





































Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

There would be no risk because individual would not be considered. But I'll say that as an example, and I'm going to use this as a local context because it's been brought to my attention, and this is a very different process because it's at a school level, not at the level that we're discussing, but it's an example that we should consider. Some of SOT community members have brought to my attention that when they're searching for a principal, that the screening process will not sometimes allow certain candidates to get through that first round. So as a part of that process, the SOT may not have and be privy to potential individuals and very unaware of who actually applied. So I think it's imperative that we're in a bigger space and it's too important and too much is at stake that we should definitely as trustees, our responsibility is to see all candidates, even those that do not make it through that first round.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

That's fair, Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan. I believe that that covers it by seeing review all applicant, not all qualified applicant. 5.2 G says, "Review all applicant materials, CVs, resumes of all applicants for background." At this point, this is the candidates who apply. Then there's an evaluation of candidates using our rubric. Does that make sense?

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

So I want it to be on record that as a trustee, I want to be privy to all of those Vedas and resumes and records of applicants, whether they are qualified or not.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay, thank you. I believe that covers it through in 5.2 G. I appreciate that. Trustee Brooks.

Trustee Brooks:

Thank you. Madam President. I think if we require disclosures of the people who aren't qualified, then they should grant us permission. They might not want it out there that they didn't qualify. So if we're going to include them, we could consider having some sort of permission for disclosure. That way it respects them. Otherwise, you're going to have a really shallow pool of applicants who might not want to put their name out there. And then building off a comment that Trustee Cavazos made. I think it's important to have some sort of way to identify affiliations with other organizations. Maybe they're not conflicts of interest because that's very narrow, but if we could have a place for them to identify boards that they serve on or companies that they own or something that would allow us to know if they have other affiliations that might not be considered a conflict, but might be something that we need to be aware of.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

All right, thank you. Trustee Brooks. I want to make sure I come over to Trustee Cavazos and make sure that that captures her original intent to identify affiliations through boards, memberships, organizations, et cetera.

Trustee Cavazos:

Yes. I think that Trustee Brooks and I are on the same page when it comes to that.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Trustee Cavazos. Thank you Trustee Brooks and Trustee Brooks you mentioned, I'm going to go back to you for a second. I'm sorry.

Trustee Brooks:

It's okay.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

I'm injuring my colleague here with this pencil lead. It's a real problem. Trustee Brooks, can you please go back to the permission for disclosure? Is this something that we would need to include in this particular request for proposals to indicate to people who are responding to our request, companies who are responding to our request to provide, to be clear that that's what we're going to be expecting from them?

Trustee Brooks:

Actually, that's probably going to be a conversation that we have with the actual vendor we choose.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Understood. Okay. Thank you. Anything else? Okay. All right, colleagues. I don't see any other questions. I want to recap what I've heard so far. I've heard the edits so far that we've discussed include in section 4.2 adding a section F, letter F, that indicates that ask vendors to identify affiliations including boards, service groups, et cetera. I've heard under page seven, 5.1 include our mission and vision and organizational values. I've heard page eight, the need to include the PCG reports on culture and climate of our district as additional material. And then on page nine, E, add in conjunction with the board and based on community feedback and develop a rubric for screening. And that's what I've heard so far from my colleagues in terms of the changes. Please let me know if there are anything that I missed. Otherwise, we will continue going through this document and I am open to any additional pauses to help us gain clarity or make any edits or changes to the document. Okay. All right. I'm going to move on colleagues. So if the section I mentioned, 5.2 meat and potatoes of what we're asking vendors for, A through O, that continues on to page 10. Of course that again is standard M, N and O on page 10. We're going to move on to the tentative schedule. I want to point out a couple of things here. Obviously this is stricken in red simply because these dates are not applicable to us at this moment in time. But I want to point out that this process will happen over the course of several months. Like once, and this is part of my introduction, earlier section A, there will be a presentation and interview by the board. The vendor supplier is selected. Candidate interviews will begin. This is section B. Section C, superintendent selection, accomplish negotiations initiated.

I want you to pay a special note between the moment that we select a vendor to the moment where we select a superintendent, right? In this case in 2017, we had several months in between, five months in between the holidays took place. But I do want to note that this is an example of what has taken place in the past. The board can expedite this process or slow it down as much whatever, based on its appetite to move this work forward. If there is a desire to move this work forward faster, there will need to be special meetings that take place for the board of trustees and where we will have these presentations take place.

So just I ask for your support in ensuring that we do have special meetings to help not exactly expedite it in the sense that we need to rush this process, but we do want to be efficient with our time and also ensure that we're moving this work along and there's no major delays. So in this process here, you'll see that section D, there is an offer that's extended to the selected candidate. That work is done in conjunction at a board meeting and in conjunction also with counsel to ensure that there's a contract that takes place once the contract is accepted and brought before the board, the superintendent's start date will begin. Are there any questions specifically or comments regarding the tentative schedule and appetite to move this forward expeditiously and purposefully or to take the time that's needed for this? Trustee Guzmán?

Trustee Guzmán:

Thank you President Garcia Morales. I totally am supportive of special meetings and ensuring that because it looks like it was a seven-month process. The longest part of this process was presentation and interview by the board and the supplier selected, to the time that the candidate interviews actually begin.

So my thought process is that instead of taking four months for that to occur, to shorten that process because I just feel like the candidate interviews could happen in a shorter time. When you're doing a national search, usually they take about, well, we have to find the supplier obviously. So I don't know how long that particularly takes, and that might be something that we need to find out. But usually when there's a posting, a national posting takes about a month for the actual screening to occur. And then the candidate interviews, at least what I have seen with superintendent searches. So that's my question has to do with the supplier selected because I think that that is what might have held this up and made it four months instead of maybe two.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. I will. I see some other members in the queue. What I do want to share is that thank you for your commitment to have special meetings first of all, Trustee Guzmán. Best practice based off of procurement is that we, once we provide procurement, the updated language on this RFP, they post it for three weeks. This is standard procedure in the district, anywhere between two to three weeks to get vendor responses. They will need about a week to review the proposals that come in. And again, then we will need to post for public agenda to have these items shared with all of us. So we're looking at early May for a meeting to discuss the two to three vendors that we'll eventually interview. And then there needs to be some sort of lead time that exists. We could give them two weeks to a special meeting in the month of May to turn around and give us, be prepared to present to the board.

