

**MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 9, 2018
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

October 9, 2018

1. Opening Items

1.01 CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees was called to order at 2:02 p.m. at the Washoe County School District's Central Administration Building, 425 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada.

1.02 ROLL CALL

President Katy Simon Holland and Board Members Debra Feemster, Veronica Frenkel, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, and Malena Raymond were present. Board Member Angela Taylor was not present at the time of roll call. Superintendent Traci Davis, Deputy Superintendent Kristen McNeill, Chief of Staff David Lasic, Student Representative Anonti Ali, and staff were also present.

1.03 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Cristina Oronoz led the meeting in the Pledge of Allegiance.

1.04 PUBLIC COMMENT

John Eppolito remarked that, as the president of Protect Nevada Children, he had been asking various questions related to the protection of student information and data for a number of years. Most recently, he had been asking why the District no longer allowed parents and guardians to opt their children out of having a District email address, but had not received a response. He also believed that many of the statements made by the Board had been misleading or false related to third party educational technology vendors, such as Edmodo. He was aware of a number of teachers who used the programs provided by the vendors as "babysitters" for students because of the large class sizes. He urged the Board to educate the parents and families about the problems with the third-party vendors and allow them to decide if their children should participate.

Trustee Taylor arrived at the meeting at 2:06 p.m.

1.05 ACTION TO ADOPT THE AGENDA

It was moved by Trustee Frenkel and seconded by Trustee Kelley that **the Board of Trustees approves the agenda as presented.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: Pass (Yea: Debra Feemster, Veronica Frenkel, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, Malena Raymond and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

2. Consent Agenda Items

President Simon Holland opened the meeting to public comment.

John Eppolito provided remarks related to Consent Agenda Item 2.09, Approval of the Microsoft Volume Licensing 3-year agreement and payment for Fiscal Year 2019 in the amount of \$613,249.71. He believed that Microsoft was better at protecting student information than other vendors, but was still concerned over their ability to collect and store information. He understood the need for students to learn about technology but felt there were better ways the District could go about providing that education.

It was moved by Trustee Mayer and seconded by Trustee Taylor that **the Board of Trustees approves Consent Agenda Items 2.02 through 2.09.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: Pass (Yea: Debra Feemster, Veronica Frenkel, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, Malena Raymond and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

- 2.02 The Board of Trustees approved the second one (1) year extension contract with United Health Care for the fully insured portion of the Employer Group Waiver Plan (EGWP) for an effective date of January 1, 2019 for a rate of \$93.88 per member per month.
- 2.03 The Board of Trustees approved the addendum to the L/P Insurance Services contract for an increase of \$6,000 per year, for a total annual amount of \$101,160, effective November 1, 2018, through December 31, 2020.
- 2.04 The Board of Trustees approved the new contract for Human Capital Management System with PeopleAdmin in the amount of \$868,238.73 for five (5) years beginning November 1, 2018, and ending October 31, 2023.
- 2.05 The Board of Trustees approved the participation agreement through Nevada Health Partners with Northern Nevada Medical Center to be effective January 1, 2019.
- 2.06 The Board of Trustees awarded Bid #020-02-09-19, Milk and Other Dairy Products, to Model Dairy in the estimated annual amount of \$1,545,851.09

for a term of two (2) years beginning October 9, 2018, and ending October 8, 2020.

- 2.07 The Board of Trustees awarded Bid #61186A, Fire Alarm Upgrades at Edward L. Pine Middle School, to Baldwin Electrical Installations, Inc. in the amount of \$181,046.
- 2.08 The Board of Trustees awarded Bid #61186B, Fire Alarm upgrades at Desert Heights Elementary School, to Nelson Electric Co., Inc. in the amount of \$121,640.
- 2.09 The Board of Trustees approved the Microsoft Volume Licensing 3-year agreement and payment for Fiscal Year 2019 in the amount of \$613,429.71.

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

3.01 A PRESENTATION TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES REGARDING TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE'S (TMCC) MEN OF COLOR (MOC) MENTORING PROGRAM PARTNERING WITH FOUR (4) DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOLS: GALENA HIGH SCHOOL, PROCTER R. HUG HIGH SCHOOL, NORTH VALLEYS HIGH SCHOOL, AND EDWARD C. REED HIGH SCHOOL

Debra Biersdorff, Chief Academic Officer, introduced the agenda item to the Board of Trustees. The Men of Color program at Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC) was an important mentoring program that worked within high schools in the District to prepare students for higher education.

Sharon Wurm, Executive Director, Student Success Office, TMCC, explained the Men of Color program began in 2016 to increase enrollment and graduation rates for underrepresented groups of young men at TMCC. The school was committed to the program and had recruited a coordinator who understood the importance of education for young men who had life experiences that were not conducive to college preparation.

Miguel Martinez, Access Outreach Recruitment Coordinator, TMCC, began the presentation on the Men of Color Mentorship Program. The program was important because there was about a 10% disparity between female and male graduation rates, which was even larger for some subgroups in the community. The gaps were widest among Hispanic and Africa-American populations. When TMCC reviewed the data, they determined it would be important to provide a mentoring program to young men interested in attending college and reaching their professional goals. Students were identified during their sophomore year in high school and support provided to both the students and the families. The program would see their first high school graduates during the current school year from Galena High School, North Valleys High School, and Edward

C. Reed High School. The program began recruiting students at Procter R. Hug High School this school year, so it would be 2 years before students from Hug High School graduated. The goal of the program was that students took away five (5) things: ability to demonstrate professionalism and learn leadership skills, ability to navigate college funding options, giving back to the community, ability to succeed in college, and articulate components of their own identity.

President Simon Holland asked what articulate components of their own identity meant. Mr. Martinez remarked that it was the ability to talk about themselves, where they came from, and how their life experiences would define what college would be like for them and how that would be different from the college experience of others because of life experiences.

Mr. Martinez continued with the presentation. The mentors would meet with the students one-on-one, as well as in group sessions, to ensure they were aware of different opportunities coming up that they should take advantage of, such as dual credit deadlines and summer programs. Some of the information and various opportunities presented to students and families were shared with the Board. Currently, 40 students were enrolled in the program. The hope was that the number would increase to 80 students by the end of the school year. Over 74% of the students were Hispanic, 7.5% were African-American, 6% were Pacific Islander, and 12% multi-racial.

