take to basically run a pilot of a different delivery model for both custodial services and site-based technicians, which correspond with those two areas at the bottom. The second was to document the final requirements in anticipation of bringing it forward to the Board, because we were clear from the beginning of the process that these transfers of responsibility required Board approval. Interestingly enough about the conversations with the principals, and this is what I believe from my perspective, so it's attributable to me, but as a service provider, one of the most valuable parts of this whole process was the discussion with the principals as to what they were actually trying to get to. We went in with the same approach for both the technical support as well as the clean environment with the custodian. During the discussion between Central Services, the service provider and the principals, we moved from an RFP discussion on site-based

technicians to a different delivery model with the District as the service provider still. So, that was really a good discussion, and I'm going to continue through my comments for the sake of brevity, but that is a little bit of what Principal Taton is going to talk to you about, because she was one of the ones personally involved in that discussion. Principals also weighed in on the topic of ensuring a clean and well-maintained learning environment, and they expressed through that conversation that they had some needs at their sites which they did not believe could be met through the traditional delivery model, and we worked to define autonomy goals. At the conclusion of that discussion, the principals expressed their desire to move forward with exploring an outside vendor, pending Board approval, again as I discussed.

So, there were five major consideration points used to form the recommendations that were brought forward to the Board, the first of which was a consultation component, which is what I just talked about. For the second component, after understanding the needs of our customers, we began to look at the feasibility of what was being proposed. Central Services staff reviewed policy, law and negotiated agreements. They looked at timelines for implementation and mapped backwards dates to align with the proposals for the principals. Additionally, Central staff in both Technology Information Systems and Facilities assigned specific monetary value to these two items under consideration for the transfer. I want to point out here that that was very important to the principals, because if we're asking them to make a decision, they needed to see what both sides of that ledger were going to look like. Both Central staff and the principals we worked with were concerned about the potential risk, which is the third factor, to the larger organization, i.e. the District, associated with the transfer proposals. Subject matter experts from various Central Services departments, including Risk Management, Facilities, Legal and Technology, weighed in on concerns related to equipment, background checks, potential human resources implications to schools, district-wide testing preparedness and a number of other issues. Central and the principals worked together to mitigate those risks before bringing the proposal forward to the Board of Trustees. The team also discussed what impacts the implementation schedule would have on the larger budgeting and personnel process. Last but not least, all of these conversations took place with the overarching goal of ensuring it was in the best interest of the schools and the students.

On October 26, 2017, the transfer of responsibilities proposals for school technology support and compliance and for ensuring a clean and well-maintained learning environment were brought to the Board for approval. The Board approved, as we've already discussed a little bit previously in the meeting, the transfer of funding for both items into school strategic budgets for the 2018-2019 School Year. They also approved a modified service delivery model for a small number of schools in the technology support and compliance area. It's important to note that back in September of this year, regulation R042-11 was amended to move to provide freedom for the schools to have selection and supervision and payroll for their custodians and their employees, so this transfer actually moved the money for the payroll. This was the approval of the money for the payroll. As I stated earlier, we have the pleasure of having one of the principals responsible for helping outline the delivery model for the site-based technicians with us.



**Misti Taton (Principal, Cashman Middle School):**

I'm merely one of the principals who was involved in this, who opted into this. This wasn't something that was forced upon us or anything like that. This was something we opted into. As Mr. Neal discussed, there were two informational meetings to even start with. From the onset, it's never been about employees. It hasn't been about employees who weren't doing their jobs or employees that were in some way insufficient in the job. It was literally about, "Are we doing this for the best interest of our kids?" I really want to exemplify that, because as soon as this started, a lot of times I was seen as anti-custodian or anti-site-based technician, but it's never been about that. For my personal expectations going into it, I went to my custodial staff and I went to my site-based technician and talked to them about it, and we agreed we wanted information and choices. My SOT would ask me questions that I had no answers to. So, like several of the other principals, I went into this with open eyes to come up with the ideas of, "What can we do better with what we're doing now," and that's what the idea was. It wasn't about saving a dollar. It wasn't about that, it was about, "Are we doing the best for our kids in the best model that we can do?" What Mr. Neal isn't telling you is that a couple of those meetings were kind of contentious. I can say that, looking at something new, if any of you guys have gone to the gym, the first few times you go to the gym, it's not the easiest thing in the world. It's the same thing going into this. It was changing and shifting the paradigm of what we're looking at. Some words were said, but at the end of the day, we're looking back at our kids. This is an ongoing process that we're still working through. In fact, I was in a meeting yesterday to look at what the site-based technician delivery model would look like, to look at a menu. I'm not 100 percent in yet, but I want to have an option, and that was really what this was about, going back and getting informed decisions to my SOT and my school. What could we leverage with the money that we have for the best interest of the kids that we have on our site? Is it somebody fulltime, is it services from the District? That is at the end of the day what we were looking for.

To give you one example, one of our concerns in the deployment of our technology is our building. Because we are an academy of math, science and engineering, we do have a lot of—I'm in an old building, so we've taken the technologies for the students, because I don't have a lot of designated labs, so we are deploying about 23 carts between laptops and iPads and those things. If you know anything about that, that can take up to 3 months to get that into our kids' hands, so what is a different model that I could use to procure services from the District to get those in the hands of my kids for that first week? Because they need that in their hands to be able to do this. So, those are the things we're looking at. Again, it was never about employees, it was about options and what was in the best interest of our students.

For how it's going, it's really turned from discussions about outsourcing to options and choices that we have for our students. It's opened up some great conversations within our building and within our SOTs and with other schools. What works for my school might not work for an elementary school down the street. It might not work for the high school that's near me. But what is my option and what works best, and I think that's the value of the conversation, because for the first time, we've had those conversations. Mr. Neal's been very honest about those, and having a conversation, if we continue what we're doing,

doesn't make it the right thing. And again, it's not a one-size-fits-all, and to me, at the end of the day about this, it was all those conversations, because I think we came up with a solution that none of us walked into with the idea of. The idea was never replacing the site-based technicians, it was how we could have a model that worked better for our schools and was individualized for our schools. I think at the end of the day, that's what we're all about. So, just for me, the value was in the conversation, and I really believed and what I told my staff was that information is power. So, we'll make that decision in January when we have some more numbers to look at, like what this would cost going this way, what would be the benefit and the pros and cons, because at the end of the day, that's what we all wanted, what the pros and cons were.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I guess I'm confused. What's the model? You don't have the model yet? Because I didn't hear it.

**Ms. Taton:**

So, what we've looked at instead of outsourcing is utilizing a menu of services that we can use from our own Central Services, so we'll have a model. So, if I want to deploy my computers, I can hire from them to come deploy it for a cost, I can make a choice with my funds if I want to use a prep-buyout for a teacher that I have on site for the day-to-day maintenance. So, that's the model we're looking at.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

You mentioned that the conversation turned to outsourcing. Outsourcing of what? Or that was tabled?

**Ms. Taton:**

The initial discussion was, instead of using site-based technicians within the District, are there other models that worked, like using different services or using a bid out to find other people to do that job as opposed to—that's where the original conversation started, but it was looking at services as opposed to what was in the best interest of our students.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

Can you repeat the number of principals that wanted the status quo, like not having to manage this part of their school buildings, versus how many did want to? I think it's important that we know that difference of how many principals really, really want it and how many really like the way things are running currently. If they have a budget where they're going to have someone at school, there are many principals who've had their custodian there for decades. So, I just want to hear a bigger perspective. How many principals want it versus how many don't?

**Dr. Barton:**

You may recall a slide that I shared previously in September, where we surveyed about the custodial service and also the site-based technicians. We started with approximately 25 principals in each of those categories. As we continued to meet with that group of principals, some dropped off as they learned more information. They wanted to ask some questions, then after that, they sort of determined that they wanted to stick with a central model. Mr. Neal probably has better numbers as far as what it landed on as far as the ones going with the site-based technician point-of-service model and the custodial option as well. But really, in September, about 25 were in each of those categories where it started.

**Mr. Neal:**

So, for the site-based technicians, we landed on 9 schools, and 11 for custodial. That's the final number of people that decided to move forward. There are a couple other things that I'd just like to add. First of all, the discussion over outsourcing, there were a lot of assumptions that came in when we had the meeting in the beginning, because I really hadn't, as a service provider, had a lot of opportunity to talk to the customer. So, once we were talking with the principals and getting through the discussions, and like she said, we had to get through some tough spots as to what the real problem was, once we got to the root cause, that's where it started to move off. It's not so much that you're not providing a good service when you're providing it, but sometimes it's taking too long. There are others that don't need it 100 percent of the time, so they needed a model where they could have some flexibility on that. In my position, because it's a unique position, when I brought it to the Board, my position there is to bring forward the proposal and to try to get that to go through, but there's another side to my job as a service provider. I'm trying to provide the best service that I can within the resources that I have. One of the things, because we discussed a little bit earlier in this meeting, is changing the mindset of my personnel, and it's not so much changing it as reactivating it and tying them back to what the end mission was, because my people don't educate kids directly, but we do set the conditions so the educators can focus. We were looking at what's in the best interest of the kids. If I can remove distractions from Ms. Taton's plate so she and her people can focus, then that's what I want to do. Leadership does start at the top, but it ends at the point of contact. So, on the operational side, the discussion still continues. Just because the RFP did not go through does not mean we have closed off discussions with our folks on custodial services, nor have we closed off discussions about people who are outside of this pilot group. We just have to make sure we can operate within the resources we are assigned.

**Chair Roberson:**

Seeing no other questions from the Committee, thank you for your presentation.

THE CHAIR CALLED FOR A RECESS.

**Dr. Barton:**

Just highlighting some success with the reorganization, we know that our SOTs have been vital with the shift. So, we have three members here today. I want to introduce our chair from Garside Junior High School, Estrella Gomez. We also have two students, and one of the students is an SOT chair at Valley High School. We have Shelsea Contreras and Omega Gdeye.

**Chair Roberson:**

Shelsea, you are the president of the SOT?

**Shelsea Contreras:**

No, I was the chair last year.

**Chair Roberson:**

Okay. Wow, that's great. It's so nice to meet all of you. Thank you for coming.

**Ms. Contreras:**

My experience on the SOT was actually really amazing. When I first asked to be chairwoman, they weren't as surprised as I thought they were going to be. They kind of just welcomed it. The principal was like, "Yeah, of course you can be." There were no questions asked, there was no, "Well, what if it's not something she can do," or anything like that. They encouraged it and they helped me throughout the whole year. When I had questions, they stopped and answered them. A lot of the questions were like, "What is FRL (free and reduced lunch)," things like that. But it was really easy for me to step up and say that I wanted to lead an organization like that, because Valley was a student-led school, and it always has been like that. From freshman year to now, my senior year, they have worked on building these leaders. So, I'm part of their Hospitality and Tourism program, and through there I've been able to develop my speaking skills. I've been able to develop my writing skills and my professionalism, so they really helped me in building these qualities that I need for the job.

**Chair Roberson:**

Very impressive.

**Ms. Contreras:**

Thank you.

**Omega Gdeye:**

I am the current SOT chair at Valley High School. When I wanted to be chair, it was much easier because Shelsea had previously done it very well. When I was nominated by the

teacher, I felt that I was very prepared for it because there was an SOT training that was before that. They had a chair workshop and they really explained what leadership was required, being chair, and that helped with understanding what was required for it. After becoming chair, it really evens out the playing field, because a student does not get a vote on an SOT, so being chair gives you more of a voice, and since CCSD is trying to make students the main focus of their district, having a student give their on-the-ground, personal experience on their SOT gives it a much more authentic feel. So, I think that being chair and being on an SOT is very important for Valley.

**Estrella Gomez:**

For me, my experience has been awesome. Right now, I've been the current chairwoman at Garside for 2 years, and I'm actually the vice chair at Rose Warren as well, so I'm a very involved mom of four. I have a list of things that I wanted to go over, like pros and cons and things like that of what I think. I think the pro about it is that we have a very open atmosphere as far as how we want to hold our meetings. Some people like to do it with more formality, other people like to do it with a more laid-back thing, and that's the kind of thing that I've been comparing with Rose Warren and Garside. You know, one's formal, one's open, and I think just being able to have the opportunity to do that is awesome, and we have more say that way. I think that parents being able to be involved in a lot of this is amazing, because I've always asked things like, "Is there a parent teacher organization (PTA) I can get involved in? Is there something as parents that we can do for our community?" Things like that. So, being able to step up and be a part of this SOT has been great. As far as having the goals to accomplish as far as the budgeting, being able to say, "This is where the money should be spent," versus "You know, we don't really need this," is an amazing feeling as a parent, because I know that, especially like with Garside, we have the iPads for the kids, and I know somebody brought it up earlier about changing the programs constantly, constantly having to go through a different program here, a trial basis there. I think if we did have something more consistent, that would be awesome for our students. I think last year's program was core ingenuity, or something like that, and now we switched to something else.

