

Minutes  
Clark County School District  
Special Meeting of the Board of School Trustees

TELECONFERENCE ONLY

Wednesday, July 29, 2020

1:06 p.m.

---

Roll Call: Members Present  
Lola Brooks, President  
Linda P. Cavazos, Vice President  
Danielle Ford, Clerk  
Irene Cepeda, Member  
Chris Garvey, Member  
Deanna L. Wright, Member  
Linda E. Young, Member

Jesus F. Jara, Ed.D., Superintendent of Schools

Also present were: Mary-Anne Miller, Board Counsel, District Attorney's Office; Eleissa Lavelle, General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel; and Cindy Krohn, Director, Board Office.

**Adoption of the Agenda**

*Adopt agenda, except note additional reference material provided for Items 3.01 and 3.02.*

*Motion: Cavazos Second: Ford Vote: Unanimous*

**Public Comment on Agenda and Non-Agenda Items**

Mrs. Krohn provided a summary of the written comments submitted as follows:

Item 3.01

Some writers do not support the removal of the superintendent while others would like to see Dr. Jara removed from being the superintendent. Some expressed that Dr. Jara has lost the trust of the governor, the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) superintendent and the Legislature, and that CCSD needs an effective leader for equity whose integrity will not be questioned.

Points were made that taking carryover funds was not a good idea; that if the superintendent is removed, the person who takes over as interim superintendent should not be the permanent superintendent; that Dr. Jara's submission of Assembly Bill (AB) 2 was appropriate and well-intentioned in order to help CCSD balance the budget; and that Dr. Jara was targeted as political payback to help further the political agendas of others.

**Public Comment on Agenda and Non-Agenda Items** (continued)

A writer commented that they do not support firing Dr. Jara, that staff needs leadership during this challenging school year. Concerns were expressed that there has not be enough African Americans hired as building principals or as school employees; that with the AB 2 crisis with legislators, the state superintendent, the governor and some of the Trustees, there is no credibility, honesty, integrity, or Trustee as an effective leader; and that making changes to the superintendent would cause higher stress levels.

It was suggested that Dr. Jara has been dishonest and that it is in the best interest to remove him due to his ineffective leadership and dishonest and inadequate work performance.

It was also suggested that if Dr. Jara is removed there are retired cabinet members who could serve as interim superintendent until a new superintendent is hired.

Item 3.02

A writer expressed that detailed information was presented at multiple Board meetings and questions were answered by CCSD staff, which makes her believe the intentions and motivations for this item and meeting are not honorable.

Item 3.03

A writer believes that several Trustees have personal, negative biases against Superintendent Jara and are taking this action to further their own personal and political agendas.

A writer is asking for stability in the District.

Some expressed that now is not the time to let the Superintendent go but to focus on students.

One writer does not agree with Superintendent Jara's action and lack of transparency but states now is not the time to let him go.

A writer states that he has the utmost respect for Dr. Jara and knows his priority is students.

Nevada Superintendents sent a letter expressing their support for Dr. Jara.

A writer feels that this is a rush to judgment.

A writer stated that Dr. Jara inherited a school system that is ranked very low and that Dr. Jara leads from strategic planning through operational execution with superior skills.

A writer said that most parents and staff have lost confidence in CCSD's reopening plan.

Someone expressed that removing Dr. Jara would bring instability to the school district.

## **Public Comment on Agenda and Non-Agenda Items (continued)**

Non-agenda items

A writer asked to focus energy on providing Chromebooks and internet access to students.

One writer suggested using some of the facilities money to install upgraded air purification systems.

A writer asked that schools be open to those who want to attend in person and said those who want to go online could do so.

A writer expressed concern with the four-by-four schedule.

Someone asked if education support professionals (ESPs) and teachers received training to ensure safety of employees or if only some employees were able to receive the training.

A writer would like to bring awareness of meditation, breathing techniques, and Brain Gym exercises for all students.

### **Conduct of Dr. Jesus F. Jara**

Discussion and possible action regarding the conduct of Dr. Jesus F. Jara concerning Assembly Bill 2 of the 2020 Special Session of the Nevada State Legislature and the resulting relationship between the School District, the Nevada Department of Education, the Office of the Governor, and the Nevada Legislature, and its effect on the community including whether, in the future, Dr. Jara could function as an effective representative for the Clark County School District.

