

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
ASSEMBLY BILL 469 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
SEPTEMBER 13, 2022
3:00 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

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Dr. Katherine Dockweiler, Chair
Mark Newburn, Vice President
Dr. René Cantú
Lisa Guzman
Tamara Hudson
Tim Hughes

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Felicia Gonzales, Consultant to the State Superintendent
Jose Silva, Chief Strategy Officer

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

Greg Ott, Chief Deputy Attorney General (DAG)

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

Ryan Lewis, Principal, Garehime Elementary School
Luke Pusching, Clark County School District
Nicole Donadio, Principal, Bob Miller Middle School
John Schleifer, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees
Eva White, Community member
Ed Gonzalez, School Organizational Team Member, Liliam Lujan Hickey Elementary School

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Meeting called to order at 3:00 P.M. by Chair Katherine Dockweiler. Quorum was established. Chair Dockweiler led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

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

Nicole Donadio, Principal, Bob Miller Middle School, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Ed Gonzalez, School Organizational Team Member, Liliam Lujan Hickey Elementary School, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

3. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE STATUS OF CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT'S (CCSD) CARRY FORWARD FUNDS

Jason Goudie, Chief Financial Officer, CCSD, and Kellie Kowal-Paul, Chief Strategy Officer, CCSD provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding [Information Related to School Carryforward Funds](#).

Vice President Mark Newburn expressed concern with the size of dollars seen for Carryforward funds because at the end of a legislative session it could end being swept away and not going to education. Vice president Newburn noted that the Board is looking for ways to keep the continued growth from happening and give Principals the flexibility to use the funds the way they choose. The Board is interested in ways to remove roadblocks the principal's have in spending those dollars as well as imposing some guardrails to the process. Vice President Newburn noted that the whole process of the reorganization was an attempt to spur innovation so the board is hoping that when the principal's have these dollars to spend, they can come up with new innovative processes that helps the students. Vice President Newburn asked what that process looks like, and what is being done to create that process. Mr. Goudie responded that there are different processes for different types of spend. Most of the spend that relates to personnel and other components that are school based are fairly unlimited. Regarding other uses of funds such as site-based projects involving construction or technology, those go through the appropriate groups meaning facility groups for approval to ensure that all the specs are met, and it works well as the technology department for those types of components.

Vice President Newburn asked CCSD to offer suggestions on possible guardrails on carryforward funds. Ms. Kowal-Paul responded that the CCSD Board of Trustees has been seeking the same thing. Last week the board of trustees passed the first draft of a regulation aligned to the entirety of the reorganization that has carry forward language throughout. For example, a monitoring piece has been added for the superintendent to monitor carry forward to ensure the money is spent on the students for whom it was allocated. This addition will be reflected in the next revision that goes to the Board of Trustees in October. The existing draft made it clear that principals have the authority and responsibility for carrying out the school plan of operation which included specifically planning for and the use of carry forward dollars toward meeting the goals established in the plan of operation. A list of items principals shall include in SOT conversations was also included in the existing draft. The Board of Trustees asked CCSD to add that the SOTs would be included in a conversation that considers the schools carry forward when parents are being asked to give contributions of school supplies for fuds to the schools. Ms. Kowal-Paul noted that in her own drafting of the district level regulation, she did not find guardrails to place that didn't feel like an overstep of the legislation.

Member Tim Hughes asked what the expectation of principal's is currently to use carryforward funds. Ms. Kowal-Paul responded that there is no current guidance for principals on the use of carryforward funds and noted that she anticipated it to be less strict. She does not believe that CCSD has the authority to put a timeline on the use although it would be wise. Ms. Kowal-Paul noted that she anticipates operationalizing tighter oversight from principal supervisors throughout the budget development process. The whole idea of carry over from the conversations in 2015-2016 was to mitigate the inability of schools to staff.

Chair Dockweiler asked why a principal has to apply to use their funds on certain resources. Why can't they just go out and purchase something, what the current timeframe is, and how that timeframe can be reduced. Mr. Goudie responded that the only items that have an application process are site funded projects or technology projects. Most of these are projects that would generally be funded from the district itself but given CCSD's limited resources financially and personnel wise were not able to get them. The deferred cap on CCSDs plan is about \$6 billion short of the need.

