

Minutes
Clark County School District
Special Meeting of the Board of School Trustees
Edward A. Greer Education Center, Board Room
2832 East Flamingo Road, Las Vegas, Nevada 89121

Wednesday, May 15, 2024

9:10 a.m.

Roll Call:	<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Members Absent</u>
	Evelyn Garcia Morales, President	Lisa Guzmán, Clerk
	Irene Bustamante Adams, Vice President	Ramona Esparza-Stoffegan, Member
	Lola Brooks, Member (Virtual)	Katie Williams, Member
	Linda P. Cavazos, Member	
	Adam Johnson, Member	
	Lisa Satory, Member	
	Dane Watson, Member	
	Brenda Zamora, Member	

Brenda Larsen-Mitchell, Ed.D., Interim Superintendent of Schools

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Welcome, everybody today. Good morning. I'm President Garcia Morales, and I call this special board meeting of May 15th, 2024 to order. The time is 9:10 AM. I'd like to remind everybody to please silence their electronic devices. We acknowledge the land on which we gather is a territorial homelands of the Nuwu, the Moapa Band of Paiutes, and the Las Vegas Band of Paiutes.

Flag Salute

Trustee Garcia Morales:

The Pledge of Allegiance will be led by Trustee Cavazos. Trustee Cavazos. Okay. Great. Thank you

Adoption of the Agenda

Motion to adopt the agenda.

Motion: Zamora Second: Cavazos Vote: Unanimous

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Now, I'm seeking a motion to approve the agenda. Trustee Zamora.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you, Madam President, members of the board, I would like to make a motion to adopt the agenda with the following changes. Reference materials provided for item 2.01, superintendent search request for proposal review of respondent proposals, reference materials provided for items 2.02, superintendent search request for proposal finalist interview questions.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Zamora. Trustee Cavazos,

Trustee Cavazos:

Madam President, I would like to second that motion.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Cavazos. Colleagues, we have a motion by Trustee Zamora, a second by Trustee Cavazos. Please cast your vote. Trustee Brooks.

Trustee Brooks:

Aye.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Is Trustee Guzmán on the line? Trustee Williams? Thank you. All right, let's count the vote please. Thank you, colleagues, that motion passes 5-0. Okay.

2.01 Superintendent Search Request for Proposal Review of Respondent Proposals.

Discussion and possible action regarding the review of respondent proposals to the Superintendent Search Request for Proposal. (For Possible Action) [Contact Person: Evelyn Garcia Morales] (Reference material may be provided.) (*According to Governance Policy GP-3: Board Responsibilities*)

Motion to recommend Alma Advisory Group; McPherson & Jacobson, L.L.C.; and Hazard, Young, Attea & Associates.

Motion: Bustamante Adams Second: Zamora Vote: Unanimous

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Now, we're going to move on to item 2.01, that's the superintendent search for proposal review of respondent proposals. And I am your point of contact for this. This is an action item, so anyone who has not had a chance to complete a public speaker card, please do so now. Once we begin this item, and presenting on this item, there will not be an additional yellow cards taken. Reminder again, colleagues, this is an action item. I'm going to begin with your permission, colleagues, to provide a few remarks about this item, and then I'm going to move us in an organized manner to provide the average scores of each proposal that we received.

That will give us a chance to come to... The goal at the end of this item is to have our top firms selected for the superintendent's search... who will help us conduct the superintendent's search, excuse me. Okay. And I want to acknowledge the team members that we have from CCSD, Mr. Mike Casey, who's the Chief Operations Officer, and Ms. Kris Blake, Director of Purchasing Department, and of course, Mr. Joe Caruso, district extraordinary, liaison to the superintendent and to the board of trustees, and all the things in between. Grateful. Thank you all for being here and for your support. They are here to help us answer any particular questions with respect to the support material that we received... reference material that we received. All right, I'm going to kick us off here. What we're going to do today is review the respondent's... the superintendent's search request for proposal that close on May 9th.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. The trustees received the respondent's information on May 10th when the public also received this information via BoardDocs. Trustees were asked to review the respondent's information in preparation for the meeting and rate their respondents using a rubric agreed upon at the regular board meeting on May 9th. Pursuant to Open Meeting Law, all responses made on the rubric will then be posted as reference material after our meeting concludes today. Please be prepared to submit your rubrics to Board Counsel at the conclusion of our meeting so that they can post that information accordingly. The purchasing department has scored the respondent's for cost and provided that information on an evaluation sheet for the trustees to review. Now, I've already shared that we have Ms. Blake and Mr. Casey here with us today to answer any questions on the scoring if needed. Also, they're here to ensure that we are compliant with the RFP process.

Our goal today is to discuss our feedback of the respondent's proposals and determine how many finalists we'd like to interview at the special board meeting on May 29th, 2024. The purchasing department will then invite the finalist to attend/present at the special board meeting on May 29th. Okay. Are there any questions about any of the items that I just discussed? Okay. Any questions from the members on the phone? Okay. I think that's a no, we'll move on. Now, we're going to move on to the ratings. I've asked Board Counsel to track the responses provided by each of you and then provide the average score specifically, and that in this sheet, colleagues, is the technical term of this... it's the combined average score. Okay. The combined average score for each proposal that was submitted to us, the respondent's proposal.

So I'm going to go through this list here. We'll start with the top. Excuse me, as I pull up the proposals. Yeah, that's right. Okay. All right. We'll start. So again, colleagues, now, for the ratings, I've asked Board Counsel to track the respondents... responses, excuse me. And ultimately, counsel will be helping us create an average score of 9, who are currently present, counsel? We've decided that... we're collecting everyone's information, the combined average scores of each respondents... of your combined average for each respondent, and we're collecting that information for all members. So that means we're also going to be dividing that by the number of members who are part of this meeting. Is that accurate, counsel?

Nicole Malich:

Yes, that's accurate. And when you guys are reading your totals, we don't need to read in the two components that purchasing rated, since those will be the same for everyone. So let's keep to your guys's average. So essentially, boxes 1 through 5. Does that make sense? Okay. Perfect.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. I'm going to give members a minute if they need to review their rubric and make adjustments for that. Okay. All right. Are there any questions about this particular section, colleagues? Again, we're going to be going down the list, maybe from left to right, and then into the air. My left, left to right, starting with my colleague at the very end, going to the right, and then into members on the phone, we'll be asking for the combined average of each supplier for sections, the rating criteria 1 through 5, which is what we rated each supplier with. Okay? Great.

Nicole Malich:

And due to Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan's absence today, in preparation for her absence, she did provide me with her rubric so I can read that into her averages into the record. She didn't configure the averages, but I did. And we'll post her rubric along with your guys's.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Okay. All right. So once we collect, once we provide counsel all of the... we're going to go firm by firm, member by member, provide counsel that opportunity to collect this information and average out the scores for us. Then we'll have a discussion based off of what comes up from the numbers. Okay. All right. Colleagues, do you feel good? Are we good?

Trustee Zamora:

I think we need to see it once.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Yeah, we need to see. Trustee Cavazos, I think you're going to be our first person to try this out. Are you good on this... Yeah, you're good. Absolutely. She is a pro. Thank you Trustee Cavazos. All right. For Trustee Cavazos, we'll

Trustee Garcia Morales:

start with Alma. Colleagues, that's the first supplier that we're going to be providing the combined average score to counsel. Trustee Cavazos, your combined score for Alma?

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you, Madam President. And the Board Counsel does want the total, not the individual-

Nicole Malich:

[inaudible 00:11:13] average.

Trustee Cavazos:

Okay, the total amount is 20.

Nicole Malich:

[inaudible 00:11:20].

Trustee Cavazos:

4. Thank you. 4, and the total is 20. Thank you.

Nicole Malich:

And if you guys need it, I can do the average [inaudible 00:11:32]. That's fine. Whatever works for you guys. Just go with [inaudible 00:11:37].

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Thank you, Trustee Cavazos for being the brave one and going first. Colleagues, do we have any questions based off of what Trustee Cavazos modeled? No? Okay. I think we're good. Trustee Cavazos, yes, please.

Trustee Cavazos:

Yes, Madam President, Thank you. Are we going to be doing discussion per each supplier, or are we going to do questions after each member goes ahead and gives her total? I wasn't sure about that.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thanks for that clarifying question, Trustee Cavazos, I'd like to get the scores out ahead of us so that it gives counsel a chance to tabulate, and then we'll come back and discuss.

Trustee Cavazos:

Sounds good.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. All right, Trustee Watson.

Trustee Watson:

Total... thank you, Madam President, 18.

Trustee Zamora:

1 through 4?

Trustee Watson:

4. Great. I thought it was-

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Watson, that's 18 out of five, five sections of the rating criteria. Correct.

Trustee Johnson:

[inaudible 00:12:46].

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Yes. Okay. Thank you. You're good. Thank you. 18 or 20. Thank you.

Trustee Watson:

Is that clear?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Yeah. Thank you, Trustee Watson, appreciate you being the second one to dive into this. Perfect. All right. Trustee Zamora, are you ready? You were born ready. Trustee Zamora, I need you to turn on your mic, please. Thank you.

Trustee Zamora:

My average, I have 4.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Thank you, Trustee Zamora. You're good. Trustee Bustamante Adams.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

My total is 20, so average of 4.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. All right. My average is 19... excuse me, not my average, my total is 19 out of 20. Thank you. Trustee Johnson.

