

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
ASSEMBLY BILL 469 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
DECEMBER 14, 2021
3:00 PM

Office	Address	City	Meeting
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo	Las Vegas	Room 114
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson	Board Room
Department of Education	Virtual/Livestream	n/a	n/a

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Dr. Katherine Dockweiler, Chair
Tim Hughes
Mark Newburn, Vice President

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Tina Statucki, Education Programs Professional

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

Hawah Ahmed, Clark County Education Association
Jeff Horn, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees (CCASAPE)
Kenneth Paul, W. Mack Lyon Middle School
Anna Binder, Community Member
Sylvia Lazos, Nevada Immigrant Coalition
Ed Gonzalez, Hickey Elementary School
Lindsey Dalley, Community Education Advisory Board Member
Linda Cavazos, Clark County School District Board of Trustees Member

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Meeting called to order at 3:01 P.M. by Chair Katherine Dockweiler. Quorum was established. Chair Dockweiler led the Pledge of Allegiance and provided a land acknowledgement.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

Jeff Horn, Executive Director of CCASAPE, provided comment regarding Assembly Bill (AB) 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Kenneth Paul, Principal, Mack Lyon Middle School, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Sylvia Lazos, Nevada Immigrant Coalition, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Ed Gonzalez, Hickey Elementary School, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Lindsey Dalley, Community Education Advisory Board, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Hawah Ahmed, Clark County Education Association, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Kay Barlow, Clark County School District Parent, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Rebecca Garcia, President of Nevada PTA, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

3. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT'S EFFORTS RELATED TO THE REORGANIZATION

Kellie Ballard, Chief Strategy Officer, Clark County School District (CCSD) and Jason Goudie, Chief Financial Officer, CCSD, provided an update on action proposed at the December 9, 2021, meeting of the CCSD Board of Trustees regarding Service Level Agreements (SLA) as well as an update on the status of CCSD's collective bargaining agreements.

Member Newburn asked why Clark County School District did not consult the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) before approving the recommendation. Ms. Ballard responded that CCSD's actions were in direct result of the joint meeting with the State Board of Education in September of 2021. Kellie Ballard stated that in hindsight, the district should have consulted the Nevada Department of Education.

Member Newburn expressed concern with the statement that CCSD does not have SLAs planned for 2022-23. Member Newburn asked for clarification on how CCSD plans to come into compliance. Ms. Ballard responded that there is a distinction between the service level agreements and the transfer of responsibility. CCSD would not pick and choose when to provide service but would do so when able to provide service to schools so schools can choose whether to purchase from the central office and negotiate the service level agreement as contemplated in the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC).

Member Newburn asked what CCSD's plan is to achieve 85% funding into the hands of the local school precinct. Mr. Goudie responded that the district is attempting to analyze all services that are outside the strategic budgets and identify those services which are not legally bound to be provided such as correctional schools. The next step would be to look at the other items which could be legally transferred but may not be able to be operationally transferred such as transportation. The last step is to look at areas for which the schools want autonomy, and that the district believes it can give autonomy such as landscaping. Jason Goudie stated that the objective would be to identify all previously listed components, then make a computation to determine what is not legally required. Mr. Goudie stated that they are positive that CCSD cannot reach 85% without including utilities and transportation. If it is agreed that transportation and utilities cannot be transferred to the schools, then CCSD will not be able to achieve 85% under NAC.

Member Newburn stated that SLAs are part of Superintendent Canavero's agreement with the district and asked for clarification on why CCSD cannot use SLAs. Kellie Ballard responded that CCSD is not deciding to not use SLAs in the future. Kellie Ballard stated that the agreement with Dr. Canavero took place before the NAC. If the NAC had been in place before the transfer of services, CCSD would not have transferred those services. If CCSD can determine an appropriate authority that needs to be transferred to schools that the district can offer as a service provider, then CCSD will implement an SLA.

Chair Dockweiler asked Deputy Attorney General (DAG) David Gardner if CCSD is closer to compliance with the removal of the SLAs. DAG Gardner responded that CCSD is farther away from compliance because there is not even an attempt to get 85% to local school precinct as required by statute.

