

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
ASSEMBLY BILL 469 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
MARCH 14, 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
Tamara Hudson
Tim Hughes
Lisa Guzman

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Felicia Gonzales, Consultant to the State Superintendent

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

Kenneth Paul, Principal, W. Mack Lyon Middle School
Jeff Horn, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees (CCASAPE)
Kelly Grondahl, Principal, Vegas Verdes Elementary School
Ed Gonzalez, School Organizational Team Member, Liliam Lujan Hickey Elementary School
John Schleifer, CCASAPE
Anna Binder, community member
Leonardo Benavites, community member
Lindsey Dally, Community Education Advisory Board
Linda Cavazos, community member

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

Meeting called to order at 3:03 P.M. by Chair Katherine Dockweiler. Quorum was established. Chair Dockweiler led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

Kenneth Paul, Principal, W. Mack Lyon Middle School, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

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

Kelly Grondahl, Principal, Vegas Verdes Elementary 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)*

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

Dana Roseman, Principal, Jesse D. Scott Elementary School, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

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

Tam Larnerd, community member, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

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

Felicia Gonzales, Consultant to the State Superintendent, Nevada Department of Education, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding [Assembly Bill 469 National Non-Compliance Policy Examples and Proposed Regulatory Language](#).

Member Lisa Guzman noted that the examples provided from other States are specific statutes that allow for the appointment of a receiver and are primarily for financial reasons. Member Guzman asked if there is a place in Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) that provides for a receiver specifically in 388G. Senior Deputy Attorney General (DAG) David Gardner responded that NRS 388G.580 subsection one states the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall take such actions as deemed necessary and appropriate. DAG Gardner stated that the word receiver is not in the statute, but the term “takes such actions as deemed necessary and appropriate” is a large enough term to allow for the receivers. Member Guzman asked what safeguards are being put into place to ensure that the large school district doesn’t need a receiver. Superintendent Jhone Ebert responded that with the proposed regulatory language presented today, a receiver is the very last step. Superintendent Ebert noted that if the school district and the Superintendent come into compliance then this work is moot, but if the school district does not come into compliance, the department has laid out steps that would be taken. Chair Dockweiler noted that these policies will be in place regardless of who happens to be a member of the Board, a superintendent of a large district, or superintendent of the State.

Vice President Mark Newburn noted section 1(e) of the proposed regulatory language regarding placing a large school district in either partial or full receivership and suggested adding language that states *with the approval of the State Board*, place a large school district in either partial or full receivership. Vice President Newburn stated that there should be a safeguard at that point where in the future this decision to place the fifth largest school district in receivership cannot be made by one person in private with no public input. It should come with the weight of both the State Superintendent and the State Board of Education. DAG Gardner stated that adding language regarding the power of the State Board in this matter, will make it more difficult to pass through legislation, and the Legislative Council Bureau (LCB) may reject it entirely. However, the Board has the ability to decide what to do with their regulatory power.

Member Tim Hughes asked about the effectiveness of the noncompliance laws from other States provided in the presentation as examples. Superintendent Ebert responded that she does not have any data or examples to share today of the effectiveness of these example but will provide such information at a later date.

Member Hughes asked for some clarification on the distinguished educator mentioned in the possible regulatory language specifically, what the value add, and the profile of that person might be. Superintendent Ebert responded that it would be someone who has proven their success such as retired Superintendents and/or current staff that have worked in other school districts. Superintendent Ebert noted that the Department does not have boots on the ground every day working with the school district so there is a knowledge gap for the Department. This way the Department will have someone that is assisting with the needs of the district, a day-to-day boot on the ground working alongside those in the school district to be able to move the entire system forward. Member Hughes stated that he believes having someone to liaise between the Department and the large school district could be helpful, however, he is skeptical that technical assistance is going to achieve much because at the cabinet level folks generally understand what should be happening and what the law says but adding a liaison might not change the will to come into compliance. Member Hughes suggested a modification to the proposed regulatory language that the distinguished educator is more of a liaison position from NDE directly rather than a third party.