Cristina Oronoz, Principal, Procter R. Hug High School, mentioned Hug High School was interested in implementing the program because there was a 15% gap in core credit attainment between males and females in the 9th grade and that gap widened to 20% by the end of 10th grade. The staff at Hug High School understood there were a variety of reasons for the gap, but believed the Men of Color program was one tool they could use to engage minority male students more.

Trustee Taylor wondered where the mentors for the program were from. Mr. Martinez indicated all mentors were on-staff at TMCC, with 5 of the mentors being part-time student employees and 2 full-time employees.

Trustee Feemster asked if there was the possibility of extending the program to 9th graders. Mr. Martinez remarked that they were looking into the possibility of recruiting students earlier. The sophomore year was selected because that appeared to be when students began falling behind but still had time to turn everything around. He was also interested in working with the middle schools so the parents at least had the information on the program earlier.

President Simon Holland inquired about how the program was funded. Mr. Martinez noted a combination of resources funded the program, including TMCC's General Fund, grant opportunities, GEAR UP, and the state.

Trustee Raymond asked if the program would continue to support students after they began college. Mr. Martinez stated that the current program was a 3-year program. Students would apply their sophomore year and the mentoring would continue through at least the first semester of college. Ms. Wurm added that the hope was that the students would also apply for the Nevada Promise Scholarship, which provided 3-year mentoring when students began college.

President Simon Holland wondered if the program was looking at specific strategies to increase the number of African-American students in the program and if TMCC was also recruiting Native American students. Ms. Oronoz noted that different schools recruited students in different ways. Hug High School was identifying students and then reaching out to the parents to see if there was interest.

Student Representative Ali asked if the program was looking at working with other high schools in the District. Mr. Martinez indicated that if the program reached 80 students, they would be close to capacity with the number of mentors currently on staff. He would be interested in offering the program at all high schools in the Washoe County School District if additional funding were identified.

President Simon Holland and Trustee Taylor mentioned that No Opportunity Wasted (NOW) might be interested in providing additional support. NOW worked with Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), but they also focused on similar populations and opportunities.

3.02 PRESENTATION FOR THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES ON TITLE I SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT SECTION 1003(a), TITLE IV A, NEVADA K.I.D.S. READ/READ BY GRADE THREE, AND TURNAROUND GRANTS, AND SELECTED PROGRAMMING SUPPORTING THESE GRANT PROGRAMS

Dr. Kristen McNeill, Deputy Superintendent, explained the Board had requested a presentation on some of the programs for school improvement offered through the Nevada Department of Education. The presentation would look at the strategies for each program, which included a review of data to make informed decision-making, support provided to some of the lowest performing schools, and the different types of funding mechanism used by the District for the schools.

Debra Biersdorff, Chief Academic Officer, noted the Nevada Department of Education assisted all school districts in Nevada in applying and administering grant funds from the federal government. The Nevada Department of Education wanted to ensure the outcomes of the programs supported the state improvement plans they were required to submit to the U.S. Department of Education.

Ben Hayes, Chief Accountability Officer, presented information on the Title I School Improvement Section 1003(a) grant, which was part of the Title I funding the District received. The state would identify the lowest performing schools in the school districts. School districts would then have the opportunity to apply for the funding if the tenets outlined by the state were included in the school performance plan. The tenets included a focus on leadership development, data informed decision-making, and focus on low performing schools. The Washoe County School District was awarded funds for four (4) schools during the 2017-18 School Year and had been awarded funds for eight (8) schools during the current school year.

President Simon Holland asked if the grants were competitive or formula driven. Mr. Hayes indicated the 1003(a) grants were competitive.

Mr. Hayes continued with the presentation. The focus of the 1003(a) grant was to increase school performance to at least a three (3) star rating and sustain that higher performance. The state required a focused approach on improvement based on evidence included in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Schools were allowed to work with state-approved vendors on implementation of the improvement plans, with most in Washoe County working with Partners in School Innovations.

Randy Drake, Assistant Director of Grants, presented information on the Title IV A grant. The grant was currently a competitive grant, but would move to a formula based grant for the next school year. The intent of the Title IV A grant was to improve student academic achievement in three (3) different ways: 1) provide a well-rounded education; 2) improve school safety conditions to increase student learning; and 3) utilize technology to improve academic achievement and digital literacy. The District had used funding from the Title IV A grant to hire additional social workers, re-engagement specialists, social and emotional learning coaches, an equity and diversity coach, and a 21st Century learning coach. The additional staff members not only assisted students, but were also able to provide training and leadership development to teachers and other school site staff to improve student achievement.

Mr. Hayes mentioned Desert Heights and Natchez Elementary Schools were two of the original schools to be included in the Title IV A grant. They had started working with a District-data coach prior to receiving the grant funding and were now working with Partners in School Innovations to create a train the trainer model that could be used in other schools throughout the District. The train the trainer model was important because the funding received for the current school year was not enough to provide data coaches in the additional schools added to the grant. The goal of the train the trainer model was to allow coaching in the schools so teachers and administrators did not have to be pulled out of the buildings.

Ms. Biersdorff provided information on Nevada K.I.D.S. Read/Read by Grade Three grant programming. The funding was based on a competitive grant and the awarded based on the literacy plan for the District and individual school. Additionally, for a school to receive the grant funding, they could not be receiving Zoom School or Victory School funding. Essential elements of the program were similar to the focus of other grant programs: leadership and sustainability, data driven decision-making, alignment of program to state expectations, professional learning opportunities, and a strong focus and commitment to family and community engagement.

Mr. Hayes presented the Turnaround grant program to the Board. The intent of the Turnaround grant was similar to the 1003(a) grant, except the funding for the Turnaround grant was from the state, not the federal government. The state had similar requirements surrounding school improvement, but opened the applicant pool to any school that was able to pinpoint areas of improvement they were interested in focusing on to increase student achievement and reduce achievement gaps.

Roberta Duvall, Principal, Cold Springs Middle School, explained how Turnaround grant funding had been utilized at Cold Springs Middle School. Cold Springs Middle School had not seen additional funding because they were not eligible for Title I funding or similar opportunities. The school partnered with Solution Tree to work with school leadership on how the additional funding could be utilized to reduce achievement gaps. Cold Springs Middle School was also working with the elementary schools in the area since they were an important part of student achievement as well. There was no real additional commitment on the part of staff, but instead the program was more collaborative in nature and had teachers working together on programming. The school had been working with Solution Tree for over a year and were now learning about how the programming could be sustained if they did not receive the additional funds in the future.

