

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
APRIL 15, 2021
9:00 A.M.**

Meeting Location

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the State Board of Education met via videoconference. In accordance with Governor Sisolak's State of Emergency Directive 006, Section 1, no physical location was designated for this meeting. The meeting was livestreamed on the Nevada Department of Education's (NDE) website.

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Via Videoconference

Dr. René Cantú
Katie Coombs
Dr. Katherine Dockweiler
Alex Gallegos
Tim Hughes
Cathy McAdoo
Mark Newburn
Felicia Ortiz
Mike Walker
Wayne Workman

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Dr. Jonathan Moore, Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement
Felicia Gonzales, Deputy Superintendent for Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement
Heidi Haartz, Deputy Superintendent for Business and Support Services
Jessica Todtman, Chief Strategy Officer
Sarah Nick, Management Analyst III
Dave Brancamp, Director, Office of Standards and Instructional Support
Craig Statucki, Director, Office of Career Readiness, Adult Learning, and Education Options
Randi Hunewill, Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Career Readiness, Adult Learning, and Education Options

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General
Greg Ott, Chief Deputy Attorney General

PRESENTERS IN ATTENDANCE

Erica Mosca, Candidate, State Public Charter School Authority Governing Board
Don Soifer, Candidate, State Public Charter School Authority Governing Board

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

Via Livestream

1: CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Meeting called to order at 9:00 A.M. by President Felicia Ortiz. Quorum was established. President Ortiz led the Pledge of Allegiance and provided an acknowledgement of the native lands that today's meeting were taking place on.

2: PUBLIC COMMENT #1

Ed Gonzalez and Eva White, Clark County School District School Organizational Team Representatives, submitted public comment regarding agenda item 8. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

The Nevada State Education Association submitted public comment regarding the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

3: APPROVAL OF FLEXIBLE AGENDA

Vice President Mark Newburn moved to approve the flexible agenda. Member Katherine Dockweiler seconded. Motion passed.

4: PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Ortiz provided an update regarding the Friday, April 9 work session held by the Board to develop their goals in alignment with their Silver State Governance training. The Board developed a draft vision statement: "all Nevada students are equipped and feel empowered to pursue the future of their choosing as a result of collective efforts to provide a world class learning experience." President Ortiz encouraged public input and noted that further work sessions would be scheduled.

5: SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, provided an update regarding the 81st Legislative Session. Superintendent Ebert noted that Friday, April 9 was the deadline for bills to pass out of their first legislative committee, and all six of the Department's bills successfully passed. The Department participated in a workshop with the joint Assembly and Senate Finance Committees for K-12 and Higher Education on April 7 to discuss the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. She noted that many of the recommendations released by the Blue Ribbon Commission for a Globally Prepared Nevada were incorporated into Senate Bill 215, introduced by Senator Mo Denis.

Member Tim Hughes asked if there were any additional education bills of note. Sarah Nick, Management Analyst to the Superintendent, responded that the Department provides technical assistance on dozens of bills during the Legislative Session, and often works on developing amendments. Ms. Nick highlighted Assembly Bill 417: School Bus Safety, Senate Bill (SB) 173: Back on Track Act, and Assembly Bill 195: English Learner Rights as items on which the Department had provided technical assistance.

President Ortiz asked why SB 173 was necessary. Ms. Nick noted that the legislation invites districts to opt into creating a plan for summer learning under the bill, rather than requiring them to. Regarding the larger motivation for the bill, she recommended inquiries be directed to Senator Marilyn Dondero-Loop, who introduced the bill. Ms. Nick further noted that the Department does not mandate or direct districts regarding the use of their federal relief funds, but may show examples, provide invitation, and prioritize and provide support to districts as they make spending decisions.

President Ortiz inquired about what value the districts would find in providing a plan in accordance with SB 173. Superintendent Ebert noted that districts would be planning for summer learning regardless of the legislation and having access to plans across districts provides additional support and follow-through. The federal American Rescue Plan Act also established a minimum amount of funds that must be used to address learning loss at the State level, and district plans could support the direction and cohesiveness of the investment. Member Wayne Workman noted that districts are always happy to receive support from the Department, and districts have always done summer programs that include remediation and enrichment. While submitting the plan will be an increase in work, Lyon County School District will do whatever is necessary to meet the needs of their students.

6: APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

President Ortiz asked members whether any items needed additional discussion before approving all consent agenda items in a single motion.

