

**MINUTES OF THE JUNE 4, 2019  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

June 4, 2019

**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 Jacqueline Calvert, Andrew Caudill, Scott Kelley, Ellen Minetto, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor were present. Superintendent Traci Davis, Deputy Superintendent Kristen McNeill, Chief of Staff David Lasic, and staff were also present.

**1.03 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Former Lt. Governor Sue Wagner led the meeting in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**1.04 ACTION TO ADOPT THE AGENDA**

President Simon Holland stated staff was requesting Agenda Item 4.01, Revisions to Board Policy 3320, Procurement, be pulled from the agenda due to changes required from legislation passed during the 2019 Nevada Legislative Session.

It was moved by Trustee Taylor and seconded by Trustee Kelley that **the Board of Trustees pulls Agenda Item 4.01 and approves the agenda as revised.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: Pass (Yea: Jacqueline Calvert, Andrew Caudill, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, Ellen Minetto, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

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

**4.06 CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED SEXUALITY, HEALTH AND RESPONSIBILITY EDUCATION (S.H.A.R.E.) HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF AND THE S.H.A.R.E. ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

President Simon Holland explained there were some in the audience who wished to provide public comment on Agenda Item 4.06, but were unable to stay until the item would be heard. She would open the item for public comment only for those who were unable to remain at the meeting until the item was opened for presentation and discussion by the Board of Trustees.

Carole Fineberg stated she was very disappointed in the desire of the District to implement what she viewed as a sex education curriculum designed to educate students about sex in all forms. She believed there were aspects of the curriculum that were not akin to the values of some families in the community and was alienating a large segment of students. Her understanding was that families had the ability to opt out of the program but wondered why the program should not be an opt in program instead.

President Simon Holland clarified that pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes, the Sexuality, Health and Responsibility Education (SHARE) program was an opt in program.

Dr. William Tarbell expressed concerns about the first lesson of the proposed SHARE curriculum. He claimed there was no firm scientific belief that established how sexual orientation could be formed in human personality and believed that introducing children to different "feelings" about gender could validate those feelings. He also believed the lesson was contrary to all basic religious teachings and urged the Board to remove the lesson from the curriculum.

Former Lt. Governor Sue Wagner stated, as someone with over 30 years of public service to Nevada and a member of the State Senate when the sex education legislation was originally passed, that the Board should approve all proposed lessons to the SHARE curriculum. She was concerned that the curriculum had not been updated since 2003 and everything included in the new lessons was reasonable for high school students to learn.

Jasmine Merrill urged the Board to approve the proposed SHARE curriculum. She was surprised by the amount of pushback the proposed lessons were receiving from a state that allowed legal gambling and prostitution, especially since young adults had access to the internet. She stated that was critical the schools provide a safe place for students to have conversations and learn the facts so they were able to protect themselves from violence and diseases, as well as learning about consent.

Paul Sandoval expressed concern over the proposed SHARE curriculum as a parent because he felt it went too far. He did not believe the schools should be teaching students how to have intercourse but only how to avoid sexual risks. He believed the schools should be focusing on academic knowledge so students could prepare themselves for the future and the District should not concern themselves with teaching sex education.

Margo Piscevich urged the Board to send the proposed SHARE curriculum back to the committee because it went too far in her opinion. She felt the young people in today's society were already bombarded with images of sex and the schools should only be focusing on providing medically accurate information so students could protect themselves from bullying and sexual violence.

## 2. Consent Agenda Items

Trustee Raymond stated she had a disclosure related to Consent Agenda Item 2.12, Approval of the three-year grant application to Community Foundation of Western Nevada's Women's Giving Circle for the Children in Transition Program for \$95,500. She disclosed, pursuant to Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 281A.420, that her mother was a member of the Community Foundation's Women's Giving Circle; however, her mother received no pecuniary benefit from her membership and, pursuant to NRS 281A.240(3), her independent judgement was not materially affected by the membership because, pursuant to NRS 281A.420(4)(a), her mother would not receive any benefit from her vote. Also, pursuant to NRS 281A.420(4)(b), Nevada law supported elected officials voting whenever possible and as a result she would vote on the item on the advice of general counsel.

It was moved by Trustee Caudill and seconded by Trustee Taylor that **the Board of Trustees approves Consent Agenda Items 2.02 through 2.17**. The result of the vote was Unanimous: Pass (Yea: Jacqueline Calvert, Andrew Caudill, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, Ellen Minetto, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

- 2.02 The Board of Trustees approved the minutes of the February 26, 2019 Work Session of the Board of Trustees.
- 2.03 The Board of Trustees provided final approval to the proposed revision of Board Policy 4400, Equal Opportunity in Employment (formerly Board Policy 4111).
- 2.04 The Board of Trustees provided final approval to the proposed revision of Board Policy 7420, Performance-Based Contracting (formerly Board Policy 7088).
- 2.05 The Board of Trustees provided final approval to the proposed revision of Board Policy 3265, Equipment and Property.
- 2.06 The Board of Trustees approved the renewal of the agreement with Infinite Campus, Inc. for comprehensive web-based student information system

beginning July 1, 2019 and expiring June 30, 2020 in the amount of \$515,171.

- 2.07 The Board of Trustees approved the Year 2 Microsoft 365 A3 Subscription License Agreement, effective October 31, 2019 through October 30, 2020, in the amount of \$613,900.77.
- 2.08 The Board of Trustees approved the annual renewal of the BusinessPLUS software maintenance agreement with PowerSchool in the amount of \$119,759.52 for July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020.
- 2.09 The Board of Trustees approved the renewal of the services agreement with Blackboard Inc. to provide ConnectEd services, Website Content Management services, and Mobile Communication services in the amount of \$206,142.78 for the term of July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.
- 2.10 The Board of Trustees requested and authorized the Washoe County Treasurer to make an advance of taxes apportioned to the Washoe County School District's General Fund in an amount allowed by Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 354.280, and if determined necessary by the District's Business Office to meet cash flow needs prior to the first property tax apportionment in September 2019.
- 2.11 The Board of Trustees approved the renewal of the District's property, liability, excess workers' compensation, network security, crime, National Flood Insurance and active assailant coverage for the renewal policy period of July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020 for a total renewal premium of \$3,112,294.
- 2.12 The Board of Trustees approved the 3-year grant application to the Community Foundation of Western Nevada's Women's Giving Circle for the Children in Transition Program for \$95,500.
- 2.13 The Board of Trustees approved Renewal 2 of Request for Proposal (RFP) #16-004, Web-Based Student Data Assessment System, to SchoolCity, Inc. for a period of one (1) year beginning July 1, 2019 and ending June 30, 2020 in the estimated amount of \$285,976.25.
- 2.14 The Board of Trustees approved the renewal of the Master Subscription Agreement with Northwest Evaluation Association to provide Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) tests in Reading and Math to all District schools in grades 1–8 and selected grade 9 and Individual Education Plan (IEP) high school students for the 2019-2020 School Year in the amount of \$359,500.

- 2.15 The Board of Trustees approved the appointment of Richard Jay (At-Large Member) to a 2-year term beginning July 1, 2019 and ending June 30, 2021 to the Safe and Healthy Schools Commission and approved the re-appointments of Misty Vaughan Allen (Medical/Mental Health Professional), Charlene Bybee (Government Agency Representative), Marci Burke (At-Large Member), and Jeffrey Frame (At-Large Member) for 2-year terms beginning July 1, 2019 and ending June 30, 2021.
- 2.16 The Board of Trustees approved the Projected Fiscal Year 2019-20 Reduction of Pupil-Teacher Ratio in Certain Classes Plan to be filed with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.
- 2.17 The Board of Trustees accepted the extension of the Nevada Ready! Prekindergarten Grant from the Nevada Department of Education in the amount of \$130,984.22 to be used for Early Childhood Education classrooms and programming.

