

**Nevada Department of Education
Nevada State Board of Education
NRS 388G Subcommittee
October 15, 2025
3:00 PM**

Office	Address	City	Meeting
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Rd.	Las Vegas	Room 114
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Silver Ore
Department of Education	Virtual	YouTube Link	

Summary Minutes of the Subcommittee Meeting

Subcommittee Members Present

Dr. Tricia Braxton
Danielle Ford
Tamara Hudson

Members Absent Excused

None

Department Staff Present

Lisa Ford, Interim Deputy Superintendent for the Student Achievement Division
Amelia Thibault, Management Analyst
Angie Castellanos, Administrative Assistant
Zach Khan, Administrative Assistant

Legal Staff Present

Greg Ott, Chief Deputy Attorney General

Audience in Attendance

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Meeting called to order at 3:00 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
- ii. Lindsay Dally, Community Member
- iii. Erica Nungaray, Parent, Clark County School District High School Registrar

3. Information, Discussion, and Possible Action Regarding the Review of Statutory and Possible Regulatory Changes Related to NRS 388G.500-810 (*Information, Discussion, and Possible Action*)

Lisa Ford, Interim Deputy Superintendent of the Student Achievement Division, delivered a presentation that provided an overview of the statutory changes to NRS 388G enacted through Senate Bill 460 (SB 460). Her review focused on: Substantial changes resulting from SB 460, including the striking of NRS 388G.500 and the removal of all language associated with NRS 388G.610. The addition of language in blue and removed language struck through in red within the statutory draft. Substantive changes in NRS 388G.650, where authority regarding carry forward monies was changed from "shall not" to "may intervene." Changes to reporting dates in NRS 388G.680 and 388G.690, giving the Superintendent authority to

determine the date rather than fixed dates. The removal of the last sentence under Section 5 of NRS 388G.740 and the addition of a new section speaking to the creation of Innovation Schools by July 2026. Discussion ensued regarding the operational impact of the statutory changes on school precincts and the subsequent regulatory work required by the State Board of Education (SBE).

Chair Braxton asked Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Greg Ott to confirm whether the Clark County School District (CCSD) was currently obligated to begin implementing responsibilities outlined in SB 460. DAG Ott confirmed that the district was obligated to enact the statute according to its effective dates, noting that effective dates varied by section.

Member Ford and Member Hudson expressed concerns about voids left by the repealed statutory language, specifically noting the need for guidance and clarification, particularly around School Organizational Team (SOT) training.

Interim Deputy Superintendent Ford clarified that the SBE's authority for regulatory change was limited only to areas where statutory authority was granted; matters requiring new policy or authority must be addressed through the legislative process via a bill draft. She also clarified that the SOT training plan is approved by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, not the SBE.

The subcommittee discussed the need for a definitive timeline and a plan to integrate community input into the regulatory process.

Member Braxton moved that the subcommittee requested the Department of Education (NDE) identify all related administrative code (NAC) reflective of NRS 388G, propose changes to that language, and present the information to the subcommittee for review prior to going to workshop. Member Ford seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Member Braxton moved that the Department of Education (NDE) provide the subcommittee with the identified regulatory changes and draft language for consideration regarding NRS 388G.500 through 810 no later than December 1. Member Ford seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

The members then discussed scheduling the next meeting, which DAG Ott advised be handled offline by the Chair to comply with open meeting laws.

4. Public Comment #2

- i. Ed Gonzalez, Community Member
- ii. Lindsay Dally, Community Member
- iii. Anna Binder, Community Member

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

The subcommittee members offered the following item for future agenda consideration:

- Chair Braxton requested a discussion to begin developing regulations that establish and govern the creation and operation of innovation schools.

6. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by Chair Braxton at 4:16 PM.

Appendix A: Statements given during public comments

1. Ed Gonzalez, Community Member, provided public comment regarding agenda item 3.
2. Lindsay Dally, Community Member, provided public comment regarding agenda item 3.
3. Erica Nungaray, Parent, Clark County School District High School Registrar, provided public comment regarding agenda item 3.
4. Ed Gonzalez, Community Member, provided public comment regarding agenda item 3, during public comment #2.
5. Lindsay Dally, Community Member, provided public comment regarding agenda item 3, during public comment #2.
6. Anna Binder, Community Member, provided written comment regarding agenda item 3, during public comment #2.