Member Tim Hughes asked about alignment crosswalks with the Nevada Academic Standards for the Digital Game Development Standards. Craig Statucki, Director of the Office of Career Readiness, Adult Learning, and Education Options (CRALEO) noted that crosswalks are not typically provided within the Standards for Board approval as they are typically still under development. He noted that the Crosswalk and the Standards are developed simultaneously, but Crosswalks are intensive and may take more time to fully complete.

President Ortiz noted that in the Career and Technical Education Cybersecurity Instructional Materials there were no multilingual glossaries or references to students with disabilities. Randi Hunewill, Education Programs Supervisor for CRALEO, responded that many Instructional Materials do not have access to multiple languages. She highlighted that these Instructional Materials are one of many potential resources. She further noted that accessibility for students with disabilities is addressed in the adaptive technologies provided to students. President Ortiz asked that this information be more explicitly noted in the rubrics.

Vice President Newburn moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Member Hughes seconded. Motion passed.

7: INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING AN APPOINTMENT TO THE STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY GOVERNING BOARD

The Board reviewed [Appointment Applications](#) of candidates for the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) Governing Board, of which two members are appointed by the State Board of Education. Two new candidates, Erica Mosca and DeRonda Williams, and the incumbent, Don Soifer, had applied for consideration. The recruitment was announced at the March Board meeting, advertised via social media, posted on the NDE website, and shared with the SPCSA for dispersal to their constituents. Member Hughes asked for greater advertisement in future to cultivate a wider pool of applicants.

President Ortiz had asked earlier in the week for applicants to be present during the Board meeting, but it was not a listed requirement in the application. Erica Mosca and Don Soifer were able to attend. Vice President Newburn asked for clarification regarding Ms. Williams' residency; Superintendent Ebert noted that she is currently in the process of moving to Nevada. President Ortiz asked that each candidate present provide a brief statement.

Mr. Soifer stated that he has been a charter authorizer for 13 years, supporting an equity agenda and ensuring that charter schools serve with quality and fidelity all learners. He supports shifting the strategic plan to include the growth of individual students over time for student subgroups.

Ms. Mosca stated she is the Founder and Executive Director of Leaders in Training, a community-based organization supporting students to be the first in their family to graduate from college and return to the community as leaders, a program which has seen a 100% college acceptance rate. She shared her personal experience as a student in Title I schools and as the first person in her family to graduate from college.

Member Katie Coombs asked about the current makeup of the SPCSA Board with regard to diversity and inclusion. Ms. Nick provided a [list](#) of the SPCSA Board Members, their appointment status, and term. Member Soifer stated that the SPCSA Board has three Members who identify as African American and six who identify as white.

Member Hughes asked the candidates for their perspective on the role of charter schools in education. Ms. Mosca stated that charter schools provide autonomy which may be used to develop new practices which may be shared out to develop better best practices. Mr. Soifer emphasized academic growth, although noted that obstacles include charter lotteries that authentically represent inclusion and placement of charters in communities with need.

Member Katie Dockweiler moved to appoint Ms. Erica Mosca to the SPCSA Governing Board. Member René Cantú seconded. Motion passed. Superintendent Ebert and President Ortiz thanked Mr. Soifer for his service and commended him for his contributions to education and students in Nevada.

[Convenience Break]

8: INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION OF ASSEMBLY BILL 469 (2017)

Felicia Gonzales, Deputy Superintendent for Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement, conducted a [PowerPoint presentation](#) regarding the implementation of [Assembly Bill \(AB\) 469 \(2017\)](#), relating to the organization of Clark County School District (CCSD), the placement of educators, and other requested information.

Vice President Newburn noted that the current system for carryover dollars and the budgeting process have been reported to him as problematic. President Ortiz reflected that language may need to be added to regulations to clarify that schools should not be relying on carryover dollars as a savings account or for future projects. Member Hughes asked what would be considered early enough as a timeline for carryover dollars, and what supports have been provided to Clark County in their efforts to implement AB 469.

Superintendent Ebert stated that carryover dollars are created when schools are allocated funds to hire educators, but the school is unable to fill a position. The gap between these costs creates carryover funds; however, carryover funds are not available until the following fall. Superintendent Ebert added that if those funds were available in the spring, the school may be able to use those funds to fill the position with a full-time educator. She noted that her predecessor, Superintendent Steve Canavero, worked closely with CCSD during initial implementation of AB 469. She stated that during her two-year tenure there has been less focused support, as attentions have been focused on COVID-19 response and recovery. When issues were brought to the Department's attention by CCSD constituents in the fall of 2020, the Department followed up with CCSD.

