



Breaking Up Is Hard To Do: Issues to Address in the Reorganization of the Clark County School District

Executive Summary

Nevada has embarked on a process to reorganize the Clark County School District (CCSD) by the beginning of the 2018-19 school year. In 2015, the Nevada Legislature adopted AB 394, which creates an Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee to develop a plan to reorganize CCSD into local precincts. The plan must be completed on or before January 1, 2017. Proponents aim to achieve three main goals by reorganizing CCSD: (1) improving responsiveness to local needs; (2) improving student achievement; and (3) improving efficiency.

This policy report focuses on five critical issues that the Advisory Committee will need to address to ensure the goals of the legislation are met: (1) community based communication; (2) demographic and educational equity; (3) funding equity; (4) education facilities; and (5) governance structure. To assist the Advisory Committee in its analysis, this report is accompanied by a series on interactive maps that illustrate demographic differences based on factors such as race, socioeconomic status, academic outcomes, school choice, age of facilities, and teacher vacancies.

This summary includes preliminary findings and recommendations related to a possible reorganization. However, it is important to emphasize that **the Guinn Center is not endorsing or opposing the reorganization of CCSD**. If reorganization of CCSD does occur, this report is intended to identify important policy considerations that should be addressed during development and implementation of the reorganization plan.

Key Findings and Recommendations

1. Community Based Communication and Information Process

Findings

- The Advisory Committee has not publicly outlined its strategy for gathering information from the public about local needs to determine the differences in needs by precinct.
- The Advisory Committee has not publicly outlined a strategy for communicating to the public, especially minority communities, the purpose and goals for the possible reorganization.
- Given disparities in student achievement by race, ethnicity and socioeconomic background and given the historical poignancy of real and perceived discriminatory treatment of such groups in education, the failure to include a public process could create lasting feelings of resentment that could undermine the legitimacy of any decision.

Recommendations

- Establish and disseminate a comprehensive community engagement plan that aligns with the work and schedule of the Advisory Committee.
- Schedule regular and formal community information sessions.
- Conduct focus groups and surveys across the district.
- Meet with community stakeholders to allow for the communication of community concerns.

2. Demographic and Educational Equity

Findings

- CCSD students currently face significant levels of segregation.¹ This isolation exists by race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and language.
- Low levels of student achievement are highly correlated to large concentrations of minority, low income, and English Language Learner students.
- High performing schools are concentrated in suburban areas while low performing schools are concentrated in central Clark County.
- Magnet schools and other specialized programs are concentrated in central Clark County.
- Schools for special populations such as alternative education and special education students are not evenly distributed throughout CCSD.
- There are high numbers of novice teachers and teacher vacancies in schools with high concentrations of low income students.

Recommendations

- Conduct a preliminary needs assessment of the district that can be used to inform the design of precincts.
- Develop measures to compare student learning within and across precincts to monitor progress of each subgroup and to incentivize educational equity.
- Consider strategies to configure precincts in a way that promotes demographic equity, increases choice, and improves educational outcomes.
- Establish a robust system of high-quality public school choices within each precinct, including magnet schools and charter schools.
- Develop strategies for serving populations in alternative and special education schools on a regional basis.
- Explore using monetary and non-monetary incentives to improve the distribution of high-quality, experienced teachers across and within precincts.

3. Funding Equity

Findings

- Schools have differential costs based on teacher experience, transportation and repair needs, etc.
- Local revenue is not generated equally throughout Clark County.
- State and Federal categorical funds are distributed based on target populations and are not distributed evenly throughout the district.

Recommendations

- Analyze current costs to develop a formula for calculating the Basic Support Guarantee for precincts and central services to be provided by CCSD.
- Develop a mechanism to equalize local revenue received outside of the Basic Support Guarantee.
- Develop criteria for determining which functions could be conducted most efficiently by precincts or the central district.

¹ While this term has been used in various contexts to connote intentional or invidious discriminatory classification and categorization, it is used in this paper generally to mean an aggregation or grouping without ascribing intent to this aggregation or grouping except in those sections of the paper which discuss historical segregation.

- Create methods to distribute State and Federal categorical funds in a manner that ensures targeted populations in each precinct have equal access to resources.

4. Education Facilities

Findings

- Capital facilities needs are currently underfunded in CCSD.
- Older facilities are located in central Las Vegas and newer facilities are predominantly located in suburban areas.
- Existing debt is for newer facilities, which are concentrated in suburban areas.
- Property tax revenue to pay debt service is not generated evenly throughout the district.

Recommendations

- If facilities functions remain centralized, create a governing body with representatives from each precinct to prioritize projects and determine how to charge precincts for facilities functions.
- If ownership and responsibility for facilities is transferred to precincts, determine how to distribute revenue between precincts and how to repay past debt.

5. Governance

Findings

- Governance structure does not have a significant impact on student achievement.
- CCSD has not taken full advantage of current laws allowing parents to have a greater role in school site decisions.
- Accountability and oversight will be important to ensure goals of deconsolidation are met.

Recommendations

- Review governance models of districts and charter schools to choose a structure for precincts.
- Create a mechanism to foster a pipeline of quality board members.
- Create avenues for community and parent input in schools.
- Create mechanisms to keep precincts accountable for student achievement and fiscal efficiency.

Conclusion

Looking beyond the plan required by AB 394, it is important for the Advisory Committee to recognize that simply reconfiguring CCSD will not improve student achievement. The three main goals of the legislation should consistently remain at the forefront. As each decision is made, the Advisory Committee should evaluate whether the action will increase responsiveness to parents and the community, improve student achievement, and improve efficiency. Through its work, the Advisory Committee can recommend structures and accountability measures that will help achieve these goals.

Additionally, and most importantly, the Advisory Committee should take care to outline a process that is transparent and maximizes parent and community input throughout each stage of discussion. Community buy-in to the reorganization plan will be critical to the long-term success of deconsolidation of CCSD.



Breaking Up Is Hard To Do: Issues to Address in the Reorganization of the Clark County School District

Introduction

The Clark County School District (CCSD) had 320,123 students enrolled in the 2014-15 school year and is ranked as the fifth largest school district in the United States.¹ Nevada has embarked on a process to reorganize CCSD by the beginning of the 2018-19 school year. In 2015, the Nevada Legislature adopted Assembly Bill (AB) 394, which creates an Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee to develop a plan to reorganize CCSD into an undetermined number of local precincts.² The plan must be completed on or before January 1, 2017. Regulations must be adopted by the Nevada State Board of Education and approved by the Legislative Commission prior to implementation of the plan.

There have been various proposals to deconsolidate CCSD since the 1970s. The current effort to reorganize CCSD arises out of a historical context of increasing demands for accountability through standards and testing (see Appendix A). Additionally, it mirrors both successful and unsuccessful initiatives in other states to deconsolidate large urban districts (see Appendix B).

Crafting the plan required by AB 394 will be a highly complex endeavor. This policy report focuses on five critical issues the Advisory Committee should consider as it develops the reorganization plan: community based communication, demographic and educational equity, funding equity, education facilities, and governance structure. For each issue, this policy report analyzes data on current conditions and recommends a framework for considering the applicable policy issues. To assist the Advisory Committee in its analysis, this report is accompanied by a series on interactive maps that illustrate demographic differences based on factors such as race, socioeconomic status, academic outcomes, school choice, age of facilities, and teacher vacancies.

A. Legislative Goals of CCSD Reconfiguration

It is important to understand the goals of the legislation to ensure that the plan developed by the Advisory Committee will address these goals. The proponents of the bill aim to achieve three main goals by reorganizing CCSD: (1) improving responsiveness to local needs, (2) improving student achievement, and (3) improving efficiency.

1. Improving responsiveness: The legislation reads, "Reconfiguring the structure of the Clark County School District into local school precincts will offer an educational system that is responsive to the needs and concerns of the residents of that school district." The sponsor of AB 394, Assemblyman David Gardner, underscored this goal during the first hearing on the bill, stating, "This bill is an attempt to make our school districts more accountable and closer to parents."³
2. Increasing student achievement: Another key goal of the legislation is to improve educational outcomes in Clark County. During the first legislative hearing, the bill sponsor presented research indicating that smaller school districts have higher levels of student achievement.⁴

3. Increasing efficiency: Proponents of the bill also argued that smaller entities can be more efficient than large school districts. The bill sponsor cited research indicating that diseconomies of scale are inherent in a large school district.⁵

B. Five Critical Issues for the Advisory Committee

AB 394 includes a lengthy list of issues the Advisory Committee is required to consider, ranging from transfer of assets and liabilities to personnel issues. The plan will need to determine the number of precincts and their boundaries. It will also need to create a new governance structure and define roles and responsibilities of the district vs. the new precincts.

This policy report does not attempt to address every aspect of the pending reconfiguration plan. Instead, it focuses on five critical issues that the Advisory Committee will need to address to ensure the goals of the legislation are met. For each issue, this policy report provides data and a framework for decision makers. These five issues are discussed below.

- Community Based Communication and Information Process: The legislation requires the Clark County Board of Commissioners to hold public meetings to present “preliminary findings and the proposed plan.” This section provides recommendations on how to increase communication with community stakeholders to gather and share information.
- Demographic and Educational Equity: The goal of the legislation is to create smaller entities that will be more responsive to local needs. This section discusses how the number of precincts and their configuration should include consideration of equity concerns for racial and socioeconomic groups. Since one of the key goals of the legislation is to improve student achievement, the configuration of precincts will also need to take into account how to ensure all students have access to a high-quality education. This section provides recommendations on how to increase high-quality educational opportunities and to ensure at-risk populations are served.
- Funding Equity: To ensure funds are distributed equitably and used efficiently by the new precincts, the Advisory Committee will need to examine several funding equity issues. This section discusses how per pupil funding can be determined for each precinct and the central district. It also recommends criteria for determining which functions would more effectively be performed by the central district or the precincts.
- Education Facilities: The Advisory Committee must consider the large scale of facility needs and insufficiency of funding. This section discusses the implications of either continuing to administer facilities functions centrally or transferring ownership and responsibility to precincts.
- Governance Structure: This section discusses options for the structure of the precinct boards. A sound governance structure should include avenues for public input and mechanisms to keep precincts accountable for student achievement and fiscal efficiency.

Issue 1: Community Based Communication and Information Process

AB 394 recognizes the importance of public participation. The legislation states that the Clark County Commissioners are to “conduct not less than six public meetings.” At each public meeting, the Advisory Committee “shall present the preliminary findings and the proposed plan.” Additionally, the legislation delineates the composition of the Technical Advisory Committee, whose role is to “assist the advisory committee with technical expertise, input, advice and assistance.”ⁱⁱ

To date, the Advisory Committee has not publicly outlined its strategy for gathering information from the public about local needs to determine the differences in needs by precinct. Neither has the Committee publicly outlined a strategy for communicating the purpose and goals for the possible reorganization to the public, especially minority communities. Given disparities in student achievement by race, ethnicity and socioeconomic background, and given the historical poignancy of real and perceived discriminatory treatment of such groups in education, the failure to include a public process could create lasting feelings of resentment that could undermine the legitimacy of any decision.

Given the range of issues and their level of complexity and the various differences across CCSD, the Advisory Committee should consider expanding opportunities for community and parent engagement and participation in the process.

A. Establish and disseminate a community engagement plan

The Advisory Committee should consider establishing and disseminating a community engagement plan that aligns with its schedule. There are several existing models that could inform the process and tenets of a community engagement plan. As part of its Student Assignment and School Boundaries Review Process, the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education in Washington, D.C. established a community working group that included “parents from both charter and [public] schools, as well as individuals with a deep knowledge of schools, neighborhoods, D.C. history, and urban planning, or with legal and policy experience.”⁶ The community working group was part of a formal community engagement plan that included a series of meetings “in order to discuss and receive feedback” on the process, as well as focus groups and surveys.

