

**MINUTES OF THE APRIL 26, 2022  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

April 26, 2022

**1. Opening Items**

**1.01 CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Board of Trustees was called to order at 1:01 p.m. in the Board Room of the Central Administration Building, located at 425 East Ninth Street in Reno, Nevada.

**1.02 ROLL CALL**

President Angela Taylor and Board Members Jeff Church, Adam Mayberry, Ellen Minetto, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, and Beth Smith were present. Superintendent Kristen McNeill, Student Representative Victoria Gomez, and staff were also present.

**1.03 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Lauren Ford, Lead Area Superintendent, led the meeting in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**1.04 ACTION TO ADOPT THE AGENDA**

It was moved by Trustee Rodriguez and seconded by Trustee Nicolet that **the Board of Trustees approves the agenda as presented.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jeff Church, Adam Mayberry, Ellen Minetto, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

**2. Consent Agenda Items**

Trustee Church requested the following items be pulled from the Consent Agenda for additional discussion and consideration:

2.03 – Approval of the minutes of the March 29, 2022 Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees; and

2.13 – Approval of the 2022 Renewal of the Commercial Leader Agreement for the property located at 5450 Riggins Court with Z Bar T Properties (Landlord) for eight District departments beginning June 1, 2022, and expiring May 31, 2027, in the estimated amount of \$1,268,064; and

2.23 – Possible action to provide preliminary approval to the proposed revisions of Board Policy 9110, Meeting Protocols, specifically to update and clarify

language and intent, and initiation of the 13-day public review and comment period.

President Taylor opened the meeting to public comment.

The Board received an email from Shelley Buchanan related to Consent Agenda Item 2.05.

It was moved by Trustee Nicolet and seconded by Trustee Smith that **the Board of Trustees approves Consent Agenda Items 2.02, 2.04 through 2.12, and 2.14 through 2.22.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jeff Church, Adam Mayberry, Ellen Minetto, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

- 2.02 The Board of Trustees approved the minutes of the March 8, 2022 Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees.
- 2.04 The Board of Trustees approved the minutes of the April 8, 2022 Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees.
- 2.05 The Board of Trustees approved the 3rd Quarter Fiscal Year 2021-22 average daily attendance and pupil-teacher ratios for grades K-3 report to be filed with the Nevada Department of Education.
- 2.06 The Board of Trustees accepted the Budget Transfer Reports and provided authorization to include budget transfers between functions or programs for the General Fund, 2017C WC-1 General Obligation (G.O.) Bonds Fund, 2018 WC-1 G.O. Bonds Fund, 2020A WC-1 G.O. Bonds Fund, and 2005 AB299 Indian Colony Fund for the period March 1, 2022 through March 31, 2022 and approved the transfer of \$65,000 from the District's General Fund Contingency account to the School Police budget account in the official Board minutes, as required by Nevada Revised Statute 354.598005.
- 2.07 The Board of Trustees approved Renewal #1 of Request for Bid (RFB) #054-17-03-20, District-wide Fire Extinguisher and Ansul Testing, Maintenance and Repair, to Fire Extinguisher Service Center for an estimated amount of \$175,071.75 for an additional two (2) year term beginning May 23, 2022 and ending May 22, 2024.
- 2.08 The Board of Trustees awarded Bid #22-94-B-03-DA, Door Hardware Upgrades at Desert Heights Elementary School, to Gary Romero, Inc. for \$136,500.