Trustee Kelley wondered how the Board could help improve the chances of the District receiving additional grant funding and if there were matching requirements the District had to adhere to. Mr. Drake noted the criteria for each grant was different, but there was a greater chance of receiving positive funding if the school or District program was aligned to the state's plan. The grants presented did not require the District to match any funds.

Trustee Frenkel asked if the schools applied individually for the grants and competed against each other or if the District would apply for the grants on behalf of the schools. Mr. Hayes remarked that the District's Grants Department would identify eligible schools and work with the area superintendents to determine if the schools were interested in applying. The Grants Department would then assist the schools with the application process. David Lasic, Chief of Staff, clarified that a single application was submitted on behalf of all the schools in the District, with the individual schools providing a narrative on how the funding would be used.

President Simon Holland inquired if Cold Springs Middle School had seen any results from the programming yet. Ms. Duvall stated she had seen additional collaboration and discussions during staff professional development times. There was improved and increased focus on student success at the school now, with the staff much more interested in getting to know individual student stories so better supports could be provided. Mr. Hayes added the District had seen an improvement in test scores at Cold Springs Middle School.

Trustee Raymond asked about the reporting requirements for the grants. Mr. Lasic explained there were reporting requirements for both the state and federal governments related to the individual grants. Most of the reporting was completed by the Grant Department, with cooperation from the Office of Accountability.

President Simon Holland recessed the meeting for 15 minutes.

3.03 PRESENTATION TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES REGARDING SEXUALITY, HEALTH, AND RESPONSIBILITY EDUCATION (SHARE) UPDATE FROM THE OFFICE OF ACADEMICS, DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION FOR THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES TO PROVIDE DIRECTION TO THE SHARE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Debra Biersdorff, Chief Academic Officer, mentioned the Board had requested an update on the Sexuality, Health, and Responsibility Education (SHARE) Advisory Committee. The current curriculum had not been updated since 2003 and the Trustees were anxious to see a curriculum that was current and relevant to educate students.

Rochelle Procter, SHARE Facilitator, explained the SHARE Committee was moving forward with the intent to update the high school curriculum during the current school year and then review the middle school and elementary school curriculum. She began working with a group of high school health teachers in the spring to determine what was missing from the current SHARE curriculum, what information could be retained, and what had changed since the last update. She took their suggestions, then began looking at what other school districts were using across the county. One of the primary goals was to include information related to LGBTQ+ students that had not been included previously in the curriculum.

President Simon Holland requested clarification on the timeline and that an update to the elementary school curriculum would not be in place until the 2021-2022 School Year. Ms. Procter indicated that was correct.

Trustee Frenkel recalled that a curriculum update had been in progress a couple of years ago and she wondered what happened to that information. Kindra Fox, Director of

Curriculum and Instruction, explained there had been a lot of discomfort expressed by members of the community in the curriculum that was being developed. The District was not comfortable presenting the curriculum to the Board for that reason and because the curriculum had been developed by an organization that had some political issues at the time. Staff determined the District should look at building their own curriculum so it would be relevant to students within Washoe County.

Trustee Frenkel remarked that she was uncomfortable with the proposed timeline for completion because there were a lot of issues related to sexuality occurring in the country and students needed to be educated on the facts surrounding sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), protection, consent, and inclusion. Ms. Fox mentioned information related to those particular topics would be included in the update to the high school curriculum, which should be completed by the end of the current school year. The District could look at incorporating some of the lessons into the middle school and elementary school curriculums as appropriate.

Trustee Taylor also expressed concern over the proposed timeline. She understood and supported the reasons staff held back on bringing the curriculum to the Board, but felt the timeline had to be shortened to address immediate concerns impacting the health and safety of students. She urged staff to work with the SHARE Committee on developing a new timeline.

President Simon Holland agreed with the prior remarks. She wondered if the topics could be addressed for all grades at the same time, instead of focusing on the grade levels. Ms. Biersdorff indicated staff could share the desire of the Board to move up the timeline at the next SHARE Committee meeting. She reminded the Board that the process did take time because the District sought input from various groups, such as parents and guardians, community members, and teachers.

President Simon Holland expressed appreciation for the work staff had done on the curriculum because it was challenging work. The topic was one that was not easy and had torn apart communities across the country, but the current Board believed that not preparing the students for all aspects of life was a liability.

Ms. Proctor continued with the presentation. Some of the updates already occurring related to the SHARE curriculum were that parents now signed their children up for the program during on-line registration. The new process allowed schools to see exactly who had not signed a release and work directly with that family.

Claudia Bessette, Chair, SHARE Committee, noted that the on-line form was new and there were some parents who had not signed up because they completed an early registration packet. Schools were reaching out to those families as well. The SHARE Committee was also interested in including third grade parents in the preview nights at

the schools so the families would know in advance if they wanted their children to participate. Additional information would also be provided to non-English speaking families related to the curriculum, especially for middle school students.

Trustee Raymond thanked staff and the Committee for the information. She appreciated that third grade families would be included in the preview nights. Ms. Bessette believed the parents would have a better understanding of the program and curriculum if they were invited to participate sooner. Ms. Proctor noted the District had already conducted the high school preview nights for SHARE and the parent attendance had doubled from last year, so parents were also concerned with what was being included and excluded from the curriculum. She would begin the middle school preview nights soon and had been working with some parent involvement facilitators at Title I Schools to present information during some of their parent meetings. She believed she could present a revised timeline to the SHARE Committee at their next meeting that would allow changes for all grade levels to occur beginning with the 2019-2020 School Year.

President Simon Holland mentioned she would receive questions from community members on the curriculum and what an inclusive curriculum was. She wondered if staff could provide some information so the Board would be able to properly advocate for the work occurring. Ms. Proctor remarked that she was hesitant to share too much because the Committee had not seen the information yet. Generally, the curriculum should include accurate vocabulary and terminology when addressing different student populations, contraceptive methods, sexual assault, and being an ally. Ms. Bessette reminded the Board that each school had a team of counselors that advocated for students and were willing to work with teachers and parents so that if there were concerns, the students and their families would know who to go to.

