

Chair Roberson, Vice Chair Diaz, and Committee members,

My name is Caryne Shea of HOPE, Honoring Our Public Education. Given the plan's faster timeline and the many questions this plan raises regarding adequate resources to fund it, our desire is that this effort not become another failed attempt to realize the goal of increased student achievement. We would like to go on record with what we deem important concerns to consider before moving forward:

1. Our current Assistant Chiefs' job description is the same as the Plan's School Associate Superintendents. Does this mean the Chiefs' new position will expand to include responsibilities like training, budgeting and plan development for their schools and Administrators? How do we ensure confidence at Chiefs' ability in that expansion? What is the cost?
2. The School Teams need to be an integral part of successful school autonomy, but how do we ensure participation when less than 1/2 of our schools have a parent group? Does the school Admin bear the burden of creating these where absent? Are there more than a handful of non-licenses personnel available? Why do 1/2 of the teachers need to be union? Why are we encouraging and limiting participation at the same time. What happens if schools can't build School Teams?
3. Can the Plan define exactly how surveys will be more effective, given they will be neither mandatory nor anonymous?
4. Why and how should Elementary, Middle, and High school students be funded differently? How does it relate to current per pupil expenditures? Are "identifiable learning groups" in addition to those weights? Will our current state categorical funding supplement or supplant CCS Weighted Student Funding? What happens if the WSF formula doesn't balance?
5. What kind of budget autonomy will Administrators have if, as recommended, individual schools are enabled to control 85 percent of their budgets at school level but personnel salaries and benefits make up almost 90% of each school's budget? And even if they can negotiate a landscaper or copies with any remaining budget, what are the savings predicted, if at all? It was also recommended that the Advisory Committee consultant determine available unrestricted federal funds. Will Mr. Strembitsky now be hired to do that on an ongoing basis?



**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
JENNIFER BLACKHURST | **PRESIDENT**  
CARYNE SHEA | **VICE PRESIDENT**  
ERICA REYNOLDS | **SECRETARY**  
ANNA ANTOLICK | **MEMBER**  
JULIE VIGIL | **MEMBER**

---

6. We know that change of this magnitude cannot be cost neutral and the fact is, we have grossly underfunded NV K-12 education for the last 50 years. CCSD has the lowest per-pupil allocation in the state and Nevada is at the very bottom of the funding list compared to the rest of the country. Combined with our epic teacher vacancy dilemma, this plan demands we start funding education like we value it. That number, by the way, is not \$5600 per pupil.

7. While AB394 was meant to improve methods and outcomes in our school's education, it also has raised many questions and concerns with certain items labeled as "unspecified". Once this "consultation" ends, who then becomes responsible for filling in the blanks?

And finally, one of AB394's three goals was to improve student achievement. Sadly, students aren't mentioned in this Plan.

We look forward to any additional insight you can give.