Trustee Brooks stated this is not meant to be a disciplinary hearing for Superintendent Jara.

Superintendent Jara said he was hopeful that the Board's decision at the conclusion of this meeting will allow him to continue to focus on students and the critical work that is needed, and he is confident they can move past today and work together toward student success. He said he is saddened that the focus on their core business, which is taking care of the children, has been lost.

Trustee Ford said this item relates directly to Superintendent Jara's conduct concerning Assembly Bill (AB) 2 and the resulting relationship between the District, the Nevada Department of Education (NDE), the office of the Governor, and the Nevada Legislature and its effect on the community and Superintendent Jara's ability to effectively represent the District in the future.

Trustee Ford spoke about why she brought this discussion forward and reviewed documentation to support her reasoning as shown in Reference 3.01, which she said shows some misrepresentations that Superintendent Jara and the District made regarding AB 2.

Trustee Wright questioned why two Trustees were directing the Superintendent to take action as opposed to the Superintendent taking direction from the full Board. She asked if individual Trustees have the authority to do that.

**Conduct of Dr. Jesus F. Jara (continued)**

Trustee Ford said she did not believe that is relevant at this time, as they are discussing the Superintendent's relationship with the state with relation to AB 2.

Trustee Wright stated there was an announcement that the District and the NDE agreed to a new collaboration regarding distance education. She said the District and the state are moving forward and working together for students. She asked if they could discuss that.

Trustee Ford said she was not sure what Trustee Wright was asking and how this relates to AB 2 and the misrepresentation of the District.

Trustee Wright pointed to how this new agreement between the District and the NDE shows that they are moving forward. She said perhaps there were missteps but stated the Superintendent is an educator, not a politician.

Trustee Ford asked Trustee Wright to summarize her statements into one question.

Trustee Wright asked if Trustee Ford thinks any of the Trustees contacted principals and asked them to take a vote of no confidence against the Superintendent.

Trustee Ford said she did not see why that question is relevant to the item at hand. She said this is about Superintendent Jara's conduct.

Trustee Wright said the Superintendent's conduct would be part of the Superintendent's evaluation.

Trustee Ford asked Ms. Miller to advise.

Ms. Miller stated Trustee Wright's initial question was relevant as it pertained to an email highlighted by Trustee Ford for the Board. She said as the agenda item is written, all the questions are on the right track at this point.

Trustee Ford said that as late as Sunday, according to the newspaper, the NDE Superintendent of Public Instruction Jhone Ebert expressed concerns about Superintendent Jara. She referred to the letter from Governor Steve Sisolak and Superintendent Ebert from several weeks ago and said she has since seen things that show they have not changed their stance on the issue.

Trustee Wright asked if the new partnership with the NDE is relevant to this.

Trustee Ford said she believes the District would continue to work with the NDE no matter what, but she believes the impact will be seen in the future as it relates to federal funding, especially related to the next legislative session.

**Conduct of Dr. Jesus F. Jara (continued)**

Trustee Wright asked Trustee Ford if she was aware of any direct contact with principals in an effort to undermine the Superintendent's operational decisions.

Trustee Ford asked Ms. Miller to weigh in as she did not believe this question relates to AB 2.

Ms. Miller answered no, it does not seem to.

Trustee Wright referred to an informational document prepared by the Clark County Education Association (CCEA), stating their representatives were present when the discussion took place regarding AB 2. She asked if that would be discussed.

Trustee Ford asked Ms. Miller if they should be discussing that.

Ms. Miller said if they were going to discuss what is in the newspaper, what other interested stakeholders said is also important, but it is up to the Board.

Trustee Ford asked for clarification of the question.

Trustee Wright said since CCEA was part of the discussion and are giving information related to the negotiations for AB 2, it is relevant to the AB 2 discussion.

Ms. Miller stated if the concern is about what happened around AB 2 and someone who was in the room during the discussion has relevant information, the Board can consider that. She said specifically on the document in Reference 3.01 (Q), it does not appear the reference to Trustee Ford is appropriate, only the references to AB 2.

