

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

Thursday, June 26, 2025

5:00 p.m.

Roll Call: Members Present
Irene Bustamante Adams, President
Brenda Zamora, Vice President
Tameka Henry, Clerk
Isaac Barron, Member
Lorena Biassotti, Member (Virtual)
Linda P. Cavazos, Member
Lydia Dominguez, Member
Ramona Esparza-Stoffregan, Member
Adam Johnson, Member
Lisa Satory, Member
Emily Stevens, Member

Jhone Ebert, Superintendent of Schools

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Good evening, everyone. We'd like to welcome you. I am President Irene Bustamante Adams and call this regular board meeting of June 26th, 2025 to order. The time is 5:00 p.m. I would like to remind everyone to silence your electronic devices. We acknowledge that the land on which we gather is a territorial homeland of the Nuwu-the Moapa Band of Paiutes, and the Las Vegas Band of Paiutes.

Flag Salute

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

We'll start with our opening item, item 1.01, flag salute. Trustee Henry, would you please lead us?

Before we move on, I'd like to make sure that if Trustee Biassotti is on the line. Not yet. Okay. We'll continue to move on though.

Adoption of the Agenda

Motion to approve the agenda with the following changes, Pull item 2.06 Memorandum of Agreement Between CCSD and the Acelero Learning Clark County for separate discussion, Deletion of Item 2.15 Contract Awards., Reference materials have been provided for item 4.05, Discussion and Possible Action on Entering Into a Contract with Parker Nelson & Associates Law Firm, Additional reference material has been provided for item 4.06, 2025 Legislative Session Overview.

Motion: Zamora Second: Cavazos Vote: Yeses – 5 (Bustamante Adams, Cavazos, Dominguez, Henry and Zamora)

Not Present: Biassotti and Stevens

Motion passed.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

For item 1.02, adoption of the agenda is there anyone that did not get a chance to fill out a public speaker card? It's a yellow comment card. Nope. So no. Thank you. There's no public speaker card for the adoption of the agenda. Therefore, I will turn to Trustee Zamora to make a motion to approve the agenda.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you, Madam President. Members of the board, I would like to make a motion to adopt the agenda with the flexibility and the following changes. Pull item 2.06, memorandum of agreement between the Clark County School District and Acelero Learning Clark County for separate discussion and vote. Deletion of item 2.15, contract awards, reference materials provided for item 4.05, discussion and possible action on entering into a contract with Parker Nelson & Associates law firm, and additional reference materials provided for item 4.06, 2025 legislative session overview.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

I have a motion. Trustee Cavazos?

Trustee Cavazos:

Yes, Madam President. I'd like to second that motion.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Okay. I have a first and a second. Please cast your votes. Do I have Trustee Biassotti on the line? Not yet. That motion passes five to zero. Next I'd like to go to item 2.06, the Acelero contract and I'm going to turn it over to Trustee Henry for a statement.

Trustee Zamora:

We have to [inaudible 00:03:14] the consent agenda first.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:
Oh. Sorry, Trustee Henry. I jumped the gun.

Adoption of Consent Agenda

Motion to approve the consent agenda.

Motion: Cavazos Second: Esparza-Stoffregan Vote: Yeses – 4 (Bustamante Adams, Cavazos, Henry and Zamora); Noes – 1 (Dominguez)
Not present: Biassotti and Stevens
Motion passed.

Motion to approve item 2.06

Motion: Satory Second: Esparza-Stoffregan Vote: Yeses – 4 (Bustamante Adams, Cavazos, Dominguez and Zamora)
Abstain: Henry
Not present: Biassotti and Stevens
Motion passed.

2.01 Approval of the Minutes.

Discussion and possible action on the approval of the minutes from the regular meeting of April 24, 2025, and the work session meeting of May 7, 2025, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)** (Ref. 2.01)

2.02 Student Expulsions.

Discussion and possible action on approval of student expulsions according to Nevada Revised Statutes 392.467 (Board Policy 5114 and Regulations 5114 and 5141.1), as listed, is recommended. (CONFIDENTIAL) **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Jesse Welsh] (Ref. 2.02)

2.03 Interlocal Contract Between the Clark County School District and the State of Nevada Office of the Military, Nevada National Guard STARBASE Henderson.

Discussion and possible action on approval to enter into an Interlocal Contract between the Clark County School District and the State of Nevada Office of the Military, Nevada National Guard to offer the STARBASE Henderson program to elementary school students, effective August 1, 2025, through July 31, 2028, with no impact to the general fund, and for the Superintendent of Schools, Clark County School District, and the President and Clerk, Clark County School District Board of Trustees, to sign the Interlocal Contract, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Dustin Mancil] (Ref. 2.03)

2.04 Contract Between the Clark County School District and the Department of Defense on Behalf of the 926th Air Force Reserve Wing for STARBASE at Nellis.

Discussion and possible action on approval to enter into a Contract between the Clark County School District and the Department of Defense on behalf of the 926th Air Force Reserve Wing to offer the STARBASE at Nellis program to elementary school students, effective July 1, 2025, through June 30, 2028, with no impact to the general fund, and for the Superintendent of Schools, Clark County School District, and the President and Clerk, Clark County School District Board of Trustees, to sign the Contract, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Dustin Mancl] (Ref. 2.04)

2.05 Memorandum of Agreement Between the Clark County School District and the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education on Behalf of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Discussion and possible action on the approval of the Memorandum of Agreement between the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education on behalf of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Educational Policy and Leadership Program and the Doctor of Educational Leadership Program to continue a partnership in building leadership capacity to prepare preservice administrators for entry-level positions and current administrators through their doctoral program, executed by both Parties, with no impact to the general fund, and for the Superintendent of Schools, Clark County School District, and the President and Clerk, Clark County School District Board of Trustees, to sign the Memorandum of Agreement, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Dustin Mancl] (Ref. 2.05)

2.06 Memorandum of Agreement Between the Clark County School District and Acelero Learning Clark County.

Discussion and possible action on approval to continue a Memorandum of Agreement between the Clark County School District and Acelero Learning Clark County, also known as Head Start, to develop and deliver early childhood educational experiences to Clark County School District families and students at Cecile Walnut, Reynaldo Martinez, and Yvonne Atkinson-Gates Child Development Centers, effective July 1, 2025, through June 30, 2030, with no impact to the general fund, and for the Superintendent of Schools, Clark County School District, and the President and Clerk, Clark County School District Board of Trustees, to sign the Memorandum of Agreement, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Monica Cortez] (Ref. 2.06)

2.07 Warrants.

Discussion and possible action on ratification of the warrants as listed in the Bills Payable Transmittal and the Board Memorandum to be presented at the Board meeting, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Diane Bartholomew] (Ref. 2.07)

2.08 Recap of Budget Appropriation Transfers.

Discussion and possible action on authorization to include the Recap of Budget Appropriation Transfers between governmental functions of all funds for the period beginning May 1, 2025, through May 31, 2025, in the official Board minutes as required by Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 354.598005, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Diane Bartholomew] (Ref. 2.08)

2.09 Engagement with Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP.

Discussion and possible action on the approval of the engagement with Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP as bond counsel and special counsel to the Clark County School District in connection with the General Obligation (Limited Tax) Building Bonds, New Money Bonds Authorization, Series 2025B and 2025C, General Obligation (Limited Tax) Various Purpose Medium-Term Bonds and General Obligation (Limited Tax) Building Refunding Bonds Authorization, Series 2025B and 2025C, through December 31, 2026, for an approximate fee of \$385,000.00 to be paid from the 2015 Capital Improvement Program Bond Fund, Fund 3150000000, Cost Center 1031502060, and for the Superintendent of Schools, Clark County School District, and the President and Clerk, Clark County School District Board of Trustees, to sign the agreement, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Diane Bartholomew] (Ref. 2.09)

2.10 Unified Personnel Employment.

Discussion and possible action on approval to employ unified personnel, as listed, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: RoAnn Triana] (Ref. 2.10)

2.11 Licensed Personnel Employment.

Discussion and possible action on approval to employ licensed personnel, as listed, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: RoAnn Triana] (Ref. 2.11)

2.12 Purchase Orders.

Discussion and possible action on ratification of the purchase orders in the total amount of \$1,093,711.37 as listed, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Mike Casey] (Ref. 2.12)

2.13 Purchasing Awards.

Discussion and possible action on approval to purchase goods or services in the estimated total amount of \$7,331,947.18 in compliance with Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 332, as listed, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Mike Casey] (Ref. 2.13)

2.14 Change In Service.

Discussion and possible action on approval of Change in Service in the estimated total amount of \$70,351.25, and for Brandon McLaughlin, Assistant Superintendent, to act as the Clark County School District Board of Trustees' designee to sign the granting documents, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Felicia Gonzales] (Ref. 2.14)

2.15 Contract Awards.

Discussion and possible action on approval of Contract Awards in the estimated total amount of \$170,000.00, and for Brandon McLaughlin, Assistant Superintendent, to act as the Clark County School District Board of Trustees' designee to sign the granting documents, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Felicia Gonzales] (Ref. 2.15)

2.16 Capital Improvement Contract Awards.

Discussion and possible action on approval of Capital Improvement Contract Awards in the estimated total amount of \$52,836,500.00, and for Brandon McLaughlin, Assistant Superintendent, to act as the Clark County School District Board of Trustees' designee to sign the granting documents, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Felicia Gonzales] (Ref. 2.16)

2.17 Grant Applications Multiple Grants Various Funding Agencies.

Discussion and possible action on authorization to accept the funds and implement multiple grants with various anticipated performance periods as indicated in the Multiple Grants table, in an estimated amount of \$423,029.47 to be paid from Fund 0279 and/or Fund 0280, with no impact to the general fund, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Kellie Kowal-Paul] (Ref. 2.17)

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

I'm going to go ahead and go to item 2.02, the consent agenda information. I will entertain a motion to approve the... No, we just did that. One moment please. Okay, thank you. Sorry for my hesitation there. I'll move to item 2.02, the adoption of the consent agenda. Do I have a motion? Trustee Dominguez?

Trustee Dominguez:

Madam President, I have a statement if possible.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Yes, please proceed.

Trustee Dominguez:

I want to continue to make this statement. I feel like I'm blocked from being able to ask questions during our trustee briefings. Questions that matter to our families and our schools that I represent. The current process requires that any item I want to raise must be pre-approved by the board president or vice president, which creates a barrier to open dialogue and accountability for the consent agenda. I believe it should be open and we should be able to ask any questions we have regarding the consent agenda. This isn't about staff or their ability to answer the questions. They are always willing to help us. It's about the system that is currently in place that limits my ability to do the job I was elected to do. My constituents deserve a representative who can ask tough

Trustee Dominguez:

questions, seek transparency, and advocate on their behalf. And I again advocate that we change this process. Thank you.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you for that statement. Trustee Cavazos?

Trustee Cavazos:

I actually was going to make a motion to second the motion, second the motion to approve the consent agenda.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Okay, and so that would be a first and so Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

And I will second that.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. I have a first and a second. Do I have Trustee Biassotti on the line? Okay, then please cast your vote. That passes. Four yeses, one no. And we'll move on to item 2.06 and we pulled that for separate discussion and that is the Acelero contract and Trustee Henry, would you like to make a statement?

Trustee Henry:

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I just wanted to let you all know that I currently serve as the chairperson of the board of directors for Acelero Learning Clark County, and so I will be abstaining from voting on this item.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Is there any public comment, yellow card that has been completed for this item? Seeing none. Any questions about the contract? Okay, seeing none, I will entertain a motion to approve item 2.06. Trustee Satory?

Trustee Satory:

I'll move to accept.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. I have a first. Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan?

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

I will second that motion.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

I have a first and a second for item 2.06. Please cast your votes. We have four yeses, one abstention. That motion passes. Next, Trustee Henry, would you please read the warrants?

Trustee Henry:

Yes, Madam President. The ratified warrants is listed in the bill's payable, transmittal and board memorandum number 21-24-25 in the total amount of \$179,905,774.04.

3.01 Focus: 2024 Strategic Plan Update — Student Discipline.

Presentation and discussion on the acceptance of a report as presented on Focus: 2024 Indicators and Results pertaining to SS-4(C): Student discipline. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Jesse Welsh] (Ref. 3.01) *(According to Governance Policy B/SE-3: Board Report and Progress Monitoring, B/SE-4: Board Report Content, B/SE-6: Board Report Schedule, and B/SE 7: Board Response to Board Reports)*

Motion to accept the report as presented.

Motion: Johnson Second: Barron Vote: Yeses – 6 (Bustamante Adams, Biassotti, Cavazos, Dominguez, Henry and Zamora)
Not present: Stevens
Motion passed.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. We are going to go ahead and move to item 3.01. Is there anyone that has not filled out a public speaker card, it's a yellow card, to provide public comment?

Trustee Zamora:

Can you ask Trustee Satory [inaudible 00:07:56]?

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Okay. Seeing, is that one?

Trustee Zamora:

3.01.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Okay. We do have one for 3.01, so thank you and we'll turn it over, superintendent to the team?
Okay, Mr. McPartlin please proceed.

Kevin McPartlin:

Okay, great. Thank you, Madam President, members of the board, Superintendent Ebert. I'm Kevin McPartlin, Associate Superintendent for the record. I'm joined here this evening by Dr. Sam Scavella, Assistant Superintendent and Brandi March, Director of the Multi-Tiered System of Supports department to bring you the regular focus 2024 strategic plan report on student discipline, which will cover our efforts and results through the third quarter of this school year, which ended on March 14th. As a reminder, these student discipline presentations contribute to the vision of the board of school trustees under the student success priority and within the area of safety and engagement. As part of the Focus 2024 strategic plan, we have presented the student discipline updates multiple times starting in 2019 with the last event occurring in March 2025 as part of the consent agenda.

As you'll see in this presentation, we are observing positive trends related to overall student discipline and as a result, if we are maintaining our theory of action, which is that if we successfully implement a Multi-Tiered System of Supports to address academic achievement, social emotional growth and behavior development, and if we provide schools with effective monitoring tools, then student discipline will decrease. Our strategies to address student discipline are aligned to this theory of action and include our comprehensive dashboard, which is used by schools and central offices to guide our efforts to support students and families. We also continue to increase and refine our partnerships both internally and externally in the community, including within Nevada Department of Education, to wrap our students and families with the supports they need as well as to provide schools with an expanded toolkit of options to address and improve student behaviors.

Finally, we continue to refine our use of both punitive actions and restorative practices to ensure students are held accountable but are also encouraged to learn from past behaviors and reconnect with their school community as appropriate. On slide seven, we'll start the data slides. Here we see the comparative data for total suspensions during the first three quarters of the last five school years. You can see we continue our downward trend of student suspensions over the past three years since returning from COVID. Schools have issued approximately 2,200 fewer suspensions this year compared to through the third quarter last year. This represents a 10% decrease in total suspensions. As a reminder, we continue to include the expired targets from the focus 2024 strategic plan as references for you. However, at this time we truly use this data to compare we were last year at this point in the school year for each level.

As we did for our chronic absenteeism presentation, we added the extra column so you can easily see how the data compares from last year to this year. At the elementary level, suspensions are down 13% compared to last year. At the middle school level, which you know is an area of focus for us, suspensions have decreased by 11% compared to last year. And at the high school level, which demonstrated great improvements last year, we continue to see an 8% decrease in suspensions.

Slide nine demonstrates disproportionality in student suspensions by student group. As a reminder, this data is expressed as a ratio of suspensions per student or by student group per 1000 students. So just to provide further context to this, using suspensions per 1000 students allows us to level the playing field as some student groups are much larger or smaller than others and it prevents us from being misled by raw numbers. It gives us a true picture of the rate of suspensions within each

Kevin McPartlin:

group, making disproportionality much clearer and helping us identify where our efforts should be targeted.

Overall, we are seeing decreases in this ratio for each student group from this time last year with the only exception being the Asian student group, which went up by just over a point. Our largest decreases include a 15.5 point reduction for African-American students and an eight point reduction for Hispanic students. We want to acknowledge that the Black African-American student group while having the largest decreases over the past several quarters is still an outlier in data compared to the other student groups. Additionally, we continue to work with the student support services division to support schools in addressing students that are eligible for special education services. Within this presentation, we will share our steps of how we'll be addressing these areas of concern.

Slide 10, we moved to discretionary expulsions during the first three quarters for the past five years. As a reminder, in the Clark County School District, schools must recommend students for expulsion for a number of offenses, including weapons on campus, battery to staff, battery to students, distribution of a controlled substance, and sexual assault. However, this data point in this presentation uses only the state guidelines for mandatory expulsion, which is students, it is only mandatory to expel students for situations related to a weapon on campus. An expulsion for anything else during this presentation is considered discretionary.

The graph displays that schools have processed nearly 80 fewer discretionary expulsions compared to last year. This is an 8% reduction. We want to acknowledge that overall, the past two years schools have reduced expulsions by over 200, which represents that they are engaging their students in the school community, addressing behaviors without pushing them out. Slide 11, again, discretionary expulsions by level. Here we see the middle schools, again, an area of concern had 418 discretionary expulsions, which is a 12% reduction from last year. High schools demonstrated a reduction of 4%, but again, this is in addition to the 14% they decreased last year.

To reiterate, again, this is a testament to the work being done by their school leaders to support families and students to change behaviors. Slide 12 demonstrates disproportionality and discretionary expulsions by student groups. Again, calculated by discretionary expulsions per student or by student group per 1000 students. The data shows that with the exception of students eligible for special education, which increased by less than a point, we have seen a decrease in the discretionary expulsion ratio for all other student groups ranging from a 2% to 19% decrease. As with suspensions, we acknowledge that Black African-American student group is an outlier compared to other student groups. Slide 13 is the slide that traditionally is used to showcase how the Clark County School District compares to other districts. As we've discussed, this is a difficult metric to display due to the variety of ways that districts can code disciplinary actions.

But as we've mentioned, we look forward to working with you to adjust the presentation template to provide you with data more aligned with what your expectations are. We did after the briefings look to see if we could provide you with at least Washoe County data because there might be some similarity in state coding. In reaching out to their data division, they did inform us that their schools have until June 30th to validate their data. So we look forward to bringing this to you in the end of

Kevin McPartlin:

the year presentation. And now Madam President, with your permission, I'd like to turn it over to the brilliant Dr. Scavella and the amazing Ms. March to continue with the presentation.

Sam Scavella:

Thank you, Madam President, members of the board, Superintendent Ebert. Sam Scavella for the record, Assistant Superintendent. Our primary challenge continues to be shifting mindsets and practices towards restorative approaches while maintaining student and staff safety as the highest priority. Schools are making meaningful progress by implementing restorative practices that promote positive school climates. These practices address undesired behaviors through accountability, collective dialogue, and meaningful action. This shift fosters personal responsibility for behavior and the repair of harm caused by those behaviors while moving away from punitive or exclusionary discipline unless necessary to better support the academic, social, emotional and behavioral needs of all students. When we look at our successes, the implementation of our restorative disciplinary protocols has resulted in measurable positive changes district-wide. Exclusionary practices have decreased across all school levels and among nearly every student group. By the end of the third quarter, 27,819 restorative resolutions were documented this year in data totaling 28,056 restorative approaches utilized this year.