Member René Cantú noted that at a local high school had a Special Education teacher vacancy and an English teacher vacancy. If they are unable to higher that special education teacher now that student today is not receiving the benefit. Member Cantú asked how the district ensures one or two years from now, the dollars that were saved for special education are then used for special education and not some other project. Mr. Goudie responded that special education is separated from this component because it is restricted. CCSD works off its individualized education plans (IEP) so those have to be met regardless. There is no carryover in special education because there are mandated plans that have to be performed for each student each year and those are done through the SSD department. Member Cantú asked if that would also include ELL, GATE, or other special populations for which money is earmarked or weighted. Mr. Goudie responded that there are four weights in the new pupil centered funding plan. Special education could be called a quasi-weight, it is not a weight, it is outside the plan. If you receive money for special education, it does not matter whether you have one of the other three weights, you do not get any incremental weighted funding. Gifted and talented (GATE) is still a resource-based funding model you receive GATE funding as well as resources to support those programs. EL and At-risk receive weighted funding under the new funding model for both EL students and At-Risk students. Right now, the At-risk definition is students who receive free and reduced lunch which causes challenges because it does not address the true at-risk students. NDE and the State Board are working to revise a better program that truly bases At-Risk on what is called a graduate score. There are approximately 200 components for major areas that address all different types of needs through millions of points of data that truly show At-risk.

Member Cantú noted that it seems that local school precincts can carry forward dollars for an indefinite number of years. Mr. Goudie responded currently under the law yes. Member Cantú asked if the district believes there should be some guardrails or limits. Mr. Goudie responded that there should be some limits on time, what needs to considered is that even thought carryover may be somewhat of a recurring cost, it really is not. It is a one shot of money at one point in time If to much limitation is put on it, then you run the risk of spending a large amount and then are not able to recur those programs over time. Mr. Goudie noted that he believes there should be guardrails for carryforward funds but that he does not know what they are. He does not want to limit principals in being able to spend the funds in the ways they see fit over a period of time.

Member Lisa Guzman asked if the carryforward dollars conflict with any CCSD policies or regulations with the amount of carry forward dollars that schools would carryforward. Ms. Kowal-Paul responded that CCSD will need to look at the policy because it is her understanding that the law would trump the local policy.

Chair Dockweiler referred to slide seven of the presentation that notes one of the barriers being teacher and substitute shortages and asked if those carry over funds have been used or could be used as retention

bonuses for staff currently at a school. Mr. Goudie responded that if the district were to implement an increase in pay, by law the district would have to increase their budgets in order to meet the law. If the district were to implement a district wide incentive program, it would increase the individual school's budget and it would not do anything to technically spend the carryover piece because essentially, the district is funding the additional component. There have been conversations around addressing some of the specific high need schools. One of the ways that is being done now is that there are incentives allowable for licensed personnel only. The challenge with this is the weights are not fully funded yet.

Chair Dockweiler asked if there is anything prohibiting an SOT to choose to spend funds on a retention stipend. Mr. Goudie responded that currently there is no ability for additional stipends to pay to the principal's discretion for those components. There is a couple of equity concerns in that. There is going to be significantly higher carryover in some of these schools that may not be high need and if the District opened it up, they can pay very large sums of money to attract teachers out of the schools where we may need them more.

Member Hughes asked if principals could collectively say we would like to give X% of these dollars for retention bonuses to be used in a strategic way across the district. Mr. Goudie responded that he does not know for sure. If the principals were using their discretion, and they all agreed and did something like that there is some way to do that within the law.

Chair Dockweiler referenced the time limits for establishing a monitoring process for the carry forward funds and asked if CCSD has an anticipated time frame and what the process would look like. Ms. Kowal-Paul responded that the list of new operational responsibilities set up by the district's new regulation is very long. Some of them are date specific which would mean they will be the first priority for the district. Vice President Newburn noted that carry forward funds will be an ongoing effort and discussion and as the subcommittee gets a better understanding on what it can do guardrail wise, he would like the district to think about suggestions. Chair Dockweiler agreed.

Chair Dockweiler invited Ryan Lewis, Principal, Garehime Elementary School and Nicole Donadio, Principal, Bob Miller Middle School to answer questions on carryforward funds and how it relates to their work.