Trustee Garvey referred to the emails that show two Trustees giving direction to the Superintendent regarding testifying about AB 2, and she expressed concern, stating it is not within the purview of individual Trustees to direct the Superintendent. She said with reference to the letter from CCEA, communication from the Superintendent aligns with what is stated in that letter regarding individuals contacting the District and trying find money to solve the problem, which is what happens every time there is a budget crisis in this state.

Trustee Garvey asked Trustee Ford why she does not believe that is a possibility. She said she was told legislators were asking about carryover funds, and she said she has concerns about carryover herself. She asked Trustee Ford why such credence is given to all the documents except the one that says it originated from the state asking for suggestions to resolve the budget crisis.

Trustee Ford said her reason for bringing this forward is the misrepresentation of who came up with the bill. She said if the state had come up with the bill, that would be one thing, but they did not.

**Conduct of Dr. Jesus F. Jara (continued)**

Trustee Garvey said she was not sure that is correct because as stated previously they were not in the room during the discussion, but there are individuals saying there were certain things proposed by the state. She added this would not be first time the Governor has infused himself in collective bargaining between the District and an employee group. She said she believes what the Superintendent says.

Trustee Ford referred to the timeline and said while she understands those discussions had been taking place, the issue at hand is that a legislator stated they have lost trust in the Superintendent. She said based on this and based on the fact that the District did request the bill and then keep it from the Trustees by erasing that information from emails, she questioned whether they would have the confidence and trust in the Superintendent to lead and represent the District.

Trustee Garvey said the discussion was about limiting how much carryover can happen, and she has concerns about the increase in carryover money that is not reaching the children. She said she has a problem in trusting that her fellow Board members are going to honor this. She said it was brought to her attending that Trustee Ford had a man enter the Administrative Center executive garage to deliver the letter of this noticed meeting to the Superintendent, and she asked if that was true.

Ms. Miller advised the Board to remain on the topic of the meeting and keep the discussion on the District's relationship with the state and the legislature and the NDE.

Trustee Cavazos stated she was at no time directing Superintendent Jara but was simply responding to his phone calls. She reminded the Board this is not a disciplinary hearing for Trustee Ford nor for Superintendent Jara and said they need to stay on topic.

Trustee Cavazos said on July 10, 2020, the Trustees received a proposed draft regarding AB 2 that was in support of taking carryover funds. She shared some of the questions she submitted to the Superintendent in response to that proposed draft and the answers she received. She said she had concerns with the bill, and she was concerned that all the principals had not been notified. She said she was also concerned that CCEA was presenting instead of the Superintendent or a CCSD representative.

Trustee Brooks asked Trustee Cavazos if principals are normally polled about proposed legislation or if she asked to have this done just this time.

Trustee Cavazos said she only asked if principals had been notified. She said as part of the Superintendent's testimony, he stated he would be working with all the principals to find a solution that works for all students, but as of the date of the testimony, the principals had not been notified.

**Conduct of Dr. Jesus F. Jara (continued)**

Trustee Brooks asked was it not part of the Superintendent's testimony that he would be allowing the schools to keep their carryover funds, and he would be working with principals to address budget cuts.

Trustee Cavazos said she believed that was correct but said she was looking at the proposed testimony in favor of.

Trustee Young said the problem is that Trustees do not receive proper communication, and the point here is that Trustees were not properly notified of AB 2. She asked that the Trustees remain on topic.

Trustee Ford said she had some questions for Superintendent Jara.

Trustee Brooks stated this is not a disciplinary hearing and asked Ms. Miller if Superintendent Jara was required to answer questions.

Ms. Miller said Superintendent Jara was not required to ask questions. She said Trustee Ford can state her questions and if other Trustees have questions, Superintendent Jara can make a responding statement after all questions have been heard.

Trustee Ford asked Superintendent Jara whether it is his statement that Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Speaker Jason Frierson, and Superintendent Ebert originally proposed the idea for AB 2.

