

**MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 8, 2020
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

December 8, 2020

1. Opening Items

1.01 CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Board of Trustees was called to order at 2:00 p.m. in the Reno High School gymnasium, 395 Booth Street, Reno, Nevada.

1.02 ROLL CALL

President Malena Raymond and Board Members Jacqueline Calvert, Andrew Caudill, Katy Simon Holland, Sharon Kennedy, Ellen Minetto, and Angela Taylor were present. Superintendent Kristen McNeill, Student Representative Victoria Gomez, and staff were also present.

1.03 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Trustee-Elect Kurt Thigpen led the meeting in the Pledge of Allegiance.

1.04 ACTION TO ADOPT THE AGENDA

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

2. Consent Agenda Items

Trustee Simon Holland requested Consent Agenda Item 2.10, Approval of the 2020-21 Early Separation Incentive Program, be pulled for additional consideration.

It was moved by Trustee Simon Holland and seconded by Trustee Caudill that **the Board of Trustees approves Consent Agenda Items 2.02 through 2.09 and 2.11 through 2.12.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: Pass (Yea: Jacqueline Calvert, Andrew Caudill, Katy Simon Holland, Sharon Kennedy, Ellen Minetto, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

- 2.02 The Board of Trustees accepted the Annual Independence Statement from the Chief Auditor, as forwarded by the Audit Committee.
- 2.03 The Board of Trustees accepted the Internal Audit Annual Audit Plan for Fiscal Year 2021, as recommended by the Audit Committee.
- 2.04 The Board of Trustees accepted the "Budget Transfer Report" and provided authorization to include budget transfers between functions or programs for a total amount of \$7,158.53 for the period October 1, 2020 through October 31, 2020 in the official Board minutes, as required by Nevada Revised Statute 354.598005.
- 2.05 The Board of Trustees accepted the "Budget Transfer Report" and provided authorization to include budget transfers between functions or programs for a total amount of \$12,105.40 for the period November 1, 2020 through November 30, 2020 in the official Board minutes, as required by Nevada Revised Statute 354.598005.
- 2.06 The Board of Trustees approved the five-year lease agreements for new Xerox production copiers for Damonte Ranch High School, Galena High School, Robert McQueen High School, North Valleys High School, Edward C. Reed High School, Reno High School, Spanish Springs High School, Sparks High School, and Earl Wooster High School in the estimated amount of \$478,295.40.
- 2.07 The Board of Trustees acknowledged receipt of notification of declared emergency repairs pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 332.112 and 338.011(2), contracts related to emergency, for the cleanup and repair of water damage at Sun Valley Elementary School.
- 2.08 The Board of Trustees approved the Eighth Amendment to the Commercial Lease Agreement for 535 East Plumb Lane, City of Reno, with Simons Properties (William J. Simons, Landlord), for the English Language Learners (ELL) and Title I Departments for an additional 12-month term beginning January 11, 2021 and expiring January 10, 2022, for a monthly amount of \$7,291.20 and an estimated total amount of \$110,294.40.
- 2.09 The Board of Trustees approved the one-year agreement for Reliastar Life Insurance Company, a Voya Company, for stop-loss coverage of \$425,000 with a rate guarantee of \$31.60 per employee/retiree per month, beginning January 1, 2021 and ending December 31, 2021.

2.11 The Board of Trustees approved the Agreement to Provide Professional Consultant Services with Benchmark Inc. for Roof Replacement at B.D. Billingham Middle School in the amount of \$115,800.

2.12 The Board of Trustees approved the Memorandum of Understanding between the Washoe County School District and the Washoe Education Association for the terms of the C-19 Sick Leave Bank.

Due to technical difficulties, the hearing on Consent Agenda Item 2.10 was delayed.

3. General Public Comment

3.01 PUBLIC COMMENT

John Eppolito, Protect Nevada Children, expressed concern over the data on students collected and stored by Infinite Campus. He claimed District staff routinely entered data without parental consent and had contacted Protect Nevada Children over their concerns with the amount of information being collected. He had repeatedly requested information from the District on the information being collected, but had been told by the District that the information was proprietary and could not be provided. He was also concerned about the inappropriate content students were able to access on District-issued devices and that the content was negatively impacting students.

Donald Gallimore agreed with the comments provided by Mr. Eppolito. He urged the Board to take the requests of Protect Nevada Children seriously and look at the information being collected and stored. He indicated Protect Nevada Children was trying to ensure students remained safe and that their information was not being given away.

The Board also received comments from the following:

Jarrid Green
Darla Lee
Adrian Lowry
Jeannette Famoso
Jole Rector
Janna Rager

2. Consent Agenda Items

2.10 **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE APPROVAL OF 2020-21 EARLY SEPARATION INCENTIVE PROGRAMS (ESIP) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CERTIFIED AND PROFESSIONAL-TECHNICAL EMPLOYEES WHO MEET THE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS PURSUANT**

**TO THE RESPECTIVE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS AND
EMPLOYEE HANDBOOKS**

Trustee Simon Holland requested addition information on the program and why the District continued to provide the opportunity to certain employees. She was concerned about the program because it cost the District over \$1 million in incentives to certain employees to leave when the District needed the experience of those employees and when the District had challenges filling the same positions, even though the District would save money in the long run. Emily Ellison, Chief Human Resources Officer, explained the Early Separation Incentive Programs (ESIP) remained in the contract for certain employee groups.

Trustee Simon Holland noted the Office of General Counsel had indicated that the strength of the agreements with the employee groups did not allow the Board to not approve the recommendation, which frustrated her because it put the District in a difficult situation when they were already having difficulty filling positions. She believed it was in everyone's best interest to work to remove the program from the agreements in the future. Neil Rombardo, Chief General Counsel, provided additional information on the ESIP program. The program had been part of employment agreements since the 1990s, because of 30 years of precedent and the program being included in District regulations, the Board had to approve the recommendation due to fair labor practices. It was his opinion that the Board would have to negotiate the provision out of agreements if they were not interested in continuing the practice in the future.

It was moved by Trustee Kennedy and seconded by Trustee Taylor that **the Board of Trustees approves the Early Separation Incentive Program (ESIP) recommendations.**

President Raymond opened the motion for discussion.

Trustee Taylor agreed the program seems counter-intuitive but based on the information provided by the Office of General Counsel, she would support approval of the recommendation.

The result of the vote was 6-1: Pass (Yea: Jacqueline Calvert, Andrew Caudill, Sharon Kennedy, Ellen Minetto, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor. Nay: Katy Simon Holland.)
Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

4. Budget Items**4.01 DISCUSSION, PRESENTATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTIONS REGARDING
THE ADOPTION OF WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD
RESOLUTION 20-015, A RESOLUTION TO AUGMENT THE FISCAL YEAR**

2020-21 BUDGET, AND APPROVAL OF AUGMENTATION AND TRANSFERS AND CONTINGENCY TRANSFERS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2020-21 BUDGET

Mike Schroeder, Budget Director, presented Washoe County School District Board Resolution 20-015, A resolution to augment the Fiscal Year 2020-21 Budget. Information on the proposed augmentations and transfer of funds were reviewed. The primary purpose of the augmentation was to true up the funds with the enrollment numbers. The enrollment decrease did create a \$12.5 million shortfall in the budget the District had to adjust for, as well as an increase in enrollment in charter schools which decreased overall District funding. Other decreases to the budget included a decrease in Medicaid reimbursement and funding changes from the Special Session of the Nevada Legislature over the summer. The total decrease in revenue the District had to account for was about \$13.4 million. Information on budget reductions made to cover the shortfall was provided and included the use of federal grant funding related to COVID, elimination of vacant positions, and use of ending fund balance.