Chair Dockweiler noted items 1(c) through 1(e) and suggested that a report be provided to the Board in addition to the State Superintendent. Chair Dockweiler stated that since the large district will be paying for the distinguished educator, and that educator may be able to hire a staff to assist in the duties required, guardrails should be placed surrounding the staffing piece.

Chair Dockweiler referenced item 1(g) on the possible regulatory language the training to be provided to the stakeholder groups. Chair Dockweiler agrees with how the language is delineated and specifies who needs to receive the training and suggested a line item to make the training materials available to the public in case there are any other stakeholder groups that are not on the list who would like to learn more about the reorganization. Regarding the line after the 30 days that the district can move out of receivership, Chair Dockweiler suggested providing additional support and a gradual release after the 30 days. Member Tamara Hudson agreed.

Member Hughes asked for clarification on the work of a receiver to address one of the specific findings of noncompliance. Superintendent Ebert responded that a receiver would be helpful with supporting all School Organizational Teams (SOT) to bring them to a level where they are high functioning. In addition, a receiver would provide support with the financial aspect of the 85-15 distribution. Superintendent Ebert noted that if the initial distinguished educator was in place and were able to complete those tasks and the district was able to come into compliance, then there would be no need for a receivership.

The Subcommittee decided to allow the department to revise the proposed language and continue the discussion at a future meeting.

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

Felicia Gonzales, Consultant to the State Superintendent, Nevada Department of Education, provided a presentation regarding the [Revisions of February 23, 2022 AB469 Subcommittee Proposed Draft Regulation Language](#).

Member Hughes asked for clarification on the implications of the emergency substitute teachers' regulatory language. Ms. Gonzales responded that the language was added due to concern that was expressed by the Commission on Professional Standards and brought to the attention of the Board. The logic behind the addition of the language is that if it was not added, an emergency substitute could be hired above a licensed teacher or a standard substitute. Ms. Gonzales noted that the wording added makes it very clear that an emergency substitute can only be hired when there are no licensed teachers and substitutes available for hire.

Vice President Newburn moved to approve the regulations and revisions and forward them to the State Board of Education. Member Hudson seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Member Hudson requested a discussion on funding and the 85-15 distribution. Member Newburn requested a discussion on carry over dollars. Member Guzman requested a discussion on the definition of direct supervision. Member Hughes requested a discussion on the implications of the new funding plan and formula during the discussion on carry over dollars.

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)*

Kenneth Paul, Principal, W. Mack Lyon Middle School, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Lindsey Dally, Community Education Advisory Board, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Kole, student, Clark County School District, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Fernando Romero, community member, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Sylvia Lazos, Nevada Immigration Coalition, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Charlene Paul, community member, provided public comment regarding AB 469. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:09 P.M.

APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS GIVEN DURING PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Kenneth Paul, Principal, W. Mack Lyon Middle School, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
2. Jeff Horn, Executive Director, CCASAPE provided public comment regarding AB 469.
3. Kelly Grondahl, Principal, Vegas Verdes 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.
5. Hawah Ahmad, Clark County Education Association, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
6. Dana Roseman, Principal, Jesse D. Scott Elementary School, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
7. Ryan Lewis, Principal, Garehime Elementary School, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
8. Tam Larnerd, community member, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
9. Ed Gonzalez, School Organizational Team Member, Liliam Lujan Hickey Elementary School, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
10. Kenneth Paul, Principal, W. Mack Lyon Middle School, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
11. Lindsey Dally, Community Education Advisory Board, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
12. Kole, student, Clark County School District, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
13. Fernando Romero, community member, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
14. Sylvia Lazos, Nevada Immigration Coalition, provided public comment regarding AB 469.
15. Charlene Paul, community member, provided public comment regarding AB 469.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 1: KENNETH PAUL