Vice President Newburn noted that in the early days of carry forward dollars the thinking was typically there would be Title I schools that would have trouble hiring full time staff and be forced to utilize substitute teachers and those dollars went away from those kids somewhere else. The intent was if the dollars are kept, the principals will figure out other ways to spend them to support the students who couldn't have the full-time teacher. There were discussions about additional out of school programs and summer programs. Vice President Newburn asked if this type of thinking really works. Ms. Donadio responded that she believes that kind of thinking works. Currently at her school they have not received that type of additional support. However, they have used carryover funds to be incredibly creative to meet the needs of the students. Specifically in programming when you're looking at students in sixth through eighth grade it's okay if they could not find a math teacher because they could transition to prep buys and then offering children co-teach classes, grade level classes, accelerated classes, double accelerated classes, algebra, and geometry in the building because of carryover funds. In terms of students who are struggling with social emotional barriers, keeping them from accessing curriculum, Ms. Donadio and her team have put into place a miller mindset academy where they are again able to buy preps because there maybe is not "the right teacher" for the all-day programming but they are reaching those kids where they are emotionally so that they are still accessing rigorous curriculum and they are on campus.

Mr. Lewis noted that before carryforward funds, his school had to expend all excess dollars every year because they had no choice because they would otherwise lose the funds. This created limitations because they would end up spending some dollars not as wisely as they would have liked to because they had to encumber them or lose them. Mr. Lewis noted that the current situation is a much better compromise to that. In previous years, there was not enough funds in his school's budget to run the school at a level that was what the students deserved, and they had to rely on fundraising by parents to supplement the funds. Currently, Mr. Lewis noted that he does have enough money in his budget to run the school the way it should be run without having to depend on parents or students to fundraise dollars for the school. It has taken until this school year to do so.

Mr. Lewis noted that the presentation given by Mr. Goudie and Ms. Kowal-Paul was very fair and did a great job of articulating what some of the challenges are that principals have. There is a capacity issue within the district to carry out this new wave of thinking. There are structures within the system that need to be put in place to allow innovation and to reach those kids that have barriers.

Member Hughes asked for Mr. Lewis and Ms. Donadio's perspective about the idea of the right balance between autonomy and accountability. Ms. Donadio responded that she believes that the district has always focused on aligning a school's resources to where the need is based on the school's data. No matter what that has looked like over the years even in terms of the school performance plan where you have put your resources and you have identified areas that are being worked on for improvement, they are routinely called back through supervisory conferences and through the Nevada State performance framework.

4. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT'S (CCSD) PROGRESS RELATED TO THE ALLOCATION OF 85 PERCENT OF UNRESTRICTED FUNDS TO LOCAL SCHOOL PRECINCTS

Vice President Newburn noted that CCSD has been very consistent from the very beginning that they could not meet the 85-15 and the Legislature has also been consistent and that they expect the district to meet the 85-15. Vice President Newburn noted that he is hoping for concurrence on providing an opportunity for the district to prove its case. Unfortunately, this may involve making the Board more informed in the budgeting process and it will take some time to bring the Board up to speed so that they understand the details and the intricacies involved around the process. Having read the presentation regarding the 85-15 provided by CCSD at the July 7th Board meeting, Vice President Newburn noted that he does not believe the notion that you can sweep the items under NRS 388G.610 (3) and declare them as restricted funds. Vice President Newburn noted that the Attorney General's office has also stated that this is not allowable. The intent was that the 15% would include those things and that was the cap of the central office spending to force more dollars to the school. Vice President Newburn noted that he views these as unrestricted dollars because if they suddenly become restricted dollars, it creates the sense that central office could grow unbounded and could suddenly start pouring dollars in there because they are coming off the top.

Chair Dockweiler asked CCSD for an explanation, background information, and legal aspects for the claiming of unrestricted funds. Mr. Goudie responded that the way that NRS 388G.661(a) reads "money may only be identified as restricted if it is required by State or Federal law or if it is proscribed by the department, or if it has been otherwise encumbered" going back to the point around 388G.610(3) it says that "except as otherwise provided in subsection seven, a large school district shall remain responsible for paying for and carry out all other responsibilities necessary for the operation of local school precincts, and the large school district which have not been transferred to the local school precincts to subsection two without limitation responsibility for items listed A through U." Mr. Goudie noted that one part of law requires the district to perform and pay for these services, and another part requires the district to give almost 50% of the cost of those to the schools in the order for the district to meet the 85-15 component.

Chair Dockweiler asked if A to U were classified as restricted, what is left to the schools and what flexibility do they have in their spending. Mr. Goudie responded that they have their school strategic budgets which is that those numbers alone. There is also what is called supplemental allocations of schools which are some of the items that were previously transferred to schools so therefore they have this money and there are testing components to where the district was not able to provide, and the money was moved to the schools because they could better utilize those funds. Mr. Goudie noted that those funds are around 78% of unrestricted and about \$1.85 billion.