Member Hughes asked since CCSD has stated that 85% to local school precincts is mathematically impossible, how does CCSD plan to reconcile the problem. Ms. Ballard responded that CCSD would inform the community of what choices would have to be made in terms of loss of services from central, in terms of risk to equity, etc. to achieve the 85%, to broaden the understanding of how those types of choice make achieving the 85% relatively impossible.

Member Hughes asked what parameters and guideposts CCSD is using to make those difficult decisions, and who's voices of the community are being heard. Ms. Ballard responded that those items will be planned out in the future, the parameters used in the past were if a student is directly involved in the service or if a service took place at a school. Ms. Ballard stated that in the future the parameters will be different.

Member Hughes suggested sharing the computations CCSD made to determine that they are not able to meet the eighty five percent with the public. Jason Goudie agreed, stating that CCSD would like to work with NDE, the State Board, and the public to ensure agreement on items that are legally required and can't be distributed, items that can be transferred legally but not operationally feasible, and then work collaboratively to find a solution.

Member Newburn stated that they are unsure if CCSD will be able to come into compliance without the support of NDE. Member Newburn stated that if achieving 85% is impossible as suggested by CCSD, no one will believe CCSD, however they may believe the Department of Education. Member Newburn stated that if CCSD, the Department of Education, the State Board of Education, all work together full compliance, or modifications to the law and the NAC can be achieved. Ms. Ballard agreed.

Chair Dockweiler suggested to the Subcommittee a potential recommendation to the State Board of Education that as a consequence for noncompliance, CCSD be placed in receivership under Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 388G.580.

Regarding English language learners (EL), Superintendent Ebert asked if there has been conversation with schools with high EL populations on what the need is within the district and the supports that are provided by the district. Ms. Ballard responded that they would need to consult their team to answer the questions specifically.

4. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ASSEMBLY BILL (AB) 469 (2017)

Chair Dockweiler opened the discussion regarding the implementation of AB 469. Member Newburn suggested as a corrective action from the Superintendent, training from the Department of Education for the CCSD Board of Trustees on the reorganization law and rewriting regulations to mandate said training. Member Newburn suggested an interaction between CCSD and the Department of Education to prevent further issues with implementation of AB 469, potentially a community committee to oversee issues on the reorganization. Member Hughes and Chair Dockweiler agreed. Chair Dockweiler added a suggestion of extending training to principals and School Organizational Teams (SOT).

5. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING SURVEY RESULTS

Tina Statucki, Education Programs Professional, Nevada Department of Education, provided a PowerPoint presentation on the [AB 469 Stakeholder Survey and the principal/School Organizational Team Survey](#).

Member Hughes asked if there is any information on the respondents to the survey. Tina Statucki responded that the directions given to all the respondents clearly stated to ensure their answers represented the individuals they represent. Ms. Statucki stated that the original deadline of the principal/SOT survey was moved back to allow principals to meet with their SOTs prior completing the survey.

6. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Member Newburn requested NDE to provide feedback and an analysis of agenda item 5.01 from the CCSD Board of Trustees December 9, 2021, meeting. Member Newburn requested a closed client attorney meeting with the Attorney General's Office to go over the broad spectrum of potential actions. DAG Gardner responded that it would be considered a non-meeting for litigation purposes. Member Hughes requested discussion on the possible regulatory actions.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

Lindsey Dalley, Community Education Advisory Board, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Sylvia Lazos, Nevada Immigrant Coalition, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Anna Binder, community member, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Kenneth Paul, Principal, Mack Lyon Middle School, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Ed Gonzalez, Liliam Lujan hockey Elementary School, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

8. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 5:22 P.M

APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS GIVEN DURING PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Jeff Horn, Executive Director of CCASAPE, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
2. Kenneth Paul, Principal, Mack Lyon Middle School, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
3. Sylvia Lazos, Nevada Immigrant Coalition, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
4. Ed Gonzalez, Hickey Elementary School, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
5. Lindsey Dalley, Community Member, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
6. Hawah Ahmed, Clark County Education Association, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
7. Kay Barlow, Clark County School District Parent, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
8. Rebecca Garcia, President of Nevada PTA, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
9. Lindsey Dalley, Community Education Advisory Board, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
10. Sylvia Lazos, Nevada Immigrant Coalition, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
11. Anna Binder, community member, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
12. Kenneth Paul, Principal, Mack Lyon Middle School, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
13. Ed Gonzalez, Liliam Lujan Hickey Elementary School, provided public comment regarding AB 469.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 1: JEFF HORN