Trustee Johnson:

Total of 20, average of 4.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Perfect. We'll move on to colleagues-

Nicole Malich:

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan is a 3.8 average.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. All right, I'm going to move on to Trustee Brooks, who's on the air.

Trustee Brooks:

Average of 4.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Great. Do we have any other colleagues in the air? No. Mr. Casey? Please go ahead, Mr. Casey.

Mike Casey:

Madam President, members of the board, just for clarification, counsel had mentioned that we would be providing scores for Trustee Satory, and the comment was on Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you for catching. Can you clarify who you're collecting the scores for?

Nicole Malich:

I think you misheard, it's Esparza-Stoffregan. I for sure haven't said Satory.

Mike Casey:

Okay. Apologies.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. So to be clear, Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan's scores are in the record? Great. Okay. Anything else, colleagues? Nope, we're good. All right. I think, Trustee Cavazos, are you ready to take us through another rodeo? All right. Trustee Cavazos, can you help us with the evaluation, your either combined average or your total score of Hazard, Young... HYA and associates?

Trustee Cavazos:

Absolutely. 4.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Trustee Watson.

Trustee Watson:

4.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Trustee Watson, I believe you said 4, correct?

Trustee Watson:

Yes.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Thank you. Perfect. Trustee Zamora.

Trustee Zamora:

3.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Thank you, Trustee Zamora. Trustee Bustamante Adams.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

My total is 18.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. This is where I'm wearing glasses now, my average is 3.6. Trustee Johnson.

Trustee Johnson:

Total of 20, average of 4. Total of 20. Average of 4.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Johnson. Trustee Cavazos, can I go back to you in a second after I get Trustee Brooks?

Trustee Cavazos:

Yes.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Thank you. Yep, thank you. Trustee Brooks.

Trustee Brooks:

Average of 3.8.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Now, Trustee Cavazos. Oh, forgive me, Trustee Cavazos. Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Nicole Malich:

Average of 4.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Average of 4. Okay. Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

Yes. I just wanted to clarify that we were allowed to do, as far as the averages, that, because I had a question from a constituent, and I think they're getting confused as far as our total and our average, we are allowed to, for instance, you said 3.8, is that correct? I did not catch Trustee Johnson, his average.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

We'll allow him to turn on his mic.

Trustee Johnson:

The average was 4.

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you very much, but I just wanted to clarify that for the public.

Trustee Johnson:

You're welcome.

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Thank you Trustee Cavazos. Colleagues, do we have anything else... what I missed regarding HYA?

Okay. Nope. I think we can move on to the next reference material. That's for JG Consulting. JG

Consulting. All right, Trustee Cavazos, ready to take us through again? Thank you Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

For JG, it's 15.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you Trustee Cavazos. Trustee Watson.

Trustee Watson:

For JG, 18.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Trustee Zamora.

Trustee Zamora:

My average is 4.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Trustee Bustamante Adams.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

My total is 10.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. My average is 2.6. Trustee Johnson.

Trustee Johnson:

Total, 18.5, average of 3.7.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Trustee Brooks.

Trustee Brooks:

Average of 4

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Counsel.

Nicole Malich:

Yeah, give me one second.

Trustee Johnson:

So I just learned it needs to be whole numbers, not-

Nicole Malich:

The average can be decimals, but your rating has to be whole numbers. So I caught that he had to have done a half because it was 18.5.

Trustee Johnson:

So we had a 2.6 average, which would've mean that we'd had a decimal in there somewhere else as well, right?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

So for example, mine was a two point... was it a 2.6? Yes. 2.6. The total number that I had was 13 divided by 5.

Trustee Johnson:

So we have to have whole numbers for... All right.

Nicole Malich:

For the rating, but the average isn't always going to be whole.

Trustee Johnson:

Okay.

Nicole Malich:

So let's come back to Trustee Johnson.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Trustee Brooks, for the record, can you please share your average score again?

Trustee Brooks:

My average is 4.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Thank you. Trustee Johnson.

Trustee Johnson:

Yep. Total, 17. Average, 3.4.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. And counsel, we captured Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan?

Nicole Malich:

Yes. Her average is 2.6.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Thank you. Okay, colleagues, thank you for that. We're going to move on to McPherson & Jacobson. Thank you, Trustee Cavazos, for being ready. I'll turn it over to you.

Trustee Cavazos:

Yes, thank you, Madam President. My average is 4.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Trustee Watson. Got it. Okay. Cool. Here we go. Thank you. Trustee Watson.

Trustee Watson:

Total of 17.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Watson. Trustee Zamora.

Trustee Zamora:

My average is 3.4.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Zamora. Trustee Bustamante-Adams.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Total of 20.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. My total is 20, average, 4. Trustee Johnson.

Trustee Johnson:

Total is 19. Average, 3.8.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Trustee Brooks.

Trustee Brooks:

Average of 4.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Counsel for Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Nicole Malich:

Her average is a 4.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Okay. All right. Colleagues, I believe we've got a good rhythm and we're ready to move on to the next supplier or response by Propyrior. All right. Thank you, Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you, Madam President. My total is 6.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Trustee Watson.

Trustee Watson:

Total, 12.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Trustee Zamora.

Trustee Zamora:

Average, 3.8.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Zamora. Trustee Bustamante Adams.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Total, 10.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Sorry, there we go. Could you say that one more time, please?

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Total, 10.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. My total was 9. Average, 1.8 Trustee Johnson.

Trustee Johnson:

Total, 15. Average of 3.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Trustee Brooks.

Trustee Brooks:

Total, 10. Average of 2.

Trustee Garcia Morales:
Counsel for Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Nicole Malich:
1.2 was her average.

Trustee Garcia Morales:
Okay. Okay. Perfect. All right. Counsel, do you have all the numbers you need to begin your calculation? Could you please turn on your mic and share that into the record? Counsel, could you please turn on your mic and share that into the record?

Nicole Malich:
Sorry. Yes. Can we have purchasing put on the record their totals for component 6 and 7?

Trustee Garcia Morales:
Yes. Thank you, Mr. Casey. Mr. Casey, Kris, who would like to take that on? Kris, I'll turn it over to you. Please turn on your mic and walk us through the scores. Thank you.

Kris Blake:
Thank you, Madam President. The scores for Alma Advisory... I want to see how we have this structure, the overall evaluation is a 4, and the cost rating is a 3.09. For Hazard, Young, the overall rating is a 3.9, their cost rating is a 3.79. For JG Consulting, the overall rating is a 3.8, the cost rating is a 4. For McPherson & Jacobson, the overall rating is a 4, the cost rating is a 3.54. For Propyrior, the overall rating is a 4, and the cost rating is a 3.

Trustee Garcia Morales:
Thank you very much, Kris. Trustee Johnson.

Trustee Johnson:
Thank you. I just want to make sure I'm clear on how the scoring happened. It sounds like we were asked to score in whole numbers and then think of a combined average, which would've led us to our averages of three point... whatever. But looking at... did you all go in the same fashion where you scored buckets in whole numbers and then combined in average?

Kris Blake:
Good question. Thank you, Trustee Johnson. For the cost, we start with our lowest respondent, they get a 4, and then we do a mathematical formula based on how everybody else priced out their solution. So it does come up with some very uneven numbers, because if someone's just a little bit less, they'll lose just a little bit of percentage points, where someone's a lot less... I mean, a lot more, I'm sorry, I'm saying that backwards, if someone's a lot more, they'll lose a lot more points. So it's a formula that we punch into an Excel sheet that comes up with those numbers.

Trustee Johnson:
Okay. So there's an algorithm of some sort that says \$10 less equals 0.1 deduction?

Kris Blake:

Correct.

Trustee Johnson:

Okay. And then for compliance... we were trying to make sure that they comply with every step of the process?

Kris Blake:

Correct. And so they will lose partial points. For instance, if they miss some minor sections, they might only lose 0.2 points, whereas if they're missing a significant section or oppose our terms and conditions, we will mark them down by a full point.

Trustee Johnson:

All right. And maybe this is minutiae, this is irrelevant, but it's for my edification, I guess, because we're out of 4, did we divide somehow? So for example, we have parts 4.1 to 4.7-ish in this, so how do we determine whether the cost appendix is... if they submitted that, if they didn't submit that, how do we determine how much comes off for that category, versus scheduling, or are they all weighted equally?

Kris Blake:

Very good question. No, they're not weighted equally. So if they miss the cost appendix, that's a significant miss. So we will take a full point out of those 4 off because they did not submit anything. For the 4.1 through 4.6, if they miss those items, we might only take off a 0.1 point of scheduling. That's a significant miss as well, so we might take a half point off for that.

Trustee Johnson:

Okay. And were they given this rubric ahead of time?

Kris Blake:

No, they're not.

Trustee Johnson:

Okay.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Johnson. I'm going to turn it over to Trustee Cavazos, and then I'll check in with Trustee Brooks to see if she has any questions.

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you, Madam President, and I thank you, Trustee Johnson, because that covered pretty much what I was going to be asking also too. Just wanted to confirm that on the rating on having to do with the cost, that the rating is 1 to 4, with 4 being the lowest price. And again, I think there's some confusion out there as far as interpreting that, and we're interpreting that correctly?

