



# **Assembly Bill (AB) 469 Survey Data**

Tina Statucki, Education Programs Professional  
Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family  
Engagement

AB 469 Subcommittee Meeting – December 14, 2021

# Presentation Outcomes

AB 469 Subcommittee members will receive a summary of the responses received on the AB 469 Principal/ School Organizational Team (SOT) and Stakeholder Surveys.

# Principal/ School Organization Team (SOT) Survey

To ensure that local school precincts are able to carry out the responsibilities of their plans of operation, the AB 469 Subcommittee of the State Board of Education requested input from principals and SOT members on the implementation of Service Learning Agreements (SLAs) within the Clark County School District. This survey was to be completed collaboratively between the school principal and the SOTs and could be submitted anonymously.

# Principal/ SOT Survey (continued – 2)

	Yes					No					No Response
	E	M	H	O	Total	E	M	H	O	Total	
Has your school precinct formally “entered” into these agreements each year?	40	8	5	0	<b>53</b>	48	12	21	3	<b>84</b>	1
Have you met with your School Associate Superintendent annually to review each SLA?	17	3	2	0	<b>22</b>	72	17	24	2	<b>115</b>	1
In the past or recently, have you expressed a desire to modify any SLAs or terminate the services for future school years?	17	8	16	2	<b>43</b>	72	12	10	1	<b>95</b>	0

# Principal/ SOT Survey (continued – 3)

Which service(s) did you request to modify or terminate?

Landscaping/Grounds	31
Correctional Schools	6
English Language Learner Testing	6
Various	4
Family and Community Engagement Services	3
Academic Centers	3
Student Awareness Abuse Program	2
Summer Academy	2
Utilities	1

Transportation (Events)	1
Custodial	1
Student Success Advocates	1
Gifted and Talented Education	1
Peer Administrators	1
Graduation	1
Hope 2	1
Attendance Officers	1
Site-Based Technology	1

# Principal/SOT Survey (continued – 4)

What was the outcome of your request(s) to modify or terminate service(s)?	Total
No response	15
Denied	12
No Change	10
Pending	2
Resolved	1
Too expensive	1

Was your request(s) to modify or terminate services presented to the School Board of Trustees to deliberate?	Total
Went to Board but was denied	1
Went to Board (member) but not discussed	1

# Stakeholder Survey

- The Nevada State Board of Education (SBE) created the Assembly Bill 469 Subcommittee to review the implementation of AB 469 (2017) - the reorganization of the Clark County School District. The Subcommittee is also charged with making recommendations to the SBE to ensure that the reorganization (NRS 388G.500-810) is implemented as intended to support a site-based operational model that meets the needs and concerns of the students and families within each local precinct.
- The Assembly Bill 469 Subcommittee of the State Board of Education requested input from stakeholders (NRS 388G.590) to ensure that local school precincts are able to carry out the responsibilities transferred to them from the large school district (NRS 388G.600).

# Stakeholder Survey Respondents

- Clark County Education Association (CCEA)
- Nevada State Education Association (NSEA)
- Community Educational Advisory Board (CEAB) and School Organizational Team
- Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees (CCASPE)



# Stakeholder Survey

## Section 1: Service Learning Agreements

	CCEA	NSEA	CEAB/SOT	CCASAPE
After reading the information at the top of Section 1, the information and resources provided to local school precincts to implement the Service Level Agreements (SLAs) is sufficient.	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree*	Disagree

# Stakeholder Survey

## Section 1: Service Learning Agreements (continued - 2)

	CCEA	NSEA	CEAB/SOT	CCASAPE
What additional information and resources need to be provided to local school precincts to implement the Service Level Agreements (SLAs) that is not included in <a href="http://guide.ccsd.net">guide.ccsd.net</a> (e.g., SLA approval process procedures, vetting process for potential vendors, denial of SLA services procedures)?	N/A		There is NOTHING helpful provided by CCSD on that page! In fact, just on the first PDF regarding custodians, it contradicts state law giving principals autonomy over all staff at their school. This is the classic example of compliance allusion because all of those “rules” have the opposite affect of promoting “reorganization/ decentralization compliance.”	The Guide reads as though there is a choice. Principals have no choice in the services provided. It is unclear how a school would go about getting a vendor vetted for potential service in the current format. The Guide is unclear in the fact that the SLAs are “Rough Drafts” and are to serve as a starting point to negotiate with precincts. A negotiation process is needed, including steps for disagreements between parties. A vetting process for potential vendors that could follow many of the same procedures as school self-funded projects is also needed. There needs to be procedures for either hybrid or denial of central service.