Member Cantú raised a concern that CCSD provided salary averages, which did not reflect that lower-income schools may pay teachers at a lower rate than their peers at more affluent schools. He requested greater transparency regarding these practices. Deputy Superintendent Gonzales stated that Senate Bill 543 (2019) may address this issue as the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan has implications for equitable distribution of funding.

President Ortiz asked that a meeting be scheduled to enable the Board to hear directly from CCSD principals and stakeholders regarding these matters.

9: FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Member Dockweiler requested that the Board receive a summary of the 81st Legislative Session during their June 3, 2021 meeting. Vice President Newburn requested a breakdown of any changes in the responsibilities of the Board related to legislative activity. Superintendent Ebert noted the Department would be prepared to provide an update but given that the Legislative Session would conclude less than 72 hours prior to the meeting, there may not be formal documents or presentations prepared in time for the conversation.

President Ortiz also asked that Member Alex Gallegos be recognized at the June 3, 2021 meeting, despite his term concluding on May 31, 2021. Member Hughes asked for engagement regarding the goals developed by the Board. Member Cantú requested an update regarding the impact of COVID-19 on students.

10: PUBLIC COMMENT #2

The Education Support Employees Association submitted public comment regarding agenda item 8 (*A complete copy of his statement is available in Appendix A*)

11: ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 11:44 A.M.

Appendix A: Statements Given During Public Comment

1. Ed Gonzalez and Eva White, Clark County School District School Organizational Team Representatives, submitted public comment regarding agenda item 8.
2. The Nevada State Education Association submitted public comment regarding the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan.
3. The Education Support Employees Association submitted public comment regarding agenda item 8.

Item A1, Ed Gonzales and Eva White

Superintendent Ebert, President Ortiz and Members of the Board,

In the 4 ½ years since the passage of the original regulations of the CCSD Reorganization, the law has forced CCSD to provide an unprecedented level of transparency and that has been a good thing.

The transparency from the CCSD Reorganization and the information surfacing at School Organizational Team meetings has parents, educators and support staff looking at budgets rather than the principal being the only eyes on this information. You could easily say that with this knowledge people are starting to ask the right questions about what funding is coming into the district and why it is being spent in certain ways.

However, what we have also seen is that many parts of the law still have not been implemented after 4 ½ years or in some cases so poorly implemented that it is contrary to what is written in NRS or NAC.

We both want to thank the Department of Education for their work and know how challenging it has been to do during a legislative session.

Since the public comments submitted by Ed Gonzalez at the last State Board meeting regarding the autonomy of principals and the use of carryover dollars we have found more issues with the current implementation and believe even more exists.

One of those is the Service Level Agreement on Correctional Schools that states it cannot be modified, terminated or outsourced and school administrators do not have any autonomy or control over this service. We believe this item should not be an SLA since it does not fit the definition under NAC 388G.110 - 140 and possibly violates both NRS 388G.600 and NRS 388G.660 as well.

Due to these issues, we believe it would be best to continue the investigation into current implementation of Assembly Bill 469. Therefore, we are requesting two work sessions in the late afternoon/early evening that will give parents, educators and school staff the opportunity to have their voice heard after they are off work to address the current implementation of Assembly Bill 469. The first work session can be devoted to listening to the concerns of non-compliance and other disputes while the second work session can address any resolution to these issues among the stakeholder groups. We believe if done this way, some of the smaller issues can be easily resolved while larger issues can be discussed in more detail.

We have attached our concerns. They include but are not limited to the autonomy of principals and their ability to procure service when not satisfied by what CCSD offers, the proper distribution of monies to schools, the lack of processes to allow SOTs to give input on certain employees, such as principals, that is permissible under NRS, just to name a few.

Some may seem relatively minor but we felt they should be included as the Legislature has been adamant that the Reorganization must be fully implemented.

We will also be submitting these comments to Superintendent Jara and the CCSD School Board.

Thank you,

Eva White
Community Member
Bailey Middle School
School Organizational Team

Ed Gonzalez
Community Member
Hickey Elementary School
School Organizational Team

Item A2, Nevada State Education Association

The Nevada State Education Association has been the voice of Nevada educators for over 120 years. NSEA is submitting these comments related to the update on the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan.

