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I. INTRODUCTION

In 2015, the Nevada Legislature enacted Assembly Bill 394 (Chapter 543, Statutes of Nevada), which calls for a plan to reorganize the Clark County School District (CCSD). Due to the growth of the greater Las Vegas area and the way Nevada has organized school districts on a countywide basis, CCSD has grown to become the fifth largest in the country with 320,000 students. Many have looked to restructuring CCSD into something more manageable as a solution to our State’s consistently poor educational rankings. The bill created an Advisory Committee, composed of legislators, and a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), composed of members of various communities, to develop a plan to reorganize CCSD. The role of the TAC is to provide the legislative Advisory Committee with technical expertise, input, advice, and assistance.

The TAC held a public meeting in Las Vegas, Nevada on June 17, 2016. A majority of the TAC Committee was present. The findings in this report were derived from recommendations made during the three hearings TAC held exclusively for interested community groups. The findings were approved unanimously and without modification by the TAC during its June 17, 2016, meeting.

Each member of the TAC submitted recommendations, which the members asked the TAC to consider including in its report. The approved recommendations, some of which were modified during discussion amongst the members, are also included in this report. The members’ recommendations appear in their original form in Appendix B.

The full report will be forwarded to the Advisory Committee to Develop a Plan to Reorganize the Clark County School District and to the consultant to the Advisory Committee for their consideration as they develop the plan to reorganize the school district.

A. COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND STAFF

Section 26 of A.B. 394 prescribed the appointments to the TAC, which consists of the following:

- One member appointed by the governing body of each incorporated city located within Clark County—Carolyn G. Goodman, Mayor, City of Las Vegas; Andy A. Hafen, Mayor, City of Henderson; Kraig Hafen, City Council Member, City of Mesquite; John J. Lee, Mayor, City of North Las Vegas; and Rich Shuman, City Council Member, City of Boulder City;
• One member appointed by the Governor—Daniel Stewart;

• One member appointed by the State Board of Education—Allison Serafin;

• One member appointed by the CCSD Board of Trustees—Dr. Linda E. Young, President;

• One member appointed by the Clark County Board of County Commissioners—Mary Beth Scow, Commissioner;

• One member appointed by the Legislative Commission from a list of recommendations made by the Clark County Education Association (CCEA)—John Vellardita;

• One member appointed by the Legislative Commission from a list of recommendations made by the Urban Chamber of Commerce—Hannah Brown;

• One member appointed by the Legislative Commission from a list of recommendations made by the Las Vegas Latin Chamber of Commerce—Tom Rodriguez;

• One member who is a parent or guardian of a CCSD pupil appointed by the Legislative Commission from a list of recommendations made by the Nevada Parent Teacher Association—Stavan Corbett;

• One member appointed by the Legislative Commission from a list of recommendations made by the Las Vegas Asian Chamber of Commerce—Duncan R. Lee; and

• Any other persons who have knowledge, experience, or expertise in the matters before the Advisory Committee, appointed by the Chair of the Advisory Committee—Senator Becky Harris, Chair, TAC; Senator Michael Roberson; Assemblyman David M. Gardner; Vikki Courtney; Brent Husson; Marsha Irvin, Vice Chair, TAC; Brian Knudsen; Ashok “Ash” Mirchandani; Dr. Larry Moses; and Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent, CCSD.

The Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) provided staff services to the TAC. Research Division staff included Kelly S. Richard, Principal Research Analyst; Janet Coons, Principal Administrative Assistant; and Christina Harper, Senior Research Secretary. Risa B. Lang, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel, and Karly O’Krent, Senior Deputy Legislative Counsel, provided staff services from the Legal Division. Julie Waller, Senior Program Analyst, provided staff services from the Fiscal Analysis Division.

B. MEETINGS AND ACTIVITIES

To date, the TAC has held nine meetings. Three of those meetings consisted exclusively of presentations by interested community groups, including the Asian Chamber of Commerce; the Latin Chamber of Commerce; the Urban Chamber of Commerce; the cities of Henderson,
Las Vegas, Mesquite, and North Las Vegas; Clark County; Laughlin; Moapa Valley; Sandy Valley; the Clark County Black Caucus; Honoring Our Public Education; and the Nevada Parent Teacher Association.

All meetings were open to the public and conducted through simultaneous videoconference between legislative meeting rooms at the Grant Sawyer State Office Building in Las Vegas, Nevada, and the Legislative Building in Carson City, Nevada. The summaries of testimony and exhibits are available online at: http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Interim/78th2015/Committee/Studies/CCSDTechAdv/?ID=60.

II. FINDINGS OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Based on the testimony provided during the TAC’s meetings and numerous supporting documents, including community outreach surveys and presentations by those with expertise in school district organization, the TAC finds the following relating to the CCSD:

A. TEACHER TRAINING

Teachers and administrators should have access to professional development training that addresses teacher, administrator, and student needs.

Professional development training should be created with specific, identifiable student achievement outcomes and be made available across multiple platforms (in person and virtual).

B. MORE CLASSROOMS/SMALLER CLASS SIZES

Class size reduction should remain a priority and be utilized to promote increased student achievement.

More resources should be allocated for special needs students.

The Nevada System of Higher Education should offer academic coursework for teachers and administrators that are aligned with the needs of Nevada’s students.

C. AUTONOMY/DECENTRALIZATION

Schools currently operating with greater autonomy, from the central office, should be allowed to continue along that model. Opportunities for increased decision making at the school site level should be expanded. Greater autonomy should be allowed at the school site level for budgetary decision making, including, but not limited to, programs to support curriculum, transportation, and equipment purchases.
D. ALLOW PARENTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE DECISION MAKING PROCESSES TO IMPROVE PARENT/TEACHER/STUDENT COMMUNICATION

Pathways should be created for direct and meaningful parental participation in public schools, including parental and community input on issues such as school budgets, curriculum, discipline, and food services.

School-based governing bodies should be established that include: administrators, businesses, community members, parents, students, and teachers to address and support student achievement at the school level.

Meetings may be held after normal work hours and/or at locations convenient to the school community.

E. CULTURAL REPRESENTATION

There should be more cultural diversification among teachers and administrators.

F. EARLY PREPARATION

More emphasis should be placed on early learning programs, including early childhood education, pre-kindergarten programs, and Head Start programs.

G. EXTRACURRICULAR PROGRAMS

Extracurricular programs expand students’ learning opportunities. Extracurricular programs should be supported and expanded, including: before and after school programs; community centers; libraries; summer science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) programs; and sports.

H. UPDATED TECHNOLOGY

Investments should be made to upgrade technology in classrooms. Access to technology for students outside of school should be expanded. Improving access to technology within communities outside of school would improve communication between parents and teachers.

I. TUTORING

Tutoring programs should be encouraged for students.

Mentoring programs should be encouraged for students, teachers, and administrators.
J. ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING/ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE/ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION FUNDING

English language learning (ELL) programs and English language acquisition programs should be expanded to include all children experiencing language challenges.

K. INCENTIVES TO KEEP TEACHERS LONGER

More incentives should be provided for the recruitment, hiring, and retention of qualified teachers and administrators.

L. MAGNET/CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Magnet and career and technical education (CTE) programs should be continued and expanded.

M. TRANSPORTATION

Transportation available to rural schools should be more flexible.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A. DECENTRALIZATION

Properly vet highly qualified school principals before they are placed in each school and provided with greater control and latitude in developing the budgets and curricula of their schools. Provide appropriate technical business training and assistance. Give schools flexibility in responding to the unique needs and circumstances of their students with regard to additional funding, curriculum, course and extracurricular offerings, and staff development and training, especially as age/divisional matriculation warrants (elementary, junior high, high school).

(Submitted by Carolyn G. Goodman, Mayor, City of Las Vegas)

Make each school its own precinct for purposes of the reorganization plan.

(Submitted by Kraig Hafen, City Council Member, City of Mesquite)

Provide significantly more budgetary and instructional autonomy to local schools, and transition the district to a model that enables individual schools to control at least 85 percent of their budgets at the school level, with the available unrestricted federal funds to be determined by the consultant to the Advisory Committee to develop the plan to reorganize the school...
district, in part by defining what a central service agency will be, the services to be provided, and associated costs.

(Submitted by John Vellardita, CCEA)

Mandate and formalize an autonomous, site-based decision making team at all schools, including the duties of the team, membership of the team, designation of the team chair, development of an appeal process for team decisions, required meetings to review the school’s plan and budget, and share achievement and attitudinal results.

(Submitted by Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent, CCSD)

B. EDUCATIONAL PROFESSIONALS

Increase teachers’ salaries across the board. Establish educational and training requirements, along with competitive salaries, to attract and retain the best and brightest teachers for CCSD. Require CCSD to staff each classroom with a certified, licensed full-time teacher except at the high school level, in which case, specialists with high-level academic degrees may be certified because of their educational specialty and education.

(Submitted by Carolyn G. Goodman, Mayor, City of Las Vegas)

Transition the district office to a central service agency, charged with providing essential noninstructional services to schools, and create a leadership system within CCSD to give school leaders the relevant skills they need to effectively and accountably manage a site-based decision making team.

(Submitted by John Vellardita, CCEA)

Include in the reorganization plan new principal training and skills development that incorporate the competencies needed to operate a site-based system. This will require access and collaboration with the available resources in higher education, nonprofit think tanks, and the business community to design a training and evaluation system that adequately reflects the attainment of the required core competencies.

(Submitted by Brent Husson)

Establish a district training program, including both internal and external experts, to identify training topics and develop recommendations for methods of implementation. This delivery of professional development by district staff may include a readiness assessment, blended learning, face-to-face learning sessions, differentiated support, and onboarding of site-based decision making team members.

(Submitted by Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent, CCSD)
C. LOCAL CONTROL AND GOVERNANCE

Establish optional (permissive) education councils that give parents and the community a greater voice in public education.

(Submitted by Andy A. Hafen, Mayor, City of Henderson)

Create site-based decision making teams for school precincts that make decisions regarding the education of students, including the principal, teachers, and support staff of a school; parents; and both elected members and members appointed by the governing bodies where the students come from (specifically, either the city council, township board, or both.)

(Submitted by Kraig Hafen, City Council Member, City of Mesquite)

Create site-based decision making teams at local schools made up of parents, teachers, support staff, and school leaders with shared decision making. Transition CCSD’s current top-down administrative framework to a standard-based system for the site-based decision making model around student outcomes.

(Submitted by John Vellardita, CCEA)

At the discretion of the site-based decision making team, provide stipends for parents and family members of students who serve on local school site governance boards and engage in new models of family engagement to boost parental involvement in local schools, especially in urban areas.

(Submitted by John Vellardita, CCEA)

Request the consultant to the Advisory Committee to develop the plan to reorganize the school district to address challenges and needs unique to the rural areas of CCSD in the reorganization plan.

(Submitted by Dr. Larry Moses on behalf of Moapa Valley)

Allow site-based decision making teams to have input in the selection of teachers, administrators, and curriculum, and make decisions concerning expenditures at local schools.

(Submitted by Dr. Larry Moses on behalf of Sandy Valley)

D. PER PUPIL FUNDING

Establish an increased per pupil allocation, including a base figure plus access to additional fund allocations not limited to special needs, gifted, ELL, Title I, and other circumstances as designated by earmarked funding sources. Ensure the per-pupil increased allocation follows
each pupil to the school he or she attends, without exception, so that a firm budget is allocated to each school for management.

(Submitted by Carolyn G. Goodman, Mayor, City of Las Vegas)

Limit spending at the district level in order to make sure that money follows students and precincts are able to execute their objectives without significant financial restraint.

(Submitted by Kraig Hafen, City Council Member, City of Mesquite)

Accelerate the transition to a weighted student funding formula to ensure that local schools have the resources they need to adequately educate their student populations, and mandate any new money added due to weights on the funding formula stay with the individual students at schools.

(Submitted by John Vellardita, CCEA)

E. OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

Study changes to be made to attendance zones, assignments to schools, magnet schools, CTE schools, select school programs, and federally mandated programs to ensure equitable funding under the Nevada Plan, equitable access and opportunity for all students, and compliance with federal and State law, prior to adoption of a reorganization plan.

(Submitted by Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent, CCSD)

Site-based decision making teams should address education inequity by identifying schools where inequities exist and develop a plan for each, including, but not limited to: advanced placement and gifted and talented education programs, curriculum, CTE programs, discipline disparities, facilities, and teacher shortages.

(Submitted by Marsha Irvin)

Implement the requirements of the Every Student Succeeds Act.

(Submitted by Marsha Irvin)

Consider the community schools model as a reform strategy.

(Submitted by Marsha Irvin)

Provide more access for high-quality preschool programs.

(Submitted by Marsha Irvin)
Examine existing CCSD funding and expenditures including operations, capital expenditures, and management-based (central office) budgeting/spending. Make the central administrative budget available for public inspection. Ensure the central budget is transparent and presented in an understandable format.

(Submitted by Carolyn G. Goodman, Mayor, City of Las Vegas)
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APPENDIX A

Assembly Bill 394 (Chapter 543, Statutes of Nevada 2015)
AN ACT relating to education; authorizing boards of trustees of contiguous school districts to consolidate their respective school districts; creating an advisory committee and technical advisory committee for the purpose of developing a plan to reorganize the Clark County School District into certain local school precincts; providing for the membership, compensation and duties of the committees; requiring the State Board of Education to adopt regulations providing for the implementation of the plan; revising provisions related to collective bargaining, contingent upon implementation of the plan; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Legislative Counsel’s Digest:
Existing law requires each local government employer to engage in collective bargaining with the recognized employee organization, if any, for each appropriate bargaining unit among its employees. (NRS 288.150) For these purposes, effective upon implementation of the plan for the reorganization of the Clark County School District into local school precincts pursuant to sections 21-29 of this bill, section 20.7 of this bill provides that the District remains a local government employer with respect to employees engaged in any centralized services or functions provided or performed by the District, while each local school precinct becomes the local government employer of employees engaged in the services or functions of the local school precinct. Existing law establishes a process for the resolution of impasses in bargaining involving a school district and an employee organization representing teachers or educational support personnel. (NRS 288.217) Section 20.9 of this bill revises these provisions to make them applicable also to a local school precinct.

Existing law creates county school districts, the boundaries of which are coterminous with the boundaries of the counties of this State. (NRS 386.010) Sections 20.1 and 20.2 of this bill authorize two or more boards of trustees of contiguous school districts to consolidate the respective school districts by interlocal agreement.

Section 25 of this bill provides for the creation of an advisory committee for the purpose of developing a plan to reorganize the Clark County School District into local school precincts and to study the distribution of federal, state and local funds and the impact of local school precincts on public school financing. Section 26 of this bill creates a technical advisory committee for the purpose of assisting the advisory committee. Sections 25 and 26 also provide for the membership, compensation and duties of the respective committees. Section 27 of this bill requires the advisory committee, in consultation with the technical advisory committee, to contract with a consultant for the purposes of conducting a study with respect to developing the plan and with the study of the distribution of federal, state and local funds and the impact of the precincts on public school financing. Section 27 authorizes the advisory committee to request from the Interim Finance Committee an allocation of money to conduct the study. Section 27 prescribes the
subject matter which must be contemplated by the advisory committee in
developing the plan. **Section 28** of this bill requires the Board of County
Commissioners of Clark County to conduct certain public meetings within the
County for the purpose of receiving public comment and input with respect to a
proposed plan. **Section 28** requires the advisory committee to file the plan with the
State Board of Education, the Board of Trustees of the Clark County School
District and the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau for transmittal to the
79th Session of the Nevada Legislature. **Section 28** also requires the State Board to
adopt regulations necessary and appropriate to effectuate the implementation of the
plan not later than the 2018-2019 school year. The plan must not be implemented
until the regulations are adopted and effective.

EXPLANATION – Matter in **bolded italics** is new; matter between brackets [omitted material] is material to be omitted.

**WHEREAS,** The system of public education in Nevada is
organized by county school districts, the boundaries of which are
coterminous with the boundaries of this State; and

**WHEREAS,** Recent statistics indicate that the Clark County
School District is ranked as the fifth school district in the nation
with the highest enrollment of pupils and the seventh largest by area
in the continental United States, covering over 8,000 square miles;
and

**WHEREAS,** The Clark County School District, with a pupil
enrollment of approximately 315,000 pupils, accounts for 70 percent
of the pupils who are enrolled in the public schools of this State;
and

**WHEREAS,** The unique geography of this State has resulted in
the concentration of some schools and pupils at locations that are
considerably distant and remote from the centralized administrative
offices of the various school districts; and

**WHEREAS,** Allowing smaller school districts to consolidate
services, functions and personnel could result in cost effective
savings and provide more accessibility for pupils and parents who
reside in remote areas of this State; and

**WHEREAS,** 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; and

**WHEREAS,** The plan to develop local school precincts will take a
considerable amount of time and study to ensure the plan is
designed in a manner that benefits the residents of the Clark County
School District; now, therefore,
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, REPRESENTED IN SENATE AND ASSEMBLY, DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

Sections 1-20. (Deleted by amendment.)
Sec. 20.1. NRS 277.103 is hereby amended to read as follows:

277.103 1. The governing bodies of a county, the largest city, and each other incorporated city which chooses to participate may consolidate the services provided by those governments, by interlocal agreement pursuant to the provisions of NRS 277.105.