We can expedite this process through our own work to ensure that this process here with the selection of the candidates is purposeful and expeditious. And at the same time, request that of our vendor, they may want to know that we are trying to move forward expeditiously as well, because that may determine whether they submit a proposal or not. Okay. Trustee Brooks, did you have anything to add? I know that you or Trustee Cavazos, based off of your experience on this particular piece. Trustee Cavazos, did you have something to add with respect? Okay. I'll turn it over to you and then I recognize I'm going out of order here. So thank you colleagues in advance for your consideration. Trustee Cavazos?

Trustee Cavazos:

Trustee Brooks can go first if she likes.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

You're first. You're first.

Trustee Cavazos:

Does it matter? Okay. I just wanted to basically say that in addressing what Trustee Guzmán brought up, we had some issues with, because it was close to, it was around the holiday time, and so we had some things that we had to change around that kind of slowed the process down because we wanted to make sure that the vendor was being given adequate time to do what we had asked them to do. And then also too, we were trying to be cognizant of the applicants at that time, having enough opportunity to schedule their interviews and to get basically all of their materials together. So that was something that slowed it down.

Trustee Garcia Morales:  
Thank you for that feedback Trustee Cavazos. Trustee Brooks.

Trustee Brooks:  
Thank you Madam President. The only thing I want to add is that between steps A and B, there's a lot of stuff that occurs. First you have to do the rubric part. So typically there's one meeting where you're actually working, well, you got to do the listening, right? And then you have to do the rubric. And then after you work on the rubric in public, you have to bring it back and then it has to be voted on. So there's quite a bit of steps in there. I think you can shorten it some. I guess maybe we should decide, do we have to have these actual dates? Or can we just choose a time chunk that is, like we want to do this within six months, or do we need actual months here?

Trustee Garcia Morales:  
I don't believe that we need actual months. We do need actual months. We do need actual months. Months and years. A year. This year. A year. This year. We're not going to turn this into 2025.

Trustee Brooks:  
We can't have start, end date goal? No?

Trustee Garcia Morales:  
It's going to be important for us to be able to provide the vendors a clear expectations about what we want from them in terms of the timeline. And again, that will determine whether they submit a proposal or not.

Trustee Brooks:  
Okay.

Trustee Garcia Morales:  
Thank you for that. Trustee Brooks, anything else? Okay, I'm going to go back to the queue. Trustee Bustamante Adams?

Trustee Bustamante Adams:  
Thank you, Madam chair. I am in support of making sure that we get the right person for the position and one of the public comments that really stuck out to me is the fact that we are a dynamic region and our opportunity is growth and especially in the diverse sector. So I don't necessarily want to put us into such a tight format. When I was on the search committee for a UNLV president one time, the process was about eight months. And so I think that it's upon us to be able to provide that clarity to whatever search firm we pick and that's where the efficiency is going to happen. So that's just my two pieces of comment.

Trustee Garcia Morales:  
Thank you. Trustee Bustamante Adams. Trustee Williams.

Trustee Williams:  
Thank you, Madam President. I think just in general, if we don't put a date on it of when do we want this

Trustee Williams:

potential new person to start, we can't backwards plan this at all, right? So we're looking at, let's put out the RFP, let's do this, let's do this, but we don't have a date of when we want this person to actually start and take over the district. And in order to do that, you have to just set a date. So whether it's seven months, eight months, or a year, it doesn't matter, really doesn't. But just knowing that day, then you can backwards plan that and that's how every other type of organization runs and that's how they run efficiently, is they put a goal date. By this date this will happen. And how do we get to that point in those steps, which is my only comment.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Williams. If we were to look at the schedule that we used in 2017 for about seven months' worth of work, that will take us to October on possibly November 4th. We'd want a potentially superintendent to start by November 4th. Okay. Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

... May.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Yeah.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

Thank you. Thank you, Madam President. So I did a little bit of research on some of the other districts in the state of Nevada that are doing the process and some of them have selected certain firms, which I'm not going to discuss and advocate, but some of those documents are online. There is in the Washoe County School District. I would entertain us thinking about it differently is not looking at dates. Could we consider phases? What is the process that we want to accomplish in a certain part of our phase, which, I believe Trustee Brooks was mentioning that it's going to be looking at what should come first, which is that listening piece and then making and developing a rubric. So maybe could we be creative and think about phases and then we could backward and put, of course, a start date for the superintendent based on what needs to get done by those phases and the tasks that need to be completed.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan. Again, I do want to point out here that this particular item says the services shall commence on or about the date that we hope to have selected a vendor. The following milestones are considered critical in meeting the board's desired deadline of the date the superintendent will start. And when it comes to this particular piece, this is a request for a proposal and we still have a contract that has to come back before the board that will essentially allow us to accept and adopt and make potential changes to this timeline. For the purposes of this particular request for proposal, we're simply providing a sample draft of what... It's a definitive document, but a guide of what we're hoping to accomplish by when, and if we do it sooner, if we accomplish it sooner, high five for all of us. If we're not able to, then we have a different conversation and maybe an amendment to the contract. So I want to bring that up and shine light on that for my colleagues. Trustee Zamora.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you, Madam President. As you mentioned, the November date and just looking, comparing right from 2017 and '18 to now, November's kind of tricky where it's a busy month and I also think about just the

Trustee Zamora:

time off of school. So November, December, what would that work look like if that person was to start in November and seeing if maybe just aiming for January type of thing, which I know sounds a little bit further out, but being realistic of November and December and holidays and breaks and everything.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Zamora for your feedback. Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