# Stakeholder Survey

## Section 1: Service Learning Agreements (continued - 3)

	CCEA	NSEA	CEAB/SOT	CCASAP
The current SLA process enables local school precincts to carry out the responsibilities of the plans of operation as intended.	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree

# Stakeholder Survey

## Section 1: Service Learning Agreements (continued - 4)

	CCEA	NSEA	CEAB/SOT	CCASAPE
What parts of the SLA process are working well? What is not working? What needs to change?	SLA provides school precincts 'choice' in terms of the type of service they want from CCSD or to find an alternative to provide that service.		NONE OF IT WORKS AT ALL! We have tried tirelessly and met with [the Chief Financial Officer] himself who stonewalls us, probably on the superintendents order.	The parts of the SLAs that are working well include how schools currently receive the money and it is taken away and principals do not have to do very much with, around, for, or to the SLAs as outlined.  Parts of the SLAs that are ineffective include the “one size fits all” approach and no apparent reason why a universal approach to providing services when the services are not fully applicable to those upon whom it is exacted. SLA funds are part of the 85% of unrestricted funds for the per-pupil model, not a separate SLA amount. District is to provide costs for transferred services as close to actuals as possible. There is no negotiation process or mediation process when disagreements arise. There is confusion about precincts asking for the transfer of new authorities (SLAs) that would need board approval and a rough draft for the new ones vs. already transferred authorities that have (ideally) existing agreements that can be used, modified, or rejected.

# Stakeholder Survey

## Section 2: Staffing

	CCEA	NSEA	CEAB/SOT	CCASAPE
How should "In Good Standing" be defined?	Having proper licensure, effective evaluation, and no serious discipline pending.	NEPF rating of Developing or higher	Licensed teachers who are not a physical or sexual threat to students, have a past history of success at other schools or come with good recommendations, present well to principal and SOT interviewing teams.	Eligible to be hired with a clean and clear license. Not have an Ineffective or Developing evaluation. Not have any active discipline. (Consider application of the "three years plus one day" timeline.)
Principals are making every effort to ensure that effective licensed teachers are employed at the local school precinct.	Agree	Don't Know	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree

# Stakeholder Survey

## Section 2: Staffing (Evaluation)

	CCEA	NSEA	CEAB/SOT	CCASAPE
Employee evaluations should affect or impact an employee's "good standing."	Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
What evaluation rating/s should affect or impact an employee's "good" standing?	Effective	Rating of developing or above should mark good standing	The employee's ability to accomplish their responsibilities and build up the school community.	Any overall ratings of Ineffective or Developing on evaluations should disqualify a person from "good standing." Furthermore, those with marks of any "2's or "1s" in any portion of such evaluations should be able to be considered by potential hiring local school precincts.

# Stakeholder Survey

## Section 2: Staffing (Discipline)

	CCEA	NSEA	CEAB/SOT	CCASAPE
Employee discipline should affect or impact an employee's good standing.	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
What type of discipline?	[Discipline at a] serious level where an educator may have been relieved of their duty pending an investigation		The focus of the question seems unclear. I'm not familiar with types of educational discipline.	All active discipline should affect "good standing."

# Stakeholder Survey

## Section 2: Staffing (Attendance)

	CCEA	NSEA	CEAB/SOT	CCASAPE
Employee attendance should affect or impact an employee's good standing.	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
What attendance issues or concerns should affect or impact an employee's "good standing"?			Seems pretty self explanatory. If you don't show up you don't have good standing.	Excessive absenteeism and any unauthorized absences should be a consideration. Attendance issues should also include: arriving late, leaving early, and noticeable patterns in absenteeism.



# Stakeholder Survey

## Section 2: Staffing (Personnel Records)

	CCEA	NSEA	CEAB/SOT	CCASAPE
Principals should be provided access to personnel records (previous evaluations, disciplinary documents, etc.) for current district employees, both licensed and unlicensed, who could be placed in their schools.	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree

# Stakeholder Survey

## Section 2: Staffing (Impact on Students)

	CCEA	NSEA	CEAB/SOT	CCASAPE
The current staffing practices and policies affect student achievement.	Don't Know	Don't Know	Negatively	Negatively
How do current staffing practices and policies affect student achievement?			They are NOT centered on promoting student centered achievement, rather on protecting mediocre employee performance. The schools shouldn't be in the "staff fixing" business. We are messing with children's lives.	Forced placements which do not involve the school precincts in the hiring process do not take into account any criteria to ensure the person is a "fit" for the individual school or program. Placements of poorly performing staff continue to occur - persons with discipline, excessive absenteeism, have been forced upon principals in very specific programs, eg. assignment of at least one employee into a highly regarded performing arts position, thereby jeopardizing the program's reputation.

# Stakeholder Survey

## Section 2: Staffing (To the Greatest Extent Possible)

	CCEA	NSEA	CEAB/SOT	CCASAP
How should “To the Greatest Extent Possible” be defined?	An educator who is available for employment who has been rated effective, has the proper license, and has no serious discipline pending and should be hired before any substitute is hired for the vacancy.		If the SOT team can justify it, it should be seriously considered. That’s a good reality check and balance.	The individual school precinct made a good faith effort to hire a staff member who is qualified and best fits the needs of the school. Consideration of allowing a long-term substitute versus accepting a forced placement of a person not in “good standing” should be allowed.

# Stakeholder Survey

## Section 2: Staffing (To the Greatest Extent Possible - 2)

	CCEA	NSEA	CEAB/SOT	CCASAPÉ
Principals should have access to the personnel records of all potential candidates, not just those who applied to their schools (resume, previous evaluations, letters of recommendation, etc.)?	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
All school precincts should be provided equal access to potential candidates.	Don't Know	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Agree



## Contact Information:

Tina Statucki

Education Programs Professional

[tstatucki@doe.nv.gov](mailto:tstatucki@doe.nv.gov)