

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

Work Session

Wednesday, September 7, 2022

9:01 a.m.

---

Roll Call: Members Present  
Irene Cepeda, President  
Evelyn Garcia Morales, Vice President  
Lola Brooks, Clerk  
Linda P. Cavazos, Member  
Danielle Ford, Member  
Lisa Guzmán, Member  
Katie Williams, Member

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

Also present were: Nicole Malich, Board Counsel, District Attorney's Office;  
Dr. Brenda Larsen-Mitchell, Deputy Superintendent, Office of the Deputy Superintendent;  
Cindy Krohn, Director, Board Office; Carmen West, Executive Manager/Director II, Office of the  
Superintendent; and Denise Zagby, Administrative Secretary II, Board Office.

**Announcements**

Trustee Cepeda acknowledged that the land on which they are gathered is the territorial  
homelands of the Nuwu-the Moapa Band of Paiutes and the Las Vegas Band of Paiutes.

**Flag Salute**

Trustee Garcia Morales led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Adoption of the Agenda**

*Adopt agenda.*

*Motion: Brooks    Second: Garcia Morales    Vote: Unanimous  
Trustee Ford and Trustee Williams were not present for the vote.*

**Approve Revision of the 2022 Calendar of Board Meetings**

Approval on the revision of the calendar of work sessions and regular meetings of the Board of  
School Trustees for the period of January 2022, through December 2022, as requested in  
Reference 2.01.

**Approve Revision of the 2022 Calendar of Board Meetings (continued)**

Trustee Cepeda stated the request is to move the November 10, 2022, regular board meeting to November 17, 2022, due to the Nevada Association of School Boards' (NASB's) annual conference being held on November 11-12, 2022.

*Motion to approve.*

*Motion: Cavazos Second: Guzmán Vote: Unanimous  
Trustee Ford and Trustee Williams were not present for the vote.*

**Board Member Arrives**

Trustee Ford arrived at the Board meeting at 9:05 a.m.

**Approve Reconsider Item 5.08 of the November 18, 2021, Meeting of the Board of Trustees**

Approval on selection of an outside expert to conduct an investigation into allegations of a hostile work environment at the executive and administrative levels of the Clark County School District. *(Contact: Item for Reconsideration placed on agenda by Vice President Evelyn Garcia Morales, who voted on the prevailing side of the motion).* This action requires a majority vote to reconsider. If a motion to reconsider item 5.08 passes, the previous action to select an outside expert to conduct an investigation into allegations of a hostile work environment at the executive and administrative levels of the Clark County School District is rescinded.

*Motion to reconsider Item 5.08.*

*Motion: Garcia Morales Second: Guzmán*

Trustee Guzmán asked if this item was ever put forward and if there were any expenditures associated with this item.

Trustee Garcia Morales said there were no expenditures on this item.

Trustee Guzmán asked why this item is being reconsidered.

Trustee Garcia Morales said they would be removing this item as there is no further action needed on this item.

Trustee Cavazos asked if the item they would be considering rescinding has the same language as the original item posted as Item 5.08 on the November 18, 2021, agenda.

Trustee Garcia Morales answered yes.

Trustee Cavazos asked legal counsel whether the two items are exactly the same.

Ms. Malich stated the language in the item is clear enough to distinguish which item it references.

**Approve Reconsider Item 5.08 of the November 18, 2021, Meeting of the Board of Trustees**

Trustee Ford stated the item on the November 18, 2021, agenda took a lot of time and was very disruptive, and she wondered if they should continue the work and get the investigation started as opposed to bringing another item forward.

*Vote on Trustee Garcia Morales's motion was unanimous.  
Trustee Williams was not present for the vote.*

Trustee Garcia Morales stated that the original item was a knee-jerk reaction to behavior that led them to a specific place during that time and said they were in the middle of a transition during that time. She said she would like the Board to consider another item in lieu of Item 5.08.

*Motion to rescind Item 5.08.  
Motion: Garcia Morales*

Trustee Brooks asked for clarification of whether action is needed.

Ms. Malich stated no action is needed. She clarified that the previous vote rescinded the item.

*Trustee Garcia Morales withdrew her motion.*

Trustee Ford asked if the original intent of the motion was to investigate the Trustees' and the Superintendent's relationship as it was presented in the Superintendent's claims of harassment or if it was to investigate all the levels of staff that the Board heard harassment claims from.

Trustee Garcia Morales said she would not be discussing this item further and was ready to move to Item 2.03.

**Approve Culture and Climate Study of the Clark County School District**

Approval regarding the creation of a Request for Qualification for highly qualified and experienced firms to conduct a Culture, Climate Study of the Clark County School District and to create a report with the findings from the study and to serve as a consultant to support the implantation of key priorities.

Trustee Garcia Morales presented and briefly reviewed the draft Request for Quotes (RFQ), as shown in Reference 2.03.

