

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
JOINT MEETING WITH THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SEPTEMBER 30, 2021
4:30 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

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING

STATE BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Felicia Ortiz, President
 Dr. René Cantú
 Katie Coombs
 Dr. Katherine Dockweiler
 Russell Fecht
 Tamara Hudson
 Tim Hughes
 Mark Newburn, Vice President
 Christina Nguyen
 Mike Walker

CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES PRESENT

Linda P. Cavazos, President
 Lola Brooks
 Irene A. Cepeda, Vice President
 Danielle Ford
 Lisa Guzman
 Evelyn Garcia Morales
 Katie Williams

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction
 Dr. Jonathan Moore, Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement
 Heidi Haartz, Deputy Superintendent for Student Investment
 Felicia Gonzales, Deputy Superintendent for Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement
 Jessica Todtman, Chief Strategy Officer
 Craig Statucki, Director, Office of Career Readiness, Adult Learning, and Education Options
 Tina Statucki, Education Programs Professional, Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General, Office of the State Attorney General
 Mary-Anne Miller, Clark County District Attorney

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

Anna Binder
 Dr. Brenda Larsen-Mitchell, Clark County School District (CCSD)
 Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association

Dana Roseman
David Rose, CCSD
Diana Battista, NVAdvocacy
Ed Gonzales, Hickey Elementary School
Esperanza Mauger, Global Community High School
Eva White
Fernando Romero, Hispanics in Politics
Hawah Ahmed, Clark County Education Association
Irene Hauver
Jan Giles, Education Support Employees Association
Jason Goudie, CCSD
Jeff Horn, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees
(CCASAPE)
Jessica Jones
John Schleifer, CCASAPE
Ken Takahashi, KSNV News
Kenneth Paul, Mack Lyon Elementary School
Kerry Larnerd, CCSD
Kyle Heislebetz
Leonardo Benavides, CCSD
Machelle Rasmussen, CCSD
Nadine Jones, CCSD
Rebecca Garcia, Nevada PTA
Renee Paterson
Ryan Lewis, Garehime Elementary School
Syriisa Jolley, Mack Lyon Elementary School
Tiffany Lane, KSNV News

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, AND LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

State Board of Education Meeting called to order at 4:30 P.M. by Board President Felicia Ortiz. Quorum was established. President Ortiz led the Pledge of Allegiance and provided a land acknowledgement. Clark County School District (CCSD) Board of Trustees Meeting called to order at 4:32 P.M. by President Linda Cavazos.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association, provided comment regarding Assembly Bill (AB) 469 *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Ryan Lewis, Principal, Garehime Elementary School, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A summary of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

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

Jeff Horn, CCASAPE, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A summary of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Jan Giles, Education Support Employees Association, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Rebecca Garcia, President, Parent Teacher Association, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A summary of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Dana Roseman, Principal, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A summary of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

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

Kerry Larnerd, Principal, Clark High School, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A summary of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

David Rose, Principal, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A summary of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Lindsay Dalley, Moapa Valley SOT, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A summary of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Kenneth Paul, Principal, Mack Lyon Middle School, provided public comment regarding the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan (PCFP). *(A summary of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Syrissa Jolley, School Organizational Team, Mack Lyon Middle School, provided public comment regarding the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan (PCFP). *(A summary of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Jessica Jones, Teacher, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A summary of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Machelle Rasmussen, Guinn Middle School and Global Community SOT, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Fernando Romero, Global Community SOT, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A summary of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Rex Rivers provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Senator Joe Hardy, Nevada District 12, 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)*

Assemblyman Gregory T. Hafen II, District 36, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

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

Felicia Gonzales, Nevada Department of Education Deputy Superintendent for Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement, presented a PowerPoint regarding the [Implementation of Assembly Bill \(AB\) 469](#). State Board Member and AB 469 Subcommittee Chair Katherine Dockweiler provided a review of the work that the [AB 469 Subcommittee](#) completed during its September 8 and September 14, 2021 meetings. Kellie Ballard, Director II, Teaching and Learning Unit, Clark County School District (CCSD or District), provided an update regarding CCSD's perspective on the current state of reorganization per the District's [October 1, 2021 Report](#). This report reflected the 2019-20 and 2018-19 school years.