2. Two or more boards of trustees of contiguous school districts may consolidate the respective school districts, by interlocal agreement pursuant to the provisions of subsection 3 of NRS 277.105. The boundaries of a consolidated school district created by interlocal agreement must be coterminous with the boundaries of the contiguous school districts being consolidated.

3. The provisions of this section and NRS 277.105 supplement, and in case of conflict prevail over, the provisions of NRS 277.110 to 277.180, inclusive.

Sec. 20.2. NRS 277.105 is hereby amended to read as follows:

277.105 1. In a county in which governmental services are consolidated, the governing bodies may establish a permanent administrative entity to perform specific functions throughout the participating cities and in the unincorporated area of the county, including, but not limited to:

(a) Prevention and suppression of fire.
(b) Sanitation and sewerage.
(c) Planning, regulation of use of land and buildings, inspection of buildings for safety, and the issuance of building permits.
(d) Regulation of business and gaming and issuance of business and gaming licenses.
(e) Provision of parks and recreation, including the maintenance of existing facilities.
(f) Provision of informational systems and data processing for the county and participating cities.
(g) General services and the maintenance of buildings and vehicles for the county and participating cities.

2. The county and each participating city may negotiate concerning the manner of contributing to the budget of the administrative entity in proportion to the sum of revenues derived by each from taxes, licenses for business and gaming, and fees for services performed, in each city and in the unincorporated area of the county, respectively.

3. An interlocal agreement entered into between two or more boards of trustees for the purposes of consolidating contiguous
school districts may set forth any terms and conditions necessary to facilitate the creation, operation, management and administration of the consolidated school district.

Sec. 20.3. Chapter 288 of NRS is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section to read as follows:

“Local school precinct” means a local school precinct that is organized in the Clark County School District in accordance with a plan developed and implemented pursuant to sections 21 to 29, inclusive, of this act.

Sec. 20.5. NRS 288.020 is hereby amended to read as follows:

288.020 As used in this chapter, unless the context otherwise requires, the words and terms defined in NRS 288.025 to 288.075, inclusive, and section 20.3 of this act have the meanings ascribed to them in those sections.

Sec. 20.7. NRS 288.060 is hereby amended to read as follows:

1. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 3, “local government employer” means any political subdivision of this State or any public or quasi-public corporation organized under the laws of this State.

2. The term includes, without limitation, counties, cities, unincorporated towns, school districts, charter schools, hospital districts, irrigation districts and other special districts.

3. Regarding the Clark County School District, the term means:

(a) With respect to any centralized services or functions provided or performed by the District in accordance with a plan developed and implemented pursuant to sections 21 to 29, inclusive, of this act, the District; or

(b) With respect to the services or functions of a local school precinct not described in paragraph (a), the local school precinct.

Sec. 20.9. NRS 288.217 is hereby amended to read as follows:

288.217 1. The provisions of this section govern negotiations between school districts or local school precincts and employee organizations representing teachers and educational support personnel.

2. If the parties to a negotiation pursuant to this section have failed to reach an agreement after at least four sessions of negotiation, either party may declare the negotiations to be at an impasse and, after 5 days’ written notice is given to the other party, submit the issues remaining in dispute to an arbitrator. The arbitrator must be selected in the manner provided in subsection 2 of
NRS 288.200 and has the powers provided for fact finders in NRS 288.210.

3. The arbitrator shall, within 30 days after the arbitrator is selected, and after 7 days’ written notice is given to the parties, hold a hearing to receive information concerning the dispute. The hearing must be held in the county in which the school district or local school precinct is located and the arbitrator shall arrange for a full and complete record of the hearing.

4. The parties to the dispute shall each pay one-half of the costs of the arbitration.

5. A determination of the financial ability of a school district or local school precinct must be based on:

(a) All existing available revenues as established by the school district or local school precinct and within the limitations set forth in NRS 354.6241, with due regard for the obligation of the school district or local school precinct to provide an education to the children residing within the district or local school precinct.

(b) Consideration of funding for the current year being negotiated. If the parties mutually agree to arbitrate a multi-year contract the arbitrator must consider the ability to pay over the life of the contract being negotiated or arbitrated.

7. If the parties do not enter into negotiations or do not agree within 30 days after the hearing held pursuant to subsection 3, each of the parties shall submit a single written statement containing its final offer for each of the unresolved issues.

8. The arbitrator shall, within 10 days after the final offers are submitted, render a decision on the basis of the criteria set forth in NRS 288.200. The arbitrator shall accept one of the written statements and shall report the decision to the parties. The decision of the arbitrator is final and binding on the parties. Any award of the arbitrator is retroactive to the expiration date of the last contract between the parties.

9. The decision of the arbitrator must include a statement:
(a) Giving the arbitrator’s reason for accepting the final offer that is the basis of the arbitrator’s award; and
(b) Specifying the arbitrator’s estimate of the total cost of the award.

10. Within 45 days after the receipt of the decision from the arbitrator, the board of trustees of the school district or the governing body of the local school precinct, as applicable, shall hold a public meeting in accordance with the provisions of chapter 241 of NRS. The meeting must include a discussion of:
   (a) The issues submitted pursuant to subsection 2;
   (b) The statement of the arbitrator pursuant to subsection 9; and
   (c) The overall fiscal impact of the decision which must not include a discussion of the details of the decision.
   The arbitrator must not be asked to discuss the decision during the meeting.

11. The superintendent of the school district or the executive head of the local school precinct shall report to the board of trustees or the governing body of the local school precinct, as applicable, the fiscal impact of the decision. The report must include, without limitation, an analysis of the impact of the decision on compensation and reimbursement, funding, benefits, hours, working conditions or other terms and conditions of employment.

12. As used in this section:
   (a) “Educational support personnel” means all classified employees of a school district, other than teachers, who are represented by an employee organization.
   (b) “Teacher” means an employee of a school district who is licensed to teach in this State and who is represented by an employee organization.

Sec. 21. As used in sections 21 to 29, inclusive, of this act, unless the context otherwise requires, the words and terms defined in sections 22, 23 and 24 of this act have the meanings ascribed to them in those sections.

Sec. 22. “Advisory committee” means the advisory committee created by section 25 of this act.

Sec. 23. “Plan” means the plan required by paragraph (a) of subsection 1 of section 25 of this act.

Sec. 24. “Technical advisory committee” means the technical advisory committee created by section 26 of this act.

Sec. 24.5. The Legislature hereby finds and declares that a general law cannot be made applicable to the purposes, objects, powers, rights, privileges, immunities, liabilities, duties and disabilities provided in sections 21 to 29, inclusive, of this act.
because of the number of atypical factors and special conditions relating to the Clark County School District.

Sec. 25. 1. There is hereby created an advisory committee to:
   (a) Develop a plan and recommendations to reorganize the Clark County School District into local school precincts not later than the 2018-2019 school year.
   (b) Study the distribution of federal, state and local funds and the impact of local school precincts on public school financing.

2. The advisory committee consists of nine members appointed as follows:
   (a) Four members of the Senate who are elected from districts which include any area located within Clark County, two of whom are appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate and two of whom are appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate.
   (b) Four members of the Assembly who are elected from districts which include any area located within Clark County, two of whom are appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly and two of whom are appointed by the Minority Leader of the Assembly.
   (c) One Legislator appointed by the Legislative Commission who is elected from a district which includes any area located within Clark County.

3. At the first meeting of the advisory committee, the advisory committee shall elect a Chair and a Vice Chair from among its members.

4. A majority of the members of the advisory committee constitutes a quorum for the transaction of business, and a majority of those members present at any meeting is sufficient for any official action taken by the advisory committee.

5. A vacancy in the membership of the advisory committee must be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

6. Members of the advisory committee serve without compensation, except that a member is entitled, while engaged in the business of the advisory committee, to receive the per diem allowance and travel expenses provided for state officers and employees generally.

Sec. 26. 1. To assist the advisory committee with technical expertise, input, advice and assistance, a technical advisory committee is hereby created consisting of the following members:
   (a) One member appointed by the governing body of each incorporated city located within Clark County.
   (b) One member appointed by the Governor.
   (c) One member appointed by the State Board of Education.
(d) One member appointed by the Board of Trustees of the Clark County School District.

(e) One member appointed by the Board of County Commissioners of Clark County.

(f) One member appointed by the Legislative Commission from a list of recommendations made by the Clark County Education Association.

(g) One member appointed by the Legislative Commission from a list of recommendations made by the Urban Chamber of Commerce.

(h) One member appointed by the Legislative Commission from a list of recommendations made by the Latin Chamber of Commerce, Nevada Inc.

(i) 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.

(j) One member appointed by the Legislative Commission from a list of recommendations made by the Las Vegas Asian Chamber of Commerce.

(k) Any other persons who have knowledge, experience or expertise in the matters before the advisory committee, appointed by the Chair of the advisory committee.

2. At the first meeting of the technical advisory committee, the technical advisory committee shall elect a Chair and a Vice Chair from among its members.

3. The members of the technical advisory committee serve without compensation, except that a member is entitled, while engaged in the business of the technical advisory committee, to receive the per diem allowance and travel expenses provided for state officers and employees generally.

 Sec. 27. 1. The advisory committee shall, in consultation with the technical advisory committee and to the extent money is available pursuant to subsection 2 and from any gifts or grants received for this purpose:

(a) Contract with a qualified independent consultant to perform a study and assist the advisory committee with:

(1) Developing the plan required by paragraph (a) of subsection 1 of section 25 of this act; and

(2) Studying the distribution of federal, state and local funds and the impact of local school precincts on public school financing.
(b) As soon as practicable, establish benchmarks that must be met within the Clark County School District to ensure that the plan may be implemented not later than the 2018-2019 school year.

2. The advisory committee may request approval from the Interim Finance Committee for an allocation of money to conduct the plan and the study required pursuant to paragraph (a) of subsection 1.

3. The plan and the study conducted pursuant to paragraph (a) of subsection 1 must be completed on or before January 1, 2017.

4. In developing the plan to reorganize the Clark County School District, the advisory committee must:
   (a) Ensure equity in the reorganization of the Clark County School District with respect to the Nevada Plan.
   (b) Take into consideration:
       (1) The contiguous boundaries of each proposed local school precinct.
       (2) The allocation, dedication and transfer of any revenue to a local school precinct that may be dedicated to capital projects and improvements for schools and school facilities, school programs, pupils or other costs directly incidental to the operation, management and administration of the local school precinct.
       (3) The authority to issue bonds or otherwise raise revenue.
       (4) The application for and receipt of any grant, gift or bequest.
       (5) The creation and administration of accounts to manage any money received by a local school precinct.
       (6) The transfer of any interest in real or personal property, including, without limitation, lease agreements.
       (7) Precinct planning and management, including, without limitation, financial planning for school programs, pupil funding and capital projects and improvements.
       (8) Administrative support, including, without limitation, accounting, data processing, payroll and purchasing agreements.
       (9) The liability of a local school precinct with respect to any duties and obligations of the Board of Trustees of the Clark County School District which will be assumed by the governing body of a precinct.
       (10) The civil and administrative liability of a local school precinct and its employees.
       (11) Interlocal agreements between a local school precinct and a state, county or regional planning authority.
       (12) Staffing, including, without limitation, the transfer, reassignment or hiring of personnel.
(13) Employment contracts and collective bargaining.
(14) Employee and pupil safety.
(15) The maintenance of schools, school facilities and school
grounds.
(16) Transportation.
(17) Interscholastic athletics and activities.
(18) Curriculum.
(19) The provision of services and education to pupils:
    (I) Who have limited proficiency in the English language.
    (II) Who are eligible for free or reduced-price lunches
pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1751 et seq.
    (III) With disabilities.
(20) The composition of the governing body for each local
school precinct and the compensation, if any, of the members of a
governing body.
  (c) Ensure that the Clark County School District is funded in
accordance with the Nevada Plan and that such funding is
distributed on a per pupil basis among the local school precincts
created by the plan.
  (d) Authorize one or more local school precincts to consider and
agree with the Clark County School District to share in any bonding
capacity of the District and to otherwise raise revenue.
  5. As used in this section, “Nevada Plan” means the formula
created for providing state financial aid to public education
prescribed in NRS 387.121.
Sec. 28. 1. Upon completion of the preliminary findings and
the proposed plan prepared pursuant to subparagraph (1) of
paragraph (a) of subsection 1 of section 27 of this act, the Board of
County Commissioners of Clark County shall conduct not less than
six public meetings. Not less than one of the public meetings
conducted pursuant to this section must be held in an unincorporated
area of Clark County.
  2. At each public meeting conducted pursuant to this section,
the advisory committee and the consultant retained pursuant to
paragraph (a) of subsection 1 of section 27 of this act shall present
the preliminary findings and the proposed plan prepared pursuant to
subparagraph (1) of paragraph (a) of subsection 1 of section 27 of
this act for the purpose of receiving public comment and input.
  3. Upon completion of the public meetings conducted pursuant
to this section, the advisory committee shall:
    (a) Revise the proposed plan, as necessary;
    (b) File the proposed plan with the State Board of Education and
the Board of Trustees of the Clark County School District; and
(c) Submit a copy of the proposed plan to the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau for transmittal to the 79th Session of the Nevada Legislature.

4. The State Board of Education shall adopt regulations necessary and appropriate to effectuate the implementation of the proposed plan not later than the 2018-2019 school year. The plan must not be implemented until the regulations are adopted and become effective.

Sec. 28.3. Upon notice from the State Board of Education that the plan developed pursuant to sections 21 to 29, inclusive, of this act has been implemented, the Governor shall issue a proclamation to that effect.

Sec. 28.5. The advisory committee shall submit a report of the results of the study required by paragraph (b) of subsection 1 of section 25 of this act and any recommendations for legislation to the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau for transmittal to the 79th Session of the Nevada Legislature.

Sec. 29. The members of the advisory committee and the technical advisory committee must be appointed on or before January 1, 2016. The Chair of the advisory committee shall convene the first meeting of the technical advisory committee.

Sec. 30. 1. This section and sections 20.1, 20.2 and 21 to 29, inclusive, of this act become effective on July 1, 2015.

2. Sections 20.3 to 20.9, inclusive, of this act become effective upon the issuance of the proclamation by the Governor pursuant to section 28.3 of this act.
APPENDIX B

Supporting Materials for Recommendations
Provided by Committee Members
FUNDING NECESSITIES and Transparency

1. ANY EFFECTIVE REORGANIZATION CANNOT possibly BE ACHIEVED WITHOUT NECESSARY and ADEQUATE FUNDING. THE FIRST STEP THEREFORE MUST BE THE EXAMINATION OF FACTUAL, TRANSPARENT, EXISTING FUND AVAILABILITIES AND EXPENDITURES IN: CCSD OPERATIONS, CAPITAL EXPENDITURES AND MANAGEMENT-BASED (Central office) BUDGETING/SPENDING. Thus the Central Administrative budget must be released and is herein requested—or will be subpoenaed, if need be. This Central budget must be presented with total transparency in a clear, concise understandable format.

Budgetary Issues and Per Pupil Allocation

2. Based on these clear and comprehensive budget figures, an increased per pupil allocation must be established which includes a base figure plus access to additional fund allocations not limited to special needs, gifted, ESL, Title 1, and other circumstances as designated by earmarked funding sources. The per pupil increased allocation must follow each student to THE school he attends, without exception, so that the firm budget is allocated to each school for management.

Decentralized Decision Making

3. Highly qualified school principals should be well-vetted to place in each school and thus have greater control and latitude in developing the budgets and curricula of their schools. Appropriate technical, business training and assistance must be provided. Schools should have flexibility in responding to the unique needs and circumstances of their students with regard to additional funding, curriculum, course and extra-curricular offerings, and staff development and training especially as age/divisional matriculation warrants (elementary, junior high, high school).

Teachers Are Key

4. Teacher salaries should be increased across the board. Educational and training requirements, along with competitive salaries, must be established to attract and retain the best and the brightest teachers for CCSD. Each classroom must have a certified, licensed full-time teacher except at the high school level in which specialists with high level academic degrees may be certified because of their educational specialty and education.
Recommendation to the Technical Advisory Committee to Develop a Plan to Reorganize the Clark County School District

Submitted by: City of Henderson Mayor Andy Hafen

Education Council

- An optional (permissive) Education Council that gives parents and the community a greater voice in public education.
- Can be established voluntarily by a local governing body such as a city or township.
- Exists independently from the site based councils required under the existing empowerment statute in NRS that will be a part of each precinct school site.
- Comprised of a combination of parents with a child or children attending the Clark County School District (CCSD) and members of the community.
- Responsibilities and authority should include:
  1. A guaranteed ability to obtain CCSD data for analytical and assessment purposes.
  2. Communication and coordination with site councils and CCSD on community issues.
  3. An advisory role on the selection of a school Principal in the event of a vacancy.
  4. Coordination of wrap-around services provided by local government to families as a means to enhance school performance and maximize educational opportunities.
  5. Authorization for the Education Council to raise donations to be spent on charitable activities that further educational excellence and address school, classroom, teacher and student needs; identification of grant opportunities.
  6. Creation of community-wide strengths and needs assessments.
  7. Ability to utilize municipal site sharing agreements.
- Education Councils should be encouraged to provide or augment training to principals and for parents and community members who will be involved in site councils at the individual school precinct level.
• Decision making, composition and terms of service:
  1. The local unit of government responsible for creating the Education Council determines how often members shall meet.
  2. Membership on an Education Council is initiated by appointment for a fixed term.
  3. Members of an Education Council must reside within the jurisdiction.
  4. Education Councils should seek to recruit members with experience in areas such as finance and human resources and from the local business community.
Education Council Recommendation Background

Submitted by: City of Henderson Mayor Andy Hafen

The City of Henderson appreciates the opportunity to contribute a recommendation to the Technical Advisory Committee to Develop a Plan to Reorganize the Clark County School District (CCSD).