Superintendent Jara referred to a timeline discussing carryforward that was sent to the Trustees from Brad Keating, Director, Government Relations Department, Office of the Superintendent, dating from May 21, 2019, to July 9, 2020, and said that outlines the entire process and could be added to the record.

Trustee Ford asked again if Assemblywoman Carlton, Speaker Jason Frierson, and Superintendent Ebert originally proposed the idea for AB 2.

Superintendent Jara again referred to the timeline outlining the entire process.

Trustee Ford said if that timeline answers the question of specifically who was responsible for coming up with AB 2, perhaps it could be displayed on the screen and Superintending Jara could point out where it states that.

Trustee Brooks said Superintendent has given his answer at this time.

Trustee Ford asked Superintendent Jara when Superintendent Ebert contacted him to discuss AB 469, as was stated in a communication to employees on July 13, 2020.

**Conduct of Dr. Jesus F. Jara (continued)**

Superintendent Jara said that information is in the timeline that was sent to Trustees.

Trustee Ford asked that the timeline Superintendent Jara is referring to be displayed on the screen.

(Trustee Ford was experiencing technology issues.)

Trustee Cavazos stated the timeline the Trustees received was sent per her request which she made after she could not find in any previous emails the timeline that Trustee Wright was referencing on Twitter.

Trustee Ford said she is trying to get the answer of who originally proposed AB 2. She said she would still like to see the timeline that Superintendent Jara referred to but that she added a timeline to the reference material that was clear. She said it seems that Superintendent Jara either waffled or misrepresented himself regarding AB 2 at a time when educators were fighting for \$160 million in cuts to education. She said the focus was instead on whether or not Superintendent Jara misrepresented the District's involvement in AB 2, which now has led to concerns about the District's relationship with the Governor's office, legislative leaders, and the NDE.

Trustee Ford said with the evidence presented here, she does not anticipate legislators trusting Superintendent Jara to submit proposed bills and testimony on behalf of the District in the upcoming legislative session. She acknowledged that there are local government leaders who support Superintendent Jara but said she has not seen any statements by legislators on behalf of Superintendent Jara, and in fact several have contacted her to express concern regarding his poor relationships in Carson City.

Trustee Wright said typically there are groups that have proposed bills that they ask to be put through for them by entities such as legislators or the NDE. She said that is not unusual. She said she does not believe two Trustees should have asked Superintendent Jara to testify. She said she believes that Trustees making their preference known to the Superintendent put pressure on him, and that is not something the Board or individual Trustees should be doing.

Trustee Wright said it was mentioned that this is a communication issue, and communication has to do with performance and should be addressed in the Superintendent's evaluation. She said further that Trustee Young specifically said the Superintendent did not do his job, and that again is a performance issue. She said if that is why they are here, they should motion to adjourn this meeting because she believes this, in a roundabout way, is in violation of his contract by having discussions about his performance.



**Conduct of Dr. Jesus F. Jara (continued)**

Trustee Young said this discussion would not have been necessary if there had been proper communication. She said she was told by Superintendent Jara that Superintendent Ebert was responsible for this bill, and she was in support of the Superintendent from the beginning. She said the issue is that they are not getting a straight answer from the Superintendent of how this bill came forward, and she is still unsure. She said they need to get a straight answer as to what happened and see if they can correct the issues.

Trustee Brooks reminded everyone that this is not a disciplinary proceeding.

Trustee Cavazos shared information from CCEA that Superintendent Jara included in the timeline under July 9, 2020, sent to Trustees, and she asked Superintendent Jara to expand on the conversations around unemployment for support staff and AB 2 and what took place.

Superintendent Jara said on July 9, 2020, he received notice that Dr. Keating received a call from the Governor's office about paying for unemployment using AB 2 dollars. He said his answer was absolutely not, they would not be paying for unemployment because the District is self-insured.

Trustee Cavazos asked if there was any follow-up and if it had been confirmed through the Nevada State Education Association (NSEA) that this actually happened.

Superintendent Jara said he was asked if he would be willing, and he said no; he was asked if he would be willing to do it for one year, and he said absolutely not. He said he cannot speak to conversations between other parties.

Trustee Cavazos said this is of grave concern to her and suggested this is something they may need to follow up on.