President Ortiz highlighted that the goal of the State Board was to assist in the full implementation of the bill and potentially avert breaking up the District, which she did not believe was in the best interest of students at this time. The goal was to provide clarifying language and develop regulations as necessary. She noted that AB 469 also needed to be understood in context of the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. Vice President Mark Newburn suggested that breaking up the District may be the best long-term solution. The reorganization under AB 469 was meant as a test to see if reform was possible prior to that solution. President Ortiz noted that collective bargaining agreement negotiations should also be completed by the end 2021, as it has been five years since AB 469 passed.

CCSD Trustee Lola Brooks stated that one factor leading to the passage of AB 469 was a narrative that the District may have been using funds inappropriately; instead, it seems as though the issue is fighting over limited resources. However, she struggled to reconcile the inequities that decentralization has caused in the system. President Ortiz stated that putting guardrails in place around school autonomy may support the issue, but underfunding was a critical component.

CCSD Trustee Lisa Guzman emphasized the importance of focusing on the items presented under public comment, identifying failures and improving student outcomes. She specifically focused on accountability and performance reviews. President Ortiz noted that the stakeholder survey being administered by NDE

should provide a better understanding of “in good standing” as it relates to educator performance reviews, and that accountability must lie with supervisors and administrators, not governing boards or trustees. CCSD Board of Trustees President Cavazos supported the need for clarity regarding “greatest extent,” “in good standing,” and accountability. She emphasized the importance of guardrails regarding autonomy that prioritize transparency and communication. Member René Cantú stated that there is a philosophical gap between the idea that broad centralized efforts lead to greater success versus the idea of local control, which is the gap seen in AB 469 versus centralization arguments. Member Tim Hughes emphasized the importance of being data-centered, which CCSD Trustee Irene Cepeda agreed with. CCSD Trustee Danielle Ford stated that the Trustees hadn’t received any training regarding AB 469 and its implementation and, as a result, it has been impossible to provide oversight.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

Renee Paterson provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A summary of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

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

Anna Marie Binder provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A summary of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Syrissa Jolley, Mack Lyon SOT, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A summary of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

5. ADJOURNMENT

State Board Meeting was adjourned at 6:58 P.M. CCSD Board of Trustees meeting was adjourned at 6:59 P.M.

APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS GIVEN DURING PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association, provided comment regarding Assembly Bill (AB) 469
2. Ryan Lewis, Principal, Garehime Elementary School, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
3. Hawah Ahmad, Clark County Education Association, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
4. Jeff Horn, CCASAPE, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
5. Jan Giles, Education Support Employees Association, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
6. Rebecca Garcia, President, Parent Teacher Association, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
7. Dana Roseman, Principal, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
8. Ed Gonzalez, Hickey Elementary School SOT, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
9. Kerry Larnerd, Principal, Clark High School, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
10. David Rose, Principal, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
11. Lindsay Dalley, Moapa Valley SOT, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
12. Kenneth Paul, Principal, Mack Lyon Middle School, provided public comment regarding AB 469
13. SyriSSa Jolley, Mack Lyon Middle School SOT, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
14. Jessica Jones, Teacher, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
15. MachelLe Rasmussen, Guinn Middle School and Global Community SOT, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
16. Fernando Romero, Global Community SOT, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
17. Rex Rivers provided public comment regarding AB 469.
18. Senator Joe Hardy, Nevada District 12, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
19. Sylvia Lazos, Nevada Immigrant Coalition, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
20. Assemblyman Gregory T. Hafen II, District 36, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
21. Renee Paterson provided public comment regarding AB 469.
22. Hawah Ahmad, Clark County Education Association, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
23. Anna Marie Binder provided public comment regarding AB 469.
24. SyriSSa Jolley, Mack Lyon SOT, provided public comment regarding AB 469.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 1: CHRIS DALY

The Nevada State Education Association has been the voice of Nevada educators for over 120 years. NSEA represents educators in every Nevada school district. We represent teachers and other licensed education professionals as well as education support professionals.