Appendix A, Item 1: ED GONZALEZ

Thank you, Madam Chair, Deputy Superintendent Ford and members of the committee. For the record my name is Ed Gonzalez. The reason I come to speak is on item 3 is looking at some of the reviews statutory and regulatory changes. I feel like on the when we look at SB 460 that was a very large bill. It was an omnibus bill and when it pertains to 380 AG in the reorganization there seems to be a lot of. Unintended con. Intended consequences. Oversights as you can tell from the document and I do appreciate deputy Superintendent Ford for the document. There was a lot of things that have been taken out of the code I'll give some examples of concerns that we have that we think should be put into the regulatory practice you see on page 8 of the document NRS 38610 that takes out of. Statute what goes what responsibilities are passed down to a school. It's essentially what would go in a budget the selection of principals and staff. And nothing has replaced that. There's also other areas to you about the provision for the 8515 as well that will be pulled out of it and I believe July first 2026 and so if you go to page. 18 it's going to say the team still have to vote on a budget but there's nothing to say what's actually in a budget and you can see in the school board policy that they're currently debating and and we'll have a second read voting on there's a line that says. That a portion of the school budget is determined by the Superintendent. I don't have an issue with that as a short term because that's a Superintendent determine what's in a budget. We have budgets coming in January and February to be voted on for next year but we don't have any guidance. I think what we're missing is we have gaps in the law we need. Definition and guidance as well and I think it's completely missing. So, you have teams who are going to be asked to do stuff and have no idea what that's going to require and all that could do is cause confusion. There's other aspects of the law as well. There's sections where they deal with purchase of services that is located on page. 13 in NRS read HG 650 section one B schools are able to get a list of equipment services and supplies they may obtain from a large school district but once again the section of the law has been pulled out. So there is actually no definition of what a service they could provide is. So like I said there's many gaps in this law as it currently stands. I know. We'll talk about the rural allocation part of it that's also in another section I believe that's in 670. But like I said there's many provisions in here that will be reviewed. There's also some additional ideas I know that was brought forth by a different bill that legislature did not pass. As pertaining to how to make SOTS form better but I think in the short term there's many areas that need to be defined. Another section that was added in the law was in 650 Section 5 where a Superintendent may intervene into spend carry forward money. That should be defined as well. Thank you.

Appendix A, Item 2: LINDSAY DALLY

Good afternoon, I think it's not evening yet. My name is Lindsay dally. I'm from logndale. Wanted to just briefly address the gaps that SB 460 legislation has left in rural schools in Clark County. And. We in logondale and northeast Clark County as well as other areas in Clark County. Easily meet the rural remote the state rural remote criteria. But we get swallowed up in the large urbanis of CCSD and and I understand why. But the

reality is is. We we have to. We can't educate by zip codes and that's one of the problems. Is that our our students don't get this the same opportunities afforded because of their zip code so we got to be really careful about that and we do we we we've got some ideas and thoughts on how to do that? We started to work with CCSD to the end of jara 's term you know for good or for bad. And then then it was cut short but we I could see a room for legislation because the specific concern that is going to be brought up. Is? In the the part of the law that was eliminated 388 G 0.60. Law 670. Very small paren and I I wanna I'm gonna just cherry pick out the part here so you can know what I'm referring to. It says except if a specialty school is proportionately reduced in size or manner authorized blah blah blah the weights and categories assigned pursuant to this section must ensure. That any specialist school or rural school that exists on and gives the date May 17th. Or may 2017. Before the district became a large school district. So what we have here is an attempt there to make some equity between before and after so that you know things just wouldn't be laid waste well that got pulled out and so now where are we and I would suggest. That regulation could maybe fill that gap because we're in a particularly unusual situation where the school district has a small school and I put it in quotes allocation budget to that. What it does is it provides additional teachers? For remote rural schools which is appropriate but it does it on a sliding scale and the more students you get the less teachers you have. Now you're going OK. How does that work you know? There and so anyway that's one of the one of the issues and there needs to be addressed and on that rural mall part and we we've got some ideas and thoughts on that and would love to help thanks.

Appendix A, Item 3: ERICA NUNGARAY

Good afternoon, Chair Braxton and members of the board for the record my name is Erica Nungaray. I'm a parent of students in elementary middle and high school and I also work for the Clark County school district as a high school. Register for the past 5 years I've served on my children 's school organization teams at each level. From that experience I can tell you that the lack of training for SOT members is a serious issue. Not only for parents and staff but even for some principals over the years I've done my best to learn the process and understand budget allocations. But every time I start to gain a clear picture the laws funding formulas change. Often without real explanation or accessible training to help teams keep up it doesn't make sense to expect SOTS to make informed budget decisions when members don't receive constant or meaningful training. In my experience the school budgets we receive are estimates at best and there is no stable transparent formula that carries over from one year to the next. I strongly recommend that the department require standardized data-driven training. For all SOT members one that explains real budget formulas, funding sources and how changes affect school level decisions. That kind of training empowers teens to participate with confidence and accountability when schools choose principles the processes is often misunderstood. Sots only recommend candidates who have already and advanced by regional superintendents. The team is not given access to all applicants and even then, the final decision rests with the Superintendent not the SOT when an administrator is under performing or a leadership issue arises. The responsibility should not fall on the SOT whose role is advisory not decisive I believe budget decisions should remain at school level where those closest to the students can best determine how resources are used. The central office already provides oversight and approval ensuring accountability without removing schoolboys recently decisions would only reduce transparency weaken the purpose of NRS 388 G which was meant to give schools families and communities. A seat at the table. Please keep decision makings at school level where those closest to students understand their needs best. Thank you for your time.