Trustee Garvey said the outreach and communication she is receiving from constituents and people in the legislature says they should be focusing on getting through this time and supporting the students through this pandemic. She said she does not believe the relationship is so damaged they cannot function. She said everyone needs to focus on moving forward. She stated a conversation regarding carryover does need to happen.

Trustee Cepeda said in regards to AB 2, it is clear that the Superintendent needs additional support in navigating the political structures. She said having a solution-based mentality, she is thinking how they can best support the Superintendent. She acknowledged that all this is taking place during a time when they are planning to reopen schools. She said communication is something that needs to continue to be improved upon. She said it is difficult for her to think about termination over this one issue.

**Conduct of Dr. Jesus F. Jara (continued)**

Trustee Ford asked that the timeline sent to Trustees that Superintendent Jara referred to be displayed on the screen. She asked Superintendent Jara to explain where the timeline states who the originator of the bill was.

Superintendent Jara said he does not have authorization as CCSD Superintendent to add proclamations to special sessions, and he said he never saw the bill AB 2 written so he cannot answer who authored the bill.

Trustee Ford said the original question was who came up with the idea to add AB 2 onto the special session.

Superintendent Jara said he thinks that is highlighted in the timeline.

Trustee Ford asked if Superintendent Jara could point out where in the timeline.

Trustee Brooks said Superintendent Jara has answered the question in the manner that he wanted to answer. She asked Trustee Ford if she had another question.

Trustee Ford said the language in AB 2 seems to mirror proposed language in emails from Jason Goudie, Chief Financial Officer, Business and Finance Unit, and Dr. Keating. She asked why Superintendent Jara was trying to declare that CCSD was not an author of the bill when it included language aligned with a request made from Dr. Keating to Superintendent Ebert and Speaker Frierson and copied to the Superintendent and Chief of Staff in emails sent on June 16, 2020, and June 23, 2020.

Trustee Brooks said it was her understanding that multiple sources stated that CCSD asked for this bill to be pulled.

Trustee Ford said yes, after asking for it.

Superintendent Jara said he cannot speak to authoring of the bill.

(There was a brief recess to address some streaming issues.)

Trustee Ford read an email from Mr. Goudie to Dr. Keating shown on page 2 of 4, Reference 3.01 (F). She stated when this email was forwarded to Trustees, it ended after the first paragraph, and the remaining paragraphs were excluded. She referred to the email sent to Trustees from Superintendent Jara shown on page 4 of 4, Reference 3.01 (F). She said when she read this email she thought the state was interested in the amount of carryover funds but said this was misrepresented to the Trustees and what was actually being sent was a request for a bill because that information was excluded from the email Trustees received. She said she believed that information was critical for the Board to have.

**Conduct of Dr. Jesus F. Jara (continued)**

Trustee Ford asked Superintendent Jara if he thinks it is okay to modify an email that was sent to the state before forwarding to Trustees with the assumption that the email was what was sent to the state in its entirety.

Trustee Brooks asked if it is typical for Trustees to receive an email with every chain response in it from every employee.

Trustee Ford asked if Superintendent Jara sees any problem with this having been done.

Superintendent Jara stated there is no doctoring of emails, that staff forwarded the information that was necessary for the Board.

Trustee Ford asked if it is common practice that the Board does not receive information and it is not noted anywhere that this is the only portion deemed important for the Board to receive.

Trustee Brooks said it is her assumption that Trustees would not receive the entire thread of email responses between staff but would receive only what is pertinent.

Trustee Ford said she feels there was pertinent information that was removed before being forward to Trustees. She said she does not feel comfortable knowing important information regarding legislative bills and the District's handling of carryover funds would be removed from an email forwarded to Trustees. She said this was the basis for all the problems that occurred, so she said in an effort to make sure the Superintendent is trustworthy, she wants to know how often this occurs. She said if the Superintendent feels this is an acceptable practice, she has a problem with that.

Trustee Brooks said Ms. Miller would like the Board to note this discussion should be about AB 2 not about communication or miscommunication in general.

Trustee Young said she did not understand what Ms. Miller meant.