Kris Blake:

Good question. Thank you, Trustee Cavazos. Yes, that is correct, 4 is the lowest price.

Trustee Cavazos:

Okay. And I have another question here having to do with the compliance where we are talking about part 4, 4.4, loss of agreement, that we have one supplier, McPherson & Jacobson, where it states that, "There's an issue with release of information and there is nothing deducted from that." And you answered that sufficiently with Trustee Johnson having to do with how things are looked at and weighted. So I'm assuming that this is something that then when we go further into the process that we would be able to address?

Kris Blake:

Correct.

Trustee Cavazos:

Okay. Thank you very much.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Cavazos. All right, colleagues, I'm going to give counsel an opportunity to break down these numbers... Well, I'd like to be able to give counsel an opportunity to get these numbers. Can you please turn on your mic?

Nicole Malich:

I'm sorry. There's so few of you here that I forget that... Are we going to calculate back-end purchasing numbers now, or do you guys want to keep that separate? I need discussion from you guys and a feel for that so I know exactly how I'm calculating. I want to make sure everyone's on the same page. Does that question make sense?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

I'll provide some insight. I think it would be important to evaluate the entire package, so both what purchasing has provided and what the board of trustees, our average score, are for the supplier. I believe that may only make sense. Kris, did you have something to share?

Kris Blake:

Thank you, Madam president. Typically, we just need your scores and then we do the math after that, adding in our scores along with it. So we would just need your average scores.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

All right. So we'll use that-

Nicole Malich:

Just disregard your guys's scores for my purposes?

Kris Blake:

Correct. Thank you.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

All right. All right. Perfect. Thank you for that. Counsel, you're good calculating these numbers on your end?

Nicole Malich:

Yes,

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Yes. Okay. All right, colleagues, would you like to wait until we get the final numbers before we have a discussion? Is that okay?

Trustee Brooks:

Madam President, am I allowed to ask the clarifying question of purchasing?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Yes, please.

Trustee Brooks:

Are we able to know what the range of prices was? I see the rating for that, but do we have a range of these prices, how much they vary?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Kris.

Kris Blake:

Thank you, Trustee Brooks. At this time, we typically do not share cost until the evaluation is complete, as far as the quality of the responses.

Trustee Brooks:

Okay. Thanks for that information.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

And colleagues, I do want to point for the record, we do not have public comment on this particular item, so we're going to... thank you for your patience as we're crunching numbers over here to this side of the dais, and look forward to a healthy discussion based off of the scores. Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

I apologize, I'm just trying to make sure that... because we're all taking our own notes here, I did hear counsel state the scores for Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan, we do not have numbers that were submitted for Trustee Guzmán, Trustee Williams, and Trustee Satory?

Trustee Garcia Morales:
I believe they had emergencies.

Trustee Cavazos:
I'm sorry?

Trustee Garcia Morales:
Yes, that's correct. They had emergencies so they're not able to make it to today's meeting.

Trustee Cavazos:
Well, I actually know that two of them are out of town, I'm not sure about the third one. But I just want to clarify that scores for those three trustees are not being added into what... Board Counsel, I see, is ready to answer.

Nicole Malich:
The only scores I received in advance were from Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Trustee Cavazos:
Thank you so much for that clarification.

Nicole Malich:
My apologies, I wanted to do each one twice just to double-check.

Trustee Garcia Morales:
Thank you, counsel. Please, take us there.

Nicole Malich:
Okay. So for Alma Advisory, our average for rating criterias 1 through 5 is 3.9, for the eight of you that provided scores.

Trustee Garcia Morales:
Could we keep going?

Nicole Malich:
Yep. For Hazard, Young, they average for the eight trustees... and I went two decimal points, if you guys need to go fewer, obviously, round again, but 3.75. For JG Consulting, the average for the eight of you was 3.15. For McPherson & Jacobson, the average was 3.83. And for Propyrion, it's 2.18.

Trustee Garcia Morales:
Very good. Thank you, counsel. Colleagues, at this time, we have a choice to have a discussion on each of these firms, and we can do it in an organized manner. One of my big priorities is that we don't fall into any potential protests, and I'm not talking about the picketing ones, well, because it's like a picketing one, like a protest, but in the formal sense of the RFP process, there is an action that suppliers can take to protest our

Trustee Garcia Morales:

decision. And I'd like to, may I, either Mr. Casey or Kris, to remind us of what could get us to a protest. Maybe there are a lot of things that make protest possible... Yeah, so many things. Yeah, for the purposes of it, just from what I remember, this meeting on the 9th, we're very clear about what we could discuss, which was items, information that was relevant to the RFP when we were discussing this rubric. I guess, I don't want to discuss anything that's outside of this proposal. Is that a clear safe parameter? Kris?

Kris Blake:

Thank you, Madam President. Yes, as long as it's in the RFP documents you received, and reviewed, and rated, and we're in a public meeting, everything that's in those documents can be discussed. Outside of what's in those documents, we would just steer clear of that. Because some people may have knowledge of some of these companies outside of what is in their response. So we always advise our raters to not take that into account because that's not part of today's process.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you for that, I appreciate it. So perfect, colleagues, and I see some members in the queue ready to discuss. What I do notice in the reviews is that we have two very top contenders that are two high rated firms, that's McPherson & Jacobson and Alma. And I'd like for us to consider, at minimum, including them in the interview process. Now, I'd like to see if that checks out with you as colleagues... I like to check out with my colleagues to make sure that I'm not off by reviewing these numbers. If you have any objections, please let me know. Please, let's discuss this. And then is there a third firm that you'd like to entertain? Those are my two questions for you. Trustee Johnson, I'll turn it over to you.

Trustee Johnson:

Thank you. To me, we went through this process to be able to get to the most objective way to make a decision, and the cluster of three at the top is separated by about point two-tenths of a point. And so to me, it feels like we have a top three, 3 out of 5 generally is a way to give ourselves some good variation. Even the firm who's a 3.75 out of 4, they may be able to provide some information at the interview process that clearly distinguishes them from their two competitors. So to me, because we've went through it an objective process, we now have some quantitative information on which we can make a solid decision. And we have three firms that are within 1 point, 0.2 points of each other, that to me feels like the place where we can start to gather some qualitative information from them in-person.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Johnson. Trustee Watson.

Trustee Watson:

Thank you, Madam President. And as Trustee Johnson has alluded to, I do believe that the third one, HYA, was definitely highly rated in my opinion, and so I would definitely want them to come in as well. They do national stuff, and I think that's absolutely a great opportunity for us to see what they have to say.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Great. Thank you, Trustee Johnson. Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

I must concur with my two colleagues, and I believe that Trustee Johnson and Trustee Watson basically explained the same thought that I was having, that these top three would be the ones that I would want to interview. And I believe that the minuscule difference between the first, second, and third merits us having the top three to interview. Thank you.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Great. Thank you. Trustee Cavazos. Trustee Bustamante Adams.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Ditto for me on the top three. I would like to include the third component, what stood out for me... something that I'm interested in is their urban references, especially in Prince George's County and Los Angeles. That's why.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. All right, colleagues, it sounds like we have general consensus, but this is an action item and we do need a motion. So who would like to make a motion to accept those three to move on to the next phase? Trustee Bustamante Adams.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you, Madam President. A moment... I would like to make a motion on the search request for proposal review of the proposals, and recommend that Alma, McPherson, and Hazard and Young be moved forward.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Great. Thank you, Trustee Bustamante Adams. Trustee Zamora.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you, Madam President, I would like to second that motion.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Great. Thank you, colleagues. All right, colleagues, we have a motion by Trustee Bustamante Adams, and a second by Trustee Zamora. Please cast your vote. Trustee Brooks.

Trustee Brooks:

Aye.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay, colleagues, that motion passes 5-0. Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you.

2.02 Superintendent Search Request for Proposal Finalist Interview Questions.

Discussion and possible action regarding the Superintendent Search Request for Proposal Finalist Interview Questions. (For Possible Action) [Contact Person: Evelyn Garcia Morales] (Reference material may be provided.) (*According to Governance Policy GP-3: Board Responsibilities*)

Motion to approve.

Motion: Brooks Second: Cavazos Vote: Unanimous

Trustee Garcia Morales:

All right. We're now going to move on to item 2.02, the superintendent search request for proposal finalist interview questions. This is an action item and we will be taking public comment on this item. If there are members of the audience who would like to provide public comment, please do so now. Otherwise, once we begin this item, we will no longer take yellow cards. All right. Now that we've completed item 2.01, we need to review the script and questions for the special board meeting on May 29th, 2024. I'd like for you to please refer to the reference material, which is attached a copy of the script/questions, provided by purchasing department for our review and use. Thank you purchasing department for giving us that template to work with. I'm going to give members a chance to pull that information up since I know it's deep in our packet here. Great. Thank you, everyone.