Trustee Caudill requested clarification on the differences in the amount of ending fund balance provided. Mr. Schroeder explained the ending fund balance from the prior fiscal year was the opening fund balance for the current fiscal year. The actual ending fund balance was \$53.2 million but the District claimed a \$45.7 million opening fund balance so they did not have to account for all funds on the expenditure side to provide flexibility in the future. Since there remained numerous uncertainties due to COVID, the District wanted to ensure they were conservative in their numbers and had some emergency funds available if needed.

Trustee Kennedy requested additional information on why the District received less in Medicaid reimbursements. Mr. Schroeder mentioned there was about a 70% reduction in the reimbursement amount for speech therapy in Medicaid. The District received most of their Medicaid reimbursements for speech therapy so it did account for a larger portion of that budget.

It was moved by Trustee Simon Holland and seconded by Trustee Minetto that **the Board of Trustees adopts Washoe County School District Board Resolution 20-015, A Resolution to Augment the Fiscal Year 2020-21 Budget, approves budget transfers as proposed, and approves contingency transfers.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jacqueline Calvert, Andrew Caudill, Katy Simon Holland, Sharon Kennedy, Ellen Minetto, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

4.02 DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD RESOLUTION 20-016, A RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR: (1) THE ISSUANCE OF A GENERAL OBLIGATION (LIMITED TAX) MEDIUM-TERM

BOND, SERIES 2020B IN AN AGGREGATE AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$1,550,000, FOR ACQUIRING SCHOOL BUSES AND OTHER SUPPORT VEHICLES FOR THE DISTRICT; (2) PROVIDING THE FORM, TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE BOND; AND (3) AUTHORIZING THE SUPERINTENDENT OR CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER OF THE DISTRICT TO ACCEPT A BINDING BID FOR THE BOND

Mark Mathers, Chief Financial Officer, presented Washoe County School District Board Resolution 20-016, A resolution providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds. The Board had previously approved a resolution providing for the issuance of \$7.5 million in medium term bonds, conducted a public hearing on the issuance, and received approval from the Nevada Department of Taxation for the issuance of the bonds. The current resolution would be the first issuance of the bonds and would be used for the purchase of school buses and support vehicles, primarily for School Police.

Trustee Caudill asked if the District should take advantage of lower interest rates and purchase additional buses to reduce the average age of the fleet. Mr. Mathers mentioned the District was not recommending that at the present time because the source of revenue to pay for the bonds was the Government Services Tax and they had seen some declines in revenue in that area during the pandemic. Once the District began to see increases in people purchasing vehicles again, they would look at recommending using low interest rates for additional purchases.

It was moved by Trustee Caudill and seconded by Trustee Kennedy that **the Board of Trustees approves Washoe County School District Board Resolution 20-016, A Resolution providing for: (1) the issuance of a General Obligation (Limited Tax) Medium-Term Bond, Series 2020B, for acquiring school buses and other support vehicles for the district; (2) providing the form, terms and conditions of the bond; and (3) authorizing the Superintendent or Chief Financial Officer of the District to accept a binding bid for the bond.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jacqueline Calvert, Andrew Caudill, Katy Simon Holland, Sharon Kennedy, Ellen Minetto, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

4.03 **PRESENTATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE THE WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, TO INCLUDE THE 2020/21 'B' MAJOR PROJECTS PROGRAM IN THE AMOUNT OF \$82.7 MILLION IN PROJECTS THROUGHOUT THE DISTRICT, PURSUANT TO THE ATTACHED LIST OF PROGRAM PROJECTS AND ASSOCIATED COSTS FOR EACH PROJECT, AND THE 2020 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT, AS RECOMMENDED BY THE CAPITAL FUNDING PROTECTION COMMITTEE**

Adam Searcy, Chief Facilities Management Officer, explained the Board would be provided with the information presented to the Capital Funding Protection Committee and then asked to approve the 2020/21 'B' Major Projects Program.

Theresa Golden, Director of Design and Planning, reviewed the Capital Improvement Program Annual Evaluation Report. The information was also available on-line on the District's building website and through new quarterly reports. An example of the information available was provided and included a priority list of projects based on the age and possible failure rate of systems, as well as the bids received on contracts. The Capital Renewal Program and costs associated with each project were highlighted. Major projects currently occurring in the District were reviewed and their budgets were provided.

Trustee Simon Holland thanked staff for all the information. She appreciated having the information on the amount of savings the District was able to achieve with the projects because it was important the community understand that the District did save money when and where they could.

Trustee Minetto asked what the enrollment for the new Procter R. Hug High School would be. Mr. Searcy noted the enrollment at opening would be about 1,900 and the total capacity would be 2,200.

Trustee Minetto wondered if the current banners and other recognitions at Procter R. Hug High School would be moved to the new school. Mr. Searcy stated conversations were on-going with the school staff and architects on how to incorporate the honors. While some banners and plaques would be transferred, other memorabilia might be transformed and the honorees recognized in different ways. Additional conversations would occur with the current student body, alumni, and staff on how and what traditions would remain with the name of the school.

Mr. Searcy reviewed the presentation provided to the Capital Funding Protection Committee on the status of the Debbie Smith Career and Technical Education (CTE) Academy. The Board had approved the educational specifications and proposed programs of study, which allowed the architects the opportunity to look at current space and what would need to be changed to house the programs based on the educational specifications. Approximately 50% of the current structures could be removed beginning in June 2022 and completed by August 2023 to allow for some programs to begin. After the new buildings were constructed, the remaining structures would be remodeled and repurposed into CTE spaces. The anticipated completion date for the entire project was January 2024. The presentation provided to the Committee related to the William O'Brien Middle School replacement school project was reviewed. Updated information on the public and school community outreach was highlighted since the project was an in-fill project. Construction was beginning and the remaining proposed budgets explained.

Cost comparisons with other recent middle school construction projects was reviewed. The final construction budget for the project was \$76.85 million, with the total project construction budget at \$86.7 million. The final recommendation for the Board was to approve the 2020/21 'B' Major Projects Program and the 2020 Capital Improvement Annual Evaluation Report.