First of all, I am appreciative of what is happening here today and the progress over the months. When the law was first passed, I was told by others that local precincts would never be able to pry the money out of the hands of central admin and I didn't believe them because it was the law but here we are today. As we go forward, the agenda item and the need for regulatory language. I do believe that there is a need for a dispute resolution process when it comes to central and site-based disagreements. Right here, I have the binder, it has been sitting on my floor for a while of the 1st and 2nd chairperson to our lions SOT and evidence of disagreements with central as we sought to implement the law over the last few years. The minutes actually start in October 20, 2016. The common theme is no authentic resolution process for legitimate disagreements. One example and this one was over utilities and landscaping, I'm gonna read just a small part of the minutes of December 12, 2018. And then um an email on the January 9, of 2019 to operational services Rick Neil with CFO CC'd. So the minutes was discussion concerning SLAs utilities trash disposal, landscape, Ken will meet with Jason Goudie on Thursday December 20th and then it gives a list of names of members teachers, that were going to attend with him. Part of a summary that he said, hey, you ought to write Rick Neil over operation. I said several members of Lyon's SOT teachers, parents, community members and I met with CFO and author of utilities and trash disposal SLA Jason G on Thursday December 20, 2018 at his office. Jason understands the current infrastructure at school sites gives little to no control of utilities. As a result, little to no control of costs or savings. Jason G. Mentioned your name specifically in discussing the needed plan to transition schools to this capability. Currently, W. Mack Lyon Middle School is scheduled for an HVAC replacement in the near future. These project managers do not seem to have a plan, a vision, or a timetable for transitioning authority increased control over utilities to school sites. I want to make sure I have accurately reflected points of the conversation. So I will CC Jason G. Lyon Middle School in Overton is asking for shared HVAC controls with EMS specifically with the ability to control set points and scheduling. This control would be through a school site user interface. EMS would act as the technical and supporting role as appropriate. I would like to see a plan, a vision, and a timetable developed in the near future for building the capacity of shared utility controls, not just for Lyon Middle School, but for every school. And then the second one is a very recent as we are trying to negotiate.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 2: JEFF HORN

Good afternoon. My name is Jeff Horn in the Executive Director of the Clark County Association of school administrators and currently heading the association that oversees approximately 1300 administrators and professional technical employees, which about 98% are members of our association and like to thank Chair Dockweiler members of the Board and Superintendent Ebert for your work on this, I'll be brief today. I just want to lend my support for the proposed regulations that have been put together by your staff and in particular, Felicia Gonzales working hard to to put together some good language here that will help maneuver and help us work through some of the issues and problems we've had with to the greatest extent possible and in good standing. There's a couple of items I wanted to point out specifically under 1(c). We are in support of changing that uh to allow for a written warning instead of oral warning for employees to remain in good standing. Our only concern is if there are employees, and this would be limited probably only a handful even if that that could receive actually multiple oral warnings in a year or two years or three years. So that could cause a problem if an employee has several of those without receiving written warning. So, I'd like just to bring it to your attention on 1(e) sub paragraph 2, If I'm saying that correctly, we also are in supportive of of changing probationary employees to developing, as we recognize that they're in their learning years as an employee and and growing at that time. But we do feel that after that initial probationary time is over that to be in good standing you should have an effective or higher evaluation. So we're in support of the regulations uh with those two items we like or that first item for discussion we'd like on the oral warnings. Um We look forward to this being worked through and passed on to the full board for hopefully approval. We think that the most important thing that can happen here is to bring back what this law originally intended to do which is to have hiring authority and autonomy by the principal so they can select the best possible employees for the school. That will be the most impactful on students. And I said it last time at the last meeting how important it is to look through the eyes of the child, the student and not the adults in the room I think we did that. In fact, I know we did that and our CBAs and our association where assistant principals and ministers have to be hired and selected by the principal that cannot be placed there. So we changed our CBA To ensure that that occurs at the detriment of our members, and we did that because we feel that the most important people here are the students not the adults. And we look forward to this continuing on in the discussion that lies ahead. Thank you very much.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 3: KELLY GRONDAHL

