

**MINUTES OF THE 2015-2016 INTERIM
ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO DEVELOP A PLAN TO
REORGANIZE THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

AUGUST 16, 2016

The meeting of the Advisory Committee to Develop a Plan to Reorganize the Clark County School District was called to order by Chair Michael Roberson at 9:58 a.m. at the Grant Sawyer Building, Room 4401, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada, and via videoconference at the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Room 3137, Carson City, Nevada. Exhibit A is the Agenda and Exhibit B is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT (LAS VEGAS):

Senator Michael Roberson, Senatorial District No. 20, Chair
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz, Assembly District No. 11, Vice Chair
Senator Moises (Mo) Denis, Senatorial District No. 2
Senator Aaron D. Ford, Senatorial District No. 11
Senator Joseph (Joe) P. Hardy, Senatorial District No. 12
Senator Becky Harris, Senatorial District No. 9
Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Assembly District No. 7
Assemblyman Stephen H. Silberkraus, Assembly District No. 29
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart, Assembly District No. 22

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Brenda Erdoes, Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Risa Lang, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Karly O'Krent, Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Julie Waller, Senior Program Analyst, Fiscal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Jaimarie Dagdagan, Program Analyst, Fiscal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Adam Drost, Program Analyst, Fiscal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Kelly Richard, Principal Research Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Angela Hartzler, Secretary, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Linda Hiller, Interim Secretary, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau

OTHERS PRESENT:

Carolyn Edwards, Trustee, Clark County School District Board of Trustees, District F
Autumn Tampa, CCSD Employee

Annette Dawson Owens, Break Free CCSD
Lindsey Dalley, Moapa Valley A.B. 394 Community Education Advisory Board
Task Force
Courtney Sweetin, Break Free CCSD
Terri Shuman, CCSD Employee
Terry Woods
Amanda Morgan, Legal Director, Educate Nevada Now (ENN)
Sylvia Lazos, Policy Director, ENN
Adriana Martinez, ENN
Alison Turner
Tod Story, Executive Director, ACLU of Nevada
Jose Solorio, Vice Chair, College of Southern Nevada Institution Advisory Council
Fernando Romero, President, Hispanics in Politics
Rebecca Warf
Annalise Castor, Break Free CCSD
Vicenta Montoya
Susie Lee, Board Chair, Communities In Schools
Andy Hafen, Mayor, City of Henderson
Concetta Tedesco, CCSD Employee
LaTonya Watts, CCSD Employee
Brent Husson, President, Nevada Succeeds
Carolyn Goodman, Mayor, City of Las Vegas
Guillermo Vazquez, Executive Director, Education Support Employees Association
John Vellardita, Executive Director, Clark County Education Association
Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School
Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees
Pat Skorkowsky, Superintendent, Clark County School District
Mary Beth Scow, District G Commissioner, Clark County Board of County
Commissioners
Michael Strembitsky, CCSD Reorganization Consultant, International Consultant,
Former Superintendent of Schools, Edmonton Public Schools, Edmonton,
Alberta, Canada
Assemblyman David M. Gardner, Assembly District No. 9

Chair Roberson:

I will open the meeting of the Committee to Develop a Plan to Reorganize the Clark County School District with agenda item II, public comment.

Carolyn Edwards (Trustee, Clark County School District Board of Trustees, District F):

I want to explain why I am not accompanied by other trustees—three are out of town, one is at work, one is complexly ill, and with me is Trustee Kevin Childs. Our position is that while some progress is being made as the regulations are being updated, there

continue to be legal issues remaining. We were provided the latest version of the draft regulation on August 11 and we do not believe it resolves our concerns regarding student achievement, equitable funding issues, student equity concerns and financial and employment issues. The Board is concerned that this process of developing the regulations has proceeded too quickly to allow for careful review and consideration of the practical implications this process will have on Clark County School District (CCSD) and the operations of the schools. I have submitted my written testimony including a document that sets forth the District's concerns ([Agenda Item II A](#)).

Chair Roberson:

Thank you, we would like to see that document. I spent several hours yesterday with Superintendent Skorkowsky and the District's legal counsel. There were others in the room as well, and we all came away with the impression that they were satisfied that the District's concerns had been met. As we go through this Committee hearing today, please get involved more specifically in the issues you raised because I believe you will find they have been addressed.

Senator Aaron D. Ford (Senatorial District No. 11):

We do not typically respond or engage in discussion during public comment, but I have a couple of questions. I have a lot of respect for you and the Board and what you are elected to do, which includes speaking up on issues and concerns you may have with the process. I have been on record as saying from the get-go that I did not like the bill, but I like the process we have been engaged in over the last 10 months—being as inclusive as possible, incorporating comments, trying to address concerns, etc. So frankly, I am a bit dismayed that although we had CCSD Board of School Trustees in our meetings during the entirety of this process, we did not get these entreaties and requests until recently. I understand you have public meeting records and laws you have to comply with, but, that said, I would be very interested in understanding specifically how you would address some of the concerns you have raised.

You have asked questions about student achievement, procurement laws, student equity, weighted funding formulas and a litany of other things. I would very much appreciate proposed language, as opposed to a delineation of problems; a proposed solution to address those concerns. I think, frankly, that some of these things have been addressed. We have work to do, no question, even with this final draft, but a lot of these concerns have been addressed—from the equity issue to the procurement issue. In the new regulations, section 14, I believe, it says that all procurement laws in our State be followed by a school that is purchasing instructional items. Other things may not have been addressed, but I do not know that, because I have not seen proposed language that would address those concerns.

I also find it a bit disappointing that the Chair of this Committee can have a meeting with the superintendent and general counsel and be advised that things are okay, and then

almost immediately thereafter, we hear that the Board of Trustees is still not satisfied with the solutions that have been recommended. All of that goes back to my initial point, which is that I would really appreciate more than a litany of issues and more of a list of proposed solutions.

Autumn Tampa (CCSD Employee):

I want to publically thank the CCSD Board of Trustees for doing their due diligence. I would love to see positive change in the CCSD. There are too many unknowns and not enough details in this plan. I do not understand how cutting the budget of central services by over 60 percent can give the students of this school district what they need. Many groups have suggested the timeline be slowed down, so I ask you again to please slow this timeline down. I have submitted my written testimony with specific concerns and recommendations for the reorganization plan ([Agenda Item II B](#)).

Annette Dawson Owens (Break Free CCSD):

We are so excited to be breaking free from being dead last in education. Over a year ago, we came here and talked about this being our marathon. This has been a laboriously long process. I want to thank all of you for your hard work and efforts on the Advisory Committee, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), our superintendent who has a really tough job, and our hero, Michael Strembitsky, who has shown us a better way. Every person's efforts have made a difference. I may actually miss you all, but I will get over it.

Now is the time for our ultra marathon that only the crazies, or the truly dedicated, embark on. Some believe this reorganization will not change anything, so let us prove them wrong. Now is the time for us to be part of the movement for change in education; to empower every school to soar as we have in the past with great models. We need to fund education, have the best training, work on recruitment and increase achievement in our schools. We do not want to ever look back again or be in 2026 saying, "Remember when we tried to reform education?" There will be bumps in the road. Do not be a naysayer; one who looks for a problem and says, "See? I told you so." Look for, and be part of the solutions and the change you want to see. This is the time for all of us to come together as one in our District and our communities and put every one of our kids and their education first. Thank you for allowing us to be a part of this process. Break Free CCSD will be here for you and will help in any way we can.

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

We have worked closely with Break Free CCSD in this process. We thoroughly enjoyed your town hall meeting held in Logandale for Moapa and Virgin Valley remote schools. We understand this process has many moving parts but we admonish this Committee to keep our children's needs first and foremost. We have met with local principals and they are excited and want to move forward to start reorganizing. Some of the major

obstacles to our students' education, identified by principals in Moapa Valley, center in section 14, subsection 3 of the proposed regulation ([Agenda Item V A-1](#)), the part that lists the central services. As soon as possible, our schools need these responsibilities to be assigned to us. The number one priority for our principals was transportation services. We are not asking for the whole thing to be upended; they are looking for one person locally who could set the bus schedules. That is a huge problem.

The second priority coming from our principals was buildings and grounds maintenance. We have situations right now where it is more difficult to figure out how central services should solve the problem than the problem itself. We have janitors doing central services' responsibilities because central does not know how to solve the problem within the system at our remote schools.

Our third priority is capital projects. I know this is looked at as building schools, but we are not concerned about that. There are many small capital projects that occur in remote schools that require us to go to a board in Las Vegas that does not understand our rural needs. For example, light poles in a middle school, which is not something those schools usually have, but our middle school was formerly a high school. Those light poles were financed by the local community and now need replacing.

The final priority we identified is that there needs to be some sort of remote school policy exemption. Policies for CCSD are created in Las Vegas for Las Vegas by Las Vegas residents and that is fine. But the consequences of these policies can shackle our remote schools into a one-size-fits-all. We want what is best for our students, which in turn will empower our teachers and support staff to provide the best educational opportunities and services to our students.

Courtney Sweetin (Break Free CCSD):

We got involved with this process from the beginning because we know that teachers, principals and support staff have unions, but parents and kids do not have unions to represent them. We wanted to make sure the parents and the students were not forgotten in this process. We are happy to see that everybody on these Advisory Committees has the children and parents at the forefront of their minds.

When we started this, we wanted two things—local control and dollars following students to schools and this plan accomplished them both. We could not be happier. We do not want to see the timeline slowed down. Talking to parents, we know we cannot stop and wait. We need to act now. We are grateful to all the many people here and behind the scenes who are working on this and making it a reality. We are really excited to move forward. It will be a better outcome for students and we will see those achievement gains when the people closest to those students are making the decisions, rather than someone far away. I live in Mesquite, and it does not make any sense that

the majority of our decision making is done 90 miles away in Las Vegas. We are happy and grateful and ready to get to work.

Terri Shuman (CCSD Employee):

A couple of months ago I was at a CCSD Board of School Trustees meeting where I posed a question to them—if you were a support staff employee who had not received a raise in more than 8 years, would you still be working for CCSD? At the time, I did not receive an answer, but I want to tell you why I am still an employee. While I was in college, I became pregnant and lost that baby. It took 25 years for me to realize there was a bigger plan. In 2002, I became a substitute teacher and my love for kids has grown so now I feel like I am doing the thing I was supposed to do all along, which is to support my kids. I now have 1,000 kids. When I walk into my middle school and see kids I taught in elementary school, their response is, “Miss Shuman, it is so good to see you!” that means I meant something to them while I was teaching them, which brings me to this point—support staff at CCSD have not been respected for a very long time. So why am I still here? I believe not only do I have my kids to be responsible for; I have my coworkers to be responsible for, too. My job is to advocate for them.

In the proposed regulation ([Agenda Item V A-1](#)), section 25, subsection 1, paragraph (c), before the regulation was revised, there were two support staff employees assigned to each school committee. When it was revised ([Agenda Item V A-2](#)), one of those representatives was removed, leaving only one support staff employee on the school organizational committee. I feel like our voice is again being taken away. We have been spit on and kicked until we just do not have any purpose anymore. We are tired of fighting and we want to be treated as equals with our coworkers; the teachers. Please consider adding our support staff employee back to the school committee. It is not just good enough to come to school every day and go by the rules; it is important enough to me to be a part of this committee and to have my voice heard.

Terry Woods:

I am originally from California and I have a program that solves the discipline problems in the classroom, stops the dropping out of students and helps teachers be more effective in their classrooms. The program was chosen as the most effective program in the State of California and it was presented at the annual principal’s conference for academic excellence and effective schools. I have lived here for approximately 20 years and am offering this program for free to any school in this city to prove what I can do. This happened to me in California and after they saw the success in the first school, everyone wanted it. I have submitted a document with testimonials from teachers and principals about this program ([Agenda Item II C](#)).

Amanda Morgan (Legal Director, Educate Nevada Now (ENN)):

I want to reiterate the importance of adequately funding special education on a per pupil basis. For this reorganization to work, schools will need resources to provide services.

The bipartisan Task Force on K-12 Public Education Funding for modernizing the Nevada Plan recommended a weight of 2.0 for special education students. That weight gets to the actual need, which is the amount actually needed for students to achieve. The State Superintendent's proposed weight of 1.53 is based on historic expenditures. Legislators voted to modernize the Nevada Plan because they recognized that the old system was not working. We expect this Committee to lead the effort and demand a forward-looking weight that will actually make a difference.

We are pleased to see the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and special education included as a responsibility of the District on the revised regulation ([Agenda Item V A-2](#)). As someone who has advocated for families and students with Individual Education Plans (IEP), I know firsthand that a school alone cannot solely take the reins for special education services and compliance. The consequences of getting it wrong are significant, not only for the child, but with respect to legal liability. We know that this can only work if adequate funding is available for a strong central oversight and quality professional development. We also urge you to supplement the legislative record in some way so it is clear that all State and federal mandates tasking the District with oversight to protect students' civil rights remain in place under this autonomous structure. I have submitted written documents ([Agenda Item II D](#)).

Sylvia Lazos (Policy Director, ENN):

Education reform is a bipartisan effort. We are 6 months away from the next session of the Legislature and this process has taken 10 months through bipartisan collaboration. I want to congratulate the Committee and the community that has put forward suggestions and ideas in that spirit. Are we getting to the heart of the problem at CCSD? Are we allocating talented teachers to the neediest students? Over and over, the consultants have testified that leadership makes or breaks the system. Does this regulation help get us to a place where we have a high degree of confidence in the leadership? There is still work to do.

On the allocation of talented teachers, the main mechanism in the regulation to help principals in our at-risk schools retain talent is the idea that site-based budgeting will give them more flexibility and allow them to provide incentives in solid actions. That is essential to keep our talent in these schools. I am happy to see we are going to revisit the idea of allocating teachers through average cost within 1 year of the implementation; tasking the State Department of Education (NDE) to look at this equity issue. What does it mean in real life to be using average numbers? I have submitted a document with the following data using Dean Peterson Professional Development Elementary School (page 4, [Agenda Item II D](#)). At Peterson, the actual teacher salary is \$7,500 less than the average for the District. That is an annual total of about \$400,000 that Peterson does not receive. Where Assemblywoman Diaz used to teach, C. C. Ronnow Elementary School, their differential between actual and average salary is about \$3,000. Another school, J.E. Manch Elementary, a historically struggling school, has a

differential of about \$6,000 per teacher. There is a connection between the differentials in salaries and where these schools are located. By going to average salaries, we are taking away an important tool for these principals, which is to be able to use the budget to incentivize and put in structures to help and retain teachers.

On the leadership side, as a community member, I have seen that our distribution of talent on the principal side is a normal curve—we have some great principals and some not so great principals. Clearly, we need professional development. What happens if we cannot train the bottom part of the normal curve of principals to become the outstanding leaders that make this model work? We may have work to do in the next legislative session so we can exit those folks who do not understand their kids, cannot do economic leadership and cannot shift to collaborative work. Those individuals should not be leading a school of 1,000 kids and handling a budget of \$4 million.

I am not a math major; I am a lawyer, but if you take the \$5,400 we allocate to each student in CCSD under Senate Bill (S.B.) 508, 80 percent of that is \$4,300 per pupil that will be used in the budget for each school.

SENATE BILL 508: Revises provisions governing the Nevada Plan. (BDR 34-1184)

If you add back in the weights for each English Language Learner (ELL) child of 1.2, which is what State Superintendent Steve Canavero wants to do, the per pupil total comes to roughly \$5,100 per student. I will point out that the premier charter school for ELL students, the most successful charter operator in the country, operating out of south Texas, will not even contemplate a jurisdiction where the per pupil is not around \$9,000 per ELL kids. So that gap is pretty substantial and we will have to address that in the next legislative session. Again, congratulations on all the hard work you have done. I have a document with more information to submit ([Agenda Item II D](#)).

Senator Ford:

I am a lawyer who used to be a math teacher and I think your math is exactly right. I just want to commend you on your involvement. Your group has been instrumental in giving us good things to think about. I think the points you have made are accurate. We have talked about the actual versus average funding and we have continued to discuss this issue. We will see if the models in Oakland and elsewhere can apply here. On per pupil funding, you have a commitment from me that we will continue to try to increase that. I just wanted to put on the record that you guys have been instrumental in the conversation and I appreciate your input.

Ms. Lazos:

Thank you for your graciousness and also thank you to all the bipartisan leadership that I see here which is aimed at making things work for kids.

Adriana Martinez (ENN):

I have attended many of the town hall meetings and also these Committee meetings and, to its credit, this Committee created an environment to collect feedback from all members of our community and I give you credit for that. However, my observation is that many parents, mostly from lower performing schools in key underrepresented demographics like special education, Free and Reduced-Price Lunch and ELL, are still confused by the reorganization proposal. In my personal experience, with the town hall meetings I attended, the attendance from actual parents was dismal.

I saw a lot of support staff who are concerned with their jobs, rightfully so. Without support staff and teachers, we cannot have a school district. I also cannot emphasize enough the importance of community outreach. I have done a lot of community outreach with various organizations and it is a tough job to get parent involvement. I was part of the Parent Teacher Association (PTA) and I would tell other parents what was going on. The reorganization of a school district is complicated enough for everyone in this room today. Imagine how it is for parents with a second language or those who hold two jobs and cannot attend these meetings. It is complicated. These are parents who care about their children. I care enough to stand before you and ask you to please fund an outreach person to go to schools and inform people what is taking place. The stakes are too high for every parent and child. The only way the town hall meetings are truly effective is if parents know; and they do not know what they do not know.

Alison Turner:

I am a past president of the Nevada PTA and continue to work with the PTA at the federal level. Most of my work now is with the National PTA, but I represent neither of those organizations today. I was also on the former Central Design Team for Empowerment Schools for CCSD during the second iteration. The Legislature funded the initial experiment with empowerment schools but declined to continue that funding. The District then came up with its own funding and set up a carefully designed rollout to look at how empowerment schools work in very different school communities.

My concerns with the draft plan are included in my submitted written testimony ([Agenda Item II E](#)). I would strongly caution against moving too quickly. I do not see an opportunity for people to be trained to take on enormous responsibility. As Ms. Martinez just said, parents do not know what they do not know. More importantly, in terms of equity, our most at-risk students tend to come from families with either limited or negative experiences with education. These parents cannot know by osmosis what they need to do to help their children.

