

**MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 25, 2025  
WORK SESSION OF THE  
WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

February 25, 2025

**1. Opening Items**

**1.01 CALL TO ORDER**

The work session of the Board of Trustees was called to order at 10:04 a.m. in the Board Room of the Central Administration Building, located at 425 East Ninth Street in Reno, Nevada.

**1.02 ROLL CALL**

President Beth Smith and Trustees Adam Mayberry, Diane Nicolet, James Phoenix, Colleen Westlake, and Alex Woodley were present. Trustee Christine Hull was present via video conference. Superintendent Joe Ernst and staff were also present.

**1.03 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Jeff Bozzo, Budget Director, led the meeting in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**1.04 LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

President Smith read the land acknowledgement.

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

**2.01 PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT'S FISCAL YEAR 2025-26 BUDGET PROCESS AND STATUS; AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO DIRECT THE SUPERINTENDENT TO ANALYZE AND REPORT BACK TO THE BOARD NEW ITEMS RELATED TO THE FISCAL YEAR 2025-26 BUDGET**

Mark Mathers, Chief Financial Officer, began the presentation on the district's Fiscal Year 2025-26 (FY26) budget process and status. He noted the district had greater clarity on the Governor's recommended budget since the prior Board work session on February 11. The updated documents showed revenues for the State Education Fund were anticipated to remain flat due to the sales tax underperforming, especially in both Clark and Washoe Counties, with a 3.1% increase in FY26 and a 0.6% increase in FY27. For per-pupil funding, the new documents showed a decrease in the base funding by 1.1% in FY26

and an increase of 0.7% in FY27. The decrease in FY26 was due to cost-shifting funds to the SB231 account to expand the program to charter school employees. In terms of implications for the Washoe County School District, the per pupil funding remained flat for FY26 and showed an increase of 0.73%, or \$71, for FY27. Additionally, the district was anticipating an enrollment decrease of 1,025 students, which amounted to a reduction in revenues of just under \$10 million. Additional information was provided on SB231 funds and an overview of weighted funding amounts. The concerns were that the funding would not provide the appropriate amount needed for the district to off-set increased costs and expenses.

President Smith asked if school districts were able to provide the information to the Governor's Office or Nevada Department of Education prior to their development of the recommended budget so they understood the needs of the school districts throughout the state. She was concerned none of the school districts, including charter schools, were able to provide input. Mr. Mathers stated school districts were excluded from the early discussions per Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS), but the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) was part of the conversations. The Commission on School Funding was the only way to raise concerns and they did not provide a formal recommendation to the Governor or NDE.

President Smith appreciated the information that school districts were not allowed to take part in the development of the Governor's budget. She hoped NDE would advocate for stability in education funding and represent the needs of the school districts. Mr. Mathers agreed and noted that the district had previously raised concerns with the Commission on School Funding and in testimony to the State Board of Education as a way to provide input. One of the challenges for the district was having consistency in funding, especially for the weighted categories and understanding who was considered at-risk.

Trustee Nicolet noted there had been an increase in funding for at-risk students in the district. She wondered what had changed. Mr. Mathers stated he was unclear. The total at-risk funding for the state had decreased, but the district's portion had increased. One of the flaws with the at-risk category was that no one had a clear understanding of the factors that went into determining if a student was at-risk. He highlighted that the state was increasing the amount of special education funding they were providing during the biennium by \$25.6 million.

Jeff Bozzo, Budget Director, presented an overview of how the district's General Fund budget was developed, which began with a base budget, to which step increases and known cost changes were applied, and then the budget was aligned to what the district anticipated receiving from the state. Details on the known expenses were reviewed and showed an anticipated expenditure increase of \$28.5 million. Based on current anticipated revenues from the state and other sources, the district estimated there would



be a deficit in the General Fund of \$9.7 million. Future budget discussions would look for opportunities to close the deficit by providing cost-savings ideas.

President Smith commented that the budget outlook in 2023 also started in a similar, pessimistic place and that it was standard for the district to begin the process with conservative estimates prior to additional information coming out the Nevada Legislature. Mr. Mathers indicated that was a correct and in past years, after the Economic Forum met, there was optimism for increased state revenues; however, there appeared to be less optimism occurring during the current cycle, citing a lack of growth in sales tax revenues and broader economic headwinds, such as further reductions in federal funding.