It was moved by Trustee Caudill and seconded by Trustee Simon Holland that **the Board of Trustees approves the Washoe County School District Capital Improvement Program, to include the 2020/21 'B' Major Projects Program in the amount of \$82.7 million, to include projects throughout the District pursuant to the attached list of program projects and associated costs for each project, and the 2020 Capital Improvement Program Annual Evaluation Report, as recommended by the Capital Funding Protection Committee.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jacqueline Calvert, Andrew Caudill, Katy Simon Holland, Sharon Kennedy, Ellen Minetto, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

4.04 DISCUSSION AND ACTION TO ADOPT WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD RESOLUTION 20-017, THE 2021 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT BOND RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE DISTRICT TO ISSUE ITS GENERAL OBLIGATION (LIMITED TAX) SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT BONDS, SERIES 2021, IN AN AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$130,480,000

Mark Mathers, Chief Financial Officer, explained Board Resolution 20-017 would fund the projects associated with the 2020/21 'B' Major Projects Program. The bonds would be Rollover Bonds and not related to WC1.

Ryan Henry, Sherman and Howard, reviewed the timeline of the proposed bond sale. The intent was to close the sale on the bonds by January 28, 2021.

Trustee Caudill wondered what the District's debt coverage was like and if there was room to cover the costs. Mr. Mathers noted the District had sufficient authority under the property tax program at the present time. The total debt projected for Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 was \$67 million and property tax revenue for the same period projected to be \$64 million. After FY22, the District would see the maturing of a number of bonds.

Trustee Caudill asked if the item needed to go to the Debt Management Commission for approval. Mr. Mathers stated the District had previously sought approval for numerous bond sales from the Debt Management Commission. The current agenda item was the final sale of that previous approval received, so if the District wanted to sell additional bonds in the future, they would need to go back to the Debt Management Commission for approval.

It was moved by Trustee Simon Holland and seconded by Trustee Taylor that **the Board of Trustees adopts Washoe County School District Board Resolution 20-017, The 2021 School Improvement Bond Resolution authorizing the district to issue general obligation bonds in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$130,480,000.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jacqueline Calvert, Andrew Caudill, Katy Simon Holland, Sharon Kennedy, Ellen Minetto, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

President Raymond recessed the meeting for 15 minutes.

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

5.02 PRESENTATION, ANNOUNCEMENT, AND ACTION TO RECOGNIZE THE TENTH ANNUAL HOLIDAY CARD CONTEST WINNERS

Melissa Gillis, Graphics Communication Specialist, provided background information on the Annual Holiday Card Contest. The District received submissions from over 400 elementary, middle, and high school students. The Board recognized a finalist from each school level and the winners' artwork would be used for the District's holiday card that would be sent to the community.

The winners were:

Marley Sass, 5th grade, Bud Beasley Elementary School

Cole Draper, 8th grade, Lou Mendive Middle School

Adelina LaForge, 9th grade, Incline High School

It was moved by Trustee Kennedy and seconded by Trustee Minetto that **the Board of Trustees recognizes the winners of the Tenth Annual Holiday Card Contest for elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jacqueline Calvert, Andrew Caudill, Katy Simon Holland, Sharon Kennedy, Ellen Minetto, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

3. General Public Comment

3.01 PUBLIC COMMENT

President Raymond reopened the general public comment period.

Phil Kaiser, Washoe Education Association, expressed concern over the lowering of standards for substitute teachers in the District so they would only need a high school diploma and fingerprint card. He felt the proposal undermined the professionalism of

educators and could harm students, as well as the public perception of education in the state. He believed the perception would become that the purpose of schools was only to provide a place for children while their parents were at work and did not honor the District's mission. He urged the Board to consider qualified substitutes who had experience and training in classroom management and were able to provide professional instruction. He was also concerned about the insufficient testing and contact tracing in the community because those were some of the reasons the secondary schools were moved to the full distance model.

Elizabeth Cadigan was a teacher in the District and expressed her appreciation for the updated information recently sent to music teachers in the District. She thanked President Raymond for their meeting last week and providing information on how the Board of Trustees operated and collaborated with District Administration. She suggested the Board create a staff representative position that would be able to sit with the Trustees during meetings to provide information on how policies and programs could impact the schools and classrooms, which would be similar to the student representative position currently on the Board.

Calen Evans, Empower Nevada Teachers, explained he was interested in getting teachers involved and advocating for education in Nevada. He did not believe education had ever been a priority in Nevada and wanted to ensure future generations were provided with the education they deserved through proper funding and support. He was concerned about the impacts to education during COVID and the inequities shown, which would only continue to worsen during the upcoming Legislative Session and transition to a new funding formula. He was interested in seeing District employees work with the community to demand better from their state representatives and properly fund education.

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

5.01 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO ACCEPT THE AUDIT OF THE WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PERFORMED BY PROTIVITI, AS RECOMMENDED BY THE AUDIT COMMITTEE

Kirk Starkey, Internal Auditor, presented background information on the audit of the Capital Improvement Program. The Internal Audit Department for the District had been asked to contract with a third party to conduct an audit of the Capital Improvement Program. He worked with a member of the Audit Committee and a member of the Capital Funding and Protection Committee to develop the procedures that would review WC1 proceeds and expenditures. Protiviti was selected to complete the audit.

Jack Benton, Protiviti, presented the audit for acceptance by the Board of Trustees. The audit had previously been presented to the Audit Committee for their review. Overall, the Capital Projects Department and Program was in compliance with the requirements of WC1; though two recommended improvements were suggested. The first recommendation was that the Department consider standardizing the formatting and information included in major project proposals with specific information. The second recommendation was that the District standardize project status communications based on the type of project and distribute the information in a quarterly report.

Trustee Simon Holland expressed her thanks to everyone involved in the process. She knew the audit was a long-time coming, but she was pleased they were able to find a company like Protiviti to conduct the audit. She praised the work of the Capital Projects Department since the findings only included recommendation on how information should be distributed and displayed.

It was moved by Trustee Simon Holland and seconded by Trustee Taylor that **the Board of Trustees accepts the audit of the Washoe County School District Capital Improvement Program, as recommended by the Audit Committee.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jacqueline Calvert, Andrew Caudill, Katy Simon Holland, Sharon Kennedy, Ellen Minetto, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

5.03 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED SEXUALITY, HEALTH AND RESPONSIBILITY EDUCATION (SHARE) AMENDMENT TO THE WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT SHARE CURRICULUM'S DEFINITION OF ABSTINENCE RELATED TO PREGNANCY, AS RECOMMENDED BY THE SHARE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Troy Parks, Chief Academic Officer, provided information on the Sexuality, Health and Responsibility Education (SHARE) update and introduced the presenters for the agenda item. He thanked the SHARE Advisory Committee for all their work on the curriculum and the impacts of their work on students.

Rochelle Procter, SHARE Coordinator, explained the current agenda item would amend the current definition of abstinence to add the following statement as an additional bullet point at the end of the definition: "Pregnancy most commonly results from vaginal sex." The current definition was reviewed. The definition was developed 3 years ago by the SHARE Advisory Committee and was the start of the updates to all SHARE curriculums. If approved, the definition would be used for all SHARE curriculums in the District. The intent was to ensure information was included on what caused pregnancy as part of the definition.

President Raymond asked if the proposed amendment was unanimously approved by the Committee. Ms. Procter stated that it was a unanimous vote.

Trustee Minetto wondered why the words "most commonly" were used as part of the definition. Ms. Procter indicated the Committee decided the language of the amendment after a lot of discussion.