Effective family engagement takes place in the home but parent involvement takes place in the school and may require some training. It is wonderful that you have written into regulations the strong requirements on parent involvement in the school organizational teams. However, parent involvement in CCSD was completely

dismantled by the former District superintendent around 2010. He assured me repeatedly that there would be a replacement, but that never happened. In 358 schools, there are 12 elementary school Family Engagement Centers, most are in high risk schools. There are four Family Engagement Resource Centers in high schools. They do not currently practice family engagement and have not done that much during their tenure. They are wonderful resource centers for students, but do not provide resources for families.

The lack of transition will completely torpedo what appears to be your interest in ensuring that parents are represented on these school teams. I understand that we want a silver bullet, but there is no such thing. What CCSD did before with empowerment showed wildly varying results and it did not fix all schools; nothing will fix all schools. This is a complex problem and I hope this is a step in the right direction but I believe that some of this is possibly ill-considered. I have submitted my written testimony ([Agenda Item II E](#)).

Tod Story (Executive Director, ACLU of Nevada):

Our involvement today is precipitated because of the need to address some of the legal issues we think are outstanding in this process. We appreciate that there have been multiple public meetings to gain public input, but today we face possible action by the Committee with a vote on adopting regulations and not a plan. We are concerned that the premature adoption of these regulations may run afoul of the Nevada Administrative Procedures Act, Chapter 233B of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS).

Assembly Bill (A.B.) 394 created this Committee to develop a plan to deconsolidate CCSD. While the debate over that necessity may never be resolved, we must agree on the need to address the specific needs and legal requirements of educating every student in an inclusive and equitable approach, free of discriminatory practices. I have submitted my written testimony with all our concerns listed ([Agenda Item II F](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 394: Creates an advisory committee and a technical committee to develop a plan to reorganize the Clark County School District and revises certain provisions related to collective bargaining. (BDR 22-900)

Chair Roberson:

I appreciate the ACLU's input. Be assured that Legislative Counsel has been involved every step of the way. We do believe we are complying with the law in all respects.

Jose Solorio (Vice Chair, College of Southern Nevada Institution Advisory Council):

I am a longtime Latino community advocate, especially in education. I am also the son of immigrants and was an ELL student when I attended school here, going to inner city urban schools of Las Vegas and graduating from University of Nevada, Reno (UNR).

My son is a senior at Columbia University. I am involved in this process from the standpoint of treating all our children the way they should be treated, with equal education opportunity. That is what the U.S. Supreme Court says our children should have. This plan tries to address that but there are three things it should address: empowerment of the schools, equality of funding and equity in educational opportunity.

I see that the empowerment is clear, focused and on track but I do not see the equality and the equity. When we talk about equality, the funding should follow the student. We should not have an average cost of teachers because that is a disguise for discriminating in your budgets. We are funding certain schools anywhere from \$300,000 to close to \$1 million in difference in budgets between schools. We are then wondering why our students are not performing or graduating from inner city schools when we are not providing an equality of budgets. That issue needs to be looked at with the same importance as how we look at empowerment.

I look at equity as the additional funds necessary to take a student—whether it is through special education or ELL—to a level they need to be. That is where the weighted funding formula comes in. This Legislature has looked at equity but has not implemented it. This plan seems to address empowerment but leave equality and equity behind. In a sense, what you are doing is taking from Pablo to educate Paul; from one group of students to educate another group of students and not being fair. This has occurred over time and is not done on purpose, but now we know it exists and it needs to be addressed. We will continue to have high drop-out rates and be unfair to our students if we do not look at equality and equity in the same way we look at empowerment. I implore you to look at not using average unit costs and consider using actual costs in the budgeting.

Fernando Romero (President, Hispanics in Politics):

I am a 49-year resident of Clark County and president of Hispanics in Politics, Nevada's oldest Hispanic political organization. I am here to declare my full support of the recommendations and testimony submitted by Educate Nevada Now through their policy director, Dr. Sylvia Lazos. I ask that special attention be placed on item 5 of her letter on page 3 and the fifth paragraph of item 6 on page 4 ([Agenda Item II D](#)). I also recommend that CCSD's support staff be protected from any outsourcing that would compromise or jeopardize the employment status of current staff.

Lastly, I recommend the creation of the position of an ombudsman or community student advocate to ensure the reorganization plan as approved and submitted is adhered to and emphasizes community involvement. As a Latino advocate, I support the involvement of Latino parents and students. I also support the concerns addressed by Trustee Edwards ([Agenda Item II A](#)). If you have addressed these concerns, I am glad. If not, I would like a special emphasis placed on student equity. As to the money, let us hope the Nevada Supreme Court rules against S.B. 302, the educational savings

account bill. Who it saves money for, I do not know. It certainly is not the school districts. I do think we could use that extra \$30 million that we will be giving to parents in Green Valley and Summerlin and the other very minimal number of individuals within the low income areas.

SENATE BILL 302: Establishes a program by which a child who receives instruction from a certain entity rather than from a public school may receive a grant of money in an amount equal to a certain percentage of the statewide average basic support per-pupil. (BDR 34-567)

Thank you for all the work you put into this. Certainly we will keep a close eye on it. There is a matter right now vacancy at a local high school; I will not go into specifics, although I can if you ask me.

Chair Roberson:

Go ahead and tell us about this, Mr. Romero. I think I know what you are going to say and it is more for the benefit of the school district.

Mr. Romero:

Western High School had a very good principal who unfortunately was there for only 2 years. She was taken away by one of the private charter schools. There is a gentleman at Western, David Kirkhart, and it appears that he is not going to be considered for principal, even though the school community wants him. I am sure that if the proper thing is done by CCSD, we may embrace A.B. 394 with a little more approval. Hopefully something is done to satisfy the wants and the needs of the Latino community and the Latino students at Western High School.

Chair Roberson:

I am already receiving texts saying they agree with you 100 percent on this issue. Your remarks have resonated outside this room.

Senator Ford:

To you and Mr. Solorio, we are trying hard up here to find the best solution to implement A.B. 394. In law school, we learned in the first year that you do not have to solve all problems with one piece of legislation. We are not going to solve all the issues being addressed and raised through this one regulation, but you can rest assured that everyone on this dais is attempting to find ways to address other issues as they arise and they may be in separate pieces of legislation. I am not saying that you will not see some answers to some of the questions and issues that have been raised, but I am as concerned about equity as anyone else. I am concerned about ensuring we have diversity in our schools, so these issues are not falling on deaf ears. Just because some of these issues may not appear in the final version of these regulations does not mean that they will not be addressed. I appreciate the work you have done. Talking about

average versus actual teacher pay was a conversation we had 2 months ago. I am trying to figure out the best approach.

Rebecca Warf:

I have been a CCSD support staff employee for 16 years and I have two children that graduated from CCSD schools. Several people have already expressed my concerns, but there are still questions. The teacher and principal training to implement all this is important. As support staff, we are concerned about our jobs. We love our jobs and the students.

I worked for food service and my job was outsourced. The managers are still in place, but the other helpers had their hours reduced, their benefits removed and their jobs were outsourced. Now they are making \$10 per hour with no benefits. There is a lot of dedication from the workers and the people in the community but there are still a lot of questions. I do not know why we need to rush this when it does not have to be passed this soon. It would be good to have some of the training in place before it is passed.

Annalise Castor (Break Free CCSD):

We are here to say thank you. What Senator Ford said is right; this is a really huge problem and I do not think anyone looks at the bill and says, "This is perfect; this is exactly every single thing I wanted." But this is such a great place to start and to build from. You have done a wonderful job with an impossible problem. We are excited about these school organizational teams. This is going to be awesome; it will change so much of how we see education here in Nevada. I think it will bring a sense of community into a really transient city. There will be so much good that will come in every area of town from these teams. Thank you for all the time and effort you put into this. We endorsed this bill and we are excited to see it go forward in the future.

Vicenta Montoya:

I am a product of CCSD, back during what may be considered the golden age of the District. I had a child go through the District and now have a grandchild who will be entering in the future. I was part of the Family Engagement Resource Center (FERC) this past year as a coordinator for Sunrise Mountain High School (SMHS). My concern has to do with the teams you will be establishing in the parental involvement. I attended parent meetings in the high school and it was all conducted in Spanish. We were fortunate because the SMHS principal spoke Spanish. I am concerned about the high schools without this advantage, which are the vast majority of schools, who do not have someone fluent in Spanish to converse with a student population that is 50 percent Latino. Most of these children will have parents who mainly speak Spanish. How will you train these people effectively? Will principals reach out to engage those parents?

In my family, I was my mother's translator. She was born in the U.S. and her first language was Spanish, so I see my mother in those mothers and my father in those

fathers. My parents made sacrifices so I could go to Catholic school and I was eventually able to become an attorney. My program, FERC, no longer exists after this year. It was funded through AmeriCorps but that grant was not picked up by the United Way so that resource will not be there in those four high schools that are almost 90 percent Latino. This is a major concern.

In regard to outsourcing, the way the regulation is written, it is so broad. Are we going to be losing people who otherwise might have employment through CCSD? I am not a real fan of outsourcing because I have seen what it has done nationwide. We need to have something in place for the protection of those workers. We also need to make sure we are not doing outsourcing in the private sector only to be able to pad their bottom line. We need to do things responsibly, like using central purchasing to ensure we get the lowest costs.

Susie Lee (Board Chair, Communities In Schools):

Thank you and congratulations for all your hard work, I want to reiterate what Dr. Lazos from Educate Nevada Now (ENN) said about the intent of this legislation and what we look at when we talk about student achievement, which is getting the best teachers to our neediest students, allowing leadership to flourish so we have the best leadership in our schools. I caution against the timeline, especially in a school district with more than 300,000 students. I know there is a legislative timeline, but we should slow it down.

I was on a few empowerment committees in the District back in the day. It flourished in some schools where there was great leadership and then it did not flourish where the leaders were not prepared to undertake the task. I would like to see more emphasis on professional development.

The average cost versus actual cost issue will still make this legislation be laid on the backs of our most at-risk students. I am alarmed that we are willing to wait a year or two to address that issue because that is time in the lives of the students we serve. In section 17 of the regulation ([Agenda Item V A-1](#)), it appears to be addressing the weighted student funding (WSF). If that is the case, will there be a definition of what those weights will be? Is this the legislation that will drive that conversation or is there a separate piece of legislation to do that? I support the WSF that addresses the special populations, but how does that legally play out in the next Legislative Session?

Finally, on the committee composition, Communities In Schools partners with more than 56 schools in the State; 49 schools in Clark County, as an evidence-based wraparound service provider. We have a graduation rate of more than 88 percent for the most at-risk students. In the schools where principals have selected us as a partner, in that committee composition if there is a provider providing such wraparound services, I would like to see a seat at the table. I am curious about section 25, subsection 1, paragraph (e) of the regulation (page 16, [Agenda Item V A-1](#)), where it says “A number

of parents ..." will be on the school committee. Who determines what that number will be? Also, I am curious why you are calling each school a school precinct instead of just school? I also agree with Autumn Tampa that if a consultant is needed to implement this, that person should be paid for by the Legislature, not CCSD, since it is already under budget constraints.

Andy Hafen, (Mayor, City of Henderson):

It is probably no secret where I came from as Mayor of Henderson at the beginning of this process. Many residents in my city, like me, wished to have our own school district. Thanks to the good work of this Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee, I think we have a plan that we can embrace as residents of Henderson and the city council. Last week, four out of the five of us mayors had lunch and one of our topics of discussion was A.B. 394. The consensus was that we were all pleased with those regulations ([Agenda Item V A-1](#)) that have given a voice to the local municipalities.

Specifically, section 20 gives cities the input in hiring the associate superintendents; section 21 requires the associate superintendents to give a quarterly report to the governing body, and section 29 which, by regulation now, enables cities to create a Community Education Advisory Board (CEAB). These things are very important to us and with the voice you gave us and local government, it really enhances the community identity we were all looking for.

Concetta Tedesco (CCSD Employee):

I am a Title I instructional assistant with CCSD for the past 13 years. Thank you for all your hard work on this effort. I am very much against outsourcing as the support staff are all concerned about our jobs.

One day when I was on playground duty at Priest Elementary School, I observed a little girl talking to a man on the other side of the fence. I went over to both of them and asked her if she knew the man. "No," she said, and the man quickly responded that he was just talking to her. I gave a detailed report about the incident over the radio and after lunch, went back to the classroom. The principal, Dr. Griffith came and found me to thank me. I told her that not on my watch would anything happen. I felt that had I not intervened, that girl could have been abused or worse. When I asked the little girl what the man was asking about, she told me he wanted to know her name and where she lived. I hope that man thought a second time about trying the same thing at another school.

At a different school, I was working with some children in a small group in the Route to Intervention program. At the end of the year, the teacher, Mr. Ortiz, thanked me for helping his students succeed, explaining that some of the students I was working with had gone from reading on a level D to reading on a level B. I was so happy to hear that. If we get outsourced, who are you going to get and where are you going to get these

employees from? An agency? The street? They will not have the experience, background and knowledge to do what we do. Please change section 14, subsection 2, paragraph (c) (page 4, [Agenda Item V A-2](#)) where it says, “plan of operation for the local school precinct. Equipment, services and supplies may be procured from the School District or elsewhere”. That “or elsewhere” is really is really concerning to me and many of the other support staff. Please change this wording so it supports us.

LaTonya Watts (CCSD Employee):

I have worked for more than 28 years as a CCSD support staff employee. I have worked at schools in the affluent communities, at-risk schools, behavioral schools and so on. My comments are addressed to the support staff and our ability to keep our jobs and to keep doing our jobs well. We are highly underpaid. At 28 years, I still have to work extra jobs to make ends meet and I do not live in an affluent neighborhood or drive a fancy car. In my job, we are required to be teacher, mother, nurse, cop, doctor and any other form that child needs, including technology. We are not given the proper respect we deserve and I would like to see that change. I have had to set up technical equipment for students with special needs.

We are constantly told, “Oh, you are overstaffed,” but no one comes into the classroom to assist with changing a child that requires three people because he cannot control his body and he injures other people, and yet we are overstaffed. We are the dumping ground. We are the ones who have to take up the extra cost for insurance and things for administration and our teachers. We are at the bottom of the rung. For example, for a parent with four children to be covered by insurance, their first paycheck and part of their second paycheck will go to pay for that insurance. That needs to be changed.

I would like to see this process slow down. Instead of looking at schools when they are all shiny and polished and it is a special day, I would like to see the Legislators and the community go into those schools on days when it is not a special day and actually substitute in the classroom all over the county. Visit all the schools, including the affluent schools and at-risk schools and all the schools in-between before making a decision about how we should dismantle the school district as well as the budgeting for where the money goes. That way, you could truly see where the disparities are and what needs to be changed.

Brent Husson (President, Nevada Succeeds):

I want to remind the Committee that many of the concerns brought up here were not created by this legislation. For example, the average teacher salary versus actual teacher salary has been in used CCSD for several years, if not decades, and that was not created by A.B. 394. The inequities that exist today in our schools in the outer ring versus the inner core would continue to exist without A.B. 394. As Senator Ford said, every concern does not have to be addressed with this bill.

As to the training for principals, we probably have a fairly standard distribution of talent in the principalship. We have some great ones, we have a lot of very good ones and then we have some on the other end of the scale. Again, A.B. 394 did not create that distribution, but it gives us an opportunity to address that, expose it and do something about it. The fact is the distribution of principal talent and teacher talent cannot be solved by moving these employees around from school to school, creating a deficit from where they left. The way to solve it is to raise the talent of all. I believe A.B. 394 provides us with that opportunity.

This is a reorganization that changes the operating system. It is not a silver bullet and does not answer every question, but it allows us to have a system to support human talent management. That is the only way we are going to solve the problems that exist differently in different schools. We have to raise the aggregate level of talent in the CCSD and the only way to do that is to allow them to work individually in their buildings and to have collaborative cultures. While I am absolutely on board with some of the concerns the trustees brought up, I want to commend the panel for taking all the community's concerns seriously. I have seen the work you have done in revising these drafts. I know about the phone calls back and forth to assure people these concerns are addressed and I have seen the results in the regulations being changed when new issues are brought up. My heartfelt thanks to the panel and to Assemblyman Gardner for proposing this bill. This has moved the conversation on education in Nevada dramatically forward. It is an outstanding opportunity, not a guarantee, but an opportunity to change things and to really make a difference for kids by changing how we operate in the system today.

Assemblywoman Dina Neal (Assembly District No. 7):

You said you agreed with some of the comments brought up by the trustees. Which comments do you agree with?

Mr. Husson:

Some of the concerns they have about labor laws and equity, but to my understanding those issues were addressed by Senator Roberson and his staff and the CCSD. I know we still have several days before final regulations are approved and I am assuming that anything that has not been addressed will be addressed. We use the trustees as a punching bag and I want to remind everybody that we are all on the same team here. I have not talked to any of the adults involved in this who do not say the kids are the most important thing, and this includes our School Board Trustees. They are put in a difficult situation. One of the particulars they brought up is that if we are not responsible for, let us say, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) implementation, yet we are the corporate entity that has to answer all the questions or the lawsuits because something was not adjusted at the school level, that puts us in a tough spot. Based on their understanding of the regulations at the time, that was a legitimate concern. However, my understanding is that the attorneys have addressed those issues and that has been

resolved. It was not wrong of them to come into the process and raise that concern and it was right that we addressed it and make it so they are not exposed in a way they can do nothing about. That is how the process works; that is good governance.

It may seem to some that this has moved quickly, but this bill was passed in June of last year so it has been a year that we have been doing this work, meeting for 9 months. My personal participation has been more than 8 years now and a lot of these issues have not been adequately addressed. I do not think we are moving fast; I think we are incredibly slow. When we take the shackles off and allow Pat Skorkowsky, Mike Barton, Kim Wooden, Jeff Geihs and Grant Hanevold—the brilliant people who work in our District—if we take the shackles off and give them the opportunity to work in a system that does not constrain them daily, we will see unbelievable things because these are unbelievable people.

