

**Nevada Department of Education  
Nevada State Board of Education  
NRS 388G Subcommittee  
December 18, 2025  
3:00 PM**

<b>Office</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Meeting</b>
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Rd.	Las Vegas	Room 114
Department of Education	Virtual	<a href="#">YouTube Link</a>	

**Summary Minutes of the Subcommittee Meeting**

**Subcommittee Members Present**

Dr. Tricia Braxton  
Tamara Hudson

**Members Absent Excused**

Danielle Ford

**Department Staff Present**

Lisa Ford, Interim Deputy Superintendent for the Student Achievement Division  
Angie Castellanos, Administrative Assistant

**Legal Staff Present**

Christena Georgas-Burns, Deputy Attorney General

**Audience in Attendance**

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

Meeting called to order at 3:02 P.M. by Chair Braxton. Quorum was established. Chair Braxton led the Pledge of Allegiance and provided land acknowledgement.

**2. Public Comment #1**

i. Ed Gonzalez, Community Member

**3. Information and Discussion to Receive an Overview of SB460 and Its Implications for NRS 388G  
(Information and Discussion)**

Michael Stewart, Todd Butterworth, and Kimberly Marsh Guinasso from the Guinn Center for Policy Priorities presented a summary of Senate Bill 460 from the 2025 Legislative Session.

Key highlights included:

- **Pilot Innovation Schools:** Authorization for school districts and the Charter School Authority to designate a limited number of innovation schools, effective July 2026.
- **CCSD Superintendent Duties:** Revisions to the duties of the Clark County School District (CCSD) Superintendent, effective July 2026.
- **Repeal of Site-Based Decision Making:** Repeal of provisions requiring site-based decision-making in CCSD precincts.

Todd Butterworth recommended that the Subcommittee catalog statutory changes, distinguish technical from substantive amendments, and identify necessary updates for the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). Kimberly Marsh Guinasso clarified that although specific sections of NRS 388G were repealed, the State Board maintains a mandate to adopt regulations it deems necessary to carry out the organization of large school districts.

**4. Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action to Review Regulatory Updates Needed to Align NAC 388G With SB460 (2025 Legislative Session) *(Information, Discussion, and Possible Action)***

Lisa Ford, Interim Deputy Superintendent, presented a summary of existing NAC provisions affected by SB 460. She noted that the existing NAC 388G provisions, with the exception of NAC 388G.100, would be stricken under the new law.

The Subcommittee reviewed three regulations from 2022 (R063-22, R064-22, and R065-22) that were never fully codified. Sections of R063-22 and R064-22 must be removed or amended to align with SB 460, while R065-22 appeared largely unaffected and ready for the codification process.

**Member Braxton moved to motion to accept the proposed regulatory language reflecting statutory changes to NRS 388G and bring the draft forward for consideration. Member Hudson seconded motion. Motion passed unanimously.**

**5. Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action to Advance Draft Regulatory Revisions to a Public Workshop *(Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action)***

Lisa Ford, Interim Deputy Superintendent, requested the Subcommittee determine whether to hold a public workshop during a future Subcommittee meeting or have the Department conduct it separately. The Subcommittee discussed the importance of public input and the logistics of scheduling.

**Member Braxton moved to motion that the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) move forward with public workshop of the language, with invitations sent to members of the State Board to attend or view online. Member Hudson seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.**

**6. Public Comment #2**

- i. Ed Gonzalez, Community Member
- ii. Ed Gonzalez, Community Member

**7. Future Agenda Items *(Information and Discussion)***

The Subcommittee requested the following items for upcoming agendas:

- A presentation regarding items in the budget, specifically referring to NRS sections 70, 710, and 720.
- Continued discussion regarding the establishment of pilot innovation schools.

**8. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Braxton at 3:58 PM.

## **Appendix A: Statements given during public comments**

1. Ed Gonzalez, Community Member, provided public comment regarding agenda item 3.
2. Ed Gonzalez, Community Member, provided comments during public comment #2.