### **3. Legislative Items**

3.01 **PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO PROVIDE DIRECTION RELATED TO LEGISLATION APPROVED DURING THE 2019 NEVADA LEGISLATIVE SESSION BASED ON THE 2019 WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM, TO INCLUDE BUT NOT LIMITED TO SUPPORT OF WHOLE AND STABLE EDUCATION FUNDING, IMPROVING EQUITABLE ACCESS TO RELEVANT AND RIGOROUS EDUCATION FOR ALL STUDENTS, AND PROVIDING A SAFE AND RESPECTFUL LEARNING ENVIRONMENT**

Lindsay Anderson, Director of Government Affairs, stated the 2019 Nevada Legislative Session ended at midnight and she was still reviewing all the last minute changes that had occurred. She explained how some of the legislation aligned to the Washoe County School District Legislative Platform, especially related to increased resources for students. Some of the most important pieces of legislation were related to increases in per pupil funding and beginning the process to modernize the funding formula. Additional information related to specific legislation was provided. Governor Sisolak had 10 days to either sign the approved bills or veto them, so the status of some bills would continue to change.

President Simon Holland requested clarification on Assembly Bill (AB) 309, which was related to a waiver for the minimum expenditure requirement (MER) for textbooks and if the waiver would remain in place indefinitely or if it was for a specific time period. Ms.

Anderson explained the waiver would only be applicable for Fiscal Years 2020 and 2021. The bill did not address prior fiscal years.

President Simon Holland opened the meeting to public comment.

John Eppolito stated he was still trying to understand why the District chose not to support the bill advocated for by Protect Nevada Children that would have required school districts to educate parents on the dangers of free educational technology vendors and data collection. He wondered if the District would be completely moving away from free ed tech vendors which was the reason they did not support the legislation.

President Simon Holland requested staff provide clarification. David Lasic, Chief of Staff, explained the District was reviewing each app used by teachers to ensure the safety and privacy policies were in-line with federal laws and other District requirements. Some of the free apps were no longer being allowed by the District and a list of approved apps was available to teachers and parents on the website.

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

##### **4.02 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO PROVIDE PRELIMINARY APPROVAL TO THE PROPOSED REVISION OF BOARD POLICY 7110, NAMING OF SCHOOLS, WHICH ADDS LANGUAGE TO CLARIFY THE PROCESS BY WHICH THE SCHOOL NAMING COMMITTEE MAY CONSIDER SCHOOL NAMES ALREADY RECOMMENDED TO THE BOARD, BUT NOT CHOSEN BY THE BOARD, FOR FUTURE SCHOOLS, AND INITIATE THE 13-DAY PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT PERIOD**

Riley Sutton, School Capital Needs Initiative Public Relations Specialist, reviewed the proposed revisions to Board Policy 7110, Naming of Schools. The intent of the revisions was to remove certain proposed names from consideration by the committee related to specific areas of Washoe County, such as Sun Valley or Arrowcreek. The current language in the Policy would have semi-finalist names remain with the School Naming Committee indefinitely and location names were not always appropriate for consideration of future schools not located in the specific areas.

It was moved by Trustee Kelley and seconded by Trustee Calvert that **the Board of Trustees provides preliminary approval to the proposed revision of Board Policy 7110, Naming of Schools and Other District Facilities, and initiates the 13-day public review and comment period.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jacqueline Calvert, Andrew Caudill, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, Ellen Minetto, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

4.03 **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF REQUEST FOR WAIVER FROM MINIMUM EXPENDITURE REQUIREMENTS FOR PURCHASE OF TEXTBOOKS, INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES, INSTRUCTIONAL SOFTWARE AND INSTRUCTIONAL HARDWARE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2018**

Mark Mathers, Chief Financial Officer, stated the agenda item was to apply for a waiver for the minimum expenditure requirements (MER) for textbooks for Fiscal Year 2018. The legislation previously reviewed was not applicable to the current agenda request.

Mike Schroeder, Budget Director, reviewed the request and noted the District was also seeking clarification on if the MER requirements were only related to the General and Special Education Funds or if the requirements could be met from other funds. The District was also seeking clarification on if the requirements were for when the textbooks were purchased or when they were delivered. The District had met the requirements; however, some textbooks had not been delivered on time and some of the funding came from accounts other than the General and Special Education Funds. The District was continuing to work with the Nevada Department of Education on some of the questions and a waiver was not required at the present time, but staff wanted to ensure they were prepared if a waiver was required. The agenda item would allow the District to file the waiver in the future, if it became necessary.

It was moved by Trustee Raymond and seconded by Trustee Caudill that **the Board of Trustees, should circumstances dictate the need to do so, approves the submission of a written request to the Department of Education for a waiver for all or a portion of the amount of money required to be expended for textbooks, instructional supplies, instructional software and instructional hardware pursuant to Nevada Revised Statute 387.206 for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2018.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jacqueline Calvert, Andrew Caudill, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, Ellen Minetto, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

4.04 **PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE GRANT PROPOSAL FROM INCLINE HIGH SCHOOL THROUGH THE DAVID AND CHERYL DUFFIELD FOUNDATION (DCDF) TO IMPLEMENT COMPETENCY BASED LEARNING STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE STUDENT ENGAGEMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$655,000 FOR THE 2019-2020 SCHOOL YEAR**

Aaron Parsons, teacher, Incline High School, began the presentation on the grant proposal from Incline High School. The David and Cheryl Duffield Foundation had invested in various opportunities throughout the years to improve public education at the Incline Village schools, including improvements to the Boys and Girls Club of North Lake

Tahoe. The proposed \$655,000 would allow Incline High School to implement competency-based learning at Incline High School and provide additional opportunities for students. Competency-based learning allowed students to focus on projects they were passionate about with the intent of allowing students to exceed state and District standards. The grant would provide opportunities for teachers to implement flexible scheduling, blending learning with 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning, and student internships to allow for real world experiences.

Dr. Andrew Yoxsimer, Principal, Incline High School, explained one of the reasons Incline High School was interested in competency-based learning was that the data from the student climate survey showed that student engagement was lower than the District average, even though the students were high achieving. The goal of the program was to increase positive student engagement. The allocation of the grant funds was presented and would include opportunities for teachers and counselors to attend conferences and visit other school districts where competency-based learning had proven successful. The grant would be for 1 year, with the possibility of renewing if the objectives were met and positive results shown.

Trustee Kelley requested additional information on why a marketing and communication specialist position was included in the grant application. Dr. Yoxsimer stated the marketing and communication specialist would focus on additional fundraising opportunities for the program and allow the program to continue and expand once fully implemented in the high school. Since there were only three schools in Incline Village, the goal was to eventually expand the opportunities into the middle and elementary schools so the students would have a clear understanding of competency-based learning once they reached high school.

Trustee Taylor requested additional information on the proposed stipends for teachers and if the stipends would only be for the new teachers included in the grant proposal. Dr. Yoxsimer indicated the stipends would be for any staff member who worked with the students outside of their contract times.

President Simon Holland noted she had been assured that those teachers hired under the grant understood the positions were for 1 year only and future years were not guaranteed. She appreciated that there was a strong focus on professional learning and building capacity so if the grant did not continue, there would still be opportunities for students interested in competency-based learning to continue with the projects even if the entire school was not moving in that direction.

It was moved by Trustee Kelley and seconded by Trustee Minetto that **the Board of Trustees approves the grant proposal from Incline High School through the David and Cheryl Duffield Foundation (DCDF) to implement Competency Based Learning (CBL) strategies to improve student engagement in the amount of**

---

**\$655,000 for the 2019-2020 School Year.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jacqueline Calvert, Andrew Caudill, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, Ellen Minetto, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

4.05 **CONSIDERATION OF AWARD OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) #19-002, HEALTH INSURANCE BENEFIT PROGRAM, TO ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD (ANTHEM) FOR A TERM OF THREE (3) YEARS BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2020 AND ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2022 IN THE ESTIMATED ANNUAL AMOUNT OF \$2,173,187**

Trustee Raymond disclosed, pursuant to Nevada Revised Statute 281A.420, that her spouse was an employee of Renown Health and her mother served on the board of Hometown Health. However, her spouse and mother would not receive any direct benefit from her vote and would receive the same treatment as all other employees or board members. As such, her independent judgement was not materially affected, and she would be voting on the agenda item at the advice of legal counsel.