That is a total of 132% increase since the district adopted restorative practices in the 2021-22 school year. Every school now has three to five educators trained in the fundamental theory and processes of restorative practices, which comprises their restorative leadership teams. Additionally, 249 schools have restorative leadership teams led by culturally inclusive champions who are educators and administrators who have completed 33 hours of professional learning, including a training of trainers' course through a partnership with the International Institute for Restorative Practices. These leaders are equipped with the curriculum, tools, and expertise to train and support staff in implementing restorative practices effectively at the school level.

The tiered school support framework developed in alignment with our MTSS framework was established in response to concerns identified at the middle school level last year. This framework delivers coordinated multi-departmental resources to targeted schools and has already produced positive outcomes. Notably, suspensions have decreased at nearly all participating schools and approximately 50% of the original identified schools no longer fall within the range requiring continued support. Another significant success was the collaborative effort between the district's MTSS department and the Nevada Department of Education. Over 100 schools were supported in completing a self-inventory to identify root causes contributing to the increased use of exclusionary practices. This reflective process also helps schools develop targeted action steps to include in their 25, 26 school improvement plans.

So when we look at our lessons learned, as we continue to prioritize this work district-wide, we see clearly there are two takeaways. One, sustainable change requires a strong commitment to MTSS systems that holistically address students' academic, social, emotional, and behavioral needs. This includes intentional use of restorative approaches and resolutions that emphasize accountability, healing, and relationship building rather than exclusion. This work, as we know, is very complex and cannot be done in isolation. Our school leaders need to be surrounded by consistent support

Sam Scavella:

both from central office teams and their school supervisors to foster lasting positive change in school culture and discipline practices. I will now turn it over to my colleague Brandi March and let her take over from there.

Brandi March:

Thank you, Dr. Scavella. Madam President, members of the board, Superintendent Ebert, Brandi March, Director of Multi-tiered System of Supports for the record. For our next steps in alignment with our MTSS framework, we continue to offer the tiered school support at the identified middle schools to address student discipline. We're adjusting and expanding the number of middle schools included in our focus group for the upcoming school year. In June, as a part of our partnership with the Nevada Department of Education, our schools with high levels of suspensions will submit their results from a self-inventory tool called the Tiered Fidelity Inventory. This research-based monitoring tool allows them to measure the fidelity of their own practices, helping them identify concrete action steps to address student discipline in the upcoming school year. In July, the education services division will offer district-wide professional learning for school administrators to expand and reinforce best practices when dealing with student discipline.

By November identified schools will include addressing high levels of suspension as a part of their 25, 26 school improvement plan within their school connectedness goal. And finally, we will continue in the fall with our student town halls that include a focus on lessons learned and next steps for the leadership at each of those locations. This process is really key in capturing student voice and in the decision-making process. And that concludes our presentation. We're happy to receive any questions or comments you may have.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you so much. Trustee Barron.

Trustee Barron:

Oh, I didn't turn on the thing. Thank you, Madam President. I had to retrain myself to hit the two buttons same time. Thank you very much for this presentation. I come into this position, trustee at a very interesting time having kind of recently been, it was only like last May that I bid farewell to the classroom. And I have to admit, I really saw a change in the last three or four years as a teacher. In the bad old days, it was really easy to just go ahead and take students, expel them, they'd go off to an opportunity school. And by the end of the school year, we'd have a whole bunch of kids back at Rancho High School from all over the district. It seemed like it was just really easy to go ahead and just throw people away. And the easiest thing is just go ahead and banish kids, throw them away.

But really, if you've been around anybody, especially youngsters, you know there's never any one thing here. I've very rarely had, yeah, I had the occasional kid who had monitoring device on them, right, but they were very, very few. What I found was my next-to-last boss, she introduced social workers, that was the name for them, that she paid for out of her own budget, but they were actually trained psychologists. They were actually licensed psychologists. And I have to admit, I

Trustee Barron:

don't know the statistics, but it didn't seem that when you see the list of exposed kids, we didn't have that many, right, at Rancho. It seemed like it really helped out. I guess my big question is maybe in the future we could parse out where we have a nice wraparound services like communities and schools along with other investment that the site might have, say with these so-called social workers that might be trained therapists, like a few people that I know and respect very highly.

Perhaps in the future if you might be able to get even some colloquial information as to how important that might be. Again, time and time again, it seems like there's always a mental health aspect to behavior. I applaud that you're able to get this information that you gave back to us. I think we're definitely in the right direction, but if we could parse out just a little bit of those things, what schools are achieving a little bit higher because maybe they have a secret sauce that can be shared with the rest of the district. Thank you, Madam President. And that's kind of like my question-ish.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you for that suggestion. Trustee Zamora.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you, Madam President. One of my first questions is, is there any discretionary expulsions in elementary school?

Kevin McPartlin:

There are no, I apologize Trustee Zamora. There is no expulsions at the elementary level-

Trustee Zamora:

Okay.

Kevin McPartlin:

In general.

Trustee Zamora:

I just didn't see any. It's not on the data. The second question I have, so I got a little ahead of myself. So in the slide where we talk about successes, there is a section where we mention, there we go, the last bullet point on success. I read that, that the partners have already identified some action steps for us to take. And then in the following slide it says that the next steps is for us to do a survey to, there we go, "Partnering with the Nevada Department of Education to ensure schools with high levels of suspension submit the results of self-inventory tool to identify action steps to address." Are we talking about the same thing or are those two different things? Are we reinventing the wheel?

Brandi March:

Trustee Zamora, thank you so much for that question. Brandi March for the record. Those are the same items, essentially it just fits within the timeline. So with the, could you go back one slide please? Thank you. With this bullet point for the successes, part of the Tiered Fidelity Inventory, that monitoring tool that I spoke about is a survey in which the schools conducted that self-inventory. And so those have been done. And now based on the inventory results, they are using that to help drive their action items and their action plans. And that information is due on June 30th.

Trustee Zamora:

Okay. Because I know we're at the end of June already.

Brandi March:

Yeah.

Trustee Zamora:

A follow-up to that, what are we thinking are the steps to hold ourselves accountable, that those action steps are being completed?

Brandi March:

Trustee Zamora, thank you so much for the question. Brandi March for the record. That's a fantastic question, to make sure. As a part of their school improvement plan, the schools identify monitoring action items for each of those steps. So for example, if they chose an item to really identify school-wide expectations, just broadly speaking, then they would have items in their school improvement plan in order to say, these are the monitoring pieces and the timeline for that. So typically, three times a year, there's an interim assessment for each of those items.

Trustee Zamora:

Perfect. Thank you.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

Okay. So during our briefing, in fairness, we didn't have the presentation, no one's fault, but now we have it. So I do have a lot of questions and I know I tend to have questions that go a little deep in the weeds, not for operational pieces, but for systemic coherence. So I want to start backwards with slide 15 because I want to thank you first and foremost, the fact that you have three departments working in collaboration in tandem is key. And that is the silos that we're breaking. And I'm looking at our new superintendent. I'm sure that was a past practice, but going forward, I think it's really, it's essential for us seeing some difference. So thank you for that.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

So on 15, the student town halls. So on a past presentation, we had surveys of students expressing whether they felt safe at school, and I brought up the point that there was a big discrepancy between the district average and our African-American subgroup. And what I want to ask you, is there conversations about when we're having student town halls, are we talking to those students at those schools with the higher incidence? Because if they're not feeling safe at their own school, is there a correlation between the behaviors that are being escalated? And so I just want to see if we can look at those schools and if that is something with that self-inventory, if we're actually surveying the students for their perspective. And I'll pause.

Sam Scavella:

Thank you for the question, Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan. Sam Scavella for the record. When we have student town halls, we begin with a planning meeting. And with that planning meeting, we identify schools based on the discipline data, based on cultural data. And so the process to select students comes through that meeting with the principals and their leadership teams. And we look at students who are doing exceptionally well. We look at students who are struggling in terms of academically, behaviorally. We look at students that struggle with their attendance.

So we get a real good picture of all students in that school. And through that process of the restorative conversation, we make sure it's a safe place so students have an opportunity to really speak and we can hear their voice. And with those town halls, we really get information that's critical to next steps for serving those students in regards to providing some of those wraparound services that Trustee Barron was speaking about so that we can get a good grasp of what are the needs and how do we fulfill those needs in regards to ensuring that we are addressing those critical issues that hold them back from success at schools.

Brandi March:

Thank you so much. Brandi March for the record. Just to further answer your question about the Tiered Fidelity Inventory, the monitoring tool that the schools are using, there are many questions incorporating and asking schools if they are incorporating student voice, student engagement, and as well as whether or not what the school is doing is working for those students. And we do a random sampling of student interviews as well as part of the process, collecting walk-through data. Some of the questions also ask a lot about student engagement as well as family engagement and faculty and staff engagement. And so really looking at what are the processes, the procedures, and the systems that the school has in place in order to ensure that they're getting that student voice. And finally, there's even guidance and questions on whether or not they're including students and family and community members in their teaming structures. So thinking of a leadership team similar to an SOT. Are they using that input from those various stakeholders in order to make decisions?

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

One more, Ms. Madam President. I know we have a lot of other trustees, but again, here we go. So the other one I want to talk about is, okay, so the discretionary expulsions on slide 10 and through 12, I've heard some of the families express frustration because of the fact that "discretionary" means that a principal can decide, ultimately, that it goes through the process of appeal or not for them to be expelled. That sometimes at one school a student may be expelled for battery on another student. But in another school, because they're implementing and providing MTSS, that that is not necessarily the outcome for that particular student at that particular school. So my question is, because of the fact that your division is a part of the process, they see all the schools and so are there conversations from your division when it hits their desk to say, "Listen, how are we implementing or intervening?" Is that part of the process to have that deeper conversation in the real time of when that student is being put out so that there's not disparity between one school giving a consequence that's not the same at the other?

Kevin McPartlin:

Thank you for the question. It is something that we are absolutely cognizant of. So just to give you an idea of the process, there are three region behavior directors that work directly through ESD. They are the code of conduct experts. They meet and hold all the first level of appeal conferences. But they also are, for expulsions, schools reach out to them even before they do the referral packet and that's where they try to give guidance and their support of, "Here's what the code of conduct says. Here's what best practices are. Here's what schools around you do, here's some alternatives if that's appropriate." So that coaching does occur. Of course, the principal with discretionary still can have the right to proceed, but then it goes through us as well. So we'll go ahead and we adjudicate them down. We deal with school supervisors to really make sure that the ones that are making it through the due process are ones that have been vetted at multiple levels. But that is something that... It does occur and as we're streamlining it to improve that.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Trustee Dominguez.

Trustee Dominguez:

Thank you, Madam President. And I appreciate that, Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan. I think that if I could expand a little bit on that. We had discussed this during our trustee briefing and I think it's really important to discuss is that a lot of teachers, from what I hear is that they feel like the schools are being penalized for these behavioral numbers. So they believe that maybe the principal's admin don't want to place that kid under a suspension or actually label that action as some kind of behavioral problem. And so they're sent back. Can you talk to us a little more about that?

Kevin McPartlin:

Yeah. Trustee Dominguez, thank you for bringing that up, because that was an important piece of the briefing. In general, what we found and what will definitely be a part of the training that we do again in the summer is it's the unknown, right? The teacher sends the kid out, sees that student

Kevin McPartlin:

back, assumes nothing happened, and maybe there's not that communication that's effective within the school site. So that's really what we're attacking. We don't see that schools are not addressing behaviors or dealing with them, potentially, with more restorative first for minor behaviors, which is part of our goals. But I think it's that communication piece back that we need to improve upon and we're going to work with our schools on that.

Trustee Dominguez:

That's good to hear. One of the things I've also hear is that maybe do we do any de-escalation training with our teachers? I know probably our CCSD-PD, but do we do anything with our teachers?

Kevin McPartlin:

Go ahead, Sam.

Sam Scavella:

We have different types of training. We have restorative training; we have cultural competency training and also culturally and linguistically responsive training. And that gives teachers an opportunity to identify student behaviors as whether or not this is a misbehavior or is this a cultural behavior. So when I understand that, then I know teachers know how to respond effectively and appropriately. And then one critical part of this is teaching students situational appropriateness, because there are times when behaviors are cultural behaviors that come into the classroom, but they're not appropriate for a school environment. So that's important for teachers to be able to have that skill set and that connection with students to be able to teach those skills.

Trustee Dominguez:

To identify. I appreciate that. This is a difficult one. This was something that hurt me as a mom to see. It was a teacher that was severely assaulted in the classroom a few years ago. I think it was about two, three years ago. From my understanding, the student didn't have anything in the record as far as behavioral. I haven't looked at it directly, but that's just from what I'm hearing. There had to have been something before that led to that severe attack to that teacher in her classroom. What is the misconnection that we're missing between labeling something as far as destruction of property, assault on a student or maybe something gang related? Where are we missing that connection?

Kevin McPartlin:

Trustee Dominguez, thank you for the question. I think I understand the question and so again, part of the region directors is they coach schools, schools will contact them. We have the situation and they, again, to make sure it's consistent between these three, which are the experts on the code of conduct, to make sure they're advising schools on what that coding should be and where it should be. In situations like that, which again, high-level situations that occur, we always look to see where there are clues or where their things that could have been indicators, which is part of our process.

Kevin McPartlin:

Just to kind of also go back to the de-escalation, since you mentioned that as well. There is through our emergency management department, they do true de-escalation with campus monitors, with front office. Hasn't quite expanded that to full licensed personnel, but that is something that the district does offer as well. But as far as coding, that is part of our processes with our checks and balances.

Trustee Dominguez:

Perfect. Thank you.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you, Madam President. And some of my questions have already been answered by my colleagues that have asked them. And I'm sorry. Thank you, Mr. McPartlin, Dr. Scavella, and Ms. March for the presentation today. So some of this has already been... Someone asked for some clarifications because some of it has been answered. Going back to slides 17. I mean 15, I'm sorry. On the self-inventory tool. I think Trustee Zamora had asked about that, and the correlation that's the same instrument we're talking about with the state. Did I understand you correctly that on the self-inventory tool, there are specific categories within that tool that these questions are being asked?

Brandi March:

Trustee Cavazos, thank you so much for that question. Brandi March for the record. The short answer is yes. The Tiered Fidelity Inventory tool, that monitoring tool is really broken up into four scales or four categories of items. Dealing with leadership, strategies or practices, systems, and then finally data and evaluation. So I was part of that. Each of those categories or types of questions work towards a lot of different opportunities for our leadership teams to really dive into all of those different things to see what they can do to really help the students, specifically, in those areas.

Trustee Cavazos:

Okay, thank you very much for the elaboration. Also, still on page 15, going back to the town halls, and Mr. McPartlin knows that's one of my favorite things to ask questions about. You had already talked about this as far as on, I believe, Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan's question about trying to get to the students that are not feeling safe, and how we are making that connection. What is the actual... We don't see those town halls, so is there an actual structure that is unique to the school where the town hall is being held or is it basically a consistent structure for each school?

Kevin McPartlin:

Thank you, Trustee Cavazos, for the question. And Dr. Scavella may want to jump in since he does lead them, but... So there's a structure for the preparation. They develop a lesson plan. They look at the data, what are our key indicators that we want to address? Once we get into the town hall, which again has 20 students, 10 staff members, that kind of breakdown and a good representation of the school, that's when it can take on a life. Dr. Scavella and his staff are so skilled at really pulling out when students are really talking about one thing. And it could be safety of students that are being disciplined or also the safety of students that are experiencing and seeing someone else being disciplined. So those are things that are very personalized by the school and that's what Dr. Scavella's staff brings out.

Trustee Cavazos:

Okay, thank you. Did you want to add to that? Anything?

Sam Scavella:

Yeah. Trustee Cavazos, it's important for us to understand that in those town halls, it's a safe place for students to express how they are really perceiving school in regards to, is it meeting their needs? One question that we always ask also is, "What adult student connections are there in the school?" Because a lot of schools leverage those connections for performance in regards to behavior, academic effort and social emotional connections as well. So those town halls really give us an opportunity to really hear students' concerns as well as ideas from students and how we can do better and how we can really improve the culture and climates in our schools. So that's a both win-win for us in those town halls.

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you so much. It sounds like with these student town halls, the student voices are the most important on the town halls. Just to clarify, these are requested by the principals?

Kevin McPartlin:

Thank you for that question. It's actually twofold. So we do have principals that in looking at their own data and the culture and climate of their campus request it. And then there are some that are identified by the student disproportionality or student suspension data. So it's both.

Trustee Cavazos:

Okay. And that was a constituent question. They want to know. I know I've asked that of Mr. McPartlin before. One last follow up real quickly. Looking at the restorative... We as trustees, one of our duties is we do serve on the expulsion review hearings and we are trained in the practices. So we see a lot of these things coming and every case is unique, every student's case is unique. Is there any consistency that you see with any particular restorative justice practice that you really see some results? Maybe you're hearing from the principals or you're hearing from the parents, the kids. And if you don't have that, that's okay. It's just kind of jumped in there with that question.

Sam Scavella:

Thank you for the question, Trustee Cavazos. One practice that we're really seeing a lot of is teachers' ability to use those effective statements to build those relationships in the classroom, as well as using effective questions and having small impromptu conversations to resolve those everyday conflicts that happen in the classroom, in the cafeteria, in between change of classes. One thing is, we have to get in front of the referral process, and every behavior doesn't result in a referral, but that referral process really generates the disproportionality once that referrals are submitted. So teachers are really getting comfortable with using those restorative processes in order to resolve those conflicts before a need for a behavioral referral. So we're hearing a lot about that in the schools. We're hearing a lot of positive things about that and also the restorative circles in the classroom, building circles that they're having at the Tier I level. So that is really a process that gives the students opportunity to even reset before a conflict results and in something that's going to result in a behavioral disciplinary issue.

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you so much. It really sounds like we are going in a very proactive direction with some good results. So I thank you for that. Thank you so much.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Trustee Satory.

Trustee Satory:

I thank you. Yes, thank you for the presentation and for all of your hard work in moving the needle in the right direction. Thank you so much. My question is regarding the student suspensions. So there's 19,000 plus. Do we have data on how many of those are repeat offenders and are we doing any specific, more targeted intervention towards those repeat offenders such as mentorships and things like that? That was my curiosity there.

Kevin McPartlin:

Thank you for the question, Trustee Satory. Absolutely, that is the... Recidivism is a huge priority within ESD. The region behavior directors, they provide data to the school supervisors to, again, work with schools to identify the students that are repeat. What is the other MTSS components that we're bringing in for those students? Because again, just putting the kids out repeatedly is not going to resolve anything. So that is a huge part of our efforts, for sure.

Trustee Satory:

Do you know a percentage? Of 19,000, how many actual... Do we know how many students that is?

Kevin McPartlin:

I don't have that with me, but that's something we can pull.

Trustee Satory:

Okay, thanks. Appreciate it.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Trustee Johnson.

Trustee Johnson:

Thanks for the presentation that you all... I really appreciate the way this moved from the briefings to here. It was really helpful to see the evolution of the presentation. I had three questions and one will be a follow-up to the second. On slide... I can't remember the slide it was, in particular. One more back. Two more back. Right here. So slide 12 of 17. So there was a significant drop in suspensions for students who identify as American Indian, Alaska Native. Do you happen to know what caused that significant? I mean, that's more than two times the amount of drop in any other category, so I don't know...

Kevin McPartlin:

Thank you for that. Yeah, absolutely. So again, the American Indian, Alaska Native, that is one of our smallest student groups. So one or two students can skew that data and that's what we saw in that.