Since the introduction of SB543 two years ago, NSEA has expressed policy concerns at every opportunity—the lack of educator voice; no new revenue; watering down Zoom and Victory schools; freezing and squeezing school district budgets; a giveaway to charter schools; and undoing the rules of collective bargaining.

Let's be real. Nevada ranks near the bottom of states in education funding. The new school funding plan without new and ongoing revenue feels a lot like rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic. NSEA maintains it is bad policy to effectuate a seismic shift in the state's education funding formula during the COVID-19 crisis, especially as further general fund cuts are proposed for our schools. But as the legislature seems compelled to move forward at this time, NSEA has presented three changes to ensure the new plan does significantly less harm to Nevada's students and educators.

First, grandfather existing Zoom and Victory Schools, located in Nevada's poorest communities, serving the highest percentage of at-risk students, and proven models of education equity. With the shift away from a school-based approach, Zoom and Victory schools will have their budgets reduced and lose significant momentum on school climate and culture, jeopardizing gains made for students in our most impacted schools and communities. Some good news is CCSD is looking to backfill any shortfalls to these programs—a de facto grandfathering. Given this move, it makes little sense to not grandfather Zoom and Victory in the formula.

Second, hold districts truly harmless by using the greater of 2020 total budget or per-pupil amount by district, adjusted by the inflationary costs of doing business. Modeling the new funding plan showed most districts would end up with frozen budgets for years. This means growing districts like Nye or Storey County could have a serious reduction in their per-pupil funding level. Also, without inflationary increases to revenues, districts under hold harmless would have to shift funds away from classrooms to cover increasing fixed costs like utilities, healthcare, and step increases. Budget discussions last week make clear there is strong support for this direction in the legislature.

Finally, remove anti-union language that increases the district ending fund balance walled off from collective bargaining to 16.6%, to preserve the collective bargaining process. One of the most serious unintended consequences of SB543 was the impact this provision would have when coupled with another provision sweeping district ending fund balance over 16.6%. Taken together, education unions would be unable to negotiate over any item with a cost, like salaries and benefits and proposals for worker and school safety. This would adversely impact our educator shortage and would jeopardize labor peace in Nevada. It is unfortunate this issue has received so little discussion at the legislature or the Funding Commission.

Item A3, Education Support Employees Association

The Education Support Employees Association (ESEA) represents education support professionals (ESPs) throughout Clark County. ESEA has concerns with the employee reassignment process in the Clark County School District (CCSD).

In 2017, Assembly Bill 469 reorganized CCSD, transferring much decision-making authority to individual school precincts. The language stated each local school precinct shall have the authority to select staff who work under the direct supervision of the principal. This language has caused a lot of confusion for both the district and education support professionals with conflicting language on transfers and reassignments in existing contract language. ESEA has maintained it was never the intent of AB469 to override contract language on this issue. Unfortunately, in 2017, an opinion issued by Attorney General Laxalt disagreed.

For many years, the surplus process in CCSD allowed the district to balance staffing with decreasing student enrollment. ESPs with the lowest seniority in their position went through the surplus process when schools could no longer afford their position. This process had nothing to do with job performance. While the surplus process was stressful for the employee, nearly everyone was placed in a new position at the end of the day. Last fall, relying on the 2017 opinion, CCSD began requiring ESPs to interview with a school principal as a part of the surplus process. Over 50 ESPs went through this new process, and several ESPs were rejected for a lateral position through no fault of their own, at a principal's discretion. Serious questions of racial bias have been raised in this process.

The Employee-Management Relations Board (EMRB) issued a decision in December rejecting the 2017 Attorney General Opinion as well as various arguments regarding the authority held by principals in a surplus or reduction in force situation. While that decision was appreciated and remedied reassignment issues created by the new process, the issue is not settled with pending litigation.

ESEA would like more clarity and fairness in the employee surplus process, including the consistent application of the surplus process. This would help resolve any employee confusion with district work practices.

Thank you.

Appendix B: Documents Submitted for Board Review in Addition to Public Comment

1. Concerns regarding School Organizational Teams, submitted by Ed Gonzalez and Eva White

Item B1, Concerns Regarding School Organizational Teams

Implementation of Service Level Agreements in relating to School Autonomy.

When discussing the CCSD Reorganization, it is helpful to understand that NRS 388G gives local school precincts the responsibility over services that have been passed to them under the law or by the school board, while NAC 388G.110 -140 gives local school precincts the autonomy to make choices on how to provide the service.