Okay. That reference material is 2.02, superintendent search request for proposal finalist interview questions. I'd like for you to reference that material, which is a draft copy of the script/questions provided by the purchasing department. We have allocated 30 minutes for each finalist to present, and 30 minutes for trustees to ask any clarifying questions immediately following each finalist presentation. The document we're reviewing has draft questions that the presenters will have to answer during their 30-minute presentation. And I want to be clear that these questions that we have here will not be questions that we're directly asking them. However, we're providing the presenters of the firms we just selected with the listing of them so that they can embed them into their presentation. The intent is to keep questions as standard as possible, and to avoid any potential accusations of favoritism that could be used as the basis for a protest. There's my favorite word again, protest.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Thank you, colleagues, and I can't help but to emphasize how important this aspect of the selection process is as well, we want to be consistent and ensure that we're transparent and clear with the firms we've just selected as they prepare to present to us, and they're equipped to successfully present to us because of the work that we are doing tonight, or today. After the presentation concludes by each firm on May 29th, they'll have 30 minutes to ask... We, excuse me, we will have 30 minutes to ask clarifying questions on items shared during the presentation. Depending on the number of presentations, we may take a break between presentations as needed. We have three, we can work through the logistics of the time as we need to. That meeting is an evening meeting as well, just a reminder to my colleagues. We'll now review the categories and questions noted on page 1 and page 2, and make revisions as necessary to the questions.

So I want to remind you that purchasing shared their expertise with us, and we're incredibly grateful that they've already given us a really strong template to help us build on if we need to make any additions or changes to it. Again, these questions will be questions we provide to the firms so that they can embed these in their presentation. Now, trustees may revise the existing questions that are in this draft document, and delete and or add questions that they may feel are relevant. Please note that no revisions will be made

Trustee Garcia Morales:

following this meeting, and as we need to send this final document to the finalist for the review and preparation. Okay. Please note that the goal is to have all of the concerns addressed in the script, and to use the final 30 minutes to clarify what was heard during the presentations.

Again, it's an hour long, we have an hour with each firm, and 30 minutes of it will be dedicated to them answering our questions that we provided to them in advance through their PowerPoint presentation, and then we will have 30 minutes to ask clarifying questions about what we heard during the presentation. As a reminder, the intent is to keep questions as standard as possible to avoid any potential accusations that could be used for the basis of a protest. Do members have any questions regarding what we're reviewing today? I don't believe so. I believe members are ready to jump into discussion, and I welcome it. All right. Trustee Watson, you're up.

Trustee Watson:

Thank you, Madam president. It was about clarifying questions, so I think you were addressing it in your opening remarks on this piece, because I wanted to know the timeline in which I could submit a question or do some variations on it. And also I think the deadline is today.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

It is a quick turnaround. Grateful to my colleagues for your presence today so that we can get through this particular piece. Okay. Thank you for that. Trustee Johnson.

Trustee Johnson:

I'm recognizing that we have three firms, one hour each, that's already a three-hour meeting. And I guess I'm looking at the amount of information we're asking our selected firms to put into 30 minutes, six sections each would at least two subsections, and then under some subsections, there are more bullets. And it feels like there may be challenges to get to the level of... I also see that you say, "They shall include all this information," so they don't have to address everything. And so I'm just trying to figure out if we're going to ask standard questions and they may have nonstandard presentations, how do we make sure we have uniform information on which to make a good decision? Because 30 minutes is going to go very quickly, that's five minutes a section, but even with the subsections, it's going to be less than a minute to mention each one of these sentences.

So I'm just trying to figure out how can we get them to give enough information in the time it's allotted so that we can make a good determination, especially since we can only ask very limited... the follow-up question seemed like they can't be ad hoc, they have to be pre-submitted. Not seem like they cannot be ad hoc, they have to be pre-submitted, which means even if they don't mention something in their presentation and we're curious about, we might not be able to ask about it because that could lead to protest. So I guess my question is, is there any way for us to extend the presentation time and take some of the hour and give 45 for presentations and then 15 for questions?

Trustee Johnson:

Especially since the questions are going to be standardized, they'll be pre-known, and we can just... as opposed to us being able to have to think about it while we're there and then ask follow-ups, instead just say, "We'll give you more time to present the information that we know we want to hear," so then when we have to make a decision, we're making it on that and maybe the two or three questions that are

Trustee Johnson:

standardized. So I'm asking if we can adjust the allotment of time, instead of 50/50, maybe it's 75/25, or 80/20, because we're going to ask them to speak and we can't ask any flexible questions.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you for that, Trustee Johnson. I do see what you're saying and we do have the flexibility to make shifts and changes to the timeframe. So if there's an appetite for the board to do 40, you said in 20 or 45 something, that's a little bit more than 30 minutes.

Trustee Johnson:

Whatever the determination is fine. I don't know, but just thinking about how much we have, how much time.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Yeah, that's fair. So just adding more time to the firm. And I think the other thing I heard in your remarks were... or your questioning, your thought processes regarding how are we measuring, the word rubric comes to mind, but that may not have been your intention. Trustee Johnson, do you want to get back on the queue so I can clarify?

Trustee Johnson:

I always like a rubric because I think it's helpful for us to make fair determinations, and it helps us know how we're going to evaluate someone going in, and then we can be clear about what we're looking for. I would ask though, if we create a rubric, if we share it with our firm so they know what we're grading on as well. So that everybody is really clear about what to deliver because they know what our expectations are, and if we can state those clearly, then they can come prepared, and maybe they can fit everything in less time if they know they need to hit points 1, 2, and 3, because that's what I'm being graded on.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you for that. Perfect. So I will appreciate your comments and pieces. Mr. Caruso, did you have something that you wanted to share?

Joe Caruso:

Good morning, Madam President, members of the board. Trustee Johnson, to your question, I just reconfirmed with purchasing that, in essence, your questions are your rubric. So the questions that are listed here as a draft, they can embed on a spreadsheet and then that's your rubric. So they're going to get this as soon as the letter goes from the purchasing department, these are the questions that you need to answer, they'll come and prepare it, and then there'll be a form that purchasing can basically take these, embed them on so it's the same thing, and then that will be available at the meeting on the 29th. So hopefully, that answered.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Thank you for that. So we have a consideration of more time for the firms and a rubric. Okay. Trustee Zamora, turning it over to you.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you, Madam President. I was just thinking about the timing for the questions. I do believe a 45-minute presentation would be nice so they could go into details, but I do think about 15 minutes of questions is not enough time, considering that we're 11 trustees, and if we all have three minutes to ask questions, that's 33 minutes in itself. So that's my only flag. Follow up question, because we still follow those rules, correct? Three minutes per trustee?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

That is best practice, and that's a really good point. That's best practice also, I'll leave it there. We would definitely time everyone during that meeting. But then the other thing to consider is that we have three minutes to ask questions, but then the firm is also responding to our question. So that's more time. Yeah. Great thoughts, great perspective. Thank you for that. I hear an intention for more time and giving the presenters more time, and then evaluating the amount of time that we have. So thank you, Trustee Zamora. Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you, Madam President. And listening to my colleague, Trustee Johnson and Trustee Zamora, part of what I'm looking at and the reason that we go through such a complex process with a lot of thought and work... and our staff, as usual, Mr. Caruso saved me by that clarification as far as the information being embedded. One of the things that we're looking at here that is embedded through all six categories is their professionalism and their experience, and having done this before, and are they going to be able to do this job for our district? So I understand where Trustee Johnson is coming from, 30 minutes seems like just not enough time. I might be willing to go maybe 35 minutes, but we are the ones for the community that are going to be making this final decision.

So before we want to say we want to give them 45 minutes, we want to give them 40 minutes and cut down on our time, that could have some unwarranted consequences in not having enough time and then somebody saying, "Oh, I didn't get a chance to ask that question," and then we have President Garcia Morales who is trying to stick to best practices and have everybody fair and equitable. So I think what we need to look at here is what we're giving them is quite sufficient for them to be able to condense that. If they need a little bit more time, like I said, I might be willing to go maybe another five minutes, but I definitely would not be in favor of giving them 40 or 45 minutes and us only having 15 minutes, because part of what we're looking at here is, are they going to be able to do this job for us, and are they going to be able to work within the material that we've given them? So that's just my opinion right here. And Mr. Caruso, thank you for clarifying those points.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Cavazos. I hear you in support of five extra minutes, but not more than five? Got it. Okay. Thank you for that. I'm going to go up to Trustee... Sorry, colleagues, I'm going to go out of order here, Trustee Bustamante Adams, and Trustee Brooks, and then Trustee Johnson. Okay.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you, Madam President. I would also support the idea of more time for the presentation from the search firm. I would like to add, just on the last meeting that we had, this list of questions covers the diversity inclusion that I had asked about last time. It also covers the timeline and deliverables. My question is on innovative solutions, I don't know where that fits, but I would like to have them incorporate that. What

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

innovative approaches or strategies... do they have examples that sets them apart from their competitors on securing diverse candidates? And then my other question is about placement, their placement rate. And it's important for me that they may be able to find the right person, but that person doesn't stay in the job longer than a year. So I don't know if that's in question number 2 or not, or where it would fit, or maybe I missed the question and then I don't see it, but placement rate is important for me.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Bustamante Adams. I hear you're in support of some additional time, your average tenure of those placements, you're right, that is in section 2D2, 2D2, section 2, section D, section 2. I hope I'm saying that right. Can you look at that and see if that fits your need? Yeah. Okay. Oh, yeah. Sorry, colleagues, I cleared the... okay, thank you. I hear you saying yes, and I accidentally cleared everybody off the queue, so sorry about that. If you were in the queue, please put yourself back in... buttons, my fingers. Okay. And then I heard you say incorporating a question around innovative approaches and strategies that support the recruitment of candidates, diverse candidates?