Trustee Cavazos asked if this study is only to include the Board of Trustees or would it also include the Superintendent and executive level staff.

Trustee Garcia Morales guided Trustee Cavazos to the last line under Description of Need where it states, "...companywide (Board of Trustees, leadership and staff)."

**Approve Culture and Climate Study of the Clark County School District (continued)**

Trustee Cavazos referred to the last sentence under History and said although she agrees, she acknowledges that the Superintendent has most of the power and the operational authority over schools and employees.

Trustee Guzmán said she was looking for the data from the analysis provided through their training with consultants Dr. Debb Oliver and Deb Darby-Dudley. She suggested it would be beneficial to take the input provided to Dr. Oliver and Ms. Darby-Dudley into account. She said this draft also does not include trends on staffing and trends on school boards and the policies they pass.

Trustee Garcia Morales said it is an assumption to believe that content would not be included and that what she is hearing from Trustee Guzmán is that insight would be helpful for the consultant hired to conduct this study.

Trustee Guzmán said there are requirements in the draft that she feels they will not be able to meet. She said she did not think they would find anyone to meet the requirement in the second bullet point under Consultant requirements but said the consultant should be familiar with AB 469.

Trustee Garcia Morales offered to change the language in that requirement to say the consultant should be familiar with AB 469 instead of having direct experience.

Trustee Brooks said she believes this is being viewed in a negative light and some Trustees may be interpreting this as a different want to investigate the hostile claims but said she views this as a broad assessment that needs to be done. She suggested the writing and the scope in this draft is too narrow for what they want to accomplish. She asked the Superintendent if this was something he would be interested in exploring organizationally and allowing the Board to have a part in it.

**Board Member Arrives**

Trustee Williams arrived at the Board meeting at 9:38 a.m.

**Approve Culture and Climate Study of the Clark County School District (continued)**

Superintendent Jara said he is interested, because they hear a lot of negative remarks but when he is out in the field, he hears positive things and said he feels that it is important to share the great work that is happening in the schools and in the community. He suggested that the experience or familiarity be not specific to AB 469 but more of a decentralized system. He expressed support of this study as a continuous improvement process for the District.

Trustee Brooks suggested it would make the rest of the Board more comfortable if this were framed as a broad organizational cultural assessment in conjunction with the Superintendent.

**Approve Culture and Climate Study of the Clark County School District (continued)**

Trustee Ford stated the Board has put money, time, and effort into similar endeavors several times. She said they Board was provided with a comprehensive evaluation report, as well as a self-evaluation of the previous Board, prepared by Dr. Thomas Alsbury, Balanced Governance Solutions, that they have not gone back and reviewed. She stated they have also worked with Dr. Oliver and Ms. Darby-Dudley and questioned where the full results of that training are and whether they completed the training. She said they need to put the same amount of effort they put into the climate and culture of the Board into understanding the climate and culture of the schools and the administration in the schools. She said this draft is not clear and specific enough and more details are needed.

Trustee Garcia Morales reminded the Board that this is a draft, and the point of the discussion is to see if they can come to an agreement and that it is an RFQ, and a contract would still need to come before the Board and would need to be voted on.

Trustee Cepeda said she believes the Board creates the culture and that culture is created by more than just policy and discussion. She said she would be supportive of broadening this RFQ.

Trustee Williams said she is supportive of this and recognized that it is an RFQ, not a contract and not something that is final. She agreed with Trustee Ford's points regarding details that need to be answered.

There were further comments related to concerns and expectations for the process; including the input that was provided through the Board's training with Dr. Oliver and Ms. Darby-Dudley; including details like the cost and the timeline; and ensuring that the consultant is objective and can give a thorough analysis.

**Public Hearing**

Anna Binder commented that a presentation on the last meeting agenda included positive articles in the media about the District. She said she agreed with just about everything everyone has said on this item. She shared that the Audit Advisory Committee was told that EthicsPoint is completely confidential but said the Committee was not allowed to view the document that was supposed to contain information that was representative of reports that come into EthicsPoint.

*Motion for the Superintendent to continue his work on the cultural piece but work with Trustee Garcia Morales to ensure that the work includes the Board and that there is an expectation that the work produces a report that is a clear and honest assessment and that whatever consultant is selected has the autonomy to do their job without being micromanaged.*

*Motion: Brooks Second: Williams Vote: Yeses – 4 (Brooks, Cepeda, Garcia Morales, Williams); Noes – 3 (Cavazos, Ford, Guzmán)*

*The motion passed.*

### **Approve Superintendent Evaluation Process**

Approval regarding the Superintendent's evaluation process, evaluation facilitator, and related policy review that includes GP-11: Public Comment, B/SE-1 Board and Superintendent Evaluation Methodology; B/SE-3: Board Report and Progress Monitoring; B/SE-5: Board Report Vetting; B/SE-6: Board Report Schedule, and B/SE-7: Board Response to Board Reports.