It was moved by Trustee Kennedy and seconded by Trustee Taylor that **the Board of Trustees approves the proposed amended Definition of Abstinence to be used as part of the Sexuality, Health, and Responsibility Education (SHARE) Curriculum, as recommended by the SHARE Advisory Committee.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jacqueline Calvert, Andrew Caudill, Katy Simon Holland, Sharon Kennedy, Ellen Minetto, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

5.04 **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED SEXUALITY, HEALTH AND RESPONSIBILITY EDUCATION (SHARE) 7TH GRADE CURRICULUM, AS RECOMMENDED BY THE SHARE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Rochelle Procter, SHARE Coordinator, presented the proposed Sexuality, Health and Responsibility Education (SHARE) 7th grade curriculum. Background information on Nevada Revised Statutes and Board Policies related to the SHARE curriculum were reviewed. She noted the composition of the SHARE Advisory Committee was the same as the Committee that developed and recommended the 8th grade curriculum, which was previously approved by the Board. The current 7th grade curriculum was inadequate and did not address various important topics, including consent, healthy relationships, and setting boundaries or provide medically accurate local resources and address the needs of the District's diverse student population. The SHARE Advisory Committee meetings and subsequent votes on the lessons for the proposed 7th grade curriculum were provided. The results from the survey distributed after the parent preview nights showed families were supportive of the lessons.

Trustee Taylor noted the lesson related to abstinence, contraceptives, and sexually transmitted infections (STIs) was the only lesson that was not unanimous from the SHARE Advisory Committee. She wondered what the concern of the Committee member was related to the lesson and why they did not support moving the lesson forward. Ashley Wade, SHARE Advisory Committee Chair, indicated the reason was related to a specific activity included as part of the lesson and an activity being considered low risk or no risk.

Trustee Caudill appreciated the work of the Committee and including a lesson surrounding boundaries. He did have a concern of including Planned Parenthood as a resource because he did not support the District advertising controversial organizations to students

and would rather parents provide that information to students. He also had some concerns with some of the activities regarding risk because he believed it was inappropriate to tell 7th graders that bathing together and mutual masturbation were considered "no risk" activities because those activities could lead to other higher risk activities.

Trustee Simon Holland thanked the Committee and District staff for all their work. It was critical the curriculum was updated since that had not occurred since 2003. She appreciated everyone working together and coming to consensus on difficult topics.

Trustee Kennedy wondered if there were places in the lessons where the teacher could continue the conversation regarding low/no risk activities becoming higher risk activities. Ms. Procter mentioned there was not a specific place where that could occur. The Committee did have a long conversation regarding the lesson because there were concerns about providing some of the information; however, the Committee ultimately decided it was important to address some of the activities students could be hearing about and involved in.

Trustee Kennedy asked if school counselors taught the 6th grade lessons and science teachers taught the 7th and 8th grade lessons. Ms. Procter responded in the affirmative.

Trustee Minetto agreed with the comments from Trustee Caudill. She was concerned about the immaturity of the students in 7th grade and believed the "low risk" activities could lead to something more. She mentioned the Crisis Pregnancy Center should be listed as a local resource for the students as well.

Trustee Taylor remarked the context of the lesson was important to consider and that the activities mentioned were considered "low risk" for contracting an STI. She would like to see that part emphasized when could ease some of the concerns raised by Trustees.

President Raymond agreed with Trustee Taylor. As the parent of a 6th grader, when she reviewed the lesson, she read it as a way to provide medical information regarding the transmission of STIs. She wanted to ensure the students had the tools and information available to make smart decisions and know that while a specific activity was considered low risk, it could lead to higher risk activities.

Trustee Kennedy noted the lessons were taught by experienced science teachers who knew their students. The lessons were not salacious but provided in a professional and serious manner.

Trustee Simon Holland reminded the community that parents did have the ability to opt their students out of the SHARE curriculum, if that was their desire.

It was moved by Trustee Simon Holland and seconded by Trustee Kennedy that **the Board of Trustees approves the proposed 7th Grade Sexuality, Health, and Responsibility Education (SHARE) Curriculum, as recommended by the SHARE Advisory Committee.** The result of the vote was 5-2: (Yea: Jacqueline Calvert, Katy Simon Holland, Sharon Kennedy, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor. Nay: Andrew Caudill and Ellen Minetto) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

5.05 PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE NEW PUPIL CENTERED FUNDING PLAN, WHICH TAKES EFFECT ON JULY 1, 2021, AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS FOR WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mark Mathers, Chief Financial Officer, began the presentation on the Pupil Centered Funding Plan (PCFP), which was the new way of funding education in Nevada, scheduled to take effect in 2021. The topic was dry but critical because it was very different than the current funding formula and would impact school districts in different ways. The initial legislation was approved in 2019 and was law, so unless there were changes during the 2021 Nevada Legislative Session, the new formula would go into effect, no matter if school districts agreed with the changes or not. The presentation would provide an initial background information for the upcoming budget discussions for the District. No longer would there be conversations surrounding the Distributive School Account (DSA) or per pupil guarantees because those would no longer be part of school funding in Nevada.

Lindsay Anderson, Director of Government Affairs, explained the intent of the presentation was to discuss the differences between the current "Nevada Plan" and the PCFP so the Board and community would have a better understanding. It was important to note there were some positive aspects to the new plan for the Washoe County School District, but there were also negative aspects to consider. The initial legislation, Senate Bill (SB) 543, was approved in 2019 and an interim committee formed to work through many of the details and provide recommendations to the Governor on how to implement the new formula. One positive aspect to the PCFP was that the funding for school districts would be streamlined and there would not be different buckets of funding for different programs, which should provide more local control over how funds were spent based on the students. However, the new plan did not address how much money the state would spend on education or increase resources for students as a whole.

Mr. Mathers provided background information on the Nevada Plan, which was enacted in 1967 to provide a state-wide, formula-based funding mechanism for public schools. Throughout the years, the state created different categorical programs to address specific needs. The current plan was fragmented and confusing and that it did not provide transparency to either the public or policymakers. While the Nevada Plan did provide a per-pupil guarantee, the state considered local revenues as part of the guarantee and

would provide less state funding if local revenues increased. He highlighted that per-pupil funding had increased nominally, but when inflation was taken into account, the actual number decreased and that the state's general fund commitment to education had decreased over the past 10 years, from 40% to about 33%, primarily due to increases in local revenues. Had the state continued to fund education at 40% of the general fund budget, school districts would have hundreds of millions more in education funding available. The positive changes to the PCFP were presented. The first aspect was the streamlined funding for education by providing a base funding amount for all students and then a weighted formula for four groups: special education, English learners, at-risk students, and Gifted and Talented.

Ms. Anderson mentioned the District should benefit from the streamlined approach during legislative sessions because there would not be questions on if a certain program would be funded or not. School districts would have a more predictable number in terms of the amount they would receive from the state, which would also help school districts provide more certainty for positions.

President Raymond mentioned that just because the categorical funding would be removed, that did not mean the District did not believe in or support the specific program. Her understanding was that the District intended to continue to support the programs, they would just be funded in a different way.