ⁱⁱ The technical advisory committee shall consist of: (1) One member appointed by the governing body of each incorporated city located within Clark County; (2) One member appointed by the Governor; (3) One member appointed by the State Board of Education; (4) One member appointed by the Board of Trustees of CCSD; (5) One member appointed by the Clark County Commissioners; (6) One member appointed by the Legislative Commission from a list of recommendations made by the Clark County Education Association; (7) One member appointed by the Legislative Commission from a list of recommendations made by the Urban Chamber of Commerce; (8) One member appointed by the Legislative Commission from a list of recommendations made by the Latin Chamber of Commerce; (9) One member who is a parent or guardian of a pupil enrolled in the Clark County School District appointed by the Legislative Commission from a list of recommendations made by the Nevada Parent Teacher Association; (10) One member appointed by the Legislative Commission from a list of recommendations made by the Las Vegas Asian Chamber of Commerce; and (11) Any other persons who have knowledge, experience or expertise in the matters before the advisory committee, appointed by the Chair of the advisory committee.

In Los Angeles, California, the city and school district created a joint commission in 2005 to recommend changes to the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) governance structure. This commission held a series of community input meetings in each of the seven LAUSD board member districts to elicit ideas.⁷

Drawing on these examples, the Advisory Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee should develop a formal community engagement plan. As part of this plan, the Advisory Committee may want to consider expanding representation from the community on the Technical Advisory Committee.

B. Establish a communications plan

The Advisory Committee should also establish a formal set of procedures to communicate with the general public about the work of the Advisory Committee, the recommendations, and the proposed plan. The Advisory Committee should consider the use of surveys and regular focus groups to strengthen community engagement and communications outreach. In Washington, DC, a website and online forum was established where the community could review the materials from the Advisory Committee meetings and share ideas.

Issue 2: Demographic and Educational Equity

AB 394 aims to create smaller entities that will be more responsive to local needs. This goal will need to be balanced against demographic and educational equity concerns for certain populations, including racial/ethnic minorities, low income students, English Language Learners (ELLs), special education students, and other alternative students. These populations have faced historical and continuing challenges, such as segregation and bias in performance expectations, which have undermined their ability to achieve educational equity. The Advisory Committee should ensure that the reorganization plan provides all students with an equal opportunity to receive a high-quality education. This includes considering how to distribute high and low performing schools; how to distribute magnet schools; how to serve alternative education students and other students with special needs; and how to address inequities in teacher experience levels.

A. Consider why demographic equity is important

There are two reasons why demographic equity should be a key component of the decision making process on precinct boundaries. First, redrawing school district boundaries has the potential to maintain or increase segregation, which has legal implications.ⁱⁱⁱ Second, there is substantial research on the benefits of integration and the implications of racial, socioeconomic, and ELL isolation.

1. Legal requirements

The U.S. Constitution and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibit racial discrimination in schools.⁸ The Advisory Committee should be conscious of these laws to ensure that precinct boundaries are not drawn in a way that increases racial segregation. In *Wright v. Council of City of Emporia* (1972), the U.S. Supreme Court held that the Fourteenth Amendment may be violated when school district boundaries are redrawn as part of a school district breakup in ways that have the effect of reinforcing school

ⁱⁱⁱ As stated in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, segregation by race in schools can either be by law (de jure) or by effect (de facto).

segregation.⁹ Similarly, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act applies the same standards in reviewing instances of racial segregation, regardless of whether the action is de jure or de facto.¹⁰ The Office of Civil Rights in the U.S. Department of Education enforces Title VI and can take a variety of approaches to ensure compliance, including requesting voluntary compliance, referring the case to the U.S. Department of Justice for court action, initiating proceedings before an administrative law judge, or terminating Federal education funding.¹¹

Recent Federal case law allows school districts to consider race to further the compelling interests of achieving diversity and avoiding racial isolation in K-12 schools (*Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1*).¹² Based on this case, guidance from the U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Justice advises school districts to first consider approaches that do not take into account the race of individual students in school assignment.¹³ The guidance provides practical examples that use non-racial factors such as socioeconomic status and educational attainment levels of parents.

2. National Research Findings on the Impact of Segregation and Integration

Extensive research has been conducted on the educational and societal impacts of segregation and integration. Students attending racially and economically diverse schools tend to have better academic outcomes than comparable peers attending schools with high concentrations of low income students and racial minorities.¹⁴ Students from disadvantaged backgrounds benefit the most from attending integrated schools, but benefits accrue to students of all racial and economic backgrounds.¹⁵ There are also long-term social benefits, including reduced segregation in neighborhoods, colleges and workplaces, higher levels of social cohesion, and a reduced likelihood for racial prejudice.¹⁶ In contrast, schools with high levels of low income students and minorities have numerous factors that impede academic achievement, including less experienced teachers, high rates of teacher turnover, inadequate facilities, and less challenging curricula.¹⁷ In addition, attending a school with a high level of poverty can have a larger impact on a student than the actual poverty level of the student.¹⁸ There are also important counterarguments that posit that past integration efforts have not considered the interests of minority populations and have negatively affected the social and economic fabric of these communities.¹⁹

3. Nevada Research Findings on Impact of Segregation and Integration

Research has also been conducted on the academic impact of CCSD's court-ordered and voluntary desegregation efforts. As a result of the Federal *Kelly v. Guinn* (1972) case, CCSD had a mandatory desegregation plan from 1972 to 1992 called the Sixth Grade Center Plan.²⁰ This plan converted predominantly African American West Las Vegas schools into sixth grade centers that drew students from across CCSD. Students from West Las Vegas were bused to schools outside the neighborhood for all other grade levels. In 1988, an assessment of the plan by Southwest Regional Laboratory found that, "while there were no detriments to student achievement and both parents and teachers felt positively about sixth grade centers, the program's curriculum needed a review, and the burden of busing rested unduly on the Westside's Black students."²¹

In response to demands by African American parents, CCSD replaced the Sixth Grade Center Plan with the Prime 6 voluntary desegregation plan in 1993.²² This plan provides West Las Vegas students the option of attending a neighborhood Prime 6 school, an assigned school outside of the local community, or

another school of choice (e.g., magnet, charter school) subject to availability. There are currently nine schools in the Prime 6 area, including five traditional schools and four magnet schools.²³

In 2009, the Civil Rights Project at the University of California, Los Angeles reviewed the impact of Prime 6.²⁴ This study found that the program has resulted in resegregation of West Las Vegas, which is now a mix of African Americans and Latinos. Key findings include: (1) most assigned schools outside of the local community enrolled very few students from a Prime 6 attendance area, with one-third of assigned schools enrolling no Prime 6 students; (2) assigned schools were less segregated than the Prime 6 schools; and (3) only three to eight percent of West Las Vegas students attended a magnet school in the local Prime 6 area. Another major finding was that academic outcomes for students at Prime 6 schools trailed the outcomes for Westside students who attended the assigned schools. In addition, the study found that teachers at Prime 6 schools had less experience than the district average.

B. Review the current state of segregation in CCSD

CCSD's demographics have shifted dramatically over the years and the district has become more racially and ethnically diverse. In 1990, 68 percent of CCSD students were White.²⁵ By 2000, there had been large increases in the Latino population and Whites were no longer the majority.²⁶ In 2006-07, Latinos surpassed Whites as the largest racial/ethnic group.²⁷ As of 2013-14, minority populations represented 57.3 percent of enrollment. The 2013-14 population distribution was 29 percent White, 7 percent Asian, 12 percent African American, 44 percent Latino, 0.5 percent Native American, and 7.5 percent other.

Within this rich diversity, significant levels of segregation exist for Latinos, African Americans, low income students, and ELLs. The interactive maps accompanying this report illustrate that African Americans, Latinos, low income students, and ELLs are concentrated in certain areas in central Clark County, North Las Vegas, and eastern Clark County (see Race and Ethnicity Map and Special Populations Map).

Segregation exists within both the general population and the school district. Demographic data from the U.S. Census shows that residential segregation in Clark County's general population has evolved as demographics have changed. Demographers measure segregation using a dissimilarity index, which captures the degree to which two groups are evenly spread among census tracts in a given city.²⁸ A recent study found that Black-White residential segregation in the Las Vegas metropolitan area has decreased from being highly segregated in 1980 with a dissimilarity score of 62.9, to moderately segregated in 2010 with a score of 35.9.²⁹ In contrast, as the Latino population has grown, segregation has increased from a score of 22.5 in 1980 to 42 in 2010.³⁰

Within the school district, minorities, low income students, and ELLs experience significant levels of segregation. A total of 74 percent of Latinos and 69 percent of African Americans attended schools with more than 57.3 percent minorities in 2013-14. In addition, 49 percent of Latinos and 40 percent of African Americans attended schools with 75 percent or more minority students. Appendix C provides additional data illustrating that schools attended by a typical minority, low income, or ELL student are more segregated than the districtwide population.

This isolation by race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status and ELL status is associated with poor school performance. Table 1 shows the correlation between the percentage of the school population of a particular race and two key academic indicators – graduation rate and Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) index score (over period school years 2011, 2012, and 2013). This data shows a

positive correlation between the percentage of White and Asian students and the academic indicators, indicating that schools with more White or Asian students tend to have higher graduation rates and NSPF index scores. In contrast, there are negative correlations between the percentage of African American and Latino students and the academic indicators, indicating that schools with higher levels of African American and Latino students tend to have lower graduation rates and NSPF scores. There are also negative correlations between the percentage of ELLs and FRLs and the academic indicators. The interrelationship between academic indicators and demographic factors can also be seen in the NSPF Rating and Graduation Rate Maps that accompany this report.

Table 1: Correlation Coefficients, Race/Special Populations and Academic Indicators

Category	% White	% Asian	% African American	% Latino	% Native American	% ELL	% FRL
Graduation Rate	0.44	0.51	-0.31	-0.52	0.35	-0.58	-0.48
NSPF Index Score	0.51	0.43	-0.29	-0.48	0.11	-0.42	-0.56

Source: Guinn Center calculations using NSPF and Nevada Report card data over years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014.

C. Conduct a needs assessment of the district

The Clark County School District has not yet conducted a needs assessment of the entire district to understand root causes of high and low levels of achievement. A needs assessment could be used to gather data and information about the specific challenges or gaps faced by students and the relationship to educational outcomes. This information could help inform the final geographic configuration of precincts. The unit of analysis could be the school, a group of schools in a feeder pattern, or schools in each performance zone.

D. Determine strategies to address demographic and educational equity in precincts

The requirement to draw precinct boundaries presents a multi-faceted challenge. It creates a new opportunity to learn from the shortcomings of past integration efforts and to address the existing racial, socioeconomic, and ELL isolation in CCSD. Conversely, creation of new boundary lines could solidify existing neighborhood segregation patterns and could incentivize creation of new segregated housing patterns that further isolate racial minorities, low income students, and ELLs.

The overriding goal of the Advisory Committee should be to consider the number of precincts and their configuration in conjunction with equity concerns for racial and socioeconomic groups. Strategies are outlined below to help the Committee achieve this goal. Input from parents and community members will be paramount to ensure that policies are responsive to community needs and do not disproportionately burden any particular group.

1. Ensure that precincts do not have a demographic composition that is grossly disproportionate: The Advisory Committee should establish a framework, including ratios, for reviewing the racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, and ELL composition of each precinct so that its composition is not significantly and unjustifiably different from districtwide demographics. Given that demographics can change markedly over time, this framework should reflect projections for the next ten years from the Nevada State Demographer.³¹ Because current housing patterns in Clark County have produced isolation of racial minorities, low income students and ELLs, the precincts will likely need to be relatively large

geographically to achieve this demographic equity. The large size of the precincts will create some tradeoffs with the goal of the legislation to provide more parent input and local control. To help guide the drawing of these boundaries, the Advisory Committee could establish additional criteria, such as keeping precincts as compact as possible, and keeping neighborhoods and established communities together to the maximum extent possible.

