

MINUTES
CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES
BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER, ROOM 466
5100 W. SAHARA AVE., LAS VEGAS, NV 89146

THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 2014

11:30 a.m.

Members Present

Davis, Al
Haldeman, Joyce
Halsey, Jim
Hawkins, Frank
Kubat, Charles

Lavelle, Eleissa
Lazaroff, Gene
Philpott, Steve
Tate, Cameron

Members Absent

Bruins, David
Earl, Debbie
Lopez, George

A recording of this meeting can be obtained by contacting the Capital Program Office at 799-8710.

1.01 ROLL CALL.

Jim Halsey, Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:40 a.m.

1.02 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA.

Motion was approved to adopt the Agenda for April 17, 2014.

Motion: Davis Second: Lazaroff Vote: Unanimous
Cameron Tate not in attendance.

2.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

None.

3.01 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

Motion for approval of the Minutes for March 20, 2014.

Motion: Davis Second: Lazaroff Vote: Unanimous
Cameron Tate not in attendance.

3.02 FUTURE BUILDING PROGRAMS – AVAILABLE SEATS.

Joyce Haldeman, Associate Superintendent of Community & Government Relations; and Rick Baldwin, Director, and Steve Burda, Coordinator, of Demographics, Zoning, and Geographic Information Systems Department, provided copies of “Strategic Planning Areas – Report of CCSD Available Seats.”

FUTURE BUILDING PROGRAMS – AVAILABLE SEATS (continued).

Ms. Haldeman reminded members of the list of topics that the Board of School Trustees (Board) must consider as they develop a future building program in terms of timing, amount, scope, and other decisions. Each of these topics will be discussed at this committee and then again at the next scheduled Board meeting. Decisions will not be made at either meeting on these topics. A handbook of considerations will be developed to assist the Board with the next ballot question.

Ms. Haldeman stated that today's topic is seat availability. We will be discussing the number of students and seats that we currently have, how many seats are available, and where the available seats are located.

Mr. Baldwin defined and explained the purpose of strategic planning areas (SPA); provided the geographic population of students who reside and number of students enrolled within each SPA; identified the number of select schools, such as, Magnet, Career and Technical Academies, Virtual, Special Education, and Alternative school programs; and defined and explained self-contained programs for each SPA.

Mr. Baldwin also provided the program capacities for elementary (9-month and year-round), middle, and high schools; available seats; number of portable classrooms; and enrollment changes for each SPA.

Charles Kubat questioned the number of portables used over the years, and if the 200 applicable elementary schools were to operate on a year-round schedule, would it eliminate the use of portables. Ms. Haldeman stated that a future presentation will be provided on the topic of portables.

Steve Philpott questioned if the 9-month self-contained programs could be held in a small portable classroom rather than a classroom built for over 20 students. Mr. Baldwin stated that the self-contained programs are required to have close proximity to a restroom.

Frank Hawkins stated that since the District does not have \$60 million to operate 200 applicable elementary schools on a year-round schedule and \$1.1 billion to build 44 new schools, there is a need for another bond program; however, we don't know how to get the majority of voters to say yes. Mr. Hawkins suggested that this committee, the Board, and everyone involved in education should spread the word among the general public and parents.

Mr. Hawkins questioned if District policy dictates the use of a tentative map (students and seats) to drive the need to build new schools; are there other measures that could be used other than the tentative map so that the District will not be the one responsible for the infrastructure for a new school; if notification can be made to new home buyers that a school will not be built in their neighborhood; or make notification to the public that schools will be placed on a year-round schedule if a bond is not passed. Mr. Halsey stated that future presentations will cover these topics.

FUTURE BUILDING PROGRAMS – AVAILABLE SEATS (continued).

Following a question by Eleissa Lavelle on the formula or process that is used to determine the number of seats, Jim McIntosh explained State/District standards that are used for student-to-teacher ratios. These standards are used to develop the budget. For kindergarten there are 21 students to one teacher, first grade is 18-1, second and third grades are 21-1, fourth and fifth grades are currently budgeted for 32-1, sixth through twelfth grades are 35-1, and magnet programs are 28-1.

Ms. Lavelle questioned what happens when there are too many children for a classroom. Mr. Baldwin explained that the District tries to place the fourth and fifth grades in the portables to keep the younger children and self-contained programs in the building.

Mr. Kubat and Mr. Philpott requested additional information on the number of portables that would be eliminated if 44 new elementary schools were to be built.

Following a question by Gene Lazaroff, Mr. Baldwin explained that when a school is under capacity by more than 3 percent, an application process takes place for student enrollment. This process has taken place and those numbers are included for the projections for next year.