- 2.09 The Board of Trustees awarded Bid #22-95-B-03-DA, Door Hardware Upgrades at Donner Springs Elementary School, to Gary Romero, Inc. for \$139,200.
- 2.10 The Board of Trustees awarded Bid #22-96-B-03-AA, Relocation of Mobile Classroom Buildings to John C Bohach Elementary School, to Simerson Construction LLC for \$443,690.
- 2.11 The Board of Trustees awarded Bid #22-97-B-03-AA, Installation of Shade Structures at John C Bohach Elementary School and Michael Inskeep Elementary School, to Bruce Purves Construction, Inc. for \$210,840.
- 2.12 The Board of Trustees awarded Bid #22-98-B-03-DA, Replacement of Warehouse Racking and Fire Sprinklers at the Administrative Building Warehouse, to Sullivan Structures, LLC for \$329,321.
- 2.14 The Board of Trustees acknowledged receipt of notification of declared emergency repairs pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 332.112 and 338.011(2), contracts related to emergency, for the replacement of Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) Cooling Tower at B.D. Billingshurst Middle School for the estimated cost of \$300,000.
- 2.15 The Board of Trustees accepted the information collected from a single anonymous donor related to Nevada Revised Statute 386.390.
- 2.16 The Board of Trustees provided preliminary approval to the proposed revisions of Board Policy 5400, Student Attendance, and initiated the 13-day public review and comment period.
- 2.17 The Board of Trustees provided preliminary approval to the proposed revision of Board Policy 5600, Student Wellness, and initiated the 13-day public review and comment period.
- 2.18 The Board of Trustees provided preliminary approval of the proposed revisions of Board Policy 6171.1, Alternative Education Program, and initiated the 13-day public review and comment period.
- 2.19 The Board of Trustees provided preliminary approval to the proposed revision of Board Policy 6160, Instructional Materials: Selection, Adoption and Disposal, and initiated the 13-day public review and comment period.

2.20 The Board of Trustees provided preliminary approval to the proposed revision of Board Policy 6200, Literacy, and initiated the 13-day public review and comment period.

2.21 The Board of Trustees provided preliminary approval to the proposed revision of Board Policy 6300, Mathematics, and initiated the 13-day public review and comment period.

2.22 The Board of Trustees provided preliminary approval to the proposed revisions of Board Policy 6400, Assessment, and initiated the 13-day public review and comment period.

### **2.03 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 29, 2022 REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Trustee Church remarked he would like additional detail included under Board Reports, similar to what was provided under Public Comment.

It was moved by Trustee Smith and seconded by Trustee Rodriguez that **the Board of Trustees approves the minutes of the March 29, 2022 Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees.** The result of the vote was 6-1: (Yea: Adam Mayberry, Ellen Minetto, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, and Angela Taylor. Nay: Jeff Church.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

### **2.13 APPROVAL OF THE 2022 RENEWAL OF THE COMMERCIAL LEASE AGREEMENT FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 5450 RIGGINS COURT WITH Z BAR T PROPERTIES (LANDLORD) FOR EIGHT DISTRICT DEPARTMENTS BEGINNING JUNE 1, 2022, AND EXPIRING MAY 31, 2027, IN THE ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF \$1,268,064**

Trustee Church expressed an interest in the District reducing the number of leases held by the District.

It was moved by Trustee Rodriguez and seconded by Trustee Minetto that **the Board of Trustees approves the Commercial Lease Agreement Renewal for 5450 Riggins Court with Z Bar T Properties (Landlord), for eight District departments for the period beginning June 1, 2022, and expiring May 31, 2027, in the estimated amount of \$1,268,064.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jeff Church, Adam Mayberry, Ellen Minetto, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

### **2.23 POSSIBLE ACTION TO PROVIDE PRELIMINARY APPROVAL TO THE PROPOSED REVISIONS OF BOARD POLICY 9110 MEETING PROTOCOLS,**

**SPECIFICALLY TO UPDATE AND CLARIFY LANGUAGE AND INTENT, AND INITIATION OF THE 13-DAY PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT PERIOD**

Trustee Church believed the proposed revisions would remove his ability to pull items off of the Consent Agenda for additional discussion, have input in agenda creation, and gave too much authority to the Board President over the individual Trustees. He felt there were various conflicts within the new language between sections. He was also seeking clarity regarding the ability of a Trustee to delay action on an agenda item.

President Taylor mentioned the Board Policy Committee held extensive discussions regarding all concerns raised by Trustee Church. Many of the proposed changes would codify long-standing practices by the Board, such as allowing the Board President, or designee, to set the agendas and run efficient meetings. The language was consistent and required multiple Trustees to request an item to be pulled or placed on an agenda.

Trustee Rodriguez recalled during the Policy Committee there was a discussion regarding the “timely fashion” of adding items to an agenda if requested by two or more Trustees. While he believed the current Board Leadership worked to add items as soon as possible, he was concerned that would not be the case in the future and would like to see something more definitive.