Good afternoon, Kelly Grondahl Principal at Vegas Verdes Elementary School here in Las Vegas Nevada. I'm here to comment on AB 469 read a little something that I prepared. Thank you very much for all of your time. Thank you for allowing me time for my testimony regarding AB 469 in the positive effects that have been provided by the piece of legislation. One of my most important tasks of principal is to create an environment of equity for my students and community in regard to educational opportunities. Among this wide umbrella of duty is the most important are encompassed in identifying retaining training and supporting effective teachers. These individuals are the backbone of school success, and I can never truly explain the magnitude of their reach and the inspiration for our students The goal of equity for all our students is multiplied exponentially throughout the district as well as in each town city and throughout the state. In the field of education. In addition to the equity lens, the task of managing resources to effectively address the financial roller coaster in regards to funding at the school level is a constant challenge faced by all educational leaders This yearly struggle consistently tasks administrators with decisions too often choose between the minimum, bare minimum options to provide for instruction and the extra support needed by struggling communities such as communities and schools and other wraparound services. The autonomy provided by the legislature in regard to AB 469 has helped maintain continuity and staff provide wraparound services to the community, provide flexibility on a site level for decision making and give me the ability to plan years in advance to protect the systems and structures put in place for all students, families and educators. In conclusion thank you for your vision and guidance in regard to AB 469, I know of no other bill which provided support more support of our campuses, administrators, teachers and communities that was more impactful to reach our goal of educating our students and providing opportunities for successes. As you face the challenge of identifying changes and support for Nevada's Nevada in the future. Um excuse me, I lost my place. In the future preparation of legislative sessions. I hope each of our leaders who developed and support the document. Feel pride and success in knowing AB469 has been so successful and I believe I still have a couple of seconds left. Alright. Um one of the most important pieces of my job as the principal is to find highly educated and highly successful people or at least build those people and having the autonomy of putting people or keeping people on my campus or even omitting options that get pushed onto my campus is the only way I know to, to create a better environment for our kids and I keep my school and as other administrators will, will state, I'm sure they've had many situations like this. Um, we have to have control of who comes on to our school and that should be our choice. Thank you.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 4: ED GONZALEZ

Thank you. Members. My name is Ed Gonzalez. I'm the community member at the Hickey Elementary School organizational team, I'm also here with my chair, Jessica Jones before I get started. I am glad to see you on the, on the, on here trustee Guzman. I know I've been the last couple of meetings onto this, but I felt like when we started this process, there wasn't a voice from CCSD. So I hope once this gets through this process this will continue to the schoolboard. So, I appreciate, you're being on here and having your voice heard, um, I've looked through some of the guidelines. I think there's two things that I really want to appreciate what this body has done when this was first brought forward. It was brought forward of just looking at the principal's versus the teachers versus the support staff and where placement was, and you know, some of us said this needs to be a broader look, we didn't want to get the state board too much involved in the central running's of the school district, but I think the guidelines you put in as I was reviewing them seemed very broad at the same time allows for paths where the disputes were happening. One section I do appreciate the fact that if there is a dispute. I felt like some of the stories that I've had with the district, and I'll show you one from a few years ago, our school Hickey doesn't actually have um bussing for except for special education because our zoning is so small, and one of the first strategic budgets came out, we had bussing for one student for a run general aid student when we did it. So, I talked to the time to um the higher up in central administration, I said that money should be in our budget if you're gonna give it to us because it's the flexibility and this goes to a great SLA argument that we've had here for a while. And he said, well that's not how it works. And I said, you're right, what should happen is I get the per-pupil, it goes into our budget and then we figure how we buy the service is something you guys are all familiar with, Needless to say that led to probably a 15 or 20 minute discussion and it was, well, it is what it is and then a month later that one student was taken out of her budget, which didn't exist to begin with. But that's typical situation of a discussion You guys have set a path where if there's a dispute it can be resolved whether you agree or disagree with the results. There's path there for to get it done. So, I do appreciate that. And just other things as well that's going through this process, I think there's some things that will always need to be looked at when we come back on definitions that things are nature, But I think the framework that's been provided allows for that to happen and allows that if there's anything else, the State Board needs to do that. It can come back to you through the State Superintendent as well because some of the language when you talk about Receivership, I will say in the record once again when AB 469 was passed. Former State Superintendent Steve Cannavaro believed that the language provided him to put as an extreme measure the district into Receivership onto it when it was being proposed. So, I appreciate the work you've done I've missed you guys. I haven't been here for a while. So, thank you.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 5: HAWAH AHMAD

Good afternoon, Subcommittee Chairperson Dockweiler, and Subcommittee members,

The Clark County Education Association and the thousands of licensed education professionals we represent thank you for your hard work and communication with stakeholders. CCEA would like to especially thank this committee on how our concerns over the previously presented regulations were addressed.