Also, the only thing that I don't like as far as being an SOT parent is that I don't feel like I have that much of a voice. I feel like, whatever it is I feel I need to say is not addressed. For example, if I think that there's a concern that I have, not only just specifically to the SOT budget, but if I have a concern about something that's going on in our school, I feel like, "Oh, you have to take that up afterwards," things like that. I think that us as SOT members should actually be able to have more of a say of what's going on in our hallways, like with the teachers using their phones or if kids are using profanity and things like that, and what we can do to better those things. Also, having some community resources, like shoes for kids that really need them or a food bank for them, or even backpack supplies, things like that. If we could, as SOT parents, maybe start funding for that or something, even outside sources, to get help for the kids that do need it in our school, that would be amazing. I know my school, for example, is a Title I school, both of them, as well as Zoom at Rose Warren, so we have a lot of families that are below the guidelines as far as monetary dominations go. So, I think being able to have that kind of voice, or even having that kind of option to be

an SOT parent and being able to implement something in place of that, not just talk about the budget, but say, "Hey, these are other concerns that we have going on in our school as well," would be amazing, not just, "Let's stick to the budget, let's stick to the budget, let's stick to the budget." We need a more open atmosphere to speak, and especially about the bullying and about everything that everybody is concerned about. Why can't we address these kinds of concerns during these meetings?

**Chair Roberson:**

So, Estrella, you're the chair for Garside, but you're also vice chair of another school?

**Ms. Gomez:**

Rose Warren.

**Chair Roberson:**

Wow. That's great.

**Ms. Gomez:**

Yeah. I've got four kids. My oldest son is autistic, and I've got two with ADHD and ADD and also anger management problems, things like that. So, it makes it easy for me to be involved with them since I have to be a stay-at-home mom to take care of them. Like I was saying before, working on a budget, it's not easy, so I've become a very resourceful person because of it. I go to my local community food banks, I go to charities to get backpacks for my kids every year and things like that. I think that because I'm resourceful, a lot of parents aren't. I think that if we had a community-based thing, like, specifically in each school for our individual students who are attending that school, it would make a big difference in our community, especially for these kids who need shoes. I walk around the school campus when I go to volunteer, and I see kids who have holes in their shoes or holes in their backpacks or don't have a pencil to even write things down. I think if we, as SOT parents or even as a community and the school, stepped up to try to make that kind of difference, it would be huge, and it would just turn around the whole entire atmosphere.

**Chair Roberson:**

That's great. I'm so impressed by all three of you. Thank you all for being here today and sharing your stories. There are a lot of people here on the Committee who want to talk with you and ask questions.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

Congratulations, Estrella, Omega and Shelsea. I like the women power going on, that movement. So, I've been thinking about, because my experience with the SOTs, just through this Advisory Committee and hearing about the deployment of it and putting it into

practice and hearing that the schools have concerns over it, but you are chairs and you've been through the process, so I want you to be honest with the feedback of how much time is the SOT spending on the budget versus academic achievement versus the school climate? So, if you would have to attach a percentage of time, how much time are we talking numbers or budget? So, would it be 70 percent? For academic achievement, how much would you allot, and how much time do we spend talking about school climate? Just to get a feel from your experiences.

**Ms. Contreras:**

So, when I was on the SOT, we spent 1 day, I think it was like 3 hours, talking about ways we could improve academic achievement. That was for about 3 weeks, right before we had to approve the strategic budget, and we talked about our graduation rates, how to improve our English Language Arts classes, programs we could incorporate and things like that. What we did was we took data, we looked at what could actually work, what the students wanted to see in a classroom, and we left the money to figure out, "How are we going to fit this into the budget? How are we going to work with all these other grants" last, because we wanted to focus mainly on the students.

**Ms. Gdeye:**

I have been to two meetings so far. I'm the newly elected chair. So, I agree with Shelsea's testimony. We did talk a lot about education, and what's really important is that when we do talk about budget, we talk about it directly and how it affects student achievement. So, it's like, "If we put this money towards this, how's it going to improve student achievement?" So, I feel like that's a really important point to make.

**Ms. Gomez:**

I know that during our meetings, the first priority when we did the strategic budgeting last year, because everything was thrown at us so fast, was that we wanted to make sure we had a teacher for every classroom. That was our big thing. That's always our main priority, especially of our principal, Scarlett Perryman, is to make sure we have enough teachers teaching our kids. So, that was the biggest thing. And then once we got that out of the way, we started working on how many iPads we might need for these kids, or do we actually need them? What more do we need, and making sure that we separated the needs from the wants. So, we made sure that we sat down, and I think the very first time we went to meet, it was probably close to about 2 or 2 1/2 hours. We sat down and we went through everything, and Ms. Perryman, she was awesome. She already had most of that stuff figured out, especially with the numbers, so we just kind of went back and forth as far as agreeing what we thought would be good and what we thought wouldn't be good.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

Based on what you said, how many of the items related to academic achievement were carried out when you were chair? How many of the academic solutions were carried out that

you submitted? My question to you is, if you're chairs and you're worried about what's on the agenda, why don't you set the agenda? Why can't you set the agenda to address the issues that you want?

**Ms. Contreras:**

So, for example, we needed a stronger base in math, so we suggested adding SpringBoard into the math classrooms. We have SpringBoard for English, and that works very well. It's kind of like the skeleton that you guys addressed earlier. It was kind of like the skeleton for English, so we thought, "Let's try it out in math." That was carried out this year, I believe.

**Ms. Gdeye:**

You mentioned that we should make our own agenda. Valley High School's chair is in charge of the agenda, and we're told what the other members want on it and then we can add whatever we choose to be on the agenda. So, we have a lot of freedom with the agenda.

**Ms. Gomez:**

At both of the schools that I do SOTs for, I don't have that option. The principal actually comes up with our agenda. I don't get to have a say in what the agenda will be. And that's the same thing for Rose Warren. So, I don't know if that was a possibility, then I just found out about it now and I will get that started, you better believe it, because I'm a mom on the move.

**Chair Roberson:**

I would say that if you're the chair, you make the agenda.

**Ms. Gomez:**

Sounds good to me.

**Chair Roberson:**

So, principals at Garside and Rose Warren, are you listening to this? I hope so.

**Ms. Gomez:**

They better be. They know to watch out for me.

**Senator Harris:**

You mentioned that you're on the SOT of a Title I school, and you identified having a teacher in every classroom as one of your critical must-dos. Can you just tell the Committee



a little bit about how successful you were in that effort? Were you able to accomplish that task?

**Ms. Gomez:**

We were able to accomplish it, but when we walked in this year, we already had our budget set for this year coming in, but then I went to the very first meeting of the year and found out we had budget cuts and things like that, so we had to reassess our budgeting. I know that we are in the process of hiring one teacher right now, but for the most part I would say that we have most of our classrooms filled.

**Senator Harris:**

So, that's fantastic, and I just want to highlight for everybody in attendance, this is an example of SOTs that are working, Title I schools getting those qualified teachers in place who are going to stay the course and be there year in and year out for our kids because we've got really motivated SOT members who know what's important on an SOT.

**Ms. Gomez:**

And it also takes amazing principals at the same time, because as long as the principals are willing to open their ears and listen, then that works as a group to make sure that everything flows smoothly.

**Senator Harris:**

I think that's excellent. I have one question for each of you. You can choose to answer it or not. If you had an opportunity to submit what you think is the appropriate criteria for the hiring of the new superintendent for the School District, would that be something that interests you?

**Ms. Gomez:**

Yes, most definitely. I think that parents should have that kind of involvement. It shouldn't just be up to city officials or state officials. I think us as a community of parents should have a say-so as to listening to what they are willing to offer as well, and I know that's another thing I wanted to bring up that I completely forgot about. I know we have the SOT training meetings, but you guys have to understand that some of these schools are in a poverty area. They can't afford the transportation, or even some people don't have the cars to get to these meetings, so maybe for future reference, maybe offering up an Uber gift card or something like that just to make sure that parents can get to these meetings for the training would actually continue their involvement, because a lot of the people that sign up for the SOT don't know what they're getting themselves into, Like we discussed previously and multiple times, just the short little videos, people don't listen to them. I'll be honest. They don't want to sit here and watch a 5-minute video on somebody talking in a regular way, basically like an infomercial. We don't want an infomercial, we want the statistics like,

"This is what you're going to be involved in. If you're willing to step up to the plate, let's get this done, make a difference," that kind of motivation is what I think the SOT parents need, and being able to have open elections through the year for the parents that do drop out.

**Senator Harris:**

So, I chair a working group on SOTs as part of this Committee. I would invite you to attend that, and we'll get your information. Your feedback has been invaluable and the challenges that you've highlighted are all future agenda items, just so you know.

**Ms. Gdeye:**

I also agree and say that we should be involved in the picking of the next superintendent, but I believe that we should get training for it so we can really understand what is required of a superintendent and what exactly goes into his or her work. So, I believe that would be what we need.

**Ms. Contreras:**

I also do agree. Personally, going into the SOT, I didn't know what to expect, what my job really was, until probably the second meeting, until somebody actually explained it to me. For picking the superintendent, I would want to know what their job is, what's required, and then that will help me understand, "Oh, is this person good for this job?" So, understanding the superintendent's job before even letting me pick is important.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

First, I want to congratulate each one of you, because you gave us one of the best, most concise presentations, and your answers, quite frankly, have been the most thoughtful and relevant and informative ones I think we've gotten today. Senator Harris asked one of my questions, so I'm going to ask Shelsea, now that you're no longer the chair and you're available, would you actually consider applying to be the superintendent?

**Ms. Contreras:**

Yes.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

Great answer. Please get into the running.

**Senator Denis:**

Do you think that the process you went through was a fair process? Obviously, it worked in your case. Did you see any issues there that we could do better, other than transportation

for the parents which you mentioned, and that's always one of my big concerns is how you train parents, especially in the lower income areas.

**Ms. Gomez:**

Like I said, the big concern would be the transportation to get them to these training meetings, but was it easy to start this off? No. The first year, last year, we were just kind of thrown into it and just kind of had no training, no idea what we were really doing. I just knew that I wanted to be involved in whatever had to do with the school to better the education for my kids. I wish a lot more parents thought like that, but that was my perspective. I was willing to learn what I needed to do to get the job done.

**Senator Denis:**

The other folks that were with you, were they as engaged as you were?

**Ms. Gomez:**

Two other parents were, but then like I said, we had six initial parents that signed up, and at the end of the year, we were left with three, so that's why I said if we had open elections throughout the year or something like that so we could replace these members, that would be even better.

**Senator Denis:**

What about the others, the teachers and staff?

**Ms. Gomez:**

The teachers showed up every meeting, yes, and the staff. Even the assistant principal and the dean at Garside showed up, just because they wanted to be there and be involved, so we had a very good, close-knit, kind of a family thing going on, because we wanted to make sure we were all on the same page and we all agreed on everything and to make sure it was for the benefit of our kids and our schools.

**Senator Denis:**

Great. And with you other two, did you find the same thing, that people were engaged and participating?

**Ms. Contreras:**

Yes, especially the parents. So, some of the parents on our SOT were actually teachers or substitute teachers in the District, so it was really easy to get it going. They understood the acronyms, things like that, and it made the process very smooth. The only issue was understanding why we were there, understanding that we were going to manage the money

that went into schools. It's really just understanding the job that was difficult about being part of the SOT, because going into it my first year, I didn't know what it was about. I didn't know what I was applying for, and then after a couple meetings, I understood, "Oh, I'm approving the strategic budget. I'm looking at how many teachers are going to come into the school, what teachers are coming into the school. If our principal leaves, it's on us to pick the next person who comes in." So, having our members understand that is extremely important, and having our members understand how to address things, how to bring things up at a meeting as well, is very important.

**Ms. Gdeye:**

Yeah, I agree that the election process was very fair. When you do get into it, you are a little unaware of what's going on, which is why I believe that, after your first year, you really have it down, and if you went on to a second year, I think it would really benefit the SOT, which is why I believe that 2-year terms might be a good idea for an SOT. Also, in terms of teachers, Valley is in a poverty-ridden area. It's a very needy school. We're Title I, and we are a Victory school. I personally am an international baccalaureate (IB) student, so I don't experience many unqualified teachers, but I believe that we need to put more qualified teachers into our State in general, which is why Glenn Christenson mentioned that there should be a teacher preparation program at Nevada State or other colleges or universities here. I think that might be a very good idea to put qualified teachers back into our schools, because having a lot of long-term substitutes is not what we need.

**Senator Denis:**

And just to be fair, I think UNLV and Nevada State and even the College of Southern Nevada (CSN) and other private ones do have teacher preparation, we just don't have enough, and I think the one thing, especially that Mr. Christenson said, is that we need to grow our own, so we've got to figure out ways that we can get more folks that are already here to go into teaching. So, I agree with that.