The Service Level Agreement was designed to allow for the autonomy of decision making if the school chose to continue using the service being provided by CCSD. Also, it allows local school precincts the ability to discuss receiving better service from CCSD since an agreement of expectations could always be revised.

While the SLA's have provisions to modify or even opt out, there seems to be no mechanism to do that.

In fact, the common attitude by CCSD about SLAs is that schools cannot change or opt out of them even though there are provisions in those agreements as required under NAC. SLAs are viewed as being calculated as a district-wide expense, then assessed back either as a per pupil or per school to each local school precinct.

An example of this is when CCSD Chief Financial Officer Jason Goudie told the Senate Education Committee on April 5, 2019, "[W]e cannot allocate the funds to schools that are necessary to carry out items centrally while still carrying out those responsibilities."

This top-down mindset is inaccurate because when a service level agreement is reached, those dollars are sent back to CCSD to provide the service. In fact, once the authority to carry out a responsibility is given to a local school precinct, CCSD is no longer responsible or has the authority to provide the service unless an SLA is agreed to as prescribed in NAC 388G.110.

This also allows for local school precincts to have serious conversations about improving services since the SLA is a contract that contains the expectation of a certain level of service for a school who enters them.

A public example of this type of conflict happened during the 2019 Legislative Session on SB469. A major part of the bill was to allow CCSD to exempt utilities and transportation from the 85/15 ratio. If passed, it would also eliminate the SLA on these topics.

Jason Goudie highlighted CCSD's top-down mindset in the Assembly Education Committee on April 30, 2019, when he said, "In reality, the schools cannot make decisions around transportation at any specific level, because they cannot bond to buy the buses themselves. We still provide that service from the central office with an agreement whereby the schools essentially buy that service back from us."

First, this testimony to the Legislature was incorrect as CCSD was working with RTC at the time on a pilot program to have high school students use RTC bus passes as a way to reduce costs in transportation. It was announced a few months later that Spring Valley High School would be the first school to do this.

In addition, it failed to take into account that local school precincts may have serious conversations about improving services.

Testimony from the same committee by Twitchell Elementary School SOT member and now University Regent, Bryon Brooks highlighted poor service which resulted in one of the highest late bus rates in the entire district at his school:

"We also have an SLA that is essentially a contract with the central office on what is expected from any service provided by the district. This is a newer way of getting things done and the point of the reorganization.

The Las Vegas Review-Journal wrote that Twitchell Elementary School has one of the highest late bus rates in the district. The Clark County School District is challenged in terms of getting our kids to school on time and picking them up from school on time. Students who ride the bus are missing opening statements, the Pledge of Allegiance, and run behind for any after-school activities. Needless to say, student achievement is negatively affected by tardiness.

As an SOT member, we are hoping that we can have a real conversation about why this is happening because we have a contract and we should be able to ask for changes. This is one way that the reorganization changes and shapes the dynamics inside the district.”

The lack of proper information that CCSD provides to schools and other government agencies about SLAs prevents local school precincts from utilizing these agreements as the law and regulations intended.

Service Level Agreements concerning Correctional Schools.

In a review of Service Level Agreements, the one dealing with Correctional Schools particularly stood out in that it should not be an SLA due to the lack of autonomy or opportunities to make any modifications.

This SLA pays for the Juvenile Court School, secondary school for Spring Mountain Youth Camp School that includes middle and high school age population, and high school for Summit View Youth Camp School. Some students have been detained for as little as a couple of hours to as long as well over one year. Youth who are adjudicated and sentenced to one of the youth correctional facilities are generally incarcerated for six to eighteen months.

Upon further inspection of the SLA for Correction Schools it states that these schools are required under NRS and the SLA states that the agreement cannot be modified, terminated, or outsourced, and school administrators do not have any autonomy or control over this service.

We believe this does not fit the definition of a SLA under NAC 388G.110 -140 and offer two possible solutions.

These dollars should either be designated as restricted and placed outside the 85/15 ratio due to being required by state law under NRS 388G.660 (1a) which states in part:

“Money may only be identified as restricted if it is required by state or federal law, if it is prescribed by the Department or if it has been otherwise encumbered.

Another alternative is that correctional schools should be designated as a specialty school allowing it to become its own school precinct under NRS 388G.555 and NRS 388G.600 (1).

388G.555 includes an alternative program of education in the definition a specialty school and NRS 388G.600 (1) states that any specialty school be deemed a local school precinct.