As we move forward, CCEA is excited to support this regulation and we believe that today's presented language serves as a fair compromise that will help to support our educators and administration and put student achievement at the forefront of the conversation.

CCEA was an active participant in the drafting of AB469 (2017) and served on the technical advisory committee to ensure that the intent of the law would be carried out. These regulations, especially 3(b)(2) make it very clear that the justifiable reasons a substitute may be chosen over a licensed educator may not include financial savings, a turning point for why CCEA vehemently supported the bill. Additionally, 3(c) and 3(d) will provide much needed guardrails that support placement of licensed educators in good standing and helps create and provide notice of the burden to be met for "to the greatest extent possible". Lastly, CCEA appreciates the forward-thinking language that creates an annual report for the State Board of Education on the number of candidates available for vacant positions, the number of licensed educators interviewed for any given vacant position, reason/s why a licensed educator was not selected and justification, in accordance with the definition of "to the greatest extent possible" to defend if a fully licensed substitute is utilized to fill a vacancy.

CCEA believes that these regulations are a great starting point to implement AB469 across the Clark County School District and we appreciate the transparency from the subcommittee members during this process.

Respectfully,
Hawah Ahmad, Lobbyist
Clark County Education Association

APPENDIX A, ITEM 6: DANA ROSEMAN

Good Afternoon,

I'd like to share my perspective in regards to AB 469 and the term in Good Standing. I am in support of the current proposed AB469 Subcommittee Draft Regulation revisions. It's important to note that having a licensed teacher in a classroom is always the goal, but it is also important to take into consideration that having the right fit in a classroom is paramount.

Historically, many of the hard to staff schools like mine are not always the first pick for qualified candidates, so having a committed long-term sub in a room who connects with our students supports the school. I'd like to debunk the ideology that principals are staffing with subs to save money. Most of the subs who staff rooms long term have blended themselves into the fabric of our schools because they have been there to get to know our students, teachers, and families. They are not just well-versed with the climate and culture of our schools, but they are also knowledgeable (more so at times than a surplussed teacher) with the academic expectations and curriculum used at each school. The subs at times are more qualified than some of those whom AB469 (without the draft revisions) protects. It's important to have the right fit before our students at all times.

Principals don't intentionally opt to have a sub to save money. We do use subs to get the job done and support our students. A licensed teacher who is a good fit for our school is always the ultimate goal.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 7: RYAN LEWIS

Good afternoon! My name is Ryan Lewis, principal of Garehime ES in the CCSD and President of CCASAPE. I apologize for not being able to attend in person today, I took the opportunity to spend the day without students with my own children.

I would like to take this opportunity to support the recommendations that have been proposed in regards to AB469. After some reflection on the discussion and comments made during the last subcommittee meeting, I believe the minimum for being considered in good standing for a post probationary teacher should be a satisfactory rating. While teachers often do make changes within their own career assignments, good teachers meet the minimum expectations to be satisfied even if they are learning new content and/or skills. Probationary employees are at the beginning of their career and may be growing their skills that may fall into the developing category during this period. For that reason, they should be provided more grace within this process.

Site-based decision-making is essential and crucial to the improvement of our schools. School communities make the best decisions for their schools based on the data and needs of the participants. Individual campuses have unique priorities in meeting the challenges they face. I appreciate your support in making AB469 a functional reality for our school communities.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 8: TAM LARNERD

Public Comment from Tam Larnerd - Henderson resident and Retired High School CCSD Principal:

Madam Chairwoman, members of the Board of Education, Superintendent Ebert...thank you. Thank you for taking on this important work related to holding a rogue, non-compliant, school superintendent accountable. It's time. If we continue with no real consequences, we will continue to see Dr. Jara thumb his nose at the law, completely ignore his fiduciary responsibility, and he will continue to re-centralize the Clark County School District despite his legal obligation to comply with NRS 388g.