President Taylor noted there had been a lot of discussion regarding a possible timeline, but in the end, there was not a consensus.

It was moved by Trustee Rodriguez and seconded by Trustee Minetto that **the Board of Trustees provides preliminary approval to the proposed revisions of Board Policy 9110, Meeting Protocols, and initiates the 13-day public review and comment period.**

President Taylor opened the motion for discussion.

Trustee Nicolet highlighted the delay of action Trustee Church had previously mentioned was related to when a Trustee provided extensive supplemental material at a Board meeting. A Trustee could request the agenda item be tabled to the next meeting if that were to occur.

Trustee Church thanked Trustee Nicolet, but would still like to see the wording changed. He was also not happy with the intent of the proposed revisions.

The result of the vote was 6-1: (Yea: Adam Mayberry, Ellen Minetto, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, and Angela Taylor. Nay: Jeff Church.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

### **3. Items for Presentation, Discussion, Information and/or Action**

#### **3.01 PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON THE THREE FEDERAL GRANTS, TITLE IA, TITLE I 1003(A), AND TITLE IV B, ADMINISTERED BY THE WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT TITLE I DEPARTMENT FROM THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AWARDED TO THE WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Joe Ernst, Chief Accountability Officer, and Brian Prewett, Title I Director, provided a presentation on three of the major federal grants administered by the District. Background information on the types of grants and general criteria used to evaluate and determine eligibility was reviewed. The first grant was the Title I, Part A grant which was a formula grant based on census data, with schools being selected based on the number of Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students within a school's attendance zone. Schools were ranked and then served by highest FRL status and every school with a 75% or higher FRL population was required to be served by Title I funds. Individual school districts were able to determine if they wanted to fund additional schools. The Washoe County School District currently served schools with a 64.82% or greater FRL status. The purpose of the grant was to supplement local education programs and ensure economically disadvantaged students were provided the same opportunity to achieve state standards as their more affluent peers. The difference between supplement and supplant was explained. Information on how the funds could be used in the individual schools was reviewed.

Trustee Minetto asked how long the District had been using Title I funding. Superintendent McNeill stated the District began receiving Title I funding in 1965 through President Johnson's War on Poverty Act, as part of the elementary and secondary school funding. Various changes had been made to the law over the years as the legislation was reauthorized.

Trustee Minetto wondered if the District had been able to collect data to show how/if the additional funding was making a difference. Mr. Prewett noted the individual schools were able to determine how the Title I, Part A funds were spent, as long as it was aligned to the school's performance plan. The District was responsible for monitoring how the funds were spent and reporting the information to the state. Mr. Ernst added the District had seen some Title I schools succeed in student and academic performance.

President Taylor cautioned that it was important for everyone to think about what the Title I schools would look like if they were not provided the additional funding. It would be difficult to have a "control" group because that would mean some students would automatically be without. For her, it was best to remember what other studies showed and how that would apply to Title I schools, such as the research showed students

learn better if they have had a healthy breakfast and lunch. Mr. Ernst agreed with the comments. He highlighted that many Title I schools would focus a lot of the funds on providing additional professional development for their staff. Since many Title I schools had a larger number of novice teachers, providing additional professional development allowed them to learn more about how they could help students from more experienced teachers and mentors.

Trustee Nicolet requested additional information on the supports, especially related to data, provided to Title I schools so they could make the best decisions in terms of spending Title I funds. Mr. Ernst explained the District had two performance plan coordinators that would work side-by-side with principals to review the school data and then use that information to determine where the focus should be related to Title I funds.

Trustee Nicolet asked if school administrators were paid through Title I, Part A funding. Mr. Prewett acknowledged there were some administrative staff paid for out of the Title I set aside budget, such as those employed directly by the Title I Department. However, the individual school allocations were paid for by the District as part of the school site allocations. If an individual school wanted to have additional allocations, above what the District provided, those would be paid for out of Title I funds, such as dean or assistant principal positions.