Trustee Caudill wondered if the weighted funding would be adjusted throughout the year, similar to how count days were currently used. He was concerned that the District would need to move staff if a student changed schools since the funding was supposed to follow the student. Mr. Mathers remarked that there were many unknowns with the PCFP and while the Commission on School Funding had tried to provide recommendations on many areas, there remained a lot to be done. The Commission had advocated for a single count day because staffing was based on an entire school year so it would become difficult for school districts to move staff around. There were positives and negatives to having one count day versus using average daily enrollment counts, but a final decision had not been made.

Trustee Caudill indicated some schools took a hit in funding recently due to grants ending because they had relied on those grants. He wondered if the schools would see similar impacts with the PCFP or if the schools would be able to see some additional funding come their way because they house larger numbers of certain weighted students. Mr. Mathers explained the schools should receive additional funding based on certain student populations; however, the final weights had not been set and the overall funding could still not be considered adequate. He used an example of a school that might house a large number of English learners and how their funding could change.

Mr. Mathers continued with the review of the positive changes under the PCFP. The second positive change was the elimination of the hybrid approach, local and state sources, to education funding, with funding now only coming from the state. The third positive change was the creation of a new State Education Fund as a special revenue fund where money should not be able to be removed once deposited into the fund. The fourth positive change was related in that the PCFP attempted to stop the erosion of state funding by tying the state's contribution to the new education fund to the Economic Forum's projected increase or decrease of state revenues. For example, if state revenues increased by 5%, the total funding for K-12 education should increase by 5%. Some neutral changes of the PCFP were "equity adjustments" that continued to fund rural school districts differently and had previously resulted in per-pupil funding ranges from \$7,029 in Washoe County up to \$19,184 in Esmeralda County. Another neutral change was how certain positions were allocated to ensure each student received the same services if they were part of one of the weighted categories and included new reporting requirements.

Superintendent McNeill requested clarification on if a student would receive additional funding if they were considered part of multiple weighted categories, such as a student who was both an English learner and part of the Gifted and Talented program. Mr. Mathers stated the student would only be eligible to receive the highest level of funding from one category. So, if a student was included in special education and an English learner, they would receive the funding associated with the special education weight only. The concern for school districts was that the student would still need to be provided with English learner services and supports and how those would be paid for.

Trustee Caudill asked if the state was looking at restrictions on how schools spent funding or if the District should look at putting restrictions in place. Mr. Mathers mentioned school districts were generally provided with flexibility in how supports and programs were provided to specific groups of students, though there were certain requirements that did not necessarily align with the PCFP so there could be some challenges moving forward. For example, Nevada Revised Statutes did include specific requirements for Gifted and Talented programming, but that did not align with the goal of providing equal services no matter where the student attended school.

Trustee Caudill wondered who would be responsible for the new reporting requirements and if additional positions would be needed. Mr. Mathers mentioned most financial reporting requirements fell on the Office of Business and Finance, but those were part of continued discussions with the Nevada Department of Education.

Mr. Mathers presented the negative changes to the PCFP, especially for the Washoe County School District. While the PCFP did include a cost-of-living or cost-of-wage adjustment, the analysis selected by the Commission on School Funding showed Washoe County as having some of the lowest wages in the state, even though the United States

Bureau of Economic Analysis showed Washoe County as having the highest cost of living in Nevada. The end result was millions of dollars would be shifted away of the District.

President Raymond requested additional information on the composition of the Commission on School Funding and the representation from Washoe County. Ms. Anderson noted the Commission was made up of 11 members, 4 school district chief financial officers and 8 members selected by the Governor and Legislative leadership. Washoe County School District was represented by Mark Mathers.

President Raymond expressed frustration in the analysis because it was not reflective of the reality in Washoe County. Mr. Mathers agreed and noted no one had questioned that Washoe County had the highest housing prices in the state, but conversations about providing a living wage for teachers, especially trying to attract new teachers, had stalled. Ms. Anderson mentioned she believed the District would be able to provide additional information during the Legislative Session that should work to change minds. She was hopeful the District would be able to see the same allowances as Clark County, which amounted to about a \$14 million swing in revenue.

Mr. Mathers continued with the possible negative changes for the District as part of the PCFP. The new plan did not address the level of funding for education and school districts had not seen the Governor's recommendation for FY22 or FY23. Another negative for the District was the Hold Harmless Clause, which was intended to be a safety-net for school districts who would see less funding under the PCFP compared to the Nevada Plan. The Hold Harmless Clause would freeze funding levels at the total funding received during FY20. Because the District was considered "over-funded" according the recommended cost-of-living adjustment, the District would be part of the Hold Harmless provision and not receive any additional revenue from the state. The final negative change was that there would be additional legislation in the future to clean-up any concerns that arise with new legislation and the current collective bargaining agreements have areas tied to local property tax revenues.

Ms. Anderson concluded the presentation. It was important to note there remained numerous questions and challenges to be addressed by the PCFP heading into the 2021 Legislative Session that might not be answered until close to the end of the Session. The District would continue to work with the Commission on School Funding and through the Legislative process to provide information on the possible impacts to the District and students.

Trustee Caudill remarked the Hold Harmless provision sounded great, but based on the numbers, unless the state provided additional funding for education, the District could be in a Hold Harmless status for a number of years. He requested clarification on if the change to the cost-of-living analysis were to change, the District would be in a better position. Mr. Mathers stated that was correct and a change to that part of the formula

would have the biggest impact to the District at the present time. If additional funds were added to education, then the District would be in a better position.

Trustee Taylor asked if the Commission on School Finance considered the marijuana tax revenue and if those funds would remain for schools. Mr. Mathers mentioned he could not recall specific conversations but during the 2019 Legislative Session a change was made to redirect the tax on retail sales to education so it was already a part of education funding.

President Raymond wondered if there was anything the Trustees could do to assist in the conversations with the state. Ms. Anderson indicated that it would be important to remind our legislators that the current analysis did not accurately reflect what was happening in Washoe County.

Superintendent McNeill thanked staff for the presentation. She and other members of the District had provided comments at the Commission meetings regarding the analysis and had been providing information to principals on the possible impacts of the PCFP. The District would continue to monitor what was occurring in terms of the state and the Governor's recommended budget.

President Raymond recessed the meeting for 32 minutes.

5.06 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO REVIEW AND RECEIVE AN UPDATE IN THE AREAS OF CONTACT TRACING, TESTING, EMERGENCY SUBSTITUTE NEEDS, AND SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMMING IN ADDITION TO THE COVID-19 CASE COUNTS IN SCHOOLS, ADEQUACY OF STAFFING LEVELS AS WELL AS DATA INDICATORS USED TO ASSESS COVID-19 COMMUNITY RISK SUCH AS COMPLETE RISK ASSESSMENT FORMS, TEST POSITIVITY, COMMUNITY WIDE CASE RATES AND HOSPITALIZATIONS, AND, IF DATA INDICATORS SUGGEST VERY HIGH RISK OR ABOVE FOR UP TO 7 DAYS, OR THE BOARD DEEMS IT NECESSARY, THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES WILL CONSIDER REAFFIRMING A RETURN TO THE HYBRID LEARNING MODEL FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS ON JANUARY 4, 2021; AND/OR CHANGES TO LEARNING MODELS AT ALL LEVELS; AND/OR CHANGES TO 2020-2021 ATHLETIC SEASONS

Dr. Kristen McNeill, Superintendent, explained staff would provide a significant update on the learning models, as well as additional information on testing and contact tracing capabilities and the status of guest teachers in the District based on the emergency directive provided by the Nevada Department of Education.