Trustee Nicolet urged everyone to take a more optimistic approach because the district had always found a way forward. She expressed concern over the number of unfunded mandates under consideration by the Nevada Legislature.

*Trustee Woodley was absent from the meeting at 10:30 a.m.*

Mr. Mathers concluded the presentation with information on the next steps for the budget process. Since the Governor's Recommended Budget was delayed, the district was also about a month behind the normal budget schedule. He was confident that the district remained ahead of others in terms of budget analysis and planning. While the projected deficit of \$9.7 million was serious, he believed the district would be able to address it through potential operational savings, alternative funding strategies, and cost shifts. The district would continue to provide regular budget updates to the Board through updates and future work sessions.

President Smith opened the meeting to public comment.

Pablo Nava Duran spoke of the academic and programmatic imbalances between different high school elective class offerings. He believed it was important to provide equitable access to classes for all students but there were a number of high schools who were unable to offer classes such as theater or culinary arts for whatever reason. He was concerned that some schools were able to provide more for the students through booster support and signature programs, while other schools were left without comparable opportunities. He urged the Board to be mindful of the imbalances and take them into consideration in future budget discussions.

The Board received emails from the following:

- Christa Rossi
- Julie Cleghorn
- The Klint Family
- Lindsey Massie
- Carrie Yamamoto

John H.  
Melody Mehrabi

President Smith thanked staff for the information. Based on the presentation, she felt any decision-making related to the budget should be postponed until more information was known. She explained she would be requesting a fiscal analysis of the needs of the Internal Audit Department, which had seen reductions over the past few years due to budget constraints. The Department continued to function effectively, and their efforts were vital to maintaining public trust and financial integrity and it was important for the Board to ensure they continued to do so. The request would not commit the Board to any action but provide information on what resources would be needed should additional capacity be considered.

It was moved by President Smith and seconded by Trustee Westlake that **the Board of Trustees directs the Superintendent to conduct a fiscal analysis of needs of the Internal Audit Department and report the findings back at a future meeting of the Board of Trustees.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Christine Hull, Adam Mayberry, Diane Nicolet, James Phoenix, Beth Smith, and Colleen Westlake.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

It was moved by Trustee Westlake and seconded by Trustee Nicolet that **the Board of Trustees provides direction to the Superintendent to analyze and report back to the Board items related to the Fiscal Year 2025-26 budget.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Christine Hull, Adam Mayberry, Diane Nicolet, James Phoenix, Beth Smith, and Colleen Westlake.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

## **2.02 PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON THE WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT SCHOOL ALLOCATION PROCESS; AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO DIRECT THE SUPERINTENDENT TO ANALYZE AND REPORT BACK TO THE BOARD POTENTIAL CHANGES TO THE ALLOCATION PROCESS**

Tiffany McMaster, Deputy Superintendent, Dr. Mike Paul, Lead Elementary Associate Chief, and Jeff Bozzo, Budget Director, provided a presentation on the allocation process. The presentation covered how projected school enrollment and preliminary allocations were determined and the processes for making staffing adjustments throughout the school year. They would also provide information on other areas of interest identified by the Board, including collaborative school allocations, class size ratios in grades K-3, and special education student counts and allocation calculations. There were a variety of factors that influenced allocation decisions and the process involved balancing several priorities, such as ensuring adequate support for students while managing staffing challenges, the timing and impacts of decisions, addressing unique circumstances, and aligning decisions with available resources.

President Smith indicated she was interested in seeing a refinement in how special education students were weighted in the allocation process since some special education students were spending a significant portion of their days in general education classrooms but were not fully counted as part of the general allocation calculation for that classroom. She suggested exploring different approaches that were based on actual classroom presence rather than what program they were in, which could allow for targeted adjustments since large-scale funding shifts were not feasible at the present time.

Trustee Westlake agreed with President Smith's suggestion. She felt special education students should be counted as being in a particular classroom full-time regardless of the amount of time they spent there because of the impacts they had on the classroom. She was frustrated that the current system was failing to meet the needs of all students.