**Chair Roberson:**

Thank you all for being here today. We really appreciate it.

I will now invite Mr. Vellardita and Mr. Augspurger to the table. We'd like to hear your perspectives from the teacher and principal communities as to the state of the reorganization. What's going well, what's not going so well, what needs to be done, from your perspective, going forward?

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

So, there are a number of things that I want to speak to, but frankly, what is working well is what initially was rolled out from the word "go," and that's what you just heard: the formation of the SOTs. Second to that, I would argue, what we heard from Principal Taton at Cashman is another example too about when you change the delivery system and you

empower those schools and the hub of delivery now is at the point of education, you have to allow for flexibility and innovation to acknowledge what kind of resources you have available and how best to use them, because you're on the front line that is correlated to outcomes and student achievements. So, I can't add anything in terms of what's best that has happened up to this point, short of what you heard in your testimony today.

Given that, I certainly can add my two cents on a number of issues. First off, leadership is critical at this point in the game. The law was passed. There's progress on some fronts, there are struggles on some fronts, and there's obstruction on other fronts, in terms of fully implementing this law. Leadership obviously is critical. For leadership in the "right now," I've been a big advocate that we can't wait. I don't want to appear to be cavalier about this approach, but I don't want to lose this school year. I don't want the year to go by and changes that we could have made we didn't make, and there are outcomes as a result of that. The compass for us and all decisions center around student achievement. So, we are very concerned with the announcement of the Superintendent retiring who's leading the effort on the reorganization, but we are also aware of the fact that, under the law, the Department of Education can have more of a role in trying to guide this through. I don't want anybody to construe this as, "Vellardita is saying State control of the School District." That's not at all what I'm saying. What I'm saying is that we need leadership. We need guidance moving forward this year to be in compliance with the law.

The second part of leadership is the more strategic piece, and that's what you've all been talking about and what you asked input from both a Trustee as well as the Superintendent and others, and that's the type of superintendent we need in this School District moving forward. I would argue that we need an implementer. We need somebody who will get things done, and I know that sounds broad and general. We've been out there, we've shared with the community what we think the characteristics of a superintendent are, but if that person cannot embrace this new delivery system that empowers the community to take control of the neighborhood schools and the stakeholders who are empowered to make sure that kids learn, then that's not the right type of leader. I'm saying this publicly, that we believe there are leaders out there, nation-wide. We believe there are leaders here who can embrace this and take it in a direction. But we also know that that's not a large pool. The large pool that exists is a very top-down, centralized model of management that exists nation-wide, and it would be a mistake to bring that kind of individual into the system who would not embrace this culture. So, I'm not going to say anything more on that.

So, the next thing I'd like to talk about is the budget. It has been very challenging from our perspective on a few fronts. Obviously, we represent educators. Many of you here on this Committee we worked with in this last legislative session. We worked with you in the previous legislative session, and we went into the 2017 Legislative Session with our number one priority being to add to what we left out in 2015 with this law, and that is funding for the weights. We went into that session, and we worked with you, Senator Denis, and other folks in the Legislature to try to address that so the kids who were left out of categoricals, the kids who didn't have enough with the basic per-pupil funding, had some additional money, but not just any money, very prescriptive around intervention strategies. We came up with a piece of legislation and the money that was available to try to do that, and that was done

with the Department of Education as well. So, moving forward, it's a little challenging to hear the discussion about the District's finances, where they're at, the attrition savings and how they're used. While this hearing was going on, I was texted by a number of not just teachers but principals who said, "I can tell you what I can do with that extra money," and it all centers around intervention strategies in the now, this year, so that we don't waste this year. So, there's that frustration that exists out there. I think whoever the new leader is doesn't necessarily have to have a strong financial background, but I believe a key leadership component in the District is someone with a sound, strong financial background, and it doesn't have to be somebody who comes out of a school district or education. It has to be somebody with those kinds of foundational strengths in finances, and it's a plus if they're public finances. The District's CFO, who they've recently hired, I've recently gotten to know him a little bit. I see positive things. I'm hoping this individual can assist the District in their financial situation moving forward, but we're watching you very carefully and we still have a lot of skepticism as to how money is being managed. But for you as Legislators, I would argue this: So, we heard conversations about how we're underfunded and we need more money, and I think that goes without saying, and I think people in this room and elsewhere know me well enough to know that we don't advocate just for money. We say, "If there's additional revenue, where does it go and how is it tied to outcomes, and what kinds of benchmarks and metrics can you put in there for accountability to see that your money is really achieving what it's intended to?" But I would suggest this: As much as there's discussion right now around the Nevada Plan and other sources of funding, this delivery system that essentially is trying to put 85 percent of all unrestricted dollars into the school precinct I think begs a discussion to take place at the Legislature in terms of how you may fund differently with the particular needs and challenges that emerge from a bottom-up type of delivery system. Right now, it's the DSA and categoricals. The DSA goes into a bucket and it goes to Central and it's disbursed. It's discretionary. Categoricals are restricted, prescriptive and they have outcomes attached to them. This is a model that essentially says you're taking the stakeholders in a school and you're giving them 85 percent of the budget and you're making them responsible for student achievement and outcomes. So, I think it begs the question as to what kind of funding, and not just how much, but what kind of funding should come down to Clark County with this new model. So, I would just put that out there for your thinking.

Another point I want to raise is that I know it's a challenge, and I don't want to sound like a broken record, but it's one thing to transfer money to the schools to create now the precinct as the hub of delivery, but the conversion of Central administration into a service model that now services those precincts, I just have not seen a lot of evidence that we've made progress around that. So, I'm going to take a case in point. So, under section 16 of the law, there are various services that Central administration carries out that the precincts don't, and the idea to reach 80 or 85 percent of unrestricted dollars going into the school is to look at some of those services and start to transfer them. Today, you heard two services, only two out of all those services listed in section 16. Only 37 percent of the budget of the District had been transferred. Custodial services are one, and that's the one I want to talk about. So, that represents, I think last time I saw, about 3 percent of the budget, maybe a little plus or minus. That was transferred to the schools, but it was transferred to the schools with the same Central model in place. In other words, you use the same kind of system that you

have in place. We saw an effort on the part of those struggling with the idea of converting administration into a service who said, "Let's try a pilot program. Let's go to principals and ask them if they want this flexibility, if they want this autonomy to be responsible for the service and use the dollars in the best way possible that's in the totality of what they're operating under. How would they do it?" So, they came up with a proposal, and it was a relatively simple proposal. The proposal essentially said, "We want to use what we have existing, but guess what? We have figured out that we can have that same service at other hours of the day," night service I believe is what was proposed, "and so we want the ability to go out and see if there are any services out there that can provide that service." Now, this was something that was proposed by people we've empowered with that responsibility, and it's a responsibility that was transferred to the schools. It then is presented before the Board of Trustees, and the Board of Trustees then says, "Okay, if you're going to do it, because we just gave you that responsibility, you have to go through an RFP process," and then I witnessed two meetings back to back where there was this incredible amount of conversation about, "What do we put in an RFP to have all these kinds of protections" or issues or whatever. Mind you, if you're the governing body, you should be very careful about that stuff. But I've got to tell you, this is what happened: Nothing got done. So, what you heard Principal Taton describe about innovation and flexibility, that could not occur with those principals in those schools who were given that responsibility and wanted the flexibility to figure out how they could provide custodial services differently. It didn't happen. So, to me, how does the governing body that is responsible for the RFP process have the ability to trump what, under law, has been transferred to the school precincts' authority and responsibility to exercise? To me, that's something that has to be worked out. I know in part one way it's being worked out is that the service-level agreements that I think the Department of Education is trying to work out, and it sounds like that is pretty encouraging and promising to try to get to not just moving resources, but really to give this empowerment into these buildings so they can do what they're being asked under the law to do. But I've got to tell you, one of the more challenging things out of this whole process—and I'm a convert. I have learned through this whole process that we have short-changed the Board of Trustees' role in this. I'm not going to speak to the fact that they've been, as a whole, as a body, resistant to the change, but I don't think we've incorporated them into this process enough so they understand the new role they have. So, for example, the way this RFP model was delivered to them, I don't think they were given the opportunity to act in the best interest of Trustees to make the right decision. So, I just think, since you're asking what would be different, I think these Trustees have to be involved in this process more, and I think that starts with more training and education of them around this delivery system. It's a conversion on their part to adjust that they're giving up areas of responsibility and control where before they had it all together, and the role of CCSD staff to those Trustees should be looked at, because this is a governing body whose core competency isn't a \$2,400,000,000 budget or human capital management of 41,000 employees. They listen to whatever staff presents to them and they make the best decision. I think that needs to be looked at, because I don't think the best decisions have been made as of late. So, that's another thing that I would raise.

On the service-level agreements and with the Department of Education, I would raise the same concerns that I saw with the RFP. If we're going to do these kind of agreements, and

I'll let Dr. Canavero speak to what they are, because I don't even pretend to know exactly how this is going to play out, but my understanding is, where there isn't a transfer of some of the responsibilities under section 16, there'll be an agreement between Central and the building around purchasing or acquiring, or whatever, these services that now will be the responsibility of the building. My only concern is that what I saw in the RFP around custodial is not safeguarded against in these service-level agreements, then what you can have is Central setting up dynamics, parameters if you will, that make it very cumbersome for school precincts to have any kind of flexibility in being in control of services and programs that I think the law intended them to have. So, those are some of the comments that I have.

I think, on the whole, the Clark County Education Association (CCEA) would like to see CCSD be the first destination district of employment for educators in this country. We would like to see CCSD be a school district where we're trying to have economic development in Southern Nevada, where new employers come in and they say, "That checklist is off my box in terms of there's a great school system because I know there are improvements being made and the kids will be taught," because that's a critical piece. So, we're very much vested in the outcome of this law and its implementation, and I'll come back full circle. We need an implementer. We need it now, and we need it moving forward. I am very concerned that, if there isn't progress made this year, this Committee sunsets, we have another legislative session and I think one of you, I can't remember if it was you, Assemblywoman Neal, there's this mindset up there that you throw something new every 2 years, and I don't want a discussion to occur in the 2019 Session as to, "Geez, we did all of this, and you know, it's not doing what it said it did. Let's do something else," because I think that would be a huge mistake. I think you got a kernel of the future when you heard the participants who have been empowered with taking care of their kids' education. I think you got a kernel of the future when you heard a leader in a building given flexibility and responsibility on how they want to do best for kids, and I'd like to see the kernel turn into a crop.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I heard your opinion, but in A.B. 469 in section 16(2)(c), when it talks about procurement, it says to do procurement, it must be carried out in accordance with the applicable policies of the large school district. So, we have the policies, and when you go and read the policies, the benchmark is then the statutory provisions. So, I'm trying to get an understanding of what it is that you're trying to get at. I get innovation, but we're not doing innovation at the expense of the law or prudence. So, I'm not clear on what you're actually seeking to achieve, because I don't want 300 schools to cut corners and make mistakes. I also don't want 300 schools to go in and then change the policy so much without guidance and understanding of the impacts of the law. Just because a principal is an instructional leader does not mean that they have the aptitude to then go and really understand the complications without someone being an oversight body, like the Board of Trustees. So, I need to understand what you're trying to go for.



**Mr. Vellardita:**

I would love to. I actually don't think that we're saying two different things, so let me explain. I absolutely believe and support the law, as it is, that gives authority to a school district to develop those policies. That's not what the issue is. That should take place for a lot of different reasons. If there's going to be an attempt to empower a building or principal to seek services or programs elsewhere, they should follow whatever the procurement policy is and the RFP that might transpire as a result of it. But when you start adding on to that things that become so unreasonable that, in effect, there will not be an RFP, when you start adding on requirements that normally would not have been the requirement, that's when the process essentially circumvents the responsibility you've given to that building to try to see whether or not there's a service out there. I would ask that you go back and review the minutes of that meeting, or in fact, look at the RFP when it was initially introduced and the RFP when it came back a second time, and the comments on the part of those Trustees about what they want to see in an RFP. You get to a point where nobody is going to be able to provide you a service or a program because it's just so over-burdensome. That's the point I'm making, not around taking away the authority of the governing body to develop that stuff, but to add on to it in such a way that it becomes prohibited and it's no longer an option. That's the concern.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

But should we be making a decision? They haven't done that many RFPs. So, you're saying the viewpoint that the Board took was cumbersome and the requirements they wanted to add on then prevented the action. That's in their purview as an elected body to decide, "Is this an appropriate policy, that when the RFP was put out, should there have been things placed in there or not?" That's their purview. So, I'm trying to figure out, what power would you like us to take from them? Their ability to review, discern and interpret?