The community of Henderson places a high value on education. In multiple surveys, residents have identified education as their number one priority. Henderson residents are engaged and want to play an active role in making decisions about education and schools in our community.

As part of the AB 394 information gathering process, Henderson hosted an open house, convened focus groups and conducted two online surveys, one in January of this year and one in March, where more than 1800 respondents answered questions and provided valuable feedback.

The top two concerns expressed by these participants were 1) quality of instruction and 2) student achievement. The bottom line expressed by parents and community members is that they want results.

They are happy with the schools in Henderson, but are dissatisfied with CCSD overall and they expressed a clear concern about the quality of education being provided to students across Southern Nevada whom they see as lacking the resources needed for academic success.

Henderson residents don’t just want good schools in their city, they want good schools for every student regardless of where they live. And they want Henderson’s two and three star schools to become four and five star schools.

Respondents also favored the City of Henderson playing an active role when it comes to supporting schools and education. They see the City as having a clear mandate to serve its citizens, including when it comes to education. More than 90% said that the City should be part of plans to reorganize the CCSD. In addition, they expressed a strong desire to see the City of Henderson taking the lead on strengthening relationships between schools and community partners and in efforts to help attract additional outside funding to enhance schools and provide more programs for students.
We also learned that respondents overwhelmingly do not feel the CCSD Board of Trustees represents their views and concerns. In addition, they do not believe they have access to the CCSD Board of Trustees or can directly influence decisions by the Board and its members.

Residents are very happy with the teachers at their local school and to a lesser extent, the administration, but they are overwhelmingly dissatisfied with the School Board’s leadership.

The top two factors they see as being most important to their child’s success in school are teachers, along with support and participation by parents. They want input on curriculum, teacher/principal performance and budget decisions.

Two-thirds of those asked from Henderson said that the best way for parents to be formally represented in decision making at their child’s school was by participating in a group that provides direction to the school on key decisions. But Henderson residents also said there should be a role for members of the community who are not parents to help in finding ways to ensure educational success.

More than half of all those asked directly said they would serve as part of a council that provides direction to schools on key decisions. The top issues where they want a say on such a council are 1) curriculum, 2) budgeting and 3) teacher/principal performance.

In order to address the concerns outlined above and to ensure that parents and other members of the community have a more direct voice in education, I am recommending that the AB 394 reorganization plan include an optional “Education Council” that can be put in place through action taken by a city such as Henderson or another government entity such as a Township.

These Education Councils will be reflective of community priorities, will serve as advocates for community needs and will offer the opportunity to promote demographic equity. Key areas of focus for Education Councils should include 1) establishing short and long term goals, 2) measuring school performance indicators and 3) engaging in ongoing assessments of students and their needs. Education Councils can also provide a sounding board for community input and feedback above and beyond what is given at the precinct level.

A detailed description of the complete Education Council recommendation has been submitted along with this background information for consideration by the members of the Technical Advisory Committee to Develop a Plan to Reorganize the Clark County School District.
Final Recommendation to the AB 394 Technical Advisory Committee from the City of Mesquite and Virgin Valley CEAB
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To: AB 394 Technical Advisory Committee

From: The City of Mesquite and the Virgin Valley Community Advisory Education Board (CEAB)

I. OVERVIEW

The Virgin Valley includes the City of Mesquite and the Township of Bunkerville. It is home to roughly 20,000 residents. At the outset of the Technical Advisory Committee hearings the City of Mesquite sent out a survey that received virtually more responses than any other community based on number or percentage. Two results of that survey demonstrate the disconnect between the very large, urban school district of Clark County and the small-town values and culture of the Virgin Valley. First, seventy-five percent (75%) of respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the current structure of the Clark County School District. Second, seventy-three (73%) of respondents disagreed with the statement, "Do you feel that the Clark County School District policies and procedures accurately represent you/your family?" Clearly, there is a disconnect between the priorities of the Clark County School District as a whole, and the Virgin Valley.

The following brief asks this committee to accept the recommendations of the City of Mesquite and Virgin Valley CEAB and recommend them for inclusion in the plan being drafted by Michael Strembitsky. Those recommendations are as follows:

1. That the Virgin Valley receive a precinct at each school located in the Virgin Valley for the purposes of AB 394.

2. That each precinct be organized by way of a precinct committee that makes critical decisions regarding the education of students. The precinct should
include the principal of a school, staff members, and both elected and appointed members. In the case of appointed members, these appointments should be made by the governing bodies where the students come from (specifically, either the city council, township board or both).

3. That district-wide spending be limited in order to make sure that money follows students, and precincts are able to execute their objectives without significant financial restraint.

II. ISSUES OF MAJOR CONCERN FOR THE VIRGIN VALLEY

A. THE VIRGIN VALLEY – MESQUITE AND BUNKERVILLE

The Virgin Valley has a population of about 20,000 and is made up of both the City of Mesquite and the Township of Bunkerville. Of that 20,000, roughly 25% of residents are below the age of 18. The Virgin Valley has four schools that are part of the Clark County School District: Virgin Valley High School (Mesquite); Charles Hughes Middle School (Mesquite); Virgin Valley Elementary School (Mesquite); and J.L. Bowler Elementary School (Bunkerville). All schools serve both the Mesquite and Bunkerville Communities, except for Virgin Valley Elementary, which serves only students in Mesquite.

B. FOUR MAJOR ISSUES OF CONCERN IN EDUCATION

1. Academic Opportunity

The Virgin Valley lacks the same academic opportunities that are available for students in the district who live in the Las Vegas Valley. This includes lack of access to magnet schools, technical schools, advanced placement classes, college and career centers, adult education and transportation for academic programs like debate, marching band and field trips. Specifically, through its presentations to the Technical Advisory Committee, the City of Mesquite demonstrated that Students in the Virgin Valley lack
access to at least 40 specialized educational courses, opportunities, or programs that are simply not offered in the Virgin Valley, but are offered to students who live in the Las Vegas Valley.

The district’s prohibition against local communities solving these problems and focusing on areas of learning where students might be more engaged has led to low graduation rates for at-risk student populations. For example, the graduation rate for Hispanic Students from Virgin Valley High School is 50%. This is directly connected to the fact that 279 Virgin Valley High School students qualify for “some type” of English Language Learning (ELL) need, but the Clark County School District does not have the resources to provide to students in the Virgin Valley. As a consequence, ELL students fall behind academically, are unable to catch up, and are left behind.

2. Athletic Opportunity

Virgin Valley student-athletes travel more than nearly all of their counterparts in the Clark County School District. Moreover, these students often miss more class time than their counterparts because of increased travel time. Finally, because Virgin Valley High School has less lighting for nighttime events and has a smaller gymnasium than other schools of its size in Clark County, students have to find time to practice either indoors from 6am to 10pm or find time to share facilities with the many other sports on campus. Since Virgin Valley High School has the same number of student athletes as many of the larger high schools (300+), its participation is highly disproportionate to the School District expected participation sizes. Virgin Valley schools are also unable to solve their own problems in these contexts, further disadvantaging students.

3. Special Education

The Clark County School District has a quota system that it uses to implement certain special education programs. Because schools in the Virgin Valley do not meet
these quotas, students with behavioral, mental or physical disabilities are grouped together in a single classroom at the school to which they are geographically zoned. This creates not only significant barriers to teaching and communication with special-needs students, but also creates an inherently unsafe situation for many children.

4. Collective Bargaining

Virgin Valley teachers make up a very small proportion of the Clark County Education Association. As a result, the best interests of Virgin Valley teachers are not generally served by sharing in the best interests of teachers in the Las Vegas Valley. For example, teachers in the Virgin Valley are required to obtain substitute teachers when they have to complete continuing education courses, since those courses are provided in the early afternoon in Las Vegas (nearly a 90 minute drive from Mesquite). That issue is complicated by the fact that it is difficult to become a member of the substitute teacher list through the Clark County School District for Mesquite residents. Specifically, fingerprinting, background checks and training must be completed in person at various offices in Las Vegas, requiring at least three hours of roadway travel per trip. This is the case even though the City of Mesquite has its own Police Department and schools who could provide the same or better services to the District, thereby allowing many more Mesquite residents to become substitute teachers.

Finally, under the most recent collective bargaining agreement, some teachers in the Virgin Valley must travel to Las Vegas for healthcare needs. This is true even though the City of Mesquite has its own urgent care, hospital, and numerous other medical facilities. Other hospitals and facilities abound in St. George, Utah, much less than half the distance of travel to Las Vegas.
III. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CITY OF MESQUITE AND VIRGIN VALLEY CEAB

A. CREATION OF PRECINCTS

The City of Mesquite and Virgin Valley CEAB recommend that precincts be created under AB 394. These groups further recommend that precincts be as small as possible in order to allow for as much local input and control as possible. The residents of Virgin Valley are in favor of four precincts (one at each school). Each school would constitute its own precinct with a precinct advisory board that is in control of all major decision making. This structure would allow for every school to be an empowerment school. To clarify, the terms “precinct” and “empowerment school” would be used synonymously.

B. PRECINCTS: ORGANIZATION, MEMBERSHIP, AND CONTROL

When it comes to school advisory boards for each of these empowerment schools, the City and CEAB recommend a board consisting, at a minimum, of the principal, school staff, some elected positions and one appointed position from the community governing board from which students come. For example, Virgin Valley High School would have one appointment made by the Mesquite City Council, and another by the Bunkerville Town Advisory Board. However, in case of Virgin Valley Elementary School, the Mesquite City Council would only make an appointment to that board, because there are no students from Bunkerville who attend Virgin Valley Elementary School.

As AB 394 permits, and the school empowerment model suggests, the City and CEAB recommend that local schools have decision making authority and purchasing
power over as many areas as possible. The City and CEAB want to ensure local control over the following key issues:

1. Staffing or being able to decide the number and types of employees within each school, including part time, support staff and teachers and substitute teaching.

2. Collective bargaining or allowing our Virgin Valley teachers and staff act as their own bargaining unit for issues like continuing education, and securing affordable healthcare closer to home.

3. Implementation of curriculum, including selecting and purchasing the materials, programs and supplies that the principal and teachers deem most appropriate for the students at their school.

4. Local control over programming, especially special education, English Language Learning and specialized courses and vocational training. There are many local professionals including those currently within the schools, who are ready and willing to implement more effective and appropriate programs than what the district currently offers but are unable to do so within our highly centralized school district.

C. HOW PRECINCTS SOLVE VIRGIN VALLEY’S PROBLEMS

Under the precinct/empowerment model, with district interference and control limited, Virgin Valley schools have already come up with plans to address the four major educational problems presented in section II(B).
1. **Academic Opportunity**

Virgin Valley principals and administrators (generally at the High School level) have already networked with local businesses and industries to create programming that would train and prepare Virgin Valley students for a variety of jobs and vocations. One such program would be a culinary training program at the high school. The instructor, equipment and supplies would be provided by a local casino’s culinary department in order to create a pipeline of employees for their company. This plan was proposed and in the works until the school district rejected the idea as being too complicated for the human resources department. Local empowerment would allow Virgin Valley High School to pursue these opportunities for its students without the red tape of district approval. Such programs would result in real educational opportunities for many students, including those who currently chose to drop out.

2. **Athletics**

With local control over athletics Virgin Valley would be able to compete with other sports teams closer to home, especially in St George, Utah. This would cut down on transportation costs and the disproportionate amount of time students spend outside of the classroom due to athletic participation. Moreover, allowing contracting with the City of Mesquite to use its recreational facilities on a more regular basis would provide a consistent place for students to practice. The status quo allows students to only use City facilities as a last resort when they are “pushed out” of other facilities or practice areas due to unforeseen circumstances.

Further, a highlight of the Virgin Valley’s ability to work together can be seen in the securing of a new gym facility. Currently, the gym at Virgin Valley High School is
the size of a standard middle school gym. Virgin Valley High School was promised a new gym decades ago when student-athlete population rose to a level necessitating a larger gym. That gym was never delivered. Interested parents, CEAB members, school administrators and City officials worked together over the course of several years to receive approval for a new gym. Approval was finally received in Spring of 2016. This gym will be a very welcome addition to the over-used and over-crowded facilities currently in use. Had precincts been in place sooner, there is little doubt the students of Virgin Valley could have been the beneficiaries of such a facility long ago.

3. Special Education

Principals have made it clear that one of the first orders of business under empowerment would be to reorganize our special education classrooms to reflect student needs rather than their ages and locations. In the Virgin Valley several proposals have been made to resolve this specific problem. They include: hiring a specialist for each area of need and assigning special needs students to a school location based on need, rather than age; hiring additional specialists at the elementary school level to avoid the extreme age disparity and inherent safety issues presented; reorganizing current staff or faculty to allow for more specialized, individual, targeted education of students with special needs; working with the community and local businesses to provide additional educational opportunities to special needs students, rather than the very literal “one size fits all” curriculum that is applied to all special needs students currently.

4. Collective Bargaining

Allowing Virgin Valley teachers to act as their own bargaining unit would enable them to secure benefits that are unique to them. The most prominent example is health care and allowing teachers to seek health care in St George, UT and in Mesquite rather than having to travel to Las Vegas for health needs. A second example is professional
development. Teachers should be allowed to bargain for either compensation for driving to Las Vegas for trainings or be allowed to participate via computer or phone rather than physically attending.

Furthermore, substitute teachers can be approved and vetted by local precincts according to state and federal standards. Background checks can be conducted by resources found in the City of Mesquite and advances in secured electronic communications would allow for much quicker document review times. Virgin Valley residents who wish to substitute teach in Virgin Valley schools should not be unduly burdened by extreme travel times and the very lengthy process necessary for a community of nearly two million. Allowing more freedom for precincts to solve and negotiate these issues with local teachers would result in practical solutions to easily solvable problems.

IV. CONCLUSION

The City of Mesquite and Township of Bunkerville are engaged, active communities that care deeply about the education of their children. The Virgin Valley Community Education Advisory Board, along with active Parent-Teacher Organizations at each school demonstrate that the Virgin Valley does not lack interested parents or community members for serving on precinct boards. Further, the principals, administrators and staff at Virgin Valley schools are some of the most highly qualified and experienced in the District. In most cases, they are pillars of the community and known by not only their students, but also members of the City Council, City executive staff, the Chamber of Commerce and local business owners.

The Virgin Valley will benefit greatly by utilizing AB 394 to specifically target areas that are of unique concern to the Virgin Valley. Such problems have previously not garnered enough attention at the District-wide level to warrant macro-level change. AB
394 finally allows for a true partnership to exist between the Clark County School District and Virgin Valley Schools. Community members will be able to establish tailored, locally-driven solutions that provide the greatest benefit possible to students. As a consequence students and schools will experience unprecedented progress.

The City of Mesquite and CEAB strongly recommend the changes advocated for in this brief be accepted by the AB 394 Technical Advisory Committee.
Clark County Education Association (CCEA) Recommendations to the AB394 Technical Advisory Committee:

After hearing more than 100 hours of testimony in the legislative and technical advisory committees created by AB394, and after conducting extensive research on its own, CCEA is prepared to make the following recommendations around district reorganization, school empowerment, and parent engagement:

Core Recommendations
Based on Committee testimony and our own research, CCEA would like to formally make the following core recommendations:

1) School Based Autonomy: CCEA recommends that the Committee directs CCSD to give significantly more budgetary and instructional autonomy to local schools, and transition the district to a model that enables individual schools to control at least 85% of their budget at the local school level.

2) Equity in Funding Where Real Dollars Follow Students: CCEA recommends that the Nevada Legislature accelerates CCSD’s transition to a weighted funding formula to ensure that local schools have the resources they need to adequately educate their student populations, and mandate that any new money added due to weights on the funding formula stay with individual students at schools.

3) Central Service Agency: CCEA recommends that the Committee direct CCSD to transition its central administrative system to a Central Services agency, charged with providing essential non-instructional services to schools, and create a Leadership Academy within CCSD to give school leaders the relevant skills they need to effectively and accountably manage an empowered local school.

4) Site Based Team Model: CCEA recommends that the Committee direct CCSD to stand up a system of board governance at local schools made up of a team of parents, teachers, and school leaders with shared decision making. Transition CCSD’s current top-down administrative framework to an accreditation system.