I believe Dr. Jara is one of the most destructive forces to school autonomy, and educational excellence in Clark County. He tried to be sneaky and snatch schools' carry-over funds in July 2020, but he got caught. The funds that remain in schools' accounts is an INTENDED consequence of AB 469. Remember that scathing letter to Dr. Jara from Governor Sisolak, and the letter from CCASAPE?

Dr. Jara has since purchased district-wide curriculum for math and is in the process of purchasing district-wide ELA curriculum. He looooooves one-size-fits-all. Completely contrary to the intent of AB 469.

He also, in violation of AB 469, declared that no CCSD school could use Data Insight Partners, who had a data-management system to help principals make data-driven decisions. And then he set about directing his staff at AARSI to create a product to replicate the Data Insight Partners product. At the end of the day, it became clear that CCSD had blatantly stolen the intellectual property of Data Insight Partners and ended up paying hundreds of thousands of dollars, that could have gone to schools, to settle a lawsuit that he was clearly going to lose.

Finally, I would also like to commend your work on staffing autonomy. I believe you have developed an acceptable "middle ground." Having a clear line test, regarding if the employee has active discipline in his/her personnel file makes sense. I could argue that there are non-disciplined employees who just aren't a good fit for a specific school, but at least this compromise in the language of staffing autonomy is doable.

Please hold CCSD accountable, please hold Dr. Jara accountable, for flagrantly violating AB 469. It is time...

APPENDIX A, ITEM 9: ED GONZALEZ

Thank you, madam Chair members of the Board. Um I just wanted to comment briefly on the items that you added. Um I do appreciate, once again you're looking at more issues. The 85-15 ratio is very important. I know one of the things that I think it's difficult for the districts It feels like when they've done the 85-15 as they've taken their system and try to shove 85% of the dollars in there. I know there's been conversations in the past not to put this in regulation but maybe simplify the process. Um and I'll direct this to trustee Guzman because we weren't under her purview. And trustee Cavazos here today is for showing 100% of dollars in the budget and then taking the 15% from central and then as they buy back more services that might provide the more transparency that the That the legislation of the legislators were intending to do it. Um so I appreciate that. Also, in the SB 469 from the 2019 session, there was even a conversation of going to 90-10 So the 85-15 has been flexible in that aspect of actually pushing more dollars in. And then the second thing um I don't know, I know you guys had it was to the carryover funds. I know we had the budgets for the strategic budgets in January and February. Um There were some things in there. I think the difficulty and spending funds is one time frame again which is I feel like with carryover you should have access to like your savings account and a checking account, you should be able to spend it all year long instead of just getting, here's how much you may have in certain aspects of it and then too there are times where you know, at some schools of after many vacancies it does come you know pretty quickly and trying to figure out how to spend it. But also, there's times where there's, there's things internally in the district where it's hard to, to spend dollars if you want more mental behavioral support. It's hard to find those positions. Um If you want to have more um we're talking about school safety, I know at our school, we talked about having more campus monitors. Those are hard to find those positions even have to pay that we have. There's other aspects here think the district allowed for bonusing of employees at schools and more than just what the districts talking about. A lot of school sites. I know at Hickey, we talked about, well we're having trouble even maintaining support staff, could we give more than the required amount? There are areas where I think schools are trying to spend the money, but I don't think they're able to spend the money because of some of the internal restrictions at CCSD. So, as you guys are discussing, this is your next meeting, um I hope those questions can be asked. Thank you.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 10: KENNETH PAUL

Kenneth Paul Principal at W. Mack Lyon Middle School out in Overton and just when I was listening to the knowledge and level of CCSD about this governance model, this model to go from a central to a site based slash community model, I know very well that Deputy Superintendent Kellie Ballard has been here with both superintendents from the beginning because I know we had conversations early on with her and almost from the beginnings CFO Jason Goudie has been part of that and I have been at Lyon middle school as a principal there that entire time with this as well. There's been, I almost say volumes. I know from our valley and from our middle schools we've tried to communicate and get questions answered when we had different interpretations as to what the law meant and most of the time it was, oh yes it needs to be addressed, but will you know, we'll have to figure that out in the future. And again, it just kind of makes me shaking the idea that we're so far down the road 5, 6 years whatever it's been, and I fill out my own opinion that there really hasn't been authentic negotiation with principals and SOTs through the years as the question came up. So going back to my original comment at the beginning is I do believe that there is a need for dispute resolution or somehow to work through these things and even be a model. We've asked several times, it almost happened and then we'll shut down with our valley and they were going to work with us to kind of be the model of trying to implement that and it was going forward and then suddenly it was just stopped and so we want to figure out how this, how this can work and go forward. Thank you.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 11: LINDSEY DALLY