So let me rephrase what I was trying to explain. Yes, we need dates for an RFP, but could we first do the process of what needs to get accomplished and lay that out? So I'm just saying it doesn't have to be in this meeting as far as, but we have to identify what those steps are to get to the end game and then the dates could be added for consideration. Just a thought for out of the box thinking. This can be amended, this could be changed.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

I'm going to turn your mic back on Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan, again. Do you see that the sections A through E are like phases? Is there anything in there that doesn't seem like a phase to you? This section has definitive dates. Let me turn that on. There we go. Okay.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

So this is not granular enough for me and I think that's the problem when maybe the RFP is not delineating the process. So I want to make sure, because in the vein of transparency, we want to have that be open for the public to understand how they're going to be involved. Then maybe if we put it, it doesn't have to be in this document, but I'm saying outside of this document, let's consider what has to get accomplished.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

I hear you loud and clear. What I heard you say is that there should be a separate document that details all the phases that consist of this process and it should be done in collaboration with the board and the selected vendor. Understood. All right. Very good. Thank you for that. Trustee Guzmán.

Trustee Guzmán:

Thank you, President Garcia-Morales. If you don't mind, I'd like to ask Joe Caruso to come to the mic for a minute and ask him about these dates because I think we have to come up with dates for this RFP, is that correct?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

He's shaking his head yes.

Trustee Guzmán:

Okay. So our goal here is to ensure that there are dates that are clear so that the RFP can be utilized. So going back to my thought process and hearing what folks are saying, would we put as a... Maybe this month, maybe April, at the end of April, I'm not quite sure how that would work. And then utilize this as a guide to move forward. And then maybe instead of November 4th, maybe it would be in September, because she's right November 4th. We're getting close to election time, but going out as far as January,

Trustee Guzmán:

that's fine if that's where we are, but setting the goal as September, we can always extend it. Am I right Joe? Can we extend the start date?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

If there's an appetite from the board, yes, we can make modifications to this tentative schedule. I appreciate your line of thinking, Trustee Guzmán, that we have a start date and then work our way backwards just as Trustee Williams had a shared and the appetite from the board is not to wait until November, for example. Okay, I hear that. Thank you very much. Trustee Guzmán. Trustee Watson.

Trustee Watson:

Thank you, Madam President. I just wanted to say that I am all in favor of doing special meetings because we got to get the work done. So whatever it takes to get this ball rolling, I'm in favor of and the sooner the better.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Watson. Appreciate that. Trustee Johnson.

Trustee Johnson:

I'm in favor of moving forward as quickly as necessary. So being quick without being in a hurry is important. And then, 5.3 says tentative schedule, which, language matters. And so to me that means that we can put this here today with the thought that, already this is planned on changing because it's tentative and nothing says final. So just making sure that we need to make sure that there is a check and balance in that when we get towards a date and we're feeling anxious about the date coming, we have the discipline to say this is tentative, we don't have what we want, we're going to push it forward as opposed to... And so I don't know how we write that in. We have to just agree as 11 people to hold ourselves accountable to saying we either have what we want by this date or we don't. And if we don't, we commit to pushing it out until we get what we want, because we've already written that it's tentative, so the language is already pretty clear that whatever we write here, it can change.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Johnson, I appreciate that. And your support for a... You said walk with purpose, you said ensure that we're moving ... that interpreted as moving purpose. Quick without a hurry. I love that. Thank you. Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you, Madam President. I want to go back to something that Trustee Bustamante Adams said a few minutes ago, and that is that she noted that we want to find the right person, and sorry Trustee Bustamante Adams, I don't remember your exact wording, but basically that time is not going to be the main factor here, but that we want to find the right person and explore options. So I like what Trustee Johnson said. Quick, I don't know if I'd say quick, methodical, exhaustive process and it is going to be exhaustive, but that we don't get so focused on this is the end date and we must have this, that we forget about all the other things that we are trying to focus on having to do with the profile, having to do with what this district needs and having to do with what our community is asking us for. So again, we cannot forget the most important part here. It's going to be the stakeholder and the community intake. And we're not going to have the holiday here like Thanksgiving and Christmas, but remember we're going to be going into summer. We want to make sure that

Trustee Cavazos:

people are not being excluded because maybe they have a family vacation planned or who knows, maybe a trustee might actually have a vacation plan. I don't, but somebody else might. So I think that we need to keep our eye on the ball and what we want to accomplish. So the time span and the phases that are already delineated here are important, but I don't want us to get into the time frame of hurry, hurry, hurry, we need to get this done. And even if this is not convenient for the community or whatever the stakeholders, we're going to do it anyway. I think that we need to remember what we are actually searching for and who we're searching for. Thank you.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Thank you, Trustee Cavazos, I hear your support for this template that exists here, ensuring that we use six to seven months, more or less. Here we go. Let me turn your mic on.

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you. I wouldn't say necessarily that I'd say that I want it to be this long, seven months. I'm going more with the global attitude that we're not going to rush it or get so focused on a date. And I was just getting ready to ask the same thing that Trustee Guzmán asked about, didn't we need to have some kind of dates for the RFP if I understood it correctly? But I think saying that September as a hard and fast thing as opposed to November, maybe we could compromise on something in between. But I think the name of the game here is going to be flexibility and the process.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

I hear that loud and clear from my colleagues. So in the event that we say September 30th, which is close enough to October, is a tentative schedule, we can work our way backwards from September 30th, for example, on this timeline that we provide in the RFP. All right, Trustee Brooks.

Trustee Brooks:

Thank you. Thank you, Madam President. In an effort to move us forward, I'm going to throw some dates out that I think would work based on the feedback everyone's provided. I would say if you selected May 14th as the date that they would start, the presentation would have to be two weeks prior to that and then you can map it from there. And then the deadline I would put is November 1st, given the fact that it says the language for the deadline is "Or sooner." So we should try to be efficient, but we should also make sure that we are reasonable.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

That's May 14th. That has not given us enough time, not exactly for listening for us to interview the candidate. So in order for us to have a May 14th deadline, we need to change the amount of time the RFP is available from three weeks to two weeks.