5) Parental Engagement: CCEA recommends that the Committee direct CCSD to create a program of stipends for parents and family members of students who serve on local school site governance boards, and engage in new models of family engagement to boost parental involvement in local schools, especially in urban areas.

If implemented with fidelity, CCEA believes that these reforms have the potential to significantly improve education service delivery in Clark County. Greater detail on these proposals is continued on the next page.
I. Direct CCSD to Transition All Schools to an Autonomous Model

When the Committee began its work in 2015, it was looking at breaking the Clark County School District (CCSD) into smaller pieces, but it was not fundamentally looking at reforming the education delivery system. CCEA is pleased that, rather than simply redrawing lines on a map, the Committee chose to take a critical look at the education delivery system in Southern Nevada. The Committee has brought in experts from all over the country, including Dr. Michael Strembinsky, the pioneer in decentralized school systems, to help it craft recommendations for education service delivery reform. Today, Southern Nevada is on the cusp of a fundamental change for the better in our school system – one that will give parents, teachers, and school leaders a greater ability to tailor public education to the specific needs of the children in our communities. Based on research conducted by CCEA and testimony heard before the Committee, CCEA recommends:

1) The Committee direct CCSD to transition all schools to an autonomous model of governance.

2) The Committee direct CCSD to build a system in which at least 85% of funds are budgeted and spent by a governing board at the local school.

II. Accelerate CCSD’s transition to a Weighted Funding Formula Based on the Actual Characteristics of Students in Schools so that Real Dollars Follow Students

In the 2014 Interim and the 2015 Legislative Session, the Nevada Legislature made significant strides in reforming the Nevada Plan for School Finance. This work culminated in the passage of SB508 in the 2015 session, which altered the way that funding is calculated for special education and directed NDE to develop a plan to determine weights that apply to special education, English Language Learners, at-risk populations, and gifted and talented populations. This weighted funding plan must be submitted in the 2015-16 Interim and the weights must be in place before FY2021-22.

Decentralized education service delivery models with autonomous schools that control their own budgets require equitable distribution of resources and funding, and it is clear that the current top-down model for distributing resources to schools creates a vast amount of inequity. CCSD faces a significant teacher shortage, and this shortage is concentrated in Clark County’s poorest schools. As the Committee heard in January, under the current model, when a school cannot find a teacher to hire for a school year, that resource is clawed back to the CCSD central office and redistributed for other purposes. If CCSD is to build a system where schools budget their own resources and allocate those resources to boost student achievement, this practice must stop. CCSD must build a model where money follows the student so that schools have the resources they need to educate the population that they serve.

As the Committee heard from Drs. Strembinsky, Ouchi, and Nadelstern, weighted funding and equitable resource distribution is necessary for the success of decentralized school models.

1 http://www.doe.nv.gov/Boards_Commissions_Councils/State_Board_of_Education/MeetingMaterials/
CCEA recognizes that the Nevada Legislature and NDE have made significant progress toward the reform of the Nevada Plan. In this context, CCEA would like to make the following recommendations:

1) NDE will be submitting a report on a weighted funding formula plan on or before October 1, 2016 to the Governor and the Director of the LCB for transmittal to the 2017 Legislature. CCEA recommends that the 2017 legislature enact a weighted funding formula for the 2018/19 school year and beyond.

2) Where there are adjustments in per-pupil student expenditures for the target populations (special education, English Language Learners, students living in poverty, at-risk students, and gifted and talented students) due to the new weighted funding formula, 100% of the adjusted amount follows the student to the school site, and that adjusted amount must be budgeted and spent at the school site and be in compliance with all state and federal laws and regulations.

III. Direct CCSD to Construct a Central Service Model and Provide Guidance to the District on Central Services vs. School Based Services

Rhetoric about school choice often misses a key point: principals and teachers at public school sites often have no choice when it comes to their own curriculum, management, and budget. Schools are most often directed by central administration to implement the programs they are purveying. By adopting a decentralized empowerment model, Nevada is attempting to give CCSD schools more local authority over their educational program by giving them more direct power over their budget. CCEA is pleased that the Committee has elected to work with Dr. Michael Strembinsky, the pioneer in the development of the school-based budgeting and central service (in contrast to central administration) models at the Edmonton School District, and as such, he is an expert in how to construct decentralized school systems. In this context, CCEA makes the following recommendations:

1) In consultation with Dr. Strembinsky, CCEA recommends that the Committee provide guidance to the school district on what should be a centralized expense and what should be a school site expense.

2) Generally, CCEA operates from the principle that instructional decisions should be made as close to the student as possible. Thus, CCEA believes that services such as instruction, the appointment of educational personnel, the selection of instructional materials and technology, and the selection of curriculum and instructional methodologies should be handled at the school level. In addition, numerous recent studies have shown that educator professional development programs work best when they are job-embedded\(^2\)\(^3\); thus, CCEA recommends that these professional development activities occur at the school level. Finally, CCEA recommends that funds for parent and family engagement be devolved to the school level so that engagement activities can be closer to the family populations that schools serve, whether urban or rural.

---


Central Services Department

- Non-instructional activities, including transportation, food services, utilities, security, building maintenance, data administration, grant administration, payroll & fiscal governance
- Principal appointment
- Evaluation and accreditation of local schools
- Clark County Leadership Academy – a new organization within CCSD with two core missions:
  o Principal/Administration training and development
  o Serve as a think tank for empowered education within CCSD
- Student assignment and placement- zoning and magnet school placement

School Site-Based Services

- Instruction & appointment of educational personnel
- Selection of instructional materials, methodology, and technology
- Site-based professional development for educational personnel
- Parental and family engagement
- Local school governance

3) CCEA also operates from the recognition that some services are better delivered by a centralized model. These services are non-instructional in nature and include activities including transportation, food services, utilities, security, building maintenance, data administration, grant administration, payroll & fiscal governance. CCEA believes the CCSD’s central services department should make decisions around the appointment of principals at local schools in alignment with the site based teams input in the hiring of principals. CCSD’s central services department should also be responsible for evaluating and accrediting local schools, to ensure that they are meeting their mission and strategic goals.

4) CCEA believes that CCSD should endeavor to build its own pipeline of school leaders (administration and educators) specifically trained to take on the increased responsibilities of an empowered school. As such, CCEA recommends that CCSD take a page from the empowerment experience in New York Public Schools and develop their own Leadership Academy to give school leaders the skills they need to effectively and accountably manage an empowered local school. Such a program could be funded through existing mechanisms like the Nevada Great Teaching and Leading Fund and through philanthropy. Elements of the NYC Leadership Academy program include:
   i) An intensive 5-week summer program that simulates the actual challenges of a struggling New York City school
   ii) A school based internship under the guidance of a successful principal
   iii) In person coursework and field experience
   iv) A pass-fail evaluation system

5) CCEA recommends that 85% of every dollar saved by the reorientation of CCSD's central administration to central services be re-allocated down to the local school level. The remaining 15% should go to build the Clark County Leadership Academy.
IV. Develop a Robust Governance System for Empowerment Schools and the CCSD Central Services Department

Current law (NRS 368.700-780) provides for the designation of empowerment schools within a framework of central school district control. This law has been in place since the mid-2000s, and enabled several schools within CCSD to demonstrate the success that could be had when key decisions were made at the local school level. The law even led the Obama Administration to highlight CCSD Empowerment Schools as models of success in public schooling. Unfortunately, due to several factors, including budget cuts stemming from the Great Recession, the Empowerment Program within CCSD has been scaled back significantly, and central control has largely been re-asserted over previously “empowered” schools. In lieu of “empowerment,” nearly all schools have been given flex budgeting authority, which allocates a limited amount of resources to local schools to budget, with rigorous oversight. While Nevada’s Empowerment Law fit the conditions of its time, the law, in its current state, will not adequately serve CCSD as it seeks to decentralize most budget and authority to the local school level. CCEA believes that a new model for governance is necessary, one that better involves teachers, families, and the school community in the governance process.

1) Modeling off California School Site Councils, CCEA believes that CCSD should form elected “Empowerment Councils” at each school to represent parents, students, community members, and school staff in the school governance process. Empowerment Councils would have several responsibilities, including:
   A) Reviewing and analyzing student achievement data,
   B) Gathering community input,
   C) Developing the school’s strategic plan and the school site budget, and;
   D) Monitoring the implementation of the plan and budget.
   E) Compliance with all state and federal laws and regulations.

2) Modeling off California School Site Councils, CCEA believes that local school Empowerment Councils should be of the following composition:
   A) The school principal
   B) 3 representatives of teachers, selected by teachers at the school (one of these being a CCEA teacher representative).
   C) 2 other school support staff personnel, selected by peers at the school
   D) 5 parents of students attending the school, selected by such parents
   E) At the high school level, 2 students selected by students attending the school

3) Recognizing that many CCSD schools have existing formal and informal groups of parents, teachers, and administrators that help to develop school policies and implement special programs, CCEA recommends that CCSD should, to the extent possible and permissible under

---

5 https://www.leg.state.nv.us/interim/78th2015/Committee/Studies/CCSD/Other/8-January-2016/AB394FlexibleBudgetFinal010816.pdf
6 http://www.sfusd.edu/en/councils-committees/school-site-council.html
7 For example: Schools designated as Victory Schools create Victory School Performance Plans. In the course of creating a performance plan, the school creates a council of staff members and parents to guide its efforts. http://www.doe.nv.gov/Legislative/Victory_Schools/Performance_Plans/)
law and regulation, direct local schools to transition the responsibilities of these groups to local school Empowerment Councils.

4) Modeling off of successful models in Edmonton, CCSD should aim to have at least 85% of a school's operating budget run through the local school Empowerment Councils.

5) Generally, CCEA recommends that CCSD's central administration shift from an oversight role to a central services role. However, CCEA believes that the CCSD central office and elected officials should serve as a check on local schools. As such, CCEA believes that CCSD should “accredit” local schools based on certain standards. Current Empowerment Law (NRS 386.720) allows for the creation of Empowerment Design Teams to recommend policies and procedures related to empowerment schools and advise the CCSD Board of Trustees on issues related to empowerment schools. In consultation with Dr. Strembinsky, CCEA recommends that the committee direct CCSD to form an Empowerment Accreditation Team under the Office of the Superintendent. This team would be made up of individuals from both inside and outside of the district appointed by the Superintendent, and it would be charged with periodically evaluating the budgetary, instructional, and family engagement practices of local schools. The Accreditation Team would develop standards with which to evaluate school Empowerment Councils, and make recommendations to the CCSD Board of Trustees on the accreditation of local schools. If schools do not meet accreditation standards, the Accreditation Team with approval of the CCSD Superintendent would recommend an action plan with performance metrics and goals to meet accreditation.

V. Direct CCSD to Develop a Program that Allocates Stipends to Parents and Family Members on Empowerment Councils and Boosts Family Engagement in Urban Schools

Recognizing that parental and family engagement is associated with higher achievement outcomes and also recognizing that the new empowerment model requires the involvement of a large number of parents and family members in the school system, CCEA believes that bold efforts in parental and family engagement are necessary for success.

1) Direct the CCSD Family and Community Engagement Services department (FACES) to develop a program that provides at least $200/month for the elected parent participants in the Empowerment Councils to help compensate parents for their time and to drive interest and involvement. CCEA believes that CCSD can either use existing monies that they allocate to programs like FACES, or they can partner with nonprofit organizations (like the Public Education Foundation) to raise the money to pay for stipends. Monies dedicated for parental engagement cannot be repurposed for other uses.

2) Modeling off of successful efforts in Chicago, CCEA believes that the CCSD FACES department should develop programs that better engage families of students in urban areas in Empowerment Council. The Chicago model has been studied for its ability to engage parents of racial minorities within the Chicago school system. In particular, a Harvard University study found that “governing arrangements and Latino political incorporation play a critical role” in boosting parent and family engagement among schools with large Latino student populations,

---

8 http://newsroom.ucla.edu/stories/10-questions-for-william-ouchi-149940
and that “LSCs [Local School Councils] with Latino representation and/or LSCs that actively contributed to parent involvement were better able to help school personnel break down cultural barriers, increase awareness of cultural and community issues, and facilitate school initiated outreach.
Brent Husson’s Recommendation to the Technical Advisory Committee to be included in the Advisory Committee’s Plan to Reorganize the Clark County School District

Recommendation

The reorganization of CCSD under AB 394 provides a good opportunity to make the human capital competency changes that need to be implemented for the resulting empowered district structure to be successful. If the leadership and principal structure of CCSD are not changed to incorporate recommendations for competency improvements and changes, the district reorganization, in my opinion, will not be successful. In order to accomplish the three main goals of AB 394: improving responsiveness to local needs, improving student achievement, and improving overall efficiency, it is imperative that the training and development of principals, specifically, be restructured and redefined as the district is reorganized.

While AB 394 addresses CCSD individually, there is a larger statewide recognition that aligning the principal talent management system is a necessary component in improving the public education system overall. As a member of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), I recommend that the TAC’s plan for CCSD reorganization include new principal training and skills development that incorporates the competencies needed to operate an empowered system. These same competencies have also been identified as those that principals will need to effectively run schools by Year 2020.

In an empowered system, principals need to be able to: lead, operate systemically, create a high-performance and adaptive culture, design and execute an action plan, guide the instructional program, grow staff capacity and leadership density, recruit and retain effective teachers, and communicate with external and internal stakeholders. It makes sense to incorporate the implementation of these competencies during the reorganization of CCSD because the same competencies are needed in an empowered system. This recommendation is systemic and can be implemented alongside the systemic reorganization of the district as a whole.

Practical Implementation

In order to practically develop and equip principals with these competencies, I recommend that CCSD access and collaborate with the available resources in higher education, non-profit think tanks, and the business community to design a training and evaluation system that adequately reflects the attainment of the eight core competencies that principals in Year 2020 and beyond will need to possess.
In order to accomplish this, I recommend that CCSD approach the changes as two separate tasks. The first task is a transitional leadership training program that prepares and develops existing district leadership and principals to operate effectively in the newly reorganized district structure. The second task is to implement an institutional and ongoing training system that produces and supports competent leaders for the new type of district structure.

Within CCSD, this recommendation means that the entire principal structure in the district administration, from the superintendent through the principal level, would need to be trained on the eight core competencies. The current principals and district leadership would have to be trained by the beginning of the 2017-18 academic year. This initial district leadership and principal training timeline would have to (1) define competency, (2) train district leadership in the competencies, (3) train leadership on how to teach the new competencies to existing principals, and finally (4) train principals on the new competencies. This first task would also need to include development of an initial and ongoing evaluation system for the core competencies.

The second task of creating a district-wide system for institutional and ongoing principal and district leadership competency development would begin immediately after the initial training outlined as the first task. This second task would effectively redefine the principal talent management system, as it would incorporate and plan for the inclusion of the pipeline of future principals and the ongoing professional development of current principals. This second task, like the first task, would require the same resources in higher education, non-profit think tanks, and the business community to develop the standards and systems necessary to assess efficacy and improvement.

The overarching theme of my recommendation is that school and district leaders must be able to lead and work effectively in a reorganized system. In order to do that, I believe they must be given the training and resources necessary to be successful.
“Can you imagine a Federal law that promoted community schools — schools that serve the neediest children by bringing together under one roof all the services and activities they and their families need? Imagine schools that are open all day and offer after-school and evening recreational activities and homework assistance... and suppose the schools included child care and dental, medical and counseling clinics.”

- Randi Weingarten, President, American Federation of Teachers

With the passing of the Every Student Succeeds Act, we believe it is important to consider those requirements in the final recommendations of the Technical Advisory Committee regarding the reorganization of Clark County School District. This new law supports efforts of the Nevada Legislature to empower every school site with the flexibility to ensure every student succeeds based on school needs, with a focus on proficiency gaps.

As noted in the proficiency graphic attached, African American students have consistently performed at the lowest level of any subgroup and ask that TAC address this disparity along with the discipline disparity in any proposed plan.

“In addition to added flexibility for states, the proposed regulations offer a more holistic approach to measuring a quality education. This means that NCLB’s narrow definition of school success, which was based primarily on test scores in math and English language arts and graduation rates, will be replaced with a broader view, to include such things as student growth, college and career readiness, school climate, or student’s progress toward English language proficiency.”

The bill helps ensure educational opportunity for all students by:

- Holding all students to high academic standards that prepare them for success in college and careers.
- Ensuring accountability by guaranteeing that when students fall behind, states redirect resources into what works to help them and their schools improve, with a particular focus on the very lowest-performing schools, high schools with high dropout rates, and schools with achievement gaps.
- Empowering state and local decision-makers to develop their own strong systems for school improvement based upon evidence, rather than imposing cookie-cutter federal solutions like the No Child Left Behind Act did.
• Reducing the sometimes onerous burden of testing on students yet making sure that tests don’t crowd out teaching and learning, while not sacrificing clear, annual information parents and educators need to make sure our children are learning.
• Providing more children access to high-quality preschool.
• Establishing new resources for proven strategies that will spur reform and drive opportunity and better outcomes for America’s students.