Trustee Johnson:

Okay, that's helpful. Thanks. And then the other question I was going to ask, it's clear that the training that you've done around MTSS systems have been effective, because across the board, both suspensions and discretionary expulsions have reduced. There's still a very large variance between the rate of Black student suspension, the rate of students who have disabilities. Their levels of both expulsions and suspensions is still significantly greater than the larger populations. Do you think there needs to be specific training to support our team to be able to reduce that gap faster?

Sam Scavella:

Thank you, Trustee Johnson. We do cultural competency training district-wide and that training really helps us to understand how to respond to different students and their backgrounds. That really helps to equalize the playing field in terms of how we respond to behaviors systemically and systematically across the board. So that helps with, one student per say gets a conversation, another student gets a referral. So when we understand how to respond to different types of behaviors and we can do that consistently, then that will help with being able to provide those interventions and provide that response that, again, de-escalates the students and we de-escalate those behaviors.

Trustee Johnson:

The reason why I asked the question, I always want to think about what we can do as a body to help support. So immediately I went to, do we have the financial resources to elevate that training to make sure that we can do it two times as fast? Because if Black students are being suspended and then discretionarily expelled at two times the rate of other students, that to me would lead to larger gaps in academic achievement, feelings of unsafe, et cetera. So, if we don't have what's required in terms of financial resources to support extensive amounts of training, I think that's what we can... "We", a board, can activate figuring out how do we get the resources that are required. I guess the question then is, and maybe this is to you, Superintendent, do you think we have the resources that are required to elevate that training? Because I want to make sure that we're able to reduce that gap faster to then support academic achievement in those two student groups, which happened to be our two lowest achieving groups in the district.

Jhone Ebert:

Thank you for the... Wrong one. Thank you for the question, Trustee Johnson. I will never sit here and say that we have enough resources. I mean, given where we are at as a state and a school district, I mean, we always can use more resources. How we use... Excuse me, I shouldn't say never. One day I would love to say that. Hopefully, in my lifetime.

Trustee Johnson:

Mine too.

Jhone Ebert:

Yes. But what I will say is that focusing and making sure that the resources that we have are targeted, right, specific. Was in a conversation earlier today of it's one thing to say all students, but when you're looking at data like this, you need to name it. Those numbers should not be. So to your point of making sure that the resources that we have are directed to fixing that data is what this amazing team... And since I do have the mic, I do want to specifically call out Mr. McPartlin, Dr. Scavella and future Dr... Is it still future doctor? Okay. She's very close.

Trustee Johnson:

Make it happen.

Jhone Ebert:

Dr. Mills, in their collaboration, which was mentioned earlier. But we as a school district, were also recognized by the state. When I was in my other role, we recognized the Clark County School District for the work specifically around MTSS and making sure, because our children cannot learn if they're not in the classroom. So not only the survey data that you have been asking about which the principals and everyone takes very seriously, it's a self-assessment, but they're taking action on it. And that action improved academics in those schools that implemented with Fidelity. So it's an entire system that we're looking at. And yes, that data will change quickly based on the allocation of resources, making sure that those numbers change.

Trustee Johnson:

I appreciate that. Thank you. Thanks for the work. Again, I know it's hard work and I want to make sure that we can do our part to make sure you have what you need to do this work even better.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. And I know I have Trustee Biassotti in the queue. I'll get to you in a second. Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan?

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

I'll yield to her because she hasn't spoken.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Okay. Trustee Biassotti, I believe you're on the line, correct?

Trustee Biassotti:

Yes, I am here. Thank you, President. [inaudible 00:51:56]-

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Please ask your question.

Trustee Biassotti:

I have a question. Thank you for your work. What systems are being used to get to the root cause of the misbehavior?

Brandi March:

Thank you, Trustee Biassotti for your question. Brandi March for the record. One of the tools that we're using, we've spoke about several times now, is the Tiered Fidelity Inventory tool. That tool really focuses on the core elements or high-quality elements in Tier I that schools can focus on to really improve all of the different structures that we've talked about here today. The leadership, the teaming, the systems, the practices that we have in place, and then finally, the data to evaluate if our system is working. So as teams that we worked with throughout this process in the last six weeks, was really eye-opening for recognizing there were some gaps in the systems that they had in place. So they said, "Oh, okay, we know now we're going to focus on these things." Again, which then drives their action items that we've talked about earlier in the presentation.

When schools are implementing, as Superintendent Ebert was speaking on just a minute ago, when schools are implementing these elements, these core elements that are really research-based and shown to promote Tier I systems and structures, we see the exclusionary discipline go down. It reduces. When schools are focused on Tier I elements, safe and supportive inclusive environments are created. They're using data to inform their actions and drive their decisions.

Brandi March:

Really thinking about not just the Tier II and Tier III issues as Trustee Satory talked about, with recidivism, obviously that is a concern. But how can we implement positive and proactive measures in order to really solve the problems before they start? I think that's a lot of what we've spoke on today. So I think that the Tiered Fidelity Inventory is a fantastic way to start those conversations and to help teams really drive what they want to do in order to support their students from the ground up, from that foundational level of Tier I.

Trustee Biassotti:

So what I'm asking is basically a more specific explanation of what measures are being taken. You talked about the measures in TFI, but what measures are being taken to address the root cause? Are you engaging parents? Are you following up with parents?

Kevin McPartlin:

Thank you, Trustee Biassotti. Again, the entire theme that we hope we are getting across is we are addressing serious behaviors appropriately. Minor behaviors is where we want to address through restorative practices, through interventions to change student behaviors. And that does include as we talk about where it takes a village and it takes all of our departments. When we think about our wraparound services and psych services, and so that's where we have students being seen by social workers and counselors, mental health professionals, family advocates, getting the family involved. With a mentoring system at a lot of schools where we really try to dig into it rather than just pushing the student back and the behaviors continue.

Along that same line, just to go back to Trustee Dominguez because, again, as we have broken down silos and I'm getting support from people in the crowd. Thank you so much. When we go back to professional learning opportunities that Trustee Johnson talked about, so we do have a district-wide professional learning plan that as we bring school data forward, we're able to see what are all the things that we offer as a district and bring it to schools for professional learning that way. Crisis prevention, they do have de-escalation for support staff as well as for license. And then student support services division, they do have trauma-informed de-escalation as well. So two more for de-escalation specifically, I wanted to mention.

Trustee Biassotti:

Okay. Thank you so much for that detailed answer. I did have one other question regarding restorative policies. I know according to the data here on slide 7, I believe, yeah. There's a significant suspension rate increase from 2020 to 2021 to 2021-2022. So it jumps. I mean, it's hard not to really narrow in on it and find out something drastically different had to have happened from those two sets of years. And wasn't it 2021 the year that restorative discipline policies were implemented in CCSD?

Kevin McPartlin:

Thank you, Trustee Biassotti. I do have the slide up. Again, you're correct. It's a huge jump that we see, but that is actually when we went from the shutdown during COVID to having students back

Kevin McPartlin:

on campus. The first one with the 271, that was when students were actually at home for nearly the entire year. So that's what that discrepancy is for.

Trustee Biassotti:

Oh, so it would've been better, I think, if we could see 2019 to 2020 before because then... Yeah, that jump shouldn't even be really taken into account, the 271. I would like to see the graph before that. I guess my question is, do you see any data that reflects a positive impact from restorative policies, in general? Not MTSS, which I do think is yielding better results, but just restorative policies.

Sam Scavella:

Thank you, Trustee Biassotti. This is Sam Scavella for the record. Yes, in 2021-22, our restorative protocols were introduced. At that time, the only restorative process that we had in the district was basically peer mediation, and there were 2,900 restorative resolutions used during that school year. The next year we experienced, through the restorative professional learning, an increase of 84%, which we went from 2,900 uses of restorative resolutions to 15,000 restorative resolutions. From that year to the next year, we went up another 24%, and that was the school year before last, which school administrators utilized a little over 20,000 restorative resolutions. And this year, our restorative resolutions went up another 27%, which represents 132% increase to 28,056 restorative resolutions. What that does is, for the minor offenses, we still increase the accountability and the responsibility for behavior while we keep students in school, but at the same time hold them accountable for those behaviors and impact them with meaningful action during those restorative conversations. So that attributed greatly to the decline that we've seen in suspensions because administrators are now utilizing those restorative resolutions at a higher level.

Trustee Biassotti:

Thank you for that. And just with all this talk of restorative discipline and policies, I would like to see the numbers, the trends that we had before restorative policies because I don't think we're getting a fair assessment with the 2020 and then on, that's all showing us restorative policies in place. But the data before that is what I would like to see just because... I know there was a reference made of how removing students back in the day was easier, to suspend them. They were essentially "thrown away". But didn't we see lower rates of violence and suspension when those practices were in place? So that is my concern. I would like to restore what was working and if restorative policies are not yielding good outcomes, this graph shows us it's more or less the same numbers. So I would like to see us take an approach that yields better and faster results. But thank you for your work.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. And we have three more trustees and then we'll go to public comment. Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

What I want to celebrate is what you said earlier, and I want to also preface that I did participate as a participant in the cultural online virtual training. There were about 600 teachers, a couple of weeks ago, and it was very insightful for me as a trustee to be able to hear some of the conversations that were deep, getting to root causes. People acknowledging that we need to have and develop relationships. We do need to repair harm. We also need to understand that the goal is to keep the kids in our schools. I just want to applaud the division for that because 600 teachers in the summer is a task.

My ask is this, the data... Trustee Satory already... It's like we didn't even talk, but it's like we talked but we didn't. The actual duplicity of those particular offenses. I think if we had that a little bit more definitive for us, it would put a lot more in context and I think it would be much of a bigger celebration when you see, maybe it's certain students that are choosing certain choices on a repeat offense. I think that would put a little bit more in context for us.

One of the other things I wanted to bring up is I had conversations with administrators and what they appreciated is maybe their principals get training or the teams get training. But oftentimes the students that are making poor choices often see certain levels of administrators or people at the site. They are asking for potentially PLCs. I'm talking about between student success or between assistant principals. Talking like you're doing with the student town halls, having access to schools that are implementing MTSS very successfully or RJ, I call it restorative practices, very much so. And they said they feel like they're in silos. So that was a comment that I've heard repeatedly.

The last thing I want to bring up is we're talking a lot about adults. I want to talk about the students. And I know Superintendent and I've had deep conversations. I keep coming back to the students. At some point, I know we don't have the full capacity, but we would love in the future, in my wish list of life, getting to students to be trained on self-awareness, regulation, having strategies, how to cope. Because I think if we can get to that level at some point and maybe we can implement it somehow in our town hall as a part two. We have a great student advisory council. They would be great ambassadors if we could add that into their curriculum. I think that would be something that we need to think about in the future. So thank you.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you for that. Did you want to respond, Ms. March?

Brandi March:

If that's okay?

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Yes.

Brandi March:

Thank you. Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan, thank you so much. Hopefully you don't mind, I really... In listening to your comments, very excited to tell you about one of the collaboratives we are using to address that PLC-type model that you spoke of.

We have, now in moving into our fourth year, of what's called the elementary school support model. It's a collaborative of elementary school principals and their teams to really share what's working in the elementary schools. We meet approximately every six weeks at a different elementary school each time, and the host elementary school is able to present to the team that's there, the other leaders, what's working, their story, their struggles at the beginning, what they're working on right now, the challenges they're facing and how they're working to implement. They share resources.

Also included in that is what's called a shared space. It's a room, formally a classroom, that this school has transitioned into a multi-purposed use space. It has a lot of centers, like I related a lot of preschool, like a preschool classroom with an art area, and although it's not preschool related, but the students are able to go in there to really celebrate and acknowledge their positive behavior.

So they earn time in this shared space in which they can have some yoga time. They have yoga mats. There's an imagination station play. There is an art center, a reading area. And they don't spend a long time. We want them in class learning, so it's 15 or 20 minutes on a rotating basis when they've earned that. Sometimes that is working towards academic goals, sometimes it's behavioral goal, sometimes it's celebrating the citizen of the month.

And so this collaborative, this elementary school model collaborative, is really a positive structure. And word got out that our elementary schools were doing this. And so this year we just started the middle school support model. And in a similar fashion we have 14 middle schools that are working on participating in this pilot program, doing similar work, not necessarily with the shared space at this time, but really focused on that collaborative piece and building on what's working.

In our elementary school support model, we're moving up towards 75 schools this coming year.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you for that.

Sam Scavella:

Oh, sorry, can I-

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Go ahead, Dr. Scavella, go ahead.

Sam Scavella:

... just expand on that a little bit.

Also, we have trained over 300 students and student-led restorative practices through our BSU conferences. And we also have six model schools, Treem, Bell, Palo, Mojave. So in order for a school to meet or master restorative practices, part of that in that rubric, our restorative practices

Sam Scavella:

rubric, is that we engage students in student-led restorative practices. Students become a part of the restorative leadership team. Parents become a part of the restorative leadership team. And the goals that they develop, from three to five goals, are focused on building relationships. They're focused on reducing disproportionality, reducing discipline, addressing the root causes of those behaviors in those schools. So those are going to be beacons to professional development across the district. And those are represented in all regions.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

That's awesome. Okay, two trustees left.

Trustee Henry?

Trustee Henry:

It's almost like you were reading my mind, because I was going to ask about that. So for you to jump in talking about the restorative practices and student-led, I appreciate that.

Just looking at this report and looking at the numbers is startling, just seeing the numbers for our African-American students. I wanted to know, how else are we engaging the community and families? I know you spoke a little bit about it Mr. McPartlin, but how else is the district getting out into the community? But also you also mentioned with mentors at the school level. Are there mentorship organizations that you're currently working with and thinking about expanding?

Kevin McPartlin:

Trustee Henry, thank you for the question. So the first part with family engagement, again as we talk about the different partnerships we have in the district, we work very closely with the family engagement division with chronic absenteeism and student discipline.

As far as when we talk about reaching into our community partners, some have been mentioned tonight, Communities in Schools, Boys Town, Invo. So we do activate with a lot of community partners as well. In fact as we try to come up with when we have businesses that come through like, "Hey, how can I help?" And we were going to come up with this menu list of here's how much it costs to bring in a Communities in Schools mentor or a Boys in Schools mentor onto this campus. That's what we're looking for. So it is a huge piece of what we do.

Obviously, it's something we want to improve on. We want to make sure parents are involved before we have major behaviors when we're still addressing it at the minor level, but certainly we activate with our partners.

Trustee Henry:

And just to follow up and thank you for mentioning Communities in Schools. And I noticed that you all mentioned the larger nonprofits or those that are in schools. How are you engaging those African-American led nonprofits and mentorship organizations to support our students?

Kevin McPartlin:

Okay, Dr. Scavella will follow up. So yeah, this is a concern, because as we deal with some of our community partners, they're addressing the struggle they have in getting in to be approved to work with us. So certainly it's something we're aware of the groups. We're communicating with the leadership to work out what is it that's causing this obstacle for people that want to support us. So I'm aware of that, and I'm actively working on it.

Sam Scavella:

In addition, we meet with our community partners quarterly on the superintendent's anti-racism equity and inclusion access committee. We address the systemic inequities across schools. We look at data. We pull from their expertise and experience and connections to inform our school supervisors and as well as the district leaders as to what should we be doing to support our schools, support our administrators, support our educators in addressing the disproportionality that we're having in our schools.

So that's something that's on the forefront. We look at that data consistently. We provide an annual report. I think the last one that we presented to the Board was in December. We'll be producing that report yearly so that we can really look at how we collectively addressing these systemic issues.

Trustee Henry:

Thank you.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. And we will end with Trustee Dominguez and then move to public comment.

Trustee Dominguez:

Thank you, Madam President. So one of the things I noticed, one of my colleagues had touched on but nobody asked about, was the behavioral schools. And we know that, obviously, suspensions, sending a kid home isn't working or isn't working as well as we would like it to. What are we doing as far as utilizing our behavioral schools that we have?

Kevin McPartlin:

Absolutely, Trustee Dominguez, so such an important piece. This would be Peterson Academic Center, South Academic Center, and Cowan Academic Center, which are within my portfolio of schools. And so, one of the things that we've really worked is to utilize the funding sources that they already have within their budgets to expand mental health supports. And so you bring in social workers, to bring in mentors.

We have Chef Jeff at Peterson and he brings in leadership trainings there. They have advisory coursework within the schools. So we really are trying to make it from, instead of just being like this place they go and then they return to schools without any kind of adjustments, is that's where we're

Kevin McPartlin:

really trying to bring in some leadership, bring in some self-regulation, bring in some supports to get to some of the root causes of what caused them to get there.

So that has been a huge shift over the last two years, and the three principals of those schools are doing a great job of making those adjustments to move us forward.

Trustee Dominguez:

Thank you. And can you just very quickly just kind of go over what does it take between a difference between a suspension or getting sent to a behavioral school?

Kevin McPartlin:

Thank you for the question. So absolutely. So when we talk about a suspension, that would be a removal from school, a temporary removal from school. For our most severe behaviors, a student may be referred, or recommended for referral, to one of our academic centers based on geography of what school they would go to, Peterson, South, or Cowan.

These are schools where students are at for nine to 18 weeks. They're fully licensed staff. The same tier one instructional materials along with some of these additional supports to address some root causes. So it is a longer term placement. Students are then returned to a comprehensive school when they've successfully completed the program.

Trustee Dominguez:

Thank you. I would love a tour by the way, just putting it out there.

Kevin McPartlin:

I will take you.

Trustee Dominguez:

Thank you.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Let's go ahead and move to our public comment. We have one, Ms. Kinsley, if you would please come forth.

Public Hearing

Stephanie Kinsley:

Hello, my name is Stephanie Kinsley. I'm the president of My Children's Advocate. I'm here to just have an honest conversation with everyone. We're discussing disciplinary and yet we're focused on race, which is racist, to say that Asian kids can get to school on time and behave themselves easier than black children and acting like its race. How racist is that?

Stephanie Kinsley:

What it is, is broken homes. I got chased out of here last time for saying this. Single mothers are failing. Single mothers are failing. Kids need to be in two parent households, and if not with the two parents, at least with the dad. That's what data backs up. Has nothing to do with race. You can tell you're never going to get good fruit from a rotten tree. We could see how violent these single mothers are when they chased me out of the room for saying the simple stuff.

We need to get back to traditional families. We need to hold the bar high for all students of all colors on how to behave in school. It's not culturally okay to behave in erratic behaviors at school. It's not ever okay. We all have YouTube. We all see how these kids turn out when they leave schools like this. We're failing our kids. We need to hold the parents accountable. We need to be calling CPS on these kids. That's what needs to happen. These kids need therapy. They need their dad. And they need help.

And to just sit here and ignore that like some Disney adult with a pride flag in the school is going to be able to teach them how to be a man. No, we need to get back to Jesus. We need to get back to traditional families, because that's the only thing that's going to fix this.

None of your teachers are equipped to even teach math and science. These kids are coming out dumb. They're coming out dumb, not knowing how to read cursive, not knowing how to count back change. It's embarrassing. Our schools are an embarrassment.

So I'm going to take this moment, dear Lord Jesus, please come. Please come into these people's hearts and minds all across Nevada. Fix these broken families and get these kids into loving homes. These kids need therapy. They need to know Jesus so that they can learn to forgive their failing parents who can't keep a family together.