Trustee Brooks:

Or you could move it forward to one additional week, if you need to.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Move it to-



Trustee Brooks:  
Let's say it posts on-

Trustee Garcia Morales:  
The 10th of April.

Trustee Brooks:  
Okay, we're going to post on the 10th of April?

Trustee Garcia Morales:  
It may be earlier, but no later than April 10<sup>th</sup>.

Trustee Brooks:  
Okay, so April 10th, it's going to be posted for three weeks?

Trustee Garcia Morales:  
That's best practice. That's May 1st. We give procurement a week through May 8th to review the applications that come in from vendors. And then the board has a meeting the week of the 13th to select to distill the two to three vendors that we'll be interviewing.

Trustee Brooks:  
Okay, so you could do that two weeks. So the first week right after you get the pile of applications, you review them, you select people for interviews, and then the next week, which would be the week of the 20th, you'd be able to select someone.

Trustee Garcia Morales:  
Okay, allow me one moment. Thank you for that note. Mr. Caruso, can you please come up so that we can go through any additional pieces around the timeline

Joe Caruso:  
Good afternoon, Madam President, members of the board, interim superintendent, Larsen-Mitchell. Joe Caruso for the record, may I have just a moment of leniency here? If we could just go backwards real quick. I think I can help clarify a couple big steps.

So let's start with the process in 2017. Okay, so the board on October 13th, 2017 directed purchasing to develop a request for proposal to engage in finding a search firm. Purchasing then developed the RFP, incorporated the board's requirements as discussed at a special board meeting on October 23rd, which in essence is what we're doing today. Then moving forward from that, the RFP was open from October 24th through November 11th to allow the interested parties to prepare and submit responses.

The RFP closed on November 11th with four respondents and then purchasing then gathered that information together. The step that we have to remember collectively is that all the respondents either have to come back to the full board for review or the board has to then go through, and this is something Nicole and I have talked about, and individually rate on bonfire what they think are the top three. So you really have to allow yourself time because A, say hypothetically, let's use the number five. You have five companies saying they want to be the search firm. You then have to go through all those documents in a

Joe Caruso:

public meeting, post all the responses from those five, and then make a decision as to say the top two. Then, you need to schedule time for the project manager from the top two to come out and do formal presentations to the board in another meeting. And I say this respectfully, now think about that. Now you've got to give them a buffer time to prepare and come out and present. Now this, most of these firms have done this before, so it's not like it's new. But still we could have a firm that comes from Massachusetts or a firm here in Nevada. You'd still want to allow that time for the presentation.

And I say this respectfully, now let's look at your calendars. That's another piece, is how do we schedule this in because all of you have careers and all of you're, so that was part of the challenge that we had with this. Moving forward, you then have your meeting, you select, okay, this is the firm we want to work with. Then, under your policies, we have to bring it back to the board because you have to do a purchasing award, because you're going to have to enter into agreement. So then you'll direct the interim superintendent to work with the CFO to say, "We allocate this amount of money to as a budget item for the board office budget to pay for the firm. We bring it back as a purchasing award. So then you have to budget that two week timeframe." So I just want to make sure that devil's in the details. I love details. Sometimes I drive you all nuts with that, but that's important for us to talk about to make sure that we know the steps and the timeframe.

The other piece we did in 2017, just to put things in perspective, when this came back to the board, so the board agreed to the search firm on November 30th. It was on the board agenda December 14th. The search firm then put together a timeline, which was on the last work session agenda. So all of you saw what that timeline was, and if you noted from January 10th of 2018, the planning meeting started where the search firm would sit down with the trustees and begin that process of conversations of what are you looking for? And then you had time for the community meetings. There was a discussion, a big discussion about what you wanted on the job description. And then that was a flyer that was created and the search firm brought it back to the board and said, "What do you want us to do?"

So really, again, not to drive you crazy with the details, but I think it's important to really pinpoint that you have to allow that time to make sure that we A... The respondents, again, if we only have a few that come in, great, but you still have to have a meeting to do that and then bring it back to allow that chance to come back out. So thank you for allowing me that chance to explain.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Is there anything else, Joe Caruso around the details? You mentioned wanted to go back, you've gone back and then nothing else.

Joe Caruso:

Madam President, members of the board, interim superintendent, Larsen-Mitchell. I think the next key piece to that is looking at, even though you have a search firm that comes in, say January 10<sup>th</sup> on that calendar, the candidates weren't even interviewed until April. So there was a lot of community meetings and I know Trustee Cavazos and Trustee Brooks remember we did go on Saturdays. We had Saturday meetings, we had night meetings, we had meetings in the community. There was a lot of time that we put into that and there were many, many members that came out. And I'm looking at Trustee Cavazos, on a Saturday

Joe Caruso:

morning, you remember the school and we sat. So I think time-wise, that's not to belabor that point, but I think just knowing that that was one thing that was built in and it was a collaborative process with the search firm. Once they were hired, the board sat down and said, this is our expectation. And then that's when that calendar came out. And I'll tell you, there were revisions because of timing and dates and holidays, et cetera.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Joe. So what I hear you saying is that... the seven-month timeline is already a tight timeline and we should consider that as a draft for our tentative schedule. And it sounds like, I'm hearing from my colleagues that that may be an appetite for the board to begin to offer potential vendors that this is where we're landing with a end-of-October tentative schedule to begin to be finished by this work by the end of October. Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

Oh, was I still in there? I was just going to say thank you, Joe. Just thank you Joe and the devil's in the details, but they're in the details that we need to be cognizant of to be able to not end up at a tight place where we have not followed protocol or that we end up with all of a sudden a search firm that we've selected withdrawing and saying, "We don't have enough time. You didn't give us enough time." That's an extreme example, but thank you for being the person with the devil in the details. And it was Silverado High School on a Saturday. Right? Thank you.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Trustee Brooks.