Chair Dockweiler Superintendent Ebert members of the subcommittee. My name is Jeff Horn and I'm the executive director of the Clark County Association of School administrators and Professional Technical Employees representing over 1300 Clark County School District administrators CASAPE appreciate your work on AB 469 and is hopeful that your actions will lead to clarification and proper implementation of this law. In particular principles, ability to select effective teachers support professionals and services that best serve each individual school. CASAPE was somewhat surprised at the Clark County school district presented item 5.01 transfer responsibilities at the December 9th, 2021, board of school trustees meeting, which passed on a vote of 6:1. We believe that this actually continues to move the district further away from the requirements set forth in AB 469, which specifically provides schools the ability to select services that better support teaching and learning at their school precinct. What is most disturbing is that the CCSD routinely aligns themselves in support of what is best for adults and not what is the best for our students. CCSD continues to force place teachers and support professionals during district wide surplus, nullify the principal's authority under AB 469 to select staff. As you are aware, one of the most important factors in a student's success is an effective classroom teacher. Why would the district knowingly force a placement of a possibly ineffective teacher that would negatively impact a child's learning again Is this about the adults in the room or our Children? This practice doesn't follow the law and it harms students. Lastly, we are facing a crisis. A teacher crisis where short hundreds of teaching positions, substitute teachers are at an all-time low. Our site-based administrators are scrambling every day in a futile attempt to cover 5, 10, 15 or more classes that are left empty from tired teachers and the lack of qualified substitutes. This is force principles to sell prep periods. Other teachers pull non-teaching license staff from their positions and combine multiple classes into large auditoriums to ensure that teaching at some teaching is taking place. This is a daily event. As a former educator, this makes me extremely sad. We are failing our students our teachers, administrators, parents, and community. We need to do better and it starts by forcing CCSD to follow the law and allow our site-based principles and consultation with their SOT to make decisions that positively impact teaching and learning. Thank you for your time.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 2: KENNETH PAUL

My name is Ken Paul and the principal of W. Mac Lyon Middle School, a rural middle school about 70 miles north of Las Vegas Board members that you should already have some submitted a copy of my comments. Um I did want to talk to you about the importance that I feel with this reorg. I felt it very passionate about it and in fact tonight it was a hard decision because I have a boy right now, that's an army vet 31-year-old that is graduating tonight and walking tonight at UNLV, it felt like I needed to be here. For me the bottom line and I've said this before as if decision making and funding were in or closer to schools and communities, academic achievement and operational efficiency would improve agenda item number three at last Thursday's board agenda items. These are my observations one, the public comment and the trustees were a lot surrounding the NRS law. There is confusion and questions about it yet in the end, although legal was asked once to make a comment legal there is no legal, public legal opinions that helped clarify either the NRS or the NAC. During that meeting, the presenters were asked if they had reached out to ND or the Nevada board of education members for clarification on the law. The basic answer was that it was not required. Also, number two of my impressions to the trustees or that there is this January 15 deadline and they needed to them needed to make this vote. To my understanding the board vote is only needed when additional autonomy These are asked for by, by a precinct. Number three they prioritized compliance with the NAC over the NRS asserting that utilities and trash and transportation should not have been transferred. I know that we worked for our schoolwork for utilities and talked about controlling our own thermostats on our own schedules to know they'll transportation as a result of this law and the idea that it would happen. Her name was Shannon Kelly, I believe with transportation and then that was the impetus that helped work out a situation that's much better today with transportation. Uh, last Thursday central administrators, recent re centralized. Nearly all CCSD services took away the choice and the ability to negotiate if I have time. There's one other thing, the per pupil funding, 85% of all restricted funds in 2018 CCSD could not reach that 85% without giving up some control and some discretion of many services. The key is giving schools a choice one to accept the draft SLA. To modify the SLA something that works for us both or three, to contract out the idea that site, the site purchases staff supplies and transferred services. I'm going to skip to in here because I can hear my time running. Thank you. Overarching summary and this was actually the comments related in the report. CCSD wants to fit a square peg in a round hole. It is impossible I know. Ms. Ballard is tasked with trying to make the decentralized model i.e., law policies and regs fit into the historical centralized model. The bandage needs to come off and an all-in attitude will need to prevail.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 3: SYLVIA LAZOS