David Lasic, Chief of Staff, explained the Board had directed staff to conduct a complete healthcare plan competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process in August 2018. The process was now complete and a recommendation available for the Board to consider. He noted Nevada Revised Statutes did not require the District conduct an RFP for healthcare so the process was new to the District.

Emily Ellison, Chief Human Resources Officer, presented additional background information on the request from the Board in August 2018. The District had seen several years of large claims and medical cost inflation increases in expenses to the District's Insurance Fund, which had subsequently required the Group Insurance Committee and Board of Trustees to increase premium rates and make changes to benefit options. Since the District was self-insured, the intent of the RFP was to determine if the District would be able to reduce healthcare costs through the RFP process. She provided the Board with additional information on how health insurance was funded and how benefits and rates were determined.

Andrea Sullivan, Director of Procurement and Contracts, reviewed the RFP process for the Board. The final RFP was issued in December 2018 and an addendum published in January 2019 to answer questions and provide additional information or clarification to possible vendors. The District received six (6) proposals and then set up meetings for the RFP review committee. The review committee selected four semi-finalists to provide presentations to them in March 2019, after which the finalist was selected and notices sent to all those who submitted proposal regarding the appeal period. No appeals were received so staff was present to provide the final recommendation of award for the Board to consider. It was important to note the Group Insurance Committee could not be used

as the RFP review committee because the process was confidential and the Insurance Committee was subject to Nevada Open Meeting Law requirements. The review committee did include similar representation to those who sat on the Insurance Committee. The scoring criteria for the RFP was presented. The recommendation of award for the RFP was for Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield.

President Simon Holland requested additional information on pass/fail for financial stability. Ms. Sullivan explained part of the process included companies submitting 3 years of financial statements that were then evaluated by the Office of Business and Finance. The intent was to ensure the companies had good financial strength and would be able to partner with the District for many years. It was rare for Business to ever fail a company interested in working with the District, but it had happened in the past. None of the companies who submitted proposals related to health insurance failed the financial stability review.

Trustee Raymond asked about some of the other factors staff was looking for from those who submitted proposals. Ms. Sullivan explained health insurance and prescription benefits were the primary factors the District was looking for, but they had also requested any information on COBRA, stop-loss rates, dental coverage, and provider networks. She noted that both Renown Hospital and St. Mary's Hospital were included as in-network providers with Anthem.

Trustee Caudill wondered why a representative from School Police was not included on the RFP review committee. Ms. Ellison explained the Washoe School Police Officers Association had identified a representative to serve on the review committee; however, when the committee began meetings the individual was unable to meet the time requirements for the meetings. Since the process had already begun and it was important to move the process forward, staff determined it would be best to continue without a representative from School Police.

Trustee Caudill stated he would be more comfortable moving forward with consideration of the recommendation after School Police had at least had the opportunity to review the information.

President Simon Holland disagreed with any delays to the process. School Police had various opportunities to participate in the process and there were a lot of decisions dependent of the Board taking action at the current meeting. While she understood there were some in School Police interested in reviewing the information again, she would not want to see a delay in others receiving insurance cards or beginning the enrollment process.

Trustee Taylor asked how the employee associations were able to provide their input if the process was confidential. Ms. Sullivan explained the employee associates were asked

to identify someone who could represent their group on the review committee. The representative would not be able to discuss what occurred during the review but did have the knowledge of what their respective associations were looking for and the desires of the groups.

Trustee Taylor wondered if the vote of the review committee was unanimous. Ms. Sullivan indicated it was not and with a review committee the size that it was, she had not expected a "unanimous" vote. The recommendation of award was based on both the average scores and individual rankings, not a straight vote of the review committee.

Trustee Taylor asked if the Group Insurance Committee had voted on the recommendation. Ms. Sullivan mentioned they had not since the Insurance Committee did not have the authority to approve the RFP. The Committee had been made aware of what was occurring with the RFP process throughout the year.

President Simon Holland wondered what issues could arise if the Board decided to delay approval of the award to a future meeting. Ms. Ellison stated once the Board awarded the RFP, staff would begin working with the Group Insurance Committee on the claims history for the past year and projections for the upcoming year. The Committee would then make their recommendations to the Board regarding rates and services, generally in early August, so the process to begin open enrollment could begin on time. With the size of the District, the open enrollment period would last 8 to 10 weeks to ensure all employees, retirees, and dependents had the information they need on the changes. Even though the recommendation would not occur until January 1, 2020, the processes needed to implement the change did need to begin soon. Mr. Lasic added there were budget implications to delaying the decision as well since the decision would impact the budget cycle beginning July 1, 2019.

Trustee Raymond requested additional information on the projected saving associated with the change to Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield because there was some confusion in the media that on the new proposal the District would be paying more. Ms. Sullivan explained the District was currently paying about \$1 million annually in fees for the third party administrator contract. The proposed contract for the same services would cost more, about \$2 million annually; however, it was estimated the District would see additional savings on claims of \$2.4 million because of the expanded providers and prescription claims.

President Simon Holland opened the meeting to public comment.

Chris King, President, St. Mary's Regional Medical Center, thanked the Board and District for the work on the RFP. St. Mary's Regional Medical Center was in full support of the selection of Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield because it allowed the District employees and retirees options for their health care choices.

Chris Syverson, Nevada Business Group on Health, thanked the Board and District for their previous participation in the Nevada Business Group on Health. While they were disappointed in the structure of the RFP because they were not allowed to participate, they understood the decision of the District. They hoped to continue to work with the District in the future.

Alison Kendrick and Vangie Russell, Washoe Schools Principal Association and Association of Professional and Technical Administrators, expressed their appreciation to the Board for allowing the RFP to move forward and their support in the process. They agreed the recommendation for Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield was the best option for their members and all those covered by District health insurance.

Kevin Cogna, Executive Director, Reno Diagnostic Centers, expressed his support for the recommendation and thanked the Board for moving forward with an RFP process.

Jessica Sferrazza, St. Mary's Regional Medical Center, thanked the Board for their support of the process and urged support of the recommendation.

It was moved by Trustee Taylor and seconded by Trustee Minetto that **the Board of Trustees awards Request for Proposal (RFP) #19-002, Health Insurance Benefit Program, to Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield (Anthem) for a term of three (3) years beginning January 1, 2020 and ending December 31, 2022 in the estimated annual amount of \$2,173,187.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jacqueline Calvert, Andrew Caudill, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, Ellen Minetto, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

*President Simon Holland recessed the meeting for 15 minutes.*

**4.06 CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED SEXUALITY, HEALTH AND RESPONSIBILITY EDUCATION (S.H.A.R.E.) HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF AND THE S.H.A.R.E. ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

President Simon Holland opened the agenda item related to revisions to the Sexuality, Health and Responsibility Education (SHARE) high school curriculum. She stated the Board appreciated there were strong feelings about the topics and were grateful for the community's interest and participation. She urged everyone to be respectful of others and allow all voices to be heard. She mentioned the Board would not allow signs to be displayed in the Board Room out of respect and courtesy to others because the room was small.

Debra Biersdorff, Chief Academic Officer, expressed her thanks and appreciation to all staff who had worked with the Curriculum & Instruction Department on the SHARE Advisory Committee meetings and proposed curriculum. She also thanked the members of the SHARE Advisory Committee for engaging in meaningful conversations and volunteering their time to take part in the development of the new curriculum.