Trustee Nicolet appreciated that the Title I schools were able to hire the additional positions, but she was interested in knowing if there was a way to allow non-Title I schools to have the ability to fund those positions as well. Mr. Prewett cautioned that the Title I, Part A funds could only be used for areas that were above and beyond what the District provided. If the District were able to provide deans and/or assistant principals at all schools then the Title I school would need to use their grant funds for something else. Title I was intended to provide equitability, not equality.

Trustee Nicolet inquired as to how the District was able to provide equitable services for private school and homeless students. She specifically questioned why the District was providing for private school students. Mr. Prewett explained the District provided services for students attending private schools who were zoned for Title I schools. The funds could only be used for additional, targeted assistance; meaning the funding could only be used for additional supports for those students who qualified for the funding, not all students.

Trustee Nicolet wondered if the District was audited on a regular basis regarding the grant funds. Superintendent McNeill stated the District had a financial audit conducted on an annual basis. As part of the audit, the grant funds were "tested" by the external auditor. By testing the funds, the external audit would determine which federal and state program grants to review and look at specific transactions as part of the test. The

District was unaware of which funds would be tested in advance. The federal and state Departments of Education would also monitor grant funds and the programs the funds were applied to.

Trustee Smith requested additional information on homeless students, as well as the neglected and delinquent students. Mr. Prewett mentioned the Children in Transition (CIT) Department received funding from the Title I, Part A grant that could be used for any student in the CIT program. The CIT program determined the most appropriate way to allocate those funds. The CIT Department was also responsible for neglected and delinquent students.

Trustee Smith asked how the District defined neglected and delinquent. Superintendent McNeill indicated Title I, Section D typically defined neglected and delinquent students as those students within the juvenile justice system.

Trustee Rodriguez wondered if Title I, Part A provided any Early Childhood Education (ECE) funding. Mr. Prewett noted some of the funds were set aside for ECE, but the individual schools did not provide funding for ECE. Tina Springmeyer, Director of Child and Family Services, mentioned all funding for ECE in the District came from federal and state grants. Since pre-K was not a requirement, the programs were only able to accept a limited number of students; though the majority of the pre-K programs in the District were located in Title I schools. Additional information on ECE would be provided later in the meeting.

Trustee Mayberry requested additional information on how Title I funding was provided to private schools. Mr. Prewett provided additional information on how the District would provide supports to specific students who qualified for Title I funds at private schools. The District generally provided counseling services, supplies, and tutoring services to those students who qualified.

Trustee Church clarified that Title I, Part A funding had nothing to do with academic and student performance, but had to do with students who were economically disadvantaged, so the only way for a school to be removed from Title I funding was to lift the community out of poverty. Mr. Prewett explained the funding was aimed at improving academic and student achievement, but the basis for the funding was the number or percentage of FRL students in the particular school. If the FLR percentage dropped at a school, then a school might come off Title I status. The academic expectations at Title I schools were just as high as at non-Title I schools.

Trustee Nicolet wondered how Title I funding had been impacted by universal free lunches since there were no FRL percentages at any school at the present time due to COVID. Mr. Prewett reviewed how FRL status was determined prior to COVID and the use of community eligibility. Part of the issue with using FRL was the requirement that



a form had to be completed for a student to receive FRL and there had been times when families were not interested in filling out the forms or families would stop filling out the form once a student reached a certain grade level. Community eligibility was based on the percentage of families in the area surrounding a school who received direct services from the government. The intent moving forward was to use community eligibility more than FRL status, but it was unclear how that would work at the present time.

Mr. Prewett continued with the presentation and provided information on Title 1, Section 1003(a) and Title IV, Part B 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Centers grants. Title I, Section 1003(a) was a competitive grant focused on supporting underperforming schools through school leadership and data-driven decision making. The District utilized The New Teacher Project to assist in improving school leadership, instructional practices, and data-driven decision making. Title IV, Part B, or TEAM UP, was also a competitive grant and was focused on providing academic support and enrichment activities for students and offer families an opportunity to actively engage in their students' education. The funding was primarily used for after school programming. To qualify for both Title I, Section 1003(a) and Title IV, Part B grants, the schools had to qualify for Title I, Part A grants who were also classified as Comprehensive Support and Intervention Schools (CSI).