2. Consider distribution of high performing schools. As boundaries for precincts are considered by the Advisory Committee, it will be important to consider how to distribute high performing schools to ensure students have equal access to quality educational opportunities. As shown in the NSPF Rating Map accompanying this report, high and low performing schools are not distributed evenly throughout the district. There are 57 five-star schools in CCSD and most of these schools are located in suburban areas.^{iv} There are ten five-star schools in central Clark County, but they are all magnet schools, Career and Technical Academies, or College of Southern Nevada schools. In contrast, CCSD's 13 one-star schools are all located in central Clark County.
3. Establish a robust system of high-quality public school choices within each precinct: To maintain the desired demographic equity, each precinct will need to offer a large number of high-quality public school choices. The Advisory Committee should consider the following policies to promote both high-quality choices and integration:
 - a. Significantly expand the magnet school program to high need areas. CCSD currently has 36 magnet schools and Career and Technical Academies (CTAs) (see Schools of Choice Map). These schools provide specialized education options and are used to promote diversity.³² While there is one CTA in each region of Clark County, most magnet schools are concentrated in the central part of Clark County. For FY 2016, there are 24,048 spaces, which represent just 7 percent of CCSD's enrollment.³³ More than half of these spaces were filled with returning students and there were approximately 2.2 applicants for every open space.

The performance of these schools varies. Two magnet schools were recently listed among the top 500 schools in the country by Newsweek and all CTA schools are rated as five-star schools.³⁴ However, other magnet schools are a mix of two-, three-, four- and five-star schools as shown in the Schools of Choice Map.

To provide more high-quality choices to parents, high-quality magnet and CTA schools could be significantly expanded to target a greater percentage of students and barriers to participation could be reduced. Current barriers include: (1) most middle and high school magnets are programs within a school, which limits opportunities and can create two distinct populations within a school; (2) transportation for most magnet schools is only provided within a certain zone; and (3) academic criteria are used for entrance into magnet high schools, which can limit opportunities for diverse students.³⁵ Drawing on nationally recognized best practices, these barriers could be reduced by converting more traditional schools in high need areas to magnet

^{iv} In the NSPF framework, a 5-Star School is among the highest performing schools using an index based on growth in achievement, proficiency, reductions in achievement gaps, and attendance. On the other end, a 1-star school is among the lowest-achieving schools based on these indicators.

schools, changing magnet schools to “whole school” programs, providing additional transportation options, and making academic criteria more flexible.³⁶ Precincts could also explore using a weighted lottery based on demographics of where students live as opposed to the demographics of individual students as recommended by Federal authorities.³⁷ Expanding magnet schools could result in significant additional costs but such costs must be balanced against the larger goal of equal educational opportunity.

- b. Promote establishment of high-quality charter schools in high need areas: Another way to increase choices in high need areas and promote diversity is to establish high-quality charter schools in the neediest areas. Under current law, precincts do not have the authority to authorize charter schools. However, a precinct could collaborate with an authorizing agency, such as the State Public Charter School Authority, to recruit high-quality charter schools to targeted areas. Historically, charter schools in Clark County serving high need students have generally been low performing while high performing charter schools have not attracted a diverse population (see Schools of Choice Map). To address these challenges, charter school sponsors will need to place a strong emphasis on accountability. Charter schools could also use a weighted lottery to ensure diversity. Transportation would also need to be provided to make charter schools a meaningful option for families.
- c. Increase availability of specialty classes within each precinct: CCSD began offering a new school choice option in 2015-16 at five high schools called Select Schools. These schools are not magnet schools but provide specialized classes, including Career Technical Education (CTE), Advanced Placement, National Academy Foundation career-based curriculum, and Project Lead the Way Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) curriculum.³⁸ These offerings could be expanded to ensure that students in each precinct can attend a school with these classes. As with other choice programs, transportation would be intrinsic to success. This option would likely result in additional costs to precincts.
- d. Expand partnerships with institutions of higher education: CCSD has developed successful programs with the College of Southern Nevada (CSN), Nevada State College (NSC), and the University of Nevada Las Vegas (UNLV) to provide options for academically advanced students. This includes three high performing CSN High School campuses, which allow 11th and 12th grade students to receive dual credit. There are also a variety of other programs that allow students to receive college credit for academic and Career Technical Education programs.³⁹ These partnerships could be significantly expanded to ensure that students in each precinct have access to these academically rigorous options. Partnerships could also be expanded to include college preparatory schools for elementary and middle school students. To minimize transportation costs, some of these programs could be provided using online classes.
- e. Create inter-precinct attendance policies: Suburban school districts often have inter-district agreements that allow students to attend magnet schools or other schools of choice in another district to reduce segregation. The Advisory Committee could create a mechanism for precincts to develop inter-precinct agreements to accomplish this goal. Per Federal guidance, this policy could take into account the racial and socioeconomic makeup of specific geographic areas in each precinct.⁴⁰ The Advisory Committee should also consider whether this policy should take into

account capacity constraints, as well as the fiscal impact of losing a large number of students. Additionally, the Committee should consider the cost of transportation and how to proportionately distribute this cost between precincts.

4. Determine policy guidelines that precincts must follow to promote demographic equity such as controlled choice: The Advisory Committee should consider defining the types of policies that each precinct should have in place. The Committee could require precincts to obtain parent and community input when designing these policies. For example, precincts could be required to use the concept of controlled choice. This involves drawing attendance zones or clusters of attendance zones using information on the socioeconomic and/or racial make-up of a geographic area to achieve diversity and then providing choice within those zones.⁴¹ This strategy has been successfully implemented in areas such as Berkeley, California and Louisville, Kentucky and has withstood legal scrutiny.⁴²

E. Consider how to serve populations in alternative and special education schools

The Advisory Committee will also need to determine how to serve students attending alternative and special education schools, which draw from across CCSD. There are 13 alternative education programs, which include continuation schools, behavioral schools, adult education programs, a school for secondary students new to the U.S., and special education schools. Education services are also provided for students in juvenile detention.

To create economies of scale and minimize costs, the Advisory Committee should consider whether these services should be provided regionally by the district. The Committee should look to other states that have regional models. For example, Arizona has regional school districts that serve youth in transition, including students in juvenile detention, students in alternative education programs, and homeless youth.⁴³ California uses county offices of education to provide regional special education services and services at juvenile court and community schools.⁴⁴

F. Consider how to address inequities in teacher experience levels

The national pipeline for teachers has decreased since the Great Recession and CCSD is in the midst of a teacher hiring crisis. As of October 2015, the District had over 750 teacher vacancies, which represents 4 percent of licensed staff. Teacher experience levels and vacancies are not distributed evenly throughout CCSD. Data reviewed by the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) as part of the Nevada Educator Equity Plan showed that the percentage of inexperienced teachers in their first year of teaching was greatest at Nevada's highest poverty schools in FY 2014.⁴⁵ Schools in central Clark County are more likely to have teachers in their first year of teaching and high levels of long-term substitutes than schools in suburban areas (see Teacher Vacancy map). For the 2015-16 school year, CCSD indicates that 77 percent of its vacancies are in schools it considers to be at-risk.⁴⁶

These patterns may change once the precincts are put into place based on different salary and benefit packages at each precinct. AB 394 indicates that each precinct will be considered its own employer and CCSD will only remain the employer for centralized services performed by the district. As a result, each precinct will have a different collective bargaining agreement, which creates the potential for different salary schedules. Teachers are likely to be drawn to the precincts with the best salaries and highest performing schools.

To address these inequities, the Advisory Committee could try to draw precinct boundaries in a way that distributes teacher experience more equitably. Alternatively, the Committee could recommend implementation of incentives to attract and retain experienced teachers to high need schools. Research reveals that financial incentives alone will not help retain quality teachers.⁴⁷ Rather, both monetary and non-monetary incentives are needed to be effective.^{v,48,49}

The Committee should also explore how it can build a more robust teacher pipeline within the precinct structure. Hiring functions have not been effective at a centralized level and may be more manageable within a smaller structure. Precincts could explore innovative approaches such as redeploying coaches and learning strategists to serve as classroom teachers during part of the day and serve as master teachers/ coaches during the remainder of the day.

G. Develop measures to monitor academic impact of deconsolidation and incentivize educational equity.

Since one of the key goals of reorganization is to improve student achievement, the Advisory Committee should develop measures and metrics to compare student learning within and across precincts over time. Data should be disaggregated by race and ethnicity, gender, and special population (FRL, ELL, and special education students) to monitor educational equity and incentivize closing of achievement gaps. Particular attention should be given to tracking measures that illustrate whether students have access to pathways that lead to college and career readiness and success. Measures could include items such as length of time it takes for ELL students to achieve English proficiency, the high school graduation rate, college-going rates of high school graduates, college remediation rates for high school graduates, percentage of students taking and passing Advanced Placement courses, percentage of students completing a concentration in career technical education, disparities by race/ethnicity in suspension or expulsion, student attendance rates, and teacher attendance rates.

Issue 3: Funding Equity

Another key task of the Advisory Committee will be determining how to distribute funding among the new precincts in a manner that is *revenue neutral* to the State and meets the needs of the pupils throughout Clark County. The Nevada Plan is the primary funding mechanism for K-12 education.^{vi} AB 394 requires the Advisory Committee's plan to, "Ensure equity in the reorganization of the Clark County School District

^v Based on research of best practices, *monetary incentives* could include: (1) An increase in base pay for post-probationary teachers who are rated as highly effective under the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF); (2) Extra pay for highly effective teachers who are willing to become mentors to new teachers; (3) Extra pay for highly effective teachers who are willing to lead Professional Learning Communities; (4) Loan forgiveness for teachers rated as highly effective; (5) Payment of tuition for an endorsement to Teach English as a Second Language (TESL) or a bilingual endorsement; (6) Tuition for administrators to attend leadership courses; and (7) Scholarships for paraprofessionals to attend teacher preparation programs. Drawing on evidence-based practices, *non-monetary incentives* could include: (1) Mentoring for new teachers; (2) Training on cultural competency; (3) Job-embedded professional development on teaching ELLs and other struggling students; and (4) Allowing teachers to visit other model classrooms with ELLs and other at-risk students.

^{vi} For more information on K-12 education finance, see Guinn Center, "[Nevada K-12 Education Finance](#)" (February 2015).

with respect to the Nevada Plan.” School districts also receive funding outside the Nevada Plan. The bill requires the Advisory Committee to study the distribution of Federal, State, and local funds and the impact of local precincts on public school financing. To distribute funding equitably, the Committee should consider several issues, including: (a) whether each school precinct should receive the same per pupil funding through the Basic Support Guarantee; (b) what the Basic Support Guarantee should be for the central district; (c) how to equalize local tax revenue outside the Nevada Plan; (d) how to distribute State categorical funding; and (e) how to distribute Federal categorical funding.

A. Determine per-pupil funding for each precinct and the central district under the Basic Support Guarantee

The Advisory Committee will need to decide whether all of CCSD’s precincts should receive the same Basic Support Guarantee. As part of the Nevada Plan, the Legislature approves a Basic Support Guarantee per pupil for each school district during the biennial budget process. Funding for the Basic Support Guarantee comes from a combination of State and local revenue, with the State covering the portion of the Guarantee that cannot be funded by local revenue. The local revenue sources are the 2.6 percent Local School Support tax (sales tax) and 1/3 of the 75 cent property tax rate. CCSD’s Basic Support Guarantee is \$5,512 for FY 2016 and \$5,573 for FY 2017.