You're failing your kids if you can't keep your family together. Does anyone not know that? Does anyone not know that kids need both parents in the home? Does anyone not know that when you watch YouTube and watch the cop cams that all those kids are coming from single moms? We see what's happening. And to blame it on race is racist. Shame on CCSD. Shame on all of you for even counting race instead of going, "What's so broken in these children's home that this is how they come to school and behave?"

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you so much. With that ends our public comment. I'm going to go ahead and entertain a motion to accept the report as presented.

Trustee Johnson?

Trustee Johnson:

I will motion to accept the report as presented.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you.

Trustee Barron?

Trustee Barron:

Second.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

I have a first and a second. Will you please cast your votes? Trustee Biassotti?

Trustee Biassotti:

Aye.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Okay, with that it passes six to zero.

4.01 Notice of Intent - Clark County School District Regulation 3312.

Discussion and possible action on approval of the Notice of Intent to Adopt, Repeal, or Amend Clark County School District Regulation 3312, Purchasing Authorization and Nepotism-All Funds, prior to submission to the Board of School Trustees for approval on Thursday, August 14, 2025, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Mike Casey] (Ref. 4.01)

Motion to approve Notice of Intent Clark County School District Regulation 3312.

Motion: Cavazos Second: Esparza-Stoffregan Vote: Yeses – 4 (Bustamante Adams, Cavazos, Henry and Zamora); Noes – 2 (Biassotti and Dominguez)

Not present: Stevens

Motion passed.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

We'll go ahead and move to item 4.01. This is notice of intent for Clark County School District Regulation 3312.

Mr. Casey, please proceed when you're ready.

Mike Casey:

Madam President, members of the Board, Superintendent Ebert, Mike Casey for the record. I am joined with Chris Blake, Director of purchasing.

Tonight, we bring before you notice of intent to revise regulation 3312. In 2019, the Nevada State Legislature did revise NRS 332, essentially increasing the competitive procurement threshold to 100,000. We are proposing to revise section 1B, subsection one and two, increasing the

Mike Casey:

competitive procurement threshold to 100,000 as well as Board approval and alignment with NRS. That is the extent of the proposed revisions.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you so much. Any questions from the trustees? Trustee Cavazos, before that, Trustee Cavazos, I just want to make sure if you didn't fill out a public speaker card you do so now. I didn't see any. Okay.

Trustee Cavazos?

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you, Madam President. I see now though that there are other trustees in the queue. I actually was ready to make a motion to approve 4.01, notice of intent, Clark County School District Regulation changes to 3312.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

I will accept that and wait for other questions.

Trustee Dominguez?

Trustee Dominguez:

Thank you. I guess I don't have more of a question, I have more of a discussion that I'd like to engage in, with my fellow colleagues. It has been a lot of learning through this process, and as I made in my statement for the consent agenda, it is our obligation to make sure that we are holding the district accountable and making sure that a lot of the contracts coming through are being reviewed. And at this time, the process is just, it's not functioning.

With respect President and Vice President, you guys have to make a decision on what is briefed to us. And if the decision is not to be briefed, if an item is not seen as something important, I don't want to say important, but it's as priority, then we're not briefed, and we're asked to submit an email and then to wait for an answer.

Last time I did that, which was, I get my days mixed up because we're in the summer right now, but it was literally the day of the meeting when I received a response. And so I am very concerned that if we extend this to a 100,000 that now we're losing track of even more things that we need to be reviewing, that we need to be making sure that we're at least, I don't want to say monitoring, but just making sure that we're seeing what's coming through.

And so I have a lot of, I'm really, I guess, financially conservative on this. And I'm very apprehensive to approve this without having that ability to ask questions during the consent agenda items.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you for your comment. Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Trustee Cavazos, are you still in the queue for making the motion, or did you have a question?

Trustee Cavazos:

I just had a comment, but I was going to go ahead and let Ramona go next.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Go ahead, Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

I was just with respect; I think that Trustee Dominguez is asking a very good question and making a very good point. I just wanted to put in from prior experience and having been on the Board for quite a while, we have a huge budget, and I think the intent of this is not to hide information from us. Because I have a lot of questions just like you do, and we do have some avenues by which we can ask the superintendent, or we can ask the president to ask the superintendent and go through that.

And in respect to your statement about the consent agenda, I think that's extremely important, and you make a valid point. For this particular item, I think this is for expediency. We have such a huge budget, and this has been brought up in prior years where it was set that 50,000, 75,000. And we checking with other large urban districts, 100,000 is very common. It's a very common number to use at this point. So I just wanted to put that in to give a little bit of elaboration to it.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you, Trustee Cavazos. Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan?

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

So it's interesting, because I really did look at some other districts as well, just as a comparison. And I hear you Trustee Dominguez, that it's definitely our number one responsibility fiscally to be providing that oversight. That is our number one primary job.

I don't know that this is something that I would say is a concern for me, because when you put it in context of what billions of dollars that this budget is pushing, looking at prices right now, the way that things are going up, the way that things could potentially go even further. I just hear a lot of frustration sometimes with building principals saying, "I can't get this approved. I've got to go through three and four layers." So I just hope that we can come to an agreement that maybe this is not a big ask to go up to 100,000 to expedite those frustrations and concerns.

And it's relative to large urban districts that have billion-dollar budgets. So, I think, what I wanted to share, is in most recent times I did put in a request for some items specifically to ask for specific invoices. And I received them in a very quick turnaround, I think, for the first time since I've been on this board.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

So I thank you for that expedient response, because I am looking. And I think that's our role and responsibility is to get into the weeds of things and to ask those hard questions. But maybe in our governance policies, there could be a different conversation about how we are going to address consent agenda in the future.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Yes, I think that's the appropriate spot. Thank you for that mention.

Trustee Johnson?

Trustee Johnson:

Yeah, I also think it's important for us to always consider our role in terms of the balance governance. And when we get into operations and when minutia becomes very difficult for us to create a bright line between our work and the superintendent's work. And I want to make sure that the superintendent and team, have the autonomy and then are accountable to the results of that autonomy.

And so to me, it feels like when we allow for them this ability to make good, sound decisions based on the information that they have, it treats them as professionals as they are and allows for them to continue to move forward quickly.

The other thing I always think about as it relates to dollar figures is, and Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan mentioned it, the proportion at which this is happening. And so a \$50,000 limit in terms of the size of the budget, and while every dollar is important, I think if we were looking at that at every dime, it does not allow for a system this large to run efficiently. And then when we are inefficient, we're also spending money.

So I think it also, we have to think about, are we allowing for our team to really be accountable to their decisions? And then at the end of the day, we see the large budget anyway, and then we can ask questions around why did you make the choices that you make if those choices didn't lead to the academic outcomes that we wanted?

So to stop at every stop sign to be able to say, "Why are you spending this?" as opposed to at larger benchmarks to say, "Are we on track or off track, and what are you doing to make sure you're staying on track?" I think is a good way for us to be thinking about our role and responsibility here.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Trustee Dominguez?

Trustee Dominguez:

Thank you, Madam President, and I appreciate my colleagues' comments. I think everything is built on trust. And as much as we are a new team, the community, parents, and myself as a parent, there's been a few years where just lack of trust. And so that needs to be built and that takes time.

Trustee Dominguez:

However, I think we're kind of doing this a little backwards between approving this and not taking care of the governance first. I believe that that governance should be in place prior to doing this. I would be in favor, if you would be willing, as to hold this off till after the governance policies are approved.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

I'm just going to say, I know those will be further discussion, but I did want to second the motion.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. I am going to go to Trustee Barron, or that was his. But Trustee Biassotti, you're on the line. Do you have any questions before I call for the vote?

Trustee Biassotti:

Yes. Has there been a motion to table this?

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

I have a motion to approve the notice of intent, and I have a second. That's the motion on the table.

Trustee Zamora:

And there's no public comment.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

And there isn't any public comment. Yeah. Thank you for that. So I'm going to call for the vote. The motion is to approve the notice of intent, District Regulation 3312. Please cast your votes. Trustee Biassotti?

Trustee Biassotti:

Nay.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Okay. I have four yeses, one no. And that passes. Where's the two?

Trustee Zamora:

Lorena and Lydia.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Oh, that's right. Sorry. I have four to two, and that motion passes.

4.02 2025 Application Cycle for Proposed Charter Schools.

Presentation and discussion regarding the 2025 application cycle for proposed charter school applications for the City of Henderson, City of North Las Vegas, and Nevada State Public Charter School Authority per statutory requirements. [Contact Person: Jesse Welsh] (Ref. 4.02)

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

I will go ahead to go to item 4.02. This is not an action item. This is the 2025 application cycle for proposed charter schools. Mr. Tafoya, when you're ready, please proceed.

Dan Tafoya:

Thank you, ma'am,

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Oh, hold on for a second. Is that mic on? Try it now.

Dan Tafoya:

Test one.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Oh, there you go.

Dan Tafoya:

There we go. All right, good. Here we go.

Madam President, members of the Board, Superintendent Ebert, for the record, Dan Tafoya, Director Office of School Choice. This presentation provides an overview of the 2025 annual charter school application cycle, including statutory requirements and detailed review of proposed charter school applications submitted to the Clark County School District by the State Public Charter School Authority, the City of Henderson, and the City of North Las Vegas.

For this cycle, CCSA has evaluated a total of 10 applications from the combined entities. Each application was assessed based on demographics of students proposed to be served, academic geographies, focusing on service to underperforming areas, demonstrate a capacity and readiness to meet identified community needs, compliance with city enrollment, and location requirements.

As a reminder, this presentation is for informational purposes only. The CCSA Board is not being asked to approve or deny any of the charter school applicants being discussed today.

Slide two. Statutory requirements. This presentation is based on requirements related to new charter school applications. State law requires the SPCSA and municipalities to notify local school districts when charter school applications are received. It also mandates collaboration between the

Dan Tafoya:

SPCSA, cities, and districts in evaluating these applications. Since this is a new application process for the municipalities, CCSD has been actively working to establish collaborative relationships with those entities.

A brief timeline regarding this application cycle as follows, in May and June, the City of Henderson and North Las Vegas and the SPCSA submitted applications to the Clark County School District to review. In June of 2025, the district reviewed and submitted charter school assessment questionnaires to each individual sponsor. In June 2025, the municipalities submitted the district questionnaires to their board. The city staff notifies the public and NDE regarding. One side note here is that the City of Henderson has delayed this process by 30 days. Towards the end of July 2025, the SPCSA will submit their district questionnaires to their board, and the SPCSA staff will notify the public and NDE regarding their decisions.

Slide four. I will now discuss each of the charter school applications submitted to the SPCSA, the City of Henderson, and the City of North Las Vegas. The SPCSA submitted four applications for review. The application table consists of the school name, grade levels, six-year enrollment projection. And I'd like to take note that the six-year enrollment projection is the estimated number of enrolled students at the end of a six-year period after the school has been approved to be open. Also, we have the affiliation status, and that term states that if a school is affiliated with an EMO, which is a for management organization, or a CMO, a charter management organization, which is a non-for-profit entity that actually holds the charter and runs the school as well. They serve as the board in the educational management service, or it runs directly by a board as most traditional charter schools do.

And now I'll go over the names of the SPCSA schools that applied. The first is Citizens of the World Charter School in Las Vegas. They plan on serving grades K-8 with a projected six-year enrollment of 510 students, and they're affiliated with a CMO.

The next is Game Changers Sports Academy, which is a 6-12 grade level being served and with an enrollment projected at 560 students. They are non-affiliated.

Pathways in Education in Las Vegas is a 9-12 school with 330 students, and they're affiliated with a CMO. And if they do get approved, it would be the first school that would be approved, in my knowledge over a decade of doing this, to be on the alternate performance framework.

The next is Purpose Leadership Academy, which plans on serving K-8 with a six-year projected enrollment of 459 students, and they're also non-affiliated.

Now we'll look at each individual application as we go through. And what I'm going to do is we're going to go to the next slide, and we're going to look at the Citizens of the World. As we look at the overall rating, now the way this works, if you get a "does not meet in one area", the overall rating of the application is "does not meet". In the case of Citizens, the applicant is proposing to serve zip codes where existing schools are not overcrowded and are operating below their enrollment capacities. The application lacks demonstrated history of providing an educational model with a proven capacity, credible planning, and through research and analysis aimed to increasing access to students to three, four, and five-star schools that are now not being served.

Dan Tafoya:

Game Changers. Game Changers School also did not meet the standards. And you're going to find that a lot of these are for the similar reasons. They're proposing zip codes where they would like to locate and serve students which are not overcrowded and are operating below their capacity. Their application lacks a demonstrated history of providing access to three, four, and five-star schools. And the applicant is proposing zip codes that are not aligned with SPCSA's identified geographical needs.

Next is Pathways in Education. Pathways in Education also did not meet the standard. Again, as I stated earlier, you'll see a lot of the same reasoning, and that's because they're wanting to serve zip codes where we do not have overcrowding in the district. They're operating below their enrollment capacity. The application lacks a demonstrated history of providing an educational model with capacity to provide three, four, and five-star schools. And that's basically saying that had they done this work somewhere else and in the similar type of communities, and in those communities were they able to provide three, four, or five-star schools.

Next is two of the identified service zip codes include areas that already have access to adequately performing three, four, and five-star schools, which are not classified as underperforming.

Rounding off the last application is Purpose Leadership Academy. Purpose Leadership Academy also did not meet the standards of the rubric, and the applicant is proposing to serve zip codes that are not overcrowded. They have a lack of demonstrated history providing an educational model, and also the applicants have previously applied to the SPCSA in the last application cycle and were not granted a contract.

That concludes the SPCSA applications. Now we're going to move on to the City of Henderson applications. City of Henderson submitted four applications, and those schools are Founders Classical Academy. Founders Classical Academy did not meet the standards. And the reason they did not meet the standards is that they, again, they're proposing to serve zip codes where schools are not overcrowded. The applicant is proposing zip codes that are not aligned with identified geographical and academic needs. The identified service zip codes include areas that already have access to adequately performing three, four, and five star schools. And also, they're proposing one zip code, which is the 89015 zip code, where two of the five elementary schools and both middle schools are underperforming, so that would be one that would come closest for them choosing.

The next is Keshet Academy, and Keshet Academy also did not meet the standard. The applicant is proposing to serve zip codes where we do not have overcrowding. The applicant is proposing zip codes that are not aligned with the identified geographical or academic needs. The identified service zip codes include areas that are already being currently served by CCSD or other charter schools with three, four or five star ratings, and the only zip code that would be relevant for them is 89015. The applicant is proposing locations outside the incorporated city of Henderson, which is contrary to NRS. NRS states that they must be within the incorporated city limits if they're going to put a school sponsored by a municipality.

Next is Pioneer Technology Arts Academy of Henderson. Again, they did not meet the standard. They're proposing zip codes which are not overcrowded except for the zip code, which is 89044,

Dan Tafoya:

and for some of the schools in zip code 89052, which do have capacities over 100%. The application lacks demonstrated history of providing access to three, four, and five star schools. The applicant is proposing zip codes that are not aligned with identified geographical needs. In addition, the identified zip codes including areas that have already schools that are performing at three, four, and five star level. And the only school that would be eligible in that case is 89015.

Next is Signature Preparatory Academy. Signature Preparatory Academy, the applicant is again proposing zip codes that are not in overcrowded areas except for enrollment capacities in 89052. The applicant lacks a demonstrated history of providing access to three, four, and five star schools. The applicant is proposing zip codes that are not aligned with identified geographical needs. In addition, let me get back to there, sorry. It's hard to read and press the thing at the same time. We'll get you there. Signature Preparatory also identified service zip codes include areas that already have access to adequate performing three, four, and five star schools.

The City of North Las Vegas is our last round of applications that we will review. The City of North Las Vegas submitted two applications for the 2025 charter school application cycle for the district to review. Last week, my office was informed that both applicants were denied by the City of North Las Vegas. The applicants may appeal the decision within 60 days. Those schools are Nevada Early College and Career Academy and, again, Purpose Leadership. And we'll discuss Purpose Leadership being twice on here in just a second. Nevada Early Learning and College Academy did not meet the standards again. They're proposing to put schools that there is not overcrowding. The application lacks a demonstrated history of being able to provide access to three, four, and five star schools in the areas they plan to serve. The applicant is proposing some zip codes that are not aligned with one of the identified geographical needs.

Purpose Leadership is our last school that we will be reviewing. Purpose Leadership is... College and career, Purpose Leadership. Thank you. The applicant is proposing to serve zip codes where the existing schools are not overcrowded and are operating below enrollment capacity. The application lacks a demonstrated history of providing educational model to the service area with three, four, and five star schools. The applicant has previously applied to the SBCSA and was not granted a contract this past cycle. And this cycle, as I stated earlier, the applicant also was denied by the City of North Las Vegas, and the applicant is proposing locations outside of the incorporated area of the City of North Las Vegas, which is contrary to NRS.

Over a six-year period, if all proposed charter schools are approved and reach full enrollment, the district's enrollment could be impacted by approximately 6,675 students. This projection emphasizes the need for continuously, to update and refine our growth models to accurately forecast student distribution and to guide future planning. The potential enrollment shifts will also inform the examination of additional programs and the strategic placement of Magnet schools to ensure the continued offerings are competitive and high-quality options for families. Target marketing support will be essential particularly for schools in areas where enrollment may be affected to promote the strong programs currently available across the district and to retain student interest.

This concludes my presentation. I'm here to answer any questions that you have, and thank you. Thank you for allowing me to present this evening.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you so much. Do we have any questions from the trustees? Trustee Biassotti, you're online. Do you have any questions?

Trustee Biassotti:

No questions.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Trustee Dominguez.

Trustee Dominguez:

Thank you Madam President. I found this process really interesting because I didn't know all this, so thank you. One of the questions, I guess maybe even comments that I had was maybe we should put this on the list for next legislative sessions, BDRs of splitting the district as far as having this much intervention with charter schools. Even though the discussion is important, I feel like maybe there should be some kind of ability for the charter schools to go off on their own. And I do appreciate the conversation we're having together with them, but I'm just trying to see, I mean since we're part of the process already, are we giving them any kind of feedback as far as these are the zip codes that are underserved or at over capacity, these are the locations that would be best suited for this location or this charter?

Dan Tafoya:

Trustee Dominguez, for the record, Dan Tafoya. We are establishing collaborative efforts with all of the municipalities. This is the first year that municipalities are getting to do this, so it's very new work to them. They're trying to kind of figure out their way through this. And as they get better at it, they would be able to have more collaborative efforts. But yes, there are underway collaborative efforts to have those discussions. Great question.

Trustee Dominguez:

Do we give them any feedback, the charters that are applying?

Dan Tafoya:

The feedback that they get is from their sponsors. We're one of many people that provide. They can ask different work groups as well for sponsorship, but the sponsor such as the State Public Charter School Authority will help them because if they deny the application, they have to give them reason why they denied it, and they'll work with them. They have 60 days to come back and remedy that situation if they find that that's apropos at that time.

Trustee Dominguez:

I see. And would we give our feedback to the city municipality? I'm trying to look for not just a no, but maybe to have a where could you put this school, or where could you better align so they can

Trustee Dominguez:

get a yes. Because if we're going to try to work together and make sure our schools aren't at over capacity, maybe giving a suggestion like this zip code would be a lot better placement for everyone, for the community.