Education support professionals (ESPs) are a critical component of the family of educators in our schools. Our students are complete human beings with a range of needs that must be met in order for learning to take place. Paraprofessionals tirelessly support students in their learning. Transportation professionals make sure our kids arrive to school in the morning and return home safely. Nutrition professionals make sure no child has to learn on an empty stomach. Custodial and maintenance keep the learning environment clean and safe. Tech professionals keep our students online. Clerical professionals do multiple jobs to keep the school offices operational and assist administrators. Health aides help take care of student medical needs.

ESPs are hardworking, and without them our schools could not run. At the same time ESPs are the lowest paid employees in school districts with starting pay for some job classes around \$11 per hour. Education support professionals typically come from the communities they serve and reflect the diversity of students attending our schools.

We have been concerned about the conversation happening at the Board of Education regarding the reorganization of the Clark County School District related to service level agreements. Several comments have disparaged the work of some education support professionals and promoted outsourcing some of these public jobs.

NSEA strongly believes when trusted educators are replaced with private contractors, the overall quality and safety of our public education system is compromised. Contracting out public work also impacts the quality of jobs available to our community members, converting decent union jobs to minimum wage without benefits. This only worsens the cycle of poverty that education equity advocates have been trying to address in schools in our poorest communities.

While we have appreciated the opportunities over the last several months to discuss the importance of public work provided by education support professionals, we are concerned the direction being given by the Nevada State Board of Education and the Department to the Clark County School District could negatively impact our members and the students, schools, and communities they serve.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 2: RYAN LEWIS

Principal Lewis, representing CCASAPE, stated that it is not always the best fit when someone is placed in a classroom, and staffing autonomy is important.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 3: HAWAH AHMAD

Good afternoon, Chairwoman Ortiz and members of the State Board of Education and CCSD Board of Trustees,

My name is Hawah Ahmad, and I represent the Clark County Education Association (CCEA). CCEA bargains for over 18,000 licensed educators in the Clark County School District and is the largest independent teacher union in the country.

It is no secret that CCEA supports full implementation of AB469 to mitigate issues that currently exist with staffing and staffing discrimination, service-learning agreements, and carry-over dollars. However, we must caution these bodies that the legislative intent of both AB469 and the PCFP must be followed, and that thoughtful consideration must be given on how unused funds, distributed in accordance with the PCFP's weights, are re-allocated 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 consider utilizing the PCFP weighted funding to its fullest extent pursuant to SB543.

Further, CCEA supports this body's regulatory power to clarify ambiguous terms like "to the greatest extent possible" and after consultation with the Attorney General's Office, and judicial adjudication over issues arising from AB469, CCEA suggests that the Superintendent of Public Instruction, on behalf of the Department of Education, utilize its authority to ask for a second opinion on AB469. A second opinion from the Attorney General's Office may be useful to guide this Board in the rulemaking process to develop guidelines that take information on the implementation and aftermath of the legislation, adjudicated case law, and SB543 into account.

CCEA thanks these bodies for your hard work, and we look forward to participating in the regulatory process to define the parameters around ambiguous language in AB469.