Carolyn Goodman (Mayor, City of Las Vegas):

Thank you for doing this. It has not been 8 years; it has been 40 years. It is time for change. You cannot get much lower than 50th place. The issue is we have wonderful teachers, principals, students and parents in some areas and it is not pervasive. Anyone who has raised a child knows you have to crawl before you can walk and walk before you can run. Forty years of continual slide. So many of the issues raised today were there 10 and 20 years ago. It is time to get started. It takes courage. Everybody has to have the patience to understand that these significant issues will be addressed but we have to get started. I will not be here in another 20 years, probably, and I would hate for anybody who is here in 20 years to say, “Once again, after 40 years of watching this with the same issues recurring, nothing has changed.” You have the power to make the change.

Mayor Hafen spoke of the four mayors getting together; I was with the fifth mayor yesterday, who concurs. Time for change. Whether or not the public elects people who understand education, that is a choice. When people run for office, if the educational component is a big piece, voters need to listen to the people who are being elected and who they are going to cast their votes for. There is significance in everything that was said today. I am passionate about the inequity of what happens in every city in the U.S. and the truth is, the inner city children are the forgotten children and impoverished areas do not get the best teachers. There are formulas and ways to fix it and sometimes it has to do with financing; sometimes it has to do with structure. I have spent the past 40 years of my life passionate about this issue.

The plan to get started is the foundation, but it does not mean it is in stone. Start with the basics; we all know what the issues are—collegiality, open-mindedness and embracing everybody. If we find the plan is not working, then we make changes to it. We know why and where the system is broken. The State of Nevada and Clark County need to take leadership and say, “It is enough, let us move forward.” I have watched

from 1976, every ingredient for failure was there that year. I was told by the superintendent then that we could not do that; it would have to go to the Legislature. I said, "If you do not take charge of this, my daughter is going to be 40 years old." Sadly, she is 43 and here we are having this conversation again. Having read the most recent version of the plan, I am very encouraged that finally, something is going to happen.

Whatever we can do in the cities, we are with you. We want to take care of all our people, not just some of our people. Thank you for your patience as you have heard these comments again and again and again. I cannot wait to see the CCSD at 30th in the country and on its way up. You have the banner of the City of Las Vegas, because that is where the core city school problems are and we want them fixed so every child has the dignity of having the education and the tools to be equal in life, stay out of prison, be productive and have a family.

Chair Roberson:

I want to personally thank you for your lifetime of involvement in advancing education in southern Nevada and specifically for playing an important role last year as a member of the Technical Advisory Committee to Develop a Plan to Reorganize the CCSD.

Guillermo Vazquez (Executive Director, Education Support Employees Association):

I represent 11,579 support personnel. I want to address all the work you and our community partners have done to move this legislation forward, especially the regulations. I know it is difficult. We have all been working at it for several months and I commend you.

Some of the proposed regulations leave a wide open trail for the potential of outsourcing. We want to acknowledge the work of Senator Roberson and others on this Committee to close some of those loopholes. Some issues of concern still remain in the proposed regulations ([Agenda Item V A-1](#)). Section 14, subsection 2, paragraph (b) is a big concern for us because it addresses adhering to the progressive disciplinary procedures in our collective bargain agreement. We would like that amended. Also, section 14, subsection 7 is language that we propose in an amendment that deals with a hiring plan to increase personnel in CCSD. Specifically, that says if the District is unable to provide services at a certain point in time—air conditioning repair, for example—and that department has a percentage of its funding going to a service provider elsewhere, then we need to look inside and find a way to increase personnel within the District versus continuing to outsource it. As CCSD employees, we believe we are competitive and can provide the best quality services for the District. Some outside vendors will not have the knowledge and insight of all these buildings. Our support staff knows the personnel in the schools and has been working with the administrative staff to provide those services. It should be us providing that service first.

In section 14, we propose an amendment to deal with the transition plan; it would be subsection 8. It is in the language we sent before to you, specifying that if there is a need to outsource, there should be some transition plan in place. That has not been incorporated. These are three pieces that have not been incorporated from what we sent you last night. We also propose an additional amendment to section 14; which would be subsection 9, which is a saving clause. That ensures that our rights under State, federal and local laws are included and additionally all the rights we have secured over 49 years of representing CCSD employees in our collective bargain agreement. The last amendment we proposed to you is in section 25, subsection 1, paragraph (c), which was modified so support staff lost one seat at the table. We as support professionals provide quality service on a daily basis; we know the ins and outs of the schools and we provide the additional services—the Band-aids, the smiles, the extra dollar for the young person who does not have the money to buy their food that day. We are in there, fully invested in our community. If we are going to be fully invested, then include it in language. If we have one seat at the table versus two, that will not help us. We want to keep our voice vibrant and involved in this process.

By working with us, we will all jump on the same page to ensure quality services for our schools and students. Outsourcing to our cousins or aunts will lend itself to the friends and family outsourcing plan. I have seen it. I have been involved with outsourcing all my life and have seen what happens with the fiefdoms and waste of taxpayer money when people are allowed to choose vendors who did not have the best interest of saving taxpayer dollars. We are the ones who can provide the best quality services for our students. We are the dependable employees, not the expendable ones. Please consider all the stakeholders. We will do everything we can to move this plan forward but we must be included throughout the entire process.

Chair Roberson:

I will close public comment now and open it again at the end of this hearing. I will now open agenda item IV, approval of minutes from the last two meetings if no one has any questions.

Assemblywoman Neal:

On page 39 of the July 1, 2016 meeting minutes, Ms. Erdoes cited the legal opinion about different ways the Legislature creates the same type of bodies. I thought you had mentioned that there potentially were three. I wanted to make sure these are the only two ways we can deal with or adopt regulations in this legal opinion you cited here. Were there three or just two?

Brenda Erdoes (Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

There are many ways to create bodies and I think that is what I was trying to say to include different committees and other entities. Complying with NRS 233B is the only

way to adopt regulations that have the force and effect of law by these bodies once they are created. Am I missing your question?

Assemblywoman Neal:

So the only two ways are one, to put it specifically in statute where you are creating, and two, to give one board or another authority to adopt regulations. So those are the only two ways?

Ms. Erdoes:

Yes, I believe that is correct.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Okay. My final question is from page 33 of the July 1 meeting. I think it is a separate question because the question that was asked was about the statutory oversight over the regulations. I just wanted to make sure because it did not seem clear to me. Your answer was that based on the plan the Committee adopts, the State Board of Education is empowered to adopt the regulations to carry out the plan and those regulations, like all regulations adopted pursuant to NRS 233B, the Nevada Administrative Procedure Act, have the force and effect of law. When I read that, I kept trying to figure out who has the authority to do regulations? Is it this body? Is it the Legislative Commission? Is it the Department of Education?

If we were going to explain these minutes, should we look to the legislative intent behind the Administrative Procedure Act to determine whether or not that is the appropriate delegation of authority when we try to answer that question and unravel it? Because I have been asked this question by at least three people and by my dad who has taken me to task on it and of course, I went to the legislative intent of the Administrative Procedure Act. I would just like some clarification so I can fully explain your explanation.

Ms. Erdoes:

The best way I could explain it is to start with the Nevada Constitution because it is Article 3, which the people amended in the 1990s to give the Legislature veto power over regulations. That is what NRS Chapter 233B provisions that require regulations to go to the Legislative Commission to be approved is based on. The manner in which these regulations become law is set out pretty specifically in NRS 233B—providing that an agency has to comply with all the provisions in there, have a workshop, a hearing, follow all the different notice provisions and they propose the regulation to the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) who works with the language to make sure it meets all the requirements and is the same kind of language as the rest of the regulations. It then goes back to the agency and once they adopt the regulation, it goes to Legislative Commission and must be approved under the current statutory provisions in NRS 233B. I am not sure if I clarified everything you want.

Assemblywoman Neal:

You did. We can take a vote now.

Chair Roberson:

I think I know what you are getting at, Assemblywoman Neal. What we have before us today are proposed recommendations of the Advisory Committee. The State Board of Education (SBE) is tasked with approving regulations that are in alignment with those recommendations. The LCB has been working all summer to prepare proposed regulations for consideration by the SBE. Let us be clear, the SBE can alter those regulations if they so choose. Their limitation is that the regulations they approve must be consistent with the recommendations this Committee adopts. Assuming the SBE approves regulations, it will then go to the Legislative Commission and that body would have to approve those regulations.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NEAL MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF
JUNE 16, 2016 AND JULY 1, 2016 AS CLARIFIED.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Roberson:

This is the eighth meeting of this Advisory Committee. During the last meeting, Mr. Strembitsky walked us through the plan to reorganize the CCSD. We approved draft regulations that were prepared to carry out the plan. Since the last meeting on July 1, in accordance with the requirements of A.B. 394, the Board of County Commissioners for Clark County held town hall meetings throughout the county to solicit input from, and provide information to, the public regarding the reorganization plan. The Clark County Commissioners decided to hold eight meetings rather than six as was required by A.B. 394 so the residents of all areas of Clark County would have an opportunity to hear about and voice their concerns regarding the plan and regulations approved by this Advisory Committee ([Agenda Item V A-1](#)). As a result of those public meetings and further input from stakeholders, additional details have been added to the draft proposed regulations ([Agenda Item V A-2](#)). In addition, we have a new document listing the specific recommendations which sets out the recommendations of this Committee ([Agenda Item V A-3](#)). It is my intent that the recommendations and draft regulations, as they may be revised today, be sent to the State Board of Education (SBE) after our discussion today so the SBE has a clear direction from this Committee about the manner in which the reorganization should be carried out.

I attended seven of the eight town hall meetings. There were three primary areas of concern that I and others heard over and over. One was from support staff with concern over outsourcing. The second issue was equity; a concern that we ensure this reorganization is as equitable to students in CCSD as possible. Third, we heard a great deal of input from local government and the larger community requesting more local government and community involvement.

A lot of changes have happened in the last few days. I can assure you that Legislative Counsel has been working very, very hard since July 1 to add detail to the regulations we approved on that day. On Thursday, we sent out revisions based on public input and many of the things this Committee has spoken and dialogued about over the last few months. On Saturday morning, we received, for the first time, written input from CCSD Board of School Trustees and the District, so I and Legislative staff worked quite a bit Saturday and Sunday to update and address, to the extent we could, the concerns of the District. This plan has also been reviewed by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Steve Canavero, who had some fairly minor comments and suggestions to the plan that we also incorporated.

Most of the changes in this latest version are the result of dialogue with the CCSD, the superintendent and the general counsel for the Board. That is what we have today; a version that went out publically on Thursday, August 11 ([Agenda Item V A-1](#)) and a new version that went out last night and today ([Agenda Item V A-2](#)), so we will be looking at a few different documents. I understand that is a lot for this Committee to consider. Part of a committee chair's responsibility is to drive the discussion and drive the process. We are under a tight timeline. We must meet the August 22 State Department of Education workshop date and then the State Board of Education meeting to vote on final regulations on September 1, 2016. We are under a legislative mandate to complete this process in a timely manner. I believe that in every way—with regard to equity, with regard to outsourcing concerns and with regard to community involvement—this latest version of the plan and regulations is a big improvement over what this Committee unanimously approved on July 1. While I expect a robust dialogue today, and I do expect revisions to the plan today, even if they are verbal revisions, we do need to move forward with a vote today. I am personally happy to be here all day and all evening to obtain consensus.

Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart (Assembly District No. 22):

Being the oldest member of the Committee and certainly not the wisest, I have an observation. Yesterday, as I was reading the revised version of the regulation, making a long list of concerns I had, then, thanks to Ms. Lang and her dedicated manner, she sent us a revised version last night. I finished reading it about 9:30 and as I read it, almost every one of my concerns were checked off; from 25 concerns to 3 minor concerns. Then I went back to watching the Olympics with my wife and I said to her, "You know, based on all the concessions that Senator Roberson has made, bending

over backwards to make sure the concerns of many of these groups have been realized, I think he deserves at least a silver medal for bending over backwards to accommodate all the concerns that have been made. While we have a ways to go, I would like to commend you, not to butter you up, because I am retiring and I am certainly not buttering up anyone, but I would like to commend you and those you have worked with in the last few days for the way you have answered so many of these questions and addressed the concerns of so many of the groups. Thank you for your dedication.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you, and I want to specifically thank the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) staff. I have thanked them personally, but the public should know how hard our LCB works because Risa Lang, Karly O'Krent and Brenda Erdoes have been working around the clock to address concerns. I want everyone to know we have great State employees and support staff for the Legislature. I also want to thank the next two speakers, John Vellardita and Stephen Augspurger, for their heavy involvement in this process. Principals and teachers are a big part of this plan, so it is appropriate that they are both involved in working through those issues with us. I want to give you both the opportunity to make any comments you might have and just as important, I want the Committee to have the opportunity to ask questions on the current state of the plan.

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

I represent 18,000 licensed professionals in CCSD. This morning I left an event where we had more than 1,200 new teachers at an orientation where there was high energy and lots of excitement. Going from there to here is quite a contrast.

I have been to ten Technical Advisory Committee meetings as a Committee member, seven Advisory Committee meetings and today's meeting makes eight. I have also been to eight community meetings, many meetings with community organizations, stakeholders and members and all this has gone on for close to a year. When we started the discussions, we had a recommendation by the District to break the CCSD into different precincts. That proposal was rejected and then we were on our way to trying to have robust conversations and involve as many people as possible.

There were three people this Committee brought forward for expertise in trying to guide us through this process. One was the superintendent of the largest school district in the country in New York City; the other was an expert who did 10 years of research on school districts and how you reorganize them. Ultimately, the third, who you have hired as a consultant, actually had significant experience, not just nationwide but outside of these borders, in trying to figure out what is the best education delivery system that large school districts can develop. Those experts framed the discussion that has essentially tried to say, what is the best model we can do for our kids?

There was one statement that was very astute and should be our moral compass. It was made by Michael Flores at a community meeting after hearing many suggestions from the audience. He represented a project he is doing at Matt Kelly Elementary School, which is one of the most at-risk schools in CCSD. Michael Flores reminded everybody that “Whatever we do, it has to be about students, first and foremost.” That is my perspective, too. I think the new hub of delivery we are talking about, centered at the school, is absolutely critical. We also said that whatever organization we do with the District, we do have to address the funding issue. We know what happened in the last Legislative Session and what kind of dollars came down into the school district, but we also know there is more to be done. You cannot right-size this District without addressing that issue. I have heard from each one of you that you are prepared to move that discussion in the 2017 Legislative Session. I have also heard that the State’s Department of Education has looked at what the cost would be if we accelerated the weighted funding formula. I do not think we have a shot at changing that law to be accelerated earlier unless we make this organizational change. I think this change begs the question of funding at a level unknown up to this point for the Legislative Session to consider.

It is appropriate to have concerns about legal issues, but let us not lose sight of the fact that constitutionally, the school district is still in place as the local education agency. With that come all the responsibilities. Nothing in these proposed regulations takes away from that; the District is the employer of record. Every piece in these regulations always defaults back to compliance with District policy or State and federal regulations. That is no different than what exists today. There has not been a transfer of that authority or responsibility. What we have is the fact that we are going to empower front line educators—principals, support staff, students and to a significant degree, parents—to be in control of resources and own the outcome of what those resources are intended to do, which is to provide better education for students. That is the difference; that is the game changer.

We have heard the question of whether to pay a teacher more to go to an at-risk school. That is not the answer alone. I heard the Peterson Elementary School example. I want to remind everybody here of a slide presented by CCSD several meetings back. It showed one school that was fully staffed with licensed professionals and another school with half of the teacher vacancies filled by substitutes. The reality of the current system is that the money paid to those substitutes is a \$50,000 full time equivalent saving per instructor. So when we talk about Peterson Elementary School, look at some hard facts. That school, with a 50 percent vacancy rate filled by substitutes, has \$1 million that should have gone into that building but it stayed in central. Part of the changes in these regulations is that it turns that inside-out. If that existed today, the \$1 million would stay in the school and that is a significant development. We cannot continue the way we have been doing business in the District. We echo Mayor Goodman’s comments.

The idea that this process involves not just the stakeholders in the building but parents and the community is significant. I had a conversation with somebody with the District recently and I said, "When this process is over, with whatever is adopted, do you want to stand alone or do you want to have partners?" We need partners from the City of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, the City of Henderson, Moapa Valley and the unincorporated areas of Clark County involved. We need parents involved on a scale we have never seen. We need to empower those buildings to do the type of engagement and outreach to the community that will involve them. One of the biggest concerns a teacher has is the lack of input and involvement of parents. Where parents are present, they help shepherd the education process of that student; where they are absent, it is a hole they cannot fill. This model allows us to take steps in the right direction to try to do that.

On the issue of outsourcing, nowhere in the regulations is outsourcing encouraged or happens as a result of these regulations. On page 4 ([Agenda Item V A-2](#)), section 14, subsection 3, paragraph (a), it says "Negotiating the salaries, benefits and other conditions of employment of administrators, teachers and other staff necessary for the operation of the local school precinct." That is still the purview and responsibility of the school district, not empowered at the precinct level.

The second thing, on pages 4 and 5, section 14, subsection 3, the list of services that remain in central include administration, maintenance, repair, grounds, food services; the list is endless. The school precinct is not going to make a decision on eliminating any of that. One thing that is clear, though, is that the District can clearly ease the concerns of their support staff by adopting a policy of not outsourcing, or, for that matter, any bargaining unit, including the support staff bargaining unit, can bargain that. In fact, I have a copy of an agreement reached with the support staff in the school district about outsourcing and it is very clear that "the District management understands that the association was hesitant to complete a new collective bargaining agreement because of the uncertainty of outsourcing." It goes on to say, "the District believes the right to outsource work is an exclusive management right." I am not here to suggest that we are in the business of eliminating jobs, but it is about time we do our work different and better. We have to get more efficient. Every dollar that goes into this school district has to be spent more efficiently. Empowering the organizational team to procure equipment, services, etc., has nothing to do with some of these services listed under central service.