Vice President Newburn noted that the Board will need to bring in their own financial expertise because they are trying to create an open forum where the community can see what is going on and surprisingly not everybody believes everything CCSD says. Having alternate experts confirming, challenging, or offering alternate solutions would be beneficial.

Member Hughes noted that given the other topics discussed such as possible option of consequences, and ask what happens if the Board does nothing, the 85-15 remains and CCSD continues to not be in compliance. Superintendent Ebert responded that the Board has put into motion the steps taken if CCSD is not in compliance with NRS. Those steps are laid out but have not been fully approved by the Legislative Commission yet but will be on the agenda for the meeting at the end of the month. Until the Board makes a determination of whether CCSD is in compliance with the definition of where the components fit into the 85-15, the department will not impose consequences. Member Hughes noted that in the previous conversations, finding requisite expertise to dig into the specific areas that are not in compliance was discussed and so it feels like the Board may be doing the same thing twice because the consequences put into place should take care of this issue in theory if ultimately CCSD states that they are unable to meet the 85-15. Vice President Newburn responded that because the authority is split up between the Board and the Superintendent, the Board could walk away and let the Superintendent use the consequence ladder and issue a notice of noncompliance, bring in a monitor which could do the work. Vice President Newburn noted that the Board's authority is in regulations that could be written to clarify the situation and help, and the Board has stated before that they are interested in helping. Member Hughes asked CCSD if they feel if going down the pathway of implementing new regulations would be helpful. Ms. Kowal-Paul responded that the more they educate the Board and the Community about what they are dealing with the better. Ms. Kowal-Paul noted that she would not normally choose regulation over work, but in this case she would choose a greater understanding by all over any other option and that would be better served through the Board's work.

Member Cantú noted that the hope to build, establish, and grow trust with CCSD and one of the things that would help him develop that trust is transparency by having someone from the Board or NDE to examine A through U in detail and discover if there is anything larded up in the category and if in fact CCSD can not achieve the 85-15 then perhaps the Board could advocate for CCSD that it is an arbitrary number and move forward together to serve students.

Chair Dockweiler noted that as the Board and the district move forward and receive clarification on some terminology and legal definitions, she would caution that the Board refrains from labeling the A through U as restricted until further information is received in which to educate everybody involved.

Mr. Goudie noted that CCSD has no problems opening up the books and having individuals come in and validate the numbers. Mr. Goudie offered to provide a summary A through U and the details behind those numbers as a first step to start the conversation and provide detail. Vice President Newburn stated that he is interested in an understanding of the general budget as well as an understanding of the budget as seen by a local school precinct to be helpful in monitoring of the reorganization law. Chair Dockweiler agreed and thanked CCSD for their participation in the meeting.

5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Vice President Newburn suggested legal opinion on the restricted funds and the A through U being listed as restricted as well as an opinion on to what the Board could do regulation wise around determining restricted versus unrestricted in the context. Chair Dockweiler suggested another conversation with additional information that the Board is looking for from the district regarding carryforward funds and the legal aspects of the Board's ability and scope under the 85-15 and the restricted or unrestricted items A through U.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

Ed Gonzalez, School Organizational Team Member, Liliam Lujan Hickey Elementary School, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:17 P.M.

APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS GIVEN DURING PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Ryan Lewis, Principal, Garehime Elementary School provided public comment regarding AB 469.
2. Nicole Donadio, Principal, Bob Miller Middle School, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
3. Ed Gonzalez, School Organizational Team Member, Liliam Lujan Hickey Elementary School, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
4. Ed Gonzalez, School Organizational Team Member, Liliam Lujan Hickey Elementary School, provided public comment regarding AB 469.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 1: RYAN LEWIS

Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Ryan Lewis. I am the current past president for the Clark County Association of School Administrators and also the current elementary principal at Garehime Elementary School. It is good to see you all. It is good to be back and to comment on this issue again. You've seen me before and it's good to see everybody. I came in my running shoes um ate lunch on the way and going right back to an SOT immediately following this. I'm here today to actually kind of speak to the positive on the direction that this is going. I'm not here to be discouragingly uh debate on the length of time is has taking us to get here. What I want to speak to is that carryover dollars are kind of misunderstood by a lot of people on how that gets to that place. For the first time this past year we were able to access those dollars getting ready for the budget for this current school year. We've always had access to those dollars. I'm not gonna say that we didn't, it was just delayed, and a lot of times didn't have access until the fall which it's really hard to deal with at that time. So, it's just a timing issue. So this has really been the first year that we could really use those dollars in planning and prep dollars in planning and preparation for the upcoming year and we're gonna be able to do so for the second time in this January. So that's a positive step forward. I think that needs to be acknowledged. Number two is we want to encumber the funds. I think that's a misconception that people have that you know, we don't want to spend money for whatever reason and there isn't a principal out there that does not want to be fully staffed and funning at 100% efficiency and the dollars are remaining at the level that they should be meaning the school level. We're just gonna need time to be able to operate those dollars meaning finding the right people which we know is a real shortage that's where a lot of these dollars come from is staffing shortages. That's in my own current budget. Um, and that's where the dollars come from. We spend every cent as far as instructionally in that it just carryover dollars that we will happily spend when we get the opportunity to do so. That is no one's fault other than a system flaw that we have to work through as a country and even as the State of Nevada to finding the right people. So, I think that's something that needs to continue that should not be stripped away from that site-based control. It's the circumstances that we're now in and I just wanted to highlight that we're moving in the right direction, that sense of having those dollars available to be spent and planned for in a timely manner in a budget standpoint and those that dollar amount that we all see as carryover will diminish as we have the capacity to be fully staffed every year um to serve the student that we have in our buildings and I'm happy to entertain any questions or concerns as we move forward in this process. I would be happily involved in that conversation to give you the proper information so that we can make educated decisions. So, thank you.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 2: NICOLE DONADIO

My name is Nicole Donadio, this is my 12th year serving as the proud principal of Bob Miller Middle School and my 25th year serving the students of the Clark County School District. It's worth noting that my husband and I are both proud products of the Clark County School District and UNLV alumni. We have two daughters, thriving in local public schools in terms of our love for the State of Nevada and the Clark County School District we are all in. In preparing for this opportunity, it's bittersweet to reflect on the journey of our SOT since the inception of AB 469 the sweet is the intention behind it, putting decision making in the right hands. The bitter part is that it's truly only now that we begin to pursue legitimate conversations about preparing future ready student. When we embarked upon developing our SOT in January of 2017, one of our first tasks was to create a strategic budget for that school year over the course of the next four years. As an SOT we worked together to weather some total of nearly \$600,000 in cuts. Despite these cuts we pursued rich conversations about how to engage all students in rigorous learning opportunities while paying equal respect to our crucial role in students social emotional development and growth. In prior years carry over money simply served to maintain a minimum standard. In my nearly 12 years at Miller, our enrolment declined from 1731 to just over 1500 students. This decline in enrollment occurred at the same time that CCSD was making cuts district wide. One might surmise that the quality of our programming must have suffered. Instead, together as an SOT with carryover funds, we were able to hang on to the many programs that make Miller exceptional. Fast forward to today, we've engaged our communities and years of deciding how to allocate meager budgets that barely keep doors open. Now that the essence of AB 469 is so very close to being realized, I implore you to double down on the SOT model and believe in the exact same people charged with making those tough decisions. Carryover funds must stay with the stewards who have a vested interest in the community for which the funds have been allocated. Teams must also be allowed to fully apply their expertise to differentiate programming for all learners. I encourage you to exercise patient endurance and allow for AB 469 to work. It cannot work if the decision makers do not have full autonomy over every single penny that is allocated to that community. It takes years of implementing a plan with fidelity to see positive outcomes. For SOTs, carryover money means we finally have the chance to direct our funds toward innovative endeavors that can make each school community the very best for their kids. Thank you for your consideration.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 3: ED GONZALEZ