Superintendent Ernst emphasized that the current process was the result of deliberate, complex, and financially necessary decisions. The allocation process was a calculated and challenging effort that strove to meet the needs of both students and staff with available resources.

Dr. Paul provided an in-depth overview of how preliminary staffing allocations were determined, which began in November of the year prior with projections provided by the district's demographer and Business Department that were reviewed by Area Superintendents and the individual school principals. The differences between the allocation process for elementary schools and secondary schools was presented, with secondary schools being more complex due to the specialized licensure of secondary teachers.

Trustee Westlake requested additional information on the timeline for staff licensure. Doug Owen, Chief Human Resources Officer, explained the timeline was dependent on the type of licensure being sought. If someone held a license and wanted to move to another area of teaching, the process could take a few months for an adjacent teaching area or several years if someone wanted to move from elementary licensure to secondary licensure. The district's bill, Assembly Bill (AB) 49, was intended to ease the process and make such transitions more feasible for educators.

Ms. McMaster continued with the presentation and provided information on the spring and summer allocation adjustments, which were designed to reduce as much disruption at the beginning of a school year as possible and avoid reassigning teachers and shifting students between classes. The process included continuous reviews of the data and bi-weekly meetings among area superintendents, the Business Department, the Human Resources Department, and principals. While the district primarily used registration data from Infinite Campus, it was important to listen to anecdotal information from principals since they had a better understanding of what was occurring in their school communities. The district used trend data to determine a threshold for early allocation adjustments and

proactively manage staffing based on known program or rezoning impacts. If it looked like a school's enrollment was trending downward, the district provided the information as early as possible to the principal so they could hold off on hiring if it was likely a position would be removed on Count Day.

President Smith expressed concern over schools receiving allocations later in the summer and principals not having the time to hire someone, so a classroom began the school year with a long-term substitute rather than a permanent teacher. Ms. McMaster agreed the situation was not ideal and frustrating however it was difficult for the district to justify providing an additional allocation when the trend data showed that the allocation might be pulled back. The district wanted to ensure enrollment remained consistent over a specific period to create as little disruption as possible.

President Smith felt it was important for the district to look at a more flexible and nuanced approach to some of the situations. She had heard there were times when schools were asked to wait on an allocation and the classes began the year with larger sizes which caused families to withdraw out of frustration.

Trustee Westlake agreed with President Smith and urged the district to look at other classroom realities that could impact classrooms, such as behavioral needs, trauma, and student demographics. She wanted to ensure there was context associated with the model since 25 students with intensive needs was a much different environment than 25 students with minimal needs.

Mr. Bozzo presented information on Count Day and how the district handled allocation adjustments. He noted the Board had previously approved protecting allocations at 1- and 2-star schools throughout the current school year if their enrollment decreased to the point where an allocation would be removed. The district always tried to balance being fiscally responsible and minimizing disruption to student learning, which was why there was an emphasis on the timing of Count Day. When a school improved their star rating, the district provided them a "bridge year" so they could continue the forward trajectory.

Dr. Paul provided information on the midyear allocation process. He highlighted the numerous complexities and potential disruptions caused by re-allocating teachers midyear for both elementary and secondary schools. Additional considerations included classroom space availability, disruption of established student routines, changes to master schedules, or even if there were teachers available to hire.

Mr. Bozzo presented a detailed analysis regarding class size ratios in grades K-3. While state law prescribed a 16:1 ratio for grades K-2 and 18:1 ratio for grade 3, the funding for the ratios had historically fallen short. The district had developed their own ratios based on funding, which was 20:1 or 21:1 for K-3 classes.

President Smith wondered why some K-3 classrooms had 25 students if the district's ratio was 20/21:1. Mr. Bozzo indicated the district-wide average was 20/21:1. Consequently actual class sizes varied, with some kindergarten classes reaching up to 25 students.

The Trustees expressed frustration over the strain on teachers of the youngest students. They understood the rationale behind the process, but emphasized there was a need for on-going evaluation and potential policy shifts to better support early education. They believed it was also important for the Trustees and district staff to have a clear understanding of how the ratios were calculated and applied.