Appendix A, Item 4: ED GONZALEZ

Thank you again Madam Chair members of the committee intern deputy Superintendent Ford for the record my name is Ed Gonzalez first of all I do appreciate this meeting. This was very helpful. With the information I do appreciate deputy interim deputy Superintendent reminding us of the 2 regulations the state board has passed which had not been codified even though those are 3 years old. It is 3 OK I know none of them has to deal with the selection of staff that has the state Supreme Court opinion. That's one of the things that definitely needs to be updated on to it and then there's other aspects too. I know that it was mentioned earlier about training. I know

I sit on multiple SOTs. One of them is fairly new and I had the SOT meeting and when you talk about training it sort of seems to be it's sort of the abyss right. If you sort of know you know but you're just being referred to the information that was approved by the department by the district, and I believe that's in the next I think there is some ability to make some changes to it? But I think the thing I mentioned at the last meeting that we had was the ability for outside groups to be able to to bring forward training that could be approved. One of the things we've seen is we've seen a lot of I want to say misinformation on the law. We've seen things that SOTS like can I vote on the budget because this bill SB 460 is so. So large it's just trying to navigate it. So that's one aspect of it but I do want to mention the fact that when we did the original reorganization regulations it started in October and the legislation finished by July. So that gave a decent time frame on to it. So this could be faster because you're not recreating stuff you're sort of tweaking. But I do appreciate interim deputy Superintendent Ford. I thought your explain wonderful. You might have seen us whispering to each other like well that's a really good explanation. I wish I could explain it that well so I just want to put that on the record. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Appendix A, Item 5: LINDSAY DALLY

This is Lindsay dally. For the record I am really glad the way this all turned out I was getting really nervous when we I felt I felt like we were sinking into the depths of bureaucracy. And it was just stressing out over it. But I appreciate member Ford 's concerns and member Braxton 's efforts to bring. Organization out of chaos. And I agree with Lisa Ford while we're in the midst of a giant jigsaw puzzle handed to us by the legislature. This building a regulatory monument that just solves the puzzle. But doesn't improve the educational experience for the student and the teacher. Another way to say it is we need to keep the goal in mind of improving education not just solving the puzzle parents students and soughts are looking to the state board for guidance and help to improve education not just to discuss process and policy. A great post doctoral teacher of mine gave this great quote in one of his lectures. I'm going to do it slow because it's kind of confusing. The main thing is to keep the main thing the main thing. And just think about it. OK parents students and sought see the main thing as a teacher and a student that are in a classroom with valuable learning taking place this body needs to solve the puzzle and move the educational ball down the field which I think which I feel has started today. The rural version of this is the water needs to get to the end of the garden. Thank you

Appendix A, Item 6: ANNA BINDER

I want to thank each of you for the thoughtful work you're doing to align the new 388G legislation with the ongoing responsibilities of School Organizational Teams (SOTs) and local school precincts. Your willingness to listen, collaborate, and forge a clear path forward means a great deal to those of us working closely in the field.

For several years, there have been repeated conversations about the need for consistent, high-quality training for SOT members — training that is independent of the district and focused on building capacity at the school level. Too often, those efforts fell to the wayside. As we revisit the implementation of 388G, I urge us to center that commitment again: ensuring that training is meaningful, accessible, and grounded in the spirit of local empowerment envisioned by the statute.

We've also faced ongoing budgetary and transparency challenges over recent years. Under NRS 388G.650 – .690, precincts are entitled to clear visibility into allocations, carry-forwards, and spend-downs. For site-based decision-making to work, schools must be able to identify how dollars are spent, not just what's allocated on paper.

As always, I offer any contribution to this next phase of work, reviewing both the new statutory updates and existing NAC 388G regulations, and helping identify any remaining gaps or definitional gray areas that may hinder schools from operating efficiently, transparently, and in full alignment with legislative intent.

Thank you again for your commitment to collaboration and for helping restore the foundation of trust and accountability that local school governance depends on.