Rochelle Proctor, SHARE Facilitator, began the presentation of the proposed SHARE high school curriculum. Background information on Nevada Revised Statutes and Board Policies related to SHARE were explained. It was important to remember the curriculum had not been updated since 2003 and currently did not contain information related to consent, technology safety and consequences, healthy relationships, sexual assault/seduction, accurate local medical resources, or include information reflective of the diverse student population of the District. She added that the teen pregnancy and birth rate in Nevada was on the higher end nationally and the state ranked number one in cases of syphilis and in the top 20 for gonorrhea and chlamydia. The revisions to the curriculum were intended to begin the process of reversing those trends and ensuring students were healthy and safe no matter their decisions. The SHARE Advisory Committee timeline and approval process of the six high school lessons was explained. Once all lessons had moved through the Committee, the District conducted a parent preview of the proposed curriculum, both online and in person. A survey was conducted to determine if parents and the community supported the revisions or if additional changes should be considered. The District conducted an additional survey on the proposed curriculum that was more intended to test a new survey method but the results from the "Flash Survey" were included in the information provided so it was important to understand why the additional survey information was included even though it did not represent a statistically significant sample of parents. She reminded the Trustees and community that parents were required to opt their children into the SHARE curriculum. Parental permission was sought during the school registration process and if the question was left blank a paper permission was sent home to the parents. If parents did not return the permission forms or did not want their children to participate, the students did not participate in the lessons.

Trustee Kelley asked if the District knew the number of students who did not participate in the SHARE curriculum, either because no permission was received or the parents did not opt their children into the program. Ms. Proctor mentioned about 6% of families did not opt their children into the program. With the online registration, the District had about 12% not respond to the question and additional contact occurred with a paper permission form sent home. The District would also notify families prior to the start of the lessons so if parents changed their minds about either allowing their students to participate or not allowing their students to participate they would be able to do so. The curriculum would also be made available in the school office if a parent wanted to preview the videos or other information prior to making a final decision.

President Simon Holland requested clarification on the resources included with the lessons. She had heard concerns in the community about some of the information included being provided to the students. Ms. Proctor explained the curriculum for SHARE was developed in house and based on information from local and national resources, including but not limited to Washoe County Health District, Teen Health Mom, Northern Nevada HOPES, University of Nevada Human Development and Family Studies, and a local OB/GYN who reviewed the lessons for medical accuracy. She would cite where the information from the lessons had come from, including pages or passages from books or articles, but there was no one textbook that would be used by the students. The District was not instructing students on the "how-tos" of sex, but providing age-appropriate and medically accurate information on sex education they should be informed about. The resources were provided to students so they could access factual information on their own.

Ms. Proctor concluded the presentation with information on the staff training and professional development associated with the SHARE curriculum. She would provide the training to all new teachers who would be presenting the lessons to students and would offer to co-teach the lessons if a teacher had any concerns.

President Simon Holland opened the meeting to public comment.

YeVonne Allen thanked staff for including information and education for LGBTQ students in the lessons. She encouraged the Board to support to proposed curriculum and reminded the Trustees of the protections for the LGBTQ community in Nevada law. She felt it was important for students to understand the protections but they would not be able to fully understand if they were not taught definitions of sexual orientations, gender identity, and gender expression. She added that LGBTQ youth had exponentially high rates of harassment, depression, and suicide and the proposed curriculum would be a step in the right direction in creating a more welcoming environment for all students.

Pastor Brent Brooks stated that, as a member of the SHARE Advisory Committee, he knew the difficult position the Board was in and understood how out of date the curriculum was because there were a lot of new terms that students had to understand, such as sexting. However, he did not support the inclusion of lesson one, which had not been approved by the Committee and failed due to a tie vote. He believed the direction from the Board had been to provide an inclusive curriculum, which he understood to mean broad in scope and comprehensive. He felt the current version of lesson one only presented the LGBTQ perspective and did not embrace a traditional view of sexuality as most people throughout history had believed, namely that sex was between a man and a woman and that gender was determined at birth by genitalia and chromosomes. He expressed frustration that religion and traditional views no longer had a seat at the table, even though they were also considered a protected class under the United States Constitution.

DeeEdrah White, Power to Parent, claimed comprehensive sex education classes, such as the one being considered by the Board, were shown to have harmful effects on students and were considered failures since studies showed students who took the classes actually had an increased rate of sexual activity, pregnancy, and forced sex. She urged the Board to reject the proposed curriculum that she believed was developed by Planned Parenthood and intended to introduce children to concepts such as blood play and bondage.

Denis Dolan expressed concern over some of the resources included in the proposed SHARE curriculum. His understanding of the resources was that they provided detailed explanation of sexual practices that would be presented to students in the classroom. He felt if the information was presented in the schools, then it would be seen by the students as acceptable behavior. He urged the Board to reject the controversial topics of the lessons and allow such information to be presented by parents and private organizations approved by parents.

Pastor Tim Oates requested the Board leave information and references to values out of the SHARE curriculum. He believed that lesson one was based on values and that it encouraged students to question their gender and sexual identity by having the students role play different genders in class. He was outraged at one of the resources included because the book was a sex manual and explained how to have anal sex properly. He urged the Board to vote no on the curriculum.

John Eppolito stated the Nevada Legislature had repeatedly voted down bills related to comprehensive sex education in schools, as had the Clark County School District and even the Washoe County School District a couple years ago. He urged the Board to reject the current proposed curriculum because he believed it was not appropriate for teenagers. He was specifically concerned about the Scarleteen website and the articles included on it, such as "We had a great sex life, but now I can't make him come anymore" and "How can I get this guy to stop mis-gendering me?" He added some of the other websites provided information on making dental dams and what blood play was, which were things he would not want his child to know about.

Cesar Minera informed the Board there were a number of members of the Hispanic community unable to fully participate in the meeting because of equipment not working properly. He requested the meeting stand in recess until the problem could be resolved.

President Simon Holland requested those in the Board Room who had provided comments move to another overflow room to allow those who were having trouble the ability to be near the interpreter and participate in the meeting. The current technology required those using the headsets to be in the same room as the interpreter.

*President Simon Holland recessed the meeting for 10 minutes.*

Cesar Minera thanked the Board for their consideration in allowing the recess. He expressed concern that the proposed revisions to the SHARE curriculum had not been translated into Spanish for the parent preview night at Edward L. Pine Middle School. He was frustrated that 30% of the community had not been provided the opportunity to provide input into the new curriculum. He hoped the Board would not approve the curriculum until the information had been fully shared with all members of the community.

Jennifer Howell, Washoe County Health District, stated she had been a health educator in Washoe County for over 19 years and one of the most common statements she would hear after testing people for sexually transmitted diseases was, "Why did I never hear about this in school?" She indicated the question would come from all people in the community, no matter their sexual orientation. She noted that, from a health perspective, sexually transmitted diseases had been increasing in the community and women were transmitting syphilis to their babies because they did not have the resources or education on how to stop the spread of the disease. She pleaded with the Board to help the youth of Washoe County and provide them with the information they desperately needed to be able to protect themselves and their future health.

Cynthia Stipech stated she agreed with parts of the proposed curriculum, especially related to educating students on the dangers of sexually transmitted diseases; however, she believed anything beyond that should not be taught in the schools because that was the responsibility of the parents. She felt the District would be opening themselves up to a lawsuit if the curriculum was approved in the present form because the material was too detailed in the descriptions used about sex.

Harriet Newman urged the Board to reject the proposed curriculum because she did not feel it was appropriate for children and young adults. She claimed the voters of the County were conservative and did not want their children exposed to websites with explicit information on sexual positions and acts.