Superintendent Ernst emphasized the importance of clarifying the disconnect and ensure everyone understood the information being presented. While the Board and district might want to fund class sizes to the state ratios, there was a cost. For the district to meet the state ratios, they would need to hire an additional 203 teachers at an estimated annual cost of \$2.3 million.

*Trustee Woodley returned to the meeting at 12:32 p.m.*

The Trustees expressed interest in learning more about the costs of moving all K-3 classes to the district ratios. They were cognizant that the district was facing a projected deficit but believed it was important for the Board, and others, to have the information so they could make informed decisions.

Mr. Bozzo and Ms. McMaster provided additional information on the costs of reducing class sizes, as well as the tension between the desire to lower class sizes and the district's financial and staffing constraints. It was equally important for the Board to consider the district's ability to recruit enough qualified teachers, as each reduction in class size created a new vacancy. The presentation was concluded with information on special education allocations. Caseloads for special education teachers were set by Nevada Administrative Code and the district had to seek exceptions to those limits because while hiring had improved, challenges remained.

President Smith opened the meeting to public comment.

Pablo Nava Duran spoke of the future closure of Edward Pine Middle School and where the teachers from the school would go. He hoped the district would take into consideration moving programs that served students with higher needs, such as English language learners and special education. He appreciated the information included in the presentation and the clarity it provided to the allocation process.

President Smith indicated that based on the discussions, the Board was interested in seeing additional analysis on special education allocations based on how much time the

students spent in general education classrooms to determine if a bifurcated model was needed to reflect the differences in student supports required, and the need for a 1–2-year transition plan for schools facing closure and/or consolidation.

Trustee Phoenix inquired if staff believed they could implement a different model for special education allocations. Ms. McMaster remarked that they could conduct an analysis; however, the challenge was that Individual Education Plans (IEPs) could change and the needs of students shifted throughout the school year.

It was moved by Trustee Woodley and seconded by Trustee Westlake that **the Board of Trustees provides direction to the Superintendent to analyze and report back to the Board potential changes to the district’s allocation process based on the discussion.**

President Smith opened the motion for discussion.

Trustee Nicolet believed the motion was overly broad and asked what the Board was trying to fix regarding the allocation process.

The Trustees discussed potential ways to refine the motion.

President Smith offered the following as a friendly amendment based on the conversation: "...based on the discussion and to include an analysis of achieving district-wide class size ratios across all K-3 classrooms.

Trustee Woodley, as the maker of the motion, agreed. Trustee Westlake, as the secondar, agreed.

The final motion was: **the Board of Trustees provides direction to the Superintendent to analyze and report back to the Board potential changes to the district’s allocation process, based on the discussion and to include an analysis of achieving district-wide class size ratios across all K-3 classrooms.**

The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Christine Hull, Adam Mayberry, Diane Nicolet, James Phoenix, Beth Smith, Colleen Westlake, and Alex Woodley.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

### **3. Closing Items**

#### **3.01 PUBLIC COMMENT**

Pablo Nava Duran mentioned he had attended a recent Zoning Advisory Committee meeting. He indicated the public sentiment strongly opposed to students being rezoned

to Earl Wooster High School. He spoke of the challenges at Wooster High School since COVID and that many families were looking at other options for their students and transferring to other high schools. He believed many students were looking for additional academic and extracurricular opportunities and the Board should take note of the community's concerns.

The Board received emails from Aleece Rose and Sandee Tibbett.

### **3.02 ADJOURN MEETING**

There being no further business to come before the members of the Board, President Smith declared the meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

---


**Elizabeth Smith, President**

---

**Alex Woodley, Clerk**

---

**From:** Aleece Rose  
**Sent:** Friday, February 21, 2025 2:51 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Cc:** Zoning  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Huffaker Rezoning

 External Email: This email originated outside of WCSD. Please exercise caution. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good Afternoon,

I want to thank each of you for all your hard work and diligence!