We hear a story in a narrative about a substitute in a class that is teaching Spanish and a kid cannot graduate because that substitute does not speak Spanish? If Peterson Elementary School saved that money that goes back to central, they could use it to get bilingual resources to help those kids. Those are the kinds of services those teachers and principals need in those buildings. We are not talking about outsourcing everything and if you see that differently anywhere in these regulations, for the record, please ask

me. I have bargained contracts for 40 years, in both the private and public sector; national agreements and small agreements. I am a union guy. It does not exist here.

Back to my point about the inclusiveness of all parties; this process has tried to bring together as many people as possible. A lot of the issues and concerns have been brought up and there have been significant revisions to these regulations and they are absolutely appropriate. Do we like all of them? Absolutely not. One of the ones I do not like is the 85 percent being dropped to 80 percent. The reason for that is because every dollar you can put into the school for instruction should be a dollar we should find. However, I am prepared to support that kind of change because it says that in the second year, we go back up to 85 percent.

When it comes to the average versus the actual teacher pay, it says we are going to look at this 2 years out; the first year after implementation. I think that is a very good idea. I think there are unintended consequences if we do not have the facts in front of us before we go to average versus actual and we do not know exactly how that plays out. For example, you heard testimony earlier where Peterson Elementary School saved \$300,000 in average versus actual pay. I even gave you an example of today's reality of \$1 million leaving that school. We need to think these things through, and the fact that average pay versus actual can be looked at by the State Department of Education after 1 year of experience is very appropriate, we think. If changes need to be made, they can be made then.

We support this plan and think there have been significant changes made to the regulations. I assume there will be more made today, but nonetheless, we have to get moving on this. When Mike Strembitsky suggested we do a complete switch from the current system to a decentralized system, I was one of the first who said, "Show me the way." On the scale we are talking about, how do you make this kind of transition? He made it very clear that two systems cannot coexist. For any chance of survival, you cannot do this gradually, where you have empowerment suffocated by a central administration bureaucracy. Nor can we wait until everything is fixed in this State on public education before we can figure out what is a better delivery system for students. That is why we support this.

Assemblywoman Neal:

You cited section 14, subsection 3 and the language about "must remain responsible for paying and carrying out," which those are services that would remain with the school district. When you turn to page 6 ([Agenda Item V A-2](#)), subsection 7 it says, "in consultation with the principals and associate superintendents of each local school precinct, and additional authority not listed in subsection 2 to be transferred one or more school precincts. Such authority may include authority to carry out any of the responsibilities listed in subsection 3 other than the responsibility of capital projects if it is determined that transferring the authority will serve the best interest of the pupils." So

not only do we have a statutory construction issue, because we start off with a must and we then give a permissive authority to transfer the authority for those areas specifically in subsection 7 but it does not say how that permissive authority is created. Help me understand how a “must” and a “may” can operate in the same section, dealing with the same set of issues. Clearly, it has the potential to move because the permissive language says “may include the authority to carry out any responsibilities in subsection 3.” So either the authority exists or it does not. Apparently there are situations where it can and the regulations specifically state it. Help me clear up that statutory construction issue, moving through section 14, subsections 3 and 7 where it is recited.

Mr. Vellardita:

Can you walk me through exactly what you are looking for?

Assemblywoman Neal:

You just said there is no way this could be interpreted as the services being outsourced and then in section 14, subsection 7, it gives the authority to include those services under a permissive sentence.

Mr. Vellardita:

The scope of responsibility of the organizational team is the organizational plan. It is in that context that some of these services listed under central services are not the purview of the organizational plan. That section is in the regulations. I could take a moment to find it, but that is in essence what it is—the organizational team is charged with developing an organizational plan and the plan is in the context of delivering education to students. So, central services that are listed in these regulations are not necessarily part of that. Maintenance is not necessarily part of that. It is about instruction.

Chair Roberson:

Let me try to approach your issue from a different perspective. Section 3 starts out, “Except as otherwise provided in subsection 7,” so there is a statutory framework path from subsection 3 to subsection 7. I think that is very clear. Subsection 7 speaks to the superintendent being able to move functions; not an organizational team or a local school precinct. We are leaving this up to the superintendent to make decisions over time as to what services will be within the purview of a local school precinct and what services will be within the purview of central.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I thought about that. I relooked at the definitions. It says school district must remain responsible and it says school district means school district. Then I looked at where it says the superintendent shall determine in consultation, and it seemed that the superintendent could somehow go either behind the school district, and then start looking at subsection 3 permissively and say if needed, you can potentially give

authority to carry out any of those responsibilities in subsection 3. My thing is this, either we just need to clean it up, but I know that it is contradictory and I know that it is not clear because the sections speak two different things. And then I looked at it again to find where the original authority came from.

I then looked at NRS 386.353 to see who had the actual authority to determine these types of things in the first place—purchasing, accounting, recruiting, transportation, chief financial officer—typically, that was given to the Board of Trustees. Then I started to look to see if there was any other language where the superintendent or this new definition of what the school district means, had been given the function to look at those services in any other part of that statute. It just so happens that Mr. Vellardita opened the door for one of my issues because it is not clear to me. That is why I said it was the statutory construction issue because how the sentences are listed and phrased serves a contradiction to me and you said, show me any contradictions, so I presented it. I just want it cleaned up.

Chair Roberson:

I am not sure I agree with you on the statutory construction but we will put that to the side. The concept is the superintendent will have the authority going forward once a year by January 15 to determine if some central responsibilities should be transferred to one or more schools as long as the superintendent consults with the associate superintendent and the principal. From a policy perspective, do you have concerns with giving the superintendent that authority?

Assemblywoman Neal:

I do, if the structure of section 14, subsection 7 ([Agenda Item V A-2](#)) will remain written as it is today, giving a “must” to the school district and a “may” to the superintendent under the same set of services.

Chair Roberson:

Not to belabor the point, but I think subsection 3 says, “... except as otherwise provided in subsection 7, the school district must ...”

Assemblywoman Neal:

I understand exactly what you are saying. I am just saying that it is contradictory to have a “must” and a “may” in the same section. You cannot have “it must stay” and then a “may” if you need it later. Hey, I am just one lawyer on the Committee.

Chair Roberson:

We have a lot of lawyers here. In fact, the lawyer who drafted it is sitting to the left of me. You might want to direct your question to her. Regardless, we can spend a lot of time on that kind of issue and I am happy to resolve it with you. What I am trying to get at, though, is do you have issue with the policy?

Assemblywoman Neal:

All I can say to you is that I am not comfortable currently to give you a response to that question.

Chair Roberson:

Okay, hopefully at some point today you will.

Senator Ford:

I can unequivocally say that I would be uncomfortable with that policy. I think the Board of Trustees needs to remain the ultimate arbiter of which services are going to be “outsourced,” to the extent there is going to be an outsourcing at all. I am not certain if this implies that the superintendent may—at the instruction of the Board of Trustees in consultation with the principals—determine that certain items under central services can be given to the school district, or notwithstanding an instruction from the Board of Trustees, he or she may still allocate additional opportunities to a school to undertake what is otherwise considered a central service. What is the interpretation of that? I do not know if Risa needs to speak in on that or not or maybe there was an intention someone could share with me.

Chair Roberson:

I can speak to that. The intent was to have the superintendent who is responsible for running the fifth largest school district in the country to have that decision making ability. I understand there is a disagreement and we can work that out.

Senator Ford:

I think those elected are actually the ones ultimately responsible for running the fifth largest school district in the nation. They hire the superintendent, and at their direction, he or she can do what they say or not. We can disagree on the appropriateness of appointed versus elected officials, but those ultimately responsible for the District are the trustees, not the superintendent. So I would like to have a deeper conversation on the appropriateness of that approach.

Chair Roberson:

I understand your point. The superintendent does answer to the Board. For a significant period of time during the last month, we have not been able to speak to him because the Board put a gag order on him. There is no question we know the superintendent answers to the Board. If you look in section 14, subsection 2, paragraph (c), it actually gives the ability to an organizational team to purchase services and supplies outside of the school district. We purposely included language in here, in consultation with CCSD this weekend, that requires it to be carried out in accordance with applicable policies of the school district. Those policies are developed and approved by the School Board. I have heard the concerns about outsourcing at every public meeting and today. We really have tried to address this issue. The fact is, an organizational team—a principal, a

school precinct—can only purchase services, supplies, equipment related to the limited responsibilities they have autonomy over. Before they can do that, they must comply with all existing school district purchasing policies.

Senator Ford:

Listen, I have given you credit for shepherding this Committee in a bipartisan and inclusive way, and I am in no way indicating that you have not attempted to address concerns and issues. I believe you have. In fact, I think we have been compromising on that issue. I do believe, however, that there is real question about appropriateness of the superintendent as opposed to the Board having that power under subsection 7. I also agree with you that the enumeration of items that are to go to the school, as opposed to the numeration of items that remain in central, is the way to go. My understanding of this regulation as it will be amended soon, is that it will require just the opposite of our Constitution—if it is not given to a local school, it will stay with central. Just because it is not fully delineated under the section as to what will stay in central does not mean it does not stay in central. We will have to amend it so that under section 14, subsection 2, where it says, “The authority to carry out responsibilities that must be transferred to each local school precinct include, without limitation, the authority to:” we have to get rid of the phrase “without limitation” to ensure that only those things enumerated that are to be given to the school are those things that are to be given to the school. Everything else that is not enumerated needs to stay with central.

Chair Roberson:

You and I talked about that this morning and I understand where you are coming from. You are exactly right. If you go to section 14, subsection 3 ([page 4, Agenda Item V A-2](#)), there is the “including, without limitation,” before the list of responsibilities that central has. So unless it is enumerated in this regulation as being a responsibility provided to a school precinct wherein they have autonomy, unless it is specifically provided for, everything else is central.

Senator Ford:

We agree with that. The policy question is whether we should have, as Assemblywoman Neal indicates, in section 7, the superintendent being able to make in consultation a decision on authorizing a local school to do other functions. Should it be given to the superintendent or to the Board of School Trustees? I think that is a fair question to ask.

Chair Roberson:

I agree. It is something we will need to resolve today.

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

We are in complete support of moving forward with this. I recently had a conversation with a trustee who said principals are calling and they are upset about what is occurring with this [A.B. 394](#) recommendation to move forward. I asked the trustee which part the principals were upset with; is it the increased authority and decision making capacity they are going to have? Are they upset about being in a position where they can now share that decision making authority and greater autonomy with the school team? Are they upset about making decisions that are closest to the problem that exists in the school? Are they upset about not having to ask someone to be able to make that decision if it does not violate law or District regulation? The trustee said, no, it was not any of those things. I know I am deviating, but I want to come back to Senator Ford's question. We are on the brink of being able to make a change that is a game changer for the CCSD. We have to flesh out the details for sure, but at the end of the day, are we happy with current state of affairs in the CCSD? To that question, there is a resounding "No," for scores of reasons. Does this plan represent a new approach that will give greater autonomy and decision making to schools?

My biggest fear is that when you think of what teachers and principals do in schools today, think of it as a box and the box is completely full—teachers are doing some things and administrators are doing some things but that box is overflowing. We need to give them the tools, the decision making authority and the autonomy to do the things most impactful with the core mission of the school, which is teaching and student achievement. Those are the tools they need. That is where the decision making needs to lie, especially within the early years of this rollout. When this process first started, surveys went out asking what principals wanted their schools to have control over, including custodial, grounds, air conditioning repair, etc. It turned out that principals and teachers do not want to do that kind of work. There is no time in the day to do that.

Whatever we craft here in language has to protect what we want people to do most in schools, and that is to teach and to learn. Some of the verbiage in the regulations ([Agenda Item V A-2](#)) was added so there would not be a unilateral decision, whether it is the superintendent or the Board of Trustees, to transfer new responsibilities to the school because the District no longer wants to do them. There was a lengthy discussion yesterday about custodial services. It is a \$77 million item that was going to go to the schools. There is not an administrator out there who wants to hire and fire custodians and have one more bargaining group in their building, because it detracts from their ability to work with teachers and kids.

We need to keep in mind that the essence of this is the transfer of autonomy and authority in specific areas so teachers, principals and parents can make the decisions that will best serve the kids. We do not want to dilute that by giving them other things that could detract from that core work.

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

I understand the concept that we want a better model and we are striving to be more autonomous, but what has been lacking about this discourse is that we have not received specific information. I think people should know what is at stake. You just spoke about the \$77 million item that was on the table for debate. I think the public is owed a level of transparency. We cannot just be speaking about having greater transparency at the school site level if we are not having it in our policy making.

Our Education Support Employees Association (ESEA) brothers and sisters are so important to our school's work every day because our kids need to be fed, our classrooms need to be clean and the air conditioning needs to be fixed when it goes out. What I have yet to see is how the 80/20 breakup of the money pans out. What will the 20 percent staying at central continue to provide each school? I do not want to say I approve these regulations at the expense of my support staff folks. It needs to be clear. If we are going to lay off certain departments and no longer provide services to the schools because we cannot afford them, we need to know. We are the policy makers and guess who is going to be getting the phone calls from those laid off support staff members? Where is the clarity and the transparency in the numbers? How do I know the 20 percent going to central services will not be putting someone in harm's way?

Mr. Vellardita:

That is a valid question. Part of the problem with this process is that the governing body has not been forthright in allowing that process to take place with the kind of information that is out there. I can tell you this; approximately 3 percent of a \$2.4 billion budget is custodial services. If you look at that 20 percent and have them break it down, you will see a number of these things listed in central services as budget items. Does that necessarily mean that is spot on in terms of a figure? I do not think so, but it is a ballpark figure and one that if they did not feel they could live with it, they would have made an argument for it. In fact, they did. They said, "We do not think we can live with 15 percent in central services." Case in point was custodial services, so that got shifted. There was no other effort on the list of central services where the District made a claim that said, "We cannot meet that financial obligation."

Your point is well taken but I think the burden is for the school district to demonstrate where those figures are. Having said that 10 months into a process, I certainly would disagree with anyone who would say we should put the brakes on this until we get that information and then we find out that information is 8 weeks away when it is on hand right now. Mayor Goodman in particular and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) have been insistent about getting financial information to the penny from the District. Part of what these regulations are near the back where it asks for a breakdown is partly a result of the frustration of not getting that information. I would beg anybody from the school district to make a case that says the listed central services as proposed on these regulations today cannot meet a 20 percent obligation. And if they cannot, then that is

subject for a discussion for modifying. Also, nowhere is it being proposed that people are going to be losing their jobs. I do not see it.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

When you craft language that addresses that, obviously there is something on the table. If we did not have this in the regulations—what stays, what goes, etc.—then the point is moot. But it is in here so it means something.

Mr. Vellardita:

Again, you are spot on, but let us put this in context. The budget today as it is developed, was adopted this time last year by a governing body that said they were \$67 million broke. They told the public that. They started the school year with 700 substitute teachers for 25,000 kids. The money saved by paying substitutes went back to central and did not go to those kids. That is a year those kids will never get back. We spent \$25,000 on a forensic audit and we found in fact there was money. That kind of practice has to change. Putting forward very specifically, very prescriptively, what are central services and then putting a budget item around that, clearly, is a roadmap to say what you can deliver within your means and what you cannot deliver within your means. What is absent in this discussion is full disclosure of that information from the school district so you can make an accurate assessment.

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

During our break, I had the opportunity to talk to Mr. Vellardita and he said something about asking lots of questions so I came up with a question: as my union representative who represents teachers who care for the best interest of children, will you accept my endorsement and my agreement with you?

Chair Roberson:

Just say yes.

Mr. Vellardita:

Yes.

Senator Hardy:

Likewise, during the break, I asked the Chair if he was ready for a motion to accept the regulations and he more chuckled than anything. In my district, I think the intent we have with these regulations and with this sea change, this monumental change we are looking at, the foundation we are building, is that the intent and the accountability is huge, especially when we talk about each one of these items in section 14, subsection 3 from (a) to (s) ([Agenda Item V A-2](#)). In my district, they would simply like to be able to call someone to arrange transportation services or to avoid needing a committee of approvals to get somebody to fix a sprinkler system so the students can play football on grass instead of having the much loved janitor water the football field all alone. We

know there are challenges with an organization that is big enough that things fall through cracks. The accountability we would like to see is addressed in these regulations. I do not think everything will always be perfect and we are always going to have another bite at that apple, but I accept the acceptance of my union representative because I like what he said and I like what my other union guy said.

Senator Ford:

I like what my union guys have said, too, but there is a third union here. Just as I would not let anyone tell me that Mr. Vellardita's union issues are irrelevant or illegitimate or that Mr. Augspurgen's union issues are irrelevant or illegitimate, I am not going to let people tell me that these support staff concerns are union issues that are irrelevant or illegitimate. We have attempted to address them and reasonable minds can disagree as to whether we have actually addressed them or not, but the fact is, there are still conversations going on and I think it is appropriate. I do not think it is mutually exclusive that we can be focused on kids and focused on the parents of those kids, especially when those parents work in our schools. This conversation is fine and we can find the right reconciliation between those in these regulations to ensure that everybody is comfortable with those.

I have to give credit to the District because on the record I asked Trustee Carolyn Edwards for a list of recommendations; actual proposals to the Legislation and I did not know that she had it, but she gave it to me and we have it ([Agenda Item II A](#)). When you look at page 2 of that list, No. 15, it talks about a recommendation to add to the list of responsibilities that will remain in central as seen in section 14, subsection 3 of the revised regulations ([Agenda Item V A-2](#)), the list we have been talking about. I do not think we need to do this. Instead, I want to put on the record that we understand as a Committee that anything not listed as going to the school remains with the District and that would include these things listed that I just referenced from the Board's document. Those things listed (page 2, No. 15, [Agenda Item II A](#)), including District enrollment projections, attendance zoning, siting new schools, etc., were already what we intended to stay with central because they had not been expressly given to schools, nor could a local school determine District school zones and things of that sort.

Also, to Assemblywoman Neal's question about section 14, subsection 7 of the regulations ([Agenda Item V A-2](#)), the School Board has a suggestion on page 3 of their response list ([Agenda Item II A](#)) a way to address the issue. There seems to be an acknowledgement that the superintendent works for the Board of Trustees and that the Board can have the superintendent do or not do certain things. So if that is the case, we should not have an issue adding, "and with the approval of the Board of School Trustees" to that subsection which would allow the superintendent to consult with the principals and everybody else as to any of the services that need to go to the local school, but it still ultimately has to be approved by the Board. That is the type of

conversation that I think Assemblywoman Neal was talking about in reference to “may” versus “must” and I would agree with that particular approach.