Importantly, the regulations also uphold ESSA’s critical civil rights protections and enhance equity for historically underserved students by including all students and each subgroup in decisions related to school support and improvement. This will help ensure that meaningful action is taken in places where whole schools or groups of students are falling behind, and that clear and transparent information on critical measures of school quality and equity are provided to parents and community members. Furthermore, the regulations help to ensure more transparency for parents, educators, and community members around resource equity measures, such as access to preschool, access to rigorous coursework, and school discipline, including requiring that this information be made public on state and local report cards.”

Therefore, we offer an additional recommendation that as a first step, CCSD address education inequity by identifying schools where inequity exists and a plan to address each, i.e. curriculum, AP/GATE, facility, Career and technical programs, teacher shortage, discipline disparity, etc.

This leads us to the question of oversight and accountability. With the number of schools in CCSD we have major concerns about how CCSD will ensure equity in every school, process/procedures to deal with struggling schools, and who will parents and community contact to address problems on site? We strongly suggest implementation of the “precinct” concept with no less than precinct numbers to provide supervision of schools at a ratio of 15 schools per leader. These leaders or supervisors provide support, coaching, and mentoring, while Principals make decisions, for their own schools, with meaningful input from staff and their school community. It is also important to recognize the success of the K-12 feeder alignment structure to support students and families. We encourage precincts to be organized in a K-12 feeder alignment pattern. (Please see past presentations for additional recommendations.)

As mentioned in our memorandum dated 3-28-2016, CCBC strongly advocates for a school district that promotes a “community schools” model, and believe it enhances an “empowerment” school structure. Several cities have adopted community schools as a preferred reform strategy and we want to remind the TAC committee members of multi-faceted gains by the Coalition for Community Schools:

• improved academic performance in both reading and math
• improved student and teacher attendance
• reduced dropout rates and improved graduation rates
• improved behavior
• gains in indicators of positive youth development, such as leadership and conflict resolution skills
• greater parent involvement
• community benefits, such as better use of school buildings and safer neighborhoods

Nine primary goals of community schools:
1. Children are ready to enter kindergarten at grade level
2. Students are active in the school and in the community
3. Students succeed academically
4. Students are healthy physically, socially, and emotionally
5. Students live and learn in a safe and supportive environment
6. Families are involved with their children’s education
7. Schools are engaged with families and communities
8. Teachers and principals are effective
9. Community confidence through a transparent accountability system with measurable outcomes and monthly student assessments that drive instruction

Community schools of various models share four overarching characteristics:

- **Comprehensive** – Coordinated partnership resources respond to wide spectrum of need
- **Collaborative** – All stakeholders share leadership and meaningful engagement
- **Coherent** – Programs and services are effectively coordinated and seamlessly integrated
- **Committed** – Sustained long-term partnerships with shared vision and accountability for results

Programmatic components of a community school typically include:

- after-school youth development/sports and summer enrichment
- family/community engagement, education and leadership
- early childhood programs
- medical, dental and mental health services and resources for families in need
- community and economic development

We appreciate the opportunity to again weigh in on critical issues, which we believe will positively impact the future of students and lead to increased achievement.
## ACCOUNTABILITY: THEN AND NOW

| Issue                  | No Child Left Behind                                                                 | Every Student Succeeds Act  
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------
| **Expectations for Students** | Unrealistic goals and targets created incentives for States to lower standards for students, well below levels needed to succeed after high school. | States must set expectations for all students that will put them on a path to succeed in college or career, with flexibility to design accountability systems that best support this goal. |
| **Goals and Timelines**   | States were held to a federally prescribed timeline for all students to achieve proficiency in reading and math. | States set their own ambitious goals and short-term measures of progress that hold high expectations for all students and reflect the progress necessary to close achievement gaps. |
| **Measures of School Quality** | School performance was defined and measured narrowly, with a heavy focus on math and reading test scores and high school graduation rates. | Increased state flexibility to take a more holistic view of school performance based on multiple measures including: achievement in reading and math; academic progress in elementary and middle schools; graduation rates in high schools; rates of progress for English learners achieving language proficiency; and a state-determined indicator of school quality or student success. |
| **Transparency around Performance** | Schools that did not meet benchmarks were given a “pass/fail” mark and a label (e.g., corrective action) associated with the types of improvement efforts that had to be undertaken in the school – information that was not meaningful or particularly useful to parents and the public. | States create a multi-level rating system that clearly communicates to parents and communities how their schools are doing, taking into account all of the measures of school performance. Information displayed in a timely manner on annual report cards, designed with input from parents. |
| **Interventions**       | Federally-prescribed interventions for schools and districts identified as “failing.” | Locally-tailored, evidenced-based interventions for schools identified for support. Improvement plans designed in collaboration with teachers, principals, parents, and other stakeholders. |
| **Resources**           | Districts were directed to set-aside substantial amounts of funding for specific federally-prescribed interventions, which were not consistently effective. | Districts no longer forced to set aside funds. State funds are prioritized to a state’s lowest-performing five percent of schools, high schools with low graduation rates, and schools with persistent low performance among subgroups of students. Flexibility to use funds for locally-tailored, evidence-based strategies. |
The 2013-14 Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) is a survey of all public schools and school districts in the United States. The CRDC measures student access to courses, programs, instructional and other staff, and resources – as well as school climate factors, such as student discipline and bullying and harassment – that impact education equity and opportunity for students. The U.S. Department of Education (ED) will release additional data highlights later in 2016 on key topics such as student discipline, early learning access, teacher and staffing equity, access to courses and programs that foster college and career readiness, and chronic student absenteeism. The full CRDC data file may be downloaded now; please visit crdc.ed.gov for more information. In Fall 2016, the public will be able to look up 2013-14 CRDC data for individual schools, school districts, and states by visiting the CRDC website at ocrdata.ed.gov.

Who’s in the 2013-14 CRDC?
Number of school districts: 16,758 (99.2% of all school districts)
Number of schools: 95,507 (99.5% of all public schools)
Total number of students: 50,035,744

Nationwide Student Demographics:

Race/Ethnicity:
- White: 50.3%
- Black or African American: 15.5%
- Hispanic or Latino of any race: 24.7%
- Asian: 4.8%
- American Indian or Alaska Native: 1.1%
- Two or More Races: 3.1%
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: 0.4%

Boys: 51.4%  Girls: 48.6%

English Learners: 9.9%

Students with Disabilities: 14.0%
(includes students receiving services under IDEA and/or Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act)
About the CRDC

The purpose of the CRDC is to obtain data related to the obligation of public school districts and of elementary and secondary schools to provide equal educational opportunity. Since 1968, the CRDC has collected a variety of information, including student enrollment and educational programs and services data that are disaggregated by race/ethnicity, sex, English learner status, and disability, from public schools across the nation.

The CRDC is a longstanding and important aspect of the Office for Civil Rights' overall strategy for administering and enforcing the civil rights statutes for which it is responsible. Other ED offices, as well as policymakers and researchers outside of ED, also use CRDC information. Additionally, the CRDC database, with hundreds of data elements, is fully accessible to the public. School districts self-report and certify all data presented.

The CRDC is a mandatory data collection, authorized under the statutes and regulations implementing Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and under the Department of Education Organization Act (20 U.S.C. § 3413). The regulations implementing these provisions can be found at 34 CFR 100.6(b); 34 CFR 106.71; and 34 CFR 104.61.

For more information about the CRDC, please visit crdc.ed.gov.

What’s in the 2013-14 Civil Rights Data Collection?

- The 2013-14 CRDC provides equity and opportunity data on a wide array of topics, including:
  - Bullying and harassment
  - Early learning
  - Pathways to college and career readiness (including access to math/science and AP courses)
  - Restraint and seclusion
  - School finance
  - Prevalence of and student participation in interscholastic athletics
  - Student discipline
  - Teachers and other school personnel

- NEW Data topics now available in the 2013-14 CRDC include:
  - Chronic student absenteeism
  - Availability of free or partial-payment preschool in school districts
  - Educational access in justice (detention, correctional or residential) facilities
  - Civil rights coordinators in school districts
  - Sworn law enforcement/school resource officers in schools
  - Access to distance education courses, credit recovery, and dual enrollment/dual credit programs

What’s Coming Next In The CRDC?

Topics collected for the first time in the 2013–14 CRDC as optional data items, and that will be collected from every school in the 2015–16 CRDC, include:

- Allegations of bullying or harassment on the bases of sexual orientation and religion
- Discipline-related transfers to alternative schools
- Number of students participating in education programs in justice (detention, correctional or residential) facilities, by number of days of participation
- Preschool corporal punishment
- Number of instances of and school days missed due to out-of-school suspensions
- Number of criminal acts committed at school that would lead to discipline
- Number of preschool children enrolled in district who are served in non-district facilities
- Number of students enrolled in distance education, dual enrollment/dual credit, and credit recovery programs
- Access to instructional aides, support services staff, psychologists, social workers, nurses, and school administrators
- Number of security guards and sworn law enforcement/school resource officers
- Teacher churn/turnover
School Discipline

- Black public preschool children are suspended from school at high rates: Black preschool children are 3.6 times as likely to receive one or more out-of-school suspensions as white preschool children.
  - Black children represent 19% of preschool enrollment, but 47% of preschool children receiving one or more out-of-school suspensions; in comparison, white children represent 41% of preschool enrollment, but 28% of preschool children receiving one or more out-of-school suspensions.
  - Black boys represent 19% of male preschool enrollment, but 45% of male preschool children receiving one or more out-of-school suspensions.
  - Black girls represent 20% of female preschool enrollment, but 54% of female preschool children receiving one or more out-of-school suspensions.

- Most public preschool children suspended are boys: While boys represent 54% of preschool enrollment, they represent 78% of preschool children receiving one or more out-of-school suspensions.

- Children with disabilities and English learners are not disproportionately suspended in public preschool:
  - Children with disabilities served by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) represent 20% of preschool enrollment, but 15% of preschool children receiving one or more out-of-school suspensions.
  - English learners represent 12% of preschool enrollment, but 7% of preschool children receiving one or more out-of-school suspensions.

- Nationwide, 2.8 million K-12 students received one-or-more out of school suspensions:
  - These include approximately 1.1 million black students; 600,000 Latino students; 660,000 students served by IDEA; and 210,000 English learners.

- Racial disparities in suspensions are also apparent in K-12 schools: While 6% of all K-12 students received one or more out-of-school suspensions, the percentage is 18% for black boys; 10% for black girls; 5% for white boys; and 2% for white girls.
  - Black K-12 students are 3.8 times as likely to receive one or more out-of-school suspensions as white students.
  - Black girls are 8% of enrolled students, but 14% of students receiving one or more out-of-school suspensions. Girls of other races did not disproportionately receive one or more out-of-school suspensions.
  - American Indian or Alaska Native, Latino, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and multiracial boys are also disproportionately suspended from school, representing 15% of K-12 students but 19% of K-12 students receiving one or more out-of-school suspensions.

ED Initiative Spotlight

Reforming School Discipline Policy and Practice

The Department has made school discipline reform a top priority. In the 2016 Investing in Innovation (i3) Program, the Department seeks to support innovative alternatives to suspension. This priority builds on the #RethinkDiscipline campaign to increase awareness about the detrimental impacts of exclusionary discipline, our investment in School Climate Transformation Grants to help states and districts strengthen behavioral supports for students, and a School Discipline Guidance Package to clarify schools’ obligation not to discriminate on the basis of race in discipline.

For more information on the programs and initiatives appearing in this document, please visit www.ed.gov.

† Note: Except where the percentage is below 1%, the percentages listed in these data highlights are rounded to the nearest whole number. Numbers in phrases such as “___ times more likely” are rounded to nearest tenth (one decimal place). Black refers to persons who are black or African American; Latino refers to persons who are Hispanic or Latino of any race; and multiracial refers to persons of two or more races. The numbers in these data highlights reflect a privacy protection protocol and other methodologies for collecting and preparing the data.† For additional information on the methodology for collecting and preparing the data cited in this document, please visit ocrdata.ed.gov.
• 11% of American Indian or Alaska Native boys received one or more out-of-school suspensions, as did 10% of multiracial boys, 8% of Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander boys, and 7% of Latino boys.

• Asian and white students did not disproportionately receive one or more out-of-school suspensions.

### Students with disabilities in grades K-12 are disproportionately suspended from school:

- Students with disabilities served by IDEA (11%) are more than twice as likely to receive one or more out-of-school suspensions as students without disabilities (5%).

- More than one out of five American Indian or Alaska Native (22%), Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (23%), black (23%), and multiracial (25%) boys with disabilities served by IDEA received one or more out-of-school suspensions, compared to one out of ten white (10%) boys with disabilities served by IDEA.

- One in five multiracial girls with disabilities served by IDEA (20%) received one or more out-of-school suspensions, compared to one in twenty white girls with disabilities served by IDEA (5%).

### English learners are not disproportionately suspended from school:

- English learners make up 10% of all students, but they are 7% of those who received one or more out-of-school suspensions.

### Black students are expelled from school at disproportionately high rates:

- Black students are 1.9 times as likely to be expelled from school without educational services as white students.

- Black boys represent 8% of all students, but 19% of students expelled without educational services.

- Black girls are 8% of all students, but 9% of students expelled without educational services.

### American Indian or Alaska Native, white, and multiracial boys are also disproportionately expelled from school without educational services:

- White boys represent 26% of all students, but 35% of students expelled without educational services.

- American Indian or Alaska Native boys represent 0.6% of all students, but 2% of students expelled without educational services.

- Multiracial boys represent 2% of all students, but 4% of students expelled without educational services.

### Latino and Asian boys and girls, as well as Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander and white girls, are not disproportionately expelled without educational services from schools.

- Latino students represent 25% of all students, but 15% of students expelled without educational services.

- Asian students represent 5% of all students, but 1% of students expelled without educational services.

- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander girls represent 0.2% of all students, but 0.1% of students expelled without educational services.

- White girls represent 24% of all students, but 12% of students expelled without educational services.

### Black students are more likely to be disciplined through law enforcement:

- Black students are 2.3 times as likely to receive a referral to law enforcement or be subject to a school-related arrest as white students.

---

**ED Initiative Spotlight**

### Increasing Equity for Students of Color in Special Education

Students of color are more likely to be identified as having a disability and face harsher discipline than their white classmates. To address these inequities, in February 2016, the Department [proposed a new rule to improve equity in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)](https://www2.ed.gov/legislation_regs/IDEA/ProposedInclusionRule.html).

IDEA requires states to identify districts with “significant disproportionality” in special education—that is, when districts identify, place outside the regular classroom, or discipline children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher rates than their peers. The proposed Equity in IDEA rule would, for the first time, require states to implement a standard approach to compare racial and ethnic groups, with reasonable thresholds for determining when disparities have become significant, and would also provide identified districts with new flexibility to support student needs.
NEW A significant number of schools have sworn law enforcement officers (SLEOs), including school resource officers (SROs):

- 24% of elementary schools (grades K-6, excluding justice facilities) have SLEOs; 42% of high schools (grades 9-12, excluding justice facilities) have SLEOs.
- 51% of high schools with high black and Latino student enrollment* have SLEOs.

Restraint and Seclusion

NEW More than 100,000 students were placed in seclusion or involuntary confinement or were physically restrained at school to immobilize them or reduce their ability to move freely – including more than 67,000 students with disabilities served by IDEA:

- Students with disabilities served by IDEA represent 12% of all students, but 67% of students subject to restraint or seclusion.
- American Indian or Alaska Native and multiracial boys represent 2% of all students, but 5% of students subject to restraint or seclusion.
- Black boys and white boys represent 8% and 26% of all students, respectively, but 18% and 43% of students subject to restraint or seclusion.
- Asian, Latino, and Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander boys are not disproportionately subject to restraint or seclusion; neither are girls of any race or ethnicity.

Early Learning

NEW More than half of school districts provide public preschool programs beyond providing those services required by federal law for children with disabilities – but many children are still left without access to early learning:

- By law, all school districts must provide special education and related services for preschool children with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). In addition, 54% of all school districts report providing preschool programs to children not served by IDEA.

ED Initiative Spotlight

Supporting Early Learning Educators

In 2014, the U.S. Departments of Education and Health and Human Services issued a Policy Statement on Expulsion and Suspension Practices in Early Childhood Settings to assist states and public and private early childhood programs in preventing and severely limiting expulsions and suspensions in early learning settings. In 2016, through the Departments’ Preschool Development Grants Program national activities funds, model sites will be developed to implement strategies that improve social, emotional, and behavioral outcomes in preschoolers and support preschool teachers, administrators and families in addressing and reducing disproportionate discipline practices in early learning settings.

Among school districts that report offering preschool programs for children not served by IDEA, nearly half provide full-day preschool:

- 48% of these school districts offer full-day preschool programs.
- 70% of these school districts offer part-day preschool programs.

(Percentages above do not sum to 100% because districts can offer both full-day and part-day programs.)

Of the school districts that offer preschool programs for children not served by IDEA, 73% extend preschool eligibility to all children in the district (but do not necessarily provide preschool programs universally to every child):

- The remaining 27% of school districts extend preschool eligibility to children from low-income families or children in Title I schools, but not to all children.