I have 1 child that went through Huffaker and is now at Swope in the GT Magnet Program 7th grade, and 1 child in 5th grade at Huffaker. I live in the Lakeridge Springs community and am on the north side of Windy Hill.

I have been a part of these schools for about a decade, and I myself attended Swope and Reno High School as a child. I currently sit on the PFA board for Swope and am heavily involved in both of these schools.

After the Feb 20th Zoning Committee meeting some things have come to light.

There was an overwhelming presence from the Huffaker families, all of which were AGAINST the Vaughn Wooster options. All of the points made by the parents were valid and of real concern.

- Driving times and distances
- Community alignment
- Sports alignment for our kids
- The price of our homes when we bought them reflected certain schools
- The fragmentation we have already suffered from the last rezoning decision
- There are much closer schools that could be rezoned to Vaughn before even considering Huffaker
- The declining enrollment of Reno High indicates no reason to rezone our HS

Many of us feel as though our school is being targeted and discriminated against because we have no "nearby" MS or HS. So the thought is just stick us with anyone. Our communities have strong historical ties to the Reno High area, and we don't appreciate that being overlooked. Everyone of my neighbors went to Reno High, and some of their parents. Reno High is supported by generations of families and grads. WE ARE PART OF THAT!

There was a pretty natural consensus last night that MOST of the families are closer to Swope and would prefer we go back to our historically zoned MS.



With school of choice being an option, those few that are on the other side of Windy Hill have the option to join Herz. The data shows Herz will not be anywhere near capacity anytime soon (10+ years), allowing this option to stay viable for the foreseeable future.

This option will allow for less funds spent on busing the entire Huffaker zone to Herz, and having some of our kids on the bus 45+ minutes morning and evening.

If the School Board chooses to rezone ALL of Huffaker to Herz, those families that live less than 10 minutes from Swope will now be driving 20+ minutes each way to school EVERYDAY!

Secondary options-

I know split feeder schools are not very popular with the school board, however many parents and committee members acknowledge that it might be a perfect solution to this problem. Our zone has a natural split at Windy Hill. On the North side you have families that can get to McCarren in less than 2 minute and Swope in 10 or less. On the South side you have families that utilize Huffaker Lane/Holcomb and/or the freeway to get to Herz very quickly.

I urge you to see the simplest and most effective solution for school resources, our kids, and the families and communities around Huffaker.

Rezone us back to our original MS. It would effectively increase Swopes numbers by roughly 30 kids (55 total 5th graders, 15 are already in Swopes numbers for next year, and many families have done school of choice, effectively leaving about 30 kids going to Swope next year). According to the data that was presented last night our population is declining over the next 10years so the number of Huffaker to Swope students would be even less in the future.

Thank you for your time,

--

Cheers,

**Aleece Rose FDN-P**  
CEO/Owner Health Designed

---

**From:** Rossi, Christa  
**Sent:** Monday, February 24, 2025 1:01 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Cc:** Drlik, Dawn; Concha, Leontina M  
**Subject:** Decrease the Kindergarten Student to Teacher Ration

Good afternoon,

Thank you for taking the time to read my email. I am writing to you today to ask that the WSCD Board of Trustees bring down the student to teacher ratios for Kindergarten.

I have been a teacher with WSCD for 15 years. Of those 15 years I have taught Kindergarten for 9. My first year as a Kindergarten teacher, I had 18 students. My second year was a unique experience, I team taught and together we had 40 students. Experiencing an increase of 2 more than they year prior, if I had remained a stand-alone teacher. Each year, with the exception of the 20-21 school year, the number of students that I have been placed on my roster has increased. This school year, like many of my colleagues, I have 25 Kindergarten students.

A few years ago, prior to Kindergarten becoming a requirement before attending first grade, I was always told that because Kindergarten isn't mandatory an official cap can't be placed on the grade. When participating in a professional development with various Kindergarten teachers in the state we were informed that the "unofficial cap" for Kindergarten is 19 students. This of course led to an interesting conversation as many teachers throughout WSCD were sharing that their numbers exceeded that unofficial cap.