Thank you. My name is Lindsey Dally. I'm a member of the Moapa Valley Community Education Advisory board and a member of two SOT teams, a middle school Mack Lyon as well as a high school. Um I wanted to just echo um um Ed Gonzalez has called it. That is really true. It's trying to spend that money is sometimes very hard So, but my comment is specifically aimed at emphasizing how important where there's been a lot of discussion about how to ensure that if as we as CCSD comes into compliance that we maintain that and you know, the structures at the State Board and partners that are trying to put in place. I recall or my mind going back to the days of this legislation was being created and we and I had multiple opportunities, not just me alone but with others to sit knee to knee to Michael Stravinsky authored this. And that was our concerns. And I remember him telling us very specifically, one of the most important guardrails in maintaining compliance because all bureaucracies tend to re-centralize and they don't share power. Well, that's just a fact of life is that you, you have to develop very capable and competent, SOTs that understand the role and the power and that they guard that power very jealously. And I think we, I think our middle school and high school and CEABs are case in point as well as uh, Ed Gonzalez's SOT, I watched them guard that power. And so they have to know what that is because we, we have a couple of schools in our community that the SOTs are not functioning as well. It it takes time to weas our CEAB has have purposely gone out and tried to recruit high quality parent members and then teach them and develop them develop those chair positions so that you know, people know what the SOTs can and can't do because there's a lot of pressure from the district and principles and hoping probably about that time to shut down the power of the SOT. It's very subtly and it's very frustrating and so that training is so critical and being able to do that and it will take time. Yeah So, those SOTs will will not allow the district to railroad them. Thank you very much.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 12: KOLE

My name is Kole, I am in third grade and thank you all for the hard work.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 13: FERNANDO ROMERO

Thank you. And good afternoon, my name is Fernando Romero Thank you, madam. Chair madam Superintendent. Members of the board. Thank you for bringing the matter of AB 469 to the forefront. Whatever is decided, corrective action has to take place no matter what happens. We need to have AB 469 out in the forefront. Our Superintendent has really been very cavalier about this AB 469 and he's been admonished a number of times relevant to the to uh to the law and he has yet to adhere to it. And it has been almost a metal where he left at that particular uh state law. And my understanding is that he is working very hard to try to resend uh a the uh AB 469 and I just really hope that this board, this body uh does takeover and do something about it. I'm a member of three SOTs and I can assure you that he has intimidated all the members of the SOTs Uh members that work for CCSD the uh are afraid to take a vote and they're afraid to participate They're afraid to say anything because they are intimidated to the point that they have been um told that they will lose their jobs, should they speak against the schools or the whatever is happening within the structure. And it is a matter that that some changes have to take places as far of safeguarding the the employment of those individuals that work for the CCSD who belong to the stars, who want to participate and want to do something good for public education, something good for their own school. And yet they are unable to do so I have seen that intimidation firsthand and and we must do something about this. We must protect public education, we must protector students, our teachers and our staff. I do thank you very much for this opportunity. Good afternoon.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 14: SYLVIA LAZOS

Dear Nevada State Board of Education,

I have been a leader on education issues in this state for the last two decades. The situation of our children has never been as desperate as it is now. A crisis requires “out of the box” thinking and decisive action. For this reason I am in full support of the proposed regulations. The situation is so critical, please consider shortening notice of non-compliance period to 90 days, rather than 180 days.