**Mr. Vellardita:**

I'm not a lawyer, but I will say this, and I'll repeat again, that I'm not here to say to take away their governing authority. But I will make an argument that if they use that authority to obstruct this law, then that should be challenged, and that's what I witnessed, at least in my opinion. It isn't whether or not they should no longer have that authority, it's whether or not they're using that authority. Mind you, this was a pilot project. This was not 357 schools. This was not several thousand employees. This was a pilot project put before the Trustees by one of the best principals in this system with impeccable credentials and asking for flexibility to manage that service in the three buildings she was looking at. So, I would argue, yeah, if it looks like that authority is used to obstruct another area of law, that's what I would challenge. I'm not challenging their authority to develop the RFP or the procurement, or that the school should be in compliance with that. I'm not challenging that.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

Do you think a part-time board, like the Board of Trustees, can actually provide the services you're looking for to implement this on a day-to-day basis, especially given the haphazard nature of who gets elected to the Board, rather than having someone who understands contracting and finance and budgeting and so forth? Are they really in a position to lead this and implement it?

**Mr. Vellardita:**

They're the governing body, as it stands now. They're responsible under the law to lead and implement this. So, I'll answer that way. You're asking me if they're qualified? I'm not exactly sure.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

As you said, this is a day-to-day implementation requirement. To really make this work, it can't be done, from my perspective, on a part-time basis. So, are they the right body to actually implement this?

**Mr. Vellardita:**

They're the governing body and they're the right body now to implement it. The day-to-day operation is the purview of the Office of the Superintendent and everything that flows from that. That's what I meant earlier when I said there are two components of leadership. There's the here and now, making this successful this year, at least trying to be in compliance with the law as much as possible, and then strategically, what kind of leader do we bring in here? But the day-to-day operation is the purview of the Superintendent and all staff that flows from that, not those Trustees. The Trustees are more global in terms of being responsible for the general budget, policy, program, etc., but day-to-day operations are the Office of the Superintendent.

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

I'm really here today to speak on behalf of 351 principals about what we see still as problems in the implementation of the reorganization. Before I do that, I'd like to address four or five things I heard earlier in the meeting. Before I do that, I would like to say that there's only one thing that I take exception to from my friend and colleague here, Mr. Vellardita. I actually agree with everything he has said, other than I'm not sure that the Board has been under-utilized in this. In fact, it's my personal opinion that the Trustees are an impediment to moving forward. I could offer many reasons for that. I won't go into that at this point, but I do think, as it has been said many times in the discussion about whether we should have elected or appointed Trustees, this is a \$2,400,000,000 operation with 41,000 employees. There is a niche set of expertise that needs to be brought to the table to make the kinds of decisions that we're talking about. From inception, I've been concerned about

their will to move this forward, and I think the kinds of things we see manifest at Trustee meetings, the custodial issue is a perfect example of not having the will to implement this. I believe they believe that they've been micromanaged by the State Legislature. They resent this bill taking away their authority to make decisions in the School District, and as such, they drag their feet. We saw that happen from inception, and I do believe there are still remnants of that in place that are very detrimental to this process moving forward.

So, having said that, there are three or four other things. One, I know there's no solution to this. I just want to put this issue on the record. We'd like to think it was completely a harmonious issue. There's been a lot of contention. We've seen a lot of it here today. I think as we move forward, we'll find ourselves being more harmonious with this. But one of the things that disturbed me a month ago at a meeting with the State Board, and with all due respect to Dr. Canavero, as soon as I raised this issue, he scheduled a meeting for a number of different constituent groups. But when I hear District administrators say they appreciate Dr. Canavero's willingness to work with them on implementation of this bill, which has lots of constituent group participation, and I know there's probably no way to work around this, but it bothers me, given all the things that we're still not completely in agreement on, that we have, in essence, sidebar conversations that are occurring that no one else knows about. We can't say, "You can't talk to Dr. Canavero." That's not a legitimate way to resolve that issue, but I just want to address that as a concern. I think we ought to work really hard to make this as transparent as we possibly can so there are not decisions being made that other constituent groups that have a vested interest in this simply don't know about.

The second thing that I was concerned about that I heard this morning was the true-up that was going to occur with the attrition dollars. The question was raised, "How are we going to make up those dollars that schools should have gotten or received for Fiscal Year 2018?" The decision was put out on the table by the District that that would happen at the end of the year when we actually saw what kind of money was available. I'm paraphrasing here a little bit, but the fact of the matter is, those attrition dollars started at \$57,000,000. That was what it was last fall. It was reported today that it's now at \$69,000,000, meaning there's been an additional \$12,000,000 that's been received by the District that they've categorized as attrition. It's been made very clear to us that attrition dollars are allocated, they're budgeted, and they're spent. So, I'm not sure how we're going to take a pot of money that's been used that way, budgeted, allocated and spent, and have any means of trueing-up with those schools that have had long-term substitutes all year. Some of our high schools have had as many as six and seven substitutes, so we've heard the math thrown around a lot here today, but if you just use an easy number, about a \$60,000 difference between the average teacher salary and the cost of a substitute and you have six or seven of those, that's a lot of money that can be going to a school. I agree with Mr. Vellardita. I talk with principals every day about what they would do with that money and the specific interventions they would plan to meet the needs of kids.

The other thing that concerns me is the idea that we have 150 of our—when we started this school year, we were 400 teachers short. It's down to about 350. That makes sense, and 150 of those are special education teachers. We heard today that they were paid with

Central funds and that attrition dollars for those people wouldn't go back to schools. I beg to differ with that interpretation, because the law doesn't concern itself with funding. That's general fund money. The District receives over \$340,000,000 in general fund for special education purposes. If there's a vacancy in a special education position in a school, that principal and that SOT are entitled, I believe, to receive that money. So, someone once said, "The devil's in the details." I think as we begin to make more progress with this, we can't lose sight of those small nuances, because the goal of this is for money to follow the kids, and if money stays in Central for any reason that's related to attrition, then we're not ensuring that that dollar is following kids.

So, with that, my presentation today really is very simple. If you happened to listen to me the last time I spoke in September, you're going to hear a similar story to what you heard then, and that is, this bill, which I've been an advocate of from inception, does two things for principals. We were successful in getting principals to see this as a great thing by these two promises, I think, that are inherent in this law. The first one is that they will have greater autonomy over site-based decision making, and the second is that they'll have more money. Those things have been very slow in coming, and I'm going to talk very specifically first about the autonomy with respect to site-based decision making. There are three pieces that section 16(2) talks about, and Assemblywoman Neal, you've addressed one of those. I'm just going to kind of repeat it here a little bit today, but the first one is that the principal would have control over staffing. The second one is a greater ability to purchase supplies, equipment and services. The third one is greater control over personnel and discipline in some specific instances. So, if we take them separately, the staffing autonomy, I think, was really problematic to begin this process, but I would have to say, and I say this with appreciation to Dr. Barton and Superintendent Skorkowsky, I do believe at this point that we have a shared approach to staffing. Now, that's specific to transfers and reassignments. It used to be that the dance of the lemons was alive and well in CCSD. With this requirement under the law, we have a new procedure. It's been slow in coming. It's not perfect yet, but gone are the days when a school associate superintendent simply picks up the phone and says, "Mr. Augspurger, you have a vacant position. I have Mr. Vellardita. He'll be at your school tomorrow." Those kinds of conversations should not be happening. I know not everyone's on board with that, but the agreement we have is that school associate superintendents now will have a conversation with the principal. They'll seek their agreement on that placement in their building. I would just say to you, yesterday across my desk came notification of a transfer of an assistant principal to another school. I picked up the phone yesterday afternoon and called the receiving principal and said, "Tell me how this happened," and he described to me what I just described to you, that his school associate superintendent called him, had a conversation about the placement and the principal was happy with that placement. So, again, unilateral placement should no longer be occurring.

The more problematic piece with that—I'm assuming each one of you received the letter that Dr. Canavero sent out that identified certain problems in the bargaining group contracts. Most of those, or at least the one for our organization, dealt with reduction of force provisions. I would say to you that we've really spent a lot of time this year looking at that whole process. It's not just reduction of force. There are three other pieces that we're working on right now to make consistent with the idea that there should be autonomy for the

principal to select whom he wants in his building. Those other three procedures include the simple surplus process that oftentimes happens at the beginning of each year. Enrollment in a school doesn't materialize because they're short students. Administrators and teachers are moved. We're working out a process to give principals complete autonomy in that instance. The second one would be dealing with the strategic budget, where principals and SOTs can make decisions to actually budget an administrator out of a position. That happened a number of times this school year, so we're working on a process to determine how the receiving principals will be able to retain that staffing autonomy. The last one would be, any time a school is declared turnaround, there's oftentimes a provision where that school can be reconstituted one or more of the administrators who work in the school, as well as other staff. So, we're addressing all issues that relate to principal autonomy. With staffing, we see that, I think, as a shared responsibility with the District. We're having regular meetings to discuss how that can happen. We're not there yet, but I do want you to know that we're moving in that direction to be completely in agreement with what the statute says.

That second autonomy is the purchase of goods and services, and Assemblywoman Neal, I agree with you. I don't think we ought to have rampant purchases irrespective of what purchasing law says, but I do think we have to be open to those possibilities when they come up. This is a new model for delivering services to schools, and I think simply to reject something outright and not have a willingness to do something on a pilot program is not the appropriate way to go. So, again, I think there is much additional work that still needs to be done with the purchase of services and goods and equipment. The third one deals with greater control over personnel and discipline in certain instances. I don't believe there's been any discussion about that autonomy. I've had no discussion with the District about that. I've not heard it at a meeting. It's still an area where we need to drop back and say, "What does that look like? How do we define it? How does it assist schools with this new delivery model?" So, we then have the first issue that's a concern is that issue about site-based decision making. The second one deals with the promise of more money, and I can assure you this year that schools, unless they happen to receive some categorical funding, their strategic budget has received no new money this year, and we've heard evidence of that because that money would have come from those attrition dollars that were used for other things in the District. So, I think it's important, as we think about the development of strategic budgets in schools, that happens shortly after January 1. I think by January 15, they have to be given their strategic budget for the following year. That date does not line up with the development of the District's budget process, so while planning is certainly occurring now for Fiscal Year 2019, that tentative budget usually is approved in April. The final budget is approved in May. The best we're going to get in January is a guess on what school budgets are going to look like. Somehow, we have to address that piece. Again, kudos to the District, this year school carryover of anything that schools had from Fiscal Year 2017 carried over fully to Fiscal Year 2018. There was a little bump in the road to begin with. It didn't happen smoothly, but sometime early in the fall, all of that money was carried over by schools.

I don't know that I need to spend a lot of time on attrition, except to say that I am glad to hear today that it seems to me that we have general agreement on attrition dollars flowing

to schools, because they have not for decades. We have had discussions with the District where their position was that there's a different interpretation. I'm glad to see at this point that our interpretation is the same and those dollars will begin to follow students moving forward. I think for additional concerns that exist for principals, I think it's important to resolve the rural school funding and equity issue. That would be the Mesquite, Overton and Moapa Valley concerns that have been discussed a number of times. I think, and I'm sure we'll hear more from Dr. Canavero today, but the service-level agreements for the transfer of autonomies I think are important. It's akin to you hiring a contractor at your house, and you have a contract that simply specifies what the cost will be and what he's going to do in return.

I think too that as we move forward with this process, we should have a continual review process with the role and function of the school associate superintendent position. I think that position is key to making sure that staffing autonomies are implemented properly. I think it's key to making sure that schools receive the services and assistance they need. In fact, I would hope the school associate superintendent position is an advocate for those schools. I do believe that position could be helpful with disciplinary issues, and we want to make sure that position—sometimes it's easy to revert back to what's easiest, and what's easiest is simply a top-down approach. That's not what we want to see with that.

I think one of the big concerns that many people still have, and I spoke about this on the front end of my comments, is simply do the Trustees really have the will to move this forward? It's certainly not an easy task. This is a significant change in the Clark County School District. Virtually every function is being changed, how it's done, who's responsible for it, and the role of the Trustees certainly is changing as well. But I do believe it's key that Trustees find a way to be supportive of this process, more so than what they've been. I think when we have Trustees in public meetings say that a factor that's causing the current budget deficit, that A.B. 469 is responsible for that, is just simply inappropriate and underlies their lack of support for this effort. I think it's key that the budget and autonomy issues are resolved. We heard three speakers here before who talked about their work on SOTs. My fear is that, if we go much longer not having these autonomies identified, not having autonomies and money flowing to schools and schools owning that money so they can make decisions about programming for kids, I think the parents that are coming and the staff that's working on the SOTs are going to say, "Why do I need to continue to come to the meetings?"