Trustee Frenkel thanked staff and the Committee members for their work. She was passionate about the topic because she had a daughter who went through the District from kindergarten and was not included in the curriculum as a gay woman. It was challenging for her daughter when she was exploring her identity and having others acknowledging who she was. She was disappointed she would not be a part of the Board when the curriculum was approved, but encouraged those Board members who would remain to recognize not everyone would be comfortable with the changes to the curriculum, but that those changes were necessary.

President Simon Holland opened the meeting to public comment.

Brooke Maylath expressed concern and frustration over the slow process to update the SHARE curriculum. She had been attending meetings of the SHARE Committee for the past several years and had not seen much progress. She had attended a meeting of the Committee in March 2018, where staff told the Committee that they wanted to gather additional information from the high school counselors on the curriculum. She was

frustrated that 7 months later there was still no curriculum for the Committee to approve. She claimed that around 50% of boys had already discovered pornography on the internet by the third grade and that the District was remiss in their duties to teach proper, medically accurate information to the children of Washoe County. She believed that if the pace of updating the curriculum could not be sped up, then the District needed to determine if the proper person was in charge of the program.

Tiffany Hoffman was a member of the SHARE Committee, but providing comments as the parent of a senior at Reno High School. She was frustrated that every day she would hear incorrect information being stated as fact from teenagers and then have to correct the information. She felt the District, and the community, were failing the children of Washoe County by not providing them with comprehensive sex education. She was frustrated that the curriculum previously considered by the SHARE Committee had not been presented to the Board of Trustees and felt that the 3 years she had spent on the Committee were wasted. However, she hoped to continue working with the Committee to put forward a curriculum that served the students.

President Simon Holland wondered if the Board needed to make a formal motion related to the discussion. Neil Rombardo, Chief General Counsel, recommended that a motion be made and voted on to ensure all Trustees were heard from.

It was moved by Trustee Taylor and seconded by Trustee Frenkel that **the Board of Trustees directs the Superintendent to work with staff and the SHARE Advisory Committee to reconsider the projected timeline for approval of a revised SHARE curriculum and that the curriculum should take into account Board comments related to inclusiveness.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: Pass (Yea: Debra Feemster, Veronica Frenkel, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, Malena Raymond and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

3.04 **PRESENTATION AND OVERVIEW OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2017-2018 AND PLANS FOR 2018-2019**

David Lasic, Chief of Staff, stated that in a prior work session, the Trustees held a discussion on the metrics surrounding the Board's community engagement activities. The presentation would provide information to the Board on what had occurred during the prior school year and proposed plans moving forward.

Samantha Fredrickson, Board Community Engagement Coordinator, began the presentation. The Community Engagement Plan for the 2017-18 School Year was reviewed. The Plan included community surveys, budget forums, and individual Talk with a Trustee events. Information related to each aspect of the Plan were presented and reviewed. She reminded the Board that the District also conducted various community

engagement opportunities that the Trustees were invited to, but did not lead. Based on the feedback from all community engagement opportunities, the Plan for the current school year was to continue to conduct community surveys surrounding the budget, budget forums, and Talk with a Trustee events. In conjunction with the Spotlight on Success Ceremonies, the Trustees were also participating in Student Discussion Circles at the middle schools to hear from the students.

Trustee Kelley wondered if the Board could look at conducting addition events on social media platforms. Ms. Fredrickson noted that the District did track information related to social media posts for the entire Board, but not individual Trustees. She would look into conducting social media events and provide additional information at a later time.

President Simon Holland remarked that an interactive, on-line town hall type event could be something that the Board could participate in. Ms. Fredrickson mentioned there were opportunities on social media platforms that allowed for interaction, so she would look into some options for the Trustees to consider.

Trustee Taylor thanked staff for the work surrounding community engagement. The Board was participating in different activities and she appreciated the creativeness that was happening. She also appreciated the weekly updates about what events others were attending so she could look at her calendar if there was an event no one had signed up for and try to attend.

Trustee Raymond asked if the Board could recognize the efforts and dedication of the community members who volunteered to sit on one of the Board's advisory committees. Ms. Fredrickson indicated that discussions had already been occurring with staff on how that could occur. She noted that the Board's e-newsletter did include information about the committees and highlighted a different committee member or chair each month.

3.05 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON UPDATES TO THE WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT'S CURRENT STRATEGIC PLAN, *ENVISION WCSD 2020*, TO INCLUDE REVISIONS TO METRICS AROUND GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR THE 2018-19 SCHOOL YEAR

Erica Olsen, OnStrategy, reviewed the work completed by the Board during the September 6, 2018, Work Session of the Board of Trustees related to the Strategic Plan and Superintendent Evaluation. The Board had requested that outstanding items return for further discussion and consideration of revisions to performance measures, targets, and reporting.

Dr. Kristen McNeill, Deputy Superintendent, explained the revision for Objective 1.2.1, Reduction in achievement gaps, was changed to a three-year target instead of a five-year target. In terms of measuring the metrics for the Superintendent Evaluation, the

Board agreed that if more than half of the sub-population showed growth at or above the District average the goal would be met and exceeds expectations would equate to $\frac{3}{4}$ of all subpopulations at or above the District average. The metric for Objective 1.2.3, Increase the graduation rate for students with disabilities, would be included as part of the 2017-18 Superintendent Evaluation, but for the 2018-19 Superintendent Evaluation the metric would be included with the overall graduation rate. Staff had recommended, and the Board approved, removal of Objective 1.5.1, Reduce remediate rates for District graduates, since the data received from the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) was unstable. The metric would continue to be reviewed since it was important and when the data became more reliable, the Board would reconsider including the metric as part of the Superintendent Evaluation.

President Simon Holland remarked that the Board did hold a lengthy discussion related to the remediation rates with staff at the Work Session. No one, Trustees or staff, wanted to see the remediation rates increase; however, since NSHE continued to change how they measured the data, it was difficult to accurately track. She hoped the issue would be resolved soon so the District could continue to prepare students because remediation was a concern to the community as well as the District.

Trustee Frenkel asked if NSHE had changed their calculations from 2016-17 and 2017-18. She wondered if the Board would be able to see a comparison at least between a couple of school years. Ben Hayes, Chief Accountability Officer, responded that the calculation had changed. The District was reviewing the information they received from NSHE to determine how they got at the numbers they did, but could not figure it out yet. The larger concern was that NSHE had used three different calculations for the same cohort and came up with three different numbers. It was difficult to provide an accurate year-to-year comparison when the numbers continued to change.