Respectfully,
Hawah Ahmad, J.D.
Clark County Education Association, Lobbyist

APPENDIX A, ITEM 4: JEFF HORN

Mr. Horn stated that principals are held accountable for student outcomes, maintaining a positive school climate, and ensuring the safety of all students and staff. Passing AB 469 empowers principals to make financial staffing and service-based decisions that will lead to continual school improvement and success. The connection between effective teachers and their students is a large impact on a child's learning, and high achieving schools are built upon supportive building leadership and highly effective licensed teachers. NRS 388G.610 set out to transfer certain authorities to local school precincts, yet CCSD continually disregards it, including in their most recent email regarding the fall surplus process. Currently CCSD, CCEA, and ESEA have no concerns with placing effective employees in our schools resulting in a negative impact on schools; they have aligned themselves with what is best for the adults and not what is best for students, where CCASAPE has codified language and negotiated agreements to ensure surplus administrators must competitively interview and be selected by a principal.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 5: JAN GILES

Good afternoon Superintendent Ebert, Madame Presidents, and members of both Boards.

For the record my name is Jan Giles, and I am the president of the Education Support Employees Association (ESEA). ESEA represents Education Support Professionals (ESPs) throughout Clark County.

Over the Summer, ESEA gave a presentation to the State Board of Education regarding AB469. Since the passage of AB469, ESEA has consistently raised concerns about the impact of the reorganization of CCSD on education support professionals, including the impact on central services, budget decisions, collective bargaining, and governance.

Today, I'd like to discuss contract language and seniority. ESEA's position has always been AB469's original intent regarding the Local School Precincts/Principals "selection authority" was strictly for the budgeting of their schools. There is legislative history that support this.

The legislative history also shows that AB469 was not intended to affect collective bargaining. Both the EMRB and the District Court have found that NRS 288 can be read in harmony with AB 469. Further, nothing in AB 469 eliminates the collectively bargained rights of ESP's in a surplus or RIF situation. Unfortunately, other interpretations of AB 469 open the door to staffing decision made in violation of state and federal employment discrimination laws. ESEA's collectively bargained process establishes objective standards based on qualifications and seniority.

We ask that you reaffirm the intent of the legislation by making a clear understanding of what authority the Local Precincts/Principals have. Without it, you will allow Precincts/Principals to ignore the wishes of the elected officials and community partners who worked diligently to come to an agreement in AB469. In addition, if you don't protect our collective bargaining agreement you could be viewed as anti-worker and anti-union. The District will have a bigger problem with recruitment and retention than it already has, when you can honor something as simple as seniority.

I'd like to close with this: For the last 18 months, ESPs have been hailed as essential, and some have even called us heroes. We hear the phrase 'new normal' a lot; however, when we're discussing the outsourcing of the essential jobs in the District, to us, that's just the old normal - business as usual. ESP's are the lowest paid, and choose to work with students because the love what they do. These are the employees that did **not** receive an \$8,500 Summer Acceleration stipend like the Local Precincts/Principals did. These employees are not poor performing they just have the misfortune of being the lowest senior employee at a school with decreased enrollment or the reorganization of their department. Job security is a small benefit to ask for, considering their difficult working conditions. We demand respect.

Thank you,

Jan Giles
ESEA President

APPENDIX A, ITEM 6: REBECCA GARCIA

Ms. Garcia asked how the reorganization was benefitting students and expressed frustration at the amount of time dedicated to items such as employee agreements over the needs of students. She stated that Dr. Jesus Jara, Superintendent of CCSD, referenced how School Organizational Teams (SOTs) could be used for accountability, but that as an SOT member, she cannot say at the meeting as there is no authority in the SOT. Parents do not understand the goal of SOTs, and often SOT meetings are held when parents would not be able to attend. There is also a significant lack of training and enforcement of open meeting laws.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 7: DANA ROSEMAN

Principal Roseman highlighted that she has had two teachers assigned to her campus that have become an integral part of her campus. However, she noted the various perspectives faced when a teacher is placed in a school without contextual fit; the perspective of the student, the parent, the teacher, and the teacher's colleagues, all of whom have unique interfaces and issues as they navigate a poor fit.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 8: ED GONZALEZ