My name is Sylvia Lazos. I am with the Nevada Immigrant Coalition. This is a group of about 30 group but I will point out primarily that we include also the culinary union and the S. E. I. U, which are two union organizations that are majority immigrant. And I want to emphasize that our concern here is about immigrant families, working families and vulnerable children in particular, ELL English language learners and special education children. I admit it and I am admitting that I have never been a fan of AB 469 because I have from the very beginning doubted the ability and capacity of schools at the local level to really deal with vulnerable Children without sufficient monetary support or without sufficient staff. Currently, we're incredibly understaffed and CCSD so, those concerns are only heightened. I also want to echo all of the comments made before by the principle in terms of the amount of scrutiny that these changes that are being proposed received by the CCSD trustees last Thursday night to sum it up. It was dismaying the lack of questions, the lack of concerns for students, the lack of concerns and in particular vulnerable children would be able to receive the services required by law and since as an immigrant coalition, we are primary really concerned with ELL children. It is particularly disturbing that when the issue of ELL testers of eliminating all ELL Testers at the central office came up. Not once did any of the presenters talk about what that would mean to ELL services for ELL children. What I heard was cost savings. So, we don't really need those people. They're only needed for testing. Excuse me. The law and case law is very specific. Testing is one of the most important pieces of ELL services. Why? Because it's the gateway to having access to those services. If you're not identified as a child, you don't get those services and under the per pupil we would schools will not get those kinds of monies to begin with. So is testing is very important to an ELL child. CCSD lost track of 5000 to 8000 children during remote learning. Ask yourselves how is it possible to lose 5 to 8000 ELL Children. It's possible because you don't do the testing because you don't identify those children through your testing rigor, lack of rigor is required by law. Timely quality consistency and uniformity that was never discussed Thursday. So, I am asking you as regulators of this law to take the close, careful look that these changes required by law. The close careful look that didn't happen last Thursday. I know that the president is here, and she can explain what happened and how that decision was made but it is inexplicable frankly that these kinds of decisions are made in such a cavalier fashion, it impacts children. Our immigrant children want a future, and this is not the way to deliver. Thank you

APPENDIX A, ITEM 4: ED GONZALEZ

My name's Ed Gonzalez I'm the community member at Hickey Elementary School Organizational Team. I apologize for my tardiness. I was actually waiting for a bus for 25 minutes So um the reason I'm here today is I know a lot of people spoke well disturbed what happened Thursday. Um I'm not gonna get too much into it because Mr. Goudie and Ms. Ballard will be here to explain a little bit more but I think as we move forward on this um there's a lot of issues that we don't talk about that may come up. I'll highlight some things that I've had a chance to talk to about. I'm sure about this. So, I do appreciate it. There's some random things like you know we have some of the smaller schools like Good Springs and like Lundy who who have like combining with SOTs. Which makes sense when you have a school like you know like 30 or 50 I think Lundy two years ago, both teachers didn't want to be on the SOT. So, they didn't meet for here. So that's a little surprising when you come into the law. But I think the aspect of things where how do we make it simpler on schools? I mentioned things like we have special education schools like Helen Stewart who all their money is mostly restricted because they give a special education service and I think this committee should look at some of the stuff that they look at how the meetings go. There's not much flexibility there. Um Other things have been brought up. I do agree with the Sylvia Lazos. So, I was very surprised about the ELL um item B not brought up. Um I think the fundamental problem that I have is that I think the district doesn't understand the law. One of things was mentioned yesterday is when you pass on services and switch services to school district think schools should have um that's not how the slides, it should be what schools want. You know, even if they just don't choose the option. You know, if you wanted mentioned there's custodians there's a principal who was on national tv saying he has custodian vacancies and cleans the schools well, custodians on an SLA to begin with, it's a bunch of modification because it was passed down before there's even this process even started. And so, they get the attrition money can't hire anybody and cleans his own school sort of backwards to that process. So, madam Chair members of committee. I have further comments in the second public comment, but I just want to be brief to get to the presentations. Thank you.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 5: LINDSEY DALLEY

Dear Subcommittee,

One of the most frustrating things I have ever experienced was sitting in that Trustee meeting on Dec. 9th and watching the CCSD Administration and Trustees deal with their agenda item 5.01, the transfer of responsibility. I, like many others were appalled. Not just because of the blatant disregard for the law, but the lies and half-truths Ballard and Goudie told the Trustees. Then the Trustees voted to violate the law as Jara sat silently.