Trustee Brooks:

Thank you, Madam President. I don't think that we are going to be able to work out this timeline in public because there is a lot of nuance and I don't think 11 people discussing the nuance is going to be successful. So I'm going to throw an idea out there that maybe we determine the end date and we grant authority to Joe and to the board president to work out these details and then prior to posting to provide it to the board.

Trustee Brooks:

I would say a target start date would be like November 1st.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. November 1st. November 1st. We want to make sure that we still keep October 31st as a holiday, sacred holiday of Nevada. That is not said sarcastically at all. I'm sorry that sounded sarcastically, but on November 1st. Okay. Is that a Monday, Tuesday?

Trustee Brooks:

It's a Friday.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. That then maybe back November 1st. Trustee Williams.

Trustee Williams:

I just wanted to confirm that we're all in support of November 1st and then we're just going to let them work backwards. Is that a motion?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Not a motion that's necessary, but it is a suggestion and I've added it to my...

Trustee Williams:

I agree with that suggestion. So if there's a motion, just...

Trustee Garcia Morales:

No, not yet, but hang on tight. I love the enthusiasm. All right, colleagues, thank you for that discussion, that very hearty discussion and your commitment to have this process move along and I'll work with Joe on this. So that's the big section on 5.3 is that we've selected November 1st as a desired deadline or sooner for our new superintendent to start. Thank you very much. Joe, I think you can stick around for just a couple more minutes as we go through the rest of this RFP, the proposal and evaluation award. That's page 10, 6.1. This states that I'd like to actually make a recommendation that under 6.1, instead of saying an evaluation committee, it is... Oh, forgive me. The evaluation committee is procurement, not the board of members, the board of trustees. The evaluation committee will review the proposals and determine the best proposal based on Ovation. We need to make some edits to that particular section, actually, just because I want the evaluation committee, my recommendation, forgive me colleagues, is that procurement office reviews the proposals and provides us all of the applicants and they will use based on evaluation criteria, A through... A through what's the next page? A through H. A through H. So that's a recommendation that I have for my colleagues. Again, this 6.1 is clearly... We'll identify that there is not an evaluation committee, exactly. It is procurement who is working on reviewing the proposals and provides all applicants to the board of trustees for our review. Section 6.2, the rejection of proposals. Trustee Johnson, do you want to jump in here?

Trustee Johnson:

Yeah, just want to make sure I'm clear. So everybody will, so 10 companies send in proposals and then the purchasing department will send all 10 to us as so long as they meet A through J in section 5.2.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

In this section 6.1.

Trustee Johnson:

So as long as they meet A through H in 6.1, they will come to us and then we will make a decision.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

I'm recommending that all proposals come to us, even the ones that are... And that there's two piles. One of vendors proposals that meet the requirements and one that does another pile-

Trustee Johnson:

I was unclear. Thank you for [inaudible 02:04:16] that.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you for that. All right. 6.2 rejection of proposals against standard language here. We are going to move on to part seven special conditions again here, colleagues. Part seven is part seven and eight are, again, standard language for RFPs. Then that leads us to the end of this RFP, which is a section nine, the definitions and acronyms. Section 10 is an agreement that is provided to selected vendors, and you'll see there are some sections that need to be filled in based on the dates. Okay. So far what we have discussed is in section 5.2, we had a hearty discussion that the desired deadline of November 1st or sooner for a new superintendent date and my edited language around 6.1, the procurement department will review the proposals and provide all applicants to the board of trustees. I don't see any other changes that we've added. However, I'm open to questions or edits at this time. Trustee Johnson?

Trustee Johnson:

I don't have questions about edits because I actually wanted to go back. One more thing I forgot to ask. Once all of our companies are in front of us, what is the way by which we will select them? Like, how do we objectively determine company A is stronger than company B?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you for that. There is a rubric that's provided by procurement. This has typically been done in... The district has a process, right? When vendors come to them, they determine the vendors who meet the requirements through a standard rubric that exists through procurement. This is done internally in the organization through a platform called Bonfire. My recommendation to the board, however, is that we have the rubric that exists in Bonfire presented to the board of trustees, so that we use that when evaluating the eligible vendors.

Trustee Johnson:

Do we have an opportunity to provide any input on said rubric?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

We can, and that will be a special meeting or an agenda item that we can add to a future meeting... An item that we can add to a future meeting. Excuse me. Certainly welcome that. So that we're clear about what we're going to be evaluating on. We have to be mindful of the timing. Yes. Yeah. We have to be mindful of the timing so that we're not... Yeah, it's just something to think about in terms of timing and all of this timeline. Anything else, Trustee Johnson?

Trustee Johnson:

That's it for me. Thank you.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Thank you. Trustee Brooks.

Trustee Brooks:

Thank you. I just want to clarify, so the rubric that you're talking about, that purchasing does, is it based on part six, the proposal evaluation, A through H, or is it... And based on something else? Are these categories weighted naturally or is that something that the board determines the weights?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Joe Caruso.

Joe Caruso:

Madam President, members of the board, interim superintendent Larson Mitchell. So if you look at the bottom of page ten, 6.1, the proposal evaluation. So just to clarify that the normal process is that the rating would take place confidentially in bonfire, but the board is saying that they want full transparency through this. So it's not normal to bring all the respondents to the board first. Normally you would narrow it down and then the committee would choose the top. So the challenge we have is A, purchasing is going to have to look at the qualifications A through H to make sure, because I want to point out the very last one, other as permitted by NRS. We don't know A is say ABC consultants, are they, I don't want to say that out loud. Hypothetically a consulting firm, because there could be an ABC consultant. Are they licensed? Are they a viable vendor? Do they meet our procurement requirements? So those things we won't know. Purchasing will say, "Hey look, we've reviewed this. This is the recommendation." The other piece on 6.2, if you look the rejection of proposals, this is an important part to note because A, does the proposal have signature by an authorized representative of the respondent? Did the proposal respond by the specified opening date and time? Because are we going to allow people to submit it two weeks after? Are we going to take late homework? Are we going to say, "No, the homework assignments due. Turn it in, and this is the date." Failure to submit bonding. That's something we're going to have to rely on purchasing to clarify for us. Evidence of collusion among respondents, again, purchasing. Failure to meet the terms and conditions as specified in the request. Evidence submitted by the respondent leads the district to believe the respondent will be unable to carry out the obligations of the agreement and complete the work described. That's not something that we can tell, we won't know, that's where we have to rely on the purchasing department to give their advisement. The investigation determines the respondent is not qualified to meet obligations of the agreement and complete the work described. And then of course, cost of services exceeds the budgetary constraints. And that's the other thing, when we did this last time, we had a variety of costs and then Trustee Cavazos and Trustee Brooks will remember we had different firms come in a different price. It doesn't mean the more expensive one's a better one or the least expensive, but those are factors to look at. So we can definitely work with purchasing, ask them for their recommendation for the rubric, and then that would probably have to come as an item first on the