Dr. Paul LaMarca, Chief Strategies Officer, reviewed the Truckee Meadows Region Planning Agency (TMRPA) COVID Risk Meter, which remained in the Very High rating for the 4th week in a row. The data behind the rating and the District's data dashboard were reviewed. He noted any possible surge from the Thanksgiving holiday was about a week away but the numbers were continuing to rise. Part of the difficulty with the school data was the lag between when the Washoe County Health District received the information and were able to begin their contact tracing and reporting to the School District. It was important to remember the school specific data was related to if a student or staff member was present at the school while contagious. He provided an update on contact tracing efforts. Washoe County had put an "all call" out to County staff to determine who could assist in contact tracing and identified 43 individuals who would assist the School District, to include working directly in schools as needed. Training would be provided through the University of Nevada, Reno, the Health District, and the School District. Information on testing capacity for School District staff was reviewed, including potential agreements with companies to provide testing kits and rapid antigen testing.

Trustee Taylor thanked the efforts of Washoe County, specifically Washoe County Manager Eric Brown, in assisting the School District in the areas of testing and contact tracing so secondary schools would be able to return to the hybrid learning model after the winter break.

Emily Ellison, Chief Human Resources Officer, provided an update on the guest teacher needs. The ability of the District to provide an adequate number of guest teachers to fill open positions was one of the reasons for the recommendation to move secondary schools to the full distance learning model. The number of unfilled guest teacher requests. Since moving to the full distance learning model, the number of unfilled requests had dropped by about half.

Due to technical difficulties, the remainder of Ms. Ellison's update would be provided later in the meeting.

Jen Van Tress, Area Superintendent, and Lauren Ford, Area Superintendent, presented the update to special education services in the District with the change in learning models for secondary schools. The special education requirements under both federal and state laws the District followed and the programming offered to meet those requirements were presented. Information was reviewed on the continuum of services from the least restrictive environment, students in general education classes with accommodations and supports only in their zoned schools, to the most restrictive environment, students required to leave their zoned schools to receive highly specialized programming and services. The differences between the self-contained/specialized programs and the general resource programs were explained. About 1/3 of students in specialized programming were participating in the full distance learning model, no matter the school level, and a little over half participated in full in-person learning, with close to 70% of

elementary school aged students opting for in-person. The Board had previously approved allowing special education students to remain in-person for secondary schools and as of December 4, 2020, 57% of secondary students were in-person. Information on the services provided to special education students participating in the full distance learning model were explained.

Trustee Simon Holland requested clarification on "PWN." Ms. Van Tress noted PWN stood for Prior Written Notice and was one of the components the District was required to complete as part of proposed changes to an Individualized Education Program (IEP).

Trustee Kennedy wondered how many days of in-person learning the 57% of secondary students with IEPs were receiving. Ms. Van Tress stated the numbers were related to students in the specialized programs who were provided the option to attend every day. Some families had opted to continue with the hybrid model for their students, but the majority were in-person for 5 days a week.

Trustee Simon Holland asked if students with 504 plans were included as part of the in-person model. Ms. Van Tress remarked students with a 504 plan were not considered part of special education. While students with a 504 plan were considered part of the vulnerable populations, they were moved to full distance learning.

Trustee Simon Holland wondered how students with 504 plans were receiving some of the additional services they qualified for if they were not attending school in-person. Ms. Van Tress explained students were provided an opportunity to come into the buildings for related services or they could access services through teletherapy.

Ms. Ellison continued with the update on guest teachers. The process for an individual to apply for an emergency substitute license was reviewed and the recruitment campaign the District was engaged in discussed. It was important to note the District would not see the impact of those who applied for an emergency substitute license for about 6-8 weeks. She added that just because an individual met the requirements for an emergency license, did not mean they were not qualified to provide instruction to students or that the individual would automatically be hired by the District. Those interested in working for the District as an emergency substitute would still have to apply and go through a background check. She believed those interested in applying for an emergency license could be individuals looking at a career change or college students who had not decided on a future career path. She was excited about the opportunities that could be provided to recruit future teachers as part of the process.

Trustee Kennedy wondered where the majority of teacher absences were occurring. Ms. Ellison noted the District was primarily seeing teacher absences in the elementary schools at the present time.

Trustee Taylor asked if someone who was applying for an emergency substitute license with the Nevada Department of Education would take priority over someone who had previously submitted an application and were still waiting to hear back. Ms. Ellison indicated the applications were taken in order and there would not be the ability to leapfrog others. The length of time was more due to a bottlenecking with fingerprinting and the background check conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).

President Raymond wondered what the primary difference was between a standard substitute license and an emergency substitute license. Ms. Ellison explained the differences were in the qualifications required to apply for a license, with an emergency license only requiring a high school diploma. Emergency licenses were also only valid for 1 year, with the ability to renew 3 times. Regular licenses were valid for 5 years and could be renewed an unlimited number of times.

President Raymond noted the waiver was temporary. She asked if there was a deadline on when people could apply for the emergency license. Ms. Ellison mentioned emergency regulations could only be issued in 90 increments, so the current deadline was February 24, 2021.

Trustee Taylor requested additional information on the District's hiring process and what training was provided to substitute teachers. Ms. Ellison reviewed the hiring process, including the application and return of 4 references. The on-boarding and orientation process was explained and how guest teachers would access assignments. Guest teachers were also required to complete a classroom management training within 90 days of employment.

Trustee Simon Holland wondered if the guest teachers with emergency licenses would be eligible for long-term substitute positions. Ms. Ellison noted the likelihood of long-term substitute positions at the current time in the school year were unlikely; however, if a situation were to arise, the District would have to look at the specific situation. For example, if a current teacher's aide or assistant were to receive an emergency license and the teacher left on an emergency leave, the aide/assistant would likely be the best substitute to take on the position since they would know the students already. She believed the schools should retain the ability to keep that decision with them since they knew the substitutes best qualified for their schools and classrooms.

Superintendent McNeill requested additional information on the partnerships with higher education in the area to provide information to students on the opportunity. Ms. Ellison explained information had been distributed by the institutions as a whole, but the individual colleges and departments were also providing information specifically to their students. The schools were also sending information to employees since the positions could provide an opportunity to supplement their income when they are required to take furlough days.

Trustee Kennedy expressed some concern in recruiting college-aged students at the present time since they were more likely to engage in riskier behavior in terms of catching or spreading COVID. She wondered if the District was looking at mitigation efforts for new hires in terms of COVID. Ms. Ellison cautioned there were a number of non-traditional aged students going back to college and the District did not consider age as a determining factor in hiring decisions. The District did expect all employees to work to ensure the safety of students and fellow staff members and model appropriate behavior.