Dan Tafoya:

For the record, Dan Tafoya. Again, great question. I almost called you Senator Dominguez, so I can give you a raise there. Trustee Dominguez, as part of the package-

Trustee Dominguez:

Not yet.

Dan Tafoya:

You like that? Yeah, as part of the package, what we do is we submit the zip codes in where they're proposing, and so we give them feedback on what the capacities are and what the star ratings are, so they're able to work with their sponsors and say, "Hey, this might be a better place to put it." There's also items in NRS that state that there has to be an academic need. So as you're looking, are you putting in areas that have a high dropout rate, that have areas that a significant amount of the students attend one and two star schools. And that was a legislative action that took place around 2016 and has moved forward, and SBCS has kind of spearheaded that work. So your question is very well taken and they are working together to address those issues. And as they get better at it, let's hope they do a good job.

Trustee Dominguez:

Thank you.

Dan Tafoya:

Thank you.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Trustee Satory.

Trustee Satory:

Thank you. One question. When you're talking about the zip codes, I understand that part. And I was trying to remember, I thought that there was a distance proximity to a district school. Is that the case or not, that they couldn't open within a certain mile radius of a charter school, or is that not the case?

Dan Tafoya:

Trustee Satory, Dan Tafoya, for the record. I do not believe that to be the case. There hasn't been a statutory requirement that I'm aware of that has a mileage or a distance between those schools. As you know, we do have schools that are closer in proximity to each other, but that is something that I'm sure that may be addressed in the future. That's a great question. Thanks.

Trustee Satory:

Thanks.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Trustee Barron.

Trustee Barron:

Yeah, thank you very much, Madam President. I was wondering if we could maybe have the superintendent, if that would be okay. We had Dr. Brad Keating, who he's very familiar of course with what the state put out that we as municipalities and as a school board, as a district, basically we're working to fulfill this process that was put to us by the state. Would that be okay if maybe we had Dr. Keating come forward and explain how we came up with this process? Would that be okay?

Jhone Ebert:

Absolutely. Anytime that Dr. Keating has the opportunity, come to the mic.

Trustee Barron:

And by the way, Mr. Tafoya, it's always a pleasure to see you. I love that tie and I wish I had as much style as you do. I wish I would have half as much style as you.

Dan Tafoya:

[inaudible 01:47:03].

Trustee Barron:

I get it. I got Mickey Mouse, though.

Brad Keating:

Good afternoon, Madam President, members of the board. Brad Keating, for the record. Happy to be here right next to this fine individual, Mr. Tafoya. So if I can go back in time, and Mr. Tafoya spoke about it. So in 2017, the Clark County School District brought a bill draft forward and it failed during the legislative session. That bill draft was to ensure that there was communication and collaboration between charter schools and school districts when schools were opened. The reason for that, and the planning process, was there was a site in town here that if you take one plot of land, you cut it in four quadrants. There was a K-2 and a 3-5 school by CCSD. While the 3-5 school

Brad Keating:

was just about ready, it was a year out from being opened, we found out by a sign that there was a school, a charter school going right next door.

We had no idea that that school was going in. It was a big issue, students were confused, parents were confused, there were issues with being able to get transportation in and out for our school buses as well as parents. So that was in 2017. That bill failed, and in 2019 we went back to the legislative session. In 2019 there was what was called the Achievement School District. The Achievement School District was able to, in essence, take over failing schools and bring charters in to run our Clark County School District schools. That never occurred because of the process and what was going on at the state. But during that, in 2019, the legislature's Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson and with the help of this man next to me who was the man behind the curtain helping figure out what to do, we were able to abolish the Achievement School District. And during that exact time, we abolished the Achievement School district and we required that that collaboration occur.

So anytime a charter school opened, they had to come to the County District in which they were working at, in which they were going to be, and they had to collaborate with us. We had to look at the academic, the social, the emotional, the social needs, the academic needs, and the demographics of the school area to determine if that school was suitable. We then had the opportunity, we still were approving charters at the time, so we were able to use that data to then make a decision with you all as a board whether the charters would open or not based on that demographic information. After that, Clark County School District decided not to continue in the charter atmosphere of sponsoring them. At that point, the county and the cities were able to do so through law. And within that law this piece still stands where they have to go out and get that feedback from the local jurisdiction in which they're working at.

So we now, as Mr. Tafoya said, when the City of Henderson or City of North Las Vegas receives a school application, they work with us. We provide that information to the State Public Charter School Authority, who's the authorizer, and they utilize that information on whether to open or not. The biggest piece of all of this is for Brandon McLaughlin and the facilities team because we have to know what's coming in around us when you all are deciding where to open schools and where to build schools. That collaboration was not occurring, so the biggest reason that we have the bill and the collaboration now is to ensure that we're utilizing our dollars appropriately and building where we need to and not cannibalizing a market or having too many seats that aren't needed in one area. I hope that helps answer a little bit of that question.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you so much. And I appreciate that Dr. Keating, because as a new team, it's a learning opportunity and we want to take advantage of you being here physically. And thank you, welcome home. And number two, we are not in the charter school business of sponsoring charter schools, and so it's going to be a new arena for us as a team, and so thank you for that history lesson. Trustee Barron?

Trustee Barron:

Yeah, no, I just want to say thank you very much Mr. Tafoya. And also I wanted to go on record and thank the City of North Las Vegas. They got packed this thick and they had only about a month to go through, analyze, ask questions and bring them in for interviews, and then write a report back that, again, was about this thick. I call her our education czar, Ingrid Johnson was working with our legal team. And I'm probably forgetting someone else, but they worked really diligently and they probably didn't do anything else other than this for a whole month. So they worked very tirelessly. I appreciate their work and of course the work of the district in supporting them.

Many of these applicants, they're not that far away. I honestly believe that if they continue to evolve, they might actually be on... Again, this is the first time we've ever done this. It's a trial kind of phase there. I think with time, like anything else, they could probably grow into a public asset. But I do trust the system and I really do appreciate the work from the state working, I think, with the district and with the municipalities in this new system. Thank you so very much.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

So I just want to say, in the day, we looked at charter schools as competition for public education. But the reality of that now is that we have to be cognizant that not all students' needs can be met in certain spaces. But that's not to say that as a community, we own every child. And what I appreciate with our new leadership and with some of the new communication within the municipalities is more of that collaborative spirit as a community. We are here serving public schools and students, and we want people to know that our schools are the best. So I want that on record. Public schools are the best, and so I like the way that, the direction the collaboration is moving forward. Thank you, Mr. Tafoya. I did see you at the City of Henderson yesterday, at the community education having conversation, and I appreciate that new dialogue that's happening, so thank you.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Awesome. Trustee Dominguez.

Trustee Dominguez:

Thank you, Madam President. I really appreciate that, Dr. Keating. That was something I guess I was missing is that background history, that knowledge that you have. And I do want to say, I support parental's rights to choose whatever education they would like for their student they have. You obviously know your student as a parent. One of the things I was wondering is are we going to have updates moving forward regarding these proposals or these application cycles?

Dan Tafoya:

For the record, Dan Tafoya. Trustee Dominguez, we update the superintendent. I'm sure I'll update the superintendent and provide any information as it evolves.

Trustee Dominguez:

Okay. Will any be coming to the board quarterly or yearly?

Dan Tafoya:

For the record, Dan Tafoya. This occurs on an annual basis right around this time each year. It used to be every six months, but they've reduced it because of the amount of paperwork and time that it takes. So this typically happens around each time this year. And as her timeline stated earlier, we'll usually find out all the results somewhere towards, I'd say end of August.

Trustee Dominguez:

Thank you.

Dan Tafoya:

Thank you.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. This is not an action item, so we're going to go ahead and move on to 4.03. Thank you, Mr. Tafoya. Thank you, Dr. Keating.

4.03 Public Hearing On and Possible Approval of a New Memorandum of Agreement between the Clark County School District and the Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees Regarding Additional Pay for Certain Nurses and Administrators Responsible for Nursing Services.

This is the time and place to conduct a public hearing on, discussion of, and possible action on approval of a new Memorandum of Agreement between the Clark County School District and the Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees regarding additional pay for certain nurses and administrators responsible for nursing services. Those wishing to address the Board in person at the meeting may sign up to speak by calling the Board Office at 702-799-1072 during regular business hours. Alternatively, speakers may sign up in person immediately prior to the beginning of the meeting, or comments may be submitted in writing by email to BoardMtgComments@nv.ccsd.net by 2:00 p.m. Thursday, June 26, 2025. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Jon Okazaki] (Ref. 4.03)

Motion to approve item 4.03, the new Memorandum of Agreement between CCSD and CCASAPE Regarding Additional Pay for Certain Nurses and Administrators Responsible for Nursing Services.

*Motion: Cavazos
Motion passed.*

Second: Barron

Vote: Unanimous

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

This is a public hearing on possible approval of a new memorandum of agreement between the Clark County School District and the Clark County Association of School Administrators and professional technical employees regarding additional pay for certain nurses and administrators responsible for nursing services. I'm going to ask our legal counsel, Mr. Okazaki, do you have any comments on this one?

Jon Okazaki:

Yes. Thank you. If I could just review this. John Okazaki, general counsel for the record. What's before you today is a proposed agreement between the Clark County School District and the Clark County Association of School Administrators Association for extra pay for 13 employees who primarily provide nursing and related services. Both parties agree that these particular employees are required to go way above and beyond their normal work hours, even overtime hours to provide services on call, basically 24 hours a day, seven days a week. We are going to be negotiating this as part of the negotiated agreement, CASA has already asked for that. This is not part of the negotiated agreement. This is just a one-time agreement to pay these 13 employees for the work that has been done up to this point. I have been advised that this is late coming, that they have been doing this work for many years, and that is finally going to be addressed in formal negotiations. But before you today is just a one-time agreement, 3,500 per person for these 13 specific individuals.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you so much. Is there any questions by the trustees? Trustee Stevens.

Trustee Stevens:

Thank you, John. I'm all about bonusing people for great work, especially work like this. I just have a couple questions in the sense if you could just kind of help us understand a little bit about why these 13, how are they identified? Are there going to be others that are going to say, "We were left out, why weren't we chosen?" Was there a process? Was there anything specifically defined that said these are the ones that are going to be getting these bonuses and this is why, so that it's clear and there's no issues down the road?

Jon Okazaki:

I'm going to ask Monica Cortez to provide some information. We did go through that analysis to determine why these individuals and not others should receive this, so she could provide some information.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Go ahead, Dr. Cortez.

Monica Cortez:

Thank you, Madam President, members of the board, Superintendent Ebert. Monica Cortez, to the record. The individuals that are in front of you are doing extensive work, and without them putting in this time, we would not be able to move operationally and have students attend, or provide the necessary services. So in regards to the individuals, I'll give a couple examples. The health services directors, they are responsible for, often at 4:00 a.m., shuffling around schedules for all the nurses that are providing special procedures that are separate from school nurses. Constantly doing coverage not only amongst their region but also we have many nurses that attend with students from their residence. So it is a process that is pretty much continuous from 4:00 a.m., they start calling in, all the way to late evening.

We also have many field trips that occur in our district, and as we have identified those are necessary experiences for students. And those individuals also assist with either communicating with the teams that are there or just the processing. We've had just recently a few situations that it's been imperative to have them available. There are always people who I think do above and beyond, but these are essential duties that must occur for our students to continue having the services. In regards to the crisis response, as you're well aware, those two individuals are 24/7. We receive calls. Crisis has happened at any time, and just the availability to have them assist with not only the communication through leadership but also to constantly provide support to not only our schools but our students. And trying to think. I think that's it, but if you have specific, I can go to more detail.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Trustee Stevens? Yes.

Trustee Stevens:

Yeah, just to follow up on that. I guess what I'm, more specifically, I'm very process type, so I'm just wondering, do you have a defined formula that says these qualifiers or what constitutes this bonus for these folks?

Monica Cortez:

Do you want me to? I can tell a little bit of how we did it internally. So it is something that we've been looking at a long time. And again, a lot of people at different times do extensive work. The formula that we looked at is what is more than what is reasonable as an administrator? What is essential to students coming in? And so that's how we determined overall who these administrators would be, because I think I could tell you not only every administrator in the district, but also in our division because it is unique, there's varied situations. These individuals, if they didn't put in the time, there is no one else that could do the work.

To give an example, you have to be skilled in dealing with crisis response. In the nursing, you have to be trained and knowledgeable in what is available in different strengths. So if those individuals are not there to do this on a consistent basis, we wouldn't be able to provide that service. So that is in thinking about, I don't want to say it's an official rubric, but our process of going through, that is how we eliminated or provided the recommendation of who we thought would be relevant. When

Monica Cortez:

you're talking about other administrators, there are other avenues that we can compensate them for duties that go above their contract, but it is not to the extent that these 13 were brought to you by. The amount, I would have to defer. It was something between our general counsel CCASAPE and then input from us as well in looking at the time.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Trustee Dominguez.

Trustee Dominguez:

Thank you, Madam President. So I know you'd mentioned these won't be renewed. Showing that we're going into a next year, how are we going to be able to say, are these staff members not going to do the same work, or was it just a large amount of work this year that we just put on them?

Jon Okazaki:

We've agreed that we need to negotiate this. So both parties have agreed that the responsibilities that are being put on these employees and the work that they're doing is above and beyond and needs to be addressed. So that's why we will be negotiating, and in all likelihood potentially will have provisions in there to address these types of employees. But we did not want to say this is formal negotiations or a negotiated provision. It's not yet, so we still have to negotiate it.

Trustee Dominguez:

I see. Are these employees' salary employees?

Jon Okazaki:

Yes.

Trustee Dominguez:

I guess, do we have in their contract the hours a week? Is it a normal standard 40 hours a week that they've gone over?

Jon Okazaki:

No. I think like Dr. Cortez said, it's all administrators work more than 40 hours a week. So based on her formula, it's like a couple of criteria, right? It's essential work that nobody else can do and it is way above beyond what reasonably most administrators do. That was the form. We didn't do per hour because we're not paying per hour. CASA had asked for more. I think Dr. Cortez was probably okay with it, but the superintendent and I, I want to say negotiated, we agreed with CASA that 3,500 was a reasonable amount at this point, and so that was agreed upon. It was not hourly.

Trustee Dominguez:

Thank you.

Jon Okazaki:

If we did hourly, it would be way more than 3,500.

Trustee Dominguez:

I'm sorry, I do have a last question. Where are these funds coming from?

Jon Okazaki:

Go ahead.

Monica Cortez:

Madam President. Monica Cortez, for the record. So it's a couple of different various funds. It depends upon where their salary is funded from, but that was also in the equation to ensure that we had enough funding through either our general supply line that was allocated to the budget, or some are also split funded between Medicaid reimbursement.

Trustee Dominguez:

So this qualified as Medicaid reimbursement?

Monica Cortez:

Okay. Medicaid reimbursement, the purview is that we may use it as we feel is appropriate as long as we're abiding. It's not charges that are charged for Medicaid. We have a division, and I will tell you a bulk of our reimbursement is actually from the work that the health services department is able to provide. So it is a reasonable expense, and that is why part of their salaries is also there.

Trustee Dominguez:

Thank you. And I apologize for keeping it going, but that just led me to another question. I'm sorry. So with Medicaid and reimbursement, is it just a fund, a pot of money that we have set aside? I thought it was allocated dollar per dollars.

Monica Cortez:

Madam President, Superintendent Ebert. It is a complex question. If the superintendent approves, I could go into more a depth at another time, I would recommend, but we have a very thorough process that is not only followed through Medicaid, but through the state of how those funds are dispersed. There is a process that we do through our division in determining the needs for students and staff to provide the support that we do, that we allocate that budget. It is through a revenue that occurs the following year, but it is a budget that the district is able to utilize. At this point, we have used it to assist with student services division needs in multiple capacities.

Trustee Dominguez:

Thank you. And if you could give me a brief kind of percentage point, if half or 50 or 20 maybe, or maybe in a ballpark of how much is covered by Medicaid. Or you're estimating, projecting at least.

Monica Cortez:

With all due respect, I don't have that in front of me. I didn't realize I was going to need to get into the detail, but I can provide it to the superintendent for her information.

Trustee Dominguez:

Thank you.

Monica Cortez:

We do have the breakdown.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Trustee Barron. Did you have a question, Trustee Barron?

Trustee Barron:

Oh, I'm sorry. I did. I guess I still have meatloaf running through my head here.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

I hear you.

Trustee Barron:

Yes. Dr. Cortez, as always, thank you very much. It's a pleasure to hear from you. You described that these are essential services that these nurses are providing along with the administrators. Given right now, I guess anything medical is golden. Does this boost help you to retain and maybe even attract more people who have this essential knowledge that it's not really replicated by any other district staff, is that correct?

Monica Cortez:

Madam President and Superintendent Ebert, Trustee Barron. That's absolutely correct. It is part of our retention. It is for a very select individuals, those 13 that provide duties that we just don't have the capacity to do. I hate to put this on the record. What we are asking them to do is a lot of time, a lot of time that if we don't have our nurses scheduled and we don't have procedures covered, that means students will not be able to come to school. That means we will not be able to provide a safe learning environment for those students that we're required to do.

Trustee Barron:

And I take it's actually difficult to find people go out, fly the position, recruit for this to bring people in. I guess in a way, we're almost saving a few bucks by throwing a few bucks to keep people? That's a speculative question there.

Monica Cortez:

Madam President, Trustee Barron, yes, an alternative way to handle this would be to hire more administrators in that field and create like hospitals do a shift schedule that will exponentially increase the cost to do that.

Trustee Barron:

Okay. That's all I needed to know. Thank you so very much, Dr. Cortez.

Trustee Zamora:

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

Thank you, Trustee Barron. It was in the vein that what I was going to say is that I look at equating it to the facility side of things. We cannot find electricians and HVAC. We are competing with industry. So I think this is a minor stipend because of the demands that they are on call 24/7. And even on vacation, they are answering the phone. They have that obligation, they have that commitment and dedication. So I just want to just say to my colleagues that I would be very comfortable... I wish we could give them more, but we don't have that at this time. And maybe there's consideration in the future for reclassifying and looking at that salary in the future.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you. Trustee Cavazos?

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you, Madam President. And I will reiterate my colleagues' statements here that I think the key statements here, and I think Dr. Cortez did an excellent job of explaining our detailed questions, and that's the phrases of essential services. And the other phrase, without these services, our students would not be able to attend school. So with that, I would like to make a motion to approve 4.03, and I'm not going to read the entire item-

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

And Trustee Cavazos, it's a public hearing, so let me see if we have anybody-

Trustee Cavazos:

Oh, that's right. I'm sorry. Forgot that.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

I didn't see anybody signed up for public comment.

Trustee Cavazos:
Right.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Is there anyone here for item 4.03? And I do have Trustee Biassotti, I didn't know if you had question.

Trustee Biassotti:

I did not have a question. I wanted to second the motion.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Okay, hold on for a second. So I see nobody coming forth, so the public hearing is done. I'll go ahead and entertain Trustee Cavazos' motion to approve item 4.03, and I have a second from Trustee Biassotti. So I will call to cast the vote. I asked a great question. So Vice President Zamora is asking me if we need to take a vote and I had asked our legal counsel and he told me yes. So that's, we are proceeding that way. So please cast your votes. Trustee Biassotti?

Trustee Biassotti:

Aye.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Okay, that motion passes seven to zero.