Staff clearly told the Trustees that passing this agenda item would take them out of compliance with the provision that requires 85% of unrestricted monies go directly to the local precincts vs being kept at central, and they were correct. Then the staff did a 180 degree flip and told the Trustees they had to vote on this provision tonight to transfer SLA precinct responsibilities back to central to meet the Jan. 15th deadline. Yes, that's a bridge too far to not comply with a minor deadline, but instead blow up a huge part of 388G.

I fear that Ms. Ballard and Mr. Goudie are going to give some version of the same song and dance to this subcommittee. Something like, "We've got to break the law now, in order to obey the law later, and we're doing it for the children." This is akin to a person guilty of domestic abuse saying, "I'm going to beat you now so I can stop later, because by then I will have had time to seek counsel and therapy. See, I am getting better and I'm doing it for you."

CCSD central office staff lost their ability to determine what's right for kids the moment the legislature passed AB469, end of discussion. What's right for kids was decentralized down to school precincts. No amount of CCSD indignation and tooth gnashing will change that. During the legislative hearings the legislatures considered all of CCSD's logic, reasons, excuses, then crafted AB 469 as is, and CCSD was left wanting. It was all factored in, there was no oversight, and it passed unanimously.

After watching CCSD's twisted logic and/or manipulation over their agenda item 5.01, I came away realizing they no longer have the capacity to self correct. CCSD has reached administrative insolvency. They no longer have the administrative capacity to achieve 388G compliance and have proven it many times over four years. The State Board and Dept. of Ed will have to do that for them.

Please take action. This is what advocating for our kids looks like.

Sincerely,

Lindsey Dalley
Logandale, NV
Serve on two SOT teams.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 6: HAWAH AHMAD

December 14, 2021

Good afternoon, Subcommittee Chairperson Dockweiler, and Subcommittee members,

AB469 was signed into law by the Governor in 2017 to reorganize Clark County School District. CCEA was an active participant in the drafting and served on the technical advisory committee to ensure that the intent of the law would be carried out.

However, AB469(2017) has been interpreted against the intent of its drafters. Originally, AB469 (2017) was designed to not change the employer practices or the employer on record. Instead, Section 16.1 and 16.2 of AB469(2017) intended to transfer authority to select and directly supervise the staff of a local school precinct, while both sections 22 and 29 reiterate that all persons who interview candidates shall comply with all laws that apply to the employer when making a decision about employment. Though some individuals may read this portion of the law conservatively, the intent of this law is to ensure that all employment laws and practices are followed. Those include antidiscrimination laws, laws pertaining to the implementation of the NEPF and its uses, and hiring of licensed educators, to the greatest intent possible.

We appreciate the ability to give our feedback on the NDE survey, but we must reiterate two facts. One, we cannot demystify “the greatest extent possible” without knowing why the clause was put into the bill, to which we must look to legislative intent. Section 16.4 provided language to favor hiring those in good standing, specifically licensed educators over selecting substitutes, within the confines of the NEPF, our bargaining agreements, and employment law. This bill was never intended to give principals unconditional authority to select staff. Second, we must raise the concern over AB469 and the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan (PCFP). It is our belief that thoughtful consideration must be given on how unused funds distributed in accordance with the PCFP’s weights are reallocated as carry-over dollars. It is our belief that the reallocation of those unused funds in the subsequent school year violates the intent of the PCFP and that school precincts must utilize the PCFP weighted funding to its fullest extent pursuant to SB543(2019) in the current year.

The Clark County Education Association and the over 18,000 licensed education professionals thank you for your hard work and we look forward to further participating in the regulatory process to define the parameters around our concerns in AB469 (2017).