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Yeah, that's in there.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

That's in there too already?

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Yes.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Great. Perfect. Excellent. So that's already covered, great. So just more time. Trustee Brooks, do you have anything you want to share before I turn it over to colleagues in the queue again?

Trustee Brooks:

Thank you, Madam President. One clarifying question. So the intent of this list of questions is to ensure everybody gets asked the same question, right? So the questions coming from the board should be very minimal because they're not standardized. Am I interpreting that properly?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Yes. The answer is yes.

Trustee Brooks:

Okay. So I would suggest that that's explained thoroughly to the trustees because I don't think a clarifying question coming from the board who gets a 30 to 45 minute long presentation should be three minutes long. I would say that if you have a clarifying question at that point in time, after you get this presentation, it's to clarify something that was just presented to you in the presentation, not asking for new information. So I don't think that three minutes would be a reasonable amount of time for an individual trustee to ask questions. I think they can ask one clarifying question briefly, they can state the question, it doesn't have to

Trustee Brooks:

include anything except for a question. And then another trustee should get an opportunity to ask a question that'll minimize the amount of... I mean, there's 11 of us now, so we really have to shove a lot in to 30 minutes or 15 minutes. I'm actually okay with 15 minutes for trustee questions because a good presenter is going to be very thorough.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Brooks. I want to offer my insight before I move on to colleagues back in the queue. I am supportive of providing the finalist additional time, and I'm supportive of ensuring that our colleagues ask specific clarifying questions. We don't have a lot of time between now and then for members specifically, but the questions that we should be asking that are clarifying are on this script, based off of the presentation that we're asking them to develop, that's based off of the content that we're providing. And I appreciate Trustee Cavazos sharing the energy,

Trustee Garcia Morales:

the vibe, picking up on what is it that the presenters are sharing with us because we will be working with this firm closely. So that's something that we can pick up without having to see something on a physical presentation. So I hear all these perspectives, and certainly, I'm supportive of providing the presenters 40 minutes, giving us 20 minutes... and actually giving us 15 minutes so that we could have a five-minute breather to transition the firm off the dais.

I think that time to transition is going to be important too, because otherwise, we'll be behind. So 15 minutes for us, 40 minutes for the firm... I'm sorry, did I do that right? Yeah. And then five minutes for transition time. Okay. And we are voting on the content of this document and the questions that we're going to be sending to the firms. Correct. Oh, well, let's see... Trustee Johnson.

Trustee Johnson:

All right. Thank you for the clarification. I appreciate Trustee Brooks articulating more, finally, the point that I was trying to make. So no question that we ask during the 29th should be a newly formulated question seeking new information, it should be, if they said, "We're from Las Vegas," the clarification should be, "Las Vegas, Nevada or Las Vegas, New Mexico?" That's the clarification question, correct?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Absolutely. Yes.

Trustee Johnson:

Okay. Which should take 10 seconds of us, so that's that. And then if that is the case, I do agree. If we're going to have limited scope in our questioning, then that extra time that we are going to be limited to should be for them to share more information with us, because we're going to do more listening than we're going to do talking, if I'm not mistaken?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

That's also correct.

Trustee Johnson:

Okay. Thank you for the clarification.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. I have a clarifying question with respect to the decision of that day. So ideally, we walk away from the end of that meeting with a selected firm. So there's time that we also have to incorporate, to deliberate colleagues that evening. So I take back my clarifying questions, I'm going back to providing the firm 40 minutes, giving us 10 minutes of questions, clarifying questions in this document, and then a five-minute transition, and five minute to potentially giving us some space to deliberate. So it's really... I think that we need to incorporate that there will be a discussion and a vote that needs to take place eventually. And that will create for a longer meeting if we're not mindful of all those aspects. Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

Okay. I have a lot of clarifications right now. So are you saying right now that... are you making the decision that it is going to be 40 minutes for the presentations on May 29th, and then that we're going to have 10 minutes to ask questions, and then I think you said five minutes? Can you go over that again? Is that decision being made right now by you? I think you said with the transition time.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Yeah. I'm providing context for colleagues to consider what options exist for us. And since a couple of you have asked for additional time, I'm providing framework based off of the feedback that I'm receiving.

Trustee Cavazos:

Okay. So I do want to point out, and I realized that staff has been working very hard to help us through this, having been through this before and owning up to some mistakes that I personally made, and not being well-informed, and following up on some information, I don't think that that is enough time for the board. I'm going to just assume that all 11 of us will be here or on the phone, I don't think that 10 minutes for questions... it's gone from 30 minutes to ask questions to 10 minutes, and I think that's quite a drop there. Going back to something that Trustee Bustamante Adams had said on the three top firms that we had, that was a very important question that you asked, and I concur with you on the placement, and how long people have stayed in their jobs.

And if I'm not mistaken, after going over this again last night, I believe that the three top firms did include that in their applications, just that they were so long. So just to let you know, I think that is in there. That's a very important point. So what I'm asking right now is that this information right here, this superintendent search questions and everything, this was additional information that we were sent yesterday, I believe, that was added on to the original information that we had. This was just received yesterday? I'm not sure what time? Okay. So some of the questions that I had prepared to bring, I already had formulated those questions before going through this additional document, and with work and everything, did not have time to, shall we say, combine them, condense them. So are you asking us right now to tell you now, right now, any additional questions we have that are not on this document that we got yesterday?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Yes.

Trustee Cavazos:

Okay. All right. So I'm going to go ahead and cede my time to whoever's next there, and if you wouldn't mind coming back to me, and I think we have Trustee Brooks in the air also.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Thank you. All right. Trustee Watson, you're next. I will go to Trustee Brooks in a minute after we go through the queue here. Trustee Brooks... excuse me, Trustee Watson.

Trustee Watson:

Thank you, Madam president. And I believe I've been reading this properly, but I want to know the capacity. I know they have people working for them, but do they have the capacity to do this search and this work for the fifth-largest school district in the company. And I don't know if that's embedded into the questions. I see some questions, but I just want to make sure it's embedded in there, that they have the capacity to actually get the work done.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Yeah, thank you for that piece, Trustee Watson. I'm looking through the capacity. Capacity, you mean, people, resources, time, that was... Okay, I think you're nodding, yes, that means yes. Forgive me, and I'm just putting it into the record so that it's in the record, I know your mic is not on. I wonder how that will be different from the rubric that we just completed, because some of that is already also in the proposals. Is that right, Joe? Do you want to turn that-

Joe Caruso:

Madam President, members of the board, Trustee Watson, to your question, on the page 10 of 22 of the actual evaluation, it's the proposal evaluation and award part 6, it describes in here, "Evaluation committee will review the proposals and determine the best proposal based on evaluation criteria, such as respondents experience and success in court in conducting similar work, adequacy of resources including personnel, facilities, equipment, financial stability, and other related factors." That was actually listed in the RFP for them to submit in their respondents, which the board has today.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Anything else from staff?

Joe Caruso:

I'm sorry, Madam President, Mr. Casey also noted, it's section 3, which is page 1 of 2 on the question sheet for the finalist interviews. Thank you, Mr. Casey?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Yeah. I see. Okay. Great. Give me one second. Let's turn your mic on, Trustee Watson.

Trustee Watson:

You're referring to 3C on this new document that we received last night, correct? Mr. Caruso? Proposed team experience and availability.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Mr. Casey, or Mr. Caruso, or Kris.

Mike Casey:

Madam President, members of the board, Mike Casey, for the record. Yes, that's correct. As far as section 3 of the proposed presentation, it does look for the submitter to present your team as well as their availability, essentially, capacity.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Watson. Trustee Zamora.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you, Madam President. Clarifying question. So originally, with this first document that we received with the finalist interviews, it says on the top, "Presentations by finalist firms, 30 minutes, trustee clarifying questions, 30 minutes." And I feel after this discussion, it sounds like we cut down some of that time to add the transition and deliberating. Is there a way we can do the transition and deliberating time separate from the presentation?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Yes, and I thank you for that. There's room for us to really create this however we'd like to as a group. I think the group has a shared interest in extending some time to the presenters. So that's more than 30 minutes, that's what's proposed here. And then I just bring up the deliberation and transition as part of the total package that we need to consider for each group, because that will add to our meeting time that evening. Is that helpful?

Trustee Zamora:

Yes. As I look at the firm and the questions time, you provided 40 minutes and 10 minutes, that goes down to 50 minutes instead of the hour that we talked about in this paper that you gave us. So then my second question is, for the deliberation, would it be after each presentation, or would it be as a whole after all three?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

That's a good question. In the past, Mr. Caruso, how have we managed a deliberation?

Joe Caruso:

Madam President, members of the board, Trustee Garcia Morales and Trustee Zamora, to your question, it's really the pleasure of the board. If you wanted to have the opening, do the presentation, have your clarifying questions, and then deliberate and or include public comment on that, or do your presentation, question, presentation, question, presentation, question, deliberation, public comment, and then go back to your vote, you could do that as well. So it's really the pleasure of the board, which direction you wanted to go. I would suggest, and I'm just mapping out some times, so hypothetically, if you started the meeting at 4:00, by the time you get your opening, people come up, we get the presentation ready to go, if you start the presentation, and this is at a 45-minute timeframe, you would start the presentation at 4:15, that would go until 5:00, you'd have questions, if we did 30 minutes, again, just hypothetical, you'd be at 5:30, you'd have a transition time, next presentation, 5:45.