4.04 Public Hearing On and Possible Approval of a New Memorandum of Agreement between the Clark County School District and the Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees Regarding Additional Pay for Principals Responsible for Extended School Year Programs.

This is the time and place to conduct a public hearing on, discussion of, and possible action on approval of a new Memorandum of Agreement between the Clark County School District and the Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees regarding additional pay for principals responsible for extended school year programs in 2025. Those wishing to address the Board in person at the meeting may sign up to speak by calling the Board Office at 702-799-1072 during regular business hours. Alternatively, speakers may sign up in person immediately prior to the beginning of the meeting, or comments may be submitted in writing by email to BoardMtgComments@nv.ccsd.net by 2:00 p.m., Thursday, June 26, 2025. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Jon Okazaki] (Ref. 4.04)

*Motion to approve item 4.04, the new Memorandum of Agreement between CCSD and CCASAP
Regarding Additional Pay for Principals Responsible for Extended School Year Programs.*

*Motion: Barron
Motion passed.*

Second: Stevens

Vote: Unanimous

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

We're going to go ahead and go to item 4.07. This is a public hearing on possible proposal of a new memorandum of agreement between the Clark County School District and the Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional Technical Employees regarding additional pay for principals responsible for extended school year programs. Mr. Okazaki?

Jon Okazaki:

Yes. Thank you. Jon Okazaki, general counsel for the record. This memorandum of agreement with CASA is a little different than the one we just reviewed. The history of this is in May of 2022 the board approved a memorandum in which it provided additional pay to administrators to run summer programs, specifically extended school year in addition to their normal duties. So similar to the one we just talked about as far as doing additional duties above and beyond what administrators are required to do, the memorandum was passed for the summer of '22. And I guess based on some ambiguity, the parties continued the practice year after year '23 and '24.

When I came in and it was brought to my attention that we didn't really have a clear memorandum providing for this and that we were operating under the 2022 agreement, I recommended that we clean that up. The superintendent gave me direction to meet with CASA and determine what we're doing. So this memorandum will definitively authorize the payment for this summer because we had been operating under that premise even going into the planning for this summer. But it will be the last summer that we do this unless it is negotiated into the... it is put into the negotiated agreement. So a couple of things here: one, it memorializes the informal understanding of the parties for summer 2025, but also officially puts an end to it until it goes into the negotiated agreement.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you for that explanation. Any questions from the trustees? Trustee Dominguez?

Trustee Dominguez:

Thank you, Madam President. Same questions, where is this money coming from?

Jon Okazaki:

I actually don't know definitively. Dr. Cortez, you're getting up here, so I have a feeling, but I don't want to say.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

You don't have to be formal. Go directly to the-

Monica Cortez:

Thank you. Madam President, members of the board, Superintendent Ebert, sorry, it's habit. You only have me one more meeting for that, that is ESY is funded. We are required federally to

Monica Cortez:

provide ESY. It is through fund 250, which is general fund, and so that will also come through there.

Trustee Dominguez:

Are we setting a precedence by doing this action?

Jon Okazaki:

John Okazaki for the record. As I indicated, the board had formally approved for this pay in 2022 and the parties continued that practice. So it was my understanding that both parties understood it to continue based on that approval. I think this memorandum clears it up for 2025 that absolutely it will be... it's authorized if you approve it. But more importantly, it puts an end to it so that there's no question that unless it's negotiated into the CBA, the collective bargaining agreement, that it will not continue.

Trustee Dominguez:

I guess could you just maybe give us a little background? That might help if you could give us a background on why this came about this year versus not '23 or '24.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Mr. Okazaki gave that. Would you like him to repeat it or...

Trustee Dominguez:

Well, 'cause he said it was '22 the last time we had done this, and so I'm just wondering why not 24? Why not '23?

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

If you could restate it for the record, Mr. Okazaki?

Jon Okazaki:

I came back to the school district in August of '24 and shortly after that, I found some of these memorandums floating around and practices being done. And I've been trying to advise the superintendent on how to clean some of this up. I understand that the prior memorandum and the of the parties, that it was just a continued practice, but I wanted it cleaner. So I said we need to either continue it with a new memorandum or cancel it or both. And the agreement between the parties was yes, let's formalize it for this summer. And the understanding is that by the time I caught it, or I shouldn't say caught it, by the time I intervened and asked about all this, it was... we had already told these administrators, they were already expecting, they had already done all the prep work and so there was some of reliance that they were getting paid already. So thankfully, both parties agreed to just formalize it for this year, but this would be the last year.

Trustee Dominguez:

Okay. Thank you. And if I could just ask one last question. Have we had a set amount of... nobody else can come back and say, "Oh, I was also part of this, I can have a claim on this?"

Jon Okazaki:

No. No.

Trustee Dominguez:

Okay.

Jon Okazaki:

It's everybody's aware of this, it's been going for three years, we've never had any dispute. We have also advised all of our administrators that unless it's in the CBA, this will be the last time it happens.

Trustee Dominguez:

Got it. Thank you.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Trustee, do you have a question?

Trustee Biassotti:

I guess. Thank you, Madam President, I have a brief question. Can we get numbers again? How many principals are we talking about and what is the total amount?

Jon Okazaki:

Jon Okazaki for the record. Unfortunately, Trustee Biassotti, I don't have that information. We don't necessarily know how many ESY administrators are going to work the hours and how many schools there are and programs there were going to be. We will eventually have that number. I don't have that number for you tonight.

Trustee Biassotti:

Thank you. And based on that, I would like to either make a motion to table this or I'll wait until you get to that portion.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Okay. I have one more question from Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

It's not a question. I just want to give a little more context to the history of because I lived it as a former principal. So prior to this happening, traditionally, this is my personal point of view and experience that I'm sharing from my past, that schools didn't have the funding to compensate administrators. It was an expectation and then a way to gain experience. And typically, assistant principals or at the time, deans and back in the day, would do that work in the summer because it would be a step and a leg up to becoming promoted in the future. When COVID came around and then ESSER funding came into play is when they started to expand it and give that funding, which we've never had before, is a windfall so that all schools could provide summer school.

And so all of our schools at that time during that period were providing summer school and they were getting paid, administrators were getting paid, I believe it's almost equivalent to this amount, maybe 8,000 to \$9,000 for the summer services. So that was probably when that started. And unfortunately, thank you, Mr. Okazaki, you are definitely cleaning up some of the past practices of culture and expectation. And so I appreciate that there's an understanding that this may be the last time that they get paid for this, but it's unfortunate that we're going to be going into the summer of July and people have signed up thinking that they're going to get paid to do summer school for our students and especially our students with disability. I'm very worried that they will not have that coverage or supervision.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Since this is a public hearing, is there anybody in the audience that would like to speak to this item? I did not have anybody signed up. Okay. Yes, Mr. Okazaki.

Jon Okazaki:

I've been getting some additional information. I just want to add what I can at this point for clarification. I'm getting information that we have 68 ESY programs. Is that a fair way to say that? Some are these going to be run by 12-month administrators who would be eligible for this. Some would be 11-month administrators who wouldn't. But who would be actually paid their daily rate or something. So CASA wants me to point out that if we're paying 11-month administrators, it's going to be more than what we would be paying 450 a day for 12-month administrators. As the MOA says, it's limited to 20 days, which also excludes any days that an ESY administrator is out. So if they're sick or something like that, they're not getting the pay. So to get an idea of how much money that is, it'll be less than 68 schools and then it'll be maximum 20 days per, so 450 per day.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Trustee Biassotti, we're done with questions. Did you want to continue with your motion?

Trustee Biassotti:

Thank you. No, I wanted to thank our counsel for shedding light on it and it does give a different perspective on it, especially with the limited number of days. And so I would like to withdraw that motion. Thank you.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you so much. Therefore, I will entertain a motion to approve the new memorandum agreement. Trustee Barron?

Trustee Barron:

Yeah, I'd like to make a motion to approve.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Trustee Stevens?

Trustee Stevens:

I'll second.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Okay. Okay. I have a first and a second. If you could please cast your vote. Trustee Biassotti?

Trustee Biassotti:

Aye.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

That motion passes seven to zero.

4.05 Discussion and Possible Action on Entering Into a Contract with Parker Nelson & Associates Law Firm.

Discussion and possible action on entering into a contract with Parker Nelson & Associates law firm to provide legal services as Board Counsel, and to authorize the allocation/transfer of money to the Board's budget to pay for these services. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Brenda Zamora] (Reference material will be provided.) (Ref. 4.05) (*According to Governance Policy GP-3: Board Responsibilities*)

Motion to accept the contract as proposed to include the amount up to \$200,000.00 for services rendered.

Motion: Barron Second: Esparza-Stoffregan Vote: Yeses – 6 (Biassotti, Cavazos, Dominguez, Henry, Stevens and Zamora)
Abstain: Bustamante Adams
Motion passed.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

The next item on our agenda is 4.05. I'm going to go ahead for consistency and also on the abundance of caution to make sure it's not a conflict of interest for me, I'm going to turn over 4.05 to our vice president for the discussion and possible action.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you, Madam President. Before I open item 4.05, is there anyone who did not get a chance to fill out a yellow card? If you need to fill one out, fill it out now. All right. We're closing our public comment section for that. This agenda item I will pass it over to our board counsel, Jon Okazaki, to give us a background and overview.

Jon Okazaki:

Thank you. John Okazaki, general counsel for the record. Before you is basically the service agreement by your selected board counsel, the firm of Parker & Associates. I've reviewed this fee agreement, it's standard. Everything in there is standard for an agreement between an attorney and a client. Just a couple of things the board should keep in mind, when hiring private counsel, the contractual relationship between a client and an attorney is somewhat different in that it's completely at will. You can terminate. You are never required to retain any attorney. So at any point, regardless of what's agreed upon, you can just say, "I do not want you to be my attorney." You would be responsible for paying any for work that has been performed.

But again, it's a personal service contract between a professional attorney and a client, and a client can never be forced to accept any attorney. So just understand that what you'd be entering into is an agreement going forward for work that you would pay the fees that is indicated here. He has outlined the way his services will be rendered and you're agreeing to that. But again, if at any point you say, "This is just not working, you could literally just terminate it on the spot," but again, having to pay for any work that he has already performed. So I just wanted to let you know that it's a standard agreement. I've reviewed it and I don't see anything concerning in it. It's just a matter of whether the way it's written and the fees that he will be charging for his services are satisfactory to you.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you for that. Now I will be opening it up for my colleagues if you have any questions. We also have on call Mr. Joe to give out any answers you all might have. Questions? Trustee Cavazos?

Trustee Cavazos:

Hi. Thank you, Madam Vice President. I just wanted to ask and I just saw, because I was away, just saw the agenda and the contract and everything today, this morning. So I just wanted to ask if I could, Mr. Okazaki, as far as the way that this is formatted, we had discussed at the previous meeting when we agreed on this whether is it clarified anywhere in there, I did a very fast skim, that the mode of payment is going to be hourly, not by retainer?

Jon Okazaki:

Yes. And Mr. Parker's here, he can correct me. But my review of this is he's giving hourly wages, so I mean hourly rates. And he's articulated that he's going to be primary and he's articulated how he will oversee all work that is done for the board by any of his associates, but it is an hourly rate. And so just so you understand how that works, I assume he does it the way all other attorneys, and when I was in private practice it may have changed 'cause it's been a long time, but it's every six minutes. It's a 10th of an hour is how they charge. So the hourly rate is indicated in the agreement. It is likely that you would be charged in six-minute increments.

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you for that clarification. I believe I have one other question here and this has to do with, and this was a matter of discussion, which Mr. Parker did answer our questions at the time. In the contract, though, I need a in this service agreement need a clarification 'cause there's quite an amount of discussion about attendance at our meetings. And in this service agreement I noticed that it does state, and I wanted to thank Mr. Parker for specifying a second person from his firm, that would be available. However, I do notice it says bimonthly meetings, which, of course, are on the second and fourth Thursday of every month. And then it says any special meetings. So I wanted to clarify because we also have a third meeting every month, which is the trustee work session, which our previous two attorneys have always attended because they're all trustee items. And so I wanted to clarify if that would be included.

That's on the first Wednesday of every month unless the president sees fit to change that for different reasons. Sometimes we've had emergencies where we've had to do that or we've had trainings out of town. And then the other thing beyond meeting attendance are closed sessions. Like for instance, we have a closed session just about pretty much every Thursday regular meeting at either 2:30 or 3:00, depending on what we have presented to us by staff. So I would like to get a clarification on whether the work session is also going to be included and the closed sessions or is that something where maybe we're just using, are we using the term special meetings to include those... If we could just get a clarification because our work sessions are called trustee work sessions and closed sessions, as Mr. Okazaki always explains to us, are closed sessions having to do with 241 and 288 items, NRS 241, 288.

Jon Okazaki:

Again, I'll speak for him and ask him to correct me if I'm wrong. Again, the way this is working is you hire his firm, you tell him when you need him, he's there. Either he's there or an associate is there to provide the services that you need whenever you need them. If your concern is, is it going to be Mr. Parker at the work sessions in the closed, that would be something you would have to ask him. But I can almost guarantee you that every piece of work that you need including attendance at any meeting or gathering, if you want him there, he will be there.

Trustee Cavazos:

I appreciate that. What I'm asking is, and it's not a concern about that because he's already assured us in the service agreement and also in person during the interview, and I thank him for

Trustee Cavazos:

putting down a specific person. What I'm asking is in previous board representation, it has been, in other words, the president did not have to ask the attorney to attend every single work session or to attend every single closed session. Is that what we're saying here is that the president or the vice president would need to ask the attorney for every single work session or closed session?

Jon Okazaki:

The president or whoever you determine to be the liaison between the board and Mr. Parker could write at the beginning say, "I expect you to be at all of these meetings." And then I assume that will be his directive and he will honor that.

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you.

Jon Okazaki:

So it doesn't have to be for everyone.

Trustee Cavazos:

Thank you. I appreciate that. Thank you very much, Mr. Okazaki.

Trustee Zamora:

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan?

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

Thank you, Mr. Okazaki. Doing some math in my head, so if Mr. Parker, were hypothetically to call you to maybe collaborate a little bit because we know that that's going to be reality maybe in the beginning for historical and educational ease, language and guidance, if he had a six-minute phone call with you, then he would charge us for an hour.

Jon Okazaki:

No, that is, he charges by six-minute increments. If he talks to you for three minutes, you get charged for six minutes. And this is just the way that I understand private practice to work. Mr. Parker, correct me if it's wrong 'cause I've been out of the private practice for over 25 years. When I say six-minute increments, 10th of an hour, anything under that, you get charged for at least 10% or that six minutes. But it's in six-minute increments.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

Thank you.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you. And Mr. Parker, sorry to cut you off, Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan, if you would like to come up and just do any clarification, you're more than welcome to as well.

Theodore Parker:

Thanks.

Jon Okazaki:

Thank you.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

So back to my question 'cause I'm asking about you specifically, if he calls you, he can bill us.

Jon Okazaki:

Yes. So again, whatever he deems necessary to provide his services-

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

Correct.

Jon Okazaki:

... is going to be legal services.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

Got it.

Jon Okazaki:

The control that the client always has is he will be submitting, I would assume, at least monthly invoices, and he has to delineate every charge. So he will say, "Telephone call with general counsel to discuss June 26th board agenda, 12 minutes," and then you'll be charged for 12 minutes. It is incumbent upon the client to review those charges and if there's ever any concern, express that to him and say, "I don't want you to do that anymore, I'm not paying for that," and so on and so forth.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

So I guess my only ask before we entertain... I know there might be further discussion, is will the board have access to seeing those invoices as well?

Jon Okazaki:

That would be an internal process I would assume, so I would encourage the entire board to have access to that. And just for clarification, the agenda item includes the budget for this. And so the

Jon Okazaki:

recommendation that I was part of was, it's like our purchase award, right? We're not saying you're going to spend this much, but the motion should include a motion to approve up to or approve this certain amount from which you can draw as you're paying services. And again, if it turns out to be more than you wanted to spend, you can start limiting services. You can terminate, you can do whatever you want.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

Okay.

Jon Okazaki:

The recommendation that we put forward based on what I told you was average was 200,000 for six months.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

Okay. Madam President, I have no further questions, but when it's time, I'd like to entertain a motion.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you, Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan, and thank you for a new title. Appreciate you. Trustee Barron?

Trustee Barron:

Yeah, I guess I missed the last meeting when we were discussing this. I know we're talking about an hourly rate. Have we really discussed the advantages of having his services, Mr. Parker's services on a monthly retainer? I myself, I look at it like this. If we look at his hourly rate 350 times, probably right now we're thinking it's only going to be like eight hours a week. It's probably going to be more than that because they'll probably be talking to our legal. Just as I was listening to Counselor Okazaki and just listening to his deep knowledge of what we do here on the school board, he was able to answer questions that most other attorneys in town would not be able to answer. And that's because he has spent so much time with the district that he knows this stuff.

Our board council, might be needing to take some research that would only be very understandable for him to get caught up on the way we do things for the district. That would be time that would be billable, and again, that would be totally understandable. And I'm thinking he's going to wind up spending more than 15 hours a week catching up with us. I would strongly suggest that this contract be on the monthly retainer. I'm not good with math, but I can figure out a calculator, and I know on paper it sounds like it's pretty expensive at \$222,000. I would just point out that if you look on Transparent Nevada and see what staff attorneys earn, once you put in benefits, it's more than \$200,000 a year.

What I'm getting at is this contract that we're engaging in with Mr. Parker, with Counselor Parker, we're not paying his retirement, we're not paying his medical. He's handling all that on his own. And

Trustee Barron:

we're actually getting, how should I say, since we're not paying that, we're not incurring, hey, we don't have to pay for his pers on top of this. With all respect to my colleagues, I think it would be much more wise to engage his services on the monthly retainer fee because I have a feeling that we're going to wind up going to our board council a lot more than we even think, and he's going to be engaging us. If he's spending 20 hours a week, in the long run, it's actually going to cost us more to retain our services.

And let me tell you, having a bad attorney winds up costing you a lot more in the long run than investing in a good attorney in the short run. So I would strongly suggest to this board that we engage Mr. Parker at the monthly retainer fee. And well, I guess that would be my 2 cents on this one. Again, we've had a good success with Mr. Okazaki, but it's time to get him back to where he needs to be working on the district. I'm sure my superintendent definitely agrees with that. There's a motion later on. By the way, if we agree right now, if there's a motion to agree to take him, are we still in negotiation with his compensation or is that being negotiated right here?

Jon Okazaki:

I'm helping with the motion. Go ahead. I'm sorry, Trustee Barron.

Trustee Barron:

Yes, counselor. Again, if there's a motion right now, are we merely making the motion to retain this board council or are we also motioning for his compensation at this time?

Jon Okazaki:

Yes. So what's before you is his service agreement, his terms for providing services to the board. If you accept his terms, he will start immediately. He will be board counsel and you will begin to have access to his services.

Trustee Barron:

Okay.

Jon Okazaki:

It's hourly rate, so he will bill you when you use his services. And just to go back to clarify a couple of things that you've been mentioning. Remember I said that on average, because if you think of the meetings that he has to attend, like today we started at 2:30, we're going to be here, whatever. So just this day alone, not counting the work session, in fact, we have three meetings in two weeks here, right?

Trustee Barron:

Mm-hmm.