I guess the final thing I would say is that I'm happy to hear that Dr. Canavero is presenting and that he is actively involved in oversight of this process. I think that is a key element moving forward to ensure that things are done as they should be and that the process is implemented with fidelity.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

Mr. Augspurger, with great power comes great responsibility, and when we're talking about leadership and leaders, I believe with autonomy there should also be more accountability. We say students have to take a test to measure their academic gains over the year. We talk

about how teachers need to be held accountable for the progress their students are making for that year they're teaching their students. So, we're looking at measures for them. Currently, in all of the conversations we've had with this reorganization, I haven't heard what measures we are putting in place to ensure that administrators are being held to the same level of accountability that our students, our support staff and our teachers are being held to. So, what are those measures to ensure—because autonomy means I am trusting you to make the best decisions by your school. When they're not adhering to that mission of carrying that school where they need to be carrying it, what is the course of action to ensure that if you're not embracing this autonomy and you're not taking this great power and using it for good, how do we then come back and say, "You know what, maybe you don't need to be this autonomous person and we need somebody else," because I know very many great administrators, like Principal Decker who has multiple schools to her charge, are doing amazing things. Power to people who are that passionate about the work they do. We need every single administrator to be that passionate, because you were talking about when you contract something, we are doing it basically in return for something. So, I want to hear about where the achievement side is. To that effect, if we're talking about administrators, also their school associate superintendents need to have the same level of accountability. I don't know what process we used last time to rehire those school superintendents, but I can tell you that those superintendents need to be versed in ELL. They need to be versed in poverty. They need to know what they can give administrators who are like, "I have all these issues. I have no idea how I'm going to get the gains that I'm being asked to produce." That person should come with that knowledge, with that skillset, and actually a working knowledge of even what empowerment means, to then help carry and mentor the administrators who have some questions about it. To be quite honest, some of the associate superintendents, are they really equipped with the skillset to be side by side navigating those schools? And again, how are we going to measure that they're doing the best job for our students, because I always want to bring it back to the kids. How are we doing best by our kids?

**Mr. Augspurger:**

Let me address the first piece with principal accountability. I think if you were to talk to a principal, they would feel that there are more accountability measures than ever before. Lots of those are legislatively mandated. In the 2015 Session, there were a number of new accountability measures that were put in place for principals. Principals are subject to the same Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) requirements that any other licensed employee is. There's an evaluation written at the end of the year based on very specific criteria, and Dr. Canavero may be a better one to deal with the nuances of that. But I agree, we need to hold our administrators accountable. I think that individual who's going to hold them accountable is the school associate superintendent. I want to make clear that school associate superintendents aren't part of our group. We don't represent them. They're a non-bargained administrator. It doesn't say that there are not accountability measures. In fact, I think the Teachers and Leaders Counsel developed an evaluation system for the administrators that supervise principals. I'm not familiar with that, but I think it's there in place. But I do think and share with you the need to, as we move this forward, make sure that we're assessing the right things to determine effectiveness.

A principal is a rather lonely position, with respect to professional development. There is very little professional development on an ongoing and consistent basis for principals in our District, and I do think we need to devote more time and more effort to that. I think the reorganization as it gets fully implemented is rife with areas where that professional growth training can occur. I recall from the beginning of the meeting that Glenn Christenson talked about the many very talented principals that we have, and there are many talented principals across our District. There are also principals who are struggling to some degree with this. It's very different than anything they've ever dealt with before, the sharing of power and authority, and I would hope in those cases where there are problems in those schools that school associate superintendents are addressing that with principals, giving them opportunities to do things differently and helping them improve. That is the key. If you want to know how well a school associate superintendent is doing, ask a principal. If you want to know how well a principal is doing, ask a teacher or a member of the SOT. That's going to give us a great indication of how people are doing.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

The reason I bring this to light is because I think teachers have been speaking. I think fellow colleagues have been speaking about their leadership, although I don't know how far their clamors or their voices are heard. So, that's why I'm hopeful that maybe our State Superintendent of Education will want to take a deep look into this, because I've seen how there have been people who are not necessarily suited to have the reins or the leadership of a school, and keeping them there when they're not producing positive results, keeping the person there or then moving them from somewhere else is not going to solve our education crisis. It's kind of like the allusion to the dance of the lemons when we talk about teachers, and instead of evaluating the teacher for how they perform, we just say, "You're okay," and we make it clear that we hope they move on. We make it clear we want them to move on, they move on to the next school, and then that dance of the lemons continues sometimes. Sometimes that's happening at the administration level, and then sometimes there have been people who have been confused about decisions as to who's placed where. But who's listening, and who's really looking at data trends like, "This principal has been sitting at this school x many years"? Do we have to wait until they're on that list for turnaround to ensure that our kids are getting the best leader in that school? We have to wait for the school to be driven down that far until we say, "Oh, we've got to change course here"? My thing is, we need to be proactive, not reactive. We need to be getting everybody we need on the front end to make this work quickly, not, "Oh, we're going to wait and see and give you time and buy time," and then, "Oh, we're going to give you another chance over here. You didn't make it here, but let's give you another chance over there." Are we ensuring that our diversity is there, is present, in the administration that's coming up, because sometimes it's a matter of understanding communities. When there is no will to even want to understand a community, things aren't going to happen organically if there's not that will. So, I just think this is an area that we definitely need to keep in the forefront of our minds, because I think it's a super important one to the success of autonomy.



**Mr. Augspurger:**

I think the answers to those questions that you're looking for probably should come from the Central Administration of CCSD. I would just say, I don't want you to think that if there's a poorly performing principal that that person is ignored. I can assure you that we spend a fair amount of time with principals who are dealing with their supervisor because of performance issues. So, I don't know that I agree that people just languish in buildings and are ignored until the school has to do a turnaround. I don't believe that happens, but I think that's a better question for you to address with Central Administration from CCSD.

**Mr. Vellardita:**

So, Dr. Ochi and Mr. Strembitsky both highlighted a very important concept when you make this transition, and it's about developing a leadership program, and that's essentially what you're talking about. It's human capital, and that's one of the areas that I don't think I elaborated enough on that's not being done with this changeover. How do you develop human capital systems on so many different levels? So, you have principals now taking on an expanded role. Before they took on that expanded role, you had issues within that population. Now, you've expanded it, so there's this thinning of the herd that's going to take place. Unless you have a system in place that identifies the skillset, the experience, the training and the professional development you need to be effective with these new roles, you are going to have issues. But ultimately, the people who are responsible for it starts with the Superintendent's office. You have to build those systems. I'll never forget, we were going into the 2015 Legislative Session and I knew teacher evaluation was going to be an issue, so I asked the District, "How many out of the 18,000 teachers we represent had an unsatisfactory evaluation," because I'd been hearing we had a lot of bad teachers. The answer was like 100 out of 18,000. So, the question then was, that means we have 17,900 great teachers, so why are we talking about changing the evaluation? No, it got down to us having no real effective system. There was something in place to evaluate, but there was no execution of that, and I think that goes to some of the stuff you're talking about. How do you evaluate these administrators, the associate superintendents, with these expanded responsibilities? It's human capital systems.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

First of all, I'd like to thank you for bringing up the whole question of rural equity and the fact that we are looking into it, because it does directly impact my constituents in Mesquite and Moapa. It is a challenge, and I don't know if anybody's really presented the right answers or any longstanding answers, but I'd be interested in that. It might not be yourself, but I definitely want that to be resolved. In talking with the principals and the SOT members and the teachers up in Mesquite and Moapa, they brought up an interesting concept of the achievement equity. What they were talking about is that they work really, really hard in order to move from a two star to a three star to a four star, and this is now also happening in another part of my district just up the road here where you've got teachers who are pulling out all the stops to get the schools to work better in order to educate the kids better, and just as they make those advances, they start to lose money because they don't have as many

ELL kids, as many special education kids or as many kids with free or reduced lunch. So, there's a problem with them losing money unexpectedly simply because they're achieving what they're supposed to be achieving. So, there's got to be a way to kind of balance that out, and I don't know if that's been addressed in any of your meetings or not.

**Mr. Augspurger:**

It has not.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

Somewhere along the line, I think we really need to, because I've got schools that are moving from two to four stars only because the teachers and principals are working their tails off and they're spending every penny as efficiently as they can, and just as they achieve what we ask them to achieve, we start pulling the rug out from under them, which means they're going to drop back down to a two star and we're right where we started. The kids are the ones who get damaged in the process, so I think that somewhere along the line, we need to kind of address that as well. It looks like Dr. Canavero may have some answers on that.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I wanted to know, when you were talking about the reduction of force provisions and the contracts, what did you mean by that? I didn't understand.

**Mr. Augspurger:**

If the Superintendent declares that there's a reduction of force, he identifies where that reduction of force will take place. Previously, those processes were all driven by seniority. In the 2015 Legislative Session, Senate Bill (S.B.) 92 added the performance piece which said, at least in our contract, when you get done with all your seniority-based processes, before anyone is reducing force, then you go back and look at seniority. So, anyone who's still there with a rating of ineffective or minimally effective would be the individual who's reduced in force. A reduction of force process often results in people switching positions, so what we're looking at through our contract language is what we can still do to preserve principal autonomy with respect to staffing so someone's not just assigned to that building principal.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

So, this is going back to what you had said in a prior meeting about "pass the trash?"

**Mr. Augspurger:**

Did I use that word? Sounds bad at this point. It was probably something I read in the newspaper.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

You said it, but I was just mentioning it because I was trying to build a connection.

**Chair Roberson:**

Seeing no further questions from the Committee, now we're going to go to the State Superintendent, Dr. Steve Canavero.

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

I really appreciate the discussion today and the forum that you provided for very insightful discussion and comments. I will shorten my prepared remarks, but I can go into greater detail if you have questions. For my opening remarks, I want to underscore that I think the deference to local decisions was really part of the law, whether it's A.B. 394 or A.B. 469. Yes, it required the reorganization, but it relied upon a group of Southern Nevadans to develop the plan for which that reorganization would occur and what it would look like. The plan was developed. Of course, it stalled in the regulatory phase in the interim, and it was again adopted with incorporating the plan that was developed from the 2015 Session. I also want to underscore that I deeply believe in the promise of this particular piece of legislation in this bill. Under this law, I could see a future where CCSD develops the strongest system of school leaders in the nation, as a beacon for school leaders and teachers who feel constrained elsewhere who want to exercise true voice and agency. They could be attracted here. I also see a future where we continue to deepen the community ties with our local schools, one where this reorganization, or CCSD Achieves, provides teachers with authentic voice and parents with authentic voice in the school design and their schools' priorities. It's not always easy. We heard here today that sometimes it's messy, but that's how this work is on the SOTs. At the end of the day, we're elevating the outcomes for our kids that we know they're capable of.

I think one area of this work that we don't truly dig in and address is the transformation of Central Office to Central Services. That is truly an area that is ripe for innovation, and also challenge, like we heard today. But I could see a system in the future with the centralization of certain services, because I think even under Edmonton and other models, we know that there are certain services that should be centralized. Those would be centralized at the District. The District service would be the service to their schools, and those services would be reviewed, valued and supported.

This is no small shift, as we obviously know. I don't wish to underscore that, but I do want to recognize that there are mechanics of the change. That includes the budgets, costing out of services, supporting local SOTs and all of the discussion we heard here today. But in addition to the mechanics, and just to underscore some of what we heard today, it is a fundamental change of the status quo, the way we think about the delivery of education and our, and I put myself in that, responsibilities. We're deeply challenging the formal and informal structures that create and reinforce and authority and power, the culture of CCSD,

and frankly, how the Department interacts with and structures supports for a system of schools, rather than a school system. This is a theme that I think we've been talking about quite a bit, but, for example, at the State level, we're designed to interact with a school system, a school district, centralized authority, "Here's how it works. Here's how the funding goes. Here's the policy," and then it gets distributed from there. That's not the case in Clark County anymore. When we work around how to support struggling schools, it's a partnership with CCSD's Central Office and an opportunity for local school precincts and their principals, a very different frame to look through.

A lot of work has been completed and is in progress. I don't want to diminish the hard work and long hours applied to address this work. There are a lot of smart people inside CCSD who believe in the promise of this work and are ready and willing and able to challenge many of the assumptions and drive the work forward. They face a lot of barriers, logistical barriers and other barriers. I've had a lot of interactions with folks, and most of them are confidential, unfortunately. There is still, and I think you heard about the culture of fear, some uncertainty, which is unfortunate, within CCSD. After the decision around the custodians, in my continued interactions with CCSD, I have to say, and this is just me projecting, I did notice kind of a letdown among the staff who had worked hard to put together that proposal to the Trustees.