Mr. Gonzalez worked as a staff member during the 2015 Legislative Session when AB 394 passed, and was a lobbyist in 2017 when AB 469 passed. He emphasized that the law passed six years ago, with regulations 5 years prior, and has yet to be implemented. He noted that based on posted documents, the Legislature does not trust the school district, but the principals and parents to make decisions with educators and support staff. Issues remain with SLAs and carryover funds, particularly as money is being taken from poor schools and returned to the district over the placement of long-term substitutes and licensed educators.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 9: KERRY LARNERD

Principal Larnerd stated that 1 in 4 students in CCSD are in the lunch program, and not all teachers are created equal. SOTs require data to drive their decisions and reserving 5% of the budget every year to be carried over to the next school year would assist. We can work if we make it work.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 10: DAVID ROSE

Principal Rose expressed concern with the implementation of AB 469, and that he thoroughly reviews all potential teachers; however, through the surplus process his school has been the recipient of several low-performing educators. In turn, administrators spend more time dealing with issues caused by these inadequacies. Principals are held accountable for the performance of their schools, but the placement of inadequate teachers diminishes the ability to move the school forward.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 11: LINDSAY DALLEY

Mr. Dalley expressed frustration with AB 469 and suggested that the trustees be trained by the Department regarding the intent and process for AB 469. His school's SOT had budget for SLA funds that they had no control over, in violation of NAC 388G. Without control and discretion, the 85% allocation is not occurring. Attempts to negotiate SLAs were blown off. Ultimately, reorganization has been distorted.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 12: KENNETH PAUL

Principal Paul asked whether the CCSD governance model was close to the legislative intent; based on the implementation of the 85% allocation and poor checks and balances, it would seem not. He stated that there was need for a person or group with the authority to arbitrate or mediate disagreements. SOTs need clear messaging to support SOTs membership and function. School precinct choice would be impactful, but would require CCSD to collaborate with a neutral entity to ensure implementation and problem solving with the intent and spirit of the law.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 13: SYRISSA JOLLEY

Ms. Jolley thanked the principals who were attending and providing comment at the meeting. She stated the CCSD is a large district, and large districts are often not effective; it's why AB 469 was created. However, CCSD is not in compliance. If the law is enforced however, CCSD can become a useful tool to schools, supporting a student focus. She stated that three things were needed for successful implementation: training, a neutral committee to oversee implementation, and the district to provide control, discretion, and transparency of funding and hiring practices.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 14: JESSICA JONES

Ms. Jones expressed frustration with the implementation status of AB 469. CCSD has never implemented feedback to the administrator twice per year, and she recently heard that they may need to begin scoring their own assessments. SLAs are used for this purpose, and if they are not providing the service, will they be receiving funds back for services not rendered? The school budget is difficult to understand as the new system is not helpful to administrators or the community.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 15: MICHELLE RASMUSSEN

To the distinguished leaders of our education community: President Felicia Ortiz, Superintendent Every, President Cavazos, Superintendent Jar, trustees and board members:

Thank you for coming together to address the implementation of AB 469. There is a need to have all of you come together but also we need to hear from more teachers, students, families, and community leaders. I'm happy to see so many leaders here but I am confused as to why the whole of our education community is not together.

I would like to see an effort which puts a teacher, a support staff member, and a principal on the panel, as an advisor but not voting member of the CCSD School Board and NV DoE so that it would actually mirror an SOT. That way seeing a representative at these meetings perhaps more employees would feel that these bodies actually want to hear them and that decisions will be made together. Currently teachers feel their input is ignored and that decisions are made for them, not with them. I know a law was attempted to make more voting members that was not passed into law, but is it not allowed to have these interests represented as an advisory board in the same way a student serves on the NV DoE Board?

I am happy that there were changes made to the Per Pupil Funding however there is a need for training on this new funding formula so that SOT members can understand and make sound decisions for their school. There should also be more than a week and a half to review and plan for the budget before it is required to be submitted for approval. I feel that lack of training for the SOTs and the short consideration windows is a way to limit the power of the SOT to make budgetary decisions. Furthermore as noted several times the lack of a procedure to ensure the principal follows the recommendations of the SOTs undermines the intent of the SOT.