Jon Okazaki:

He'll be at the board retreat. So when I said that it was an average of 20 hours per week, it could very well be that. And there are less rates than a private attorney charges, trust me. But even at those rates, you're looking the 200,000 that I recommended is for six months, not a year. And in my experience, and again, I've been out of the game for a while, but retainers, the way retainers work is you pay more because they're no matter what, it's a different arrangement than hourly. So you tend to pay a little bit extra even if you don't use it all when you do a monthly retainer. But again, that's up to the board. And, of course, you can speak to Mr. Parker if you're interested in trying to negotiate a monthly retainer, as opposed to hourly rate.

Trustee Barron:

Thank you very much, counselor. Actually, Madam Vice president, when it's time, of course, after the public has had its say, if they so choose in this matter, I know I would be ready to make an motion, of course, to accept his agreement, but on a monthly retainer basis.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you, Trustee Barron. I will go to you when it's time. Trustee Johnson.

Trustee Johnson:

Just a quick opine. I think it's a bit of an unknown, so it's going to be expensive whether we have the retainer or the hourly. And I do think the ramp up is going to be expensive. So in the initial start it may be expensive it. And so, I think it's going to be wise for us to do a recalculation, just an audit of how much we've spent over this first six months and what we project to spend. So to me it feels a bit like six in one hand, half a dozen in the other, because we don't want to spend a lot of money right up front because we are getting used to the arrangement.

But to my question, and I think this has already been answered, but I just want to make sure I'm clear. If a trustee emails, or calls, or texts, Mr. Parker, will still be charged for that six, seven minute that he was required to work. So if I text Mr. Parker to get that six minutes of work, if I email him and it takes him six minutes of work, we'll be charged for any of those, because he is working on behalf. But I want to confirm that that is the case. Correct?

Jon Okazaki:

Okay. Yeah. Let me just, again, based on my own experience, the way private attorneys work, although they're allowed to charge you for every six minutes that they provide services, they don't. They don't. They will not do that. But yes, technically speaking, if you send him an email or copy him on an email that he has to review and it takes three minutes to review, you could technically be charged six minutes. You call him on the phone and he's on the phone for 15 minutes, that's 18 minutes. That's three tenths of an hour. Right?

Trustee Johnson:

Okay.

Jon Okazaki:

That's how it works. But normally, private attorneys will have that list of charges, and then they start marking things off, and they're not that petty to say, "Every two minutes, I'm going to charge you."

Trustee Johnson:

I'm not going to call them petty, but I do know that a man went to school for a lot of years and he wants to be paid for his time.

Jon Okazaki:

But he also understands that he's providing a service and he wants that to be satisfied with his-

Trustee Johnson:

Compensated for his services.

Jon Okazaki:

... Correct.

Trustee Johnson:

Understood.

Jon Okazaki:

Thank you.

Trustee Zamora:

Trustee Biossitti, do you have any questions or comments?

Trustee Biassotti:

No questions. Everything's pretty clear. Thank you.

Trustee Zamora:

Trustee Barron, do you have a question?

Trustee Barron:

Yeah, actually, I have a question for the counselor, if he's okay.

Trustee Zamora:

Are you open? Yes?

Trustee Barron:

Yeah, the other counselor. The counselor who was taking the seat. The dapper counselor there. Not that the other counselor is not dapper.

Trustee Zamora:

Trustee Barron, I recommend for you just to take a pause.

Trustee Barron:

Yeah, I'm going back to my Mickey Mouse. Counselor Parker, thank you very much for coming down. Would you be okay with us to retain you at this monthly rate of 18.5 that you proposed?

Theodore Parker:

Let me first say good afternoon or good evening to everyone. Thanks for having me, I think, the third time. And it's nice to meet you, Trustee Barron. The RFP or RFU was set up in a certain way where hourly fees were suggested. And so, that's how we responded. And my negotiations or discussions with Mr. Okazaki have been based on an hourly rate.

Trustee Zamora:

I don't know if the mic is on.

Theodore Parker:

Is it on? Okay. I'm not sitting close enough probably. And so, unfortunately, it may take some more discussions with me and Mr. Okazaki. I don't know exactly how much help or demands you'll place on my schedule, but I'm here for you. And so, he was correct. You don't have to ask me but once if you want me at all meetings or two thirds of the meetings, I'll be there, to also address what Trustee Cavazos said.

In terms of doing, it on a retainer arrangement, be it monthly, yearly, those are retainers typically dealt with. Generally, a retainer means that you pay a certain amount of money upfront. We bill our time. And we bill against that retainer. If we exhaust that retainer, you have to replenish the retainer. I really don't see how an hourly rate arrangement would negatively affect the board, because we are doing work based upon your request. It's not as if we are creating the bills for you. So I don't know if there's any real savings that you would benefit from in doing it as a retainer. Whatever hours we work or we don't work, we'll refund the money at any time. And Mr. Okazaki is correct. The ability for client to terminate the relationship or the lawyer to terminate the relationship is always available to everyone. So you're not stuck with me. Hopefully, you won't feel that you are. And, I don't have a problem doing that, getting back to your question, I just don't see where the benefit is for you. Hopefully, that addresses your concern.

Trustee Barron:

Yes, it does, counselor. Thank you very much. And I appreciate your candor in this.

Theodore Parker:

Oh, of course. Listen, if we can't go into an arrangement with some trust on both sides, then we have other things we can do. So hopefully, that gives you some comfort.

Trustee Barron:

Thank you very much. And, it does. I appreciate you coming down and even expressing interest in serving this board. It really does.

Theodore Parker:

Yes. And I will say again, Mr. Okazaki is correct, our rate to non-public agencies is a lot more than the rate I've given this board. And I don't think anyone who does this work day in and day out would say otherwise. This is a way of giving back to me and my firm. We do a lot of public or quasi-public work. In terms of getting up to speed, you won't have to teach us 241 or 288. We do this day in and day out. Perhaps some of the idiosyncrasies that go along with this board may require somewhat of a learning curve. But, we hit the ground running. But hopefully, that gives you also some comfort that we won't spend a lot of your money getting ready. Okay.

Trustee Barron:

Thank you very much. I'm satisfied now, Madam Vice President.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you, Trustee Barron. Thank you, Mr. Parker.

Theodore Parker:

Thank you so much. No other questions?

Trustee Zamora:

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan, do you have a question?

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

Not ready.

Trustee Zamora:

Okay. Well, if you're trying to make a motion, I got to go back to Trustee Barron. Sorry. Trustee Barron, I think we're ready.

Trustee Barron:

Yeah, no, at this point, I guess, I would withdraw the idea of amending the motion and just make the motion to accept the contract as proposed.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you, Trustee Barron. Trustee Barron, are you willing to amend your motion to include the amount that we would need to transfer to guide our board counsel to be able to make the negotiation complete?

Trustee Barron:

I would admit my motion to do what you said.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you. Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

Would the maker of the motion amend his motion to include the amount of up to 200,000 for services rendered?

Trustee Barron:

Most certainly. How's that? That's the easiest way to do this. Again, amended as you said.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

May I second the motion?

Trustee Zamora:

We're good. Counsel? He's excited. All right. I think we're ready for a vote.

Jon Okazaki:

It's the most important vote of my life.

Trustee Zamora:

Trustee Biasotti?

Trustee Biasotti:

Aye.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you. And that motion passes 6 to 1 abstention. Thank you, board counsel. Please do not leave us just yet. We have a few more items.

4.06 2025 Legislative Session Overview.

Report and discussion on legislative issues which may affect education, including, but not limited to, legislation passed by the Nevada State Legislature during the 83rd Legislative Session.

[Contact Person: Tod Story] (Ref. 4.06)

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. We're going to go ahead and move to item 4.06. 2025 legislative session overview. We have Dr. Keating and Mr. Tod Story in the house and I believe we have Dr. Nate Waugh on the phone.

Tod Story:

Madam President. Trustees. Superintendent Ebert. Thank you for the opportunity to provide this comprehensive summary of the 2025 legislative session. My name is Tod Story. I'm the Chief Communications Officer. And, I'm joined by Dr. Brad Keating, Assistant Superintendent of Community Partnerships and Government Relations, and Dr. Nathaniel Waugh, Director of Government Relations who joins us from the birthplace of our nation in Philadelphia tonight. We're glad that he made it there safely. Tonight, we will walk through the process, CCSD undertakes, to develop its legislative priorities, prior to the legislative session, the actual 120 days of the session, and what happens post session. The process we undertook as a district to deliver for our students was a team effort that started in early 2024, involving departments, bargaining units, superintendents, the community, and ultimately you, the trustees. With that brief history and overview, Dr. Keating and Dr. Waugh will walk us through the rest of the process.

Nathaniel Waugh:

Thank you, Mr. Story. Madam President, Trustees, Superintendent Ebert, Nathaniel Waugh for the record. CCSD's advocacy, this session centered on four student focused priorities that this board approved. As a reminder, these priorities were centering student achievement, equitable access to high quality educators, meeting students' evolving needs, and modernizing systems for a new generation. These board adopted priorities guided our engagement throughout this session, allowing us to determine which bills to engage on and whether to support. CCSD advanced two primary bills based on the BDR themes that the board approved last year. These were AB47, Assembly Bill 47, which would've directed the Nevada Department of Education to use education stabilization account funds for educator recruitment and development. This bill was heard in assembly ways and means, but did not advance further. Similar language was included in AB584, and we saw a similar more narrow concept in the speaker's AB398.

AB48, Assembly Bill 48, modernizes our bullying statutes to allow for pre-investigation screening and the reassignment of perpetrators, rather than victims. I know this is a bill that had been talked about for a long time with this board, and so we're glad that it was passed and signed into law by Governor Lombardo. Several CCSD-supported bills passed the session. Some highlights, SB45 improved CTE and work-based learning reporting. SB90 allocates funding for teacher supplies. This was a program begun under Superintendent Ebert at the state. SB400 revises IEP rules for transfer students and updates art and music teacher endorsements. SB444 requires policies on

Nathaniel Waugh:

student use of electronic devices. SB161 expedites arbitration and clarifies strike definitions. Sorry, AB398 funds hard-to-fill positions and AB527 permits use of bus stop arm cameras for traffic enforcement.

Some notable education proposals that did not pass include AB24, which was an NDE-sponsored bill around competency-based education. AB292 would've required all schools to have a space for pre-K classes. AB316 would've mandated the appointment of student trustees statewide. AB323 would've placed severe restrictions on when a board of school trustees could opt to close a school. AB426 would've made some SOT governance reforms. SB174 would've required for external behavioral service providers to be allowed on campus to provide services separate from district personnel. SB224 would've allowed for NDE to convert district schools to department-run charter schools with facility use mandates. So with those overviews, I will turn it over to Dr. Keating to go into SB460.

Brad Keating:

Thank you, Dr. Waugh. And it is certainly a pleasure to see you all in person, as opposed to being virtual in Carson City. Because we've been moving so quickly through the agenda this evening, I figured the best way to walk through Senate Bill 460 was to read word-by-word the 204-page bill. So if you'll give... No. I will walk through a few slides about Senate Bill 460. But before I do that, I just wanted to point out for you all and any public that might be watching, there is a backup material that's been provided that goes through and breaks Senate Bill 460 up by themes and provides every single section within Senate Bill 460 and the effective date and passage. This is a good tool that the Department of Education put together near the end of session that will help us ensure accountability across the way.

But Senate Bill 460 was the most significant education bill this session. It combined majority leader Cannizzaro's Bill and Governor Lombardo's education bill together. You'll see on the slides, we've included the earliest implementation dates as we go through them. Additionally, NDE, as I mentioned, created that document that provides additional reference material spelling out in detail the relevant sections. So key provisions include state intervention authority for persistently underperformed schools in July, 2026. Early literacy mandates, which includes four days of professional development for K-3 staff, school level reading plans, and the opportunity to provide flexible assessments through the state. That becomes effective July, 2026. And also, the establishment of reading proficiency targets and expanded early grade interventions. Moving forward in 460, the bill also expands accountability and leadership structures.

So it creates a new accountability system for school districts and charter sponsors. It authorizes the state superintendent to designate focus and priority districts. It modifies provisions related to charter school expansion by municipalities, placing statutory limits on the enrollment growth during a state intervention. These changes won't take effect until 2029 at the earliest, based on the state guidance. It also establishes a public education oversight board to take over persistently underperforming districts. This board, the Public Education Oversight Board, will consist of five members. The governor would serve as the chair of the board, a member appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, a member by the majority leader of the Senate, the superintendent of

Brad Keating:

public instruction for the state of Nevada, and one individual who holds a license to teach at the school district that is being reviewed.

So in this Public Education Oversight Board, which planning begins July, 2026. At the earliest, nothing could happen until 2029, where this board would take action, based on calling out a school district as being low performing. But this board, through the legislation, allows the Public Education Oversight Board to assume all powers of the Board of School Trustees and take action on those schools or districts at that point in time if the state decides to flip the switch on for the Public Education Oversight Board. Additional governance and operational changes, it converts appointed Trustees in the Clark County School districts into full voting members as of July 1, 2027. A superintendent hiring in large districts, Washoe and Clark County, will now be subject to state statutes requirements, such as holding a graduate degree or having so many years of teaching and supervisory experience, that takes effect July, 2026. In essence, the interim state superintendent on the record said that this is not meant in any way to interfere with a board's decision on who to hire as a superintendent of the district. There are just minimum requirements.

So as you choose a superintendent one day, after July, 2026, a document has to be submitted to the state showing that that individual meets certain minimum requirements, and then the state will approve it, and that will be the end of that. Repeals. Let me go back. Sorry. I think I jumped ahead. Yep. It repeals key provisions of the local school precinct model outlined in NRS 388G, while preserving the advisory and support role of the school organizational teams at their schools. And then, an education service center will be created to support struggling schools if and when the state takes over a school to be able to serve as its LEA. And that planning begins July, 2026.

Senate Bill 460 also carries some significant fiscal and HR impacts, requires the negotiation for teachers at Title 1 schools, which has a vacancy rate of at least 7% for at least two consecutive years. It revises pieces of the teacher and administrator evaluation framework, as well as dismissal policies. It mandates professional development in the science of reading for all K-3 educators to begin July, 2026. So all of our K-3 educators currently, after July, 2026, will have to take a course in the science of reading. Effective July 1, 2028, the Department of Education cannot issue a license to an individual who does not have that coursework as part of their course for licensure. So that's effective July 1, 2028. But 2026, we will start having our individuals go through a science of reading.

Provide some administrative relief through waiver options for duplicative reports. We all see a number of reports that look the same all of the time. Hopefully, we can reduce that reporting to save time and burden on staff. And then, it expands early learning grants and eligibility, providing preference for those students who might have IEPs, documented needs for behavioral, social, emotional supports, members of vulnerable populations, families whose household income is less than 250% of the poverty line, and those who speak a language in the home other than English. So as grants come in to create additional opportunities for pre-K opportunities with non-profit organizations, for instance, these are the priority areas for the students who would be admitted to the schools first.

That's the gist of 204 pages of Senate Bill 460, and I'm sure you'll have many questions and we will go through that. As we go through, I want to mention open enrollment, because it ties back. But,

Brad Keating:

we've had a number of discussions over the last 120 days about open enrollment. I certainly want to begin by commending Gia Moore and her team on the amazing job they do every single day and what they've been able to do with the change of school assignment as it was the model that was used for this legislation we're talking about today. Assembly Bill 533, the district had to go up in opposition of at the beginning of session through a number of conversations with stakeholders as they learned about the amazing work being done through our COSA process, the legislation in AB533 largely became what we currently do in Las Vegas or in Clark County already.

So AB533 formalizes open enrollment statewide. As I mentioned, it mirrors what we're doing in most cases. So things like all non-magnet, non-career technical academies, non-dual enrollment schools must accept out-of-zone students if space is available. So there are some exemptions for some of our choice schools. CCSD must provide multilingual application materials in the top five languages spoken in the district. We have to produce quarterly vacancy reports and uniform transfer policies. And then, NDE is responsible for establishing a grant program to help parents with transportation. So that was mentioned in Assembly Bill 533 and it was funded in Senate Bill 460, which we just spoke about. So through Senate Bill 460, the governor appropriated \$7 million to the Department of Education for the 26th, 27 school year only to support transportation of students attending schools outside of their zoned area. So beginning in the second year of this biennium, parents will be able to apply to the State Department of Education for funding to help cover transportation.

The reason that that was put in there is to serve somewhat of a pilot program to see what type of barriers transportation has from students being able to use the open enrollment process. So we will watch that in the 26/27 school year, but that will certainly be a heavy lift on the state to have to provide those dollars to each family. I wanted to mention Nevada Interscholastic Activities Association, because a number of years I've been at the legislature, I've never said NIAA more than I have this session. It was one of the hottest topics of the legislature, two athletics related bills. We just wanted to bring your attention to assembly Bill 184. It bans athletic recruitment. So if a coach or anybody's found to have violated or tried to recruit a student, they immediately are suspended from that current season they're in and the following season.

So it's a heavy ban on them. It improves some of the transfer student eligibility. It requires NIAA to align their regulations with law. It also allows for a one-time transfer of students. So that's something that NIAA has worked on, and they've got a policy already, I believe, on it. But this bill allows for that one-time transfer for students to be able to move. And then, Senate Bill 305. So this was a bill that was vetoed, but it would've required lacrosse as a sanction sport and created legislative oversight, a very hotly debated bill up at the legislature. So despite the veto, NIAA has committed publicly through a press release that they will sanction lacrosse by 26/27 school year. So I just wanted to put that on there for you all to know that there'll be a lift on the school districts across the state in order to sanction lacrosse by the second year of this biennium.

There were 86 bills vetoed by the governor. He broke his last record and has the most vetoes in history here. Some notable education related bills. We wanted to mention. AB 155, it would've expanded collective bargaining topics on us, which would've had a fiscal impact. Senate Bill 205, it seems every session, there's this opt-in, opt-out conversation at the legislature. They moved

Brad Keating:

forward this year with an opt-out provision that was vetoed by the governor. Immigration enforcement limits on our staff on campuses AB217, that was vetoed. And then, AB416 and 445, we've had conversations with you all over the last few months. Those are two bills. One by Brittany Miller, one by Daniele Monroe-Moreno. Library related Civil and Criminal Liability statutes. So those were both vetoed as well. I'll now turn it over to Dr. Waugh to explain some of the statewide budget information and close us out.

Nathaniel Waugh:

Thank you. Dr. Keating. Nathaniel Waugh for the record. So I'll just give this caveat as we talk about the education budget. We're just giving the overview of what was passed and the high in the sky impact. Obviously, as the conversation goes on with the superintendent and the CFO, the actual implementation of this budget will be something that this board addresses then. So just looking at 30,000 foot view, this session really came up in a time of a little economic uncertainty that the governor and the legislature had to attempt to address. The People Center funding plan faced \$162.9 million shortfall approximately. That was partly made up with a \$115.7 million transfer from the education stabilization account to kind blunt that impact. This is also partly why AB47 didn't advance further, because there were a lot of legislation to tap into education stabilization this session. So this resulted in a net \$47.2 million reduction in state K-12 revenue.