The Nevada Department of Education's website has links to NRS 388.700 REDUCTION OF PUPIL-TEACHER RATIO that states "In kindergarten and grades 1 and 2, must not exceed 16 to 1, and in grade 3, must not exceed 18 to 1." Knowing this is the recommendation and a statute, why is it adhered to for 1st grade and higher, but not at all for Kindergarten?

I have 25 students in my Kindergarten class. My fellow Kindergarten teachers also have 25 students in their class. Many teachers, according to the "2024-2025 Assembly Bill 304" are also experiencing higher numbers than the recommended state ratio.

There-in lies one question: if the department of education is recommending 16:1, why is the number of students in my class, and other classes, higher?

I asked the president of our union Calen Evans and received a very prompt response. In short, I was told that, yes, the department of education does set a recommended ration, but they do not fund their recommendations. I have included his response at the bottom of this email. While his response explains why the numbers are so high it doesn't excuse the challenges that many Kindergarten teachers are facing due to the high-class sizes.

Many Kindergarten teachers are very concerned about this increased ratio. 25 students per class is not manageable, even with the funded Kindergarten aide positions for each school. While the Kindergarten

aide position has been available since the 2023-2024 school year, some schools like Caughlin Ranch, weren't able to hire as no one applied for the position. Even this year we had our first applicant quit before spring break. Our 2nd hire is great and appreciated but can't support every teacher every day as they are only one person. We have to schedule the time between 3 teachers and classrooms. The extra support is not sufficient to support the youngest learners in our school district. If the funding can be found for an aide for a class to share, why can't there be funding for an additional teacher be allocated?

For next year we have 54 students already registered. At the current ratio of 25 students per class, we already have 2 full classes. How can kindergarten teachers be expected to have students master standards and provide specific and timely feedback for learning when numbers keep increasing?

Thank you for your time,  
Christa Rossi

*Christa Rossi, M.Ed  
Washoe County School District  
Caughlin Ranch Elementary School  
Kindergarten Teacher*

*Below message is from Calen Evans:*  
Good morning,

I appreciate you reaching out. You're absolutely right, kindergarten class sizes are way too high, and it's something that needs to be addressed. Nevada already has the largest class sizes in the country, and we can't even staff within our current guidelines. That's exactly why we're pushing so hard to improve the system, because until we get to a place where we're not constantly short-staffed, it's impossible to start making real progress on lowering class sizes.


The state does set recommended ratios, but they don't fund them, and every year, districts can request waivers to go over those numbers. That's why you see such a gap between the state's "recommended" ratios and what actually happens in classrooms. As for why first and second grade have lower ratios than kindergarten, those grades have specific NRS caps, so the only way to reduce kindergarten numbers right now would be to increase third, fourth, and fifth grade ratios. With that being said we've been advocating for the reduction in kinder ratios and will be working with the district's team on possible solutions.

We know how tough this is, and we're going to keep pushing to fix it. Let me know if you want to talk more or if there's anything else I can do to support you.

Calen

---

**From:** Julie Cleghorn  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 23, 2025 8:08 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Class size


 External Email: This email originated outside of WCSD. Please exercise caution. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am writing in hopes you can do something about class sizes. I have taught this year with 35 4th graders and I am exhausted physically, mentally and emotionally. We need allocations from the start of the school year to start with so we aren't searching for teachers in October. Secondly, not having better ratios for all elementary students is a disservice for students, teachers and school buildings. There is no way to reach all students when you have too many in your class. Please do everything in your power to change this. Teachers can't work in these conditions.

Julie Cleghorn

---

**From:** Kendra Klint  
**Sent:** Monday, February 24, 2025 4:09 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Caughlin Ranch Elementary Kindergarten Classes 2025-2026

 External Email: This email originated outside of WCSD. Please exercise caution. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello!

I am writing to you today as a parent with an incoming Kindergartener for the 2025-2026 school year. I am asking that you decrease the student to teacher ratio to the recommended 16:1. Our youngest learners deserve focused attention and instruction in order to foster a love for school and learning.

Thank you.

Klint Family


Sent from my iPhone

## Batchelder, Jennifer

---

**From:** Lindsey Massie <lindseybmassie@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 24, 2025 6:30 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Kindergarten teacher Ratio

You don't often get email from lindseybmassie@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

 External Email: This email originated outside of WCSD. Please exercise caution. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello!