Gene questioned if staff has considered utilizing middle school space for elementary students to alleviate crowded elementary schools. Mr. Baldwin stated that Instruction Unit or the Superintendent of Schools would have to respond to that question. Mr. McIntosh explained that a future topic will cover alternative solutions and that staff is exploring other options.

Ms. Haldeman reminded members that this presentation and future presentations that we will have are for the purpose of hearing all of issues, facts, figures, etc. No decisions will be made and the Board will have the same presentation to raise awareness of what needs to be considered.

Mr. Kubat requested that the Board be made aware that capacity does not include portables; clarify to the Board how the portable seats fits into the evaluation of deficits. He questioned how many new seats would be provided and how many portables would be eliminated with the building of 44 new schools.

3.03 REPORT BY STAFF AND/OR LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES.

Al Davis reported on his meeting with Rory Lorenzo, Interim Director of the Capital Program Office. Mr. Davis stated that they discussed the new organization, the historical number and movement of portables, and the percentage of enrollment housed in portables. Mr. Davis requested a future agenda item to discuss this further.

REPORT BY STAFF AND/OR LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES (continued).

Charles Kubat also reported on his meeting with Mr. Lorenzo. Mr. Kubat stated that they discussed the architectural selection process and expressed concern of how the architect was selected for projects. Mr. Kubat stated the jobs have not been necessarily assigned sequentially to the next firm on the list and the total fees involved did not result in a fair distribution of fees among the firms within a specific tier. As an evaluation tool for future recommendations, Mr. Kubat will request additional information from staff to understand how much of the fees were listed by each firm was just a “pass through” to a consultant versus what the firms actually received.

Mr. Kubat also reminded members of the four elementary school prototypes that were built and an evaluation that is due of certain criteria pertaining to how the prototypes performed from use of energy, learning environment, etc. Mr. Kubat stated that he would like to have staff present the results of that evaluation for those four prototypes for a possible recommendation.

3.04 QUESTIONS REGARDING MONTHLY STATUS REPORTS.

Jim McIntosh stated that a Facility Condition Report would be presented at the next meeting.

3.05 REPORT BY THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES LIAISON.

Trustee Linda Young reaffirmed that this committee and the Board will continue to gather information from staff for a future building program by discussing one topic each month. Trustee Young invited members to inform staff if there were other topics they would like to explore.

Trustee Young stated that once this committee completes the review of topics, key information and input from all of the presentations will be compiled and the Board will use the information to determine the parameters of the next ballot question.

3.06 QUESTIONS ON AND/OR REMOVAL OF ITEMS ON MOTIONS AND TASKINGS.

Motion to remove dated entries from Funding of Future Land Acquisitions/Off-Site Improvements to include January 20, 2011, November 17, 2011, December 15, 2011, January 19, 2012, and March 15, 2012.

*Motion: Lazaroff Second: Tate Vote: Unanimous
Frank Hawkins and Al Davis not in attendance.*

Steve Philpott questioned if staff had responded to his inquiry from May 16, 2013, on why there are two types of information (closed-circuit and broadband) being installed in classrooms. Mr. Philpott requested staff clarify why there are two delivery systems for education, and why spend money on both when one is becoming more favored.

QUESTIONS ON AND/OR REMOVAL OF ITEMS ON MOTIONS AND TASKINGS.
(continued.)

Motion to remove the dated entry of December 19, 2013, from Meeting Construction Schedule Deadlines.

Motion: Kubat Second: Lazaroff Vote: Unanimous
Frank Hawkins and Al Davis not in attendance.

3.07 AGENDA PLANNING: ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS.

After a request from Jim Halsey to have staff report on the number and age of portables, Joyce Haldeman stated that portables is on the list of topics that will be presented under the standing agenda item for a future building program. Ms. Haldeman stated that she will provide a list of topics for future presentations at the next meeting.

To ensure that the District is being transparent and that the architectural selection process is operating as this committee intended, Charles Kubat requested staff (Ruby Alston) to evaluate the architectural selection process for projects that have occurred in the last three years to determine how much of the fees within each tier went to the architect firm versus a consultant. Mr. Kubat then requested that Ms. Alston share this information with him, as the liaison, and with Rory Lorenzo. Mr. Kubat will then report on the findings at the next meeting. This could ultimately end up on the agenda for discussion upon committee approval. The conclusions could affect future processes.

Motion for staff to provide an evaluation of the four prototypes that were built.
Motion: Kubat Second: Tate Vote: Unanimous

Motion was approved to have staff provide at the next meeting their presentation on the new organization as was presented to the Board.

Motion: Lazaroff Second: Haldeman Vote: Unanimous

4.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

None.

5. ADJOURN: 1:25 p.m.

Motion: Lazaroff Second: Kubat Vote: Unanimous