### **Appendix A, Item 1: ED GONZALEZ**

Good afternoon, Madam Chair members of the committee for the record, my name is Ed Gonzalez. I'm the community member at Hickey elementary school organizational team and also Sunrise Mountain High school scoring regional team. I'm speaking on item 3 and so has the subcommittee looks through some of the changes. In the law one of the things that we've noticed is that there's been presentations by the CFO has district has gone off. Their complaints matter about some of the funding changes that they are starting to implement now, most of that conversation has been done behind the scenes. For the time being there's some excitement I know there's been some training given to principals within the last week I think at the last presentation the new CFO at CCSD in October 30th board meeting had mentioned. That 65 principals had volunteered for the process but they're looking at things like how schools are funded. On the base there's a weight multiplier in there that they're moving away from it sounds like. Like the world proportionality but I think it's very important for the subcommittee to hear from the CFO about some of those changes, as you know the budget cycle for the next school year be fiscal year. 27 starts around January, February, that used to be a defined date but the new law sort of gave the Superintendent the option of that. But it's usually around that same time and so it'd be good for the subcommittee to hear what the district is doing at that point I assume. That this will be more transparent as we'll see it transparency isn't has to be public through every step of the way but it's at some point you know what the new funding are how does it affects it. Their goal is to make sure that the base is stabilized, and we have seen the base numbers. Move in different directions and the idea is that does the base fulfill the basic needs of a school like paying for staff and things that nature and so I think it's important for the subcommittee to hear that because there may be some things that you might want. But there may be things that we want to see, and I know the presentation for the Gwyn talk about some aspects of the law change, but you know the idea behind the reorg one of them was the transparency for money from the state how it gets to the. District and more importantly how does the district get those dollars into the classroom and so we don't really have a reporting requirement right now on to it and what I like about this committee is that the district. Has always done well with some oversight? They've done well with compliance moderate oversight and always when it's been this committee the state board the community implementation council other legislative hearings committees who have looked at it so. Madam Chair, that's all the comment that I have on. To it. As for some of the regulations being proposed that looks mostly like cleanup language and I don't really have much of a comment on that. So, thank you Madam Chair.

### **Appendix A, Item 2: ED GONZALEZ**

Thank you once again Madam Chair members of the subcommittee for the record, my name is Ed Gonzalez. I know there was some confusion in the conversation about school organizational teams. I wanted to highlight a section just put into the record. It's NRS 3 8700. That's the establishment of score exam teams in the first section of them says the principal of a school local precinct shall and which is established organizational team. That means largely unaffected. And so, the question you guys are having was sort of a question that I mentioned in one of the previous subcommittees. The plan of operation is a scope performance plan and the budget what was repealed was essentially everything that's in it. So, some of the aspects that you're talking about in section 10 which would responsibilities passed down by custodians landscaping central office services that the school could decide to do they want to go to the district or go outside those responsibilities have been repealed but

they're still required to pass a. By 75%. That's in there. The question though is in the statute whereas you've heard from the Guinn Center many clarifications is one must pass a budget but there's nothing in the describing. What's in a budget? And the only thing that the school district policy has done was to say a portion. And I know CCS representatives can clear this up later too. A portion I believe the policy they said was the Superintendent determines a portion of what is in the school budget and so it's vague language because they need to get some sort of plan in place for January February. Budget cycle as it starts. And so, they're the only one who come up with any situation a school board policy can go in any kind of detail had to be a determination by Superintendent for the short term. So, there was conversation stripping some of that power. It got put back in the assembly so they shall exist and they must vote on the plan so principal can't move forward on to it now if they don't approve a plan, it's a different thing but that language is pretty strong in 707 10 and 7.20 of that section I just wanted to put that onto the record because. There was a lot of conversation the one person who didn't actually speak was your counsel just because trying to find through it in there is a ton of stuff. I would be just as lost in any other section of law except for this one so thank you Madam.

DRAFT