Trustee Simon Holland asked who made the final decision on hiring guest teachers. Ms. Ellison explained the District made the hiring decision based on established criteria. The guest teachers were then eligible to pick up assignments through an on-line system. In terms of long-term assignments, principals would reach out to substitutes who they knew from prior experience and would provide that information to the District for a long-term position. Many teachers would also establish relationships with guest teachers who worked in their classrooms on a regular basis and reach out to those individuals to ensure their classrooms were covered.

Dr. LaMarca provided an update on athletics implications when school returned in January. At the present time the only competitive sport allowed under current state directives and guidance was skiing since basketball and wrestling were labeled close-contact sports. Currently, school districts were operating under modified sports seasons, each lasting 6 weeks and beginning with winter sports before moving into fall and spring. The different dates for the first competitions or games based on when secondary schools returned to the hybrid model were reviewed. If the District were to remain on the full distance model, the winter season would be shorted by 2 weeks. The District did not have the ability to change when seasons occurred as they were established by the Nevada Interscholastic Activities Association (NIAA).

President Raymond requested clarification on if the Board of Trustees and District had the ability to change certain dates related to athletics and what could or could not occur, such as the start of conditioning, if in-person learning was not occurring at the secondary school level. Superintendent McNeill noted the NIAA set the practice schedule for when team practices could begin, but the District could allow conditioning efforts to occur. Dr. LaMarca agreed and added the NIAA did require a certain number of practice days to occur prior to the first games/competitions.

President Raymond asked if the District could allow basketball and wrestling the ability to begin conditioning. Dr. LaMarca indicated they could. The NIAA governed practices and competitions, but the school districts determined conditioning.

Trustee Kennedy wondered if the District had heard anything about basketball and wrestling returning after the start of the year. Dr. LaMarca mentioned there had been

conversations surrounding basketball resuming or being removed as a close-contact sport, but nothing coming from the Governor's Office. He believed that, based on the current directive, football could also be considered a close-contact sport and would not be allowed either.

Trustee Taylor noted the NIAA Board of Control was currently conducting their annual meeting. Conversations had occurred regarding the directives, but since the NIAA was also required to follow the directives, there was little they could do regarding allowing certain sports and/or activities to occur if they had been deemed close contact. The NIAA would continue to work closely with the Governor's office.

Trustee Caudill asked if there had been any discussions at the NIAA regarding later opportunities for basketball and wrestling. Trustee Taylor mentioned that currently the NIAA could only work with the information and guidance provided by the Governor. When directives and guidance changed, then the NIAA could look at possible changes to the schedules. Dr. LaMarca added that it would be difficult for sports seasons to overlap since there were a number of multi-sport athletes. The Nevada Association of School Superintendents (NASS) had also indicated there did need to be a deadline for spring sports so there would not be conflicts with graduations.

Debra Biersdorff, Deputy Superintendent, reviewed the proposed calendar to support the recommendation. The District was currently utilizing the full distance model for secondary schools through the end of the current semester, December 18, 2020. The recommendation was to continue with the full distance model for secondary schools for 2 weeks at the start of the second semester to allow for the efforts to recruit contact tracers, additional testing capabilities, and guest teacher applicants to move through the process, then return to the hybrid learning model for secondary schools beginning January 19, 2021.

President Raymond opened the meeting to public comment. The Board received comments from the following:

Natasha	Karri Woodhead
Sheila Kover	Kali Clayton
Annette Miller	Dallas Huldey
Cathy Ryan	Amy Pincolini-Ford
Adrienne Potter	Selena La Rue
Mary Owens	Amanda Backlung
Humma Oster	Riley Wing
Stephanie Rank	Racquel Abowd
Debra Timmons	Kristen Smith
Phil Kaiser, Washoe Education Association	Julie Manayan
Zak Woodhead	Rachel Fisher
	Michele Amundson

Dana Hamilton
Janna Rager
Jamie Winchell
Sandy Herman
The Ferrall Family
Margaret Repko
Holly Underwood
Jennifer McGovern
Julie Iljas

Sarah Raitter
Alicia Mayers
Kim Cuevas
Jessica Lumley
Lucas C
Anonymous
Keith Lowe
Alex Gauvain

President Raymond clarified for the Trustees that the decision before the Board was to change the return date for middle and high schools from January 4, 2021 to January 19, 2021. She indicated the Trustees could also consider having middle school students return to the hybrid model earlier than high school students; though she was concerned, based on the presentation, that the District might not have the resources available and could further strain the system if the appropriate numbers of guest teachers were not available. One of the lessons she learned from the start of the school year was that she would have waited an additional week to bring students back, so she did not want to make the same mistake.

Trustee Taylor wondered what Superintendent McNeill thought about having middle school students return earlier than high school students. Superintendent McNeill mentioned she was concerned about having an appropriate number of guest teachers in place and ready to fill assignments if a group of students returned earlier. She agreed that it would be important not to place additional strain on the current system.

Trustee Kennedy asked if the Board should consider moving elementary schools to the full distance model through the remainder of the semester because of the continued increase in COVID numbers.

President Raymond noted the Board could look at making that change, but personally, she could not support such a motion.

Trustee Minetto remarked the District had been short on substitutes for a number of years. She wondered what the options were if the District did not receive additional people interested in substituting for the District. Superintendent McNeill believed the District would be able to recruit the number of guest teachers needed, but it would also be important for the District to provide the appropriate level of support once the guest teachers were in place. The schools had been providing welcoming environments for substitutes and the District knew one of the reasons guest teachers returned to particular schools was because of the environment so she wanted to ensure that commitment continued.

Trustee Simon Holland expressed some concern over the Board making a decision for something that was to occur in a month when conditions were constantly changing. She wondered if there was a way to provide direction to the Superintendent to make the decision based on certain conditions. The families contacting her were concerned about a final decision being made for the future on current case rates.

President Raymond remarked the feedback she had received was more surrounding providing a final decision on the return date so families and teachers could prepare.

Trustee Kennedy agreed with President Raymond. The comments from principals and teachers she had received was that a final decision was needed and that the date would not change so plans could be made and in place.

Trustee Taylor added it was also important for people to feel safe in the schools. She wanted to ensure the number of contact tracers and guest teachers were at an appropriate level for everyone to feel safe and did not believe those numbers would be in place prior to January 19, 2021. She wanted the students back sooner, but did not believe it was possible based on the information provided in the presentation.

Trustee Caudill expressed concern over the students' mental health. He had been contacted by families and students regarding the challenges they were facing during distance learning. He would prefer to return sooner or allow opportunities for athletics and activities to occur in some manner for students because they were struggling and needed something to re-engage them.

Trustee Simon Holland asked if it would be possible for athletic conditioning to resume beginning January 4, 2021 even if the learning model did not change until January 19, 2021. Ms. Biersdorff noted most coaches and advisors were also teachers or other District staff members, so they were still working. If conditioning were to begin, the activities would not be able to occur until later in the day. She was not sure of the staffing implications for conditioning, but believed there could be some because the custodial staff would need to ensure the classrooms were ready for the following day. Additional challenges surrounded transportation and providing opportunities to participate in activities during the school day so students had the ability to participate if that was their desire.