At the end of the day, is it too great of a challenge for CCSD to accomplish this work? Absolutely not. I do not think it's too great of a challenge to throw in any sort of a towel. But what indeed is my role in all of this, which I think is the reason and rationale for the agenda item. Again, I'll emphasize the local nature of this work, and over time, I have given great deference to local decisions. I've stood back from heavy engagement, specifically and intentionally to allow the local community and the elected Trustees to iron out differences and make decisions. Second, I believe we will get further together than we will fighting each other. The more that we, and this is the State and CCSD and the community, can cooperate and learn from one another, the faster the State systems can adjust to support the reorganization and the faster the reorganization moves forward to empower local educators in the community. So, I'll first address my authority in law and generally cover what I'm doing to support this work, and then what I see as the next steps. In addition to my general authority, as provided to me by you in NRS 385.175, to enforce the observance of the law and regulation, the law and the Legislature made clear in A.B. 469 that you intended for my role to be expanded. Section 33 of A.B. 469 includes language that the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall take necessary actions as deemed necessary and appropriate to ensure that each large school district carries out the reorganization of the school district in accordance with the law and regulation. Further, you added requirements for CCSD and the State to cooperate and that CCSD would comply with requests.

So, let's talk a little about actions thus far. There have been meetings with CCSD and with stakeholders, appreciating challenges, their belief systems, understanding the barriers that they face and implementing the reorganization. There have been a number of written communications, and I believe on all of these written communications I've copied the Chair and Vice Chair, seeking clarification and information from CCSD to aid in my understanding of their compliance with the law. This is done, to this point, without determination of non-

compliance or compliance. The exception is the rural funding component that Assemblyman Edwards was talking about, and I expect to receive the final information from CCSD's reconciled budgets, upon which my team can make a determination of compliance with A.B. 469. I submitted a request for an Attorney General's opinion to clarify the application of the good-faith negotiations under NRS 288.150(2)(u) requiring policies for the transfer and reassignment of teachers with the provision in A.B. 469 section 16(2) that provides for the authority of a local school precinct over such decisions. I have engaged in regulations, and I'll just cover a few of the topics. The first is to ensure the free exchange of ideas and discussions of the SOTs to provide protections against retaliation or reprisal for members of SOTs. Since the last workshop, I have learned that Senator Harris is engaged in this alternative dispute resolution process here. I've got some information from Senator Harris, and I want to ensure that the policy provides a framework within which her good work can stand up.

I sought some regulations to create and define the contents of service-level agreements. I'll spend a little bit of time here and continue at the end if there is anything I leave unanswered. I think it's important to talk about how the law contemplates the policy side. The law distinguishes authority and responsibility. Section 16 provides authority to our schools, period, hard stop. Another part of section 16 holds certain authority at the local school district, the central services. That's the (a) through (t) list. So, schools have the authority to conduct their school site, the authority to engage in those responsibilities, and the district has the authority to engage in their responsibilities, and they also may transfer some of those authorities, the (a) through (t) list, over to schools. There needs to be a mechanism in the middle that can codify and honor a local school precinct's authority for whom they wish to contract or for whom they wish to receive services from in order to exercise their responsibility. So, that is where the service-level agreements kind of fill in this middle area that allows for a local school precinct's authority to engage in services, and those services may be from the school district, but I think the law makes clear that the school precinct may also go outside of those services provided by the local school district. Service-level agreements also provide, I think to the Vice Chair's point, differentiation. If you have a principal, even if they have the authority to carry out certain responsibilities but wish to continue to work within the school district because they feel uncomfortable, they may use their budget and contract through a service-level agreement with the school district for service. You would also have the alternative, a principal who is ready to utilize their authority in a manner with which they can work with the school district or seek alternatives. That is also contemplated, and a service-level agreement would be an opportunity or an avenue to do that.

Thirdly and finally, the service-level agreement also helps me, and I think the school community and you, appreciate the transfer of funds. So, the law says, "Hey, you've got authority and you're going to have 85 percent of the unrestricted money that is transferred for you to exercise that authority." The service-level agreement provides for reasonable central services at our expense to a school site for that authority of the local school site to then bring those expenses over into the unrestricted category and count towards the 85 percent. Now, I think a good example of this, and this was one that we recently talked about, is graduation services. So, if it costs, and I'm making this up, \$20 per pupil for the

graduation services that Central provides, that seems like something we all would agree that local school precincts regenerating those services, the diplomas or whatever comes with that \$20 per pupil, is likely not an efficient structure, one that Central should provide for their schools. They consider it to be part of the 85 percent. The service-level agreement is a mechanism by which a precinct and the district can agree upon a service, the quality of service and the cost, and mutually agree and execute the service-level agreement, and then review the service.

Service-level agreements are not without their critics, Mr. Strembitsky in particular. I've had a couple conversations with him in the past where service-level agreements, if there is a perceived or real differential of power, don't work. If a local school precinct is just handed a stack of service-level agreements or a single service-level agreement and told to sign and they have really no authority, perceived or real, to negotiate or to change or to push back, then it just simply calcifies existing systems in place, and that runs counter to the idea of the reorganization. So, that's something we are thoughtful of and need to be thoughtful of as we continue to work through that.

In addition to the service-level agreements and others, we've also defined the term allocate. Allocate is a very important term, and we've been workshoping the definition of allocate. If a dollar is allocated to a school, it is then considered to be part of the 85 percent of the unrestricted dollars that go to that school site. Allocate is a very important term. I think we probably have a bit more work to do, but where we are is that we started with, "It appears in the school's budget." In the second workshop, and I believe there are still some more comments to go through, included in addition to, "It appears in the school budget," "It can be part of a service-level agreement."

**Chair Roberson:**

For this issue of allocating, I think I've been at all these meetings the last couple years. Most of these other folks have. There's no question in my mind what the definition of allocate was meant by this Committee. It was transfer. Transfer money to strategic budgets. We've had some dialogue on that and some difference of opinion over the last few months between this Committee and the School District. If there's anyone on this Committee who has a different opinion of what allocate meant, I would love to hear it, because I'm pretty sure we knew what we meant, and I'm pretty sure the legislative lawyers who drafted this law knew what it meant. So, I don't want anyone to leave this room today with any confusion over what we intended by the definition of allocate. It was, "Transfer money to schools." That's the whole point of this reorganization, from day one. Does anybody disagree? I'd love to hear it. And I'm not for a second trying to imply that you disagree with that, Dr. Canavero. I just don't want anyone to walk out of this meeting thinking, "What exactly were they talking about? Is there a different definition of allocate?" From this Committee's perspective, there's not.

**Dr. Canavero:**

Thank you for that clarity, and I don't believe the language we workshop is any departure from your clear statements.

**Chair Roberson:**

I appreciate it. Thank you.

**Dr. Canavero:**

Finally, we're establishing a new category of schools and defining the terms related to small rural schools. When we dug in on the rural school provision, and the law has essentially a hold-harmless provision or proportional-share provision for rural schools, there are some cases where very small schools, and these are less than, I think, 100-student schools, have a significant amount of funding to them based upon the economy of scale, or the lack of an economy of scale of those schools. So, I think most recently, there's a very small list of small rural schools that would apply. The schools that we have been in discussion with, Moapa, are not the small rural schools, but that conversation in working with CCSD sought to work in that area.

It was also clear to me very early that I needed help and sound advice on how to support the law and exercise my general and specific authority that was granted to me in A.B. 469. The ongoing support to myself personally and the District provided by the continuation of the TSC<sup>2</sup> contract until the existing funds are exhausted is greatly appreciated. So, the contract is extended. No additional money, but with the balance that remains, you have provided me access to Michael Vannozzi and Brian Knudsen. I have to say that the continuation of that contract has provided me with much-needed assistance with the work. It's really unclear what I would be able to accomplish without your support of extending the termination date of the TSC<sup>2</sup> contract and the direct active engagement of both Mr. Vannozzi and Mr. Knudsen. Their ability to provide support is greatly appreciated, and I hope the same is felt by CCSD. Mr. Vannozzi and Mr. Knudsen are incredibly smart and very productive. I also need to add someone to the support team who has direct experience and success in doing this work, and by doing this, I mean doing this work in another school district elsewhere in the nation. With Mr. Strembitsky's departure, I need to find somebody else with direct, applicable experience to help guide us. Over the course of the last year, and more urgently over the last 6 months, I've actively engaged with national groups familiar with this work, as well as the national and local philanthropic organizations, to support expert consultation. I believe we, all of us, would benefit from ongoing consultation and advice from experts who have, again, done this work in other cities, like Denver, Indianapolis, New York, Chicago and Cleveland, to name a few. This is not to dismiss what we know about and have learned from Edmonton, Dr. Ochi, Mr. Strembitsky or change the design, but rather build upon it and continue to proceed along the right path guided by folks who have done this, and really learn from their mistakes. I needed to find the capacity to pick up where Mr. Strembitsky left off to provide me with advice on how to use my authority in support of CCSD and the law. Just before Thanksgiving, I was able to get a commitment

from a national funder, the Arnold Family Foundation, and last weekend I gained commitment from two local funders to provide the match, including the Agassi Foundation, to add a member to the team. I'm working out the details right now, but I expect that the individual must have experience elsewhere and will land around mid-January. we will use their experience in two general ways. First, to advise on keeping the reorganization moving along the right track and how I may use my authority, and then also and importantly, work in collaboration with CCSD and the community to aid in the implementation of the law.

So, I provided a bit about where we've been. Let me talk about where I'm going. Again, my opening emphasized how important it is to have this work led locally. The best outcome is for CCSD and the Southern Nevada community to collectively lead and implement this work. I see and hear a growing sense of frustration and many palms to the sky from principals, from some of our labor leaders we just heard from, and members of the community. At the end of the day, I'm obligated to enforce the law.

Section 18 of A.B. 469 includes the requirement of the district to establish a number of items for the next school year by January 15. I will establish a list of items that I will review on or about January 15 for compliance with A.B. 469. Based upon what I understand now, and granted this may change, I do not anticipate that CCSD will be compliant with A.B. 469. If that's true, then I'll do the following: Issue a request for corrective action from the Board of Trustees, and we'll use a 30-60-90 performance plan window to monitor their ongoing decision making under the corrective action plan. I will offer my full support and collaboration, including the expert consultation that bring this experience from other urban districts having done this work, and I will apply my authority if decisions are not made or, with continued non-compliance, exercise my authority under A.B. 469 to ensure the District is complying with the law.

Much work has been done and much work remains to realize the potential of this law, again, around building the strongest system of school leaders in the nation, deepening the community ties with their local schools, providing teachers with authentic voice in school design and priorities in elevating outcomes for students. I appreciate this opportunity and continued support.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

You mentioned the Attorney General request. You mentioned NRS 288, but what was the complete statute?

**Dr. Canavero:**

It was NRS 288.150(2)(u).

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I'm trying to be clear, what is the specific question you're asking about?



**Dr. Canavero:**

The specific question is to what extent does the principal of a school have authority over their staff? In other words, can you transfer a teacher into the school without their permission or the principal's permission or consent? We heard a little bit of it prior to this, but they're working on those details. But this is an area in need of clarity, in my opinion.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

You had used an example, and it ties into the question I just asked. When you were talking about school authority and the Board's authority, I wanted to know, what do you understand, in your opinion, to be the limitations to the school authority? What are they being balanced against, because although the school is a school site, the way A.B. 469 was written, it still is intertwined under something. So, I'm trying to understand what their limitation is in the law, because they have one. I just want to understand what you think it is.

**Dr. Canavero:**

I believe their authority to carry out the responsibilities is backstopped by the authority and responsibilities that are retained by the local school district. So, for the (a) through (t) list, so to speak, there are items on that list that are legal requirements of a local educational agency (LEA) around civil rights and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Those would be hard backstops. That's kind of federal law, as well as some state law. But I would say in addition to that, the policies that are adopted by the School Board are also backstops. So, it can be used in two ways. One way is to help clarify the lane of authority for a particular SOT. There have been questions that have surfaced around valedictorians and grade point average (GPA). Can a local SOT establish their own GPA scale? So, that's where the Central Office could be really valuable in establishing the parameters or limits of the authority. That could also cut the other way. I won't repeat the conversation that preceded me, but it could also cut the other way by creating such onerous requirements that they essentially undercut the authority to exercise the responsibilities of a school site, and perhaps put limitations on schools and SOTs that the law never contemplated.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

When you talked about the service-level agreements, what do you envision as that flexibility, because what I'm not clear on, highlighting that obstructionist example that people use, I haven't seen the RFP. I didn't know what it said and how they layered it up. But if it was a situation where a custodian believed they had a job and that was somehow going to be transferred or outsourced because someone wanted to innovate, what then would be your opinion, because I would be on the side of the custodian who would like some job security versus the innovation.