Terri Crow mentioned, as a parent of teenagers, she would rather see the SHARE curriculum focus on teaching boundaries, respect for others, kindness, and confidence. She felt the proposed curriculum lacked information on personal thoughts, values, and emotions which students needed to learn how to deal with when making decisions regarding sex. She was concerned about the information included in the resource lists that would be provided to the students because she did not want her children to learn that information and the District was taking away the parents' ability to teach their children about their views on sex and values. She also agreed with a prior speaker that comprehensive sex education only encouraged children to have sex.

Katherine Clemons expressed concern that the Board of Trustees was considering an educational program that she believed had ineffective results. She stated there had been

reputable academic studies conducted that showed comprehensive sex education was harmful and ineffective in preventing teen pregnancy and the spread of diseases. She agreed improvements to the current curriculum were needed, but the lessons presented went too far in her opinion. She would like to see a better curriculum developed focusing on preventing sex trafficking since Reno was considered a trafficking hub by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). She requested the Board consider appropriate sex education that would empower teenagers to value themselves and understand appropriate boundaries, but felt the proposed curriculum provided teenagers with a "how to" manual.

Jeanie Turner urged the Board to reject the proposed curriculum. She believed the resources would educate students on highly inappropriate sex topics by providing graphic representations that would irreparably harm the students. She was especially concerned about Planned Parenthood being used as a reference, claiming Planned Parenthood had a goal of pushing abortions on women and was part of a baby body part farming industry. She claimed the resources cited in the proposed curriculum were designed to promote early sex and encouraged the oversexualization of children. It was her belief if the Board approved the proposed curriculum, the Board would be abusing their authority entrusted to them by the people.

Andrea Thompson was a family nurse practitioner in the area. She urged the Board to approve the proposed SHARE curriculum as someone who saw the effects of non-education on women and children. She stated when she had moved to the area, she was concerned about the high rates of gonorrhea, chlamydia, and syphilis and wondered how and why the community was so far behind other areas of the country until she saw what was being taught in the schools. As a medical professional, she strove to provide information to patients based on data, research, and facts, not her opinion. She mentioned all the data and facts she had available to her showed comprehensive sex education lowered teen pregnancy rates, lowered rates of sexually transmitted disease, and lowered the number of those under 18 engaged in sexual intercourse.

Tiffany Hoffman remarked that she was a former member of the SHARE Advisory Committee and was a midwife in the area. She urged the Board to approve the proposed curriculum because it was medically accurate, evidence-based, and desperately needed. As a mother, she remarked that she had often heard her children's friend talk about sex and was concerned about the amount of misinformation they shared with each other, especially related to consent and sexting. She stated there were a number members of the community providing misinformation to the Board and there were no "how tos" in the curriculum. She reiterated the proposed curriculum was based on facts. It was proven through various research that comprehensive sex education did delay the first sexual contact teens had, decreased teen pregnancies, and reduced the spread of sexually transmitted diseases.

Cheryl Schricker expressed concern over the proposed SHARE curriculum. As a former educator, she knew the District insisted on evidence and researched based programs for students so she wondered why those principles did not apply to the SHARE curriculum. She was specifically concerned about lesson one concerning sexual orientation and gender because she knew of research that showed it was impossible to reassign someone's sex and that any procedures that supported gender reassignment did not work.

Cher Daniels urged the Board to vote no on the proposed curriculum as a grandmother and a great-grandmother.

Leo Castro expressed concern about the lack of information available to members of the Hispanic community on the proposed SHARE curriculum throughout the entire process. He did not support the proposed curriculum because he believed it would endanger children by creating confusion in their minds.

Krystal Minera urged the Board to vote no on the proposed curriculum because she believed it went beyond the job of the District in educating children. She was concerned about the progressiveness of the curriculum and the lack of inclusion of traditional views of gender and sex. She requested additional information and resources be included in the curriculum related to the Crisis Pregnancy Center.

Kelly Roper was a member of the SHARE Advisory Committee and proud of the work of the Committee had accomplished. She was frustrated that members of the community were claiming the curriculum included "how tos" regarding sexual acts or would have a textbook associated with the program. She praised Ms. Procter for including references in her resource list, even if only one sentence in the curriculum was used from a book. She provided the Board with additional information on why she felt lesson one was not approved by the Committee and requested that if the Board approved the specific lesson, it would be sent back to the Committee for a final review to ensure there was consensus.

Vanessa Vancour was a parent of young students in the District and a faculty member at the University of Nevada, Reno. She stated she would like to see the Board approve the proposed curriculum because it provided needed information to students whose parents were unable, for whatever reason, to have difficult conversations in the home regarding sex. She had worked with a number of young women at the University who did not realize they had been victims of a sexual assault until they learned the definition of sexual assault in college. It concerned her that young women were not being provided the information sooner because women needed to know how to protect themselves. She was frustrated with many of those speaking in opposition to the curriculum because they were either misinformed about the contents of the curriculum or choosing to present misinformation to the Board. She remarked that when people spoke of "traditional

views," it was important to remember that those views had historically been used to protect those with privilege and marginalize others.

Maria Rodriguez was the mother of two daughters in the District and frustrated that the information on the proposed SHARE curriculum had not been translated so members of the Hispanic community could review the information. She did not support the information included in the curriculum and did not believe it was appropriate for children.

Kelly Euse expressed concerns with lessons one, two, and four of the proposed SHARE curriculum. She believed the lessons were overreaching and would be harmful to the children of the community. She would like to see sex education in the District focus on reproductive organs and consequences of unhealthy behavior. She did not think the District should be providing any information on cultural beliefs regarding sexuality because there was no consensus and large groups would be alienated by the information. She did not think that telling parents they could opt out of the curriculum was enough so the Board should not approve the proposed curriculum.

Tom Loftus was a grandfather in the community and urged the Board to vote no on the proposed curriculum. He expressed frustration in the process since the Hispanic community had not been able to review the materials and Nevada Revised Statute included guidelines to ensure parental involvement in the development of the curriculum. He felt the curriculum had been developed by District staff with a specific agenda in mind and that the Board should send some of the lessons back to the SHARE Advisory Committee for additional revisions.

Jennifer Heywood expressed her opposition to the proposed SHARE curriculum, especially lesson one. She was concerned so many parents would opt their children out of the lessons that the students would not have anywhere to go because there would be so many of them forced out of the classrooms. She was also concerned that students would discuss the lessons with each other during lunch, so even if a student was not present they would still be exposed to the information against the wishes of the parents.

Nathan Noble was a student in the District at Earl Wooster High School and the student representative on the Safe and Healthy Schools Commission. He urged the Board to approve the proposed SHARE curriculum because it was information all students in the District needed. He stated the current curriculum was extremely out of date and did not provide accurate information on how students could protect themselves. He was concerned there were many present at the meeting interested in imposing their beliefs and values on the students in the District without regard to the facts.

Christopher Mann stated he would like to see the Board approve a SHARE curriculum that was based on science and biology. He had a number of concerns with the proposed curriculum and requested the Board send the curriculum back to the Committee.

Karel Rice was a grandparent of children in the District and former teacher. She was saddened by the proposed SHARE curriculum because she believed it was overreaching. She would like to see the District focus on the basic education of children, such as reading and writing, and not provide instruction on how to have sex to students. She stated the parents should be the ones providing the information to children, not the District.

Nestor Herrera urged the Board to reject the proposed SHARE curriculum. He was frustrated that, as a member of the Hispanic community, he was unable to review the proposed lessons during the parent preview night because the information was not available in any other language. He was also concerned the District would be violating the religious rights of people under the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment because religion was a protected class and should be taught as part of an "inclusive" curriculum.

Steve Kutz urged the Board to approve the proposed curriculum. He was a registered nurse in the community and knew the importance of providing a comprehensive, medically accurate sex education to children. He noted the Washoe County Health District supported comprehensive, medically accurate and inclusive sexual health education to help decrease the burden of sexually transmitted diseases and infections, the costs of which were extremely burdensome on individuals and the community.