So that would take you to 8:30 if you were to follow that 45/30 timeframe, before you would actually have public comment if you were to go straight through, and then obviously, time for deliberation. If you were to

Joe Caruso:

cut it back and do your 40 minute, you'd start at 4:15, you'd go to 4:55, do your 15-minute questions, you'd be about 7:20 by the time if you were to go straight again. So I see all the wheels spinning, I'm thinking time as well just to see where you're at to make sure the public has a chance to comment, and of course, you have time for deliberation as well.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you for that. Trustee Zamora.

Trustee Zamora:

So when would we decide how we will do the deliberation? Would it be at this meeting right now?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Not exactly. Thinking about how we came to the deliberation of the three firms, I put effort into proposing something to my colleagues, and then you all accepted, and we went through a seamless process. So typically, the president puts some effort into thinking through at what time. But since I brought it up here, I'm open to suggestions, and also want us to consider that as part of our timing too.

Trustee Zamora:

Okay. I have a last comment. Just I would love to give the presentation the total of their hour that we originally presented with the presentation and the questions.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Forgive me, Trustee Zamora, I'm going to turn on your mic, if that's okay. An hour, and then you said that you wanted to give the presenters just a little bit of extra time. What does that look like for you?

Trustee Zamora:

I imagined it 45 minutes, how originally it was discussed for presentation, and 15 for questions.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you for that clarifying, I appreciate it. All right. 45 and 15 minutes for Q&A from board of trustees. Super. Yes, Mr. Caruso.

Joe Caruso:

Madam President, members of the board, again, fountain of information here, thankful, Ms. Blake pointed out, you'll have to deliberate at the end, because if you deliberate in between each one, then if Trustee Zamora's finalist one, Trustee Bustamante Adams is finalist two, trustee Johnson's finalist three, whatever is deliberated on one, two could change to adapt to accommodate. So I appreciate Ms. Blake pointing that out for clarity. So you will have to deliberate at the end. So we'll need to adjust that.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay, thank you. And Joe, for the purposes of this last recommendation, make sure that we're good. Can you please map out what the 45 and 15 minute... like an hour long presentation, and then time that we would need to incorporate in transition and also public comment and deliberation. Trustee Zamora.

Trustee Zamora:

Okay. I'm even okay with the 40 minutes presentation, 15 minutes of questions, and then the 5 minutes of transition, because transition I think is important, if you want.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Otherwise, we're going to be rushing them off like, "Get off, get off," or like, "Sit behind them and then we'll push you off." So 40 minutes. 40 minutes of presentation. 10 minutes of... 15, I'm sorry, 15, and the five minutes was transition. Okay, got it. Okay. I believe that Trustee Cavazos is next in the queue? However, Trustee Brooks was in the queue as well. Trustee Brooks, do you want to jump in?

Trustee Brooks:

Yes, please. I have a couple specific change requests. One is under 2D, where it says recent work. I want to reduce those examples to three similar searches because I'd prefer to have depth versus breadth when it comes to information. Under 3C, I'm not looking at these notes, when I say CI, I want to reduce the number of examples to two to three of staff work, and I want to reward that to demonstrate similar projects versus recent projects. Under 4E, I want them to demonstrate experience or knowledge related to working with Open Meeting Law requirements specifically in the state of Nevada, which is more restrictive than other states. So I want to know if they actually have experience in it versus how they are going to do it theoretically.

And then I want to add an additional question somewhere about any community relationships that anybody doing the work or anybody within the organization has within CCSD or within the Las Vegas area. And then I agree with the deliberation or transition pieces being outside of the presentation minutes. I agree with the deliberation being at the end to remove bias for subsequent presenters. And then public comment, I think, should be at the end for all presentations.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Brooks. Okay. Got your corrections and addition. I believe that the community relationships within CCSD... or the community and CCSD, is also something that we discussed during the RFP process, so is appropriate to bring up in this space. Okay. All right. Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you to Trustee Brooks for asking the question on the process with Nevada Open Meeting Law because that was one of my questions too, so we can check that one off. Okay. I would like to have a question where we are asking about how they are basically going about researching and reflecting the diverse needs of our district. I'm not sure if we should just fit that in under number two where it has overview experience projects, because we already have 2D that says five projects that are most similar to CCSD search. And we've already asked the question about the average tenure, but I would like to have some kind of a question, maybe it could help me formulate that as far as how they will get to really know our district's unique needs. Okay. So that's one. I don't see anything here having to do with possible conflicts of interest, or appearance of conflicts of interest.

Some of the material on the three top candidates, they did include some of that information, but I would want to know if they have any affiliations with one of the groups that we're affiliated with, Council of Great City Schools, are they affiliated with The Broad Foundation? Are they affiliated with Chiefs for Change? And what does that affiliation look like, or is it just a passing connection? So I would like that included

Trustee Cavazos:

somewhere. On the search process, under number 4, "How do you find qualified candidates?" One of the top three... and I'm purposely not using names now because I just want to keep it very general, I noticed that one of them says that, "We do keep a database of candidates that have not been successful in the past, but we have let them know that there is this opening." And so I would like to know if they specifically then go out and try to recruit some of the candidates that have not been successfully placed in the past.

So I think that's the best way that I can go ahead and word that. On number 4E, on, I think it's II, "Some candidates may prefer not to be publicly named until the end of the process. Would you propose to keep candidate names confidential until the end of the process? If so, how will it affect the transparent process?" I am receiving questions from constituents, before this meeting, having to do with that, will it only be after we name the finalists or will it be when they first submit? So I'd like to have some clarification on that. And my last one would be on having to do with transparency and how they are keeping the board, shall we say, informed during the process. I am in favor of what all three firms have listed generally as far as having contact person... forgive me while I get a drink of water here, I'm sorry, allergies, and we normally do that as far as having a point person, a staff person, and then a board contact person.

So I noticed on some of the board contact persons that it was the president, and on some of the other ones on the board contact person, it was a person that was agreed upon by the entire board. So I'd want to have some kind of clarification. Well, hello there, Trustee Satory, I saved you a spot. Okay, let me move about my five pounds of things here. Welcome. So I would want to know in general how they're going to keep us informed and what they're proposing on that. And I think, I believe, the very last one, and I'm not going to say the name of the firm here, but out of the three top firms that we have decided on, one of the firms listed on their application, "Community meetings, if so desired." That threw me off for a bit, because the other two firms had a very, very specific process for including the stakeholders and our community, and this other firm said, "If desired."

So I have a little bit of an issue with that, and I know that we can delve deeper into that later on, but I would want to clarify for sure that all three firms understand that our board collectively has decided that our community will be included and that all stakeholders will be listened to. And that's about it, I think.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Trustee Cavazos, thank you for that. Yeah, I'm going to keep you on your mic hot, if that's okay. If you can turn it back on, I want to go over some of the items that you shared that you'd like to make changes to, we make sure that we capture them. I'll start on page 1, under section 2. You mentioned you want the firm to be able to share with us how they plan to get to know the unique needs of our district. Is that correct?

Trustee Cavazos:

Yes.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Great. We captured that edit. Perfect. From the second page, you mentioned section 4E2, you want clarification about... please remind the clarification of how they will keep these individuals names confidential.

Trustee Cavazos:

At what stage of the process are they kept confidential and then released.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Yep. Sounds good. There was one more within this section that you wanted addition. I wrote LC but did not write what it was. There was something else in this section that you wanted. Are you still on section 4?

Trustee Cavazos:

That was the one having to do with, I believe, the database.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Oh, okay. That's right. You mentioned a database. How can we make that question more broad so that it applies to all of the firms? So where will they source their candidates from?

Trustee Cavazos:

I guess, we could do that. Where do they source their candidates from, and does it include past candidates that were presented for appointment or consideration?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Very good. Perfect. Can you take a look at in section 4 under D, firms database? Yeah. Can you see if that one meets the spirit of your question?

Trustee Cavazos:

I think that that almost covers it, President, but this one is just talking about number of candidates, percentage of placements from database fee. Well, I didn't go into the fees. I'm talking more about whether it's like a rotating candidate database that, for instance, they have 1,000 previous candidates that have been considered for other similar positions, say, it's deputy superintendent, superintendent, and they were not placed by this firm, but they're still being kept in that database. I would assume that that is not an unusual practice to do, but I would want to know that.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

So is it something like where do your candidates come from in your database? I don't think I'm capturing-

Trustee Cavazos:

I would want the specific question answered. In other words, I want to call them, I guess, previous candidates, I guess, I don't want to ever call anybody failed candidates because they're not failed, they just didn't happen to be-

Trustee Garcia Morales:

They were not selected. Yeah, they weren't selected.

Trustee Cavazos:

Yeah, they weren't selected, or maybe they weren't a good fit for that particular... So maybe previous candidates that they had brought forward as finalists. I'm not sure how to shorten that, President.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Let's see... I want to make sure staff is capturing this, so I'm going to turn it over to them. Joe, do you need additional clarification on that particular question? Can you help us get there? Joe's a good translator for me.

Joe Caruso:

Madam President, members of the board, Trustee Cavazos, to your question, so how many candidates in the firm's database were previously finalists for another superintendent search?