1. Consider current operational costs: In determining whether each precinct should receive the same Basic Support Guarantee, the Advisory Committee should consider whether each precinct has similar current costs. The basic operational costs at each school site vary depending on factors such as: (a) the experience level of the teachers; (b) the age of the facility and the associated need for repairs; (c) whether the school is on a year-round schedule; (d) whether the school has a specialized program such as a magnet school or an alternative education program; and (e) the density of the attendance zone and the amount of transportation needed.

Data is available from NDE on the expenditures per pupil at each school site in the following categories: instruction, instruction support, operations, and leadership. However, these numbers reflect all funding sources, including State and Federal grants. For a more accurate perspective, the Advisory Committee should look solely at General Fund operating costs at each site. The Committee could review expenditures over a three year historical period to smooth out any anomalies that occurred in a specific year. The Committee should also examine outliers to determine why they spend markedly more or less than the average school. As the Committee runs scenarios of different precinct configurations, it can also calculate the average historic expenditures for each proposed precinct. Based on this analysis, the Committee can determine whether a uniform Basic Support Guarantee would cover historical costs for each precinct or whether differential rates would be more equitable.

2. Consider which central administration costs will transfer to precincts: A portion of the Basic Support Guarantee will also need to cover administrative costs that are currently at the district level but will move to the precinct level (see Text Box example on Vegas PBS). There are currently economies of scale from providing some services centrally but there are also multiple levels of bureaucracy for some services due to the size of CCSD. The Advisory Committee should develop criteria to help decide what functions should reside at the precinct level. Issues for consideration include:
 - Would the function need less staff if it is administered centrally or by precincts?
 - Are there economies of scale if the function is administered centrally or has central administration

created diseconomies of scale?

- Does the function have a centralized infrastructure (buildings, assets) that would be difficult to divide among the precincts?
- Is the function administrative in nature?
- Is the function something that would be administered more effectively if it could be tailored to the unique needs of each precinct?
- Would it be less expensive to contract out for the function and would precincts receive a better price if they pooled resources?
- Are there special populations that would be served better through regional programs that are administered districtwide?
- Should precincts have flexibility in which administrative functions they choose to perform or should there be standardization across the district?
- Are there long-term contracts or legal obligations that make it difficult to transfer the function to a precinct?
- Should centralized contracts such as the Southern Nevada Public Television/Vegas PBS remain at the district or be transferred to an individual precinct?
- What will the impact be on rural schools if a service is centralized vs. decentralized?

In determining which entity should be responsible for each function, the Advisory Committee should examine other models of centralized services. For example, California has county offices of education that support school districts by performing tasks that can be done more efficiently and economically at the county level.⁵⁰ The county offices provide centralized business functions, regional special education programs, fiscal oversight, curriculum support, and staff development. In Arizona, County School Superintendents handle many fiscal activities of school districts, regional professional development, curriculum development, teacher certification registration, and interpretation of state and Federal educational initiatives and requirements.

Once the Advisory Committee determines which administrative functions should be transferred to precincts, there should be an emphasis on redeploying existing staff to minimize the need to hire additional administrative staff. To incentivize administrative efficiencies, this portion of the Basic Support Guarantee could be a standard amount per pupil.

3. Determine Basic Support Guarantee for CCSD central services: Once the Advisory Committee determines which administrative services will be centralized, it will need to determine how to fund these services. Issues to consider include:
 - Should some services be funded on a per-pupil basis through the Basic Support Guarantee? If so, should the district receive a direct allocation from the State or should each precinct be required to transfer a portion of its Basic Support Guarantee to the centralized district?
 - Should some services be funded using a charge-back model? If so, will these services be charged based on a per-pupil basis or based on actual costs, which could vary?
 - What incentives can be put in place to ensure centralized services are administered efficiently?
 - If the district has savings or cost overruns for centralized services, which entity receives the savings or bears the costs?
 - Should precincts be allowed to opt out of centralized services if they can administer them at a lower cost?

Vegas PBS

Since 1966, the Trustees of the Clark County School District (CCSD) have held the Vegas PBS License. CCSD provides no direct financial support to Vegas PBS. However, Vegas PBS provides significant educational resources, programming and training to CCSD students and teachers.

Teachers across CCSD benefit from Vegas PBS Professional Development and Education training and content, HiSet and TASC diplomas, Desert Meadows AHEC career awareness, and Nevada Mentor training. Vegas PBS regularly provides CCSD with production services, including Inside Education, Homework Hotline, Varsity Quiz, Spelling Bee, and School Matters. Vegas PBS hosts the webcast of School Board meetings, which consume 30 percent of Vegas PBS' total production capacity.

CCSD does reimburse Vegas PBS for direct costs related to the development and production of instructional audio visual services including:

- Operation of six closed circuit educational TV channels, and educational access cable channels provided by Cox Communications;
- Production of extensive support staff, teacher and administrator video based training materials and workshops;
- Curation of a 500,000+ database of curriculum online on-demand instructional videos and lesson plans;
- An emergency data repository and transmission service for school police ;
- High school equivalency diploma online training and testing facility;
- On air public service announcements regarding school registration, bus registration, immunization requirements, Free and Reduced price breakfast and lunch registration, school speed zone rules, etc.; and
- Production of teacher recruitment videos and highly qualified certification courses.

CCSD and Vegas PBS have successfully partnered on applications for numerous state and Federal grants. Using these grant funds, supplemented by donations, Vegas PBS provides:

- A statewide described and captioned media center for special education students with hearing or vision disabilities;
- Literacy and Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) workshops during the summer;
- ELL and parent engagement video and app materials for Title I, Zoom and Victory schools;
- Training materials required under certain court settlements;
- Career and tech education online courses for high school students;
- Health education career awareness workshops for middle and high school students;
- Community workshops demonstration of our school learning opportunities with mobile applications;
- Literacy workshops at after school programs such as Boys and Girls Clubs, YMCA, and the Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority; and
- High school equivalency diploma course materials and career certification courses at juvenile correction facilities.

The Advisory Committee will have to determine whether the Vegas PBS license will remain in the hands of a centralized CCSD or given to one of the precincts. If the Advisory Committee decides to transfer ownership from CCSD to one (or more) precincts, the precinct(s) will have to apply to the Federal Communications Commission for a license transfer.

The Advisory Committee will also have to determine how to pay for Vegas PBS reimbursable costs and how to allocate reimbursable costs across precincts. Additionally, should the Advisory Committee decide not to keep CCSD as the local education agency (LEA), this would impact the ability of Vegas PBS to work with CCSD on competitive Federal and state grants.

B. Determine how to equalize taxes outside the Nevada Plan

Once the Advisory Committee has determined the Basic Support Guarantee for each precinct, it will need to address how to equalize taxes outside of the Nevada Plan. Local taxes outside the Nevada Plan include 2/3 of the 75 cent property tax rate, a portion of the Governmental Services Tax, and the Franchise Tax. In FY 2016, the Nevada Department of Education estimates that this local revenue will total \$993.59 per pupil in Clark County. Because of the prominence of the gaming and tourism industry in Nevada and the geographic concentration of these establishments in central Las Vegas (along the Las Vegas Strip), tax revenues are not generated evenly throughout Clark County. If revenue is distributed based on where it was generated, there could be large inequities between precincts. To address this issue, the Advisory Committee could consider two options. First, outside revenues could be collected countywide instead of at the precinct level and distributed to precincts on an equal basis per pupil. Alternatively, the outside local revenues could be moved into the Nevada Plan and become part of a new, higher Basic Support Guarantee. While this option would equalize funding among precincts, it could also increase the State's liability if local revenues are less than projected.

C. Determine how to allocate State categorical funds

The Advisory Committee should consider how to allocate State categorical funding to precincts. The State currently provides categorical monies to fund specific programs or to address the needs of specific populations. Some categorical programs are allocated on a formula basis while others are allocated as competitive grants. The largest programs are Special Education, Full-Day Kindergarten, and Class Size Reduction. During the 2015 Session, the Legislature created several new categorical programs and made significant investments in programs for high need populations. These include \$100 million for Zoom Schools, which target English Language Learners and \$50 million for Victory Schools, which target low income students.

1. Determine funding amounts for each precinct: The Advisory Committee should determine whether State categorical funds should continue to be awarded to CCSD or directly to precincts. Under either scenario, a methodology will need to be developed to divide categorical funds between precincts. Given that categorical programs fund specific populations, it is not possible for the Advisory Committee to calculate a universal per-pupil rate to distribute to each precinct. Rather, each program will need to be reviewed to determine the amount that is currently going to each school or special population on a per pupil basis. Once this analysis has been completed, the Advisory Committee should review whether some categorical funding should be redistributed among precincts to achieve more geographic equity. Since some grants are provided to specific schools or were based on a competitive grant application, it will not always be possible to redistribute funds across precincts.
2. Determine if some State categorical programs should be administered by the district: Some State categorical programs may be administered more efficiently at the district level. For example, CCSD is currently the fiscal agent for the Southern Nevada Regional Professional Development Program. The Committee could discuss whether these functions should be directly performed by the district or should remain separate from CCSD.
3. Plan for transition to a weighted funding formula: The landscape of categorical funding will likely change in future years. Pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 508 of the 2015 Legislature, the Department of

Education must create a plan to be approved during the 2017 Legislative Session that creates a weighted funding formula for pupils with disabilities, English Language Learners, at-risk students, and gifted and talented pupils. The plan must be fully implemented by fiscal year 2022. This funding would be provided to eligible populations on a per pupil basis to each precinct. Some categorical funding, such as Zoom Schools and Victory Schools, would likely transition from being categorical funding for specific schools to the proposed funding weights. The plan developed by the Advisory Committee should consider how allocation formulas would change once the funding weights are implemented.

D. Determine the Local Education Agency for Federal Categorical Funding

Federal categorical funding is distributed to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), which assume responsibility for receiving funds, distributing funds, monitoring use of funds, and completing any reporting requirements. The Advisory Committee will need to decide whether CCSD should remain the LEA or whether the precincts should become LEAs. Keeping CCSD as the LEA may make it easier to continue providing districtwide services, such as professional development. However, keeping CCSD as the LEA would also reduce the ability of precincts to decide how funds are spent and determine which schools should receive funds. The Committee should also consider which entity is most appropriate for being accountable for how funds are used. If the Committee concludes that the precincts should be LEAs, the Nevada Revised Statutes could be amended to indicate that precincts are considered LEAs for purposes of receiving Federal funds. If precincts become LEAs, accommodations will also need to be made for Federal competitive grants that were initially awarded to CCSD but now serve schools that are in more than one precinct.

Issue 4: Education Facilities

Another major issue the Advisory Committee will need to address is the ownership and future maintenance of school facilities. CCSD currently has 331 school sites plus administrative buildings. CCSD reports that 50 percent of school buildings are over 20 years old and that in five years, 62 percent of buildings will be over 20 years old.⁵¹ As shown in the School Facilities Map accompanying this report, the oldest buildings are in the central part of Clark County and in rural areas. Some buildings in the central area have been replaced by newer facilities, but most new facilities are on the periphery of Clark County. This is a reflection of settlement patterns over time in Clark County.

CCSD has struggled to keep up with demand for school facilities. Thirty-eight schools are currently over capacity and 22 schools operate on year-round schedules.⁵² There are also 2,095 portable classrooms throughout the district.⁵³ The district also reports that 16 schools meet current requirements for replacement based on the ratio of renovation costs to replacement value.⁵⁴

In 2015, the Legislature approved SB 119 and SB 207, which provided a 10-year extension to the district's rollover bond program to fund capital projects.^{vii} The program will be funded by an annual property tax rate of 55.34 cents, which is anticipated to generate \$4.1 billion over the next ten years.⁵⁵ This will only meet approximately 50 percent of the projected need of \$8.3 billion. There are also ongoing

^{vii} For more information on, please read Guinn Center's [Expanding Financing Options for Nevada's K-12 Facilities](#) (February 2015).

facilities maintenance needs, which are funded through the General Fund as part of the operating budget.