Mano Khosh spoke against the proposed SHARE curriculum. She stated she sent her children to school to learn about science, math, and reading and not about sex.

Mindy Lilyquist requested the Board relook at the information provided in the proposed curriculum and consider taking a lot of information related to sexuality and gender identity out. She was concerned about the age of some of the children who would receive the information and believed a more balanced approach should be taken that was representative of the entire student body of the District. She understood the reasoning of including information on LGBTQ, but felt the information could be confusing to younger students or others who believed their gender was a core part of who they were. She did not want to see parents opt their children out of the curriculum because of the inclusion of information on gender identity and sexuality because they would miss vital information on protecting their health. She also felt that many of those students who were opted out of the curriculum would be harassed by other students.

Bret Holman spoke against the proposed SHARE curriculum, specifically lessons one and two. He would like the Board to look at a curriculum that was focused on biology and anatomy, not a curriculum that was focused on diversity education. He expressed concern that other beliefs were being excluded from the curriculum in violation of their religious rights, which he felt was one of the reasons lesson one was not approved by the SHARE Advisory Committee. He would also like to see additional information in lesson

two regarding pregnancy choices including adoption and references to the Crisis Pregnancy Center in Reno.

Marling Hardman spoke against some of the lessons included in the proposed SHARE curriculum. While she supported members of the LGBTQ community, she would not want her children receiving the information included in lesson one because she believed it went too far, as well as lessons two and four. She would rather see the District work to provide additional information to parents regarding the lessons she objected to so they could be the ones to provide the information to their children.

Dr. Nicole Pavlatosdelevoye expressed concerns with the proposed SHARE curriculum because she believed the District could do better at providing information to students. She felt the information could trigger additional trauma in some students who had already experienced sexual trauma. She also did not believe the information followed the standard of care for transgender students and additional information should be included. She was also concerned about some of the information included in the resource links that would be available to students.

Marisal Camacho urged the Board to reject the proposed curriculum until the Hispanic community had a better chance to review the information and provide input to the SHARE Advisory Committee. She was concerned because her values and beliefs were not reflected in lesson one and she did not want her children thinking it was acceptable to experiment until they were able to understand the world.

Karen England stated she had spend many hours attending SHARE Advisory Committee meetings and urged the Board to reject the proposed curriculum. She was concerned about all the information included and believed the Board had been provided misinformation by staff on what was and was not included in the lessons. She claimed the lessons included on the District's website had information related to anal sex and dental dams so it concerned her that staff was now saying that information was not in the lessons. She also believed the resources presented would be used as a whole and not just certain pages or sections because the curriculum did not state to only use a certain part.

Valerie Wade urged the Board to approve the proposed SHARE curriculum. She claimed those in opposition to the curriculum were feeding into fears and bigotry against members of the LGBTQ community. She indicated those in opposition were not speaking directly against the LGBTQ community, but using "codewords," such as anal sex, dental damns, traditional values, or that the curriculum needed to be balanced. She mentioned students growing up in today's society were exposed everyday to sexting, cyber-bullying, and sexual harassment so it was vital they were fully educated. She was concerned about the rising rates of suicide in the LGBTQ community, especially the younger community,

because she believed the rates would continue to rise if students did not believe they were welcome in society.

Ashley Sonderfan was a member of the SHARE Advisory Committee but present to speak as a parent. She urged the Board to approve the proposed SHARE curriculum because it provided needed education and information to students. She mentioned the information included in the curriculum was developed to ensure the more than 80% of students who took part in the SHARE curriculum each year were informed with medically accurate information and facts.

Jesus Sepulveda spoke against the proposed SHARE curriculum. He did not believe his daughter and many other students were ready to be exposed to the information included in the lessons because it went against their families' morals and values.

Val White urged the Board to vote no on the proposed SHARE curriculum. She would like to see the Board adopt a curriculum that was more focused on abstinence and not a "how to" curriculum that encouraged students to have sex. She was very concerned about some of the resources being provided to students, specifically the website Scarleteen. She claimed to support any sex education curriculum that was developed by medical professionals, but could not support a curriculum developed by a special interest group. She added the proposed curriculum did not honor the parents and their rights on educating their children according to their values.

Susy Meza was a junior at Sparks High School and a member of the Student Advisory Council for the Superintendent. She urged the Board to approve the proposed SHARE curriculum because the students were the ones who wanted the information and if the District did not provide the information students needed and wanted, they would look for it themselves on the internet. She expressed concern over the opposition to the curriculum because she felt their interests were not consistent with promoting education. She used an example of the District teaching students about the Holocaust, not because the District supported the Holocaust, but because students needed to learn about the Holocaust. She hoped the Board understood that there were many students in the District who did not have parents they could talk to about sex so they learned about it in school and those students deserved to have as much information as possible to protect themselves.

Stephan Page, Human Rights Campaign of Northern Nevada, urged the Board to approve the proposed SHARE curriculum. He reminded the Trustees about their prior action taken to support a fully inclusive sex education curriculum, which the students were currently not receiving. He claimed the failure to implement a curriculum that addressed the needs of LGBTQ students was discriminatory and endangered the health and well-being of the students. He stated lesson one did not teach ideology, but provided factual information

on heterosexuals and those who were LGBTQ. He did agree that the information should be translated so all members of the community could have access to the information.

Edwin Nuñez spoke against the proposed SHARE curriculum. He felt some of the information included was pornographic and did not address the values of many members of the community.

Pastor Gabriel Rivarola spoke in opposition to the proposed SHARE curriculum. He believed it was the duty of the parents to provide sex education to children and not the District. He felt the information contained in lesson one was harmful to children and did not represent the values of his church and community.

Michelle Hammond had been a District employee for 14 years and had spent 8 years working directly with students identified as high risk, including students who did not have parents physically present or mentally capable of having conversations about sex education so she felt it was important the Board approve the proposed SHARE curriculum. As a parent, she understood the concerns of many in wanting to teach their children about sex, but she was concerned that was not occurring and that many children were not provided access to vital information that could change their lives. She believed the proposed curriculum was proactive and empowered the students with the information they needed to make their own safe and healthy choices. She spoke to the parents of teenagers and reminded them that even with a household that was open to discuss any topic, teenagers did not want to have the conversations with their parents and the conversations would end up being one-sided; additionally, teenagers would seek out the information themselves, either from friends or online, which could be inaccurate and cause future harm.

Celiflora Perez spoke in opposition to the proposed SHARE curriculum. She was concerned that the information had not been translated so members of the Hispanic community could not review the materials and the information included in the lessons would be harmful to children.

Dan Holly urged the Board to reject the proposed SHARE curriculum because he believed it was perverse and demonic. He could not believe the community had to speak against the information included in the lessons and the Board should focus on reading, writing, and math education.

Alonzo Ayala urged the Board to oppose the proposed SHARE curriculum because it was the responsibility of the parents to provide the information to their children.

Erika Minaberry expressed her support for the proposed SHARE curriculum. She felt the information included in the materials was desperately needed and was frustrated to hear

so many parents talk about parental rights when children were dying because of the misinformation they had received regarding sex.

Cecilio Vargas Cordez requested the Board not approve lesson one of the proposed curriculum. He stated it was his duty as a father to teach his children values and morals, including sex education, not the responsibility of the District.

Sara Yelowitz urged the Board to vote no on the proposed curriculum. She was very concerned about the resources that would be provided to the students and the controversial books where the material in the curriculum came from. She was in favor of providing information to students to protect their health, but felt the information included in the curriculum went too far and normalized promiscuity.