Trustee Cavazos:

You're absolutely a genius. Thank you.

Joe Caruso:

Okay. Trustee Cavazos, if I may have some liberty, I would love to go back, even review Trustee Cavazos, and then go back to Trustee Brooks, because she went through hers quickly, just to make sure if we're adding... So I'm trying to write as fast as I can to make sure I'm capturing it. Thank you for recapping.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Sounds good. Yes, thank you. So I hear you correctly Joe, you want to go back to Trustee Brooks, well, to make sure that we capture her pieces after we're done with reviewing Trustee Cavazos' request. Great. Thank you. Thank you for staying on the mic, Trustee Cavazos. Let's see... you mentioned relationships with organizations outside of our community. Trustee Brooks also asked a very similar question with respect to community relationships in and outside of CCSD. Do you specifically want to know if these individuals can... I'm trying to balance this piece because we did ask the firms to answer this question in the RFP. So what is it additionally, I guess, that you need clarity on for these firms?

Trustee Cavazos:

And you are correct, we did ask them to include that, and I believe, out of the top three, I can remember specifically that one of them went into... no, two of them went into detail on some of these organizations I'm asking about, and one did not. I apologize. I do. I'm very OCD on this, so I must have gone over all 200 pages, like three times, and I apologize. So I specifically want to know about those organizations that I listed before, Chiefs for Change, Broad Foundation, and the Council of Great City Schools. I would like to know specifically if they are affiliated with that Council of Great City Schools. I, of course, would not be surprised on since we are affiliated with them, but I do want to know about the other two organizations, or any other ones, specifically by name, that we would like to know about.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

I have a curiosity around this, is this something that we can ask? Can we ask this of the firms? And I'm turning to staff based off of the RFP. If we've already asked them a broad question, could we ask them more specifically this question within the question? Is that something that we can do?

Trustee Cavazos:

Of course, we can.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Will that create any protests for us? My gut is telling me yes, I don't want to limit us, and I also don't want us to be in... I mean, yes, it could create liabilities for us given that we've already asked this question, and to ask a deeper question within the question. Maybe there's another way of asking this question without-

Trustee Cavazos:

I myself don't see... although I'm not an attorney and I'm not staffed, but I understand what you're asking, President. I myself went over this several different times and looked at some of the more recent searches that have been done. I looked at the LA Unified search, I looked at the Washoe search, where they just appointed their superintendent, and I myself did not see where there would be a liability. But I'm going to go ahead and wait for staff to answer.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Yeah. Thank you everyone for your patience. We want to make sure we get this really, really right. Mr. Caruso.

Joe Caruso:

Madam President, members of the board, Trustee Cavazos, to your question, and speaking with Ms. Blake, Mr. Casey, so hypothetically, if I were to list that I'm a member of an organization by name and then you choose a different group, the question is did you choose a different group because I listed that organization by name, versus the ask of please list organizations or affiliated an open-ended way without specifying, are you a member of group A, group B, group C, then I'm choosing to tell you I'm a member of that group versus you asking me, am I a member of that group? Am I answering your question or causing another question? Sorry.

Trustee Cavazos:

Poor Joe, he's had to do this for me for six years. Thank you, Joe. And that is a good way of putting it, I just want to put on the record. And first of all, I didn't hear you say anything about a liability, you're just suggesting a better way that I could get an answer without asking with a specific name. Is that correct?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Go ahead, Joe.

Joe Caruso:

Madam President, members of the board, Trustee Cavazos, to your question, I think that's where, if I can dial a friend to Board Counsel, the litigious world that she resides in, I think that's where we're questioning how specific and how landlocked we get.

Nicole Malich:

Yeah, I do see a problem with that, and I think that is exactly what Joe was conveying, there could be a liability in it by way of a firm assuming, "Well, you discriminated against me because-

Trustee Cavazos:

Aha, that's what I want.

Nicole Malich:

So I think it's got to be asked the way Joe was saying. I know that's not exactly how you want to ask it, but I think the other way makes it troubling for liability purposes.

Trustee Cavazos:

And that's why I'm asking this question now. I do understand that, and Joe, thank you for that rewording. I do want to put on the record, however, again, studying the other superintendent searches and watching the public interact with them, I do want to put on the record that if we are giving them that opportunity, again, Joe, I concur with the way that you are presenting how the question should be asked, that if that is omitted, in other words, we don't ask them that specific name, we just say, "Included in your application, included in your presentation," if it's not included, it could come up later on in a discussion or in deliberations. So I just want to put that on the record, that if we do go ahead and ask it the way that Mr. Caruso is saying... and I do concur with Board Counsel, I do see where that could be an issue, Board Counsel, so I appreciate you weighing in on that.

So I just want to put on the record though, that that is something that I'm concerned about, and I will put on the record, that is because of the 2018 superintendent search, again, without going into details, that there were things that were omitted, that if I had known at the time that we were deliberating, there could have been different outcomes, and I will leave it at that.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

I think there was one more. Yeah, no, you're good. I'm going to turn your mic back on, Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

Okay, you had another question?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

One more. What was this... placement rate, did you have a piece around placement rate?

Trustee Cavazos:

I was basically just tagging on to Trustee Bustamante Adams, that she had asked that, and that I was just stating that I believe that all three of the ones that we selected did include that. And the only other question that was left was how they were going to keep the board informed and the points of contact.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Board informed and points of contact, that go under section 5B, responsibilities. For the proposals that was already included in that, so it's not something that's-

Trustee Cavazos:

Yes, but again, we didn't receive this until yesterday, and so I had put together some of my questions before having the opportunity to review this. So basically, you are correct, under B, define responsibility tasks that will be completed by the board of trustees or district as opposed to what the search firm's going to be doing. I just wanted some specifics because some of the firms were very specific, down to the letter of how this would be conducted. And so I just wanted some specifics for all three of them. I could see that as a clarifying question.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Perfect. So I hear you saying that as a clarifying question under section 5B, how they'll keep the board informed and who their preferred point of contact will be.

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you for doing your homework and going above and beyond, Trustee Cavazos. I appreciate it. All right. Joe, did you capture that? Do you have any questions about the additions that Trustee Cavazos had?

Joe Caruso:

Madam President, members of the board, I believe, if I'm okay, I have, "How many candidates were previous finalists in another search?" Which will go up under section 4, letter D. For section 4, letter E, number two, "When will names be released?" For section 5 letter B, "How will the board be kept informed of progress? Who will be the district contact with the search firm?" And then I'm not sure where to fit, "In what organizations are you affiliated with." Was that a question back for number 2, maybe under letter A? "How long have you been in business and then what organizations are you affiliated with?"

Trustee Garcia Morales:

I think it fits somewhere in 2. So yes, if you all can squeeze it in there, that would be great. I'm going to turn it over to Trustee Cavazos. I think she has some feedback.

Trustee Cavazos:

President, possibly, I was asking Mr. Caruso, that could be worked into possibly 2B on the firm's code of conduct. I'm not sure if that would be appropriate, or if I should just leave it as maybe a clarifying question?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Well, we can add it to section 2. Maybe the code of conduct is separate from... or the code of conduct, it would be their organization's code of conduct less our-

Trustee Cavazos:

I would be happy if we just state that we could work it in somewhere within the confines of number 2.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Go ahead. Thank you, Joe.

Joe Caruso:

So Madam President, members of board, Trustee Cavazos, to your question, in talking with Ms. Blake, so we do have the latitude, we could make 2B in essence 2C, and then add in 2B as a new question of, "What organizations are you affiliated with?" We'll shift-

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Great.

Joe Caruso:

And I'm almost thinking we're going to have to do that with some of these, just to add another line just so it's a separate. Because some of them are different questions, "When will the names be released?" Will fit in with 4E number 2, but like the district contact, I think that's a separate item under responsibility. So just so we have it delineated. And the only other question I had was the unique needs of the district. You had a complaint about question on knowing the unique needs of the district, would that be under letter 2 as well?

Trustee Cavazos:

Again, I apologize, but I had already put together my questions before I got this document yesterday, so I was trying to make my questions fit in here somewhere. Yes, I think that that could work into 2.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Great. I want to go up to Trustee Brooks to clarify her pieces. Joe, do you have specific questions about her items? She had asked for an additional section dedicated to community relationships within or outside of CCSD, and OML existing under section 4, the experience working with OML in Nevada. What questions did you have for Trustee Brooks?

Joe Caruso:

Madam President, members of the board, I also had Trustee Brooks and I thought she said her letter... I'm sorry, number 2, letter D, "Three projects that are most similar to CCSD search versus 5." Did I capture that correctly?

Trustee Brooks:

Yes. That's correct.

Joe Caruso:

I'm sorry, number 3, letter C, "Instead of 3 to 5 projects, list two to three projects the team member worked on." Did I capture that correct?

Trustee Brooks:

Yeah. And under that one, it would be, instead of most recent projects, it'd be similar projects.

Joe Caruso:

And then Madam President, with your grace, just to clarify, "Community relationships with organization, which is CCSD or Las Vegas area," where would you like that to fit in?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

We talked about that being potentially a different section, however I could see it fitting into the firm's overview experience and projects.

Trustee Brooks:

Yeah, I'm pretty open. I don't think you have to actually work out the specifics of how you rearrange this in this meeting, just that the question should be their existing or past relationships with the community and connections to CCSD. Probably will actually tie into what Trustee Cavazos was saying as well, they can be lumped one after another.