Thank you, madam chair, Superintendent Eber, members of the committee. For the record my name is Ed Gonzalez. I am the community member at the Hickey Elementary School Organizational Team but today I'm speaking as an individual as always. I do appreciate the principals coming up here. I've you know when you get feedback from principals it's always a good thing and I do appreciate one coming just before they're SOT meeting. I gave the secretary a sheet that you might have in front of you the reason I gave this is that as you heard me say time and time again that the items in 388G I think it's 610 number 3 list all the services the A through U list is it should not be labeled as restricted. What this is this is the second amendment to AB 469 when that issue was brought before the legislature, I'll direct you to the end of page six in the beginning of page seven on it what you see in the purple highlight is language stricken from the bill and if you look at number three which is on top of page seven. This states what is restricted. Number three is necessary for the large school district to carry out the responsibilities pursuant to subsection three of NRS 388G.610. So, the legislature had an opportunity to look to see if this language or see if this item should be restricted out of the 85-15. This is actually the second time in that session that language was struck out. This language was the final bill which is you can see from the amendment was from Chairman Flores of the education committee they had an opportunity to see should those responsibilities be outside the 85-15 ratio. And the reason they chose not to, is actually looked at the school budget. They looked at two. The district provided one from Bass Elementary and one from Basic High School and they saw that the amount of money that would be taken out what the district said was non-discretionary dollars because they didn't have full control and opposition to the NAC would be a large amount of money. So, they chose to keep that language. What is currently is which is part of the 85-15. So that's one concern. But I wanted to see the actual language as we got in the presentation. The second thing you hear is that 15% has to be running central and in fact it's the starting point. You know, has services are brought back from the district like it used to be utilities before the SLAs were repealed, custodians, landscaping, that percentage grows at one point it was estimated to be at 45% but it was in control of the principals. And then the third thing I'll bring up madam Chair is that there are some responsibilities that are pushed down to schools that aren't part of the SLA that are that was put down before SLAs were created. Those were custodians and those were site-based technicians or information technology services don't have full control over those dollars. And more importantly the NAC does say that any responsibility are passed down to school require service level agreement. Those don't exist. Even the landscaping that was passed the rural communities still does not have a service level agreement. I think one of the fallacies you hear is the principals don't want responsibility if they just want to hire everything through the district and we expect most principals may do that. In the beginning. They would just check a box off and check it out. And ill have more to say in the second public comment cause I believe that is my time correct. Thank you.

APPENDIX A, ITEM \$: ED GONZALEZ

Ed Gonzalez for the record. Thank you for letting me have a second opportunity. I do appreciate this committee when I handed out the amendment from last time when member Newburn mentioned we need to look at budgets, that's exactly what Chairman Flores requested. He requested two budgets and basically gave us 24 hours to respond to what we thought. And so the argument that I had is when you're looking at the restricted dollars if you restricted that A through U list if you took away and it was at an elementary school is back in elementary they had a \$3.7 million budget. Take away the principal you take away the office manager, you take away the k-three with all teachers they don't have any discretion. The term they used was it doesn't take away discretionary dollars. It ends up being about 2.2 of \$3.7 million dollar budget could have just been wiped away. No change, so that's why that amendment came forward. But I do want to highlight some other issues that this body has mentioned. I think when it looks at teacher retention or trying to fill those vacancies especially on the east side, and more importantly to Member Hughes point and Member Cantú originally the average teacher's salary was 82,000. It's approaching 96. The long-term subs of vacancy subs have gone up. It has not gone up \$14,000 so even those vacancies are even larger now. We could do at a school level what they did in SB 511 and 2015 session we can easily offer \$5000 to a school for a teacher to come in. The district does have for middle schools for 10. Honestly, we could probably offer 20,000 to get those teachers to come into the school on our side of town which is far from everything. You know gas, you know it's over at Sunrise Mountain High School. It's very it's a long way to get there teachers don't live in that area. So, that's one thing I want to mention. The number two, we talked about SLA I think there's a simple process that we can do and I made a chart and I apologize I will send a picture of this. The board. This is for landscaping, landscaping was transferred down. I took a budget from Palo Verde in 2019 2020 \$58,715.99 it could be a box saying I want the service from say CCSD at that level. I want company A which costs a little more, company B which costs slightly more, company C which costs a little bit less or the box on the bottom. I want a different level of service and so I think one of the things that Ms. Kowal-Paul had mentioned is that they don't want principals to dictate the service. That would be true if I want more and if I want more it costs more. And I think that's one of the things that you hear from principals is that there are some services they don't feel like do good coverage. So instead of having somebody come twice a month, maybe want three or four times a month, it's a different level of services and require slightly different negotiation to see what it is. And so I'm gonna take my cue from the Chair and member Newburn to be positive and to come up with solutions. I think retention signing for teachers on east side, we don't have teachers. I think is very doable and would help HR when they say you can come in with \$50,000 a \$5000 bonus in the school will give you more. I think that would help solve some of those problems, but it can't be trying to take teachers from other schools and that's why 511 initially did. New teachers come in it got watered down to people coming in from other school and eventually it became something so small that it was insignificant. Thank you Madam Chair.