Malea Hoffman was a senior at Reno High School and had provided remarks at a number of meetings of the SHARE Advisory Committee in support of the proposed curriculum. She stated heterosexual values had always been included in sex education because that was the societal norm so she was frustrated that there were so many speaking out about including information for LGBTQ students. She noted many past practices in society also used to be considered the norm but that did not mean they were right, such as slavery and women not having the right to vote. She mentioned that members of the LGBTQ community were more likely to be depressed and suicidal because of how they were treated by others in society and providing all students information would help create greater understanding and acceptance. She mentioned she had spoken with many members of the student body at Reno High School and not a single student was opposed to the proposed curriculum.

Megan Kiley spoke against the proposed SHARE curriculum. As a parent and native Nevadan, she believed the curriculum was a radical and complete overhaul of the current curriculum and against what the Board had intended. She stated she would opt her child out of the program and claimed even more parents would opt their children out so the District would no longer receive funding from the state for the program. She was very concerned about the overreach of the District in providing the information and did not believe the schools should provide the curriculum.

Angelo Flez urged the Board to reject the proposed curriculum because it was too dangerous for children. He would like to see a biology based sex education provided to students but did not feel that was what was included in the proposed curriculum. He felt the parents should be the ones talking to children about much of the information included.

Emme Machado was a senior in high school in the District and hoped the Board approved the proposed SHARE curriculum. As a straight, teenage female, she was not a member of a group of student who was provided useless information in the SHARE program; however, the information provided should be relevant to all students, not just those who

were straight. She knew that what was not taught directly to students would be learned the hard way, through consequences that were often harmful. She felt lucky that her sexuality was the focus of SHARE, but had many LGBTQ friends who deserved the same treatment and knowledge of safe sex practices. She believed providing information on the LGBTQ community would also create a more open-minded society where all people would feel supported no matter who they loved. She stated all students could either be taught how to have sex safely if they wanted to or they would become victims of the alternative.

Catherine Terry indicated she would like to see the Board allow parents to opt out of certain lessons for the SHARE program so that parents could decide what lessons they wanted their children to hear. She did not support the information included in lesson one and, if approved, would have to opt her children out of the entire curriculum. She threatened that she would also consider removing her children completely from the Washoe County School District because she did not believe it was the job of the District to provide sex education to students.

Annie Tobler expressed concerns over the proposed SHARE curriculum. She believed it was important for students to have a safe place where they could talk with trusted adults about sexuality, but the information in lessons one and two went too far and could end up being harmful to children.

Reilly Hogan was a senior in high school and urged the Board to approve all lessons in the proposed SHARE curriculum. While the remarks and opinions from parents and grandparents were important, she believed that it was critical the Board take the comments from the students seriously because the lessons would be presented to them. She stated she had hated herself for many years because what she was feeling was not taught in school. For her, it did not matter that her parents were supportive, but that she did not hear the same support in school. She remarked that encouraging students to think about gender and sexuality would not harm students, but teach them about acceptance and understanding.

Claudia Bessette was a middle school counselor and former teacher who had taught SHARE in the District. She urged the Trustees to approve the proposed curriculum because it was desperately needed. She commented that many students were fortunate to have supportive families that were able to provide guidance when students had questions; however, there were also many students who did not have the same support and relied on the teachers to guide them through difficult times and decisions. She admitted the curriculum was not perfect, but it was developed by the Advisory Committee after many hours of discussion and public comment. She added that there should not be as big of a concern with the resources included as was being discussed because students were already accessing the information on the internet and seeing far worse.

Arielle Gomes urged the Board to support the proposed SHARE curriculum. She stated she had been the victim of a sexual assault because she had never be taught where to draw the boundary lines in school. She also knew friends who had received more information about their own bodies at their first gynecological exam because their parents did not talk to them about such topics. She understood the concerns raised by some because the topic was not something regularly discussed, but it was important the students had the information so they would know how to protect themselves.

Gabriela Renteria expressed concern over the proposed curriculum because she believed the parents should be having the conversations with their children before the schools presented the information. She felt there was too much division in the community on the proposed curriculum for a consensus to occur on what information should be taught and was very concerned about the lessons not being available to the Hispanic community.

Jennifer Baker mentioned the only lesson of the proposed curriculum she had concerns with was lesson one. She believed that if the schools were to present the information then sexuality would be at the front of the students' minds and they would then actively seek out information on the recommended resource list. In her mind, that would create larger problems and instances of sexual assaults.

Kurt Baker agreed that updated information on sexually transmitted diseases and infections should be approved for the students, but hoped the Board would not approve the rest of the information in the proposed curriculum. He was very concerned about the information from staff that 80% of students were not opted out the curriculum since the curriculum had not been approved yet. He felt staff was providing misinformation to the Board and community on what was really occurring with the lessons.

Brooke Maylath, Transgender Allies Group, expressed her full support for the proposed curriculum and was outraged to hear the misinformation and lies being presented to the Board by some members of the community. She claimed the research that had been cited regarding education and information harming transgender students and other members of the LGBTQ community had been conducted by psychologists that had been discredited on multiple occasions and had been funded by hate groups. She remarked the proposed curriculum was factual and medically accurate and would save lives of members of the LGBTQ community, especially transgender women. She stated she had attended the SHARE Advisory Committee meeting where the lesson was presented and there was no discussion by the Committee on changing anything in the curriculum, so she did not agree that there were members of the Committee interested in making the lesson more inclusive because when provided with the opportunity to make changes, they did nothing.

Ethan Champagne was a senior at Reno High School and urged the Board to support all of the proposed SHARE curriculum. He stated his parents were not very open to

discussions regarding sex so the only education he received was from the SHARE program. He added that the information he received from the current curriculum was not enough and that he had many more questions because of what he was able to find on the internet and through friends. He felt the community would never come to complete agreement on any sex education curriculum because it was a difficult subject with many viewpoints and beliefs; however, students absolutely needed the information because they would be exposed to the consequences.

John England urged the Board to reject the proposed curriculum. He believed the curriculum would warp the minds of young men and women in terms of their sexuality. He felt the curriculum was irresponsible and would damage the hearts and souls of the students.

Eric Henry expressed his opposition to the proposed SHARE curriculum. He felt the minds of high schoolers were too influential and that the information included in the lessons would influence them into decisions they never would have considered otherwise. He believed the information contained in lesson one were too extreme and hoped the Board listened to all those opposed to the curriculum.

Samantha Clements was a senior at Reno High School and urged the Board to approve the proposed curriculum. She was frustrated with the opposition to the lessons, especially lesson one, because she understood the need for students to be informed and to feel accepted. She stated that, as a straight, white teenager, she did not understand the difficulties of the LGBTQ community, but she knew that those who identified as heterosexual would not be confused when presented with information on LGBTQ and that confusion occurred when students did not feel supported by their families and friends or have access to information. She hoped the Board took the comments from the students seriously because they were the ones experiencing the curriculum and having conversations with friends about sex and sexuality.

Sherry Oats expressed her support for all lessons, except lesson one, of the proposed SHARE curriculum.

*President Simon Holland recessed the meeting for 15 minutes.*

President Simon Holland thanked everyone for providing their comments. She mentioned the Board did have the ability to make revisions to the curriculum if that was the desire and that the revisions were not required to be sent back to the SHARE Advisory Committee for their review.

President Simon Holland requested additional information on concerns raised during public comment: how the resource list was developed and materials cited; if Planned Parenthood in Washoe County provided abortions; and why the lessons had not been

translated into Spanish. Ms. Proctor explained the parent preview night held at Edward L. Pine Middle School was an open house event where parents were able to come in and view the proposed curriculum. A presentation of the curriculum to the community was never intended, as the information had been presented at public meetings over a number of months. The District did have translators at the event, but the paper copies of the curriculum had not been translated. She noted the District had learned that it would be critical to have the information translated for future events and was in the process of making sure the same thing did not happen again. In terms of the citing of materials used to develop the curriculum, that information would only be available to the teachers and not the students. The students would be provided the information included on the slides where the citations were not included.