Trustee Nicolet asked if all students at a school with TEAM UP were eligible for the programming. Mr. Prewett noted the students had to be enrolled in the after school, TEAM UP program to be eligible for services.

### **3.02 PRESENTATION AND UPDATE REGARDING THE SUPERINTENDENT'S TASK FORCE FOR SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS INCLUDING INFORMATION OF THE WORK COMPLETED BY THE TASK FORCE AND NEXT STEPS**

Dr. Troy Parks, Chief Academic Officer, presented an update on the Superintendent's Task Force for Supplementary Materials. An overview of the membership of the Task Force and what the group had been able to complete thus far was provided. The Task Force had established norms and working agreements, reviewed Nevada Academic Content Standards for both social studies and English Language Arts (ELA), and reviewed current District curriculum. The next steps for the Task Force would be to take a deeper dive into the adopted K-5 (ELA) materials and determine if a recommendation to the Superintendent on additional materials was needed. If the group decided additional materials were required, the Superintendent would then determine the next steps in the process.

Trustee Church requested clarification on how members of the Task Force were selected and if the Board of Trustees was involved in the process. Dr. Parks reviewed

the application and review process. The Office of Accountability determined the criteria in selecting members of the Task Force. Debra Biersdorff, Deputy Superintendent, added the committee used to screen the applicants consisted of District staff and community members. Applications were reviewed through a blind screening process, meaning the names and identifying information were redacted prior to being sent to the committee who screened the applications utilizing a rubric created by the Office of Human Resources and the Office of the General Counsel. The Board was not involved in the recruitment or selection of members, though the Trustees could provide members of the community with information on where to find the applications.

Trustee Church inquired as to the grades the Task Force was reviewing materials for. Dr. Parks indicated the Task Force was only looking at the possibility of K-5 ELA supplemental materials.

Trustee Minetto asked what the timeline was for the Task Force. Superintendent McNeill mentioned the timeline would depend on the recommendation provided by the Task Force to the Superintendent. If she believed additional work was needed, she could send that back to the Task Force for further review.

President Taylor appreciated the information because it was important to remember the recommendation would go to the Superintendent, not the Board of Trustees.

### **3.03 PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON THE IMPORTANCE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES AND TRANSITIONING STUDENTS TO KINDERGARTEN PROVIDED BY THE WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT DEPARTMENT OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES**

Tina Springmeyer, Director of Child and Family Services, provided a presentation on Early Childhood Education (ECE) and the mission and programming provided by the Child and Family Services Department. The pre-K programming was also intended to introduce families and children to the school environment and worked to present a welcoming environment, no matter the location of the program. The District had over 1,300 students enrolled in Early Childhood programming that were either funded through Special Education or grants for General Education programming. The programs were located in 90 classrooms in elementary, middle, and high schools throughout the District, with 52 Special Education programs, 38 grant funded programs, and 3 teen parent programs. Program assessments were the same for all students in ECE programs and teachers provided professional development on the Nevada pre-K content standards. The Department work closely with families on the transition to kindergarten and collaborated with teachers to support a smooth transition.

President Taylor inquired if there was data showing pre-K provided a benefit for students in future grades. Ms. Springmeyer indicated there was some research with the

grant programs that showed students enrolled in the pre-K programs were more prepared for kindergarten, but additional research was needed. A lot of the research showed that by 3<sup>rd</sup> grade any advantage for students who were part of a high-quality pre-K program began to level off, but she would be interested in learning about the impacts of social and emotional learning and instruction to determine if the pre-K programs provided additional benefits for students and their ability to work and interact with peers.

President Taylor appreciated the information and believed it was important to advocate for universal pre-K because she would prefer to see all children enter kindergarten at the same level. Ms. Springmeyer agreed. She cautioned a lot would need to occur before universal pre-K would be able to become reality in Nevada but was hopeful systems would begin to be put in place since the pandemic showed the importance of ECE and the need for quality programming, so parents were able to work.