Respectfully,
Hawah S. Ahmad, Lobbyist
Clark County Education Association

APPENDIX A, ITEM 7: KAY BARLOW

I am commenting to express my concern for CCSD's seeming unwillingness to comply with the requirements of AB 469. The Clark County School District board voted on Thursday to take back control of all Service Level Agreements. Even if this is a necessity (which it is not), this is not something that the school board can control. AB 469 and the resulting NRS 388G is state law, and as such requires legislation to be altered. This re-org law requires (among other things) that individual precincts be given control over Service Level Agreements. This has never been the case since the passage of the law. CCSD has not even made an attempt to relinquish control of Service Level Agreements. Please require CCSD to at least try to comply with the intent of ALL aspects of the law before giving up. Thank you.

Kay Barlow-CCSD parent

APPENDIX A, ITEM 8: REBECCA GARCIA

My name is Rebecca Garcia. I'm the SOT parent representative and chair of two School Organizational Teams in Clark County. I'm also the President of the Nevada PTA. I'm not able to be in attendance because I am chairing a SOT meeting at this time. Agenda Item #5 includes reference to a SOT Survey but Noon today no backup was posted for further clarification. I'm wondering who completed this survey and how was it disseminated? I did not receive information regarding the survey or nor did I complete it with either of my SOTs. Now that the backup has finally been posted, the number of responses also seems to indicate many SOTs did not provide feedback. I'm concerned because this seems to be an ongoing issue with SOT matters. The information does not get universally shared and therefore the responses are not always fully representative of broader community feedback. The same issues were reported with the SLA survey sent out by CCSD which both my SOTs completed but I heard from several SOT members across the district that did not have the same opportunity. Until a proper communication option is set up to ensure all SOT members are reached without a middle man I worry that feedback received will continue to be lacking a full picture of SOT members' responses.

Thank you,

Rebecca

APPENDIX A, ITEM 9: LINDSEY DALLEY

My name is Lindsay Dalley for the record. I live in Logan Dale a member of two SOT teams and on a community education advisory board. Much of the discussion uh, that uh, what happened today, which was, I felt great, and I totally agreed with all the discussion here where it was going, um, this, we, I was involved in that. I don't want, I don't want to overplay this but intimately involved with the AB 469 development. Uh, we were making the pits for our schools and how to, you know, do things and, and so I got to meet with Michael Strabinsky multiple times with two or 3 people on very intimate discussion. So, I understand the theory behind what's going on here. Uh, and this, all of these items that were discussed were thoroughly discussed and vetted in front of that legislative committee. Uh, and they voted for this provision. So, it's not like this was done in a vacuum and all of a sudden, they came down and said, well, CCSD You know that's what you gotta do. I mean CCSD was right there kicking and screaming the whole time. So, the idea that somehow this just snuck up on them just does not have credibility and the legislators are smart people and they heard all these arguments from CCSD. So, I just want to make that point and I'm way too long at that particular thing. Um the 85-15 number is a very critical number because that ensures the large district won't re centralize if you start dropping that number down because they say they can't do it then you're basically playing into their hands that they're going to re centralize that number is there for a reason and Michaels Strabinsky was very adamant about that number. Um And then let me tell you a quick story about Grand Hannibal that kind of helps clarify the perspective that the district is bringing to the table that we just can't do it. It's not possible la blah blah and you know, and principals don't want this and on and on. Um he was he was a retired regional superintendent from CCSD, and we had the blessing and I'll use the word blessing to have him as our high school principal for four years. And it was amazing he came in and at that point empowerment schools were a big deal and he got to use empowerment in our high school, and he was very guarded about that. I i on while they were on cf I watched him bloom and develop and uh and he gets all the credit that I don't get any of that because he realized what it's like to have autonomy and an and this is his quote and I can just see his grin when he said it, he says, you know, I didn't know what that was really about. And after I did it, I was going what part of freedom don't you like? And he would have that conversation with this with the staff with the teachers because it took them two or three years. Sorry to figure out um, what it was like to actually have control, people have to learn that. And so, you can't sit there from the central through look through a central lens and say, oh well there's nobody wants it, people have to be taught and learn. And I watched that with Grant Hannibal then he was a great advocate for that Thank you.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 10: SYLVIA LAZOS