Joe Caruso:

agenda, and then look at all the respondents as the second item on the agenda just to make sure we're on the same page. But potentially that could be a lot, we don't know.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you Joe. Trustee Brooks.

Trustee Brooks:

So it sounds like the language where it says evaluation committee will review the proposals and determine the best is maybe not accurate wording. They're going to just determine which ones meet these minimum qualifications. And then I think we build into the process that there is a meeting between reviewing this, and after it posts sometime before we actually review these, that the board has a meeting to discuss weights for different categories of things that we've requested of them, like proof of experience or something. Because I don't know that this rubric is going to get us there, if we're going to try to make this subjective.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Right. Very good. Thank you, Trustee Brooks. I hear what both you and Trustee Johnson are saying, that need to be clear about how we're going to be measuring these vendors against each other. Got it? Okay. Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you Madam President. I just want to backtrack for a little bit as our discussion is progressing. I wanted to agree with Trustee Brooks where she had said going through all this, 11 people are not going to agree on every single thing here. So if we could just repeat what Trustee Brooks suggestion was, was that you and our board liaison Joe Caruso, can you just repeat what that recommendation was? And that seems like what we're going forward with, can you just repeat that?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Forgive me, Trustee Cavazos, are you asking Trustee Brooks to repeat that, or me?

Trustee Cavazos:

You

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Me. Oh.

Trustee Cavazos:

You can help each other.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

I was doodling over here making sure that I noted rubric, and there's little hearts on it, so I just want you to know that I was not listening fully. Forgive me, can you please repeat what you asked?

Trustee Cavazos:

Yes. On the preview, I was agreeing with Trustee Brooks that we didn't have any material ahead of time. So in sympathy for the audience and ourselves as we are slogging through this, forgive me for saying that, working through this that what was the agreement that you and Joe Caruso were going to do? What, as far as just the two of you... I'm sorry, I did not. I was doodling too, so forgive me, I didn't write that down.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

All right, let's clarify this that specifically. The comment was with respect to November 1st, deadline under 5.3 tentative schedule, that the board is in general agreement that we want our superintendent to start by November 1st, and that I would work with Joe Caruso to backwards map that timeline.

Trustee Cavazos:

Okay. Thank you so much. I appreciate it.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

I am, thank you. That's very specifically, but I believe there's an appetite for the board also to ensure that this work moves forward and work collaboratively with Joe to ensure that members have the information they need, and that we schedule meetings in a timely fashion as well. So that's a little bit of all-inclusive that I asked my colleagues. Okay. Anything else? So questions or edits to sections seven, eight, or nine at this time, colleagues with the RFP? If there are no questions, I'm going to review one more time the edits that have been recommended here on page four, five is fine. We are moving into page six where we are asking an additional item to be added for vendors to identify any affiliations with boards or groups, et cetera. We want to know that information. Page seven, include the mission, vision, and values of the district. Page eight include a link to information on the culture and climate study of the district. On page nine, section E, in conjunction with the board and based on community feedback, that specific language, and based on community feedback shall be added right before the comma, and page 10 with the tentative schedule will be worked out with myself and Joe Caruso. We are asking for the desired deadline under 5.3, desired deadline to be November 1st. Followed by part six, which is 6.1, we're asking for procurement to review the proposals and identify the vendors who meet the qualifications based on the sections below. And that's all I have at this time. Colleagues in terms of the edits, changes, additions to the RFP. Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

Thank you President Morales for that comprehensive capture of the revisions, that's a challenging thing to do with a document like this with all the verbose language in RFP. I want to rewind really clarifying, will purchasing be the ones to screen the candidates and then give you the top scores? You and Joe Caruso, can you clarify that for me?



Trustee Garcia Morales:

No. I've shared earlier that my recommendation is for the procurement to review all the applications to see and ensure that they identify the minimum qualifications that we have here. They will provide us a list, a stack of vendors who meet the minimum qualifications and those that do not. At some point before those items come before us, the board will be meeting to identify and clarify a rubric that has been provided with some guidance by procurement. This rubric will be fleshed out by the board of trustees, and we will use that rubric to rank score our vendor applications who meet the minimum qualifications. Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

Thank you for a follow-up. Joe, what was the past practice? Did purchasing bring you the top scores?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Mr. Caruso.