1. AB469 was an alternative to the breakup of CCSD and it was a proposal to *improve* performance of CCSD. The most recent SBAC data show that the current profile of learning is catastrophic, especially for children who are learning to read. Less than 5% of ELL, IEP, African American and Latinx children in CCSD are reading at proficiency at Grades 3 to 5. How has CCSD responded? With neglect. No concrete plan of action and no ARP dedicated investments in helping in the learning of these children. CCSD Board of Trustees has not focused on the academic performance of the most vulnerable children because it is hopelessly divided. Under the proposed regulations, the Nevada State superintendent would have the power to monitor student results of the state’s largest school district, and determine whether CCSD operations have so grievously neglected the academic performance of the most vulnerable populations that administrative measures need to be taken. These regulations appropriately protect vulnerable children.

2. CCSD is failing special education and ELL children. As the Nevada Immigrant Coalition has testified, the way that CCSD arbitrarily has cut back centralized services to ELL impacts ELL student learning. It has taken similar steps with respect to special education children. At no point, has CCSD reevaluated these budgetary cuts. AB469 purposefully allows for ELL and special education services to be centralized to ensure that there are quality ELL and IEP supports for all local schools throughout CCSD. For example, the ELL department has technical expertise and understands what high quality instruction looks for ELL children. However, as Nevada Immigrant Coalition has testified, CCSD has grievously neglect the student learning of ELL student. This regulation is an appropriate measure; simply put, ELL and IEP student data has NEVER been as bad as it currently is. CCSD centralized ELL and IEP Departments do not provide sufficient services to support local schools in ELL instruction, and local schools have been so decimated with loss of personnel and leadership that there is insufficient critical mass of expertise to support ELL and IEP children. The proposed regulation allows the Nevada Superintendent to focus on whether the centralization of ELL and IEP services has sufficiently supported these children and to provide feedback to CCSD so it can better perform.

For these reasons, please support the proposed regulations. CCSD has not taken seriously its legal obligations under AB469. It has not focused on academic learning of vulnerable groups. CCSD needs to be prodded back so that it becomes focused on its job -- providing quality learning opportunities for Clark County's school children. This proposed Regulation is appropriate given where we are. It’s the lives of 300,000 children that are at stake.

Sylvia Lazos

APPENDIX A, ITEM 15: CHARLENE PAUL

I'm Charlene Paul. I'm the wife of Ken Paul, but that's not who I'm. I'm just Charlene Paul right now. I grew up in CCSD. I grew up in that when I moved here, CCSD was one of the top um Districts in the nation. I think it was number three and I've watched it heartbreakingly move to where it's at right now. I mean, we don't have very many more rungs to go down my question and talking-to others that with this AB 469 that actually should be called NRS 388G because it is no longer an assembly bill. It is the law. I know since moving here back in 1997, I know of at least two administrators who were relieved of their positions this way resign or be fired and lose everything. And the reason that they were is because they misappropriated funds that were allocated to their schools. It happened quickly. They knew that if the funds weren't taken mean he knew it, they both knew it and they chose to uh, to thumb their nose at that law anyway, as I talked to others about this whole thing and this is the way that the funds go. The way that this is a law. This is a law. And if the site based administrators are held to that kind of uh, you know, tell that their feet held that closely to the fire, then why is not the central administration held the same way? You can't pick and choose what part of the law you want to follow. You can't pick and choose whether or not you want to follow the law. It is the law. And if you don't follow it then why why is he still here? Why is that administration still here? When a site based administrator pulling the same garbage would be removed, he would, he would lose his retirement and possibly end up in jail. And that's kind of a general consensus. As as I am out in the community, I talked to people, I talk to young parents, I talk to parents and grandparents like myself, retirees others who cannot understand why this, these wheels of justice or whatever they are just seem not to move at all. And I know you're working hard, I know you're trying to do the best that you can do, but seriously, if a site based administrators going to be held that accountable for allocated funds and misappropriating them and not following the law then from the top down it should be not from the bottom up, he should be held as accountable as a site based administrator would be held and I put a lot of that responsibility. I'm sorry but really put it on the Trustees You have one employee, 1 1, that 'sit. And you need to corral him and you need to convince him that he either comes into compliance with the law or you're seriously going to get rid of him this time and not rescind the vote. Thankyou.