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment and I want to repeat again the groups that fall under the Nevada immigrant coalition Just give you an idea of broad reach of our coalition. The NIC is comprised of plan Nevada culinary union make the road UNLV immigration legal clinic Mi Familia Vota, The American immigration lawyers association planned parenthood. SEIU On Doc U network children's advocacy alliance, ACLU. Catholic charities of southern Nevada, ACDC one APIA. And for Nevada's future and as a group we are highly alarmed of what's happening between CCSD and the services that ELL Children are receiving. This is the way that I see the law, you receive federal funds for IDEA and Title three and with that comes an obligation on the part of the Nevada Department of Education to ensure that services to those children are actually delivered. Right? So that obligation supersedes AB 469 It's not subsidiary to 469 but it is on top of 469. So, you need to make sure that 469 I able to be structured in a way so that those Children get the services that they need to have an equal education opportunity. That's the guarantee from the federal government with respect to those federal funds that the condition you get them is so that you follow these rules and guidelines from the federal government. Now, how do we do that number one with respect Superintendent Ebert, Some of this. Uh what CCSD said about testing and we talked to and I think you heard it and I heard it last Thursday that they talk to five principles about their capacity to do ELL Testing without support from central office with respect this is not sufficient data upon which to make that kind of decision. You also heard we were really doing ELL testing right? We would have 60 testers in central officer office and instead they eliminate all nine or whatever the number is and there's an addition 15 vacancies that have not been filled by because of their administrative decisions. What am I trying to get to? I'm trying to say you need to investigate this a little bit further this promise that yeah, we're going to do the testing right, needs to be looked at with data. Are you doing it within 30 days? What resources are principles having to rededicate so that this happens? Does that mean that staff that it should be doing our uh you know tutoring is now going to be pulled away so that you can do the testing? These things come at a cost. Look at the wider data school by school, are there outliers is their own school that has a bunch of ones and then in school that has a bunch of fives that's telling you that the quality and consistency isn't there. So, with respect ELL services need to be investigated as to what's going on with CCSD. And my final suggestion to you is this why not carve out ELL at all and special ed from This 85-15. We made that argument at the very beginning of this process; I don't know Member Newburn if you remember that discussion, but our argument has always been that when you include Special Ed and Ell Services in this 85-15 allotment that has to happen what you're doing is jeopardizing the ability of central to guide the delivery of services in a uniform way to these vulnerable classes. That is all I wanted to say thank you.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 11: ANNA BINDER

I'm so glad we're not focusing on SPED tonight because we'd be here a while. Um Some things that are really alarming. Um I'm sure the rest of that takes some digestion. But one of the biggest things that I called out last week when they put up agenda 5.01 was the spreadsheet that CCSD produced for material really only outlined that they had received maybe about 20 responses. So, it's getting all the way to the meeting and the discussion for them to actually disclose that they said they got about 220 responses back but the way that they did their outlined it only looked like a few responded and then so that's what prompted um a lot of us to start reaching out to SOTs. And some principles because I know we didn't get it and then obviously we talked to a lot like others didn't get it, like we're trying to figure that out. Um But any time like, so just even on the response that you guys got tonight like in totality, like we have what, 365 schools and you only heard back from like maybe 117. Um And also anything in the beginning of October is very difficult for SOTs Because they're going through elections around that time. So, most SOTs and Clark County run their elections right at the for the meeting in October. So that's how I know that um quite a few of the SOTs Overlooked the CCSD survey because they're juggling, you know, elections and all these things. And then um we found some other failures. Um something else alarming about the ELL. Um In the one middle school that I volunteer at, I've identified 12 students in that school that are yellow, but they're shoved into general ed and they're failing, and the teachers can't provide for them because they're in oversized classrooms with predominantly English speakers. They're all doing the best that they can do, but these students are relying upon their classmates and the grace of a Spanish speaking teacher which this campus only has two to try to help them not fail And so if that's only in one middle school, what's going on in the rest of the schools and then if you want to talk about character you can look at what CCSD tried to do the global community high school over the summer. They tried to take the amazing culture and everything that they do for immigrants in the ELL community, and they tried to rip it away from 9th and 10th graders. And then what did we have to do guys, what do we have to do? We have to go and get the community to stand there and make them give it back. If that tells you anything about like the intent of whoever is making those calls about ELL because why would you ever kind of program like that and then make the community come back and fight you for it. I mean that's like a no brainer. Why would you take that? Why would you try? And now today, I mean it's there, but now we're all on guard, like what's going to happen like, you know, can't drop that ball, can't drop that ball, thank you.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 12: KENNETH PAUL