Trustee Nicolet thanked staff for the information. She was proud that the District had opened the door for pre-K and continued to expand programming whenever possible. She appreciated the emphasis on family engagement because it was critical to bring families along with their students and teach them how to become involved in their child's education because the families were the first and forever teachers for children and they were the experts on their children.

Ms. Springmeyer continued with the presentation with additional information on ECE research and possible future evaluation considerations. The challenges and opportunities for ECE were reviewed, including the reliance on grant funding for General Education pre-K programs and securing suitable classroom space. One of the greatest opportunities was the ability to educate District administrators on the importance of ECE programs and their connection to the K-12 continuum.

Student Representative Gomez asked if the infant and toddler programs located in the two high schools were only available to students who attended those high schools. Ms. Springmeyer remarked the students at the two schools were targeted; however, students from other high schools were able to access the programs as well.

Trustee Mayberry appreciated the information provided and highlighted his daughters were able to take advantage of ECE programming in the District through the ChildFind program.

Trustee Nicolet felt it would be important for the Board to consider a Board Policy related to ECE and the work occurring in the District. She noted there were many "opportunity studies" that showed the more opportunities students were provided, the more success students were able to achieve and pre-K was an opportunity.

Trustee Minetto mentioned she was a teacher at a school with an ECE program. She appreciated that the program was included in all aspects of the school, including coming to assemblies and participating in other events.

#### **4. Reports**

##### **4.01 BOARD REPORTS**

Members of the Board of Trustees reported on their activities, meetings, and events.

##### **4.02 STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE REPORT**

Student Representative Victoria Gomez reported on activities, meetings, and events of the Superintendent's Student Advisory Council.

##### **4.03 SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT**

Superintendent Kristen McNeill reported on her activities including meetings with staff, community leaders, and the media.

#### **5. Closing Items**

##### **5.01 PUBLIC COMMENT**

Valerie Fiannaca expressed disappointment in a recent campaign mailer sent by President Taylor where she referred to 49% of voters in Washoe County as "radicals," who were pro-Trump, anti-mask, anti-vax, Republicans, and a mob who did not believe in science. She believed the ad was divisive and did not feel President Taylor would be able to continue to work in a non-partisan manner on the Board of Trustees if she lost her bid to the Nevada Assembly. She urged the other Trustees to speak out against the ad and for President Taylor to run on her record. She called on teachers to reconsider their support for the union endorsing President Taylor because the union was the reason the class sizes were large and their salaries were low. She would like to see the Board take a vote of no confidence in President Taylor and for President Taylor to resign.

President Taylor stated the mailer sent to members of the community was not mailed out by her or her campaign.

Jeff Church provided comments related to the mailer sent to members of the community. He noted the mailer was sent by a Political Action Committee (PAC) from outside Washoe County. He provided remarks directly to the PAC and told them the divisive speech was not representative of Washoe County and the community would not

stand for it. He noted the current meeting showed civility and respect and pledged to continue working in a similar manner moving forward. He mentioned the Board was non-partisan and should remain that way.

Glendia Salazar expressed concern over the bullying of students by staff in some schools. She claimed to have evidence of such bullying against her son and no one in the District had wanted to listen. She believed her family was being discriminated against because of their appearance, with the teacher calling her son a gang member. She was concerned about the aftermath these teachers were causing on students, including students with special needs, and provided information on what she was experiencing because her son's teachers did not believe in him. She understood the current frustrations of teachers but did not believe that gave them the right to tell students they were not worthy.

Joseph Silveira was a custodian in the District and member of Washoe Education Support Professionals. He expressed concern over a recent email he received that talked about the reduction in housekeeping service-levels due to the number of vacant positions. He felt the problem with the service-level reductions was that the vacant positions would not be enough to continue servicing all schools the same and eventually current employees would either be overworked, or their jobs changed dramatically. He urged the Board to look at increasing pay and providing more respect for custodians if they wanted to retain employees.

Bruce Parks, Chairman Washoe County Republican Party, provided the Board with a resolution adopted by the Party opposing the teaching of Critical Race Theory in schools and promoting the teaching of the 1776 Commission final report. He also provided the Board with the Washoe County Republican Platform and urged the Trustees to read the document because it represented what their constituents believed. He noted the document highlighted the issue with education in Nevada was not funding and additional solutions developed in collaboration with everyone.