However, there were slight increases. The base per pupil increases were \$2 per student for FY26, and \$70 per student in FY27. So most districts, including CCSD, saw funding declines. CCSD's projected reduction is \$38 million, largely due to projected decline in enrollment of approximately 7,600 students. Fiscal year '26 and '27 base per pupil amounts will be \$9,501 and \$9,572 respectively. And for context, as you can see, we included a chart. So you see what the FY25 numbers were for comparison. And we saw obviously weighted in auxiliary funding decrease slightly as well.

So what happens next? So looking ahead, the government relations department will collaborate with CCSD departments to implement newly enacted legislation. We will actively participate in the development of the regulatory framework that will shape implementation for key provisions that were passed. Beginning in 2026, joint interim committees will convene and we will engage in those hearings to inform interim reports and BDR recommendations for the 2027 legislative session. And throughout the interim, we will continue cultivating strong relationships with federal, state, and local elected officials, sharing CCSD story and keeping the education policy going. And, we will certainly invite participation trustees in that work as well at that time. So thank you for the opportunity to share this update. I do want to give on behalf of myself, and Dr. Keating, and Mr. Story, a huge, huge, huge thankful thanks to all CCSC staff who supported this work. The last-minute emails, the phone calls, the texts, sometimes panicked, sometimes not, for us to be able to adequately represent CCSD in Carson City. And so, with that, we welcome your questions.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you, gentlemen. Any questions from the trustees? Trustee Cavazos.

Trustee Cavazos:

No questions. I think they did a more than comprehensive job for us this session. And, I want to thank the entire government affairs team for your work, and especially for your communication with the trustees and the updates, it was extremely helpful in keeping us informed. And yes, there was some panic at numerous times. But you really helped alleviate that. So, thank you all so much.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you, Trustees. Esparza-Stoffregan.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

No, I would just like to echo the same sentiment. It's a stressful experience, but I appreciate the staff because of the ability for you to have, and navigate it all, and all the nuances is really powerful. I guess, my two asks are this, one, not now, but as a follow-up, fiscally, things that are going to impact us, for example, I'm looking at slide nine, the professional development and science of reading. What is that fiscal impact going to be from us and the expectation? Because that's money right there for us to train our individuals, and this is an unfunded mandate, like many are. So I'd like to see fiscal note-wise, what of the things that were passed would impact us so that we can just be informed about that and have oversight. Then, I guess the only other thing, because I'm new to this process, I felt like for those of us that were here having conversations and input about the BDR, I would like us to start that conversation a lot sooner please. We have thoughts already and ideas that we'd love to start talking about now before next session goes into cycle.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you for that. Trustee Zamora.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you, Madam President. Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan, yes, I agree a hundred percent of starting sooner is actually something that we talked about in our bi-weeklies and trainings for the trustees too of how it all works because that is something that I noticed with some of my fellow trustees that just we're also learning as we were on this plane that's on fire to be honest right. But I do appreciate the team. You all did fantastic. Honestly, being in the building, the vibe was completely different. We are moving in a really, really good direction and I know our superintendent started a little bit late towards the session, but I can't wait to see where we go, especially with the implementation phase and the interim committees and how just we continue to grow and rebuild these relationships with our legislators because there's a lot of work to do.

But thank you all because I know Brad, seeing you. I tell you, I felt like you were a jock in high school just saying hello to everyone. The energy is really different and I can't emphasize that enough to the public. We are really moving in a whole different direction. I do have two questions. So there is AB217, which is about law enforcement in the schools. I just want to, I guess give kudos to the team because that was kind of very much following of what we already have in place here at CCSD. So we were kind of leading the charge in that and we were the sample because it was kind of what policies can be in place for school districts across Nevada to protect our students.

Trustee Zamora:

The other question, well, I guess it's the real question. AB420. I know it is a bill. I didn't see it on your presentation. I believe that it is about reporting back about use of force. I am not sure if that applies to Clark. Is it one of those Clark and Washoe things? Is that statewide? What is that going to look like for us?

Brad Keating:

Thank you, A, for the kind words. B, for calling me a jock in high school. The AB420 is a use of force reporting bill by assembly member Cecilia Gonzalez. So that bill was signed. What that bill requires is what Metro and some of the other agencies do and our police department supported it. Was at the end of every school year we then have to post our use of force reporting data on our website publicly for people to see broken out by demographics, a number of different pieces. So at the end of every single school year, we will then be required to post that data so people can see what the issues were and what types of use of force were needed.

Trustee Zamora:

Would that be something that can also be presented to this board of trustees? Yes.

Unknown Speaker:

Yes.

Trustee Zamora:

Thank you. That's all my questions.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Trustee Dominguez.

Trustee Dominguez:

Oh, there we go. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Brad Keating, Dr. Keating for being our jock out there in Carson City. I was hoping you could elaborate. You had mentioned, man, I forgot what slide that was for the SOTs. Was this... Oh, I'm sorry. That's okay. Same train of thought. So you mentioned that it was, you said something about if it was related to if the district was assumed control, was there any other changes to the SOT besides if obviously if the district remained in our control?

Brad Keating:

Yes, Brad Keating for the record. So as it relates to the SOTs specifically, they will still advise the principal at the school level. They will still work with them. They will provide their recommendations. So there's no changes to that. As it relates to the public oversight board, that could be created. At that point if our school district was considered low-performing and the oversight board decided to take us over in some capacity, then they would have the authority of the exact same authority that

Brad Keating:

you would have. So they wouldn't be able to change laws or change the way the SOT process is outlined in law. They would only have the same authority as you all do every single day.

Trustee Dominguez:

Perfect. Thank you.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Perfect. Thank you. Trustee Barron.

Trustee Barron:

Thank you, Madam President. Dr. Keating, Dr. Waugh, I said that I would do it for the record. I think I underestimated your abilities. I said that, and I will admit it here in public, you guys did a fantastic job. And of course, I will also say Dr. Nate, if you're listening again, congratulations on your PHD during the session. That's quite the accomplishment. I do have one quick question here and I was a little bit unclear regarding the policies for student possession of electronic devices at school. Does that mean the district will be now mandated to come up with more restrictions? What does it actually mean?

Brad Keating:

Thanks for the question, Brad Keating for the record. So that simply means that the board of school trustees has to create a policy around electronic devices in schools and how they will be stored. So we have that guidance, we've put that out to schools, we've put that out parents. There are other districts that have not done that yet. This was a requirement for every school district in the state to do that. As research shows, it's better to have the students focused on the teacher as opposed to their cell phone.

Trustee Barron:

So we're ahead of the wave anyhow then right?

Brad Keating:

Brad Keating for the record, yes, we're ahead of the game.

Trustee Barron:

I'm sorry. I thought I was going to have another chance at payback here, but maybe not. Thank you.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Trustee Stevens.

Trustee Stevens:

Hi Brad. So you mentioned just a second ago that there's an opportunity now for this oversight, this education committee, whatever, that they have a lot more power once they deem a school or a district as low performing. In the bill, do they give the qualifiers for what they deem low performing?

Brad Keating:

Brad Keating for the record. There are mentions within the bill of what low performing means not specifically defined. The Department of Education now has to take action over the next two years to make those decisions, to codify those decisions and then provide them. We'll have an opportunity through regulatory process to provide feedback to the state Board of Education on where we think it should be. So there's a bunch of work to be done. I will say this, before a school district can ever be deemed low performing and action can be taken on our school district or any district in the state. We will be back at the legislature in 2027. So I assume that there will be changes prior to anything being enacted and as we go through this regulatory process, we will be able to make changes at the legislative session.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Trustee Biassotti, are you still on the line?

Trustee Biassotti:

Yes, I am. Thank you Madam President. I'd like to share first of all how pleased I am with the outcome of the 83rd legislative session. Our governor really demonstrated strong leadership by listening to the concerns of parents and really stood for the rule of law. So I'm also grateful for the legislative updates that have come out of this session. So thank you for being here today and for addressing all our at times tedious questions. That said, I do have one last question. What is the most impactful change we can expect to see in our schools as a result of the rollbacks on SOT operations?

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Can you repeat it one more time Trustee Biassotti? I couldn't hear it.

Trustee Biassotti:

Yes. I wanted to know as a last question, what is the most impactful change we can expect to see in our schools as a result of the rollbacks on SOT operations?

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

So the SOT part, Dr. Keating.

Brad Keating:

Brad Keating for the record. Thank you for the question and certainly thank you for the kind words trustee. I think it was mentioned during the hearings of Senate Bill 460 that NRS388G did not work

Brad Keating:

the way that it was intended to when it was created and codified into law. I think with the changes, one change that I think is incredibly important and the legislature believed was important was as we hold our superintendent accountable for a number of student achievement decisions moving forward and making sure that we're moving the needle, it provides the superintendent with the full authority to make a decision on a principal hire.

So the SOT still will have the opportunity to provide nominations to the superintendent on who she would select, who they would like to see selected. But if we are holding the school accountable for moving the needle and we are holding the principal accountable for moving the needle on student achievement, the superintendent and the academic team should have the ability to put the person in place that needs to be put there to move the needle. So that is one change of the SOT that I think is incredibly important as they will advise us in what they believe is the best decision. But the district will have the ultimate say by looking at all of the data, the human resources information, they'll have a complete picture to make the decision to ensure student achievements is the focus at all times.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you.

Trustee Biassotti:

Thank you so much for that thorough explanation and I have no more questions for now until the next couple of years. Thank you.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you so much. And gentlemen, like I said, I did owe the compliments that were given, especially from outside of our arena, those that you worked with, all made phone calls on behalf of this team for you to compliment the work. So outstanding. And so this is not an action item and so it's not required, but I do want to close. I know that it is Mr. Story's last board meeting with us, he's going to take on a new chapter in his journey. Just want to express our gratitude on behalf of the team of your investment that you've made over the years, especially with leading the campaigns, We are CCSD and also Everyday Matters. So just thank you Mr. Story for your contributions. Let's give him a round of applause.

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

With that, we're going to go ahead and move on to 5.01 public comment on items not listed as action items on the agenda. I have one person that signed up. Ms. Green? Yes, please come forward. Oh, and we have someone. Ms. Green, and then we have Tanya Attebery. There's two mics so you could come to the second one Ms. Attebery. And Ms. Green, if you can please proceed.

Public Hearing

Lynn Green:

Okay, I was here last board meeting. I'm Lynn Green for Green Valley Bands. They hired a new band director; however, they went from someone with 20 years of experience, 12 years at the school to a person who has one year of teaching experience, has not even had any jazz experience and can never replace all the programs that our children were looking forward to. We want our band director back; she could teach the new band teacher how to run a band program. He does not know what a drill chip is, which is what you use in marching band. He does not know about marching band. And he has been told by our principal that there will be no travel when Ms. Froelich had planned many trips and had the money for it so the children did not have to pay for it. In addition to that, our principal needs to be investigated. The whole school needs to be audited because Ms. Froelich filed a hostile work environment claim on May 11th. May 21st, her band line, her percussion line was taken away from her. And on May 26th, after graduation when she performed the music, she was the last day that the teachers were allowed to be on school grounds. She was told she's being transferred to in-house suspension to supervise that. She's got a disability where perfumes and stuff, it doesn't do her well. She's got an actual disability with that and in that sense, while they were doing the construction, they tore all the sound proofing off the rooms and so there was a mess and the principal has said there's no plan to replace those. They missed the lockdown because they could not hear anything because the sound panels were gone. And she got wrote up for that and she has asked for that stuff to be replaced. She needs to have the band room, it needs to be fixed regardless of who comes or goes.

But Mr. Roberts needs to be investigated and looked at because he's done major retaliatory actions as well as included children in these actions and other teachers. In my 58 years of life, I've never known. I've always said not everybody is lying. I'm going to tell you, everybody in this school is lying about her and that's all I... But it's retaliatory and we're missing out on so much.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Ms. Green. Ms. Attebery And then after her Ms. Maria.

Tanya Attebery:

My name is Tanya Attebery for the record, I'm a CCSD high school counselor. This is my 28th year. I will be probably retiring after next school year. Just an FYI, Nevada Learning Academy also has an academic center, but we're never mentioned when it comes to presentations and things. Our staff is pretty small and we have a really large ratio of students in our academic center, so it'd be nice if we were included in the presentations and with the data that goes along with it. I also want to tell you that as our school, we do support the behavior schools because we take all their kids for ESY summer school and summer school. We have over 500 kids in ESY summer school, so I just want us to be acknowledged as well. On another note, I have come before you already to talk about Regulation 6150, so I can stand here and explicitly describe how my stepfather had me sit on his hand with no underwear on.

Tanya Attebery:

I can explicitly describe to you how my virginity was taken at the age of eight, or I can write these explicit sexual experiences in a book then it can be found on the shelves of our public-school libraries. I could not, because I do not see the value or the educational value of these books being on the shelves. I know that they're promoted as healthy and therapeutic and necessary for the benefit of diversity, but librarians and teachers and counselors are not qualified mental health professionals. But we are deciding through the lens of adults that a young mind needs to read through the sexual experiences of rape, incest, abuse, experimentation, and how to books to promote a sense of healing and understanding of oneself. These books are never looked at as how negatively they could trigger a young mind. I know for me as an adult that they do trigger me.

We must look at the other side of the coin and consider that these sexually explicit books must be harmful to the mental health of our students. CCSO has no data to prove sexually explicit books improve the lives of our students on an academic environment. I just don't understand why we would allow groups like librarians who are actually holding you all accountable and saying that the superintendent is not doing their job and holding the principals accountable and that they have the power over all of you to decide what is in or inside the libraries. So I just want this broken system to be fixed. I want an open-source county library system so everybody can stop fighting. The infighting can stop, the accusations can stop all the different things that are happening as we are trying to figure out who is right and who is wrong and what is good and what is right. Open it up, let the people see what is on those shelves. You could see what's on the shelves, everybody can see, then we can all have that discussion on who is right, who's wrong, and what is indifferent. Thank you.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you so much. Ms. Maria. And then our last person would be Ms. Trussell.

Maria Mantanona:

Hello again everyone. I too was here with Ms. Green at the last board meeting. I am here to call your attention to the administrative problem at Green Valley as well. I would've brought these issues up with our SOT, but they do not announce their public meetings and they do not hold them with any sort of regularity. Why is that by the way? Is the board aware of this? And if so, are you guys doing anything to remedy that? What we have going on seems to be a principal and administration that does not support its teachers. We have an administrator who seems to have a personal problem with the teacher and now the students must suffer the consequences. We have a principal that is not required to answer to anyone regarding a decision to demote a teacher that is excelling at their job. We have a principal that is retaliating against that teacher.

For example, Ms. Froelich has been trying to get the two-band trailers re-wrapped because they are chipping and peeling. After getting appraisals and fundraising the money, it was settled that Finley Auto Company was willing to give the best price. Ms. Froelich was then pressured by multiple admin to decline their offer and to give the job to someone that they knew personally but who was not a CCSO-approved vendor. This was in December. This person then proceeded to take one trailer, not do the work and refused to return the trailer. Ms. Froelich communicated with

Maria Mantanona:

Principal Roberts trying to get his assistance in retrieving the CCSD property but to no avail. It wasn't until March when the parents became involved that anything happened. Why was it that nothing happened until the parents went over Roberts' head and brought the issue to his superiors? Why did he feel it was perfectly acceptable to do nothing until his hand was forced?

Another example of his egregious behavior, Green Valley is currently undergoing a refresh and in March, as part of this effort, all of the soundboards in the band room were taken down.

Unfortunately, there were also thrown away. These soundboards cost around \$42,000 and are pivotal in balancing the sound space and allowing the musicians to hear themselves and each other more clearly. In our cement buildings these soundboards compensate for the problematic acoustics. When Ms. Froelich brought this issue up to Roberts, he told her he knew they had been thrown away. There was no plan to replace them, but to get a quote, which she promptly did. She then heard nothing back. How is this principal looking out for the best interests of the students when he knowingly allowed necessary and expensive equipment to be thrown away? The lack of these soundboards means that the sound space is so chaotic that the students didn't hear a lockdown drill.

Our students are literally being endangered by this and the only thing that the admin did was to write her up for not hearing the drill. There's still zero plan to replace those soundboards. The impression this gives parents is that Roberts has zero care or consideration for the safety of the band students. And as a band parent, I find this very disturbing. I'm here today asking you to please do your due diligence and find out what's going on with the admin at Green Valley. Help keep our students safe and successful. Thank you very much.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Ms. Trussell, please proceed.

Ama Trussell:

I'm here before you again to discuss the incredibly troubling situation at Green Valley High. At your last meeting, our band family came before you to plead for your help in saving one of the best band teachers CCSD was lucky enough to have. While you opted not to intercede in that moment, I remain hopeful that you will rise to your duties and help us now. Our band family had assumed that because we'd had to repeatedly engage Principal Roberts' superiors over the last year and a half that the board had some sort of understanding of the situation, we were wrong. This was punctuated when one of our band parents received an email reply from Trustee Esparza. I always screw up your last name, I'm so sorry. In which you stated that it was your understanding that Roberts had been communicating with the community. That is not happening.

For example, on May 11th, my student informed me that Roberts had canceled the percussion program. I immediately began calling and emailing. On June 2nd, I received a reply from Roberts stating, per your request, doctor, he was reaching out. Why did it take a parent going to his superior for him to respond? By the way, he answered none of my questions in his response. You stated, Dr. Jaskolski, that your priority remains to provide a high-quality educational experience for every learner. How was that priority carried out by allowing a principal to remove a teacher with

Ama Trussell:

an outstanding record and replacing her with a teacher who's never led a band this size, never taken a band to a competition. And based on his resume, I doubt he has the ability to continue the band at its current level of achievement, much less be able to continue the jazz and other ensembles, which have been a core of the award-winning band program under Ms. Froelich's leadership for 12 years.

The decision to remove Ms. Froelich is simply baffling. But what is more baffling and frightening is this board is sitting quietly while there is blatant administrative retaliation happening in one of our schools. Our band family, both parents and students, could give you a timeline from the last year and a half full of examples of how Roberts' seemingly personal problem with one of his teachers has got absolutely out of control. But let's just look at the last month. After the debacle with our trailer, which has not been resolved, in early May, Ms. Froelich filed a hostile work environment complaint. A week later, Roberts canceled her entire percussion program giving no cause. A week and a half after that, he reassigned her to in-school detention.

I understand there was an issue of students claiming inappropriate behavior, but there's also video evidence proving that the students were lying. So this should be a non-issue. Bearing that in mind, does this not seem retaliatory to you? Because I don't know how else to construe the chain of events, and that's just from one month. I'm asking the board to please listen to the community, do your due diligence and investigate this incredibly troubling situation.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you, Ms. Trussell. That actually concludes our public comment.

Upcoming Meeting of the Board of Trustees

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Our next item is 6.01, upcoming meetings of the Board of Trustees. The next one will be Tuesday, July 1st, 2025 at 8:00 a.m. It will be at the Southwest Career and Technical Academy.

Adjourn: 8:37 p.m.

Motion to adjourn.

Motion: Dominguez Second: Esparza-Stoffregan Vote: Unanimous
Motion passed.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

We are now moving to item number seven. I will entertain a motion for adjournment. Trustee Dominguez.

Trustee Dominguez:

Madam President, I'd like to move to motion to adjourn the meeting.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan.

Trustee Esparza-Stoffregan:

I will second the motion.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

I have a first and a second. Will you please cast your vote? Trustee Biassotti?

Trustee Biassotti:

Aye.

Trustee Bustamante Adams:

That motion passes seven to zero and the time is 8:37. Thank you. Have a good evening.