While this latter option could technically fit under the law, we believe it would be problematic to have a functional SOT at a correctional school.

Inconsistencies in School Autonomy

We have heard stories and read news articles about how schools were once allowed to purchase or wanted to purchase services/products from outside vendors to help with student achievement only to be denied later without reason.

An example of this is CCSD's relationship with Data Insight Partners. Thirty-six (36) schools had agreed to a contract that was approved by CCSD for Data Insight Partners to provide program service that consisted of a program dashboard. The dashboard provides a visual collection of data displays and graphs that shows various data points for a school. The data can be filtered in a way to compare different racial/ethnic groups in attendance, achievement gap and transience to name a few.

For three years schools opted to utilize their purchasing authority to contract with Data Insight Partners. Even after CCSD did a pilot program with FocusED (the dashboard that CCSD created), schools that were in that pilot

program opted to contract with Data Insight Partners instead of using the CCSD program because they felt that Data Insight Partners had a superior product. These schools were willing to pay for a product from their own strategic budgets instead of using a free product CCSD was providing.

However, CCSD's purchasing department has denied school requests to purchase MyEducationData (the dashboard Data Insight Partners created).

We believe this is improper since in the absence of a service-level agreement, the school district has no authority or responsibility to provide the service to the local school precinct. Without a service level agreement with a local school precinct, the school district is limited in their ability to prevent them from using an outside vendor for a service.

Issues with Carryover and Attrition Dollars

During the hearings of the Advisory Committee to Develop the Plan to Reorganize the Clark County School District there was much discussion about the issue of teacher vacancies and where the savings on salary went when a school can only hire a long-term sub.

While the law is clear about those savings stay at the school, the committee also expressed that at least some of the attrition dollar savings should go to the school during the year so they can provide resources to help those long-term subs whether it is helping them with their lesson plans or other training so that those students were not left behind due to lack of a licensed educators.

However, it was said that this would not be possible due to the age of the Human Capital Management system in CCSD. That is one of the reasons that the 2017 Legislature approved \$17 million for a new Human Capital Management system for CCSD.

We believe that with the new HCM system, some of the attrition dollars can easily be provided to schools during the year to help those students who are being taught by a long-term sub instead of in October the following school year.

Requiring Schools to be Funded on a Per Pupil Basis (NRS 388G.670)

AB 469 required schools to be funded on a per pupil basis. CCSD has been operating on a waiver and funding schools on a staffing allocation model since the first strategic budgets were produced in January 2017. The strategic budgets for that year showed a transition to a per pupil amount through an equalization budget line. However, following a change in leadership that practice was discontinued on ensuing strategic budgets.

We believe CCSD has had enough time to figure out how to fund schools on a per pupil basis and any waiver should be denied now that five budget cycles have been completed since the original regulations were passed.

Issues on SOT Elections (NRS 388G.720)

Section 1d allows for parents or legal guardians to represent 50% of the voting members and that staff who have children at the school must be elected in their staff position as a licensed educator or support staff. We have seen instances where educators and support staff were elected as a parent member instead of the appropriate seat for which they should be running.

In addition, while not a violation of the NRS or NAC, but more of a concern, is seeing schools who struggled to fill parent seats on the smallest size an SOT can be (3 parents, 2 educators, 1 support staff) only later expand the size of the SOT to a much larger size while still being unable to fill the parent seats on the SOT. This has led some SOT's to have a majority of employees sitting on the SOT. We believe this goes against the intention of the law.

Issues with the Election of the Chair and Public Meetings of the SOT (NRS 388G.730)

Section 1 requires that the first order of business of a newly elected SOT is to elect a chair. We have seen minutes of numerous SOT that have failed to elect a chair at the first meeting and where the principal continues to chair the meetings.

Section 3 says that members of the public must be allowed to attend any portion of the meeting. Since meetings are only virtual, some schools fail to include how to get into the meeting on their agenda, depriving the public the right to attend. We saw similar issues prior to COVID-19 as the office manager may leave campus for the day while the SOT meeting is going on and lock the door, accidentally preventing the public the opportunity to attend the SOT meeting.

Lack of a Process for SOT's to Provide input on the Principal (NRS 388G.740)

Section 2 says the School Organizational Team may provide input regarding the principal of the local school precinct to the school associate superintendent not more than two times each school year.

Currently, there is no process or form to allow the School Organization Team to give input regarding the principal. In fact, of the many SOT's we have attended, we have never seen a principal tell a team about this section.