Speaking of necessary training: there are insufficient resources dedicated to training new teachers on the NEPF process. I repeat for clarification: new teachers are NOT given adequate training on the process used to rate their performance. This is unacceptable and needs to be addressed and may help some of the issues seen in our teacher rating process which causes problems with teacher retention and principals having teachers sent to them whose performance may be considered substandard when really they were never properly trained on their employment standards.

Thank you all,

Machelle Rasmussen
Guinn STEM Academy
Social Studies/Chinese language teacher

APPENDIX A, ITEM 16: FERNANDO ROMERO

Mr. Romero stated that he belongs to two SOTs and there have been numerous violations by CCSD regarding AB 469, and the CCSD Trustees are not addressing these concerns and making appropriate changes.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 17: REX RIVERS

I am the father of two students in the Clark County School District. I am also a member of the SOT team at our local middle school. Over the last five years I have witnessed how CCSD has failed to implement AB469. Instead of giving principals and SOT members the authority to make decisions and control finances at a local level, CCSD continues to follow a centralized approach with tight control over financial decisions. CCSD has followed a centralized approach for so many decades that it has become the only way that they know how to operate. CCSD will need a team of NDE officials to closely supervise and ensure that they start to follow the law immediately. If no one is watching, CCSD will quickly revert back to tight centralized control as they have done in the past. Please appoint a team of NDE officials to ensure that AB469 is implemented at CCSD as soon as possible. Thank you!

--

Sincerely,
Rex Rivers

APPENDIX A, ITEM 18: SENATOR JOE HARDY

Dear Board of Education and CCSD Board of Trustees,

It seems that there has been some transparency and accountability issues with the follow up on AB469 from the 2017 session. I think it would be wise to have a section by section, written and reported to the public and designated elected members as stipulated in the law, available for the purposes of clarification of what has been done and the plan to meet the law requirements not yet met. I am unaware that the law was changed significantly in the last 2 sessions, thus are we in compliance with the intent and practice of the law? If those in appointed and elected positions feel that the law is over burdensome or ill-conceived, then what are the intentions to change the law?

The people of Nevada, my district population and indeed Legislators and the Governor deserve an accounting of attempted adherence or willful disobedience to the 4 year old law. Please allow this to be read in the meeting today in public comment.

Sincerely,

--

Senator Joe Hardy, M.D.
Nevada District 12

APPENDIX A, ITEM 19: SYLVIA LAZOS

Dear Education Elected Leaders:

AB469 (2017) was passed with bipartisan support. We support the Nevada State Board of Education's efforts to ensure proper implementation, and commend the CCSD Board of Trustees for participating today. The state has spent millions of taxpayer dollars to ensure that reorganization works as intended. Four years later, we continue to lack clarity on this question.

Let us first note that the report from CCSD on AB469 which forms part of today's CCSD Board documentation is odd. We can report that it was never discussed by CCSD Board of Trustees and has not been shared with key stakeholder groups. Given the non-transparency and odd timing, its relevance should be weighed accordingly. There are glaring omissions that we note below.

Over the last five years, leadership of Latinx and immigrant communities has been consistent in its concerns: 1) equity in funding should not inadvertently create funding disparities at the school level, 2) civil rights of vulnerable demographics, in particular ELL children and students of color, should be respected 3) reorganization should improve school performance and student achievement in segregated communities where schools have historically underperformed, 4) appropriate leadership of schools, particularly TI, predominantly minority, is essential.