Joe Caruso:

Madam President, members of the board, Interim Superintendent Larson Mitchell. Joe Caruso for the record. So in twenty-seventeen, the purchasing department finalized the RFP. They then provided a description of the four forms with the respective qualifications, background, and then the listing of the information. So those four firms then came forth at a board meeting on November 30th, and then from that point, the board then went through the process to make that decision as to which direction they want it to go in. The difference with this is that if the board is going to commit to that transparency piece, then what purchasing would do is basically we would under the pleasure of the board, ask them to say, "Please review all of them. Tell us is there any red flags, like licensure." And then we would note that, and then still bring everything forth to the board in a public meeting. So regardless if purchasing said, "We would not recommend this," we would still see that, the board would then make that determination but then still have the ability to do it. That's not their normal process, but because of the goal to be transparent, that's something that the pleasure of the board can request and we can make that request to them.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, trustee Esparza-Stoffregan. Thank you, Mr. Caruso. Okay colleagues, if there are no additional questions or edits or additions, I'm seeking a motion to approve the edits that have been described during this conversation and have been re-reviewed and recapped several times, and that I work in collaboration with Joe Caruso to move this work forward for the board. Specifically around the selection of a firm to support us with the superintendent search.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Trustee Bustamante Adams.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, trustee Esparza-Stoffregan. Thank you, Mr. Caruso. Okay colleagues, if there are no additional questions or edits or additions, I'm seeking a motion to approve the edits that have been described during this conversation and have been re-reviewed and recapped several times, and that I working collaboration with Joe Caruso to move this work forward for the board. Specifically around the selection of a firm to support us with the superintendent search. Trustee Bustamante Adams.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you Madam President. I move to approve the edits that have been described several times, and thank you for that, for recapping. And also for you to work with Mr. Caruso to move this work forward.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Bustamante Adams. Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

I would gladly second that motion.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Cavazos. Colleagues, we have a motion by Trustee Bustamante Adams, and a second by Trustee Cavazos. Please cast your vote. Thank you, colleagues. That motion passes seven to zero.

## 2.02 Professional Learning from the Council of the Great City Schools.

Discussion regarding the Council of the Great City Schools Student Outcomes Focused Governance Framework and the next steps pursuant to the Professional Services Agreement Assisting with Member District Governance. [Contact Person: Evelyn Garcia Morales] (Reference material may be provided.) (*According to Governance Policy GP-17: Cost of Governance*)

*Removed during adoption of the agenda.*

## 2.03 Interim Superintendent Employment Agreement Negotiations.

Discussion and possible action to direct Board Counsel to negotiate an employment agreement with Brenda Larsen-Mitchell (or her designee) to serve as Interim Superintendent. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Evelyn Garcia Morales] (*According to Governance Policy GP-3: Board Responsibilities*)

*Motion to approve discussed edits.*

*Motion: Williams    Second: Brooks    Vote: Unanimous*

Trustee Garcia Morales:

We are going to move on to item 2.03. Thank you Mr. Caruso, and thank you colleagues. Item 2.03 is the interim superintendent employment agreement negotiations. This is an action item and acknowledge that there is some public comment that has been submitted in advance. If anybody who would like to speak on public comment, please submit your yellow card now, otherwise we will keep it going. Okay, well thank you. Thank you. All right, colleagues, this item here specifically as item 2.03 is as we just discussed right now, the general timeline for this superintendent search, the tentative timeline that will be submitted in the RFP process. One of the items that this item specifically will provide counsel, the direction to allow the board of trustees to discuss and enter into a conversation with the interim superintendent to ensure that we have an employment agreement. This is standard practice. In the past when the board of trustees have had an interim superintendent, we have had a contract, and so at this point I am simply asking the board to consider permission for counsel to enter into negotiations with the interim superintendent. This item once it's decided what the items that are negotiated will come back to the board of trustees at a public meeting for a vote on the interim contract. Again, this item gives board counsel direction to negotiate an employment agreement with Dr. Larson Mitchell, or her designee, to serve as interim superintendent for the Clark County School District. This item, once we have a contract, we'll come back before the board for a public meeting and a vote. Trustee Williams.

Trustee Williams:

Thank you Madam President. I was going to make a motion just so that we can move through this, because this again, like you said, is just directing the board counsel to go speak to the interim superintendent Dr. Brenda Larson Mitchell. So if you're ready, I'm ready to make this motion.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you Trustee Williams. I will note your motion. Do I have a second, colleagues? Oh, you're right. Thank you for that reminder. On all friends, I'm going to hold Trustee Williams motion if that's okay colleagues, and thank you. Thank you. I completely skipped over public comment. I apologize. All right, moving on to individuals who signed up in advance. Colleagues, if it's okay, I'm going to start with public comment and then go into discussion. Dr. Bemoll, come on up please. And then after Dr. Bemoll, Stephen Phillips.

### Public Hearing

Tiffanie Bemoll:

Good evening, Tiffanie Bemoll for the record. Thank you for addressing the fact that the superintendent deserves a contract to match the work she is doing. No one else was lining up to take this job and this kind of work. It's taken this long to discuss paying her what she's worth, especially with how much she's done in the position thus far. Hopefully this contract happens more quickly than it did for your educators. As negotiations are happening, I would like to offer the following history lesson. During the Enlightenment, Montesquieu espoused the need for separation of powers, and checks and balances. It's important to remember that absolute power corrupts absolutely, and sometimes we need to have checks and balances in place to ensure that the best practices are in play. I think everyone would agree that we all want what is best for our students, but giving away all of one's power is not always in the best interest

Tiffanie Bemoll:

of governance, and as renegotiations are happening, it's sometimes it's something to think about. Perhaps adding in some checks and balances with renegotiations of contracts would restore a little faith in the board and its ability to secure the best choice for our next superintendent. Thank you.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Bemoll. Stephen.

Stephen Phillips:

Hello, members of the board. Hello Interim Superintendent. My name is Stephen Phillips, for the record. I just want y'all to know that I'm going to be here consistently and every time we have these meetings as we go through the selection process to ensure accountability, transparency, and that we have checks and balances. So just know that. Thank you.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Mr. Phillips. Do we have any other public comment on this item? Thank you, colleagues. All right. Now I'm going to go back to the queue. Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you, Madam President. I wasn't ready to make a second, so I had a couple of questions if I may go forward to that.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Yes, please.