Given the large scale of facility needs and the insufficiency of funding, the Advisory Committee should consider the implications of either continuing to operate facilities functions centrally or transferring ownership and responsibility to precincts.

A. Consider various factors if facilities functions remain centralized

Continuing to administer facilities centrally would cause the least disruption to administration of the capital program. Under this option, property tax revenue would continue to be received on a countywide basis, which would be used to repay current and future debt for capital projects. Ownership of properties would also remain with CCSD. If facilities functions are centralized, the Advisory Committee will need to create mechanisms to prioritize projects as discussed below.

1. Determine how to prioritize capital projects across precincts: The Advisory Committee should consider whether a separate committee should be created with representatives from each precinct to decide which capital projects should be funded. The Committee should also develop criteria for prioritizing renovation and construction projects. These criteria could include age and condition of facilities, overcrowded conditions at facilities, and anticipated growth from new housing developments.
2. Determine how to fund and prioritize maintenance: If the central district is also responsible for regular maintenance, there would need to be a mechanism to fund and prioritize this work. Given the variation in age and state of repair of buildings, one option would be to charge all precincts the same amount per pupil for these services, regardless of actual costs. This would ensure that no single precinct must bear a disproportionate cost for maintenance. Another option would be charge precincts based on actual costs. Under this option, some precincts would spend greater amounts on facilities than others.
3. Explore creating a districtwide funding set-aside for deferred maintenance: Due to inadequate funding, CCSD has struggled to keep up with regular maintenance and has substantial deferred maintenance needs. Because deferred maintenance issues can create emergencies, repairs are often more costly than regular maintenance. The Committee could explore creating a districtwide funding set-aside for deferred maintenance in excess of the regular maintenance budget. These funds could be pooled across precincts and used to subsidize deferred maintenance where needs are greatest.

B. Consider various factors if facilities functions transfer to precincts

Transferring administration of the capital facilities program to precincts would provide more direct control to precincts over the prioritization of projects. However, this transfer would be highly complex and it would likely be difficult to obtain agreement among precincts. Several issues would need to be addressed:

1. Determine how to distribute revenue: A decision would need to be made on how to distribute property tax revenue earmarked for capital projects. One option would be to receive the revenue centrally and allocate it to precincts on an equal per pupil basis. While this ensures each student

generates the same amount of funding, it does not take into account the differential needs of each precinct. A second option would be allocating revenue to each precinct based on where it was generated. Because of the dominance of the gaming and entertainment industry, property tax is not generated evenly throughout Clark County. Therefore, this option would result in wide variations in per pupil revenue received by each precinct.

2. Determine how to repay past debt: CCSD has a legal obligation to repay debt that has already been issued. If precincts become responsible for all the facilities within their boundaries, questions will be raised about which entity is required to repay the debt associated with these facilities. Existing debt is for newer facilities, which are concentrated in suburban areas. Requiring each precinct to repay debt associated with properties within their boundaries would create differential impacts on each precinct. Depending on how revenue is distributed, it is also possible that a precinct's share of the revenue would not be sufficient to pay existing debt service. Another option, used in the deconsolidation of Utah's Jordan School District, would be to divide past indebtedness based on the percentage of assessed value in each district. This method would ensure that each precinct would pay a proportionate share of debt based on ability to pay, without regard to the location of buildings with outstanding debt.
3. Determine ownership of facilities: It would likely be complicated to transfer ownership of facilities to precincts in an equitable manner. In Utah's case, all buildings, maintenance yards, and transportation facilities were transferred to the district where they were physically located, regardless of value. In CCSD, some properties are part of central administration and would be difficult to divide up fairly between precincts. In addition, if the Advisory Committee opts to have the district pay debt service centrally, bondholders may prefer that ownership of existing facilities remain unchanged. The Committee could consider a hybrid option where CCSD would continue to own existing facilities while the precincts would own new facilities.
4. Determine impact on capital program: The Advisory Committee would need to determine the impact on the scale of the capital program. If each precinct has its own revenue stream, the annual revenue may not be sufficient to support a significant amount of new debt service. This could result in longer waiting times to renovate or build new schools. The cost of the capital program could also increase because the precinct would lose economies of scale achieved when renovating or building multiple schools at one time. Issuing smaller amounts of debt than CCSD has done in the past would also likely result in less favorable interest rates, which would increase costs of the overall capital program.
5. Determine impact on regular and deferred maintenance: Delegating regular and deferred facilities maintenance to local precincts would provide more local control. However, because the age of facilities varies throughout CCSD, the cost of maintenance will be different for each district. If a precinct has a disproportionate share of older buildings, it would have higher maintenance costs and less funds available for other expenses. There also may be some lost economies of scale in bidding for maintenance needs, which could result in higher costs.

Issue 5: Governance Structure

The last major issue for the Advisory Committee to consider is the governance structure of the new precincts and the role of the community. Issues to consider include: (a) the type of governing board; (b) qualifications of board members; (c) how to foster a pipeline for board members; (d) developing methods for community input; (e) how to create a system of oversight and accountability for precincts; and (f) how to minimize the cost of the structure.

A. Determine type of governing board

The Advisory Committee will need to decide whether the structure of precinct governing boards should mirror school district governing boards or have a different structure.

1. Consider whether to have elected or appointed board members: First, the Committee should decide whether precinct governing boards should be elected vs. appointed. Under current law, school district board members are elected while charter school board members are appointed (Nevada Revised Statutes [NRS] 386.160 and NRS 386.549). There are 19 states that have some school districts with appointed board members.⁵⁶ Some stakeholders argue that appointed governing boards tend to have more expertise while others argue that only elected boards can truly be held accountable to the public. Research shows no significant difference in student achievement between the two models.⁵⁷
2. If elected, consider whether board members will represent individual districts: Under current law, CCSD board members are elected to represent individual districts (NRS 386.165). The Advisory Committee could also opt to have at-large elections. However, this option would not be as representative of individual communities and could be challenged in court under the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965.
3. Consider the size of the board: The Advisory Committee would also need to decide the size of precinct boards. One option would be to use the same structure for school districts, which requires school districts with 1,000 or more pupils to have seven-member boards (NRS 386.110). In contrast, charter schools must have boards of at least five members, but can have larger boards (NRS 386.549).
4. Consider the term for board members: Another issue to consider is the term for board members. For school districts, board members have staggered 4-year terms (NRS 386.165). In contrast, the NRS does not specify a particular term for charter school board members, leaving this issue to be defined by each charter school.

B. Determine qualifications for governing boards members

Another important decision to be made by the Advisory Committee is the qualifications for board members. For school districts, the only qualifications are being a qualified elector and residing in the district (NRS 386.240). If board members are to be appointed, an alternative would be to require board members to have specific types of expertise as is done for charter schools. Charter schools require: one member who is a teacher; one member who is a teacher or school administrator; one parent of a student in the school; two members with expertise in accounting, financial services, law, human resources; plus others representing parents, nonprofits or business organizations (NRS 386.549).

C. Consider how to foster the pipeline for governing board members

Given the increased demand for board members, the Advisory Committee should consider how to foster the pipeline for governing board members. There are a variety of organizations that traditionally recruit board members for school districts, including political parties, business groups, and unions. Charter schools sometimes use private organizations to recruit board members that have expertise in specific areas.⁵⁸ To ensure that the board members understand their responsibilities and are effective, another issue to consider is whether to require board members to receive training. Twenty three states require board members to receive training.⁵⁹ Topics include responsibilities, ethics, financial oversight, accountability, collective bargaining, and leadership/ board-superintendent relationship. While Nevada does not currently require training for school board members, training can be required for Nevada charter school board members (Sections 36 and 37 of Chapter 516, Statutes of Nevada 2015).

D. Develop structures for community input

Since one of the legislative goals of reorganizing CCSD is to create an educational system that is responsive to the needs and concerns of the residents, the Advisory Committee should consider how precincts can provide avenues for community input. There are various options, including districtwide advisory committees and school-based advisory committees. The Advisory Committee could draw from past practices at CCSD and model practices from other states to create a robust structure for parent and community input within each precinct.

CCSD currently has various districtwide advisory committees in place, including the School-Community Partnership Advisory Council, the Superintendent's Executive Advisory Group, the Bond Oversight Committee and the Attendance Zone Advisory Commission.⁶⁰ In contrast, there are currently limited opportunities for parents and community members to participate in decision making at the school site level because CCSD has not taken full advantage of options available in the Nevada Revised Statutes. For example, CCSD has discontinued implementation of empowerment schools, which the Legislature authorized in 2007.⁶¹ Under the empowerment school model, parents and community members become part of an empowerment team at each school, which assists in development of a plan and budget for the school (NRS 386.730). There is also statutory authority (NRS 386.4154) for school boards to create school councils as part of a model of school-based decision making, but these have not been formally implemented in CCSD. Many schools in CCSD do have a limited role for parent input. As part of development of the State-required School Performance Plan, each school that receives Federal Title I funds must have a parent member on its planning team.⁶²

Several examples illustrating mechanisms in other states for providing parent and community input at both the school and district level are discussed below.

Examples of districtwide input in other states:

- New York: In New York City, there are 32 Community Education Councils (CEC), which serve as a vehicle for parent involvement at the district level. Each CEC includes 11 members (nine elected parents of K-8 students and 2 members appointed by the Borough President). The CECs' responsibilities include reviewing the district's educational programs and assessing their effect on student achievement, submitting an annual evaluation of the superintendent to the Chancellor, consulting on the selection of the community superintendent, and serving as liaisons to School

Leadership Teams. There are also Citywide Education Councils for high schools, special education students, ELLs, and students with severe needs. The Citywide Education Councils are responsible for issuing an annual report on how effectively the populations they represent are served, and making recommendations for improvements.

- California: California requires each school district to create a Parent Advisory Council and a District English Learner Parent Advisory Committee to provide advice on the Local Control Accountability Plan.⁶³ The Local Control Accountability Plan is a comprehensive document that outlines goals and associated funding to improve student achievement.

Examples of school-based input in other states:

- California: Each California school must also have an elected School Site Council, which is responsible for crafting the Single Plan for Student Achievement.⁶⁴ The council serves as the school community's representative body for determining the focus of the school's academic instructional program and the use of all categorical resources.
- Kentucky: Each school in Kentucky has a school council, which is responsible for setting school policy and making decisions to foster an environment that enhances student achievement.⁶⁵
- Massachusetts: In Massachusetts, each school must have a school council, which is responsible for adopting educational goals for the school, identifying the educational needs of the students, reviewing the annual school budget, and formulating a school improvement plan.⁶⁶

E. Consider the structure for accountability and oversight of precincts

To ensure the goals of deconsolidation are met, it will be important to have accountability and oversight of precincts. The Nevada School Performance Framework evaluates the academic success of each school annually, but the State has a limited role in ongoing monitoring of school plans and outcomes. In addition, the State has a limited role in fiscal oversight of schools and does not have the capacity to determine if services are being implemented efficiently.

In some states, county education agencies have oversight over school districts within their jurisdiction. Since AB 394 keeps the central district in place, the Advisory Committee could also consider whether CCSD should have an oversight role over the precincts and what areas should be covered. One option is to give CCSD responsibility for fiscal oversight, which would make sense if CCSD were given the function of administering payroll and other business services. In California and Arizona, county superintendents have fiscal oversight over school districts within their counties, including expenditures and budgets.⁶⁷ In California, county superintendents are also responsible for oversight and approval of school district Local Control Accountability Plans (LCAPs). Each school district's LCAP shows how funding will be used to support goals identified by the district and to measure progress for student subgroups across multiple performance indicators.⁶⁸

Another model that could be reviewed is the Performance Framework established by the State Public Charter School Authority, which covers academics, finances, and organizational issues.⁶⁹ This model includes interventions specific to charter schools that could be modified to fit precincts.