Ms. Miller clarified that this discussion should not be about communication in general, that would be part of the Superintendent's performance evaluation. She said the Board is here about a specific allegation of miscommunication regarding AB 2 on this item.

Trustee Young said her concern is they would not be here if everyone just followed the proper communications protocol. She cited Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 386.350 and said it is their job as Trustees to know what is happening regarding AB 2. She said she is not comfortable moving forward because she does not feel they have gotten a straight answer.

There was no action taken on this item.

## **Representations Regarding State Directives for Opening Schools**

Discussion and possible action regarding representations made by Dr. Jesus F. Jara to the Board of School Trustees regarding the state directives for reopening schools, and its effect on all aspects of our community.

Trustee Cavazos discussed specific communications regarding the state directives for the District's reopening plan. She said she does not feel the Board was given correct, truthful information, and she believes the requirements from the NDE were misrepresented. She asked what happened that the Board was given erroneous information.

Trustee Brooks asked Trustee Cavazos if she read the NDE guidance for the reopening plan including the requirements and consequences for not including those required components.

Trustee Cavazos said yes, she did read the document.

Trustee Brooks said the document states that the District must submit a plan and outlines what must be included and says there would be disciplinary action for not meeting those requirements, which implies to her that there is some sort of approval process. She asked if Trustee Cavazos interprets that in the same manner.

Trustee Cavazos said she does not. She said she interprets that they needed to meet certain guidelines but not that they needed to approve a specific plan.

Trustee Brooks said she recalls stating at a previous meeting when the reopening plans were presented that it did not mean that the District would open up in one of the models but that the plan had to include all of the models.

Trustee Cavazos said when documentation is available and it is clearly written out and the information is on the NDE website, she does not feel certain aspects are open for interpretation. She said if they are going to say these things are open for interpretation, she would suggest contacting the Governor's office and asking for clarification.

Trustee Brooks said she agreed that the guidelines are clearly written out. She asked Trustee Cavazos to clarify her question to Superintendent Jara.

Trustee Cavazos asked whether when Superintendent Jara informed the Board that the plan and the calendar days and the professional development days had been approved, that was all that needed to be approved at that time by the NDE even though emails that she received indicated staff was still awaiting further approval.

Superintendent Jara explained how he moved forward on the directives from the NDE for developing a reopening plan and what information was presented to the Board.

### **Representations Regarding State Directives for Opening Schools (continued)**

Trustee Cavazos said that only partially answers her question. She requested to take a recess to contact the Governor's office to have some questions regarding the directive from the state clarified.

Ms. Miller stated the agenda item was noticed in a way that indicates Trustee Cavazos wanted to have a discussion about whether or not she received misrepresentation of the NDE requirements. She suggested that if Trustee Cavazos wanted to find out what the NDE requirements are, she could have staff bring that forward for discussion at a regular meeting of the Board.

Trustee Cavazos said when she wrote the request for this, it was not just for one item but for a discussion. She stated that she feels the discussion is being limited in a very specific direction.

Trustee Young said the Board was told all three reopening options had to be submitted to the NDE, but she was later told that was not true. She said she felt misled by this. She said she was also misunderstood as supporting the hybrid education model.

Trustee Brooks asked Trustee Young to clarify her statement about it not being true that the District had to submit a plan that included all three options.

Trustee Young said her understanding was that the District was going to submit all three options which included in-person learning, hybrid learning, and distance learning, but that it appeared that the Board voted for the hybrid learning model.

Trustee Garvey said her understanding of the NDE Path Forward document and communication was that superintendents and boards needed to submit a reopening plan that included three learning models, and each model had to meet specific criteria, and there was going to be an approval process to determine that the requirements were met. She said it also included there would be consequences for not meeting those requirements. She said she does not believe there was any intentional misrepresentation to the Trustees. She said there were multiple conversations on this, and she did not have a problem understanding what was being asked of them.

Trustee Ford said she is trying to get clarification on statements that were made by the Superintendent, but they are not getting any answers. She said the Board never has proper information and never knows what the reality is, and this is just one instance of that, but it is a recent and important situation. She said she questions whether the Superintendent is misrepresenting things to the Trustees or if he is failing to understand them himself.