NEW Most, but not all, public preschools are free: Of the school districts that provide preschool programs for children not served by IDEA, 86% offer part-day or full-day preschool at no cost; the remaining 14% require parents or guardians to pay for part or all of the cost to enroll children in preschool.
College and Career Readiness

- **High-rigorous course access is not a reality across all of our nation’s schools:** Nationwide, 48% of high schools offer calculus; 60% offer physics; 72% offer chemistry; and 78% offer Algebra II.

- **Black and Latino students have less access to high-level math and science courses:**
  - 33% of high schools with high black and Latino student enrollment* offer calculus, compared to 56% of high schools with low black and Latino student enrollment.
  - 48% of high schools with high black and Latino student enrollment* offer physics, compared to 67% of high schools with low black and Latino student enrollment.
  - 65% of high schools with high black and Latino student enrollment* offer chemistry, compared to 78% of high schools with low black and Latino student enrollment.
  - 71% of high schools with high black and Latino student enrollment* offer Algebra II, compared to 84% of high schools with low black and Latino student enrollment.

- **Course enrollment rates differ by race/ethnicity, and by disability and English learner status:**
  - Black and Latino students are 38% of students in schools that offer Algebra II and 37% of students enrolled in Algebra II; they are 36% of students in schools that offer calculus and 21% of students enrolled in calculus; and they are 37% of students in schools that offer physics and 35% of students enrolled in physics.
    - White students are 53% of students in schools that offer Algebra II and 53% of students enrolled in Algebra II; they are 55% of students in schools that offer calculus and 61% of students enrolled in calculus; and they are 54% of students in schools that offer physics and 53% of students enrolled in physics.
  - Students with disabilities served by IDEA are 12% of students in schools that offer Algebra II and 6% of students enrolled in Algebra II; they are 11% of students in schools that offer calculus and 1% of students enrolled in calculus; and they are 11% of students in schools that offer physics and 6% of students enrolled in physics.
    - To close the participation gap in physics, more than 104,000 additional students with disabilities served by IDEA would need to participate in physics classes nationwide.
  - English learners are 5% of students in schools that offer Algebra II and 4% of students enrolled in Algebra II; they are 5% of students in schools that offer calculus and 1% of students enrolled in calculus; and they are 5% of students in schools that offer physics and 4% of students enrolled in physics.
    - To close the participation gap in physics, more than 16,000 additional English learners would need to participate in physics classes nationwide.

- **Girls are underrepresented among students enrolled in physics, but not in calculus:**
  - Girls represent 49% of all students nationwide and 49% of students enrolled in calculus, but 46% of students enrolled in physics.
    - To close the participation gap in physics, more than 91,000 additional girls would need to participate in physics classes nationwide.

---

**ED Initiative Spotlight**

**Boosting STEM and Computer Science Education**

The President has proposed a $4.1 billion Computer Science for All program that would support states’ and school district’s efforts to expand access for all students to computer science instruction and programs. And in April 2016, the Department issued a Dear Colleague letter to states, school districts, schools and education partners on how to maximize federal funds to support and enhance innovative science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) education for all students and decrease the equity and opportunity gaps for historically underserved students in STEM.
Unequal access to accelerated courses or programs: Black and Latino students represent 42% of student enrollment in schools offering gifted and talented education (GATE) programs, yet 28% of the students enrolled in GATE programs.

- White students are 49% of all students in schools offering GATE programs and 57% of students in GATE programs.
- While English learners are 11% of students in schools offering GATE programs, fewer than 3% of GATE students nationwide are English learners.
- Similarly, students with disabilities served by IDEA are 12% of all students in schools offering GATE programs, but represent fewer than 3% of GATE students nationwide.

Student enrollment in Advanced Placement (AP) courses is unequal:

- Black and Latino students represent 38% of students in schools that offer AP courses, but 29% of students enrolled in at least one AP course.
- English learners represent 5% of students in schools that offer AP courses, but 2% of the students enrolled in at least one AP course.
- Students with disabilities served by IDEA represent 11% of all students in schools that offer AP courses, but fewer than 2% of students enrolled in at least one AP course.

English learners, students with disabilities, and students of color are more likely to be retained or held back in high school: Students with disabilities served by IDEA and English learners are 12% and 5% of high school student enrollment, but 21% and 11% of high school students held back or retained.

- Black students are 16% of high school students but 30% of high school students retained, while white students are 53% of high school students but 31% of high school students retained.
- Latino, American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and multiracial high school students are also retained at disproportionately high rates, representing 27% of high school students but 36% of high school students retained.

Using Data to Ensure Equity in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

Under the new law, Congress required that states and districts include new information in their annual report cards, including data about student discipline, school arrests, chronic absenteism, preschool enrollment, accelerated coursework, and per pupil expenditures. Access to this important data is a critical step forward in ensuring that school communities are able to have meaningful conversations about equity in their communities and may help states and districts identify schools and students for supports to improve student outcomes.

ED Initiative Spotlight

Addressing Chronic Absenteeism in Schools

In 2015, the Obama Administration launched Every Student, Every Day: A National Initiative to Address and Eliminate Chronic Absenteeism to support coordinated community action that addresses the underlying causes of local chronic absenteeism affecting millions of children each year. A core component of the effort is the MBK Success Mentor Initiative — a partnership between the Department and key institutions to match chronically absent students with school-linked mentors in 30 communities to improve their school attendance and achievement.

Chronic Student Absenteeism

NEW Nationwide, more than 6.5 million students – or 13% of all students – are chronically absent (absent 15 or more school days during the school year).

NEW More than 3 million high school students – or 18% of all high school students – are chronically absent.

- 20% or more of American Indian or Alaska Native (26%), Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (25%), black (22%), multiracial (21%), and Latino (20%) high school students are chronically absent.
- High school students with disabilities served by IDEA are 1.3 times as likely to be chronically absent as high school students without disabilities.
- 20% of all English learner high school students are chronically absent.
More than 3.5 million elementary school students – or 11% of all elementary school students – are chronically absent.

- American Indian or Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander elementary school students are twice as likely to be chronically absent as white elementary school students.
- Black elementary school students are 1.4 times as likely to be chronically absent as white elementary school students.
- Elementary school students with disabilities served by IDEA are 1.5 times as likely to be chronically absent as elementary school students without disabilities.

Chronic student absenteeism where the majority of teachers are also frequently absent:

- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students represent 0.4% of all students, but 2% of chronically absent students who attend schools where more than 50% of teachers were absent for more than 10 days.
- Black students represent 15% of all students, but 21% of chronically absent students who attend schools where more than 50% of teachers were absent for more than 10 days.

Education in Justice Facilities

The 2013-14 CRDC collected, for the first time, the days and hours of educational programs – consisting of credit-granting courses and classroom instruction through grade 12 – at justice facilities. Justice facilities are short- and long-term public or private facilities (including correctional facilities, detention centers, jails, and prisons) that confine (before or after adjudication or conviction) juveniles under 18 years of age, adults who are 18 years of age and older, or both; however, the CRDC included data only from justice facilities confining individuals up to 21 years of age.

On average, justice facilities report offering 26 hours per week of educational programming during their regular school year. But more than one in seven (15%) offers less than 20 hours per week during the school year – which is less than four hours each day in a five-day week.

While state requirements for public schools vary, the majority of states require 180 days of school instruction. More than one in five justice facilities (21%) reports having fewer than 180 days in a regular school year, and one in 20 (5%) reports having fewer than 170 days. By contrast, 24% of justice facilities report having more than 230 days in a regular school year, reflecting the year-round nature of these facilities.
Teacher and Staffing Equity

- Black, Latino, and American Indian or Alaska Native students are more likely to attend schools with higher concentrations of inexperienced teachers:
  - 11% of black students, 9% of Latino students, and 7% of American Indian or Alaska Native students attend schools where more than 20% of teachers are in their first year of teaching, compared to 5% of white students and 4% of Asian students.
  - 10% of teachers in schools with high black and Latino student enrollment* are in their first year of teaching, compared to 5% of teachers in schools with low black and Latino student enrollment.

- Nearly 800,000 students are enrolled in schools where more than 20% of teachers have not met all state certification or licensure requirements:
  - 3% of black students and 2% of Latino and American Indian or Alaska Native students attend these schools, compared to 1% of white students.

- While most teachers are rarely absent, 27% of teachers are absent more than 10 school days per year for reasons unrelated to school activities:
  - About 6.5 million students attend schools where more than 50% of teachers were absent more than 10 days per year.
  - 35% of Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students attend schools where more than 50% of teachers were absent for more than 10 days, compared to 12% of white students.

- Most high school students have access to a school counselor: About 95% of high school students have access to at least one school counselor.
  - But 21% of high schools and about 850,000 high school students nationwide do not have access to any school counselor.
  - 1.6 million students attend a school with an SLEO, but not a school counselor.
    - Latino students are 1.4 times as likely to attend a school with an SLEO but not a school counselor as white students; Asian students are 1.3 times as likely; black students are 1.2 times as likely.

ED Initiative Spotlight

Focus on Teacher Diversity

In May 2016, the Department released a report titled *The State of Racial Diversity in the Educator Workforce* in conjunction with the National Summit on Teacher Diversity. Using data collected by the Department as well as data from public school districts collected by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), the report reviews trends in educator diversity and reveals that, while students of color make up 50% according to the CRDC, and are expected to make up 56% of the student population by 2024, the educator workforce is still overwhelmingly white. Other report highlights:

- In school districts with more than 100 employees that responded to the EEOC’s survey, black and Latino teachers represent 17% of the teacher workforce and 21% of newly hired teachers.
- In those same school districts, 27% of principals (including assistant principals) and 26% percent of new principals are black and Latino.
CRDC Endnotes and Definitions

1 The data analyses and highlights presented in this document are based on student privacy-protected CRDC data. The CRDC data is privacy protected by rounding student counts in groups of three to prevent the disclosure of individual student information. For example, student counts from 1-3 are rounded to two, and student counts from 4-6 are rounded to five. True zeroes are revealed where possible. In general, the distortion of rounding one student to two is balanced by the rounding down of three students to two. However, this privacy protection method may inflate total counts for CRDC data elements in which schools report only one student; for example, one student retained or held back a grade in school is rounded to two students retained.

For additional information on the methodology for collecting and preparing the data cited in this document, please visit ocrdata.ed.gov.

* "High/low black and Latino enrollment" refers to schools with more than 75 percent and less than 25 percent black and Latino student enrollment, respectively.

Students

English learner (limited English proficient student): In coordination with the state's definition based on Title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, limited English proficient students (referred to in this document as "English Learner") are students:

(A) who are ages 3 through 21;
(B) who are enrolled or preparing to enroll in an elementary school or secondary school;
(C) who are i, ii, or iii
   - (i) who were not born in the United States or whose native languages are languages other than English;
   - (ii) who are Native American or Alaska Native, or a native resident of the outlying areas; and
   - (II) who come from an environment where languages other than English have a significant impact on their level of language proficiency; or
   - (iii) who are migratory, whose native languages are languages other than English, and who come from an environment where languages other than English are dominant; and

(D) whose difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language may be sufficient to deny the individuals
   - (i) the ability to meet the state's proficient level of achievement on state assessments described in section 1111(b)(3)of ESEA, 20 U.S.C. 6311(b) (3)); or
   - (ii) the ability to successfully achieve in classrooms where the language of instruction is English; or
   - (iii) the opportunity to participate fully in society.

Note · To be classified as limited English proficient, an individual must be A, B, C, and D. For C, an individual can be i, ii, or iii. If C-ii, the individual must be I and II. For D, an individual must be denied D-i, D-ii, or D-iii.

Students with disabilities: Unless otherwise indicated, "students with disabilities" refers to students who receive special education and related services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and who receive related aids and services under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Students with disabilities served by IDEA: Students with intellectual disabilities; hearing impairment, including deafness; speech or language impairment; visual impairment, including blindness; serious emotional disturbance; orthopedic impairment; autism; traumatic brain injury; developmental delay; other health impairment; specific learning disability; deaf-blindness; or multiple disabilities and who, by reason thereof, receive special education and related services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) according to an Individualized Education Program, Individual Family Service Plan, or service plan.

Student Discipline

Out-of-school suspension: For students without disabilities, out-of-school suspension is an instance in which a child is temporarily removed from his/her regular school for at least half a day (but less than the remainder of the school year) for disciplinary purposes to another setting (e.g., home, behavior center). Out-of-school suspensions include removals in which no educational services are provided, and removals in which educational services are provided (e.g., school-provided at home instruction or tutoring).

- For students with disabilities (served under IDEA): Out-of-school suspension is an instance in which a child is temporarily removed from his/her regular school for at least half a day for disciplinary purposes to another setting (e.g., home, behavior center). Out-of-school suspensions include both removals in which no individualized family service plan (IFSP) or individualized education plan (IEP) services are provided because the removal is 10 days or less as well as removals in which the child continues to receive services according to his/her IFSP or IEP.

Expulsion without educational services refers to an action taken by the local educational agency of removing a child from his/her regular school for disciplinary purposes, and not providing educational services to the child for the remainder of the school year or longer in accordance with local educational agency policy. Expulsion without services also includes removals resulting from violations of the Gun Free Schools Act that are modified to less than 365 days. Note: the CRDC also collects data on expulsion with educational services.

Preschool out-of-school suspension:

- For students with disabilities (served under IDEA): Out-of-school suspension is an instance in which a child is temporarily removed from his/her regular school for at least half a day for disciplinary purposes to another setting (e.g., home, behavior center). Out-of-school suspensions include both removals in which no individualized family service plan (IFSP) or individualized education plan (IEP) services are provided because the removal is 10 days or less as well as removals in which the child continues to receive services according to his/her IFSP or IEP.

- For students without disabilities and students with disabilities served solely under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act: Out-of-school suspension is an instance in which a child is temporarily removed from his/her regular school for at least half a day (but less than the remainder of the school year) for disciplinary purposes to another setting (e.g., home, behavior center). Out-of-school suspensions include removals in which no educational services are provided, and removals in
which educational services are provided (e.g., school-provided at home instruction or tutoring).

**Referral to law enforcement** is an action by which a student is reported to any law enforcement agency or official, including a school police unit, for an incident that occurs on school grounds, during school-related events, or while taking school transportation, regardless of whether official action is taken. Citations, tickets, and court referrals are considered referrals to law enforcement.

**School-related arrest** refers to an arrest of a student for any activity conducted on school grounds, during off-campus school activities (including while taking school transportation), or due to a referral by any school official.

**Restraint and Seclusion**

**Restraint** refers to both mechanical and physical restraint.

**Mechanical restraint** refers to the use of any device or equipment to restrict a student’s freedom of movement. The term does not include devices implemented by trained school personnel, or utilized by a student that have been prescribed by an appropriate medical or related services professional and are used for the specific and approved purposes for which such devices were designed, such as:

- Adaptive devices or mechanical supports used to achieve proper body position, balance, or alignment to allow greater freedom of mobility than would be possible without the use of such devices or mechanical supports;
- Vehicle safety restraints when used as intended during the transport of a student in a moving vehicle;
- Restraints for medical immobilization; or
- Orthopedically prescribed devices that permit a student to participate in activities without risk of harm.

**Physical restraint** refers to a personal restriction that immobilizes or reduces the ability of a student to move his or her torso, arms, legs, or head freely. The term physical restraint does not include a physical escort. Physical escort means a temporary touching or holding of the hand, wrist, arm, shoulder or back for the purpose of inducing a student who is acting out to walk to a safe location.

**Seclusion** refers to the involuntary confinement of a student alone in a room or area from which the student is physically prevented from leaving. It does not include a timeout, which is a behavior management technique that is part of an approved program, involves the monitored separation of the student in a non-locked setting, and is implemented for the purpose of calming.

**Early Learning**

**Preschool** refers to preschool programs and services for children ages 3 through 5.

**Preschool provided by the district:** District-provided preschool includes preschool services or programs that the district provided by contracting with another entity to provide those services or programs; preschool programs or services that are operated by a non-district facility (including intermediate units, residential facilities, social service agencies, hospitals, and private schools) contracted by the district are considered district-provided preschool. Also, please note that responses from school districts that serve only vocational or high school students were among the 16,757 districts surveyed as to whether they provide preschool programs and services for children ages 3 through 5.

**Full-day preschool program** is a program that a child attends each weekday for approximately six hours or more.

**College and Career Readiness**

**Advanced Placement (AP)** refers to a program, sponsored by the College Board, through which students may earn college credit and advanced college placement by successfully completing AP courses and standardized AP exams.

**Advanced Placement (AP) course** is an advanced, college-level course designed for students who achieve a specified level of academic performance. Upon successful completion of the course and a standardized AP exam, a student may be qualified to receive college credit and/or placement into advanced college courses.

**Algebra II** (college-preparatory) course topics typically include field properties and theorems; set theory; operations with rational and irrational expressions; factoring of rational expressions; in-depth study of linear equations and inequalities; quadratic equations; solving systems of linear and quadratic equations; graphing of constant, linear, and quadratic equations; properties of higher degree equations; and operations with rational and irrational exponents.