**Dr. Canavero:**

The custodian thing seems like this red herring, but let me delve into it a little bit. But I also think it's important we recognize that this is perhaps an illustrative example of how we can work together and figure out these limits towards the authority. But at the same time, it can't keep us from focusing on the existing authority at our local school precincts and the budget that should be transferred to them and balanced. The law is clear, and I think this is where a service-level agreement also needs to be clear, that the local school can, with their authority, work with the district to carry out the responsibilities. So, this is a transfer, so let's talk about the transfer. It seems to me like that's a perfect place for a service-level agreement to identify the terms and conditions of the service, the quality of the service, the duration, etc., who's responsible for whom, and if those conditions of quality are not true, then a local school precinct, commensurate with their authority that's granted to them through the service-level agreement, can say, "Hey, this service isn't working for me. You're on notice. You're in breach of the contract. The custodian didn't come on Tuesday like they should. The quality of their service isn't—here are three photos of a dirty hallway," and I'm just using examples here. They have to have some remedy, and if that remedy is to procure those services from a vetted list of candidates that the School District qualifies, then to me, that sets up all the appropriate incentives for a responsive central service to their schools, whereby just limiting that opportunity doesn't necessarily carry out the positive incentives for the central service to continue to meet the needs of their school in a market-based way. I don't want to use that term in a bad way, but at the same time, if there's the incentive that you can go elsewhere if you're not getting the quality of service, it seems like that would be a strong motivator for Central and for staff. I would also add that I think the service-level agreements also go both directions. So, it also protects the District, because there's a corresponding requirement of the school site for particular aspects of upkeep or whatever it might be that could also be placed into the service-level agreement. Again, it's like a contract. There could be a provision for multiple years, which would also help with budgeting.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

So, using that example of a market-based strategy or a contract that a principal enters into with a custodian saying, "They haven't cleaned up in 3 days. I want the ability to terminate them," I don't know what these conversations are that are going on, but is it being contemplated that the custodian, who was technically a District employee under a collective bargaining agreement, is now going to be shifted and treated as an at-will employee who can then be fired and removed? We're treating schools as if they are private business that have the functionality to make those choices and circumvent what would be the vested right of an employee, without having to go through some level of due process for their job, because I'm confused at the layers of how this is turning out. I guess I'm worried, not really having been involved or listened to those meetings, that a principal may believe they have the authority to function as if they are a private entity, and they do not. They are a public entity and a school, under certain laws and limitations.

**Dr. Canavero:**

Correct. Many of those laws and procurement procedures are established by the District and rightful to protect public dollars and good financial stewardship practice. All of that is true. I think the point I would make here is that, if we believe the language of the law suggests that there is a transfer of authority, and I think this is the point where all of this stuff comes out, where Central is saying, "Well, we're really not going to transfer the authority, but we're going to transfer some of the responsibility." So, the law contemplates both being part of a conversation. You have the authority to make decisions, but you have certain responsibilities that you must carry out, and those responsibilities you must carry out in accordance with law and District policy. But you have the authority to find your way. The premise of the law needs to be true, then, that they need to have that authority if it's granted. If it's not granted to them, then the District remains the (a) through (t) list.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

Well, I definitely want to be included. Did the Attorney General respond?

**Dr. Canavero:**

No.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I definitely want to be included, because the sub-layers to this could be a lot of things, because you're saying the authority to find your way. The process in which you do the act can lead folks to a pathway that may be illegal when it comes to the employee who is the subject of the contract, so I'm very much interested in how this translates out, because I'm on the side of the employee with the high school diploma cleaning the hallways.

**Dr. Canavero:**

I'm not suggesting your concerns are not valid. I completely appreciate them. I think at the end of the day, if we move from what success looks like in figuring out this custodian thing and we actually transferred over 85 percent of unrestricted dollars to a local school precinct with the authority to carry out just those responsibilities not on the (a) through (t) list and they have funding to exercise certain decisions, I think that's what the predominant number of principals are looking for, I think seven of them, on the custodian issue. So, it is a litmus test of this ability to share power or transfer authority, but I don't know that it should be the one thing that grinds us to a halt when we have big pieces here to figure out. That's just my opinion.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

I just want to piggyback on Assemblywoman Neal's line of questioning, because in our most recent letter that you graciously shared with Chair Roberson and myself dated December 8,

it does say in this letter that, "As TSC<sup>2</sup> consultants pointed out in their September 2017 report, each one of the existing agreements have provisions in them that would appear to conflict with section 16(2) of A.B. 469." I think, as Assemblywoman Neal drilled, she's basically coming to the point that there are agreements that kind of bind and tie the hands of the District. So, I feel that sometimes we're beating up CCSD, but it's also bound by these agreements. They can't just say, "We're not going to comply with what we agreed with, what we collectively bargained." So, to continue with this letter, it says, "Section 35-3-3-B of 2016-2017 negotiated agreement between CCEA and CCSD," "Section 25-8-1 of the 2015-2017 negotiated agreement between the Education Support Employees Association (ESEA) and CCSD," and "Section 26-2-4 of the 2013-2015 negotiated agreement between the Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees (CCASAPE)." So, it's clear that the "we" is not just CCSD. The "we," in order for us to make any kind of headway on this issue, is a collective effort. We have to address those in the future and not in a cone. It has to be an open discussion and dialogue about what the terms are going to be going forward, and it seems like some individuals are pointing fingers at other individuals, but as my uncle has told me, "You point one finger that way but three are coming back." So, there are things that we have to step up and make sure we're part of the solution moving forward. So, agreed?

**Dr. Canavero:**

That is precisely the intent of that item. So, in previous discussions in front of this Committee, a question was raised about the application of A.B. 469 with existing collective bargaining agreements. A law can't reach into an existing collective bargaining agreement, and that's what that essentially is saying. But it is saying that when you renegotiate, then you have to contemplate the new law. So, that is setting up an expectation that those parties would negotiate in good faith going forward, in clear view of A.B. 469 and those requirements therein. I'm not party to any of those contracts, so all I can do is raise the question, provide some clarity and then, at the end of the day, suggest complaint or non-compliant if the collective bargaining agreement counteracts or contradicts A.B. 469. But that's the intent there, to ensure that all parties understand that A.B. 469 prevails, and when they renew a collective bargaining agreement or during their good-faith negotiations, that's got to be contemplated. They help answer a lot of these questions.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

So, this might be either for legal counsel or for you, if you know the answer. These are public dollars. We're trusting leaders to make the right decisions to make sure they're driving instruction in their buildings and they're doing their best. Ultimately, sometimes there are folks who get caught up and misuse public dollars. Who is ultimately responsible? Let's say there's a high school principal who wants to buy this huge thing for football because football's big on their campus. Let's say the community doesn't necessarily buy in, but it's done anyway. So, who says, "That's not an appropriate use of the public dollars that we've given your school"?

**Dr. Canavero:**

When I review the law, there's no fundamental change to the chain of responsibility of action based upon the employer and employee under such circumstances. In other words, the School District would be responsible for malfeasance at a school site or expenditures of public dollars that are inconsistent with law.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

Finally, to my question about leadership, I think that's a really important issue, and I wanted to see if you've taken a look in your conversations with folks who are experienced with this model or have any recommendations as to how we can improve in this area as a State.

**Dr. Canavero:**

Leadership matters, absolutely. Just in the sense of some empathy, as the leader of a State Department, I have 180 employees. I think Clark County has more police officers than what I have, in terms of employees. For transitioning culture, I have tremendous empathy for the task that CCSD is taking on here and working through. The leadership of our schools also matters. As a State and with the State Board, one of our big bets is on school leaders. So, a lot of our efforts with school improvement dollars, etc., are around building human capacity, building the capacity of individual leaders, more so than a particular program or a particular curriculum. Those are all decisions that good leaders can make on their own. But this is about building a culture around professional expectations and supporting our school principals to be fantastic leaders. Also, there's just an emphasis there as well on social capital and organizational capital that happens when you get great school leaders together, and then you have those great leaders working with leaders and having organizations that have the systems in place to actually capture—that is where and how we see our role in collaborating with our districts and supporting the school leaders in particular.

Now, for the specifics related to A.B. 469, so, that is, regardless of A.B. 469 or whatever, but specific to the competencies and skills for an autonomous school principal, there's a provision in the law, which I hope was a drafting error, but I think it had June 1, 2017 that I would do a report on the competencies of a principal of one of these schools, a local school precinct. What are the new skills that principals should have and how do we get the system to support the set of skills for these leaders? I've asked for the school leadership committee that came out of the Legislature to study that so it's integrated with a broader conversation around school principals, and then provide that turnback to the Department and then to the Legislature to understand and appreciate where the gaps are. I think there is a lot that's happening. So, the Public Education Foundation (PEF) is leaning in on this, and I know that John Guedry, a member of the business community, is trying to create some partners around the financial side and the accounting side.

There's still more we can do, and I think the more coherence, to Assemblywoman Neal's point, in the entire system that we can provide, and oftentimes that's really clear lanes and columns for folks to understand their authority and their world, the better. We certainly have,

I think, more here to do. Under the service-level agreements or what comes of this space that connects this authority and responsibility with dollars and services, this is also an avenue, I hope, that could be used for school leaders who are ready. I kind of mentioned this earlier, but it came to mind when you were discussing this earlier today. It could be used by leaders who are ready to activate their authority, and it could also be used by the District to actually provide that level of autonomy and funding. But it also provides principals who don't feel ready, the other principals other than the seven who said, "Hey, we want night custodians only," or whatever. It could also help the others utilize their budgets in such a way that keeps them keenly focused on instructional leadership. Right now, that's what they see to be important and what their SOT feels is important.

**Senator Harris:**

When you spoke earlier, you mentioned that you anticipate you'll be finding CCSD out of compliance with existing law. Then you explained that you're going to have timelines of 30, 60 and 90 days. Do you imagine they'll be out of compliance much beyond the 90 days? I'm just trying to get a feel for the floor and the ceiling there.

**Dr. Canavero:**

I don't. I do anticipate longer than 90 days, but that 30-60-90-day cycle would kick back in. I think in 30-60-90-day cycles for my organization. It's easy to lay out action plans and contingencies in bite sizes. I guess I can set the expectation that it'll be longer, and then we can always come in under. But I expect it'll take a little while. Again, that's based upon what I know right now. Things could change.

As a final comment, I would just say thank you. I appreciate this, and I'll continue to keep you informed.

**Chair Roberson:**

It'd be great if you could send communications to everybody on the Committee.

**Dr. Canavero:**

Okay.

**Chair Roberson:**

Thank you for all the work you're doing helping us with this.

Our last presenters are Michael Vannozzi and Brian Knudsen from the TSC<sup>2</sup> Group.

**Michael Vannozzi (Vice President of Creative Strategies, TSC<sup>2</sup> Group):**

I am the project manager of this effort. With me is Brian Knudsen. He's the principal of BP2 Solutions. He's also a contractor to the TSC<sup>2</sup> Group. Sixteen months ago, this body sent regulations to the State Board of Education regarding the reorganization of CCSD. We came into the picture a few months later. We have a contract with this Committee, with the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB). Just to remind you, our contract is to help CCSD carry out action plans, provide tactical and strategic support to CCSD, provide management support to CCSD and the CIC, conduct outreach to the community as a whole, provide advice to the Nevada Department of Education regarding the reorganization, assist CCSD with various reporting requirements, assist CCSD in designing and carrying out their new responsibilities under the law and provide this body with a final report of the reorganization, which we provided in September.

As I alluded to, we provided a final report in September, but it became evident that there was still more work to be done on the CCSD reorganization. This is particularly the case because CCSD has not met various requirements of the bill. Mainly, they have not yet taken steps to allocate the requisite amount of money to local school precincts as required in the statute in section 18(1). It was also the case because Superintendent Canavero said A.B. 469 contained two more provisions that weren't included under the initial regulation: section 33, which requires him to take such actions deemed necessary or appropriate, and section 34, which requires the State Board of Education to adopt regulations. Our original contract ran through October 31. At the conclusion of the period, there were some resources left over in the budget. The term of the contract was extended until not later than June 30, 2018 to assist with matters in the reorganization, including working with the State Superintendent to develop regulations and identify areas which would require State intervention, and also to continue with the assistance to CCSD. Over the past few months, we have assisted the State in thinking through regulations around the reorganization. We have also assisted CCSD in developing processes to ensure that the schools have the ability to shape services provided by Central to the schools. Through this process, we are currently exploring developing a system whereby schools will have the ability to enter into service-level agreements, as the Superintendent alluded to. This process aligns with the conceptual regulations that the Department of Education advanced to ensure compliance with section 18(1) of the law. We're also ensuring the Superintendent of Public Instruction has the right information to inform future regulations. Going forward, we will continue to work with the State and CCSD and report back to the Advisory Committee or the working group as requested. At this time, I would be happy to actually take back any questions or any direction from this Committee that you would like of us and offer up our help to track anything down that you'd like.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

So, I didn't ask Superintendent Canavero this, but when he was saying that he was looking for additional support since Mr. Strembitsky is not around, have you met or know who this individual is, because I'm assuming they're going to have some relationship to you.