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

I agree; we need to be concerned about what words say because the first bill I passed in the Legislature had one word—I think it was the difference between “shall” and “may”—and ended up going to court to clarify.

Mr. Vellardita talked about fixing the funding formula and I want to clarify that you are not inferring that if we fix the funding formula, we have fixed everything. The other discussion that has been alluded to is the overall finding; the size of the pot. Can you comment on that?

Mr. Vellardita:

There are two parts to that. One is to accelerate last Session’s Senate Bill (S.B.) 508 which is the weighted student funding formula to be in alignment with the implementation date of this reorganization so that money in a weighted manner is going into the buildings and following the students who need it.

SENATE BILL 508: Revises provisions governing the Nevada Plan. (BDR 34-1184)

The second piece is, will that beg the question for additional revenue? I think the answer is, “Yes.” The question then is where does that revenue come from? I do not have an answer to that today. I can tell you that I think there is a different polemic that takes place in the 2017 Session when you have reorganized the delivery system in the model we are talking about where the premise is based on money following the students. It allows for a very robust discussion about what is an adequate monetary amount that needs to follow that student. The 2015 Session addressed it, there is a cost associated with it, and it is time for the two to intersect and create leverage for that discussion.

Senator Denis:

I appreciate that. Regardless of what we do, this will not fix all our education issues. In some respects, it may create other issues because we are going to ask people to do more and we are going to have decisions made at the local level but they are still going to be limited based on money. We have done this before where we have some great things that we know succeed and work, yet we do not get sufficient funds. So I agree with you that this will put some leverage there for us to have that discussion on how we can truly fund education so we can truly have success.

Mr. Vellardita:

One last thing. Advocates for Funding, our organization, heard more times than not that money does not solve the problem. What compounded the ability to navigate through

that discussion was a very top-down, centralized bureaucracy of the size that we are talking about and the perception that money is not being spent and following the needs of the student. I think this reorganization takes that piece out of the discussion because now you are not talking about funding a top-down \$2.4 billion budget; you are talking about funding schools and students directly. That is the game changer.

Senator Becky Harris (Senatorial District No. 9):

I want to better understand what role special education will have in this plan from anybody in the room who is an expert on this subject. It is not specifically listed in any of the sections. I noticed that in delineating what is specific to the District such as transportation services, food services, etc., special education is not listed. I would like to have a degree of confidence that special education has been part of the conversation and that there is a framework to serve what I consider one of our most voiceless, vulnerable populations in our schools.

Mr. Augspurger:

That function does not change; it is still part of the District responsibility. They own that from A to Z. Schools will still be working just like they do now. School site teams will wrestle with some of those issues, but by and large, the compliance is the same. We do not envision any changes at all with how special education will be handled. There will be four categories of weighted funding coming to the schools—Free and Reduced Price Lunch, English Language Learners (ELL), special education, and gifted and talented students. Schools will see increased funding in those four categories, mirroring what the State Department of Education establishes.

Senator Harris:

So if you have an active organizational team committed to special education, those students could actually have a bigger voice and more resources put into their education than we have under our current model. Am I understanding correctly?

Mr. Augspurger:

I agree with that fully. I think as time goes on, the teams will get a broader perspective of how the school needs to run. I am sure that initially, as parents come in, their first interest will be what is best for their child. But I believe as that process unfolds and evolves, we will see people making very synergistic kinds of decisions that are what is best for the school. I think that transformation will evolve rapidly.

Pat Skorkowsky (Superintendent, Clark County School District):

The other services—occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech, assistive technology, adaptive physical education, psychological services, compliance and monitoring—will all stay centralized. We have to ensure we protect our students who have been identified with special needs. We will focus in on those centralized services and provide support to the schools. The IEP teams will make the decisions on what is

best for the student and those are based at the school with outside support. We know the level of service fluctuates with students coming in and out of the District and gets identified at various times during the school year, so we would adjust accordingly to ensure we are meeting the needs of every one of our identified students.

Senator Harris:

That gives me some comfort that with an autonomous school site decision making team and capacity at the education level that our special education children are not only going to be protected at the District level but there is the possibility for them to be protected from a budgetary perspective at the school in which they reside. It is important that those particular needs not be lost in this process.

Senator Ford:

Do we anticipate this structure to improve services for students with disabilities? We are expecting it to improve services for students in general.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

With the focus at the school site on meeting the needs of the students at the school site, it has the potential to integrate those students more than they already are, which is already at a very high level at most of our schools.

Senator Denis:

How about the ELL, at-risk, and gifted and talented students?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

The new regulations have the ELL master plan in there, which is something we have been working on for more than a year. The schools would be required to meet the needs of that population participating in the ELL master plan. Or, if they think they have a better methodology, they can come through a waiver process. There will be accountability measures for each of those populations, either through the District with our Pledge of Achievement or State accountability measures within the Nevada School Performance Framework.

Assemblywoman Neal:

My question is going to come from section 14, subsection 3, paragraph (i) (page 5, [Agenda Item V A-2](#)), where after that semicolon, after the IDEA statute, it delineates legal services. Right? So my question is around the legal services. When you see that language, how do you interpret it? Because when I was looking at NRS 386.010, it said that each school district shall have the power to sue and may be sued. My question is, if it is a school precinct, are they then potentially going to be seen as an entity that can be sued if they take on the particular services? For example, if Moapa took on transportation, who would be sued—the school district or the precinct?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I am not the best person to answer that because I am not a lawyer. The District will always be sued, I can just guarantee you that. If we are in compliance with all the policies, regulations, State and federal laws, then I assume the legal responsibility lies within the District, but I am a math person, not a lawyer.

Chair Roberson:

I met with the superintendent and Carlos McDade, the general counsel for the District yesterday for several hours and we actually changed language based on Mr. McDade's concerns about ensuring where the responsibility lies. Just as Mr. Vellardita made clear today, the CCSD remains the Local Education Agency, it remains the employer of record. Of course there will need to be professional development over the course of the next year for school associate superintendents and principals so they understand what the laws and policies are that they need to follow, but nothing changes as far as the ultimate responsibility being with the school district. As you well know, anyone can sue anybody at any time.

Senator Denis:

What about the local site-based team making decisions; will parents be liable if they make a decision that leads to a lawsuit?

Mr. Augspurger:

I think that mirrors the same set of conditions we have right now—if a department chair makes a decision in a building and someone takes that decision to task and it results in a lawsuit, the District would represent that employee.

Senator Denis:

So would the District represent the parent who is on the organizational team?

Mr. Augspurger:

That is a good question.

Mr. Vellardita:

I think that under your scenario, the parent is not making the decision; the organizational team is making the decision and they represent the school district, so if there is exposure, it is on the District.

Senator Denis:

I just want to be sure of that and get that on the record because I am sure we will see something along the way.

Assemblyman Stewart:

In the selection of principals under this new system, I assume the requirements to be on the principal list will remain. Is that correct?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

We will be revisiting that process to ensure that all the applicants in the principal's pool are qualified, fully vetted and ready so anybody who makes it through that process and is recommended to the school team would be eligible to be principal of that building.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Would a principal candidate have to be a dean and then assistant principal and then take the required courses?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

They would need their administrative endorsement from the State on their license and they would have had to go through a screening process. We are working on the logistics of the job description and changing that entire process. In the past, if they have some other administrative experience, that might qualify them for that type of position. It would not necessarily have to be a dean-assistant principal-principal path. There could be an alternative route. Most importantly, we have to make sure they have the qualifications and pass a rigorous screening to get into that principal's pool so we know if we are going to recommend them, they are able to run that school.

Assemblyman Stewart:

So it would be possible for a department chair or a dean who has the administrative endorsement to jump over someone else and get to be principal? For example in a rural area if the dean is the only one left and the principal and vice principal transfer or retire, then would it be possible for that dean to become principal?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

We are just establishing that process now. That is part of what has been talked about, but we have not established those guidelines yet.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

I have been trying to get a feel for what the allocations of money will look like. Currently, per the drafted regulations as of August 15 ([Agenda Item V A-2](#)), it says that 80 percent will go to the schools and 20 percent will remain with central services. It also states that categorical funding needs to be used for the purpose mandated by the State. What about Zoom Schools? Currently, they are supported with additional monies. How would the dollars be allocated to each school when they have their own budget on top of that allocated money? Also, regarding the support the ELL/Zoom department has to provide to other non-Zoom Schools, how does it work? I know the focus will initially be Zoom,

but thinking forward, how would a Zoom School operate in this new system? I cannot see a clear picture of how that would work.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Zoom is a categorical funding model, so it would stay in that categorical funding even though the majority of the money which makes up a Zoom School is in people at the school site. Under these regulations, that piece would not count in the 80 percent which goes to the school because it is a categorical and is set aside for that purpose. It would be the same with other categoricals. It is only the percentage of people that are in the General Fund that are unrestricted that would count toward that 80 percent.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

So the Zoom Schools will still get the amount to continue operating as Zoom Schools and they would get the 80 percent. What would happen to the ELL department that needs to provide services for schools that are non-Zoom that have considerable numbers of ELL students? Would the ELL department be deemed part of central service's 20 percent?

Mr. Skorkowsky:

For the 2016-2017 school year, we have the funds set aside for Cohort A, which is 84 schools, of which we shifted underneath the ELL master plan. We shifted so it was an opt in process for the schools instead of the District identifying which schools would be in that 84 Cohort A group. As we go forward and if more dollars are going out to school, I envision schools signing on to the ELL master plan in Cohort B, which would be the second year, using their funding to help support the central services needed to provide the professional development.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

I was missing the piece of where in their plan they were going to have to write in that they are going to be purchasing services with some of the money they now have.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

Again, this is all being developed as we go along, so this is one person's vision of how it might work.

Chair Roberson:

I would like to follow up. In essence, for the first year, which would be the next school year, at least 80 percent of unrestricted general dollars have to go to the schools. To the extent we have categorical funds, that is on top of the 80 percent, so actually those classrooms would be getting more than 80 percent. That is also subject to whether the Legislature next Session continues the Zoom Schools and the Victory Schools because they will sunset unless re-appropriated. The Legislature may decide to put all the money

into a weighted funding formula instead of categorical funding. Those are decisions we are going to need to make between now and June 2017.

Mr. Vellardita:

What Superintendent Skorkowsky just said is an example of the regulations as outlined, where central determines whether or not it is a service they sell to the precinct. That is exactly what he just outlined. If a school buys into the ELL program, it would then be charged to the school precinct as part of their budget.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

Because we have identified that our ELL students are falling behind and not graduating at the same rate as other students in our District, how do we keep the sense of urgency for administrators to make sure that is a priority on their radar?

Mr. Vellardita:

I know the superintendent will answer this, but I am going to say one word—outcome. There is accountability on outcome and that school precinct and the organizational team will have to own it. If there is a ELL population in need of that service and it is correlated to outcome, it is incumbent on the school in their organizational plan to address it and to resource it.

Mr. Augspurger:

I think that is a perfect example of the role the school associate superintendent will play. If that plan comes to the school associate superintendent and does not reflect that need, he or she would reject that plan and send it back for further modification.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

Can you show me where in the regulations the principal is equally accountable for the results and the outcome? It seems like there is a heavy hand on the associate superintendent over the principal and I want to make sure there is a balance of power and that we are not putting all the pressure on the associate superintendent. I think the principal is steering the ship and I see the associate superintendent as the copilot, so I do not think that person should be held more accountable than the principal. There should be shared responsibilities. Are they on a level playing field in terms of accountability?

Mr. Augspurger:

I do not think it is more heavy-handed. If you look in section 20 on page 10 ([Agenda Item V A-1](#)), it outlines the associate superintendent's role. Any of the accountability requirements we currently have and that were approved in the last Legislative Session will all remain for the principal. The principal is accountable for the student achievement standards. This does not change. The associate superintendent is responsible for certain things for the school and its student achievement. I think we will

have more accountability in this model than before and I think there will be more copilots.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

Do we have the metrics in mind that we are going to use to measure performance? The line that gets me here is where it says, "The school associate superintendent must be held accountable for all aspects of the performance of the local school precinct." When you multiply that times 25 schools, that is a pretty huge pressure on someone's shoulders to make sure that all aspects of performance in the local precinct is theirs. I do not see performance defined and spelled out and I do not think a survey per se is the best measure of an individual's mentoring of a principal. I have seen it play out many times where there is mentoring and sometimes the mentee is not taking the mentorship and embracing the advice, yet you are still going to hold that mentor accountable? I am confused by that.

Mr. Augspurger:

If you look in section 21, subsection 2 (page 12, [Agenda Item V A-1](#)), it does say, "The school associate superintendent must be held accountable for all aspects of the performance of the local school precinct," but that in this subsection, "performance means the overall operation of the school as measured by," the (a) to (b) list that follows, which gives further definition to what that is.

Mr. Vellardita:

Assemblywoman Diaz, that might be in need of a revision on the regulations so it spells out the accountability of the principal for outcomes working with the organizational team.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

I think it needs to be measurable. You cannot just say we want a 5-star school. There has to be a way to measure the individual's work ethic and steady mentorship that will be happening through the year. Surveying the parents will not necessarily reflect that. Many parents will not see that unless they are part of the organizational team. Same for the staff, who will be busy teaching in their classrooms. If we have measurable outcomes, beginning with the end in mind with a measurable objective, it will be easier for the associate superintendents to comply with that. It is so vague right now.

Chair Roberson:

There is always a balance between being specific and giving flexibility and discretion to the superintendent, who is ultimately responsible for running the school district. I think you see more specific responsibilities for the school associate superintendent because it is a new position. The principal position is not a new position. Nothing will change as far as the expectations the superintendent will have on a principal. We can get very prescriptive in these regulations and I am sure there are some who think we are already too prescriptive, but we have to give flexibility to the superintendent to develop criteria

that he wants to use in evaluating principals and associate superintendents beyond what is on paper in these regulations. Ultimately, that principal is responsible to the superintendent as is the associate superintendent.

Assemblywoman Neal:

This might be more of a question for Ms. Lang, but since we were on section 20 of the regulations (pages 10-12, [Agenda Item V A-1](#)) as a whole, beginning with subsection 2, paragraph (a), my first question was about the city or governing body of the city being allowed to appoint a representative to interview. What is the statutory language or framework that the regulations need to stay within? When I look at the original language of A.B. 394, it says the decision for a local school precinct, the reporting of anything, basically, shall be to the “trustees or the governing body of the local precinct, as applicable...”. I saw this as an expansion of authority because I was wondering if we can give regulatory power to the State Department of Education or anyone else not listed in the plain language of the statute itself? That was my starting question. Then I tried to understand how did the city or the county get any power to appoint a representative to interview candidates at all, because they have never traditionally had that authority; they have never been inserted into the education process where the superintendent has to discuss or answer any questions to them. Where did the authority come from? What statutory authority gave it to them? You cannot create a regulation where you cannot find a statutory provision that prescribes that authority to you.

Chair Roberson:

It is my understanding that the plan and the recommendations this Advisory Committee make generate the regulations; the regulations flow from those recommendations. We have the discretion and authority under A.B. 394 to make these recommendations for the reorganization of the school district. Specifically, with regard to the involvement of a local governmental body in the interview process or any other part of the process relating to a school associate superintendent, we have been very careful and, frankly, we have taken the suggestion of the school district’s attorneys to ensure that only the superintendent has the ability and discretion to hire or reassign someone. From my many conversations with the superintendent, I have had no pushback on the issue of letting someone from a local government or a representative of someone from a local government, participate in an interview process. Ultimately, the power to hire that person remains with the superintendent.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Before you answer Ms. Lang or Ms. Erdoes, can you deal with subsection 4 of section 20 where it says, “Upon completion of the interviews pursuant to subsection 2 and before the Superintendent makes a final determination about the candidate to hire, the Superintendent must notify the governing body of the city or the Board of County Commissioners for Clark County, as applicable, of the candidate the Superintendent intends to hire.” And then, if he hires, he then has to come answer questions to the city

or the county. I just could not figure out where that delegated power came from. Who gave it to them? Help me figure out, for my comfort, where that authority is derived from and what was the statutory authority you pulled it from? What is the statute I can go read for myself to say, "Oh, yeah, that is constitutional." I am confused because the superintendent has never had to go to the County Commission or the city to answer any questions about any decisions he makes. That has been the Board of School Trustees.

Risa Lang (Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

First, I am not sure there is an actual delegation of responsibility, but it does provide for these bodies to participate in the interviews and then also in subsection 4 of section 20, like you said, to have a public meeting where they get to talk to the superintendent and the candidate to vet information about the candidate. As was indicated, the superintendent ultimately makes the decision in his or her discretion who to hire. So the hiring decision has not been delegated. As far as the authority, it is derived from the bill which allowed for the adoption of regulations to carry out the plan. As long as it does not conflict with statute, I do not think it would be going beyond the power of the State Board of Education to adopt this regulation that would provide the authority to these bodies.

Assemblywoman Neal:

In A.B. 394, if you go to page 6, the version I printed, 20.9, subsection 11, although the highlighted language, which was the amendment out of the bill, it said, "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." But then it goes on to say, "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." That is where I started to try to figure out how this bill is congruent with the regulation, and how we got to insertion of the county and the city—that is my main thing.

Ms. Lang:

Section 20.9 is a provision that amends Chapter 288 of NRS which pertains to collective bargaining. That was initially included in the bill in the event the school district was actually split up, which is not contemplated in this plan. So I am not sure that provision really has any applicability to this plan at all. Can you restate your question?

Assemblywoman Neal:

Because you just said that because we have shifted from the break-up, that you are not even sure this language applies, but I am just trying to understand how we added additional parties who are now involved in the conditions of employment under NRS 288 through this regulation? I guess that is the simplest way since you answered me that

way, because I do not know how the city and county make these types of decisions. There is no responsibility to notify them about anything. Where does that statutory authority come from to notify them about a decision?