Trustee Frenkel wondered if there was an alternative that could be used. Mr. Hayes indicated that if the District were able to receive the raw data, then they could determine a measurement to show remediation rates. However, at the current time the District could not trust the information they were receiving. If the District would be able to look at the same data for each year they could make the determination.

Trustee Raymond mentioned there could be concerns from the community if the District came up with their own measurements since it would be different than what NSHE might release.

President Simon Holland noted that she would like the District to be sure of the information being presented than have potentially inaccurate information included as a metric in the Superintendent Evaluation.

Dr. McNeill continued with a review of the metrics. Objective 1.5.2, Establish baseline data for Career Readiness and College and Career Diplomas, would have a baseline set during the 2018-19 School Year since the state had completed the diploma requirements.

President Simon Holland asked if a measurement of career readiness had been developed. Dr. McNeill indicated the ACT exam could be used at the present time, but the diploma requirements specifically related to College and Career and Career Readiness were new beginning with the current freshman class. Debra Biersdorff, Chief Academic Officer, mentioned the District had been part of the conversations surrounding the diploma requirements with the state. Staff was confident they would be able to track the information for all students using information from the ACT exam, participation in Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) courses, Career and Technical Education (CTE) courses, world languages, and other classes. It would be important for the District to communicate the various pathways to families because there were so many different diploma types and seals students could receive.

David Lasic, Chief of Staff, provided information related to Objective 1.3, Strengthen teaching and learning through technology and 21st Century instructional strategies. The District did have data related to Objective 1.3.1, Increase the number of teachers completing 21st Century Badge classes, so that information could be reported. The 2017-18 School Year would establish the baseline for Objective 1.3.2, Increase implementation of 21st Century instructional practices for teachers. The conversation was moved to metrics included under Goal 2, Develop and retain highly effective personnel. As related to Objective 2.1.2, Increase diversity among all employee groups, staff was recommending the data be related to new hires only because there could be some years when little or no hiring occurred. The measurements for meeting and exceeding expectations were reviewed. Staff was also recommending the measurement be the same for Objective 2.1.3, Increase the number of Education Support Professional employees and Substitute Teachers that transition into certified hires each year, since the actual numbers were fairly small.

President Simon Holland expressed concern with 1% equating to meeting expectations for some of the metrics because that could come down to the District hiring one (1) person and meeting the goal. Emily Ellison, Chief Human Resources Officer, noted that the District only had a couple of years of data available for some of the metrics, so they could not look very far back to determine trends. Once the District had more years of data available, the percentages could be increased for the metrics where a small number of people could make a large difference.

Trustee Frenkel requested additional clarification on the actual numbers being discussed. Ms. Ellison explained that during the 2017-18 School Year the District had 1,450 new hires, so a 1% increase would have been 15 new hires associated with at least one of the diversity criteria.

Trustee Taylor agreed with the idea of only applying the criteria to new hires because if it were applied to the current employees, then people would be concerned they could lose their job if they were not part of one of the areas included in the diversity criteria.

President Simon Holland mentioned that she would like to see a greater goal than 1% because she did not like seeing zero growth as meeting expectations.

Superintendent Davis cautioned that the District had recently looked at where and who they received qualified applicants from. About 90% of the qualified applications were white females, so the challenge was to work with higher education across the country to increase diversity in their education programs. Since the District was continuing to look towards reducing the structural deficit, it would be challenging to increase funding for recruitment while reducing funding in other areas. The diversity issue was not only a challenge for the District, but for all employers within Washoe County. Ms. Ellison added that because of the funding challenges, it was important for the District to focus on Objective 2.1.3 and transition employees into certified positions because the greatest diversity in the District was seen in the classified positions. When she had conducted recruiting trips, she would be in the same room with numerous school districts and they were all looking at diversifying their employee pools as well, so it would really depend on if a person was interested in living in the area if they decided to apply for a position with the District.

Trustee Frenkel remarked that it might be important for the Board to define if they wanted the metric specific to a particular employee group. The conversation appeared to be related more to teachers, which would probably be a smaller number than if the metric were specific to all new hires within the District. Ms. Ellison mentioned that there could be large swings in the number of new hires in each employee group depending on a variety of factors. She was not comfortable setting a specific goal for each employee group because one year a 10% increase could mean 2 new hires, whereas the next year the same 10% increase could mean 20 new hires. The District just did not have the trend data to support a more aggressive goal at the present time. Superintendent Davis noted that there were also years where no new hiring of teachers occurred so it would be impossible to increase diversity.

Trustee Raymond wondered what the percentage of new hires was during the 2017-18 School Year that were part of one of the diversity categories. Ms. Ellison stated 45.38% of new hires fell into one of the categories.

Trustee Raymond felt that the District was doing a good job of recruiting diverse applicants if almost 50% of the new hires could be included in one of the categories. The information showed the District was working on recruitment and if the percentage did not change, she would still be okay with having the same percentage of new hires being

from one of the categories. She would like to see an increase, but would be okay if the same rate was maintained if there was little hiring occurring.

President Simon Holland commented that she did appreciate the work occurring, but wanted to see the District reach for a higher goal than just maintaining the current percentage.

Trustee Taylor wondered if there was a way to allow both the ability to maintain the current percentage as well as encourage an increase. She did want to see the District push to have a more diverse applicant pool, but understood that was challenging when the economy was doing well because large numbers of people did not go into teaching.

President Simon Holland mentioned that since the numbers were small, she would be fine with anything greater than 0 to 1% would meet the goal. She just had a hard time with zero growth being the standard.

Superintendent Davis asked how much the District dedicated for recruitment from the General Fund during the last fiscal year. Mr. Lasic mentioned the District did not allocate very much from the General Fund for recruitment because of the reductions over the past few years. Most of the recruitment money came from federal Title II dollars. If the Board were interested in seeing a larger increase, then additional resources should be dedicated to recruitment and salaries. He felt that with all the other options available in the community at the present time, if the District could maintain 45%, then they would be doing a great job.

Trustee Mayer stated he was comfortable with at least maintaining 45%.

Trustee Kelley expressed that the metric was difficult for him in general because he wanted to ensure the best person was hired and not because the person fit into a specific category.