I am writing to you today as a parent with an incoming Kindergartener for the 2025-2026 school year. I am asking that you decrease the student to teacher ratio to the recommended 16:1. Our youngest learners deserve focused attention and instruction in order to foster a love for school and learning.

Thank you.


Lindsey Massie

## Batchelder, Jennifer

---

**From:** Carrie Yamamoto <carrie.yamamoto24@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 24, 2025 8:41 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Kinder class size

You don't often get email from carrie.yamamoto24@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

 External Email: This email originated outside of WCSD. Please exercise caution. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello!

I am writing to you today as a parent with a current Kindergartener for the 2024-2025 school year. I am a volunteer and have seen first hand how difficult the class size is for 1 teacher without an aide. For the future, I am asking that you decrease the student to teacher ratio to the recommended 16:1. Our youngest learners deserve focused attention and instruction in order to foster a love for school and learning.


Thank you,  
Carrie Yamamoto

## Batchelder, Jennifer

---

**From:** John H <johnfromreno@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 24, 2025 10:16 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Kindergarten class size

You don't often get email from johnfromreno@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

 External Email: This email originated outside of WCSD. Please exercise caution. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello!


I am writing to you today as a parent with an incoming Kindergartener for the 2025-2026 school year. I am asking that you decrease the student to teacher ratio to the recommended 16:1. Our youngest learners deserve focused attention and instruction in order to foster a love for school and learning.

Thank you.



---

**From:** Melody Mehrabi  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 25, 2025 10:47 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request to Reduce Student-to-Teacher Ratio for Kindergarten

 External Email: This email originated outside of WCSD. Please exercise caution. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I'm reaching out as a parent of an incoming Kindergartener for the 2025-2026 school year to advocate for a lower student-to-teacher ratio. I strongly ask you to reduce the ratio to the recommended 16:1.

Our youngest learners thrive with individualized attention, which is crucial in fostering a love for school and learning. Ensuring they receive the support they need will set a strong foundation for their educational journey.

Thank you for your time and consideration.


Best regards,

--

**Melody Mehrabi,**

---

**From:** Sommer Elston  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 25, 2025 11:01 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Kindergarten Class Sizes

 External Email: This email originated outside of WCSD. Please exercise caution. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello!


I'm reaching out as a parent of a soon-to-be Kindergartener for the 2025-2026 school year. I'd love to see the student-to-teacher ratio reduced to the recommended 16:1. Our youngest learners thrive with more individual attention, helping them build a strong foundation and a love for learning.

I truly appreciate your time and consideration—thank you so much!

--

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 25, 2025 7:33 AM  
**To:** Hull, Christine; Westlake, Colleen M; Phoenix, James; Smith, Elizabeth A; Woodley, Alex; Mayberry, Adam; Nicolet, Diane M  
**Cc:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Federal Funding at Risk Over DEI Programs

 External Email: This email originated outside of WCSD. Please exercise caution. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning, Trustees,

This is a critical issue threatening our district's federal funding, so I am very surprised and disappointed to not see this on today's agenda. You are all aware of the recent directives from the U.S. Department of Education requiring all federally funded schools to eliminate Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) programs within 14 days or risk losing vital financial support. This could mean millions in cuts for our school district. These are vital dollars that pay for our teachers, our special education, and our student's meals.

Yes, after a decade of DEI, our graduation rates are up (84.2% last year), but our test scores are flat or are falling, with 8th-grade math proficiency down to 28% from 33% as an example. Classrooms are less disciplined, and resources are stretched thin on initiatives that divide more than they unite. Now, with funding on the line, it's time to rethink "your work". Our school district can't afford to die on the DEI hill that's underdelivering when our kids' future, and our budget, hang in the balance.

Please act swiftly to assess and remove DEI programs that jeopardize our federal support. Prioritize core education—math, reading, science—over ideology. I urge you to discuss this at your earliest opportunity and share a plan with the community. Our students deserve **merit-based** focus, not funding cuts.

Thank you,  
Sandee Tibbett  
District C