**Calculus** (college-preparatory) course topics include the study of derivatives, differentiation, integration, the definite and indefinite integral, and applications of calculus. Typically, students have previously attained knowledge of precalculus topics (some combination of trigonometry, elementary functions, analytic geometry, and math analysis).

**Chemistry** (college-preparatory) courses involve studying the composition, properties, and reactions of substances. These courses typically explore such concepts as the behaviors of solids, liquids, and gases; acid/base and oxidation/reduction reactions; and atomic structure. Chemical formulas and equations and nuclear reactions are also studied.

**Gifted and talented education** (GATE) programs are programs during regular school hours that provide special educational opportunities including accelerated promotion through grades and classes and an enriched curriculum for students who are endowed with a high degree of mental ability or who demonstrate unusual physical coordination, creativity, interest, or talent.

**Physics** (college-preparatory) courses involve the study of the forces and laws of nature affecting matter, such as equilibrium, motion, momentum, and the relationships between matter and energy. The study of physics includes examination of sound, light, and magnetic and electric phenomena.

**Retained:** A student is retained if he or she is not promoted to the next grade prior to the beginning of the following school year. Students are not considered retained if they can proceed to the next grade because they successfully completed a summer school program or for a similar reason. At the high school level, a student who has not accumulated enough credits to be classified as being in the next grade is considered retained.
**Chronic Student Absenteeism**

**Chronically absent student:** a student who is absent 15 or more school days during the school year. A student is absent if he or she is not physically on school grounds and is not participating in instruction or instruction-related activities at an approved off-grounds location for the school day. Chronically absent students include students who are absent for any reason (e.g., illness, suspension, the need to care for a family member), regardless of whether absences are excused or unexcused.

**Teacher and Staffing Equity and Other Personnel**

**Teacher** refers to a person who provides instruction, learning experiences, and care to students during a particular time period or in a given discipline.

- **Teachers include:**
  - Regular Classroom Teachers (teach Chemistry, English, mathematics, physical education, history, etc.);
  - Special Education Teachers (teach special education classes to students with disabilities);
  - General Elementary Teachers [teach self-contained classes in any of grades preschool-8 (i.e., teach the same class of students all or most of the day); team-teach (i.e., two or more teachers collaborate to teach multiple subjects to the same class of students); include preschool teachers and kindergarten teachers];
  - Vocational/Technical Education Teachers (teach typing, business, agriculture, life skills, home economics as well as any other vocational or technical classes);
  - Teaching principals, teaching school counselors, teaching librarians, teaching school nurses, or other teaching administrators [include any staff members who teach at least one regularly scheduled class per week (e.g., a librarian teaches a regularly scheduled class in mathematics once a week)];
  - Teachers of ungraded students: Itinerant, Co-op, Traveling, and Satellite Teachers (teach at more than one school and may or may not be supervised by someone at your school);
  - current Long-Term Substitute Teachers (currently filling the role of regular teachers for four or more continuous weeks); and other teachers who teach students in any of grades preschool-12.

- **Teachers exclude:**
  - Adult Education and Postsecondary Teachers (teach only adult education or students beyond grade 12);
  - Short-term Substitute Teachers (fill the role of regular or special education teachers for less than four continuous weeks);
  - Student Teachers;
  - Day Care Aides/Paraprofessionals;
  - Teacher Aides/Paraprofessionals; and Librarians who teach only library skills or how to use the library.

**School counselor** refers to a professional staff member assigned specific duties and school time for any of the following activities: counseling with students and parents, consulting with other staff members on learning problems, evaluating student abilities, assisting students in making education and career choices, assisting students in personal and social development, providing referral assistance, and/or working with other staff members in planning and conducting guidance programs for students.

**Sworn law enforcement officer (SLEO):** A sworn law enforcement officer is a career law enforcement officer, with arrest authority. A sworn law enforcement officer may be considered a school resource officer (who is assigned to work at a school in collaboration with school and community-based organizations). A sworn law enforcement officer may be employed by any entity (e.g., police department, school district or school).

**School resource officer (SRO):** A sworn law enforcement officer, with arrest authority, whose main responsibility is to work at a school in collaboration with school and community-based organizations. An SRO may have received specialized training to serve in a variety of roles, including: law enforcement officer, law-related educator, problem solver, and community liaison. An SRO may be employed by any entity (e.g., police department, school district or school).

**Teacher absenteeism:** A teacher was absent if he or she was not in attendance on a day in the regular school year when the teacher would otherwise be expected to be teaching students in an assigned class. This includes both days taken for sick leave and days taken for personal leave. Personal leave includes voluntary absences for reasons other than sick leave. Administratively approved leave for professional development, field trips or other off-campus activities with students should not be included.

**Certified teacher** refers to a teacher who has met all applicable state teacher certification requirements for a standard certificate. A certified teacher has a regular/standard certificate/license/endorsement issued by the state. A beginning teacher who has met the standard teacher education requirements is considered to have met state requirements even if he or she has not completed a state-required probationary period. A teacher working towards certification by way of alternative routes, or a teacher with an emergency, temporary, or provisional credential is not considered to have met state requirements.

**Year of teaching** refers to the number of year(s) of teaching experience including the current year but not including any student teaching or other similar preparation experiences. Experience includes teaching in any school, subject, or grade; it does not have to be in the school, subject, or grade that the teacher is presently teaching.

**Justice Facilities**

**Justice facility:** a public or private facility that confines pre-adjudicated/pre-convicted individuals, post-adolescent/post-convicted individuals, or both. Justice facilities include short-term (90 calendar days or less) and long-term (more than 90 calendar days) facilities, such as correctional facilities, detention centers, jails, and prisons. These facilities may confine juveniles (individuals typically under 18 years of age), adults (individuals typically 18 years of age and older), or both. Some states and jurisdictions include individuals younger than age 18 as adults due to statute/legislation and/or justice procedures. For the purposes of the CRDC, only individuals up to 21 years of age who are confined in justice facilities are of interest.

**Justice facility educational program:** a program for children and youth (not beyond grade 12) served at a justice facility that consists of credit-granting courses and classroom instruction at minimum, basic school subjects, such as reading, English language arts, and mathematics. Classroom instruction in vocationally-oriented subjects may also be considered part of the program. Neither the manufacture of goods within the facility nor activities related to facility maintenance are considered classroom instruction. Credit-granting refers to any course that results in a letter grade or a pass/fail designation and is required of a student to move to the next grade level or complete a program of study and receive a high school diploma.
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Recommendations for Reorganization of CCSD

Proposed by Dr. Larry R. Moses

Member of Technical Advisory Committee for the Reorganization of CCSD

1. Expand the current CCSD board from seven members to nine or eleven.

2. Divide the district into precincts with individual elected boards that hire the superintendent and appoint a member to serve on the central school board.

3. All budget, curriculum and policy decisions made by local school precinct boards.

4. All schools organized and run under the empowerment law NRS. 386.700 – NRS 386.780.

5. Base precinct funding on a per student formula in relation to the total net funding of the district not just General Operating Budget.
Precinct Board

The Precinct Board is a five to seven member board elected by the residents and other stakeholders of the precinct. Each member serves a four-year term and represents the various diverse communities within the precinct. The board elects a president, vice president, and clerk annually from among its members and schedules two regular meetings each month. The precinct board selects one member to represent the precinct on the Clark County School Board of Trustees.

The Precinct Superintendent

The precinct Superintendent is responsible for developing a precinct budget based on per student funding within the boundaries of the Nevada Revised Statues. All funding and budgeting will be done on a per pupil evaluation.

The Precinct Superintendent is the Chief Executive Officer of the precinct and is appointed by the Precinct Board. The Precinct Superintendent is responsible for implementing the Precinct Board’s policies and directions. It is the Precinct Superintendent’s responsibility to ensure that the Precinct operations and functions are adequately regulated, effective, efficient, and being carried out in accordance with applicable Nevada Revised Statutes, the policies and regulations established by the Precinct Board. He/she will provide continual supervision of the local school administrators and take actions necessary to correct any weaknesses or discrepancies he finds at the local school level. The Precinct Superintendent will represent the Precinct in matters concerning the Nevada Legislature, the federal government, the Nevada State Board of Education, and local governments. The Precinct Superintendent will be responsible for developing legislative priorities on behalf of the Precinct. The Precinct Superintendent works collaboratively and in conjunction with the central Human Resources Department and is responsible for recruiting and maintaining administrative, teaching, and support staff throughout the Precinct.

The Administrative Council

The Administrative Council is chaired by the Precinct Superintendent and consists of the Precinct school principals. The Administrative Council coordinates efforts with the business community to support, complement, and supplement the funds available to the precincts. Each school will have the freedom to deal with the community to develop a relationship with businesses and private individuals to supplement individual schools.

The Administrative Council is responsible for the coordination of Special Education Services provided by the Central CCSD Board. It is the responsibility of the group to ensure the mandates of the Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) program as determined by the Individualized Education Program (IEP) for students with disabilities are met within the individual school settings.

The Administrative Council maintains responsibility for the coordination of the School Police and the local school administrators to ensure a safe and secure educational environment at the
local school level. This body determines when there is a need for the legal services provided by the Central CCSD Board.

It is this group’s responsibility to develop, coordinate, and implement internal and external programs focused on increasing parent involvement. To increase the engagement of parents through identifying, creating and fostering opportunities for two-way meaningful communication with parents, students, community partners, and staff. The Administrative Council is responsible for testing and assessment, and food services. This group ensures that educational services are provided for individuals 17 years old and older who are seeking either a high school equivalency or high school diploma. The Administrative Council, where applicable, establishes the policy and funding for the education of non-English speaking adults the workplace literacy, numeracy, and life skills needed to become self sufficient, productive members of their community. This body maintains responsibility for setting bus schedules and provide oversight on the maintenance of the buses. They have oversight of the extra-curricular use of transportation for band festivals, athletic events, forensics, etc. They work in coordination with the central district in maintaining a safe transportation service throughout the Precinct.

Precinct Financial Officer

The Precinct Financial Officer is responsible for developing the precinct budget. The budget is developed in conjunction with the individual school principals and the Administrative Council. The Precinct Financial officer develops the budget within the boundaries of the Nevada Legislature and the funds available to the precinct. He/she ensures the individual school budget developed by the local principal meets all the fiduciary requirements of the State.

The Precinct Financial Officer is responsible for all precinct accounting, accounts payable, payroll, and employee benefits. He/she will hold a yearly audit of all Precinct schools and will give counsel as to how to resolve any issues found in the audit. The Precinct Financial Officer arranges for a yearly audit by the State Board of Education. The Precinct Financial Officer will take the steps necessary to correct any problems identified in the audit. He/she will assist the local principal in procuring equipment, supplies, and services needed as identified by the local schools. The Precinct Financial Officer will assure purchase procedures comply with state law. When requested by the principal he/she will seek out the most competitive vendors of those items needed to ensure a quality level of education in every classroom. The Precinct Financial Officer will be responsible for assisting the local principals, the Administrative Council, and the Precinct Superintendent to fill the staffing needs identified by the school principals and the Precinct Superintendent.

Individual School Principals

Each school principal is responsible for developing a budget for his/her school. The funding for the school will be on a per pupil basis and will include all district funds both state and local.

Each school principal is responsible for setting individual goals for their school. The local school principal is the instructional leader of the school and is responsible for developing a unique
educational plan that is tailored to the needs of their unique students. This plan developed in consultation with the local teachers and Community Advisory Committee shall be designed to maximize the educational growth of their students. Where appropriate the principal or his designee oversees extra-curricular activities including athletics. The Principal will, in consultation with his Community Advisory Committee decide what is needed in way of staffing, administrative, support and teaching, of the school. He/she will comply with state requirements for staffing at the elementary level. The Principal will determine the technology needs for the school and monitor the use of technology within the individual school. The local principal will work with and supervise an attendance officer. The principal working with the attendance officer assumes a primary responsibility for identifying the cause of student absences and working with the schools, parents, and other precincts to resolve attendance issues. The local principal determines when to provide Homebound Instructional Services to general and special education students who are too ill or injured to attend school as determined by a qualified physician. It is the responsibility of the local principals to ensure that preventive and routine maintenance and repair of precinct facilities are completed by a local building engineer as well as the quality of custodial efforts are maintained on a daily basis. The local school administration supervises and evaluates the maintenance, custodial and grounds personnel. The local principal will ensure that health services are available and will supervise the school nurse. Each principal or his designee will supervise the teaching staff and the support staff. The Principal will be responsible for food services on his campus.

**Community Advisory Committee**

A Community Advisory Committee is established for each school within the precinct. It shall consist of representatives from the Precinct’s community including: parents, business leaders, teachers, and administration.

**High School/Middle School Community Advisory Committee:**

1. A teacher member from each department in the school- elected by department members
2. Two to Four representatives of the Support Staff – elected by support staff members
3. Principal
4. Two to four parents of students attending the school – elected by parent organization members
5. Two to four community/business leaders in the community – selected by the rest of the committee
6. Other persons the committee deems need- selected by committee

**Elementary School Community Advisory Committee:**

1. A teacher member from each grade level in the school- selected by grade level teachers
2. Two to Four representatives of the Support Staff – elected by support staff members
3. Principal
4. Two to four parents of students attending the school – elected by parent organization members
5. Two to four community/business leaders in the community – selected by the rest of the committee
6. Other persons the committee deems need- selected by committee
There must be at least one member of the committee who:

1. has five or more years experience in school finance, school administration, overseeing academic programs and curriculum for a public school and one with experience in collection and analysis of data. (This can be one or more persons)

The Committee will meet each month with a scheduled reporting process from each of the major components of the Precinct. It is during these meetings that the Precinct Financial Officer provides a financial state of the Precinct report, the Precinct Superintendent provides Precinct level reporting, and the school Principal provides reporting specific to the school including assessment data, textbook adoptions, staffing information, etc. The Community Advisory Committee coordinates with the Precinct Superintendent to hire the principal for the school that the Committee represents.

**Teaching Staff**

In conjunction with the school administration, a Lead Teacher will be the educational leader of his/her department. The Lead Teacher will be instrumental in the selection of materials and will be the departmental leader directing his/her department in the effort to achieve the department’s and the school’s educational goals. It will be the responsibility of the classroom teacher to identify the unique educational needs of the individual student and to craft an educational strategy to maximize the learning experience for each student. One member of each department, or grade level will serve on the Community Advisory Committee.
Clark County School District Board of Trustees (CCSDBT)

The Clark County School District Board of Trustees is made up of an appointed member from the elected boards of each of the Clark County School District Precincts. The Board elects a president, vice-president, and a clerk annually from among its members. The Board shall schedule no less than a regular meeting once a month, as well as special meetings as needed.

The mission of the Clark County School District Board of Trustees is to be an organization that supports the highest level of learning for all students. This organization will provide the tools necessary for all schools to present students an education that clearly articulates into a college or career path. This board will upon the request of the precinct leaders provide through the provision of equitable, effective, and efficient services to the Precincts by working in partnership with the Precincts in: Precinct planning, professional development, curriculum instruction and assessment, Precinct leadership, Precinct management, services for diverse learning, inclusive schools, instructional media/technology, and Precinct maintenance/operations.

The CCSDBT will limit its actions to offering programs, facility improvement, transportation, and other actions that promote the mission of the Precincts represented by that board. All decisions of the CCSDBT will be made only after careful consideration and with the collaboration of all Precincts. The CCSDBT recognizes its role as an organization that provides support to the Precincts in order for Precincts to uphold their mission.

The CCSDBT ensures the equitable distribution of all educational funds, inclusive and exclusive of the Nevada Plan, on a per pupil basis throughout the Precincts. This Board ensures that all designated funds go directly to the local Precincts housing those students who qualify for the designated funds. It is the responsibility of this Board to issue and administer all bond moneys across the District. This board establishes the process whereby each Precinct will share the cost of bonds on a per pupil basis and the process by which the bonds are dispersed on a needs basis throughout the Precincts. This Board maintains audit authority over the local Precinct budgets ensuring accuracy, compliance with state law, and solvency of the Precinct.

Office of the Superintendent

The Clark County School District is responsible for hiring a Superintendent who oversees the hiring and supervising the employees necessary for carrying out the duties, responsibilities, and services of the CCSDBT as deemed necessary by the State Legislature and the local Precincts. These may include, but are not be limited to, those areas described throughout this paper.

The CCSDBT is responsible for a formal yearly evaluation of the Superintendent of the District.

The Superintendent of the Clark County School District is the Chief Executive Officer of the central District. Departments serving under the Superintendent may include, but are not limited to Assistant Superintendents, Chief Financial Officer, General Counsel, office of internal audit, the office of diversity and affirmative action, Chief of School Police, State, and Federal Assessment Manager, and the office of Government and Community Relations. Each of these entities reports to, and is evaluated by, the Superintendent of CCSD. The Superintendent is
responsible for the implementation of the Board’s policies and directions. This office serves only the CCSDBT.