Ms. Lang:

I think what this regulation would propose is that they would—if by its terms—would bring those parties in to provide input into that process that did not exist before as you have noted. But I think it is within the authority provided pursuant to A.B. 394 to come up with a plan and implement the plan through the regulations.

Chair Roberson:

I would just say that the provisions you were referencing contemplated the potential division of precincts in a way to where you would have collective bargaining handled on a precinct level, which we are not doing. In essence, this bill gave us the discretion to go further than we are actually going. That is why that particular language is not relevant in this context, because we are not going so far as to say that each precinct will handle its own collective bargaining.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Looking at the survey language where there will be surveys that serve as an evaluation to a degree, even though that word is not being used, the way the regulation is stated, the survey is being used to make a decision about someone's behavior. In NRS 391.680 on our policy for evaluation of teachers, I asked myself where the authority came from; is the survey now going to be treated as an additional evaluation that teachers or principals have to be bound to? What weight is it given and how does it work in relationship to the actual statute that says a system must be developed for an objective evaluation of teachers in a school district and who has that power to do that? I just wanted a conversation around the intent behind the surveys and how it fits into the policy under NRS 391.680 for the evaluation of teachers or principals. Because it is being used as a measure to say an employee is not doing well or performing up to the standards of these other entities or people.

Ms. Lang:

My understanding on the surveys, first of all, is that they are going to provide a summary of the surveys for groups and categories of folks, not individuals. I think the evaluations will still be conducted the way that the District does that in accordance with State law. The same would be for the principals as well; that came up a little bit earlier. As far as the intent behind the surveys, I think the others can talk to that since it is more of a policy issue, but it is to, I think, get a general sense of how the community and the people involved in the schools feel about the services that are being provided.

Chair Roberson:

I think a lot of this is about transparency. We want community input and we want the community to see how others in the community view what we are doing with this reorganization.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

Going back to section 21, subsection 2 of the regulations (page 2, [Agenda Item V A-1](#)), and how heavy-handed I feel it is, I thought about the fact that the associate superintendents have yearly evaluations by their supervisors, so why not change it to say that the school associate superintendent must show satisfactory performance per their yearly evaluation? That would be fair. I also went back to section 21, subsection 1 and it lists the things that are expected of the associate superintendent in paragraphs (a) through (e). I think these things can be part of the evaluation without us having to spell it out. Then we can say that a part of measuring their success could be the survey, but I would not want it to be entirely based on the surveys. It is not fair or realistic to just do a survey and say that measures the efficacy of the associate superintendent.

Also, during public comment, Alison Turner made the comment about her work with empowerment schools and how she realized that the caliber of leadership really mattered—if you had a really strong leader, that empowerment model rocked, and if you did not have a strong leader, it really did not happen. Will principals have to reapply for their positions to take the plunge into this autonomous school model? Will the same happen for associate superintendents?

Mr. Augspurger:

The current assistant chief superintendent position will be eliminated early in January, I believe. The announcement for the associate superintendent position will be flown sometime this fall and any individual can apply for that, including those assistant chiefs whose positions have been eliminated. That will be an important first step in getting everything else off the ground. The second piece is the importance of training. We are still waiting to hear from the District on what that training will look like—how the methodology of delivery will be determined, the content, who will do the delivery and how it will be differentiated across 357 principals, each with different ranges of experience. Training is key, and ongoing training will be necessary. We have talked of doing it in collaboration with teacher leaders in a building to further solidify the school teams. There is a lot of potential here to do some very good things with a strong culture of participatory decision making.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

So the associate superintendents will have to reapply for their positions and be cut out for the job but the principals will not?

Mr. Augspurger:
That is correct.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

Is there a reason why? I think that sometimes, people become comfortable in a school setting and having to reapply and show why you are the best person for the job will enhance principals in embracing this change. Is there a reason we did not think about the change to leadership at the principal level?

Mr. Augspurger:

There are two important reasons. First, having 357 principals reapply at once would be disruptive. Secondly, the job of principal is going to change dramatically. There will be new skill sets required plus additional complexity, so it will take a different type of person to do this job and to share autonomy and authority. We think we have lots of people who will do it well. In fact, many principals already run their buildings that way. The goal of this is to ensure that principals who are not yet set to do that can receive training so they can. There will be a high level of expectation to perform in this autonomous model.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

What if we roll this out fast forward and the associate superintendent is doing their best to mentor and help a principal but it is not taking hold after a year? What would be the way to deal with that? If the principal is not effective in this model, the whole school is not going to reap the benefits of being autonomous. What would be the course of action to ensure that another year would not go with that same performance?

Mr. Augspurger:

You raise a very good point. That same issue exists right now. In our current model, if you do not have an effective principal, you do not have an effective school. There has to be a stronger push by CCSD to ensure they follow our collective bargaining agreement that outlines the steps in progressive discipline. They cannot continue to ignore or tolerate poor behavior, inappropriate behavior or mediocre performance. I am not saying that is rampant across our principals, but everyone knows we have some employees, irrespective of their bargaining group, that do not perform well. We need to make sure we help people perform and identify those who do not perform and that we are prescriptive with the career improvement path. Sometimes that path is exiting the principalship. No one wants to tolerate a poor performer at any level, principals included. Principals have that same expectation; that their colleagues perform at the highest level.

Mr. Vellardita:

What is different now with these regulations than what we currently have centering around the principal? Twice a year in the new delivery model, every team member is

going to give input as to how things are going under the leadership of this principal. The regulations got modified to say input versus contributing to their evaluation. We learned from Mike Strembitsky and other school districts that in a system where there is shared decision making and shared outcome of responsibility, if accountability is measured by continuous feedback, which this model does, it just improves the performance.

You raised a million dollar question in terms of there being systems developed that support and provide resources so people are successful whether they are educators, administrators, associate superintendents or the superintendent. What has to be built into that system are the consequences of not performing. I would caution never to build a program around a small percentage of a target population. Instead, develop the program around the center of a bell curve that represents the overwhelming majority of educators and administrators. That is how programs should be developed, not just going after the bad apple.

To Assemblyperson Neal's questions; by statute there are evaluations for educators as well as administrators. That is not trumped by these regulations. As to the survey you referenced, if you look at section 31 ([Agenda Item V A-1](#)) in context, subsection 1 is a survey that essentially asks how the new delivery model is working. It specifically says "all persons involved with the local school precincts to measure their satisfaction with the local school precincts." The local school precinct is the new delivery model. It is a survey around how is that model working. Subsection 2 is the same thing, but it is a survey for central services, essentially trying to get input around central services, which is now a customer service bank. In that context, it has nothing to do with individuals in terms of evaluating a person; it is more of a system evaluation of the delivery model in the building and then the customer service or the service center that the central administration has been converted into.

Assemblywoman Neal:

In section 32 (page 25, [Agenda Item V A-2](#)) of the August 15 draft, it says, "Any cost incurred by the Clark County School District to carry out provisions of sections 2 to 31." Does that cost include the cost associated with section 29, which relates to the Community Education Advisory Board (CEAB) and any ongoing city or county expenses that may be related to whatever duties that are being created by their governing role? Because the language in section 32 says "any," and then it says "cost incurred by the Clark County School District to carry out the provisions of sections 2 to 31, inclusive, of this regulation must be paid for through the redistribution of existing money of the School District, including through savings realized." How do these costs roll out? What is going to be paid for? It looks like because of all these additional duties and powers that folks have been given, somebody is going to be looking for a check. Do they even have the legal authority to get it?

Chair Roberson:

In my view, the key language is, “Any cost incurred by the Clark County School District.” If North Las Vegas wants a CEAB, it is their decision. If the City of Las Vegas wants to hold a public meeting to welcome the new associate superintendent candidate and get to know that person, that is not a cost borne by the CCSD. We have talked about this in many previous meetings; this is more to reflect the cost of professional development to train these associate superintendents and principals. The superintendent has said on the record that those costs can be borne internally by CCSD at least between now and the start of the next Legislative Session. The District has already proposed legislation to request money for a new technology system, which they need regardless of whether we do this reorganization or not. There will be requests for funding at some point from the school district, but certainly between now and the next Session, they have been on the record publically that they can absorb these costs internally. We all know CCSD needs more money generally. Everyone on this Advisory Committee is well aware that by approving a plan that requires a weighted funding formula starting in 2017-2018, it is going to put more pressure on the Legislature to increase education funding and frankly, we need to. I welcome that pressure, speaking for myself.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Section 29 (page 22, [Agenda Item V A-2](#)), says, “To facilitate broad community input and to provide advice and assistance to the organizational team of any local school precinct and the Board of Trustees, one or more Community Education Advisory Boards may be created.” So this is going back to the question on the cost. How do you define providing advice and assistance to the organizational team that will help this operational plan within the school work? Are there any costs envisioned with this organizational team structure and what they may need to carry out their duties?

Chair Roberson:

There are Community Education Advisory Boards (CEABs) now. The issue is that it is a District policy that the CCSD Board of School Trustees can take away those boards at any time and frankly, the Moapa CEAB was threatened to have theirs pulled away. The City of Henderson has specifically asked for statutory authority for the city and other municipalities to create one or more CEABs. That is why this is in here. It is not a change from existing policy, but it takes away the discretion of a school board that may decide a CEAB is not necessary. We want the communities to make that decision.

Senator Ford:

Back to the topic of potential liability for the parents, I am not certain the answer is clear enough. For example, we know the school district is liable for its teachers and staff, but it also may be liable for agents. We may want to make it clear that the parents are not considered agents, or at least immunize them under our State law that deals with type of issue.

Chair Roberson:

We will discuss that before the end of the meeting today; the legal counsel stepped out briefly.

Senator Denis:

To clarify; the organizational team will have one meeting per month, posting the announcement of the meeting three days prior to the meeting and the public can attend any part of the meeting excepting confidential topics (section 24, Agenda Item V-1). It says the meetings will not be subject to the provisions of chapter 241 of NRS, which is the open meeting law. So if a parent goes to a meeting and they are not on the board and if they do not like what is going on at the meeting, how do we envision this type of meeting taking place? If it was under the open meeting law, a person could go and give their input. It seems like the meeting of the school's organizational team is basically a mini-school board meeting.

Chair Roberson:

Good question. The reason we exempted these meetings from the open meeting law is because the superintendent made the point, and I think it is very valid, that it would be very difficult for the District to train and monitor compliance with that law for 357 organizational teams. As a practical matter, it is just not feasible. One thing I do know is that right now, parents have very little say in the budgeting for their children's schools. In these recommendations, there will be a great deal more ability for parents to have input than ever before. We are taking a huge step toward parental involvement that we have never seen before with CCSD.

Senator Denis:

I was mainly wondering if I am a parent at one of these meetings and I do not agree with something that is going on, can I appeal through the District or someone else? Now, we have that opportunity to do that.

Chair Roberson:

The way the recommendations and draft regulations would work is that ultimately, the principal will submit the budget and the school plan to the associate superintendent. If the organizational team as a body disagrees, they can appeal to the associate superintendent and then further to the superintendent. Can a parent who is not part of the team appeal? No, but they can run to be elected to that organizational team. Right now, parents have no appeal rights and no say whatsoever with regard to the budget priorities or the priorities generally of their child's school.

Senator Denis:

Currently they can go to the Board of School Trustees, the principal or assistant chief superintendent. I want to make sure none of that will go away.

Chair Roberson:

No, that access will not change. I was thinking more of a formal appeal; some legal right within these recommendations that they can appeal.

Senator Denis:

If they are in disagreement with the direction the school is going and they go to the school organizational team and do not get satisfaction, could they still go to the associate superintendent? Maybe there is a disagreement between parents and half want one thing and the other half wants something else. I want to make sure people have that opportunity to be able to do something and not feel shut out.

Chair Roberson:

I think the First Amendment is alive and well. That will not change.

Assemblyman Stewart:

We seem to be running out of questions. I recommend we head toward a motion and in so doing, we might make a list of some of the changes we want, then consider them one by one and get to the point where we can vote on the total regulation.

Chair Roberson:

I appreciate that. I do not think we are quite there yet. I want to make sure all issues are addressed and aired today. We need to be compiling a list we can vote on today to verbally add to or modify this set of recommendations and regulations.

Senator Harris:

I would like clarification in section 5 (page 1, [Agenda Item V A-1](#)), about what confidential information means. I would like to see some clarifying language that with regard to the academic records of a pupil, we are also including their disciplinary record that may not necessarily be considered part of that academic record. I would not like for disciplinary records to be made available, or for there to be any confusion if, for example, an organizational team is talking about budgetary matters for at-risk or high needs children who may fall into some disciplinary categories as well as some consideration for photos or likenesses. A common practice within the District right now is for parents to be able to withhold certain types of confidential information from being disseminated publically and I would like to see that we are being consistent here as we begin to have more involvement from parents and the community that confidentiality of our students is thought about and protected.

Senator Hardy:

Section 26, subsection 4 (page 20, [Agenda Item V A-2](#)) says the organization team must meet not less than once a month during the school year. Does everyone have to be there or they get kicked off? Do they have to have a quorum of attendees? It is my experience that sometimes there is a waning of enthusiasm the less anger there is in

the community, so parents cannot be expected to be there all the time, especially if it is a year-round school.

Ms. Lang:

I do not think this would provide that they get kicked off. It is entirely possible that these teams might develop rules for how they govern themselves and how they would declare a vacancy. There is nothing in this saying that you automatically lose your position for missing a meeting.

Senator Hardy:

As we have it written now, it says they must meet at least every month, which may be problematic in a year-round school or for someone trying to figure out how to make meetings, so it does not mean everybody has to meet, is that correct?

Ms. Lang:

I think like most every other body, as long as you had a quorum present, you could take action, but you do not have to have every person present in order to have a meeting.

Senator Hardy:

So you would not have to take action as long as you did not have a quorum, but you could take action if you had a quorum?

Ms. Lang:

I think that is correct.

Assemblyman Stephen H. Silberkraus (Assembly District No. 29):

Section 22 (page 14, [Agenda Item V A-2](#)) speaks to fundraising, grants, gifts and donations. It says, "In addition to any other fundraising carried out by the local school precincts, the Board of Trustees may accept gifts, grants and donations" for those said school precincts or the District. I want to make sure that a school precinct can accept gifts or grant money without having to go through the District to do so.

Chair Roberson:

That is current law, correct, Risa?

Ms. Lang:

Yes.

Assemblyman Silberkraus:

I just wanted to make sure because when I read it at first it seemed like fundraising, which could be car washes or bake sales, was separated out from accepting gifts that were then presented to the institutions.

Senator Hardy:

In some schools or groups of schools, there is a foundation and CCSD is the mother of all foundations. I suspect that will not change in that there is a foundation potential as well as the other gifts, grants, booster clubs, etc. Is this correct?

This should not change the fact that a precinct, a group of schools or a CEAB of schools could use the mechanism already in place in the District to start a foundation which would have a separate ability to accept gifts, grants or donations, right?

Chair Roberson:

No, schools can take private money now and they will be able to continue to do that.

I have an issue I want to raise that I know some on the Committee have felt strongly about. In section 25 subsection 1, paragraph (d) (page 18, [Agenda Item V A-2](#)) of the proposed regulations regarding the student representation on the organizational team, I think we should talk about a minimum age. We have at least one school in the District that is kindergarten through 2nd grade. I think student input is valuable, but should we consider a minimum age to serve on the team?

Assemblyman Silberkraus:

Originally, I was of the same mind and opinion, but after hearing Mr. Strembitsky's commentary about good information coming from children of any age, I am actually comfortable with a child expressing his or her concerns and insights into what goes on in the classroom.

Assemblywoman Neal:

This was one of my questions, too, and I was concentrating less on age and more on a level of maturity. If you have been in a classroom, you know there can be some amazing 6-year-olds with a whole lot to say. However, considering potty breaks, etc., and understanding content and language of the organizational team, I think there at least needs to be a statement about either maturity or ability, not necessarily age. Clearly, this is a kid who will run for election in the same way they run for class president in their class, but the organizational team is handling more than whether they are going to have cookies in the snack shack, so some language around the maturity of the student versus the age is something that is probably a better language.

Chair Roberson:

What if we carve out the K-2 school?

Senator Denis:

I do not have a problem with carving out a K-2 school. We would still want to get input from kids, even in that situation, but when you are making decisions on 80 percent of

the budget, a 2nd grader is probably not going to comprehend that. A 5th grader might, not all of them, but if we carved out anything less than K-5 is probably fine.

Assemblyman Silberkraus:

I agree, but I think we would still appreciate their voice at the table, so perhaps they could be nonvoting members.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

I would suggest making it optional at the elementary level and mandatory at junior high and above. There are certain schools that already have student councils ongoing but not every school has that. I would not want to make it difficult for a school to recruit a student.

Assemblyman Silberkraus:

I agree with that, but I would add to make the choice with the student body but not the school. So, if the schools wanted a representative, they could have one.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

There should be a window of time open where the invitation is made to the student body and they can apply to be on the team. If the school does not receive applicants in that time, then the school is not bound because they extended the opportunity to their campus. I would not want to see the schools force the kids to take part in it if they did not want to.

Chair Roberson:

I agree. This is a very serious process where we are taking a vote on the direction of a school and the budget for that school. These are open meetings where students are allowed to be there. We are getting deeply into the weeds on an issue that is not a central issue within this plan, keep this in mind. What if we say the age is 10 years and older? There are children in K-2 who cannot read, yet we are asking them to vote on a budget for a school. I am all for student involvement, but we need to be practical.

Senator Denis:

On the monthly organizational team meeting, if a parent comes to the meeting who is not on the team, will they have an opportunity to give input? Since it is not a public meeting, there will be no requirement for public comment, but what if parents or teachers want to come and give input; will there be that opportunity?

Chair Roberson:

It is a public meeting; it is simply not subject to the open meeting law.

Senator Denis:

Are we requiring that they do public comment?

Chair Roberson:

I do not think we are, and I do not think we should be that prescriptive regarding organizational meetings. The school should be making those decisions. I would be surprised if an organizational team, which is required to have a monthly public meeting, would not take public input.

Senator Denis:

I would too, but I just do not want to hear complaints later that parents feel they cannot say anything at one of these meetings.