Joe Caruso:

Okay. So those two... I'm sorry, Madam President, members of the board, Trustee Brooks, to your question, so in essence, "The community relationships with organization or Las Vegas area, existing and past relationships with CCSD and community," and then maybe a subsection to that, "What organizations are you affiliated with?" Could all tie together under perhaps number 2. Did I capture that correct?

Trustee Brooks:

Yeah. But the one that's underneath... because I think the question that Trustee Cavazos is asking is not specific locally, you might want to clarify that you're talking about national affiliations as well.

Joe Caruso:

Madam President, members of the board, Trustee Brooks, so national and local affiliations, to capture both of the trustees' questions.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

I captured... I mean, I hear Trustee Brooks, I want to check in with Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

I believe that that would be correct, and I thank Trustee Brooks for making that distinction because there are going to be things that come up. One of our top three firms has been involved with the district with the previous superintendent search. So I don't know if that would be local, national, but I get the distinction that Trustee Brooks is making, and I think that it would be prudent to go ahead and list it like that. Thank you, Trustee Brooks.

Trustee Brooks:

You're welcome.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Perfect. All right, colleagues, I think that clarifies the changes so far. I'm going to move on to Trustee Bustamante Adams.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you, Madam President. I just wanted to put on the record that I do concur with keeping the one minute... I mean, the one hour timeframe and allow you to decide how we use that one hour. But I'd like to keep that one hour and support the idea of having the transition and deliberation outside of that one hour. So just wanted to put that on the record.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. Thank you. I think of the last place we landed on was 40 minutes for the presentation, 15 minutes for... 15 or 20 minutes. We'll work through those details, but certainly, I hear the intention for more time and give each group at least an hour together. Trustee Watson, you're up.

Trustee Watson:

Thank you, Madam President, and I believe what Trustee Cavazos may have been referring to with 2B, the firm's code of conduct. I think we may be, as simplified in this form of, is there a conflict of interest within your role as the firm with any, I guess, local or national affiliation. Just basically want to know if there's a conflict of interest with you being selected possibly as the firm.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you for that, Trustee Watson. I believe that we had asked a question of that nature in the RFP regarding the conflict of interest. It was a loose question, so that does fit in based off of the RFP. Give us one second while we go back to that and help identify where. So Trustee Watson, forgive me, I went straight into assumptions, I apologize, are you supporting Trustee Cavazos? I think I heard you say that, and you want an addition to or just support?

Trustee Watson:

I was just trying to clarify and make sure that we understand that it's about a conflict of interest, is what I think she was trying to get to, in my opinion.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Great. Thanks for that. I see her shaking her head, and I don't believe that there's any additions or changes to the ones that Trustee Cavazos has already suggested, right?

Trustee Watson:

Correct.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Great. Thank you for that. Appreciate it. All right. I think we are, colleagues, in a space where we've made some positive changes and have discussed timing. Thank you for your feedback there. Joseph Caruso.

Joe Caruso:

Madam President, members of the board, Trustee Garcia Morales, so am I adding that point on the conflict of interest or do we capture that?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

I believe we capture that, and I'm turning to Trustee Watson and Trustee Cavazos who they said that they're good to go. Trustee Watson was just adding an exclamation mark to this piece. Yes.

Joe Caruso:

Madam President, members of the board, Trustee Garcia Morales, to clarify, Trustee Bustamante Adams, you said before you thought there should be an item added, "What innovation solutions or strategies do they have examples of?" Was that... Yes, add that item?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Forgive me. Yes. Yes, please, add that.

Joe Caruso:

And where would we like to add that?

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Is that under the firm's overview experiences and projects? Trustee Bustamante Adams.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

I agree.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Yes. I believe, she said yes.

Joe Caruso:

And then Madam President, members of the board, just to clarify, Trustee Bustamante Adams, the placement rate comment you said that was addressed and then the diversity comment you had requested that was addressed. So the only outstanding item for you was the innovation solutions?

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Correct.

Joe Caruso:

Got it.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Great. Thank you. That's correct, she said. Thank you. All right, colleagues, I don't see anybody else in the queue here in the room, but I do see Trustee Brooks wanting to jump in.

Trustee Brooks:

Thank you, Madam President. I'm not there to read the room, but I get the sense that we're wrapping up, so I'm willing to make a motion if we are ready to do so.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

I believe we are, all the members, there's no one else in the queue at this time.

Trustee Brooks:

Okay. I move to approve the proposals for finalist interview questions, noting the recommendations that have been provided to Joe Caruso.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Oh, that's right. Thank you. Perfect. Colleagues, I just want to take a moment here and pause, and everyone around me was trying to remind me of public comment, but I'm in my head, so I have just want to pause for a second. Trustee Brooks, thank you for that motion. I want to check in if there's a second, and then colleagues, with your permission, if I can ask for a public comment, then we'll, after public comment, we'll take the vote. Okay. Mr. Caruso, did you have something you wanted to share?

Joe Caruso:

I'm sorry, Madam President, members of the board, just to clarify, if I may just put out there, I would like to work with Board Counsel just to confirm I've captured everything and be able to review it with Board Counsel before we give it to purchasing. If I can just put that out there.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you for that, Mr. Caruso, and Trustee Brooks, are you okay with that amendment, or the amendment of adding counsel to work with Joe Caruso on finalizing this document?

Trustee Brooks:

Yes.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Okay. Thank you. Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

Madam President, I would like to second Trustee Brooks' motion.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Cavazos. All right, colleagues, I appreciate that. Before we go for the vote, I'm going to ask for public comment. Ms. Binder, come on up.

Public Hearing

Anna Binder:

I thought you forgot about me.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

No, we would never forget about you. Come on up. Let's turn on your mic. I think there's something... There we go.

Anna Binder:

Testing. Okay, there we go. Good morning, Madam President, members of the board, thank you so very much for bringing forth this very detailed and gruesome process. As you guys know, the superintendent is so very important to our community, and as frustrating, I'm sure, as it seems to those listening about how detailed and the very tedious process of moving forward with this, I want to just say thank you, I appreciate your time. And I want to say that I'm not very much looking forward to a five, six hour meeting about a search firm, but I'm looking forward to the process of where that gets us. So thank you again.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Ms. Binder. All right, colleagues, we have an active motion on the floor. That concludes public comment. We have an active motion on the floor by Trustee Brooks, second by Trustee Cavazos. Please cast your vote. Trustee Brooks.

Trustee Brooks:

Aye.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, colleagues, that motion passes 5-0. All right. Please, colleagues, a deep heartfelt appreciation for each of you for coming to this meeting prepared to discuss this item and for your commitment to the search firm selection process. Thank you. And thank you, Mr. Caruso, Kelly, and Mike for your... Kris, excuse me, Kris and Mike for your support today. Mr. Caruso, do you have something to share?

Joe Caruso:

Madam President, my apologies, members of the board, we do need to clarify the timing because we have to give the presentation firms the questions and the confirmed time. So if, the pleasure of the board, I do need to get that so that we can put that on our revised draft. I'll work with Board Counsel, and then once confirmed, I need to send that... or we need to send that to purchasing so the presenters know how much time they officially have, and then what we have for questions. So if we can just confirm that.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Do we have to do that at this meeting? Do you want this at this meeting right now?

Joe Caruso:

I believe we need to, because once purchasing gets this, they'll send out a letter saying that the 29th is when they'll present.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

To be clear, we're not making a motion on this particular item, but we are providing guidance based off of the feedback that was given by colleagues. We want an hour for each firm, and that looks like 40 minutes for the presentation and 20 minutes for the trustees question/transition. Okay. Colleagues, great, thank you. Thank you. Thank you, everyone. Appreciate that. Looking forward to your continued support. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Okay. Excited. Excited.

Upcoming Meeting of the Board of Trustees

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Upcoming meeting with the board of trustees, colleagues, item 3.01, that is Thursday, May 16th at 5:00 p.m. The next meeting is here in the Greer Boardroom.

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

Trustee Garcia Morales:

All right, we're going to move on to public comment on items not listed as action items on the agenda. We'll start with individuals who sign up in advance. Is Ms. Beer here?

Anna Binder:

She said when she called in to sign up, it's for tomorrow night, but she thinks she spoke to the staff. So obviously, with our children [inaudible 01:55:16].

Trustee Garcia Morales:

All right, Ms. Binder, come on up. You're next.

Anna Binder:

I'll pass. Have a great day.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Oh, my goodness. That sounds like a great public comment to share. Thank you for that.

Adjourn: 11:05 a.m.

Motion to adjourn.

Motion: Zamora Second: Cavazos Vote: Unanimous

Trustee Garcia Morales:

All right, colleagues, this is adjournment, I am seeking a motion to adjourn. Trustee Zamora.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you, Madam President. I would like to make a motion to adjourn this meeting at 11:05.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Zamora. Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

I'd like to second that motion.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you, Trustee Cavazos. Colleagues, we have a motion by Trustee Zamora, second by Trustee Cavazos, please cast your vote. Trustee Brooks.

Trustee Brooks:

Aye.

Trustee Garcia Morales:

Thank you. All right, colleagues, that motion passes 5-0. Time is 11:05. Have a great morning. Thank you.