The Board received emails from the following:

Sarah Dockins

Ken Thomas

## **5.02 NEXT MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT**

The next Regular Meeting would take place on Tuesday, May 10, 2022.

## **5.03 ADJOURN MEETING**

There being no further business to come before the members of the Board, President Taylor declared the meeting adjourned at 3:31 p.m.

---

**Angela D. Taylor, President**

---

**Ellen Minetto, Clerk**

---

**From:** Sarah Dockins  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 21, 2022 5:24 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] What the health

I want to know why my eighth grader is being shown a well-known propaganda video called what the health in his eighth grade ELA class at Marce Herz?

This film has been clearly documented as being a propagandist video. I do not feel that this is appropriate to show. I was never asked permission for my child to see this video.. Telling my eighth grader that one egg is equivalent to smoking five cigarettes a day?

Oh I asked him if this was an example of propaganda, and he said no it was not. It was being shown as fact. I really hope he is misinformed!

I would appreciate if the School district would let me know if this is part of the curriculum.

Thank you

Sarah Dockins

Sent from my iPhone

Sarah Dockins

**From:** Sarah Dockins  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 26, 2022 8:51 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] What the Health

Good morning. I had previously emailed in regards to a movie that was shown to my eighth grade son called "what the health" at Marcie Herz. The following day the ELA teacher did come forward and tell the children that this is an example of bias. I apologize for my hastiness in sending an email. However, he did not tell the students about this ahead of time (according to my 8th grader ♦♦).

I did have to explain to my child in depth why this is an example of bias. He was absolutely and completely panicked after watching. It was a good lesson learned how you can have experts and doctors come up with testimony, and the information look very convincing, but it's not solid.

Sarah Dockins

Sent from my iPhone Sarah Dockins

---

**From:** Ken Thomas  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 26, 2022 12:23 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Curriculum Concerns

Good Afternoon,

We have heard a lot about CRT "disinformation" for some time now, including statements from the candidates for Superintendent. The statements are condescending and directly question the intelligence of parents and community members regarding their understanding of CRT. The NAACP's definition of CRT :

"Critical Race Theory, or CRT, is an academic and legal framework that denotes that systemic racism is part of American society — from education and housing to employment and healthcare. Critical Race Theory recognizes that racism is more than the result of individual bias and prejudice. It is embedded in laws, policies, and institutions that uphold and reproduce racial inequalities. According to CRT, societal issues like Black Americans' higher mortality rate, outsized exposure to police violence, the school-to-prison pipeline, denial of affordable housing, and the rates of the death of Black women in childbirth are not unrelated anomalies. CRT holds that racism was not and has never been eradicated from our laws, policies, or institutions, and is still woven into the fabric of their existence."

This is where most community members' understanding of CRT comes from, the NAACP. Unless you deem the NAACP as a source of "misinformation", I would ask that the Board recognize that when the public speaks of CRT, they are NOT "misinformed". Each time the "misinformation" statement is made, you share your personal opinion that can not be factually supported. YOU, the Board, are the source of misinformation by continuing to make this statement. The concerns about SEL go hand in hand with CRT. The general shift, nationwide, of District's SEL instruction to include topics like social justice, political issues, and racism along with bolstering diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts is alarming. In reading some of these new, refocused SEL curricula, there is just cause for many to see SEL as a Trojan horse for critical race theory.

Now to the curriculum concern. Recently Jhone Ebert, our Nevada State Superintendent, along with Angie Taylor and other WCSD staff has stated, "We do not teach CRT". This is not true. Every time a teacher speaks of systematic racism, dismantling structural inequities, white privilege, revisionist history, redistribution of power, and seeks to identify students based on the color of their skin as oppressors or oppressed in an attempt to shame or make the "oppressors" feel guilty about their skin color...THAT IS CRT! A recent response from the Detroit Public School System (see complete video link below) regarding the banning of CRT clearly admits to intentionally embedding CRT into the curriculum:

"Our curriculum is deeply using CRT, especially in social studies but you'll find it in English Language Arts and the other disciplines. We are very intentional in creating curriculum, infusing materials, and embedding CRT within our curriculum as stated by many speakers today because students need to understand the truth of history, understand the history of this county to better understand who they are and the injustices that have occurred in this country". <https://rumble.com/v11xo5m-detroit-public-schools-superintendent-crt-is-deeply-embedded-in-our-curricu.html>

As the Superintendent's Task Force on Supplemental Curriculum learns how our Nevada Academic Content Standards are structured and learn how to use and understand our adopted K-5 ELA materials, the community's expectation (via the Benchmark Supplemental Curriculum Survey and many public comments) is very clear. The focus should always be on instruction that is factual and objective. The material and



instruction should never suppress or distort historical events. The presentation of materials should be presented by teachers who serve as facilitators for student discussion; they should never share their personal views or attempt to indoctrinate or persuade students to a particular point of view. I, along with many stakeholders, believe in American Exceptionalism and take an unwavering stance on teaching American History in its entirety - the good and the bad. We have never advocated hiding or covering up any part of our Nation's history. A Nation that ignores its historical faults is doomed to repeat them.

Every student should have equal opportunity to high-quality, standards-based instruction. I believe that is something we all agree on. I would urge the task force as they are taking a deep dive into our instructional materials, they also look closely at the corresponding assessments. These assessments are designed to provide teachers with data that clearly shows each student's degree of mastery. These assessments and course requirements should never be watered down to ensure "equal outcomes". The Constitution, as amended, gives all Americans equal opportunity; however, this does not guarantee equal outcomes. CRT concentrates power to equalize outcomes, regardless of who earned what. CRT denies the idea that hard work pays off. You must believe, rather, that your skin color defines your ability to succeed. This is another tenant of CRT that should be outright rejected and never be the lens upon which our students' mastery of content is based.

In closing, as we continue to engage in the decisions that impact our children's education, we all must do a better job of listening and supporting all claims with evidence. We must agree to speak truth and never intentionally mislead with false information. If the Board's true intent is to receive input from all stakeholders in a respectful manner, I would urge the Board and all WCSD staff to:

- 1) Acknowledge the very real concern that staff, parents, and community members have about CRT being taught in our Washoe County schools.
- 2) Acknowledge that our understanding of Critical Race Theory directly aligns with NAACP's definition.
- 3) Stop making the statement that community members, parents, and staff who question CRT are "misinformed".
- 4) Acknowledge that many hold a strong belief in American Exceptionalism and unwavering stance on teaching American History in its entirety - the good and the bad.

Respectfully,  
K. Thomas

<https://rumble.com/v11xo5m-detroit-public-schools-superintendent-crt-is-deeply-embedded-in-our-curricu.html>

<https://www.hollandsentinel.com/story/opinion/letters/2021/08/14/letter-critical-race-theory-disgrace/8124819002/>

<https://www.naacpldf.org/critical-race-theory-faq>

---

**From:** Shelley Buchanan  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 26, 2022 12:42 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] regular board meeting april 26 2022 agenda item 2.05

RE: WCSD Board Meeting 04/26/2022, Agenda Item 2.05

The district states that class size mandated student teacher ratios cannot be achieved “due to available *financial support* and the *general nature* of student attendance variations from school to school and grade by grade.” Why then did the school district recently report to the Washoe County Planning Commission regarding the proposed 574 additional residences on Galena Parkway that “the school district anticipates no conflicts with the ability to accommodate students possibly generated by this project”?

I live in this area and for the second week now, my son has not had bus transportation to school. How can the district possibly state that additional growth in this area will have no impact on schools when we cannot even run our schools sufficiently with the current number of students?

I have written my board representatives and the superintendent regarding the failure of the district to adequately communicate to the county the need for growth regulation. The district cannot expect the state and taxpayers alone to make up for the budgetary strains caused by poor local planning decisions. State funding for additional teachers is just part of the puzzle. Schools overwhelmed by rapid unsustainable growth are a definite factor, but the district fails to mention this in school board meetings.

Before relying on WC-1 funds and capital improvements to justify future growth, the district must report to the county the negative impact development has on our staffing levels, not just on the ability to build more schools.

Shelley Buchanan