Ken Paul, principal at W. Mac Lyon middle school, I just wanted to talk about preceding that board agenda item of last Thursday to two days before that came out, I did receive a phone call from Ballard, and she said she was talking to four rural principals about this, the rules and landscape maintenance. And when she talked to me about it, I did ask a couple follow up questions on the phone. One was would the amount of money be what was listed in the S. L. A. Kind of hinting is that the per pupil funding or is it are you saying it's the amount there because we're not sure that actually represents what it really costs for it. And the other one, I'm trying to remember that we haven't had two questions there and uh. My brain is gone. Um So I did get a little uncomfortable because he hadn't had time to talk to the SOTs and would there be enough money in that Oh and would we still have a choice if we felt like the process of the procedures weren't there? Was this agenda item just going to say hey sink or swim. And so, I wrote an email back and saying hey I don't want Lyon middle school to really be part of this because there's just too many too many questions that she did come out to my school and visited with me and two other principals from those valleys that day. When she walked out. I felt like that day that okay maybe we can support this because they're just trying to help the rural school's kind of model this. I kind of took exception with the idea that they were going to do a full funding because I felt like the full funding should have happened supposed to be there already. So, then the very next day the agenda item came out and I had so many other things on there, you know, to where there was utilities in trash and there was the, well the E. L. L. And there was the pretty much that fourth item trying to pretty much centralized all of those back. And I do remember a couple of times before we met in person and after basically saying that it was a courtesy making sure I understood that it was a courtesy that she was telling us about that or the rules about that agenda item and the great thing, the heart, the thing that's hard for me with that is this board agenda item to me was huge and it affected so many people and so many precincts and yet it was just a courtesy that we were, we were just supposed to be watching for the mortgage in the item and figure it out for ourselves. And so I just wanted to put that out there that sometimes I feel like there's a site based administrators and central administrators and I felt like the whole law was supposed to balance that. Maybe even tweak it a little bit towards the site-based administrators but it doesn't, doesn't feel that way. Thank you.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 13: ED GONZALEZ

Thank you, madam chair members of the committee, before I get started, I do want to highlight that President Linda Cavazos is here she's, my trustee. I do appreciate her being here and actually stain for the entire meeting. She's been very forthright and trying to understand this issue. So, I just want to put that on the record. Uh I just want to highlight two things. I think when we talk about the money and the transparency do appreciate member Newburn because he brings the historical knowledge into this. I don't want to get into the legislative fights that we've had for the last five or six attempts of bills and probably last four sessions. But I think when we get to transparency, I think we're probably doing the 85% backwards. It seems like the district is trying to shove 85% of just schools and try to get that number. Um I think we probably should look at in reverse, let's start the dollar at the school and then take the 15% out. If we're really having the conversation, does 85-15 really work. We'll probably get a better idea that way for you for that transparency. So, I just want to put that out there too. Um I'm just gonna highlight something from the 2019 legislative session with SB 469. It was the same conversation to take the list of services, make it restricted. Um and take it out of the 85-15 including utilities and transportation, the legislature at that time disagreed with it and actually get that bill for that one. But in my conversation was going back and forth with Brad Keating and I were arguing with Edgar Flores who was then the chair of the Education committee after Tyrone Thompson sadly passed away. I just want to highlight one paragraph that I wrote in there and I'm more than happy to submit this to the board, later. Yeah. It says my argument has always been that money will be removed from schools and by expanding the list of services as restricted, It gives a school board an incentive to recentralize services that have already been passed down to schools such as custodians and other services. If that happens, they're exempt from the 85-15 ratio That is what CCE Wants to deal with transportation utilities instead of saying that no money will be removed from school budgets. A qualifier has been added that there is no decrease in discretionary funds. So, I feel like we're relitigating the same issues as before. Um And even in that session, um Senator Mo Denis wanted to push it up to 90% while removing some dollars So I don't think when I hear the district scene That the funding formula overrides AB 469. I don't think even the authors have built out that. And so, I do appreciate what you've done with these hearings. I know I've watched a couple of them online It's a very different tone that this board has done, and it's been a very civil conversation where it should have been from the beginning and this board has always done that. So, I appreciate what you've done. Thank you madam chair.