Trustee Feemster mentioned that a recent study out of Harvard University stated that the more a minority student saw a minority teacher or principal, the more the student would strive to succeed and graduate. She would also hear from minority parents that believe the reason their children succeeded in school was because they saw people that looked like them in front of the classes. It was a challenging task, but she believed that the certified employees should be looked at separately. She would also like to see additional supports and professional development provided to teachers who were not performing to expectations so they could succeed. The University of Nevada, Reno did offer programming specific to first generation college students and other groups, so the District should look at increasing those partnerships.

Trustee Taylor clarified that there was a difference between equal and equity. It was important the District not sacrifice excellence to achieve equity. Principals had to be able to hire the person that would add value to their school, but it was the District's job to ensure they had to have a diverse applicant pool to select from. She also knew staff was working hard to provide those options, but the economic reality was that the District had to reduce budgets for everyone. As long as the District was not moving backwards, she would be willing to support maintain the current percentage.

Trustee Frenkel noted the wording of the Objective was "increase." She appreciated the work currently occurring and felt that if the increase were anything more than zero, the goal would have been met. She agreed with President Simon Holland that meeting expectations should not be zero. The Trustees discussed what would be considered an "increase."

It was moved by Trustee Raymond and seconded by Trustee Frenkel that **the Board of Trustees approves the language for Objective 2.1.2 and sets the metrics as greater than 0 to 1% equates to meets the goal and anything greater than 1% equates to exceeds the goal.**

President Simon Holland opened the motion for discussion.

Superintendent Davis cautioned that if the Board wanted to see an increase of any kind, then it would be important to consider the resources available for the program. If resources were not provided to support an increase, it could set people up for failure because they would be required to do more with the same or less resources.

The result of the vote was Unanimous: Pass (Yea: Debra Feemster, Veronica Frenkel, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, Malena Raymond and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

Trustee Taylor mentioned a similar expectation should be set for 2.1.3 since it was looking at similar information.

It was moved by Trustee Taylor and seconded by Trustee Raymond that **the Board of Trustees approves the language for Objective 2.1.3 and sets the metrics as greater than 0 to 1% equates to meets the goal and anything greater than 1% equates to exceeds the goal.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: Pass (Yea: Debra Feemster, Veronica Frenkel, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, Malena Raymond and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

President Simon Holland opened the meeting to public comment.

Paul Kiser was the parent of a middle school student. He had previously worked as a compensation manager for a hospital in Denver, Colorado and agreed with some of the prior comments related to resources and salaries. He felt if the District wanted to hire the best person for the position, the District needed to increase salaries because if salaries were not adequate the District would get the person willing to work for that wage and not necessarily the person the District wanted to hire. He believed the concerns related to diversity of the staff would solve themselves if the District were able to increase pay.

Mr. Lasic reviewed the proposed revisions to all objectives under Objective 2.2, Provide and continuously improve meaningful, high quality professional learning targeted to concrete learning objectives and desired performance outcomes. The 2017-18 School Year would provide the baseline numbers for the objectives because they would be based on the usage of the Professional Growth System (MyPGS) platform, which was the new system the District was utilizing to track evaluations. Additionally, Objective 2.3.2, Maintain high employee satisfaction percentages as measured by satisfaction surveys, was new so the baseline year would be the 2017-18 School Year.

President Simon Holland mentioned the Board needed to have a conversation related to the metric to determine what a high employee satisfaction percentage was for staff. The metric would be based on the percentage of employees rating their satisfaction as good to excellent, but the Board needed to have a clear understanding of what high meant to both staff and the Trustees. Mr. Lasic noted the District did have information available, which was to be reported at the next meeting with the update to the Strategic Plan; however, he wanted to ensure the Board was able to have a meaningful conversation so the information would be presented at the current meeting. Ms. Ellison explained the Office of Human Resources conducted an internal satisfaction survey for employees. Overall, for the 2017-18 School Year, 86.75% of respondents rated their satisfaction as good to excellent.

President Simon Holland thanked staff for the information. She appreciated that the number was so high and wondered if the Board was comfortable with the current language or if the language should be revised to maintain.

Trustee Taylor remarked that she was comfortable with maintain because the percentage was so high, but felt it would be important to quantify what high was so it was clear to everyone. Mr. Lasic suggested utilizing 85% as the benchmark that the District should maintain.

Trustee Frenkel mentioned that the metric was not being used for the Superintendent Evaluation, but she would like the Board to consider adding language in the future to define what "exceeds expectations" would look like since the information was important.

It was moved by Trustee Frenkel and seconded by Trustee Feemster that **the Board of Trustees approves the revision to the language of Objective 2.3.2 to "Maintain at least an 85% employee satisfaction rating."** The result of the vote was Unanimous: Pass (Yea: Debra Feemster, Veronica Frenkel, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, Malena Raymond and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

Mr. Lasic reminded the Trustees that at the September 6, 2018 Work Session, there was a motion to remove Objective 3.4.1, Increase the number of volunteers in the District by 3%, but there was some confusion on the process so the Board agreed to bring the item back for further consideration. Staff was recommending removal of the metric from the Superintendent Evaluation for the 2017-18 School Year because of the changes to state law, which created instability in the numbers.

Trustee Taylor mentioned that the Board had also reduced the budget for Volunteer Services so if they were not going to dedicate the resources, then they should look at removing the metric. Additionally, even if the Board had not reduced the budget, the changes to state law requiring fingerprinting was a barrier to some people who had previously volunteered for the District.

It was moved by Trustee Taylor and seconded by Trustee Raymond that **the Board of Trustees removes Objective 3.4.1 for the 2017-18 Superintendent Evaluation period and sets the 2018-19 School Year as the baseline year.** The result of the vote was 6-1: Pass (Yea: Debra Feemster, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, Malena Raymond and Angela Taylor. Nay: Veronica Frenkel) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

Dr. McNeill reviewed the proposed change to the metric for Objective 5.1.1, Decrease chronic absenteeism rates by 2% annually. The Board had discussed changing the target to a percentage lower than the state average. The reporting requirements had been changed by the state so it would be difficult to include in the 2017-18 Superintendent Evaluation, but would be included in the 2018-19 Superintendent Evaluation.