**Mr. Vannozzi:**

That person has not been picked yet. I'm not quite sure yet what is going to happen with them.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

Okay. I'm just wondering.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

What are the next steps for TSC<sup>2</sup> and the School District? I know you're looking for us to give you some input, but I need to know how much longer you are going to continue to support the District in this transition so I can keep a timeline in mind and go from there. So, I just wanted to know, how much more work are you going to be doing with CCSD?

**Mr. Vannozzi:**

I anticipate that we will be working through the service-level agreement processes that will move through the regulatory process. That's honestly a very, very important process to get right. That's our first focus and has been our focus for the past month, really since the transfer of responsibilities vote. So, the service-level agreement process, we're getting that right, ensuring that money is transferred through service-level agreements if that's the regulation that's going to come out, and really preparing CCSD for success in that.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

What I think you would need is having the conversations with all the people who are affected by these service-level agreements and making sure that the lines of communication are open and clear and everybody's getting their voice heard and we're looking prospectively and working in unison versus trying to divide and conquest and saying, "No, I'm putting my stake here and I'm not moving." I think it would help the transition go more smoothly if everyone was having the conversations together, and hopefully they're alike, because we don't want to make the process more cumbersome. I give it to administrators. I didn't mean that we didn't have amazing, brilliant leaders. I just know that we have some areas where we can improve, but they really have a mile high of stuff on their plate already as instructional leaders, and now on top of it, the strategic budgets. So, how can we make their life easier too? How can we streamline processes to make sure they're all similar and we're not having to come up with one when we're talking about this particular service that I need and another for when I have to purchase or another one, because as educators, one of the things that's super frustrating is that we keep adding on without taking things to make it easier. So, how can we make it user-friendly for everyone?



**Mr. Vannozzi:**

I would also invite Mr. Knudsen to chime in here, because he's really a process expert in local government. I would say that is the primary work right now, trying to figure out what the best way is to articulate to people what these service-level agreements are and how the process will work so it is seamless, repeatable and a process that people can really, really dig into on a regular basis.

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

I would add that the mantra walking into the District is, "It needs to feel real to principals." So, every single time we walk in and we work with Central staff, we're thinking through, "What does this feel like if you're a principal?" When we're talking to principals, we're asking them, "What does it feel like for you?" That's going to be something that remains a critical component of our work going forward, that it has to feel real and work for the principal at that school precinct.

**Mr. Vannozzi:**

I'd like to clarify something for Assemblywoman Neal. Superintendent Canavero has invited us and Superintendent Skorkowsky to review some of the feedback that's coming in from the private funders as to the people who would come in and help. That's just going to happen over the next month or so.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

So, that information should be public, right? What they're asking you to review? I'm going to just put something out there, and it's probably going to sound horrible, but when we were doing A.B. 394, we were at a political impasse in theory. We were on one side with a conservative viewpoint about education, and now we're in the middle of it. So, I'm curious if the individuals or the funder is coming from a certain thinktank, per se, that is driving a particular agenda. That's what I'm interested in, so I might as well just cut to the chase and tell you now instead of telling you in the hallway, because that's what I want to know.

**Dr. Canavero:**

My request of the funding community was for support, particularly from somebody who has done this before. So, in other words, a superintendent or a deputy superintendent within an urban district who has gone through a decentralization of the school district, a transfer of authority and responsibility. When I get into rooms, and this is my personal experience with my own team and others, and I recognize that there are smart people trying to solve the problem but still within the constraints of the system they're used to, we can shift dramatically and more creative thinking when someone from outside sits and advises and gives ideas on the table that we can then bat around, and it advances production. So, my request was that we need to get somebody. The Arnold Family Foundation has a portfolio-based approach. They're the one funder with this view, and that's why I went to them first.

They see a wide spectrum of districts. They're aware of the work in Clark County and they've been aware of the work in Clark County, and they're going to be supportive. They will provide three names, and I can review those. I've asked others who they're going to be working with closely to review them, but again, it's directly linked to me in the sense of providing me advice. I believe this will be true, but at a minimum, it's to provide me with advice on the reorganization and long-term strategic design. I believe we will find continued, productive collaboration with CCSD as a thought partner on this work, because I think we ultimately go together faster and further than when I'm just reviewing for compliance from Carson City.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

Well, when it happens, I'd love to know who it is and what questions were asked. I only brought it up because I remember in 2015 and then in 2017, one of your staff, and I'm not saying anything negative about you or them, but they had cited to the Manhattan Institute in the Education Committee, and I took mental note, "Oh, he's going to a conservative thinktank to pull his information and put it on the table." That was a problem for me, because I'm looking for balanced perspectives about change. So, that's the only reason why I ask, because I know that was used heavily in 2015 as a legitimate resource of research.

**Dr. Canavero:**

I think this dialogue here is wonderful. So, I'm of the perspective that there are great ideas on both sides. The Arnold work is in districts like Denver, for example. They see charter schools and their version of magnet schools and community schools. They see that as a portfolio of schools around a decentralized governance model. That's not what CCSD's reorganization is. They also look at Indianapolis and other areas, like New York, where there's not a charter emphasis. The nugget here is around, "How do you decentralize and how do you provide authority under our law?" This is about implementing our law. It's not about instituting a paradigm or ideology other than what the law provides, which is this contemplation of authority to carry out responsibilities and a budget. I see this as mechanics, as much as the mechanics today with a longer view, having done this elsewhere, that they can provide around, "Okay, if you do this, this is what you might expect in 3 days, 12 months or 2 years, and if you do this, then it's a little bit more smooth sailing." So, that's the kind of advice I'm seeking: real, practical 30-60-90-day advice, but also not to impair the reorganization going forward, with smart, strategic thinking.

**Chair Roberson:**

I'm glad this process has been bipartisan from day one and will continue to be. Thank you both for all the work you've done over the past year. I'm glad to see that you both will be continuing to work to help us and the School District and the 320,000 kids in Clark County so we can get this right.

I will now open public comment.

**Guillermo Vasquez (Executive Director, Education Support Employees Association):**

I just wanted to give a little bit of a backdrop on what transpired when the discussions occurred regarding outsourcing. I wanted to delve a little bit further into what our support personnel are facing day to day as we speak. Over the last 2 or 3 years, they've been facing major challenges when it comes to their wages, obviously their benefit increases, and reductions in staff. We've actually taken probably over 85 percent of the reductions in staff, more so than any of the other units, whether it be administrators, teachers, etc. This year again we face another round of cuts, predominantly a little over 92 or 93 percent on the backs again of support professionals. So, when this discussion started percolating about reductions in staff again this year, and then going into the outsourcing piece, our people just felt betrayed, to tell you the truth. They were wondering who was out there watching their backs. Most of our members obviously live within their communities, whether they be a custodian, food service employee, bus driver, bus aide or teacher's assistant. They live there. They're invested in these communities. They don't like hearing about how they're not valued, and at this point, because of what's transpired over 7 or 8 years of these struggles, they really don't feel like part of the educational team. The irony here is that they've been asked to step up to the plate, and they have. A lot of them have been going to their own trainings to improve their skills as paraprofessionals and other services we provide through the union. But they've also stepped up to the plate to participate on the SOTs. What's really a paradox here is that they've been asked to make decisions that potentially could put their jobs at stake. We are not being treated as fair partners in this process, and we want that to be on the record for everyone to know.

When these nine schools made the decision to outsource, we believe, at least on six occasions, the SOTs did not fully delve into the matter. It was done circumventing the process, as the law requires. So, we're monitoring this. We're willing to work with these principals. We're reaching out to all these principals, because we know there are concerns, whether it be on shifting hours, etc., and we're going to do our part to try to work to find ways to fix their concerns. But beyond that, we're also working to make sure that our jobs are protected in any other way possible by making sure we're training our people. The other way is that we're letting them know what they can do to speak out, obviously to protect their jobs. Some of them did. They went to the School Board and very clearly spoke out against the outsourcing measures. To tell you the truth, I think the School Board did the right thing, the right thing for the students, because the bottom line is that they were being protective of the resources the School District has. The way it was being composed, the RFP would have created a structure of compliance that would have held the District accountable, as well as the principals accountable. Once it became clear that all the parameters within the RFP were set, most of the principals realized, "Oh, I don't have control over x or y or z," and they actually withdrew their interest in the RFP. So, let the record be clear that the administrators withdrew their interest in the RFP. Ultimately, the School Board didn't have to even consider it, because they were very clear in that testimony at that Board hearing, at least the administration was, that they no longer were interested in the RFP. There were guidelines in there that required mandatory staffing and compliance with standards of cleaning. That wasn't in the initial RFP. There were things in there to make sure our students' schools were clean. So, when we take a step back and look at that whole picture, we think the

School Board and the administration and the principals we're working with overall will continue working to find solutions. We look forward to working with them as well as you all.

**Francis Martin:**

I feel absolutely encouraged to see that there are some parents and students' opinions that were not only heard but respected today by listening to the SOT members. However, I do believe that a lot more has to be done, especially when so far my SOT only has one introductory meeting and missed the November meeting, which is in direct violation of the Legislature's language. Only some of the SOT members have only attended one training session out of the five that were put up by CCSD and CCEA.

But I would like to spend a majority of my time talking about the fact that during the last few months, I've been personally interviewing dozens of students, parents and teachers within the District from different campuses. These are some of the things I found. Number one, there are concerns about the graduation rate. Curriculums were modified and graduation rate requirements were loosened by certain school policies to create an artificial graduation rate. Number two, there's grade inflation as well. Cheating policies and retake policies have been tweaked to ensure better grades on paper, and teachers have also been nudged and encouraged and pressured by administrators to either give students test questions in advance, allow multiple retakes or to not enforce disciplinary actions against cheating. Number three, teachers who are not performing and serving the best interests of the students face no consequences and also are never held accountable in any way. For instance, there are teachers who spend their very, very precious class time chatting, talking to the students about themselves, their past and their daughters, who also just give busy work and worksheets so they can spend time at their desk doing personal business. With things like this, the students find it impossible to have an outlet to talk about these things. They just suffer silently, because when they bring a situation like this, the first reaction is, "Talk to your counselors. Talk to your teachers." Why would they be able to feel like they dare to talk to their teachers when their teachers are the ones who perpetrate these actions? Number four, there are also schools where terrible customer service has been perpetuated for years, both internally and externally. The negative, unauthoritative culture at the administrative level makes students and parents, maybe even some teachers, feel very unwelcome, and they don't feel they can be encouraged to speak out or be able to engage in campus activities. They also turn a lot of students off because they no longer take pride in their work because they don't feel a need to improve their professional skills. So, when these customers don't feel welcome and when they voice opinions, they are either shunned or ignored or sometimes even punished. They quickly become very disillusioned and helpless, and that's our silent majority, and they don't even want to bother taking a survey because they say, "We get these surveys every year and nothing has changed."

One very overwhelmingly positive and surprising outcome from speaking to these students though is that all of them have desires to learn. They're very excited to learn. They yearn for the teachers that come in and give them a passion and deliver the kind of knowledge they're seeking, and they really yearn for that. However, because of the continued lack of opportunity to meet these kinds of teachers or the kinds of administrators that will support

this kind of desire, they quickly gave up and do the minimum work that they can do required for the class, or they have to seek extra help from outside the class. There's also a very dangerous disconnect between the State rankings and the actual student college and career readiness. When increasing grades and graduation rates are observed but they are coupled with under-par performances on national standardized tests and college graduation rate and college acceptance rate, serious attention needs to be paid to these things. These are some short-sighted decisions that have obviously been made, and then building solely for the purpose of making administration of schools or the District look good, and they are not in the best interest of the improvement of our students' achievements and success in life down the road. There are many issues I'm working on personally, and I'd love to be able to have an opportunity to do a presentation, perhaps in Senator Harris' special committee, because 3 minutes is really not enough. So, I'm looking forward to an opportunity, and I'll bring my slides and hopefully it will be appreciated by her. Thank you so much once again for the opportunity to listen to me.

**Chair Roberson:**

Before you go, do you have any good news for us?

**Ms. Martin:**

Well, the good news is that I hopefully will be able, now that I have some kind of transparency from the District about the SOTs, I would love to go to the SOT meetings across the District and speak to the members. I would like to perhaps start an SOT advocacy group. So, that's what I'm looking for.

**Chair Roberson:**

Seeing no further public comment, I will now adjourn this meeting at 3:53 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

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

APPROVED BY:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Roberson, Chair

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

<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness/Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
A		Agenda
B		Attendance Roster
C	Dr. Larry Moses	Public Comment
D	Jordan Haas, Interim Secretary	Draft Minutes from the September 14, 2017 Meeting
E	Glenn Christenson, Chair, CIC	Presentation on the CIC
F	Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent, Clark County School District	Reorganization Update Presentation
G	Deanna Wright, President, CCSD Board of Trustees	Update on the Superintendent Selection Timeline