F. Consider cost of governance structure and ways to promote efficiency

The Advisory Committee should also consider how to minimize the cost of the proposed governance structure, since it represents a new cost to taxpayers. There will be new costs for central administration as well as the precinct governing boards. The Advisory Committee should determine whether existing administrative staff can be redeployed to minimize additional administration costs. For example, there are currently high level administrators and associated staff who oversee each performance zone under CCSD's current organizational structure. The Advisory Committee could explore whether these positions could be transitioned into administrative staff for the new precincts in lieu of creating new positions.

There will also be costs for the new precinct boards. For school districts, monthly compensation for board members depends on population size (NRS 386.320). Board members receive \$750 per month in districts with a population of 100,000 or more, \$400 per month for districts with a population of population of 20,000 to 99,999, and \$250 per month for districts with population of less than 20,000. In contrast, charter school board members receive \$80 per month (NRS 386.549). Additionally, counties with a population of 55,000 or more are required to broadcast board meetings, which would be an additional cost (NRS 386.330).

Key Findings and Recommendations

For each of the five issues addressed in this policy report, we present critical decision points for the Advisory Committee and recommend a framework for analysis. This section summarizes the key findings and recommendations included in each section.

1. Community Based Communication and Information Process

Findings

- The Advisory Committee has not publicly outlined its strategy for gathering information from the public about local needs to determine the differences in needs by precinct.
- The Advisory Committee has not publicly outlined a strategy for communicating to the public, especially minority communities, the purpose and goals for the possible reorganization.
- Given disparities in student achievement by race, ethnicity and socioeconomic background and given the historical poignancy of real and perceived discriminatory treatment of such groups in education, the failure to include a public process could create lasting feelings of resentment that could undermine the legitimacy of any decision.

Recommendations

- Establish and disseminate a comprehensive community engagement plan that aligns with the work and schedule of the Advisory Committee.
- Schedule regular and formal community information sessions.
- Conduct focus groups and surveys across the district.
- Meet with community stakeholders to allow for the communication of community concerns.

2. Demographic and Educational Equity

Findings

- CCSD students currently face significant levels of segregation. This isolation exists by race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and language.
- Low levels of student achievement are highly correlated to large concentrations of minority, low

income, and English Language Learner students.

- High performing schools are concentrated in suburban areas while low performing schools are concentrated in central Clark County.
- Magnet schools and other specialized programs are concentrated in central Clark County.
- Schools for special populations such as alternative education and special education students are not evenly distributed throughout CCSD.
- There are high numbers of novice teachers and teacher vacancies in schools with high concentrations of low income students.

Recommendations

- Conduct a preliminary needs assessment of the district which can be used to inform the design of precincts.
- Develop measures to compare student learning within and across precincts to monitor progress of each subgroup and to incentivize educational equity.
- Consider strategies to configure precincts in a way that promotes demographic equity, increases choice, and improves educational outcomes.
- Establish a robust system of high-quality public school choices within each precinct, including magnet schools and charter schools.
- Develop strategies for serving populations in alternative and special education schools on a regional basis.
- Explore using monetary and non-monetary incentives to improve the distribution of high-quality, experienced teachers across and within precincts.

3. Funding Equity

Findings

- Schools have differential costs based on teacher experience, transportation and repair needs, etc.
- Local revenue is not generated equally throughout Clark County.
- State and Federal categorical funds are distributed based on target populations and are not distributed evenly throughout the district.

Recommendations

- Analyze current costs to develop a formula for calculating the Basic Support Guarantee for precincts and central services to be provided by CCSD.
- Develop a mechanism to equalize local revenue received outside of the Basic Support Guarantee.
- Develop criteria for determining which functions could be conducted most efficiently by precincts or the central district.
- Create methods to distribute State and Federal categorical funds in a manner that ensures targeted populations in each precinct have equal access to resources.

4. Education Facilities

Findings

- Capital facilities needs are currently underfunded in CCSD.
- Older facilities are in central Las Vegas and newer facilities are predominantly in suburban areas.
- Existing debt is for newer facilities, which are concentrated in suburban areas.
- Property tax revenue to pay debt service is not generated evenly throughout the district.

Recommendations

- If facilities functions remain centralized, create a governing body with representatives from each

precinct to prioritize projects and determine how to charge precincts for facilities functions.

- If ownership and responsibility for facilities is transferred to precincts, determine how to distribute revenue between precincts and how to repay past debt.

5. Governance

Findings

- Governance structure does not have a significant impact on student achievement.
- CCSD has not taken full advantage of current laws allowing parents to have a greater role in school site decisions.
- Accountability and oversight will be important to ensure goals of deconsolidation are met.

Recommendations

- Review governance models of districts and charter schools to choose a structure for precincts.
- Create a mechanism to foster a pipeline of quality board members.
- Create avenues for community and parent input in schools.
- Create mechanisms to keep precincts accountable for student achievement and fiscal efficiency.

Conclusion

The Advisory Committee will need to address a panoply of issues in its plan to reconfigure CCSD. This policy report aims to provide a roadmap to help the Advisory Committee navigate five critical issues: (1) communication with the community; (2) demographic and educational equity; (3) funding equity; (4) education facilities; and (5) governance structure.

The three main goals of the legislation should consistently remain at the forefront of the reorganization process. As each decision is made, the Advisory Committee should evaluate whether the action will increase responsiveness to parents and the community, improve student achievement, and improve efficiency. Through its work, the Advisory Committee can recommend structures and accountability measures that can help achieve these goals.

Looking beyond the plan required by AB 394, it is important for the Advisory Committee to recognize that simply reconfiguring CCSD will not improve student achievement. Each precinct will also need to create conditions that foster excellent schools. This includes hiring innovative school leaders who are empowered to make decisions regarding curriculum and staffing, providing support and high-quality professional development to teachers, and building trust with the community.

The range and nature of issues that warrant discussion in the consideration of the reorganization of CCSD underscore the importance of clearly defining the process for deliberation. The Advisory Committee should delineate a process that maximizes parent and community input. While the Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee include community representatives, it is critical that the Advisory Committee provide sufficient opportunity for parent and community input. Following the model of other school districts, the Advisory Committee could establish community working groups comprised of parents, school administrators, teachers, business owners, and education nonprofit professionals. The Advisory Committee could host a series town halls and focus groups that are tasked with discussing some of the issues identified in this policy report.

Finally, the Committee must articulate a process and a final plan whereby the precincts still feel like they belong to a larger community with the sum of the parts (precincts) being greater than any individual one. The separation of the district must not result in the separation of our Southern Nevada community.

Appendices

1. Appendix A: Historical Context of Education Accountability and Efforts to Reorganize Clark County School District
2. Appendix B: Deconsolidation Efforts in Other States
3. Appendix C: Isolation of Minorities, Low Income, and English Language Learners in CCSD

Appendix A: Historical Context of Education Accountability and Efforts to Reorganize Clark County School District

- 1956 **Clark County School District created:**⁷⁰ During a Special Session, the Nevada Legislature eliminated 208 legally active school districts throughout the State and replaced them with 17 districts, each coterminous with county boundaries. In Clark County, 19 school districts were consolidated into the Clark County School District.
- 1975 **Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) Report on Educational Accountability:**⁷¹ Nevada first explored creating an educational accountability structure in 1975. The LCB report reviewed best practices and indicated that an accountability system should include development of goals and objectives, student assessments, evaluation of programs, and review of cost effectiveness. The LCB followed up with a report in 1977 focused on the use of testing to measure competency.⁷² This report addressed the appropriateness of competency testing, the subject areas to be covered, when and how often tests should be given, the definition of proficiency, and whether tests should be used as a requirement for graduation.
- 1984 **Legislative Commission Study on Education in Nevada:**⁷³ In response to the widely publicized report, *A Nation at Risk*, Senate Concurrent Resolution (SCR) 55 of the 1983 Legislative Session required the Legislative Commission to study education in Nevada. Recommendations focused on curriculum, vocational education, programs for special populations, standards and expectations, teachers, staffing and administration, and postsecondary education.
- 1995 **LCB Background Paper on Public Education Policy Structure in Nevada:**⁷⁴ This report reviewed governance of the entire K-12 education system, including the Governor, Legislature, State Board of Education, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Nevada Department of Education, School Boards, and School Districts. It also examined governance structures in other states.
- 1996 **MAP Report: Nevada School District Organization and Control: Meeting the Challenges of Growth and Diversity:**⁷⁵ In response to SCR 30 of the 1995 Legislative Session, this report explored the feasibility of deconsolidating CCSD and consolidating small, rural school districts.⁷⁶ The report used five criteria to evaluate reorganization proposals: educational effectiveness, racial and ethnic composition, organizational scale, government responsiveness to communities of interest, and financing and facilities. The report offered four solutions, including site-based management, increasing the number of school district trustees, charter schools, and alternate boundary configurations through deconsolidation of CCSD.
- 1997 **LCB Bulletin on Reconfiguring the Structure of School Districts:**⁷⁷ The subcommittee responsible for reviewing the MAP report recommended creating a process for realignment of school districts in statute. The proposal was not adopted by the Legislature.
- 1997 **Council to Establish Academic Standards in Public Schools created:**⁷⁸ The Nevada Education Reform Act created the Council and required it to review and recommend statewide standards in English, math, and science before September 1, 1998. The State Board of Education was then required to adopt standards and state tests aligned to the standards by January 1, 1999. The standards took effect during the 1999-00 school year. In 2010, Nevada adopted the Common Core State Standards (Nevada Academic Content Standards).⁷⁹
- 2001: **No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act adopted:** This Federal law mandated that Nevada adopt state standards and create an accountability structure that measured Adequate Yearly Progress towards meeting a goal of 100% proficiency in reading and math by 2013. In 2012, Nevada received a waiver to this law and created a new accountability system called the Nevada School Performance Framework.

Appendix B: Deconsolidation Efforts in Other States

As the Advisory Committee conducts its work, it should examine whether efforts to deconsolidate other large school districts have been successful and what lessons can be learned from these efforts. Our research shows there are limited examples of school districts that have deconsolidated. In addition, there is currently no academic research tying deconsolidation of a large urban school district to increases in academic achievement.

The most recent example of deconsolidation of a large school district is the Jordan School District in Utah, which split into the Jordan School District and Canyons School District in 2009. In 2008, the Jordan School District had 81,095 students.⁸⁰ As of 2013-14, Jordan School District had 51,865 students and Canyons School District had 33,644 students.⁸¹ The decision to deconsolidate was made by voters, but only voters who lived in the Canyons School District were allowed to participate.⁸² The district breakup was highly contentious and many decisions on how to distribute assets and liabilities had to be made by a three-member arbitration panel.⁸³

A study has not been done on the impact of this deconsolidation on student achievement and would be difficult to conduct because the Utah changed its state assessment in 2013-14. Review of assessment data for the past two years shows that proficiency rates in language arts, mathematics, and science increased in both school districts.⁸⁴ Comparing the two districts, the Jordan School District had lower proficiency rates in both years, but had higher growth rates in 2014-15.