Trustee Frenkel wondered if the District could use their own internal tracking information for the 2017-18 Superintendent Evaluation. She was unclear how the report to the state would impact the District's ability to track the information. Mr. Hayes noted that the state had not determined their average at the present time, so the District could not compare the numbers. The state had changed how absences were counted, which drove the numbers up for all school districts. Now if a student missed half of the day the absence was counted as a full day, whereas the prior rule was that the student had to miss $\frac{3}{4}$ of the day. The District did not have a way to go back and look at the data to determine how much of the day was actually missed. Mr. Lasic added that medical absences were

now counted towards chronic absenteeism. Because of all the reporting changes, the District felt including the metric as part of the Evaluation process was unfair.

Mr. Kelley expressed concern about comparing the District's numbers to the state's numbers. Other counties could really change the numbers for the entire state. He would rather have the District compare their own year-to-year numbers. Mr. Lasic mentioned the language for the metric would need to be changed.

Trustee Taylor remarked that she would like to see medical absences removed from the count for chronic absenteeism if the District was going to just use internal numbers. She believed medical absences were not a contributing factor in chronic absenteeism.

Trustee Raymond commented that she had been hearing the state might look at changing the way absences were counted again. She agreed with Trustee Kelley that this might be an area where the District should not compare itself against the state. Dr. McNeill noted the state had to follow the federal guidelines, which was where some of the additional changes had been generated from.

President Simon Holland agreed with Trustees Kelley and Raymond. She wondered if the best thing the Board could do at the present time would be to remove the metric from the 2017-18 Superintendent Evaluation and then re-evaluate the metric in the future when additional clarification from the state was available.

It was moved by Trustee Kelley and seconded by Trustee Feemster that **the Board of Trustees removes Objective 5.1.1 for the 2017-18 Evaluation Year and requests the metric return to the Board for re-evaluation at a future meeting.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: Pass (Yea: Debra Feemster, Veronica Frenkel, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, Malena Raymond and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

Dr. McNeill explained the proposed revisions to Objective 5.1.2, Disproportionality measures for various student populations in different areas. Staff was recommending the metrics be separated to show a reduction in suspensions and then an increase in accessibility for Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, Career and Technical Education pathways, and dual credit attainment.

It was moved by Trustee Mayer and seconded by Trustee Raymond that **the Board of Trustees approves the staff recommended changes to Objective 5.1.2.**

President Simon Holland opened the motion for discussion.

Trustee Frenkel requested clarification on if the metrics would be used as part of the 2017-18 Superintendent Evaluation. Ms. Ellison noted the 2017-18 School Year would establish the baseline targets and then the 2018-19 School Year would show the changes.

The result of the vote was Unanimous: Pass (Yea: Debra Feemster, Veronica Frenkel, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, Malena Raymond and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

Mr. Lasic indicated that based on the previous conversations related to meeting and exceeding expectations, staff was recommending the same standard be used for Objective 5.2.3, Implement 100% of the comprehensive emergency operations plan annually.

It was moved by Trustee Frenkel and seconded by Trustee Taylor that **the Board of Trustees approves the metrics to Objective 5.2.3 as: 90-97% equates to meets expectations and anything greater than 97% exceeds expectations.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: Pass (Yea: Debra Feemster, Veronica Frenkel, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, Malena Raymond and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

Ms. Olsen indicated the remaining action items were intended to clean up some of the missing information from the September work session. The Board had determined an increase would be appropriate, but the percentage of that increase had to be set. Additionally, the Board needed to finalize the metrics for the employee survey portion of the Superintendent Evaluation process. The data would be summarized and calculated based on a 5 point scale, with 5 being the high. The actual performance number from the last Superintendent Evaluation was 2.58, so the Board needed to determine if that score would be the baseline and what percentage increase would equate to meets expectations, exceeds expectations, partially met expectations, and did not meet expectations.

Trustee Frenkel wondered if the Board actually needed to set percentages from the target since the performance rating was a number. She felt the Board could determine a 4 or 5 would equate to exceeds expectations, 3 met expectations, and so forth.

Superintendent Davis indicated she would like to see how that type of rating would look before agreeing to the change because at the present time, she was unclear if it would be comparable.

President Simon Holland suggested the Board finalize the ratings for the employee survey metric at the next Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees. She would like to have the opportunity for a detailed discussion and felt that with the lateness of the hour, the Board would be making a decision "on the fly." She urged staff to present the remaining

recommendations and if there were no objections or changes, the Board could vote on the items together to move the conversation forward.

Mr. Lasic noted the recommendations for the metrics under Objective, 2.1, Attract, recruit, hire, and retain highly effective personnel, were based on the Board's previous actions.

It was moved by Trustee Frenkel and seconded by Trustee Taylor that **the Board of Trustees approves the metrics to Objectives 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 as: 90-97% equates to meets expectations and anything greater than 97% equates to exceeds expectations.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: Pass (Yea: Debra Feemster, Veronica Frenkel, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, Malena Raymond and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

Trustee Raymond left the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

Mr. Lasic stated the recommendation from staff for Objective 1.3.1, Increase number of teachers completing 21st Century Badge Classes, was a 10% increase.

It was moved by Trustee Mayer and seconded by Trustee Taylor that **the Board of Trustees approves the metric for Objective 1.3.1 as a 10% increase.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: Pass (Yea: Debra Feemster, Veronica Frenkel, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

Mr. Lasic reviewed the proposed revisions for Objectives 1.2.1, Reduction in achievement gaps, 1.2.3, Increase the graduation rate for students with disabilities, and 1.5.1, Reduce remediation rates.

It was moved by Trustee Mayer and seconded by Trustee Taylor that **the Board of Trustees approves the revisions to the metrics as proposed for Objectives 1.2.1, 1.2.3, and 1.5.1.** The result of the vote was 5-1: Pass (Yea: Debra Feemster, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, and Angela Taylor. Nay: Veronica Frenkel) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

Mr. Lasic noted the final item was to establish the 2018-19 School Year as the baseline for Objective 1.5.2, Establish baseline data and three-year targets for Career Readiness Diplomas and Career and College Diplomas.