**Board Offices under the control of the CCSD Superintendent:**

1. **General Counsel:** This office is maintained at the District level for the use of the CCSDBT and the Precinct Boards of Trustees as necessary. The office provides advice and representation for both the central CCSD Board and the individual Precinct boards on all legal matters in both state and federal courts, and before a variety administrative agencies involving alleged civil rights violations, worker’s compensation claims and appeals, unemployment hearings, disputes before Nevada’s Employee-Management Relations Board, and administrative arbitration with the various labor organizations that represent District employees. The office provides advice, consent, and counsel to staff and administration on a variety of issues faced daily by schools, Precincts, and the central office. This office provides a legal advisor to attend all Precinct board meetings. When the Superintendent or CCSDBT deems it necessary, the Office of General Counsel will contract for services outside the District.

2. **Employee-Management Relations:** Assists Precinct administrators in implementing laws, contractual agreements, Precinct policies, regulations, and procedures as they relate to personnel issues. EMR represents the interests of the Precincts in the interpretations and implementation of the employee-negotiated agreements.

3. **Office of Affirmative Action:** Provides assistance to the Precincts in handling complaints and issues related to Title VI and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Civil Rights Act of 1991 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the ADA Amendments Act of 2008, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972. The office investigates complaints and inquiries from Precinct and District staff and employment applicants who feel discriminated against in the areas of race, creed, sex, marital status, national or ethnic origin, age, and disability. Prepare an annual report on student and staff cultural diversity.

4. **Internal Audit Department:** Has financial oversight of the central District and the Precincts. They provide financial assistance to the Precincts as they develop their individual budgets and assure that all dispersal of funds is within the legal limitations of state and federal guidelines. The Precincts present their annual budgets to the District audit department for review. The department makes recommendations for improvement and corrections of any weaknesses and discrepancies revealed by its examination. The department presents an annual report to the State Board of Education verifying the accuracy of the Precinct finances. It is the duty of the audit department to report any non-corrected discrepancies to the State Board for corrective action.

5. **School Police and Security:** This division is responsible for the administration and operation of the District wide police department. This department provides campus police and Precinct patrol officers. The administrative division trains officers in the skills specific to the organizational needs of the Precincts and schools. The mission is to provide a safe, secure, and nurturing learning environment that is conducive to education.
6. **Office of Government Affairs:** Represents the District in matters concerning the District as a whole with the Nevada Legislature, the federal government, the Nevada State Board of Education, the Nevada Department of Education and local governments. This department assists the local Precincts with matters dealing with the above named entities. The office coordinates the efforts of the Precincts in establishing priorities on behalf of the Precincts and the central District during the legislative sessions. This department analyzes educational related legislation and serves as an advisor to the Precincts as to how it will affect them. This division assists the Precincts as they present the educational concerns of their constituents.

7. **Educational Services Division:** Operates the behavioral schools for secondary students to provide short-term placement for students with chronic and/or severe behavior problems at their zoned school of enrollment. Operate programs designed to accommodate students in outlying areas who have chronic or serve behavior problems and provides programs for students who have been expelled from Precinct schools. This department operates the Horizon and Sunset program for students who have dropped out of CCSD. It provides education for those detained at Juvenile Detention Center as well as an educational opportunity for both juvenile and adult detainees in local prisons. This department evaluates all expulsion referrals and long-term suspension referrals.

8. **Student Support Services Division:** This office would ensure compliance and monitoring of federal and state mandates concerning students with disabilities. The department supports bilingual services for special education students. It would also provide professional development activities as requested by Precincts or as required by State and/or Federal mandate. This office would monitor local Precincts to ensure compliance with federal grant requirements. To ensure that funding is properly used within the limits of the grants. This department assists to the Precincts in developing grants from various sources.

9. **Operations and Maintenance/Transportation:** Commissions all modernization and new projects as well as retro-commissioning of existing schools to ensure proper space conditions exist for the learning environment. They develop the landscape standards for new construction, monitor landscape contractors, and assists Precincts with self-funded projects. This department establishes the bus driver-training program and is responsible for purchasing and maintaining the bus fleet.

10. **Finance:** Establishes and controls the budget for the central District. This department provides a budget form for the Precincts and provides assistance in the development of Precinct budgets. The department would review all budgets for accuracy, conformation to state and federal law, etc. If necessary, this department would help correct problems within the Precinct budget. If it is determined, that economy of scale is a factor this department will stand as a centralized purchasing agent. This department maintains a warehouse for products identified as those that are best purchased in large numbers.
CCSD Central Board
One member appointed from each elected precinct board

CCSD Superintendent
1. Office of General Counsel
2. Employee-Management Relations
3. Affirmative Action
4. Internal Audit
5. School Police and Security
6. Office of Government Affairs

7. Assistant Superintendent
   Educational Services
   Continuation Schools
   Alternative Programs for Rural Schools
   Alternative Ed. Summer Schools
   Behavior Programs
   Specialty Schools
   Special Education
   Magnet Schools

8. Assistant Superintendent
   Maintenance/Transportation
   Modernization Projects
   Landscape New Schools
   Purchase and maintain Bus Fleet
   Train Bus Drivers

9. Business/Finance Officer
   Budget
   Accounting
   Purchasing/Warehouse
   Bond Fund Management
   Risk Management
   Real Property Management
   Inspection Services
   Capital Projects.

10. Assistant Superintendent
    Human Resources
    Human Capital Management
    Recruitment and Development
Moapa Valley's CCSD Reorganization Recommendations

These recommendations are specific only to Moapa Valley unless otherwise noted.

Recommendation #1:
Funding should be tied to the student and follow the student wherever the student is educated.

Recommendation #2:
Re-instate the Empowerment Model of governance in the four Moapa Valley Schools.

Recommendation #3:
The establishment of a single Moapa Valley precinct with a locally elected 5 member Precinct Board that hires an at-will Precinct Administrator to assist this Board in setting precinct policy and regulations, controlling precinct finances, and manage these and other duties outside of the schools. The authority to hire school principals would also be vested in this Precinct Administrator to assure loyalty to the schools and community and not central administration.

Recommendation #4:
The outlying communities, if they so desire, should be afforded a face-to-face meeting with Mr. Strembitsky to explain their unique community needs and concerns so plan accommodations may be addressed.

Recommendation #5:
Expand or restructure the CCSD Board to allow at least one board member to represent outlying communities and schools to ensure representation.
Support Material for Moapa Valley's Recommendations

Empowerment Schools are effective, not just because they align funding with responsibility, but because they create school communities where parents, teachers, and administrators are brought together to solve educational problems. This pattern describes the Moapa Valley Community. We are stable, tight knit, and separated from Las Vegas by sixty miles. Demographically, those who move here do so because they are focused on their families and their children. Educationally, our community consists of two elementary schools and a middle school, that feed into our high school.

Fifty years prior to the formation of the Clark County School District (CCSD), Moapa Valley and Virgin Valley formed the first school district in southern Nevada called "Ed District #1." In 1955, the State Legislature commissioned the Peabody Study. This group recommended the consolidation of small individual districts into large countywide school districts, one school district per county. Under the authority granted to it by the Nevada Constitution, the Legislature established a system of school districts to provide for a mechanism of local control. The Nevada Legislature held a special session in 1956 and made extensive changes to the structure of Nevada’s public school system. The legislature eliminated 208 active school districts and replaced them with 17 districts each of which is coterminous with county boundaries. Our Ed District #1 was merged into the current CCSD. (2013 Nevada Education Data Book, Compiled by the Nevada Legislative Bureau, p.3).

In 1956, the newly formed Clark County School Board of Trustees consisted of representatives consolidated from the previous districts. Three seats for Las Vegas, one for Henderson, one combined seat for Boulder City, Moapa Valley, and Mesquite, and an at-large outlying seat for the remaining communities. (Shadow, p. 56.)

This Board diversity was designed to ensure local representation but has deteriorated over the years. The Clark County School District is now divided into seven politically driven districts that cross both cultural and physical boundaries and do not give voice to local concerns. The original Boulder City, Moapa Valley, and Mesquite seat and the at-large outlying seat no longer exist. What was once local representation for Moapa Valley/Mesquite has been superseded by the representative of the large urban District B made up of over 260,000 people. The outlying representative has been melded into various urban districts. The needs and
desires of Moapa Valley, Mesquite, and other outlying areas have been lost in
demands of the large central population of the Clark County School District. In
essence, the people of Moapa Valley, Mesquite, and other outlying communities
have been disenfranchised and swallowed up in CCSD central administration and
bureaucracy.

In the late nineties Moapa Valley formed a nine member parent Community
Educational Advisory Board (CEAB) to specifically deal with "District" issues
common to our four schools. One of our main issues has been empowerment. For
ten years CEAB pleaded and fought CCSD to "empower" our four schools. We
were only successful in achieving empowerment for our high school under Grant
Hanevold. That period was a very positive community experience.

Now AB 394 has opened a door for change and brought Mr. Strembitsky to help
reorganize CCSD bureaucracy for our children's benefit. We embrace
empowerment as well as honor and support his efforts. We know assisting his
efforts will help the whole and in return help Moapa Valley as well.

However, our CEAB has concerns regarding current CCSD central administration
governance processes based on current and past CCSD performance. We choose
to confine our concerns to Moapa Valley schools and specifically to school
principal selection even though these concerns intersect many other issues. In spite
of CCSD's best efforts and intentions, the community and teachers have been
dissatisfied with the last 4 out of 5 high school principals. These selections have
severely injured our school. The one shining star of the last five principals was
Grant Hanevold. That represents a low 20% District success rate.

We know principal selection is critical to empowerment's success and feel it is vital
to now raise red flags regarding our situation. We are aware that Mr. Strembitsky
feels "parents and teachers are good at establishing criteria for school principals
but NOT good at making that selection," and we agree. In addition, there are many
legalities involved in the hiring and firing process that require a professional
administrator.

There are large isolation and cultural differences between Moapa Valley and urban
Las Vegas. CCSD central administration has many competing agendas and
processes. Here are some examples:
(1) Our schools have been used as administrative stepping stones to better paying
positions in Las Vegas and/or climbing central administration's career ladder.
Central Administration looks down on administrator applicants if they express
their desire to start and end their career at one of our schools. This is an unspoken reality.

(2) One of our elementary schools, Perkins Elementary, is very small and because a school administrator's salary is based on that school's student census, their salary is minimal. Therefore, Perkins Elementary is viewed only as a stepping stone and administrators change every couple of years. This system fails those children.

(3) Our schools are used as a quid pro quo for future administrative advancements, a "pay your dues" attitude by coming out to Moapa Valley.

(4) One of the best high school principals we've ever had, besides Grant Hanevold, was Larry Moses. He is currently on the TAC committee and relates this story: After Larry Moses was appointed principal at Moapa Valley High School, he was contacted by a friend in the District, who didn't know he had volunteered for that position and was told "Don't worry Larry, I'll get you out of there as soon as I can." But Larry Moses liked it here and stayed many years until he retired.

(5) One of our Administrator's from Las Vegas was caught embezzling extracurricular school funds. This illustrates what can happen when loyalty is not directed back into the community.

Despite good intentions, these are examples of destructive institutional processes that have and do effect Moapa Valley children. Because we take our children's education seriously we cannot accept a 20% principal selection success rate.

We have different community dynamics. Those who hire the principals need to be accountable and loyal to our community, not to the central office. This puts our interests first and prevents power from reconsolidating at the central office. We fear that without a governance change we will always be dining at the second table.

Our community has two currently successful governance models. For over fifty years our local power purveyor, Overton Power District #5, and our municipal water purveyor, Moapa Valley Water District, both political subdivisions of the State, have used a model of a locally elected board hiring a professional to manage the specific day-to-day operations. Both districts are fiscally sound and independent.

Therefore we propose that your plan have the flexibility to allow Moapa Valley be its own singular precinct that includes our four aligned schools. This single precinct would be overseen by five locally elected trustees who would then hire an "at will" Precinct Administrator. This Precinct Administrator would hire our school principals, work with the Precinct Board to set policy and regulations, control
precinct finances, and ensure our schools follow the empowerment model within your plan, as well as follow current State and Federal Law.

Because this hired professional would answer to the locally elected board, loyalty would reside here and not with a Las Vegas based central administration. This Precinct Administrator would be able to structure administrative hires to promote needed succession planning so the community, teachers, staff, and the Precinct Trustees could vet future school principals in the Dean and Assistant Principal positions prior to considering them for school principal.

In Moapa Valley, unlike an urban setting, the interview is the least informative part of the selection process as an administrator cannot hide their record or live a dual life. This would make them a known quantity rather than speculative hire. This kind of consistency is not possible if CCSD central administration maintains hiring control because it fatally ties our community back to urban Las Vegas with whom we have very little in common and has been a source of unintended policy conflict.

The two local institutions we have cited as models have multimillion dollar budgets, comparable to a Moapa Valley School Precinct, and demonstrate that Moapa Valley citizenry has the leadership capacity to manage something on this scale. The election costs and dynamics in our community are very simple. Individuals elected to each of these boards usually spend $0 or close to it because their reputation proceeds them. This is how it's functioned for over 50 years.

We would request a plan structured to leave this possibility open. We can flesh out the specifics; we just need space within your plan to do so. We would be happy to briefly sit down and discuss this.

Please leave this door open to us. This means a lot for the parents and children of Moapa Valley.

Thank you,

Expanded AB 394 Task Force of the Moapa Valley Community Educational Advisor Board
Recommendation #1:
When choosing administrators for Sandy Valley Schools the community should have input through the LEA in place, the Sandy Valley-Mesquite Valley Foundation, and DBA Keystone Enrichment Foundation.

Recommendation #2:
The LEA, Sandy Valley-Mesquite Foundation, and DBA Keystone Foundation should be instrumental in the selection of all educators that serve the students of Sandy Valley.

Recommendation #3
The community should have a major voice in the selection of curriculum and the expenditure of funds within their schools.

Recommendation #4:
The community should have an opportunity to meet with Mr. Strembitsky to explain our unique needs and concerns so they can be addressed in the reorganization plan.

Recommendation #5:
Expand the CCSD Board to allow at least one at-large board member to insure representation for outlying communities.

Background Material for Recommendations

To better serve the educational needs of the Sandy Valley area in education, the following is submitted as the perfect scenario:

The choosing of the administrator of the Sandy Valley school would include input from the community through the LEA in place, the Sandy-Mesquite Valley Education Foundation, DBA Keystone Enrichment Foundation (hereinafter the Foundation).

In past years the Sandy Valley School has been used as a dumping ground for those that urban and city schools did not desire. That practice is not conducive to either educators or the learning environment of any school.

In the same regard the Foundation should serve to advise in choices of educators and when possible curriculum. Those that live in an area know better what will have a positive impact on their children and parents. In that same regard the community should provide input on curriculum and the teachers themselves.

There are few comparisons in rural, urban and city schools. There are many educational programs that work in the urban area that would be unsuccessful in a rural school and vice versa. One strong example of this is a program new to our area yet the program is proving to be so inspiring to the students and some of the educators. The Future Farmers of America, FFA is proving to be an academic stimulant to all. Moreover, with animal
husbandry, livestock care and animal health, putting that with a business element and the future is bright for some students that have otherwise not been educationally successful.

Sandy Valley School is experiencing the benefit of a social worker for the first time. With the Foundation providing a means and location for a professional counseling group to have a presents in our community we are seeing wrap around services for the first time ever! Sandy Valley is and has always been a “Title I” school, with these two aspects it will not be long that there is more proven success in a rise of the quality of life in our community.

In few words, in the perfect world of education, each area can embrace their differences and work with their communities to enhance their student’s educational experiences.

Sandy Valley has had the honor of celebrating adult high school graduates locally through the Foundation. We now see mom’s and dad’s setting the example for their children making the statements that you need an education and proving it up by the adult getting theirs.

We have come so far in a short time by raising the quality of life with the availability and quality of education. We cannot stop now.

So in short, for continued and more success and to provide better opportunities for students, educators and parents use the benefit of the Foundation as the voice of the people and allow the community to assist in educating its own.
1. **Site-Based Management Teams** - Propose recommendations to include in the Plan to Reorganize the Clark County School District relating to mandating and formalizing site-based management (empowerment teams) at all schools. The recommendations include the duties of the team, membership of the team, designation of the team chair, development of an appeal process for team decisions, and required meetings to review the school’s plan and budget and share achievement and attitudinal results.

2. **Readiness and Professional Development** - Propose recommendations to include in the Plan to Reorganize the Clark County School District relating to establishing a District Training Program. This would include both internal and external experts, to identify training topics, and develop recommendations for methods of implementation. This delivery of professional development by District staff may include a readiness assessment, blended learning and face-to-face learning sessions, differentiated support, and onboarding of Site-Based Management Team members.

3. **Ensure Equitable Access and Opportunity** - Propose recommendations to include in the Plan to reorganize the CCSD that any changes made to attendance zones, assignments to schools, magnet schools, CTE schools, select school programs and federally mandated programs be studied to ensure equitable funding under the Nevada Plan, equitable access and opportunity for all students, and to ensure compliance with federal and state law, prior to adoption.

Submitted by Pat Skorkowsky,
Superintendent, CCSD