Trustee Cepeda stated she does not want the Board to facilitate this process and said she has asked Ms. Darby-Dudley if she was available to help facilitate the process.

Trustee Brooks agreed with having an outside facilitator. She pointed out a misalignment in the process because the Board did not finish the policy last year of voting on accepting the monitoring report, and she said that misalignment should be considered.

Trustee Garcia Morales suggested it would be helpful for the Board to have more time between the goal setting planning session and the evaluation.

Trustee Brooks asked that the Trustees discuss how they feel the current alignment shown in Reference 2.04 (A) works to drive student outcomes. She said the Board does have the discretion to agree on another process, or perhaps they may need to look at the policies and determine whether they need better alignment. She stated that adopting goals in January in the middle of the school year does not allow for working toward that goal for that school year because no resources have been aligned and no strategies have been chosen toward that goal.

Trustee Guzmán agreed with Trustee Brooks' comments regarding the timing and stated she believes they should be setting the goals in July. She said she also felt that the goals that they agreed upon should have been goals that were already worked on. She said she does feel that since this timeline is what is in policy, the Board should move forward.

Trustee Ford suggested that after this evaluation it would be a good time to schedule a better timeline for the evaluation. She said the three goals chosen in the beginning of the year should have been included in the reference material. She said she was in support of working with Ms. Darby-Dudley. She asked that the three goals be read aloud.

Trustee Williams said she would like the Board to revise the policy for the next cycle. She said she was also in support of working with Ms. Darby-Dudley.

### **Public Comment**

David Gomez spoke about his experience helping to run a large, successful business and asked who here has that type of experience. He said there is no fair process here because the Board is divided and a facilitator that is hired is going to be biased. He volunteered to help facilitate the evaluation process.

**Approve Superintendent Evaluation Process** (continued)

*Motion to move this evaluation up to have it completed by October 1, 2022; to have the Board then focus on realignment and making the timeline flow properly; and to have the Board work with Ms. Darby-Dudley as a facilitator.*

*Motion: Brooks*

Trustee Guzmán asked if the Board was allowed to change the date of the evaluation.

Ms. Malich said she could reach out to the Superintendent's legal counsel to confirm that it is okay to do that, but she said she did not see an issue with doing so.

Trustee Brooks asked if Superintendent Jara would be agreeable to moving the date of the evaluation.

Superintendent Jara said as the school year has closed, and metrics are being finalized by Nevada Department of Education (NDE) and would be released next week, he would be amenable to moving the date. He added that his contract says, "by December."

Trustee Garcia Morales asked if working with Ms. Darby-Dudley would include any type of training.

Trustee Brooks said she was thinking it would be limited just to get through the evaluation process but said the Board could explore that.

*Trustee Garcia Morales seconded the motion.*

Trustee Ford said she did not feel they were clear on what they would be evaluating the Superintendent on.

*Trustee Ford offered a friendly amendment to the motion to have the date more closely align to Superintendent Jara's contract and change the language to "...by December 1, 2022."*

Trustee Cepeda clarified that the Board would be evaluating the Superintendent on the three goals they adopted in February.

*Trustee Brooks did not accept the friendly amendment.*

Trustee Cavazos said it would be helpful to talk to the prospective facilitator regarding the timeline before moving forward with the expedited date put forth in the motion.

*Trustee Brooks offered to amend her motion to include flexibility if the consultant deems it impossible to complete the task in a proper manner in the length of time proposed.*

*Trustee Garcia Morales agreed to the amendment to the motion.*

**Approve Superintendent Evaluation Process (continued)**

*Trustee Ford offered a friendly amendment to the motion to include the word “recommended” to give the facilitator the flexibility to let the Board know if the date named in the motion is either unattainable or not recommended.*

*Trustee Brooks did not accept the friendly amendment.*

*Vote on Trustee Brooks’ motion: Yeses – 4 (Brooks, Cepeda, Garcia Morales, Williams); Noes – 3 (Cavazos, Ford, Guzmán)*

*The motion passed.*

**Upcoming Meeting of the Board of Trustees - Thursday, September 8, 2022, 5:00 p.m.**

Trustee Cepeda stated the upcoming meeting of the Board was scheduled for Thursday, September 8, 2022, at 5:00 p.m. in the boardroom.

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

David Gomez stated he heard Pastor Troy of Dads in Schools on the radio essentially declare himself the safe point of CCSD schools, stating police officers are not needed in the schools. Mr. Gomez disagreed with this idea. He said police officers are needed in the schools, and an entire department should not be blamed for one officer’s actions.

Anna Binder commented that schools are allowing parents to volunteer again and said she has told parents that if they want to volunteer on campus to attend their School Organizational Team (SOT) meetings and talk to the principals. She thanked everyone for all the work being done at the executive level and helping parents.

**Adjourn:** 10:40 a.m.

*Motion: Williams    Second: Cepeda    Vote: Unanimous*