1. Dr. Marguerite Roza has found that how districts internally fund schools is the single most important factor in school finance equity (http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_213HRR.pdf) The intradistrict AB469 funding report commissioned by Dr. Canavero reported systemic funding disparities between Title I schools and more affluent schools. There were two key reasons. First, CCSD uses "average teacher salaries" versus actual teacher salaries for school budgets. Second, experienced teachers gravitate towards the more affluent suburbs, where they find the workload to be less onerous, their work better supported, and the travel less stressful. Nevada legislature has repeatedly assured the Latinx community that the new funding formula will ensure that intra-district inequitable school funding is minimized. We ask that the SBOE and CCSD Trustees monitor what are the effects of AB469 and the new funding formula on school funding intradistrict equity. We recommend that the Nevada Superintendent create a working group to analyze impacts and ready a report for the 2023 Nevada Legislature.
2. When AB469 was first passed, the Latinx community voiced great concern that civil rights of ELL students might be impaired because of reorganization. CCSD proposed that each principal would determine the level of ELL training that his or her school required. During CCSD Board discussions, we pointed out that WESTED Aida Walqui, Clark County Public Schools Report on Instruction for English Language Learners (2012) reported that CCSD teachers were not skilled in instructional strategies for ELL students. Principals could not recognize what good instruction was for ELL students. CCSD report submitted today contains no mention of how well protected classes are doing under reorganization. Per the Nevada Report card, Student achievement for ELLs and special education students have LOST ground in the last three years. We ask that NDE and CCSD Trustees undertake a careful review of whether centralized services, as now operating, ensure that children's civil rights are not jeopardized under the current operation of centralized services.
3. In our view, the key equity question is whether decentralization is increasing opportunity gaps for children in segregated neighborhoods and from legally protected classes. This must remain a key part of the NDE and CCSD Trustees ongoing oversight, reporting and analysis.

4. Decision making under AB469 was supposed to be community-based and adapted to the needs of each school. AB469 only works if leadership at the precinct level is competent and attuned to the needs of the school's community. We are concerned that the new 60 plus principals appointed by Dr Jara due to the early retirement buyout may have calamitous effects on poor communities because novice principals may not be good matches for schools and are untrained. It is just not a matter of "diversity numbers" but also a matter of whether the principal is sufficiently well trained to lead a particular school, eg a high ELL school, or a school with endemic poverty should be led by a principal with knowledge of these student characteristics and student instruction in these areas. We note that when there is a good school-to-principal match, schools have been able to prosper under AB469. When that is not the case, the results are tragic. AB469 allows the NDE to issue regulations to ensure that principals are well trained and processes are in place to minimize mismatches. We highly urge that NDE take action and issue regulations.

Respectfully and in the spirit of helping our most vulnerable children,

Sylvia R. Lazos, Education Committee

APPENDIX A, ITEM 20: ASSEMBLYMAN GREGORY HAFEN II

Compliance with the large school district reorganization law Assembly Bill (AB) 469 is critical for Nevada's future education. Localization of school decisions and funding will bring more accountability, control, and community connection to our children, especially in the rural parts of Clark County.

National education leaders and experts were consulted and hired to help craft this legislation. The legislature passed it twice, overwhelmingly. This model is not theoretical, it came from a successful working model.

I feel we have given the State Board of Education and Department of Education the leadership to improve our Clark County education. I support the necessary steps to implement AB 469.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Assemblyman Gregory T. Hafen II

Assembly District No. 36

Office: 775.727.1629

Email: Gregory.Hafen@asm.state.nv.us

APPENDIX A, ITEM 21: RENEE PATERSON

Ms. Paterson stated that a teacher is given no choice regarding her position, where she'll teach, or who/what she will be teaching.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 22: HAWAH AHMAD

Ms. Ahmad highlighted the work done by the Clark County Education Association over the past year in attempts to support the implementation of AB 4698.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 23: ANNA MARIE BINDER

Ms. Binder noted that many community members are upset about things that they cannot control. There is a large community group seeking to break up the district, but Ms. Binder wants to keep the district as one and will be working to support that end for the upcoming Legislative Session.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 24: SYRISSA JOLLEY

Ms. Jolley emphasized that AB 469 has not been implemented. Principals need to feel trusted and there must be rapport between the district and the school that allows for local controls.