Mr. Vellardita:

We were concerned there would not be enough meetings. The initial regulations did not spell out that the team had to meet at least monthly, so a principal could say, "I had one meeting and that is enough." That would kill the environment you are trying to create. The experience with the empowerment model was that there was never a closed door of involvement. I think these teams will make their own rules of engagement with input from staff, community, parents, students and others.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Comparing the language between section 21, subsection 2, paragraph (a) (page 14, [Agenda Item V A-2](#)) and section 25, subsection 1, paragraph (e) (page 17, [Agenda Item V A-2](#))—one says the school's associate superintendent should be held accountable for the performance, as measured by satisfaction of parents, guardians, pupils, teachers and administrative staff. But it does not say how many of those persons must have voted or participated in the survey, which I think can cause issues. In section 25, subsection 1, paragraph (e), it makes sure that 50 percent of the voting members are parents. Then it says you must be selected by a vote of "all parents and legal guardians of children who attend the local school precinct." So there are two different measurements. In one scenario you want a vote of all parents in the local school precinct but when it comes down to the measurement or performance of the school's associate superintendent, it does not have the language of "all," nor does it have a percentage. I want to deal with that because I think we can try to make that language match or we can make the language at least represent something where it is measurable of who is voting on the performance of the associate superintendent.

Chair Roberson:

I apologize, could you repeat the question.

Assemblywoman Neal:

On section 25, subsection 1, paragraph (e) (page 17, [Agenda Item V A-2](#)), you have language for the number of people who need to vote. It says, "who attend the local school precinct which represents 50 percent of the total number of voting members if possible," etc. It also says, "The parents or legal guardians must be selected by a vote

of all parents and legal guardians of the children who attend the local school precinct.” Although this is a separate provision dealing with the actual voting or creation of a member, you have language in section 21, subsection 2, paragraph (a) (page 14, [Agenda Item V A-2](#)), of the proposed regulations that does not give any kind of percentage or specification of all parents, all pupils, all teachers in relationship to the performance measured of this associate school superintendent.

I am saying there could be some kind of language, either the insertion of “to the satisfaction of 51 percent of all the pupils and teachers and administrators” who are going to say that the performance is horrible or great. I am saying that one provision has a percentage where you can at least measure, and the other does not do that, yet it is speaking to the same population but for a different issue, if that makes sense.

Chair Roberson:

This is kind of apples and oranges from my perspective. I will address section 25, subsection 1, paragraph (e) first. When we say “all,” we are basically saying that all parents are eligible to vote. We are not going to be able to track down every single parent and require them to vote on who they want as their representative. All parents will have the ability to vote for representatives on this organizational team and the goal is to have half of the voting members be parents. We understand that might not be possible, but that is the goal.

In section 21, subsection 2, paragraph (a), it is more of a general statement, but I am not sure if that is the right way to describe it. Ultimately, the associate superintendent is responsible to the superintendent. All this language is meant to say is that the satisfaction of parents, administrators and other staff is part of the picture. We are saying they must be held accountable for all aspects of performance and then there is the definition of performance. I hear what you are saying, but speaking for myself, I am not sure it makes sense to put a percentage in here because the idea is general satisfaction of the parents, administrators and other staff. That interplays between the associate superintendent and the superintendent; I do not know if you can quantify that or if that would even be relevant to the superintendent what the percentage is. The point is, the superintendent is going to want to know, as he reviews the performance of an associate superintendent, how the people in the building and the people affected by what happens in the building feel about the performance of the associate superintendent.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I just keep wondering who is in and who is out of certain decision making. Because section 21 has the CEAB and the satisfaction of parents and guardians, and as you read the document as a whole, there are parties who are involved in certain decisions and then there are parties who are waiting to see if the performance of the associate superintendent is good or bad. I just did not understand how it was going to be

measured; if it was all of those parents. You said it is general satisfaction of the parties who actually turn in the survey, I am assuming. If you get 10 surveys that say they like the associate superintendent and one that is negative, then I guess we are going to say that the general group of folks thought the individual did well. I know the superintendent has the final say, but I just did not understand how the language worked.

Senator Hardy:

On one, section 25, we are actually voting to put someone on an organizational team. On the other, section 21, we are participating as parents and guardians as what we think about the associate superintendent, but we do not have power. We have not empowered parents or the staff to remove an associate superintendent. It is just a question of whether we like the person or not for the job they are doing. The vote is a majority vote to put somebody on the organizational team.

Mr. Vellardita:

The difference is this—one is decision making, that is the voting, for the parent representative so there are thresholds and parameters for that. The second one, section 21, subsection 2, paragraph (a) cannot be understood out of context without paragraph (b). The first paragraph is about input; the other is about metrics of performance. The two together contribute to what is being asked for, which is input and evaluation around performance. The other one, section 25, subsection 1, paragraph (e), is about decision making. That is the difference.

Chair Roberson:

This is in here because we collectively believe these are things that the superintendent should look at when evaluating an associate superintendent. Having said that, this takes no legal rights away from the associate superintendent, and again, the superintendent has the sole discretion in determining the hiring and the reassignment of an associate superintendent.

Senator Denis:

In that section 25, subsection 1, paragraph (e) where it talks about the number of parents just referenced, it says, “A number of parents or legal guardians of children who attend the local school precinct which represents 50 percent of the total number of voting members if possible, or if fewer are available to accept membership, then the greatest number available.” So I guess the question is, what is the definition of available? What if a principal decides he does not want parents or what if no parents step up, does that mean there could be no parents on the organizational team or would they be required to have at least one or two?

Chair Roberson:

We cannot require parents to participate. If parents choose to participate, this is the avenue for them and we have given parents the ability to make up fully 50 percent of

the organizational team. Ultimately, though, it is up to parents to see that this is a new opportunity for them to have a voice in their child's education and I would hope and expect there will be parents who will take advantage of this opportunity. We cannot require it, though.

Senator Denis:

I understand that, but at my schools, parents might not be as informed about how important their voice is. A principal might say it takes too much effort to train the parents so why bother. I just do not want to see my schools not have a parent representative just because the parents have not been educated enough to understand their important role in something like this.

Mr. Augspurger:

I think the team has a shared responsibility for this; it is not just the principal or the teachers or the support staff. Collectively, they all have an interest in greater transparency and greater involvement and only good will come when we have more parents participating. It is a collective responsibility for that group to get the call out.

Senator Denis:

How are we going to train parents? I do not know if we have set aside any money to do this and in some cases, it is going to take a while. We cannot wait until school starts next year to suddenly start training parents. Something needs to happen this year. How do you envision that happening?

Mr. Augspurger:

My opinion is that the District has thought a lot about that. We have a Department of Family and Community Engagement Services (FACES) involved in lots of parent work. As important as training is for teachers, principals and support staff, it is equally important for parents; maybe even more so.

Mr. Vellardita:

If you look further down the regulations, it says, "If no such association exists, the principal of the local school precinct must inform all parents and guardians of the opportunity to serve on the organizational team and provide the parents and guardians with information about the responsibilities associated with serving as a member of the team." The regulations charge the organizational team that if there is not a parent association in place, to at least broadcast to the parents at that school that there is an opportunity to serve.

To your second question, this is what I learned from the Chicago School District, the third largest school district in the U.S. with unprecedented parental involvement, particularly in some of the most at-risk schools, very urban and similar to what we experience in Las Vegas. They had tens of thousands of parents involved on what were

called school councils. To do those, you have to not only develop some kind of parental engagement and training around responsibility, but there are also resources allocated to that task. Currently, we have a central program for parent and community engagement, FACES, and it has a budget but I am not sure what it is. Whether or not that service is maintained where a school could buy into it or whether a decision is made by the organizational team that says, "You know what, a percentage of that 80 percent needs to go to parental outreach," there has to be action to involve the parents.

Senator Denis:

That is why I am bringing this up; to make sure we are talking about it and not coming back later saying we did nothing for parents. Another example would be that the school might decide to do their meetings in the middle of the day and parents might not be available and then they could say, "Well, there is not anybody available." If they have to do their meetings at night when the parents are available, they could do that.

Senator Ford:

I want to ensure that we are requiring the school budgets to be balanced.

Chair Roberson:

That is in the language; it is a requirement under the regulations.

Senator Ford:

I was looking through the list from the CCSD Board statement list ([Agenda Item II A](#)). On page 2 of their list, No. 17 references section 14, paragraph (g) of the August 11 draft regulations (page 4, [Agenda Item V A-1](#)), the provision that talks about services to promote and ensure equity and diversity. Typically, when we talk about diversity and equity, we think about race and gender and things of that sort, but I think they want to be certain that we state on the record that we are talking about also including A.P. classes, honors classes, gifted students and other high quality programs. Frankly, I do not think the language here lends itself easily to being inserted into our regulation, but I do think it notes that since we are talking about equity and diversity, it should include all these other programs as well. Is there any disagreement on that?

Chair Roberson:

I do not think so.

Senator Ford:

Okay. At some point are you going to take requests for amendments?

Chair Roberson:

Yes, I expect every Committee member who wants to see a change to submit it in the next half hour on a piece of paper to Ms. Lang and then we will vote.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

When we were talking about the school's organizational team and the Education Support Employees Association (ESEA) asked why they are only being offered one member to sit on that team, I was wondering why we could not consider allocating two seats on the team. Maybe it could be a minimum of one representative up to two representatives. The teachers are being offered up to four positions. I understand that, because the teachers have a lot more instructional practice, but I think the support staff perspective and certain operations of the school are also beneficial. I just wanted to see why we only put one support staff on the team in the regulation.

Mr. Vellardita:

I think it is proportional; it is that simple. There may be an exception here or there, but overwhelmingly there are not as many support staff as licensed professionals and educators in a school, so it is really about making sure there is accurate representation and I do not know of an exception of any significance to speak otherwise.

Mr. Augspurger:

If you look at a big high school with 160 teachers, they will get a maximum of four teachers on the organizational team. At that school, there will be 30 to 40 support staff, so having one representative is proportional. I know it looks different in terms of numbers but we are really looking at the size of the group and ensuring there is proportional representation from that group.

Senator Denis:

Is that true in all the schools?

Mr. Augspurger:

That may be a better question for Superintendent Skorkowsky, but my guess is that there will always be a higher percentage of licensed than unlicensed personnel.

Senator Denis:

I would anticipate that, but somebody threw out a 1 to 4 ratio and I would love to know what the numbers are. At some schools it might be 1 to 2, so by us putting something here, it is not giving those schools that option.

Mr. Augspurger:

That is a good point. In some of the special schools there would be a higher ratio of support staff to licensed staff. That might be worth looking at.

Chair Roberson:

Maybe an additional regulation down the road? Just a thought.

Senator Ford:

What I understood Assemblywoman Diaz to say was that she was suggesting we say up to two support staff representatives, not necessarily two. If we are talking about discretion and flexibility with a school, if we provide them that flexibility, I would support that if you were to make it an amendment.

Chair Roberson:

That will be one I assume you will submit, Vice Chair Diaz.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

Correct. I have reached out to some of the Clark County Commissioners regarding section 20 and section 21 (pages 12-14, [Agenda Item V A-2](#)). I spoke with Chris Giunchigliani and she submitted a letter ([Agenda Item V B](#)) where she says she disagrees with letting cities or counties weigh in on the model and that parents should not be involved in hiring staff at schools and that we really do not need to be this involved in the interviewing process of an associate superintendent. I would like to hear where the genesis came from to move in this direction. If the County Commissioners are not completely on board with what we have in front of us, I would like to hear why. Because if half the people are saying they want to do it and the others are not completely on board, then why not make it permissive and organic? Relationships can be had; partnerships can be made and if there are cities that want to foster a relationship with a school precinct and an associate superintendent, then they can reach out and tell them they want to be included, but why put that in the regulations?

Chair Roberson:

I think it is permissive in that there is a certain time by which the governing body has to schedule a public meeting. If they do not schedule a public meeting, then it does not happen. I do not believe Commissioner Giunchigliani speaks for the entire Clark County Commission. She is not here, nor has she been to any of the meetings that I am aware of. On the other hand, Mayor Carolyn Goodman is here and I would like to hear her perspective because she has been involved in this process and on the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), too. County Commissioner Mary Beth Scow is in the audience and she is also a member of the TAC so feel free to come up and speak.

Ms. Goodman:

Since I have been elected at large, we represent the inner city as well as the 135 square miles that comprises the City of Las Vegas. The biggest concern is the inner city schools, where many of these problems have been existing and where the allocation of funds has not gone appropriately to the needs of the constituents.

My sense is to be a strong part of this reorganization planning process and down the road, as different mayors take office or different County Commissioners come in, some have strong educational backgrounds and can be very effective in helping with the

decisions in this regard. Then you have some with absolutely no concept of what makes quality education happen.

One of the things I see which is great for parents is that if they do not like a school long enough, they will put in for a zone variance. They will find out where the best schools are and they will ask. Whether there is room in those schools is another thing, but it is certainly an indication to the superintendent and the school board to shine a light on a school with an inordinate number of zone variance requests where the school is doing nothing but losing its students. My personal feeling and the other mayors—and I can speak for all four of them—is that we feel education is the future for us, and we really want to have a part of it. I cannot speak for the County Commission, but the rest of us are responsible and elected at-large to our municipal areas.

Mary Beth Scow (District G Commissioner, Clark County Board of County Commissioners,):

I have not polled all the County Commissioners, but in the discussions I have heard and been approached on, there is not a huge appetite for the Commissioners in particular to be involved in interviewing the associate superintendents. I think every Commissioner feels that education is a very high priority among our constituents and our personal feelings about the future of our community. We are all very vested and many of us have a lot of experience in education. Even as a School Board Trustee, I never felt like I should be hiring or even interviewing people for positions, except for superintendent and have not felt that among the Commissioners.

However, I feel the Commissioners would be open to being involved in a setting like the Community Education Advisory Board (CEAB). We want to be involved in helping education be better and helping our constituencies feel involved in their communities and that is an exceptional way to do that. I have had experience with that as a trustee. As far as the interview process, I felt great reservation among the Commissioners.

Ms. Goodman:

In reference to Commissioner Giunchigliani, her district, District E, happens to overlap different wards of the Las Vegas City Council. That may have some reasoning from her part as to why she does not think it is appropriate. Again, mayors are elected at-large by the totality of their areas, so that is why I think there might be some differentiation.

Chair Roberson:

Right now, there is no requirement for a local governing body to participate in interviews, although they may. If you look at section 20, subsection 4, (page 13, [Agenda Item V A-2](#)) it says, “Not later than 10 days after receiving such notice, the governing body of the city or the Board of County Commissioners, as applicable, must hold a public meeting...”. If we change that “must” to “may,” then each body can decide whether they want to participate.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

I did not convey my opening statement so eloquently as you did, Commissioner Scow, so I appreciate that. In my conversations with the cities, I have only heard them wanting to have a CEAB-type of connection to the local school precincts, but in these conversations about the regulations, I never heard anyone say they want to participate in the interviews of the associate superintendents. For me, it is about power play. If you as a school district have to invite an outside entity into that interview and then the District has to go back and tell that outside entity who they selected, it might raise some red flags for some of my constituents who could wonder why they are not also being informed, especially if they are parents of a student who will be affected by this change.

For me, it does not bode well. I think a CEAB is a better structure to grow the connections to school and community. We heard in the town hall meetings where people say they have a bad taste in their mouths about how people are currently appointed to positions. I do not know if this will help or hinder, but some said that certain positions were already filled by deals made behind closed doors. I am not sure this will make sure people feel it is a transparent process when only a certain individual gets invited in.

Chair Roberson:

I want to clarify the process because that is important. To the extent that a local governing body wants to participate in those associate superintendent interviews, they may. The superintendent makes the decision in his sole discretion on who he wants to hire. Before he hires that person, he and the candidate go to a public meeting before the local governing body and introduce the candidate to the community. This starts that important relationship between this very important position of a person responsible for 25 schools and that large community. They agree to come back to that public setting on a quarterly basis and give updates on how the schools are doing and to listen to concerns. This is about building in a structure of responsiveness to the community. From a legal standpoint, the superintendent is still the sole person to make the decision to hire or reassign someone.

Ms. Goodman:

Well stated. I would only add that because of the uniqueness of downtown Las Vegas, we have already established a very close understanding and focus with Superintendent Skorkowsky and we meet on a regular basis about what we can do to help and how the cities can augment after hours or before hours. I look at how we have pulled together so much private support, community and schools and it has been a positive experience because of the people. Mayor Lee and Mayor Hafen are the type of leaders you want in there who are looking for the communal good. That is the beauty of where we are today. We cannot talk 10 years out because we do not know who will be in office then, so that is why today's experience is so tremendous; the opportunity to move our schools up from number 50 in the nation.

Respecting you, Assemblywoman Diaz and everything you are seeing, it really is about living it every single day and knowing your job. I have said a thousand times that we have surgeons who operate, but do we want a parent to come in and say how they should operate on the body of their beloved? No, you want people who are trained in the area to be the ones helping to make the decisions. Like Pat Skorkowsky, having started in 1st grade and worked his way up through everything. We know each other's stories and what works and how to make it better. We are in a unique time right now with the mayors because all the phone calls, emails and social media come into our offices when there are complaints about schools.

Senator Ford was talking about all the other things like gifted student programs to be in the formula. How about band and strings? Those are extra cost and the professionals who teach in those specialty areas have different training and may have different salary bases. That is another financial piece to look at, like sports or the high-end International Baccalaureate English professor or Spanish teacher with a PhD in Spanish. Commissioner Giunchigliani is a wonderful leader in our community, so when she said she does not prefer that, I am sure it is her personal opinion.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

It says here that the city or the Board of County Commissioners can appoint. So who would this person be? Is it the same person? Is it a different person every interview?

Ms. Goodman:

From our perspective, it would be a knowledgeable, well-educated, patient, listening, caring, involved person who is also a leader.

Ms. Skow:

The way the County Commissioners usually do business is that the commissioner representing that district would be the representative. Most of the commissioners are quite familiar with the schools in their districts. I would assume that would be the way it would be approached. We work a lot in our unincorporated areas because they do not have a lot of sense of identity like the City of Las Vegas or the City of Henderson. We work within our townships with our town advisory boards and I really feel the CEABS could be a great vehicle in establishing that neighborhood identity. I am not super keen on carrying out the interviews and politicizing it, but I am a great advocate of the CEABs.