President Simon Holland wondered what had changed in the proposed curriculum since the last update in 2003. Ms. Proctor indicated few actual changes to the previous information were made, aside from updating information. The biggest changes were the inclusion of additional information. For example, the information related to abortion and abstinence were almost exactly the same as the 2003 version but information on technology was new. She clarified that the information related to anal sex referred to in public comment was not a "how to" but to be part of a conversation for the teacher to have with students related to the discussion on abstinence. Additionally, the resource list intended for students so they would be able to access information later if they had questions. Many of the websites had parent components to prompt discussions with their children and how to have difficult conversations. The Scarleteen website was associated with Rutgers University.

President Simon Holland remarked, as one Trustee, that staff should consider adding a disclaimer of some sort to the resources list because some of the information was very detailed. She wondered why the Crisis Pregnancy Center had not been included as a resource. Ms. Proctor explained the Advisory Committee had a discussion about the resource lists and had made various changes to add and remove some items. The Crisis Pregnancy Center was mentioned as an additional resource, but no action was ever taken by the Committee to include them. Finally, the local Planned Parenthood office in Reno did not provide abortions and was included as a resource for students to access more information and health care since they were one of the largest providers of women's health care in the area.

President Simon Holland wondered if it would be possible to add information in the lesson on gender identity regarding some of the concerns raised during public comment and including something about people having different beliefs on what gender identity was. She expressed her own support of including information on what were considered traditional views to balance the information presented in lesson one with other views. Ms. Biersdorff noted information on gender identity was included in lesson one, which

failed due to a tie vote. The Advisory Committee did not have any additional conversations or discussions on possible changes to the lesson.

Kindra Fox, Director of Curriculum & Instruction, provided additional information related to the ability of parents to opt in and/or out of specific lessons for the SHARE program. The District had never offered the ability for parents to opt their children out of specific lessons for the SHARE curriculum because of the confusion that could be created for teachers. The lessons were not always provided in a specific order and the conversations with students would often overlap between lessons so the District did not want to put teachers or students in a position where someone was not supposed to be in the room during a certain conversation but was because of a clerical error.

President Simon Holland asked if "blood play" was included in the curriculum. Ms. Procter stated it was not.

Trustee Caudill expressed concern about the Scarleteen website as a resource. He was concerned about information provided telling teens when it was okay to hide things from their parents, especially related to girls having abortions without talking to their parents. He was also concerned about the medical accuracy of an article on "Kosher sex" and promoting pornography positively. Ms. Proctor stated the Scarleteen was a resource included on the Center for Disease Control website and was sponsored by Rutgers University. She reminded the Board the SHARE Advisory Committee had reviewed the resources and had the ability to make changes to the information. Ms. Biersdorff mentioned, as a former high school principal, she knew students were not always interested in asking parents or teachers for additional information because they were embarrassed. The resource list was intended to be something the students could access on their own to find out additional information.

Trustee Caudill indicated he was concerned about young adults accessing the resources and parents wondering where they received the information. While he was not Jewish, he felt an article on Kosher sex was offensive. He was also in favor of a more balanced curriculum for lesson one.

President Simon Holland reminded the Trustees they had the ability to revise the lessons if that was their prerogative.

Trustee Kelley remarked that he would not have a problem removing Scaleteen as a resource and adding information from a medical or physician's group instead. He did wonder if the Board would be setting themselves or the District up for a possible lawsuit if they approved the proposed curriculum and a student got pregnant or a disease because of information they learned during the SHARE program. Neil Rombardo, Chief General Counsel, indicated he would need to look at some additional legal information to provide an accurate answer.

Trustee Raymond commented that the proposed curriculum did include a number of other resources for students and she would not have a problem removing Scarleteen for that reason. She believed the SHARE Advisory Committee had presented a well-informed and inclusive curriculum like the Board had asked for.

It was moved by Trustee Raymond and seconded by President Simon Holland that **the Board of Trustees approves the proposed S.H.A.R.E. High School Curriculum, with the removal of the "Scarleteen" website as a resource related to the lesson on Making Informed Decisions.**

President Simon Holland opened the motion for discussion.

Trustee Taylor thanked the Advisory Committee for their work for over 2 years on the development of the proposed curriculum. She was concerned about the inclusiveness of the curriculum based on remarks from the community and that members of the Hispanic community felt removed from the process. She hoped the District would work to remedy the disconnects in the process that resulted in the community feeling excluded from the process. She added that the curriculum had been very one-sided since it was last updated in 2003 towards a more "traditional" view of sexuality but was hesitant to remove all aspects of the current curriculum so there was balance to what was presented to students.

Trustee Kelley agreed with Trustee Taylor's remarks. He would support the approval of all lessons, except lesson one since that was the only lesson that was not approved by the SHARE Advisory Committee. He would like to see the Committee conduct an additional review of lesson one with the idea of providing some additional balance.

Trustee Caudill stated he could not support lessons one, two, and four of the proposed curriculum because he did not believe they were balanced and went too far in what they were teaching students.

Trustee Raymond indicated she did not have any problem with lesson one as was currently presented, but she did not have a problem with the Advisory Committee reviewing the information again to try to find a consensus.

Trustee Raymond withdrew the original motion and moved that **the Board of Trustees approves the following lessons for the high school Sexuality, Health and Responsibility Education (S.H.A.R.E.) curriculum as recommended by the S.H.A.R.E. Advisory Committee: Making Informed Decisions, Responsible Use of Technology, Know Your Options, Sexually Transmitted Diseases and HIV, and Consent and the Law; removes "Scarleteen" website as a resource included for students; sends Lesson Topic - Understanding Sexual Orientation**

**and Gender back to the S.H.A.R.E. Advisory Committee for additional review; and requests all lessons and materials be translated into Spanish and posted on the District's website as soon as possible.** President Katy Simon Holland agreed to the revised motion as the original seconder.

Trustee Calvert asked if the lessons would also be translated into other languages. Ms. Biersdorff mentioned there were close to 100 different languages spoken in the District.

President Simon Holland felt that it would be difficult to translate the lessons into all spoken languages, but the District should have had the materials in Spanish since the Hispanic community represented about 30% of the population.

Mr. Rombardo stated that after reviewing court cases related to the question on if the District could face a lawsuit over the curriculum, his legal opinion was that the District could not be sued. Nevada Revised Statute 389 gave the Board authority to adopt a curriculum and Nevada Revised Statute 42 would provide immunity for any liability that might result.

Trustee Taylor wondered if the motion could be amended to include the Crisis Pregnancy Center as one of the resources for lesson two.

Trustee Raymond stated she was not interested in adding the Crisis Pregnancy Center to the list of resources.

The result of the vote was 5-2: (Yea: Jacqueline Calvert, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor. Nay: Andrew Caudill and Ellen Minetto.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

## **5. Reports**

### **5.01 BOARD REPORTS**

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

### **5.02 SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT**

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

## **6. Closing Items**

### **6.01 FUTURE AGENDA ITEM REQUESTS**

Trustee Raymond requested an agenda item on the collaboration between the District and KUNR, the local National Public Radio station, and opportunities for students.

Trustee Kelley requested information on if members of the community were able to rent out schools during the summer for events, such as class reunions.

#### **6.02 PUBLIC COMMENT**

Brooke Maylath expressed frustration that the Board had excluded the LGBTQ community from the SHARE curriculum by not approving lesson one. She believed the Board had violated their own policies to provide an inclusive curriculum and could face a discrimination lawsuit if they did not take action soon.

#### **6.03 NEXT MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT**

The next Regular Meeting would take place on June 25, 2019 beginning at 2:00 p.m. in the Board Room at the Central Administration Building.

#### **6.04 ADJOURN MEETING**

There being no further business to come before the members of the Board, President Simon Holland declared the meeting adjourned at 9:26 p.m.

---

**Katy Simon Holland, President**

---

**Angela D. Taylor, Clerk**