Trustee Ford said facts were misrepresented and that misrepresentation undermines the Board's confidence and undermines their relationships and prevents them from doing their job effectively. She said she has no confidence that this is going to change.

Trustee Brooks asked Trustee Ford to clarify the things she feels were misrepresentations.

### **Representations Regarding State Directives for Opening Schools (continued)**

Trustee Ford formally requested to take a recess and contact the NDE to gain clarification on some of the points raised.

Trustee Brooks referred Trustee Ford to the NDE directive for what was to be submitted.

Trustee Ford said the document states the District has to have calendar days and professional development days set, but it does not have a date as to when they have to have a reopening plan, only that the plan must adhere to those calendar days and professional development days. She said the Board was told employees would not get paid if the Board did not accept the three learning models, and that was not true. She said she is asking what happened, but without addressing it, how can she have any faith things would improve in the future, and how does a board operate with a superintendent they do not trust.

Trustee Brooks asked that the guidance memo, Reference 3.02 (I), be displayed.

Trustee Ford said she would like to see the date the District had to submit the reopening plan.

Trustee Brooks briefly went over the requirements as stated in the document on page 1 of 6. She noted that on page 4 of 6, it states the plans must be submitted to trustees for approval in a public meeting at least 20 days before the first day of the 2020-2021 school year. She said the further this approval is pushed back, the more likely employees are not to get paid because of contractual limitations.

Trustee Ford asked if Trustee Brooks knows if every school district has submitted their plans.

Trustee Brooks said she does not but does not know if that is relevant to this situation.

Trustee Ford said she does not believe they had to go through the process that they did and have every single detail of a reopening plan worked out at that time. She said they had to have a rough plan of what the three learning models might look like but making the public sit through all the discussion and the stress put on employees and parents was unnecessary.

Trustee Brooks disagreed that they only had to have a rough outline and referred to page 1 of 6. She said the requirements are all mapped out in this document and said she is still looking for what Trustee Ford feels were misrepresentations.

Trustee Ford said they could have contacted the state and gotten answers directly instead of continuing to argue about the details.

Trustee Brooks said everything is in writing, so they do not need to contact the NDE.

**Representations Regarding State Directives for Opening Schools** (continued)

Trustee Ford said the fact that the Trustees are interpreting the directive differently warrants a call to the NDE. She expressed concern with future Board meetings and ways of doing things in the future during this pandemic and budget cuts and said she does not have any faith that with the current makeup of the Board and Superintendent as a team, they will be able to operate effectively. She said she wants answers as to what is going to change.

Trustee Cepeda expressed frustration with the time and energy spent on this topic. She said she thought the document from the state was straightforward. She recognized the difficulties of communication and teamwork in a public forum and being regulated by Open Meeting Law (OML).

Trustee Wright also expressed frustration with the time spent here. She talked about the efforts the Superintendent has made in communicating with the Trustees. She said she is tired of looking back and said they need to be spending their time looking forward and focusing on supporting staff and the Superintendent in the reopening of schools. She stated that if there are issues with the Superintendent, those issues should be addressed during his evaluation process, and she thinks this was a way to circumvent that. She said it is clear the Superintendent is not a politician and suggested they should have more open conversations about their legislative platforms and what direction they want to go in the future.

There was no action taken on this item.

**Adjourn:** 3:55 p.m.

*Motion: Wright*

Trustee Brooks asked Ms. Miller to advise on whether the Board is allowed to entertain that motion.

Ms. Miller stated that pursuant to the Board's rules in their Appendix, a motion to adjourn takes precedent over any other motions.

*Trustee Garvey seconded the motion.*

Trustee Brooks asked Ms. Miller if she is supposed to call on the people in the queue or call for the vote.

Ms. Miller said under the Board's rules in the Appendix on page 1 of 2, the motion is not debatable.

**Adjourn** (continued)

*Vote on Trustee Wright's motion: Yeses – 4 (Brooks, Cepeda, Garvey, Wright); Noes – 3 (Cavazos, Ford, Young)*

*The motion passed.*

The remaining agenda item was not heard.