The Jordan deconsolidation had a major financial impact on students and taxpayers. There were large one-time costs associated with the split: \$59 million for the Jordan School District and an unknown amount for Canyons School District.⁸⁵ In addition, ongoing administrative costs increased by approximately \$10 million between the two districts due to lost economies of scale. Tax rates increased by 16.75 percent at Canyons School District and 20 percent at Jordan School District.⁸⁶ Due to differences in assessed valuation, Jordan School District officials indicate that the district received approximately 59 percent of the students but only 42 percent of ongoing revenue. Additional legislation was later adopted to try to equalize revenue countywide. A poll conducted in 2010 revealed that 75 percent of respondents thought the split was unfair to Jordan students and 71 percent thought the split was unfair to Jordan taxpayers.⁸⁷

There have also been recent deconsolidation efforts in small communities in other states, including Arkansas and Maine, but it is too early to assess the results of these efforts.^{88,89,90}

There are limited examples of deconsolidation of large urban school districts. In 1978, the Wilmington School District in Delaware and ten suburban districts were initially reorganized into a single district to comply with a court desegregation order. In 1981, the district was broken up into four new pie shaped districts, each with a portion of Wilmington.⁹¹ During the brief period the districts were consolidated, research shows significant gains for all students in reading and math, with African American students reporting the most substantial increases.⁹² After the districts were deconsolidated (1985 to 1993), research shows no appreciable gain in sixth grade reading scores as well as persistent achievement gaps between White and African American students.⁹³

There have been other efforts in the past to deconsolidate large urban districts. In 1997, the Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau wrote a report titled *Reconfiguring the Structure of School Districts*.⁹⁴ It cited


efforts to deconsolidate the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), Boston Public Schools, and Pittsburgh Public Schools. However, none of these efforts have resulted in deconsolidation of a district.

Of these three school districts, the most significant efforts have been at LAUSD. The California Legislature approved SB 699 in 1995, which authorized LAUSD to be deconsolidated if the new districts could meet certain conditions, including socioeconomic diversity, desegregation mandates, geographical compactness, and equity of resource distribution. These requirements have made deconsolidation difficult from a legal perspective.⁹⁵ In 2001, groups from the San Fernando Valley and Carson tried to secede from LAUSD but were not successful.⁹⁶ In 2005 the City Council-LAUSD Joint Commission was created to study LAUSD governance.⁹⁷ This group reviewed deconsolidation as an option but did not recommend it. Since 2005, there have been repeated calls for deconsolidation from interested parties but no action has taken place.⁹⁸

Appendix C: Isolation of Minorities, Low Income, and English Language Learners in CCSD

The following figures illustrate how CCSD schools attended by minorities, low income students, and ELLs are typically more segregated than the districtwide population distribution. In each figure, the blue columns reflect the districtwide racial/ethnic distribution in 2013-14, which was 29 percent white, 7 percent Asian, 12 percent African American, 44 percent Latino, and 8 percent other. Each figure compares the districtwide racial distribution to the population of a school attended by a typical student of a particular race, socio-economic background, or English Language Learner status.


Figure 1: District Racial Distribution Compared to Exposure Rates for Latinos and African Americans: 2013-14



In 2013-14, minority students attended schools that are more segregated than the districtwide population. Using an exposure rate calculation,⁹⁹ a typical Latino CCSD student attended a school that was 21 percent White, 5 percent Asian, 13 percent African American, 56 percent Latino, and 6 percent other. A typical African American CCSD student attended a school that was 24 percent White, 6 percent Asian, 21 percent African American, 46 percent Latino, and 3 percent other (see Figure 1).


Source: Analysis of Nevada Report Card data 2012-13

Figure 2: Districtwide Racial Distribution Compared to Exposure Rates for Whites and Asians: 2013-14



White and Asian students also attended schools in 2013-14 that did not reflect CCSD's districtwide demographics. The average White student attended a school that was 42 percent White, 7 percent Asian, 10 percent African American, 32 percent Latino, and 8 percent other. A typical Asian student attended a school that was 32 percent White, 12 percent Asian, 11 percent African American, 34 percent Latino, and 11 percent other (see Figure 2).

Source: Analysis of Nevada Report Card data 2012-13

Figure 3: Districtwide Racial Distribution Compared to ELL & FRL Exposure Rates: 2013-14

Source: Analysis of Nevada Report Card data 2013-14

Segregation also exists in CCSD along economic and language lines. In 2013-14, ELLs had limited exposure to Whites and Asians but had a disproportionately large exposure to Latinos, other ELLs, and low income students eligible for Free and Reduced-price Lunch (FRLs). A typical ELL student attended a school that was 62 percent Latino and 76 percent FRL. Trends were similar, but less pronounced for FRL students. An average FRL student attended a school that was 53 percent Latino, 22 percent ELL, and 68 percent FRL (see Figure 3).



Board of Directors

Phil Satre
Chair

Dr. Jill Derby
Vice Chair

Kenneth Ladd
Treasurer

Randolph Townsend
Secretary

Deane Albright, CPA

Dr. Joe Crowley

Tom Gallagher

Dr. Dan Hamilton

Dr. Carol Harter

Chris Roman

Douglas Seastrand

Stephanie Tyler

Missy Young

About the Kenny C. Guinn Center for Policy Priorities

The Kenny C. Guinn Center for Policy Priorities is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit, independent research center focused on providing fact-based, relevant, and well-reasoned analysis of critical policy issues facing Nevada and the Intermountain West. The Guinn Center engages policy-makers, experts, and the public with innovative, data-driven research and analysis to advance policy solutions, inform the public debate, and expand public engagement.

© 2015 Kenny C. Guinn Center for Policy Priorities, All rights reserved.

Contact information:

Kenny Guinn Center for Policy Priorities
c/o inNEVation Center
6795 Edmond Street, Suite 300/Box 10
Las Vegas, Nevada 89118
Phone: (702) 522-2189
Email: info@guinncenter.org

Dr. Nancy E. Brune
Executive Director
Phone: (702) 522-2178
Email: nbrune@guinncenter.org

Victoria Carreón
Director of Education Policy
Phone: (702) 522-2178
Email: vcarreon@guinncenter.org

¹ <http://www.reviewjournal.com/news/education/ccsd-approves-41-billion-building-plan>

² Assembly Bill 394, Chapter 543, Statutes of Nevada 2015.

³ <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Session/78th2015/Reports/history.cfm?ID=864>

⁴ Nevada Legislature. Minutes of the Assembly Committee on Education on AB 394. March 30, 2015.

⁵ <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Session/78th2015/Minutes/Assembly/ED/Final/747.pdf>

⁶ Ibid

⁷ Ibid

⁸ Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education. <http://dme.dc.gov/book/student-assignment-and-school-boundaries-review-process/dc-advisory-committee-student>

⁹ Augustine, C. et al. Options for Changing the Governance System of the Los Angeles Unified School District. RAND (December 2005) http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/working_papers/2005/RAND_WR333.pdf

¹⁰ Civil Rights Act of 1964 42 USC § 2000d <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/USCODE-2010-title42/pdf/USCODE-2010-title42-chap21-subchapV.pdf>

¹¹ Wright v. Council of City of Emporia, 407 U.S. 451 (1972) <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/407/451/case.html>
Holding: "In determining whether realignment of school districts by officials comports with the requirements of the Fourteenth Amendment, courts will be guided not by the motivation of the officials, but by the effect of their action."

¹² Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 USC § 2000d-6 <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/USCODE-2010-title42/pdf/USCODE-2010-title42-chap21-subchapV.pdf>

¹³ U.S. Department of Education. Office of Civil Rights. Education and Title VI.

<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/hq43e4.html>

¹⁴ Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1. 551 U.S. 701 (2007)

<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/551/701/> (Justice Kennedy's concurring opinion)

¹⁵ U.S. Department of Justice and U.S. Department of Education. Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools (2012) <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-201111.html>

¹⁶ Mickelson, R. School Integration and K-12 Educational Outcomes: A Quick Synthesis of Social Science Evidence (March 2015) National Coalition on School Diversity <http://www.school-diversity.org/pdf/DiversityResearchBriefNo5.pdf>

¹⁷ Ibid

¹⁸ Eaton, S. & Chirchigno, G. The Impact of Racially Diverse Schools in a Democratic Society. (March 2011) The National Coalition on School Diversity. <http://www.school-diversity.org/pdf/DiversityResearchBriefNo3.pdf>

¹⁹ Orfield, G. Segregating California's Future: Inequality and its Alternative 60 years after Brown v. Board of Education (May 2014) The Civil Rights Project <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/segregating-california-2019s-future-inequality-and-its-alternative-60-years-after-brown-v.-board-of-education/orfield-ee-segregating-california-future-brown-at.pdf>

²⁰ Ibid

²¹ Horsford, S. et al. School Resegregation in the Mississippi of the West: Community Counternarratives on the Return to Neighborhood Schools in Las Vegas, 1968 1994. Teachers College Record Volume 115, 110304, November 2013.

http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Sonya_Horsford/publication/273133480_School_Resegregation_in_the_Mississippi_of_the_West_Community_Counternarratives_on_the_Return_to_Neighborhood_Schools_in_Las_Vegas_19681994/links/54f8ba5b0cf28d6deca2bed1.pdf

²² Ibid

²³ Ibid

²⁴ Ibid

²⁵ Clark County School District. Prime 6 Programs: 2014-2015 School Attendance Boundaries and Option School Designations for Select Schools (1-5). <https://ccsd.net/schools/zoning/maps/prime-6.pdf>

²⁶ Terriquez, V. et al. Expanding Student Opportunities: Prime 6 Program Review Clark County School District Las Vegas, Nevada. Civil Rights Project at UCLA, (2009) <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/expanding-student-opportunities-prime-6-program-review-clark-county-school-district-las-vegas-nevada/terriquez-expanding-student-opportunities-2009.pdf>

²⁷ United States Census. Education Demographics and Geographic Estimates: <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/edge/tableViewer.aspx>

²⁸ Ibid. In 2000, the population of CCSD was 49 percent White, 30 percent Latino, 12 percent African American, 4 percent Asian, 6 percent Other

²⁹ Nevada Department of Education. Nevada Report Card. <http://www.nevadareportcard.com/di/> In 2006-07, the population of CCSD was 38 percent White, 39 percent Latino, 14 percent African American, 9 percent Asian, 1 percent other.

³⁰ Logan J. et al. 2011. "The Persistence of Segregation in the Metropolis: New Findings from the 2010 Census" Census Brief prepared for Project US2010. <http://www.s4.brown.edu/us2010/Data/Report/report2.pdf> The Index of Dissimilarity shows the percentage that must move from a census tract to replicate the group composition of the metropolitan area. A score of 30 to 60 is considered moderate segregation. A score of over 60 is high segregation.