Chair Roberson:

I want to make clear from my perspective that when it says representative, it does not have to be a member of the County Commission or the Las Vegas City Council; it can be someone those bodies designate to attend those interviews. I know how busy all of you are and I am not suggesting you will be able to attend these interviews in person. I want that to be clear.

Senator Ford:

In Commissioner Giunchigliani's letter ([Agenda Item V B](#)), she does say in the first line, that she could not be here because she had a County Commission meeting. I agree with the Chair's idea that making it permissive by using the word "may" should solve some of the concerns.

Senator Hardy:

Regarding section 20, subsection 2, paragraph (b) (page 13, [Agenda Item V A-2](#)), my district has at least 10 schools in rural areas where the best person for that interview may be one of those rural people who otherwise may not get a chance to have a voice on that decision. I have an appetite to include town board as a local governing body, not just the city or the county.

Chair Roberson:

I appreciate that and you could submit it, but I do worry that we are going to complicate this. Maybe it is something we look at in the future, but I think that complicates it.

Senator Hardy:

Thank you.

Senator Denis:

In the proposed regulations where it talks about making information available to parents, we are putting in that we have to put it on the Internet website of the local precinct. Not all my parents have access to the Internet, so I would hope they could post it at the school too. I am not suggesting we have to mail it home, but at least make it available in someplace other than on the Internet because not all parents would get it if you do that.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you to everyone for your patience. A document called *Recommendations for Revisions to the Proposed Regulations* ([Agenda Item V A-4](#)) has been disseminated to all the Committee members. The way I would like to handle this is that I will propose a list of these with the votes that are sufficient to pass. I could be wrong. I am going to ask for a motion to approve the proposed amendments that I list first, this will be the consent agenda of sorts and we will then take a vote. Let me ask the Committee; do we want to take one vote on all of those or do we want to take a vote on each one individually? I can go either way.

Assemblyman Stewart:

I propose we take a vote on all the ones that are noncontroversial.

Chair Roberson:

Okay, we will do that. We will take one vote on the ones I list off that I think are noncontroversial. There are four others we should vote on, but we need to explain a

little bit because the language has changed some from what is on the written page. I will do that next. If there are any others a Committee member would like to bring up and ask for a vote upon, we will do that last.

I will now ask for a motion to approve the following recommendations for revisions to the proposed regulations: Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, 13, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27.

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART MOVED TO APPROVE NUMBERS 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, 13, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27 OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS.

SENATOR FORD SECONDED THE MOTION.

Senator Ford:

I want to draw everyone's attention to No. 23 ([Agenda Item V A-4](#)), which says, "Amend section 25 to provide that parents must be informed of any potential liability for serving on the organizational team." This includes any potential responsibilities and liabilities. You may recall we had a discussion about ensuring that parents were immune from lawsuits to the same extent as employees and staff members of CCSD. The Committee agreed we wanted to do that and I proposed an amendment. We have since found, however, that at this juncture we are unable to provide statutory protection in that regard because it requires a statutory change and we cannot do that via regulation. Therefore, if we have any operations taking place before the Legislature goes back into Session in February, 2017, any parent who agrees to participate will be given notice so they can consent to the prospect, possibility and unlikely probability of being liable in a lawsuit.

That said, the intention I have, immediately at the beginning of next Session, is to put forth legislation that would offer retroactive protection for parents under the statute that gives the same protection to employees and staff members. It is important that parents know that if they are participating in this form of reorganization, there is a potential for a liability we cannot shield them from.

Chair Roberson:

I will say on the record that I will support that legislation as well. I would imagine everyone on this Committee will, but I will speak for myself.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

I need a clarification, either from Brenda or Risa, about what the process is after we agree on these regulations. We are stating that these regulations are recommendations, so what is the role of the State Board of Education (SBE) after we do this? I thought the Legislature passed a law creating the SBE as a body with regulatory authority. Also, what power does the SBE have to change what this Advisory Committee advances today?

Chair Roberson:

Let me try to answer that. As to these changes to the proposed regulations, we also need to acknowledge that the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) staff will need to make the same changes in the recommendations. The recommendations are the policy we are setting forward. We are helping the process by drafting regulations that further the intent of the recommendations. The SBE will review these regulations and may make changes to them at their August 22 workshop or on September 1 if they believe these regulations do not align the way they need to with the recommendations. Did I capture that right Risa? And if they change the regulations, the regulations in whatever form they are passed, go forward to the Legislative Commission, which can approve the regulations or send them back to the SBE to be reworked.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

Can the SBE make any changes it deems necessary? Or does it have to be in the scope of the regulations we have advanced out of this Committee? I am trying to get a feel for if they have to work with what we are sending their way or can they completely come out of left field and insert something entirely new?

Ms. Lang:

I think A.B. 394 specified that they could draft and pass regulations that carry out the plan and recommendations from the Committee. So I think it would still have to be at least carrying out the recommendations of this Committee.

Chair Roberson:

Obviously, through this process, we worked to ensure that the regulations we are recommending are very consistent with the recommendations we are approving. So there should not be much of a question of what the legislative intent here is. Brenda in Carson City, do you want to add anything to that?

Ms. Erdoes:

No; I agree.

Senator Denis:

On the issue of parent liability, if they are part of a PTA organization, they have insurance and would be covered in that case, but not necessarily under the other one. So if some of the parents are already participating, they might still be covered until we can get it fixed.

Chair Roberson:

We have a motion by Assemblyman Stewart and a second by Senator Ford to approve the following: Numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, 13, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Roberson:

The next recommendations we want to discuss are Nos. 9, 16, 17, and 22. We need to explain some changes to these. In No. 9 ([Agenda Item V A-4](#)), in section 15, subsection 2, (page 6, [Agenda Item V A-2](#)), the paragraph will simply say “Each local school precinct must carry forward its year-end balance to the next school year.” The remainder of that paragraph will be deleted. Was that the intent, Senator Ford?

Senator Ford:

I believe we needed to get the first two sentences, which are: “Each local school precinct must carry forward in its budget to the next school year any unexpended money allocated to the local school precinct. The School District must account for any such amount that is carried forward as a restricted fund balance.” Was it different?

Chair Roberson:

I think it was different. Mike Strembitsky was talking to Risa and I think the suggestion was simply to have one sentence: “Each local school precinct must carry forward its year-end balance to the next school year.”

Senator Ford:

Okay, if Mr. Strembitsky would not mind coming to the table and someone from the District as well, I need to ensure that would satisfy both of them in that instance.

Michael Strembitsky (CCSD Reorganization Consultant, International Consultant; Former Superintendent of Schools, Edmonton Public Schools, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada):

Yes, it would work. The clarity is there.

Mr. Skorkowsky:

I concur.

Senator Ford:

Then I am good.

Chair Roberson:

Let us just have a vote on that one to eliminate any confusion because we are going to be making language changes on four different recommendations. I would accept a motion from Senator Ford to amend and pass recommendation No. 9 with the added language in section 15, subsection 2 to read: “Each local school precinct must carry forward its year-end balance to the next school year.”

SENATOR FORD MOVED TO AMEND AND PASS RECOMMENDATION NO. 9 WITH THE ADDED LANGUAGE IN SECTION 15, SUBSECTION 2 TO READ, "EACH LOCAL SCHOOL PRECINCT MUST CARRY FORWARD ITS YEAR-END BALANCE TO THE NEXT SCHOOL YEAR."

ASSEMBLYMAN SILBERKRAUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Roberson:

Next is recommendation on No. 16 ([Agenda Item V A-4](#)) by Vice Chair Diaz. Ignoring the language on the paper here, I think your intent is that the school associate superintendent's performance of his or her work is to be based on the totality of their work within the up to 25 schools they oversee, not simply to have the performance be evaluated on one particular school.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

That is correct.

Chair Roberson:

Would you like to make a motion to amend and pass recommendation No. 16 as I just stated?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ MOVED TO AMEND AND PASS RECOMMENDATION NO. 16 TO READ, "THE SCHOOL ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT'S PERFORMANCE OF HIS OR HER WORK IS TO BE BASED ON THE TOTALITY OF THEIR WORK WITHIN THE UP TO 25 SCHOOLS THEY OVERSEE, NOT SIMPLY TO HAVE THE PERFORMANCE BE EVALUATED ON ONE PARTICULAR SCHOOL."

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Roberson:

Now we will go to No. 17 ([Agenda Item V A-4](#)), a recommendation by Assemblywoman Neal. It is my understanding that the language on the page should simply say the following: "Amend section 24, subsection 3 to require the plan of

operation to address academic achievement.” Does that match up with your intent, Assemblywoman Neal?

Assemblywoman Neal:

Correct; it is like an add-on.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NEAL MOVED TO AMEND AND PASS
RECOMMENDATION NO. 17 TO READ, “AMEND SECTION 24,
SUBSECTION 3 TO REQUIRE THE PLAN OF OPERATION TO ADDRESS
ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT.”

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Roberson:

The last one is recommendation No. 22 ([Agenda Item V A-4](#)). One change here was recommended by Assemblyman Stewart and Senator Hardy and another one by Senator Neal. I am asking for a motion to approve the recommendation by Assemblyman Stewart and Senator Hardy to amend section 25, subsection 1, paragraph (d) to require that it applies only to a student in middle school or high school and that an elementary school student will not serve on an organizational team at an elementary school. I have a motion by Senator Hardy and a second by Assemblyman Stewart.

Senator Denis:

When we are making reference in that second sentence, are we not talking about a student in elementary school? Or is this for any student?

Senator Hardy:

This would allow the student in middle school or high school to serve on the organizational team, but not an elementary student.

Senator Denis:

I meant in the second sentence where we took the word “not” out, it says “the student member will be allowed to participate only...”. So we are talking about in the elementary school because it says, “A student will not serve on an organizational team at an elementary school.”

Chair Roberson:

I think the intent of Senator Hardy was to apply this to the student representative in the middle school and high school. Senator Hardy, will you explain to us your concern?

Senator Hardy:

Yes, if an elementary school student becomes a tie breaker on a vote, he or she may be in a very difficult position. In a tie vote you would have 50 percent or 49 percent of the people who hate you and that is a big burden for an elementary school student to bear. So we said the middle school or high school student would serve on the organizational team but not vote on the budget or the hiring process. They would be advisory and able to vote on both A and B in your major mock-up instead of on the budget.

Senator Denis:

If I am clear, you are saying that high school and middle school students can vote, but not on the budget, and elementary students would not be on the organizational team.

Senator Hardy:

Correct, they would not be on the organizational team at all.

Chair Roberson:

I think for clarity if we reverse the second and third sentences to read:

Amend section 25, subsection 1, paragraph (d) to require that it applies only to a student in middle school or high school. In addition, the student member will be allowed to participate only in providing assistance and advice regarding the plan of operation. A student will not serve on an organizational team at an elementary school.

Senator Denis:

Thank you, it makes more sense.

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO AMEND AND PASS RECOMMENDATION NO. 22 TO READ: "AMEND SECTION 25, SUBSECTION 1, PARAGRAPH (D) TO REQUIRE THAT IT APPLIES ONLY TO A STUDENT IN MIDDLE SCHOOL OR HIGH SCHOOL. IN ADDITION, THE STUDENT MEMBER WILL BE ALLOWED TO PARTICIPATE ONLY IN PROVIDING ASSISTANCE AND ADVICE REGARDING THE PLAN OF OPERATION. A STUDENT WILL NOT SERVE ON AN ORGANIZATIONAL TEAM AT AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL."

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Roberson:

Now I would ask for a motion to approve both the recommendations that were distributed to the Committee entitled Recommendations of the Advisory Committee to Develop a Plan to Reorganize the Clark County School District ([Agenda Item V A-3](#)) as well as the Draft Regulation to Reorganize the Clark County School District ([Agenda Item V A-2](#)) that were distributed today as amended by these amendments we just voted on. This motion would allow the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) to make the necessary changes to both the recommendations and the regulations to implement those recommendations. The motion would allow LCB to make the changes we just voted on.

ASSEMBLYMAN SILBERKRAUS MOVED TO APPROVE BOTH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO DEVELOP A PLAN TO REORGANIZE THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT AND THE DRAFT REGULATION TO REORGANIZE THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT AS AMENDED BY THESE AMENDMENTS WE VOTED ON.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Roberson:

The next steps are this. On August 22, the State Department of Education (NDE) will hold workshop on the regulations. They may or not make changes. On September 1, the State Board of Education (SBE) will consider the regulations to implement the recommendations we passed today. If the regulations are approved by the SBE, the next step would be the Legislative Commission. I would anticipate a hearing before that body in the first half of September.

We do not have another meeting scheduled for this Committee at this time. I do not anticipate meeting until after the meetings of the SBE. Once those meetings have been held, we will contact members to set another date. If any of you have additional concerns after this meeting, contact Risa Lang so she may pass them on. I will remind everyone that this is a long process—this Committee will continue to meet for up to the next 2 years to oversee the implementation of the reorganization plan.

I will now open agenda item VI, public comment.

Ms. Shuman:

I said nay to bring up section 25 of the proposed regulation, the same thing I spoke about this morning. It says to allow up to two members of support staff to be on the

organizational team, but two only if there are four teachers. I do not understand why there has to be a stipulation added to this regulation that says only if there are four teachers. I consider myself equal to any employee in my school. My principal considers me equal to any employee in my school. Yet this Committee constantly wants to keep putting more emphasis on teachers and not having the equality between the support staff and the teachers. I do not understand why there has to be a stipulation. Senator Roberson, I addressed this with you at the school board meeting on Thursday night. I asked why one support staff position was taken off. You replied it was because there are more teachers. Well, there are 17,000 teachers and over 11,000 support staff, which is a difference of 6,000. If anything, we should have only three teachers because there is not double the amount of teachers. For that reason, I do not agree with this stipulation. It is about time that support staff and teachers are treated equally.

Ms. Tampa:

The sum of the parts is greater than the whole. If you take away any one part, the whole is not complete. I would like to say thank you and applaud those who did hear what support staff has to say. The legislative process is a little different than what I had hoped or anticipated in this Committee. I noticed that several items were left off, not discussed and not voted on, so I was a little bit confused about that—items 8, 14, 15, 19, etc. ([Agenda Item V A-4](#)). I thank John Vellardita for representing teachers and Stephen Augspurger for representing principals. Late in the game, you both did step up and tried to allow for us to have some input. But I still think 11,500 people impacting the children in the District have still been marginalized and I am disappointed. I did submit my comments in writing ([Agenda Item II B](#)) and that also includes my contact information. I would love to hear from someone and be able to have more input but unfortunately, I feel like we were not heard that well because of the way this process took place. I am thankful for the good things, but I do not need to ask about fixing the good things. I only need to talk about the things that are concerns because we have been limited on time.

Assemblyman David M. Gardner (Assembly District No. 9):

I just want to say thank you. You guys have put in so much good work for this and you have worked really hard. So far, this bill has done better than I could have imagined. I just really appreciate all the time and effort you have put into this. It is really what the bill epitomizes, so thank you very much.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you Assemblyman Gardner for getting us here and for sponsoring this bill.

Mayor Hafen;

I have to tell you that this is an historic moment, I believe, in southern Nevada. I appreciate you for all the work you have done and the winners here today are the students in the Clark County School District. I am looking forward to working with each

of you as we further this process, looking for great things happening to education in Clark County. Thank you for your time and effort, and to Assemblyman Gardner for your legislation. It is great for Nevada.

Chair Roberson:

Thank you. Brenda up in Carson City, I understand you may have had a concern with the technical nature of the motion. I want to make sure we get the motion the way you believe it needs to be. So if we need to do the motion again, I am happy to do that.

Ms. Erdoes:

Thank you. It would be appreciated if you would state it to include the plan as well so there are three documents in case there is a conflict we need to fix. There are actually three documents—I know it has been confusing throughout—but there is the plan, the recommendations, and the regulation.

Chair Roberson:

It was my understanding that the recommendations replace the original plan; that the recommendations are the plan.

Ms. Erdoes:

It is just that there is a mention in the bill.

Chair Roberson:

So we want to call the recommendations the plan?

Ms. Erdoes:

We could. We could call them together the same thing I guess,

ASSEMBLYMAN SILBERKRAUS MOVED TO AMEND AND APPROVE THE
PRELIMINARY REORGANIZATION PLAN THAT WE PREVIOUSLY
APPROVED ON JULY 1 TO CONFORM WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS
APPROVED TODAY.

SENATOR FORD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Roberson:

Seeing no more business for this Advisory Committee, I adjourn this meet at 8:40 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Linda Hiller, Interim Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Michael Roberson, Chair

Date: _____

Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
A		Agenda
B		Attendance Roster
Agenda Item II A	Carolyn Edwards, CCSD School Board Trustee, District F	Clark County School District Board Statement; Responses to Draft Regulation to Reorganize the Clark County School District (Revised on 8/11/2016)
Agenda Item II B	Autumn Tampa	Written Testimony
Agenda Item II C	Terry Woods	Submitted Document
Agenda Item II D	Amanda Morgan, Sylvia Lazos; Educate Nevada Now (ENN)	Written Testimony
Agenda Item II E	Alison Turner	Written Testimony
Agenda Item II F	Tod Story, ACLU of Nevada	Written testimony
Agenda Item V A-1	Chair Michael Roberson, Senatorial District No. 20	Draft Regulations to Reorganize the Clark County School District (Revised 8/11/2016)
Agenda Item V A-2	Chair Michael Roberson, Senatorial District No. 20	Draft Regulations to Reorganize the Clark County School District with Markups (Revised 8/15/2016)
Agenda Item V A-3	Chair Michael Roberson, Senatorial District No. 20	Recommendations of the Advisory Committee to Develop a Plan to Reorganize the Clark County School District
Agenda Item V	Chair Michael Roberson, Senatorial District No. 20	Recommendations for Revisions to the Proposed

A-4		Regulation
Agenda Item V B	Chris Giunchigliani, Clark County Commissioner	Submitted Letter