It was moved by Trustee Frenkel and seconded by Trustee Taylor that **the Board of Trustees approves that the data from the 2018-19 School Year will establish the baseline for Objective 1.5.2.** The result of the vote was 5-0: Pass (Yea: Debra Feemster, Veronica Frenkel, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, and Angela Taylor. Not Present at Vote: John Mayer) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

3.06 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE SELECTION OF A CONSULTANT/FACILITATOR TO CONDUCT THE SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION FOR THE 2017-18 SCHOOL YEAR FROM AMONG THE FOLLOWING: ONSTRATEGY IN PARTNERSHIP WITH THE HUMAN RESOURCE CONNECTION AND NEVADA HR TEAM; IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$25,000

Emily Ellison, Chief Human Resources Officer, explained the Board had previously voted to hire a consultant/facilitator to conduct the 2017-18 Superintendent Evaluation. The District issued a request for proposals (RFP) and received two. The RFP process was reviewed and scope of work related to the Superintendent Evaluation process explained. Whoever the Board chose would utilize the approved Superintendent Evaluation Handbook, which included the tools to be used for the employee and Board surveys. She emphasized the District liked to use an external consultant/facilitator for the process so there were no questions related to the authenticity of the evaluation. The Office of Human Resources and Office of Communications and Community Engagement would provide support in gathering information and communicating with employees about the survey. She noted the results from the survey would only be sent to the consultant/facilitator and the District would not see individual responses.

Ms. Ellison reviewed the two proposals received. The first was from OnStrategy, who facilitated the Superintendent Evaluation for the 2016-17 School Year. OnStrategy partnered with The Human Resources Connection for the process. They had extensive experience in working with school districts and staff felt the requests made as part of the proposal could easily be accommodated. The second proposal the District received was from Nevada HR Team. Nevada HR Team had more than 25 years' experience in human resources and the District believed they could support the requests included in the proposal during the project. Representatives from each company were available to answer questions.

President Simon Holland asked about an item in the proposal from Nevada HR Team. She was concerned about the portion related to working with and preparing the Superintendent's self-narrative. She wondered if that was normally included in the scope of work released by the District because she felt that should be prepared by the Superintendent. Ms. Ellison mentioned the narrative was based on a structured interview process so the consultant would conduct the interview that would support the Superintendent in preparing the narrative. The consultant did not prepare the narrative for the Superintendent.

Trustee Taylor indicated she recalled there was a similar provision in last year's agreement. David Lasic, Chief of Staff, clarified that the consultant would assist the

Superintendent in compiling the information and putting everything together for the final report to the Board of Trustees.

Trustee Feemster requested clarification on the proposed costs. Ms. Ellison noted Nevada HR Team proposed \$9,000 and OnStrategy proposed \$21,300 with a 10% contingency if the Board wanted additional work related to the evaluation process but not included in the Scope of Work.

President Simon Holland invited the consultants/facilitators to provide brief remarks and answer questions from the Trustees.

Erica Olsen, OnStrategy, stated that OnStrategy was very interested in continuing the work on the Superintendent Evaluation that they began the prior year. She explained the partnership with The Human Resource Connection had allowed both companies to blend the work related to data and human resources. OnStrategy based their fee on the work completed last year on the evaluation and the hours worked. In looking at the hours put in last year, they realized the actual time put into the work was more than what they ended up charging for the services. They had taken into consideration that the Scope of Work was not the same and changes were made to the proposed fee based on the changes.

President Simon Holland wondered what the differences were between the prior and current Scopes of Work. Ms. Olsen noted a community survey was not included in the current Scope of Work. A lot of work was done related to community outreach to ensure a reliable sample was achieved so the data could be included.

President Simon Holland asked how members of the community would be able to participate in the evaluation process if there was no community survey. Trustees Frenkel and Taylor reminded the Board that prior discussions decided to use a broader community survey that was not directly tied to the evaluation.

Cam Sorensen, Nevada HR Team, explained Nevada HR Team would be able to bring a different perspective to the Superintendent Evaluation process. He was currently a member of the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN) board and believed his work with Starbucks and Intuit would provide valuable feedback related to the culture of the District and employee engagement.

Trustee Taylor wondered if Nevada HR Team had concerns about their proposed fee based on the current discussion and review of the proposal submitted by OnStrategy. Mr. Sorensen felt that based on the prior year's Scope of Work and current Scope of Work the proposal submitted was fair. If he had underbid the work, then that was on him and not the Board or District. He believed the proposal he submitted was fair based on the information received from the District.

Trustee Frenkel requested additional information on Nevada HR Team's experience with analysis of survey reports. Mr. Sorensen indicated he had worked quite a bit with data analysis and was comfortable with his ability to review the information from the employee surveys.

Trustee Feemster asked if Nevada HR Team had experience working with school districts. Mr. Sorensen mentioned he did not.

Trustee Kelley wondered if staff had a preference between the two proposals. Ms. Ellison mentioned staff was comfortable with either team, but it was the Board's decision since they needed to determine who they preferred to facilitate the process.

Trustee Frenkel remarked that the upcoming evaluation would be the third she had participated in as a member of the Board of Trustees. She had not been satisfied with the prior evaluations for various reasons, but felt the current process was much better because of the evaluation tool the Board had adopted. She appreciated the work put in by the District, Board, and OnStrategy in the development of the tool and felt that it would be critical to continue with OnStrategy at the present time because there was a history and understanding about the District.

It was moved by Trustee Frenkel and seconded by Trustee Taylor that **the Board of Trustees selects OnStrategy to facilitate the Superintendent Evaluation process for the 2017-18 School Year in an amount not to exceed \$23,430.**

President Simon Holland opened the motion for discussion.

President Simon Holland noted she would support the motion because she would like to see consistency in the comparison from last year.

Trustee Taylor agreed with the prior remarks. She had seen what happened to the process when a different consultant took over and wanted to ensure the process was as smooth as possible.

The result of the vote was Unanimous: Pass (Yea: Debra Feemster, Veronica Frenkel, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

Trustee Frenkel left the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

4. Reports

4.01 BOARD REPORTS

Board Members reported on their attendance at District and community activities and shared announcements of dates and times of upcoming events.

4.02 SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

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

5. Closing Items

5.01 FUTURE AGENDA ITEM REQUESTS

No requests were made at this time.

5.02 PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment at this time.

5.03 NEXT MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT

The next Regular Meeting would take place on October 23, 2018 beginning at 2:00 p.m. in the Board Room at the Central Administration Building.

5.04 ADJOURN MEETING

There being no further business to come before the members of the Board, President Simon Holland declared the meeting adjourned at 6:19 p.m.

Katy Simon Holland, President

John Mayer, Clerk