³¹ Ibid

³² Ibid

³³ Nevada State Demographer. Age, Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin Estimates and Projections October 2013. <http://nvdemography.org/data-and-publications/age-sex-race-and-hispanic-origin-estimates-and-projections/>

- ³² Clark County School District. Magnet Schools and Career Technical Academies FAQs <http://magnet.ccsd.net/faqs/> & CCSD Regulation 5112. Zone Variance, Board-Approved Option, Transfer, and Magnet School Assignment. http://ccsd.net/district/policies-regulations/pdf/5112_R.pdf
- ³³ Clark County School District. Communication from Gia More, CCSD Magnet Schools and Career Technical Academies Department. September 15, 2015.
- ³⁴ Newsweek. America's Top High Schools 2015. <http://www.newsweek.com/high-schools/americas-top-high-schools-2015>
- ³⁵ Clark County School District. Magnet Schools, Career Technical Academies, and Select Schools <http://magnet.ccsd.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/magnet-cta-overview.pdf>
- ³⁶ Integrated Magnet Schools: Outcomes and Best Practices. (December 2013) Institute of Metropolitan Opportunity, University of Minnesota Law School. <http://www.magnet.edu/files/documents/integrated-magnets-best-practices.pdf>
- ³⁷ U.S. Department of Justice and U.S. Department of Education. Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools (2012) <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-201111.html>
- ³⁸ Clark County School District. Magnet Schools, Career Technical Academies, and Select Schools <http://magnet.ccsd.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/magnet-cta-overview.pdf>
- ³⁹ College of Southern Nevada, Programs for High School Students. <http://www.csn.edu/highschool/> ; Nevada State College Step Up Program <http://nsc.edu/education/special-programs-and-partnerships/step-up-program.aspx>; University of Nevada Las Vegas Early Studies Program. <https://www.unlv.edu/asc/early-studies>; Nevada State High School. <http://earlycollegenv.com/>
- ⁴⁰ U.S. Department of Justice and U.S. Department of Education. Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools (2012) <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-201111.html>
- ⁴¹ Ibid
- ⁴² Berkeley Unified School District. Information on Berkeley Unified's Student Assignment Plan <http://www.berkeleyschools.net/information-on-berkeley-unifieds-student-assignment-plan/> & Jefferson County Public Schools Student Assignment: <http://www.jefferson.k12.ky.us/departments/StudentAssignment/Index.html>
- ⁴³ Maricopa County Regional School District. Frequently Asked Questions. <http://www.mcrcsd.org/domain/35> and Gila County Regional School District. http://www.gilacountyaz.gov/government/school_superintendent/accommodation_school_district/index.php
- ⁴⁴ California Department of Education. County Offices of Education. <http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/sd/co/coes.asp>
- ⁴⁵ Nevada Department of Education. Nevada Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators (June 2015): http://www.doe.nv.gov/Educator_Effectiveness/Educator_Develop_Support/Nevada_Equity_Plan/Documents/NVEducatorEquityPlan_FINALJune_2015/
- ⁴⁶ Clark County School District. Recruitment and Staffing Update. Presentation to State Board of Education. (October 8, 2015) http://www.doe.nv.gov/Boards_Commissions_Councils/State_Board_of_Education/2015/October/Item8CCSDPresentation/
- ⁴⁷ David, J. *What Research Says About ... / Teacher Recruitment Incentives*. Educational Leadership. April 2008. Volume 65, Number 7. Poverty and Learning. Pages 84-86. <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/apr08/vol65/num07/Teacher-Recruitment-Incentives.aspx>
- ⁴⁸ Goe, L. Recruiting and Retaining Highly Effective Teachers: What Works and How Do You Know? National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. April 5, 2010. http://www.gtcenter.org/sites/default/files/docs/Presentation_TeacherRecruitmentAndRetention_toWesternRegionalSIGConference_April_6_2011.pdf, Allen, B. Eight Questions on Teacher Recruitment and Retention: What does the Research Say? Education Commission of the States (September 2005) <http://www.ecs.org/html/educationIssues/TeachingQuality/TRRreport/home/TeacherRecruitmentRetention.pdf>, and Hammer, P et. al. Rural Teacher Recruitment and Retention Practices: A Review of the Research Literature, National Survey of Rural Superintendents, and Case Studies of Programs in Virginia. Appalachia Educational Laboratory (December 2005) <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED489143.pdf>
- ⁴⁹ Ibid
- ⁵⁰ California Department of Education. County Offices of Education. <http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/sd/co/coes.asp>
- ⁵¹ Clark County School District. 2015 Capital Improvement Plan: Public Input Meetings (2015) <http://capitalimprovementplan.ccsd.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/cip-presentation-web-version.pdf>
- ⁵² Ibid
- ⁵³ Ibid
- ⁵⁴ Ibid
- ⁵⁵ Ibid
- ⁵⁶ National School Boards Association. Selection of Local School Boards (2009) <http://www.nsba.org/sites/default/files/reports/electionschart.pdf>
- ⁵⁷ Gary Hoover. January 2008. Elected versus appointed school district officials: Is there a difference in student outcomes? *Public Finance Review*. <http://pfr.sagepub.com/content/36/5/635.short>
- ⁵⁸ National Charter School Resource Center. March 2012 Newsletter: Strategic Recruiting of Charter School Board Members <http://www.charterschoolcenter.org/newsletter/march-2012-strategic-recruiting-charter-school-board-members>
- ⁵⁹ National School Boards Association. Mandated Training for Local School Board Survey (October 2012) <http://www.nsba.org/mandated-training-local-school-board-survey>

- ⁶⁰ Clark County School District. School-Community Partnership Advisory Council. <http://ccsd.net/community/partnership/about-us/advisory-council>; Clark County School District. Superintendent's Executive Advisory Group. <http://ccsd.net/district/superintendent/resources/pdf/EEDC-Committees.pdf>, Clark County School District. Bond Oversight Committee. <https://ccsd.net/departments/administrative-management/committees> and Clark County School District Attendance Zone Advisory Commission. <http://azac.ccsd.net/index.htm>
- ⁶¹ Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau. Research Brief on History of Empowerment Schools Program in Nevada (February, 2010) <http://leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Publications/ResearchBriefs/HistoryEmpowerment.pdf>
- ⁶² Nevada Department of Education. District and School Performance Planning Resources. http://www.doe.nv.gov/SchoolImprovement/District_and_School_Performance_Planning_Resources/
- ⁶³ WestEd. Local Control Funding Formula. Making a Plan to Develop the LCAP. <http://lcff.wested.org/making-a-plan-to-develop-the-lcap/>
- ⁶⁴ California Department of Education. Schoolsite Council. <http://www.cde.ca.gov/fq/aa/co/ssc.asp> See also Irvine Unified School District. School Site Council Training. http://iusd.org/education_services/school-site-council/documents/SSCPowerPointPRESENTATION.pdf
- ⁶⁵ Kentucky Department of Education. School Based Decision Making. <http://education.ky.gov/districts/SBDM/Pages/default.aspx>
- ⁶⁶ Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. School Councils: Questions and Answers. <http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/advisory/schoolcouncils/>
- ⁶⁷ Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team. Fiscal Oversight Guide for AB 1200, AB 2756 and Subsequent Related Legislation (December 2014) <http://fcmat.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2015/01/Fiscal-Oversight-Guide-2014-final-interactive.pdf> and Maricopa County Education Service Agency. School Finance <http://education.maricopa.gov/domain/96>
- ⁶⁸ California County Superintendents Educational Services Association. Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) Approval Manual. 2014-2015 Edition (April 30, 2014) <http://ccsesa.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/2014-15-CCSESA-LCAP-Approval-Manual.pdf>
- ⁶⁹ State Public Charter Schools Authority. Charter School Performance Framework. <http://charterschools.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/CharterSchoolsnvgov/content/Grocers/Performance%20Framework.pdf>
- ⁷⁰ LCB Public Education Policy Structure in Nevada (1995) <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Publications/Bkground/BP95-12.pdf>
- ⁷¹ LCB Education Accountability Paper (1975): <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Publications/Bkground/BP75-11.pdf>
- ⁷² LCB Competency-Based Education (1977): <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Publications/Bkground/BP77-03.pdf>
- ⁷³ Legislative Commission Study of Education in Nevada (1984): <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Publications/InterimReports/1985/Bulletin85-09.pdf>
- ⁷⁴ LCB Public Education Policy Structure in Nevada (1995) <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Publications/Bkground/BP95-12.pdf>
- ⁷⁵ MAP Nevada School District Organization and Control: Meeting the Challenges of Growth and Diversity (1996) <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Publications/InterimReports/1997/Bulletin97-04AppB.pdf>
- ⁷⁶ SCR 30 Enrolled Reconfiguration Resolution (1995): https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Session/68th1995/95bills/SCR30_EN.TXT
- ⁷⁷ LCB Reconfiguring the Structure of School Districts (1997): <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Publications/InterimReports/1997/Bulletin97-04.pdf>
- ⁷⁸ LCB History of Selected Components of Nevada's Public Elementary-Secondary Education Governance Structure (2010) <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Publications/ResearchBriefs/HistoryEdGovernStruct.pdf>
- ⁷⁹ Statewide Implementation History: Presentation to the Legislative Committee on Education (2014) http://www.doe.nv.gov/Standards_Instructional_Support/Nevada_Academic_Standards/Documents/LCE_April_22_2014_FINAL/
- ⁸⁰ Jordan School District Statistics: <http://jordandistrict.org/resources/statistics/>
- ⁸¹ Utah State Office of Education. Data and Statistics: Data Reports- Enrollment and Demographics, Average Daily Membership 2013-14. <http://www.schools.utah.gov/data/Reports/Enrollment-Demographics.aspx>
- ⁸² Canyons School District. About Us. <http://www.canyonsdistrict.org/component/k2/item/151-about-us>
- ⁸³ Giauque, M. "Arbitration ruling issued in Jordan School District split." KSL.com <http://www.ksl.com/?sid=5891490>
- ⁸⁴ Utah State Office of Education. SAGE results. <https://datagateway.schools.utah.gov/Assessment/SAGE/2015>
- ⁸⁵ Jordan School District. What did the district split cost? <http://jordandistrict.org/2014/05/districtsplitcost/>
- ⁸⁶ Ibid
- ⁸⁷ Stewart, A. "Poll: Jordan School District split resulted in inequity" Desert News. (March 9, 2010) <http://www.deseretnews.com/article/700014974/Poll-Jordan-District-split-resulted-in-inequity.html?pg=all>
- ⁸⁸ Ellis, D. "Board OK's division of Pulaski County Special School District" Arkansas News. (August 13, 2015) <http://arkansasnews.com/news/arkansas/board-ok-s-division-pulaski-county-special-school-district>
- ⁸⁹ Betts, S. "Rockland to hold vote on possible school district withdrawal" Bangor Daily News. (August 18, 2015) <http://bangordailynews.com/2015/08/18/news/midcoast/rockland-to-hold-vote-on-possible-school-district-withdrawal/> and St. George Municipal School Unit. Philosophy/Program Guide <http://stgeorgemsu.org/about/>
- ⁹⁰ Ibid
- ⁹¹ Institute for Public Administration, University of Delaware. Delaware School District Organization & Boundaries: Closing the Gap. (March 2004)

http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCAQFJAAahUKEwjN6dz_8IDIAhWVEJIKHd6wDDI&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.doe.k12.de.us%2Fsite%2Fhandlers%2Fdownload.ashx%3Fmoduleinstanceid%3D3431%26dataid%3D10922%26FileName%3DDelSchDistOrg-Boundaries.pdf&usq=AFOjCNGc2eALwYFogLYwuSJL-4kCMCJ-rq

⁹² Niemeyer, A. et al. The Courts, the Legislature, and Delaware's Resegregation: A report on School Segregation in Delaware, 1989-2010. UCLA Civil Rights Project. (December 2014) <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/courts-the-legislature-and-delawares-resegregation/niemeyer-delaware-segregation-2015.pdf>

⁹³ Armor, D. et al. Desegregation and Resegregation in the Public Schools. Hoover Press.

http://www.hoover.org/sites/default/files/uploads/documents/0817998721_219.pdf

⁹⁴ Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau. Bulletin No. 97-4. Reconfiguring the Structure of School Districts. (January 1997)

<https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Publications/InterimReports/1997/Bulletin97-04.pdf>

⁹⁵ Augustine, C. et al. Options for Changing the Governance System of the Los Angeles Unified School District. RAND (December 2005) http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/working_papers/2005/RAND_WR333.pdf

⁹⁶ Ibid

⁹⁷ Ibid

⁹⁸ Cohn, C. Time to Break up the Los Angeles school system. Ed Source. June 3, 2015. <http://edsources.org/2015/time-to-break-up-the-los-angeles-school-system/80754>

⁹⁹ The exposure rate is a demographic segregation measure that illustrates the distribution of racial groups among organizational units and is used to determine the average contact between different groups. It is determined by summing the product of the following two ratios for each school: (1) the ratio of students of a particular race in each school to the total number of students in that racial group for the whole district; and (2) the ratio of students of a comparison race in each school to the total school population. For a detailed formula, see Appendix A of Orfield, G. et al. Segregating California's Future: Inequality and its Alternative 60 Years after *Brown v. Board of Education*, May 2014. Civil Rights Project. <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/segregating-california2019s-future-inequality-and-its-alternative-60-years-after-brown-v.-board-of-education/orfield-ee-segregating-california-future-brown-at.pdf>