Trustee Cavazos:

I wanted to find out, since we do not have any reference material on this, because as you explained, this is simply giving direction to our board council, if I understand correctly, to negotiate. So I would assume that this would not be the meeting where we would have any background information. I was, from the time I've been on the board, I was not in a position where we had an interim and to do a contract. So is there going to be a time... Okay, I'm getting myself in deeper trouble here because of a meeting. Okay. Sorry, it's getting late here for a work session. I'm just going to go ahead and withdraw that, and just state that we don't have any background information on past interim agreements, but just confirming that this is giving direction to our counsel to negotiate an interim employment agreement and then a contract would be returning to the board.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

That's correct. Thank you. Thank you, Trustee Cavazos. Trustee Bustamante Adams.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you, Madam President. My question is, because I've not done this process either yet, and so for my edification at the moment, our interim superintendent is doing two jobs and during negotiations, does she get to pick the replacement or how does that work? That's not in the negotiations, right? I just need edification for that.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Thank you, Trustee Bustamante Adams. You're correct. Dr. Larson-Mitchell is doing both the deputy role and the superintendent role, and this employment contract will not specifically detail the pieces around the operations that she needs to conduct. It will give the board support to ensure that she has clearance to do the work that's needed for the organization to continue to be successful and move forward, and that there are no delays. So the agreement for us is simply a security for us, a security for her to be able to do to continue this work. In any case, we wouldn't have any input on who she selects as a deputy. However, the contract simply solidifies that our interim superintendent understands that there is a terms of agreement for employment that will allow her to move forward, and make the necessary adjustments that need to take place in the organization.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Bustamante Adams. Trustee Brooks.

Trustee Brooks:

Thank you, Madam President. I don't really have any questions. I do think it's appropriate to make sure that our interim superintendent is rewarded on par with her male counterpart, and I'm willing to second a motion or make a motion if there are no additional questions.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Trustee Brooks. I believe Trustee Williams has a motion on the floor. You are interested in seconding, is that correct?

Trustee Brooks:

That is correct.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. I see Trustee Williams in the queue. Trustee Williams? Not in the queue. All right, colleagues, we have a motion, thank you for that, a motion by Trustee Williams, a second by Trustee Brooks. Please cast your vote. All right, colleagues, thank you. That motion passes seven to zero.

## Public Comment on Items Not Listed as Action Items on the Agenda

Trustee Garcia Morales:

We're alive. We're awake. All right, colleagues, we're going to move on to item 3.01. That's the public comment on items not listed as action items on the agenda. This is not an action item, excuse me. This is anybody who's not had a chance to submit yellow card for public comment is welcome to do that at this point. We have one individual who signed up in advance and a one yellow card so far. Dr. Bemoll, come on up please. And then followed by Stephen Phillips.

### Public Hearing

Tiffanie Bemoll:

Good evening, Tiffany Bemoll, for the record. The first time I spoke to the board was to replay a day in my life of teaching. It was just to give a glimpse of what I do, and the expectations placed upon myself and my fellow educators on the daily. Last week, Brandon Summers presented on substitute teachers and it made me pause. Long-term substitute teachers make about \$20 to \$25 an hour in our district, and do just as much work in a day that contract teachers are required to do, sometimes more. They have to teach, write lessons, grade papers, input grades, make Tiffanie parent contact, and use all the crazy computer programs and whatnot that we do, and they do it without benefits, without holidays, without sick days. I can't even imagine doing what I do for so little. It is beyond time to rethink how we treat guest teachers, especially the ones who take on long-term vacancies, and especially the ones in special education positions.

At my site, we have two long-term guest teachers who are in self-contained classes. They would change diapers, who lived, who chase lopers. That's so much responsibility for so little. They have no sick days, no personal days, and no vacation. Just no pay when there's no school. That brings me to support staff. My amazing office manager works harder than anyone on my campus. Last Thursday, we had 38 teachers out and she had to find teachers to cover all of those classes because we did not have enough guest teachers. When Dr. Larson Mitchell was on campus at 12 o'clock, she had just finished replacing all the teachers that she needed to place for the day. She saw firsthand how difficult that is. She does all of this and makes less than a CSM. When guest teachers, office managers and registrars can make almost as much as starting employees at Sonic and Starbucks, something is wrong with the system. Office managers and registrar positions need their tiers revisited. They work so hard and are responsible for so much. When angry parents storm the office, it's not CSMs who stop them, it's the office staff. They need hazard pay or something too. With how much responsibility is heaped on these positions, they should definitely be higher than level 46 and 50. Thank you.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Dr. Bemoll. Stephen.

Stephen Phillips:

Good evening board members, Interim Superintendent, Dr. Larson-Mitchell. My name is Stephen Phillips, for the record. On the October 12th 2023 meeting, I had passed out some flyers to be put on the public record. They were not, so I would pass them out again. Please each of you request a copy and please put it on the record, I'll be checking board docs. Also, I wanted to address an issue that happened to my nephew a couple weeks ago at school. He had some eye allergies from cat allergies, so his eyes were red. But the staff

Stephen Phillips:

treated him as if he was doing something he wasn't supposed to do, and accusing him of smoking and all sorts of stuff that he doesn't even get caught up in. In 2022, his class came in second place in the Nevada State Robotics Championship, he's not that kind of kid. And I'm just troubled to hear it happening to many other people who have children in this system here, Mr. Mackey being one of them. Why are we targeting the students like this? This is not right. And that's all I have to say. Thank you.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Mr. Phillips. Colleagues at this time that concludes public comment.

### **Upcoming Meeting of the Board of Trustees**

We're going to move on to item 4.01. That's the upcoming meeting of the board of trustees on Thursday, April 11th at 5 P.M. here in the boardroom.

**Adjourn:** 6:19 p.m.

*Motion to adjourn.*

*Motion: Williams    Second: Guzmán    Vote: Unanimous*

Trustee Garcia Morales:

We're going to move on to adjournment. Colleagues, I'm seeking a motion to adjourn. Trustee Williams.

Trustee Williams:

Thank you, Madam President, I motion to adjourn this meeting.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Williams. Colleagues, Trustee Guzman.

Trustee Guzmán:

I second.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you Trustee Guzmán, colleagues. We have a motion by Trustee Williams, a second by Trustee Guzmán. Please cast your vote. Thank you colleagues. A motion passes seven to zero. The time is 6:19. Have a great evening.