It was moved by Trustee Taylor and seconded by President Raymond that **embracing cross-agency resources and a plan for expanded contact tracing, the possibility for additional COVID-19 testing, and through use of the emergency substitute teacher regulation, and acknowledging the time needed for a thoughtful implementation, the Board of Trustees takes action to extend the timeline for temporary distance learning at the middle school and high school levels with a return to the Hybrid Learning Model on January 19, 2021.** The

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

Trustee Kennedy moved that the Board of Trustees extend the full distance learning model to elementary schools. The motion died for a lack of a second.

President Raymond recessed the meeting for 10 minutes.

5.07 PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION FOR THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE DRAFT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FOR DR. KRISTEN MCNEILL, SUPERINTENDENT, WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT FOR THE 2019-20 SCHOOL YEAR

Emily Ellison, Chief Human Resources Officer, reviewed the requirements for the Superintendent Evaluation process and timeline. The contract with Superintendent McNeill, approved on May 12, 2020, included the quarterly monitoring of goals, an annual evaluation to be completed no later than December 15, an evaluation tool agreed upon by both parties, and the ability of the superintendent to provide a response within 30 days. The Board conducted two work sessions to develop the evaluation tool that included nine standards and indicators within each standard to define Board expectations. The nine standards were: Strategic District Leadership, Instructional Leadership, Systemic Leadership, Collaborative Leadership, Professional Ethics, Organizational Leadership, Board Communication, Operational Leadership, and Fiscal Leadership. The Superintendent was able to provide evidence of performance under each standard. The individual Trustees were able to review the material and provide their input and feedback, which was compiled by the Internal Auditor, Kirk Starkey.

Ben Hayes, Chief Accountability Officer, explained the District had conducted various surveys over the past year regarding the performance of the District and related to the Superintendent's performance. Survey information from students, staff, and families were used to provide stakeholder input to the Trustees on the performance of the District and Superintendent McNeill's leadership. An additional survey was sent to members of the business community.

Kirk Starkey, Internal Auditor, reviewed the Trustee scoring tool that encompassed the nine standards. The standards were scored on a 3-point response scale of "exceeds," "meets," or "does not meet." The final evaluation rating was an average of the individual Trustees' average score for each standard. The final rating was 2.5 which was equivalent to meets/exceeds.

Ms. Ellison noted the Trustees would have the opportunity to provide feedback on Superintendent McNeill's performance under each standard. She recommended a format

to allow summary feedback that included both commendations and opportunities for improvement be included.

The Board provided the following feedback based on the standard listed:

Standard 1: Strategic District Leadership

Trustee Kennedy commended Superintendent McNeill for her transparency and willingness to work with the employee groups. She was impressed with her compassion and communication with employees and other stakeholders after a difficult departure of the previous superintendent.

President Raymond agreed and added that one of the reasons she had scored Superintendent McNeill a 2 on the standard was because of the constraints placed on an interim superintendent.

Trustee Simon Holland expressed appreciation for Dr. McNeill's listening ability and openness to feedback. However, she cautioned that it would be important for Dr. McNeill to communicate her own vision during the strategic planning process to employees and the community.

Trustee Minetto praised the consistency of the communication so everyone was hearing the same thing and there were not changes every couple of days.

Trustees Caudill remarked that Dr. McNeill's ability to bring the District together and provide an opportunity to heal from a culture based on fear and retaliation. He felt that ability had set the District up for being able to open up to students during the pandemic.

Standard 2: Instructional Leadership

Trustee Taylor called attention to Dr. McNeill's willingness to work with national organizations and provide information to the Trustees and Leadership on looking to successes elsewhere to determine what could also work in the District.

Trustee Simon Holland noted scores had increased, even during the pandemic; however, there remained challenges associated with disproportionality and distance education that would need to be addressed in the future.

Trustee Kennedy agreed with the remarks regarding disproportionality, though she knew Dr. McNeill would continue to look at the numbers and strive towards proportionality.

Standard 3: Systemic Leadership

Trustee Simon Holland felt systemic leadership was a real strength for Dr. McNeill. She believed the District was far ahead of other school districts in the use of data in decision-making. She urged Dr. McNeill to provide additional information in the reporting of metrics on what/where the District was looking to move next to increase numbers.

Trustee Caudill appreciated that Dr. McNeill understood the District was looking for strong leadership during the interim period. He used the example of Dr. McNeill providing direction and leadership when the pandemic hit, and the District did not return after spring break.

President Raymond acknowledged that, for her, it was the communication that occurred when the pandemic hit. She urged Dr. McNeill to continue to work with all stakeholders and try to include stakeholders that might not normally feel included in the decision-making process moving forward.

Standard 4: Collaborative Leadership

Trustee Caudill felt this area was also a strength for Dr. McNeill. He appreciated the over-communication during difficult times and her ability to highlight members of the Leadership Team. He believed it spoke to Dr. McNeill's abilities when she allowed members of her team to provide the information on her behalf and the way the team rallied around her to ensure success.

Trustee Taylor agreed with Trustee Caudill and reminded Dr. McNeill that it was also important to allow members of the team to take on more because they had proven they were willing and able.

Trustee Kennedy highlighted Dr. McNeill's work with Student Voice and her interest in providing students opportunities to share their experiences and feedback. She also praised Dr. McNeill's quick dedication to having a team of professionals work through many of the challenges of COVID and provide opportunities to various staff members to participate.

Trustee Simon Holland praised Dr. McNeill's ability to listen and not become defensive when receiving feedback. She appreciated the additional conversations with media in the effort to provide more transparency.

President Raymond also appreciated the collaboration with internal and external groups when working through COVID and then on the re-opening of schools. She added, similar to her prior comments, that it was important to remember to include various stakeholder groups and not rely on those who are continually represented.

Student Representative Gomez thanked Dr. McNeill for always taking time to work with students and student groups.

Standard 5: Professional Ethics

Trustee Kennedy stated the transparency and availability Dr. McNeill had provided to everyone showed her ethics. As a former employee, she greatly appreciated Dr. McNeill's willingness to provide her calendar to staff so they could see what she was working on and her personal responses to emails.

Trustee Minetto remarked that she had not known anyone as ethical as Dr. McNeill and felt that showed in her work.

Trustee Simon Holland indicated that one of the elements of the standard was the connections with people both internally and externally. She appreciated that Dr. McNeill was willing to communicate with those outside the District to gain perspective and learn different methods.

Standard 6: Organizational Leadership

Trustee Taylor believed Dr. McNeill's commitment to the team was one of her greatest strengths because it also meant the team was committed to her.

Trustee Simon Holland agreed; however, she was concerned that the dedication could cause the team to want to reach Dr. McNeill's goals when they should be questioning more. She provided an example of the re-opening task force perhaps wanting to please Dr. McNeill by showing the goal could happen, when they should have taken additional time to re-open.

Trustee Kennedy highlighted the work of the professional learning communities (PLCs) and allowing those to occur from the schools and not forcing schools to provide them.

President Raymond agreed in part with Trustee Simon Holland and felt if a commitment was made to involve stakeholders not normally contacted that could address the concerns.

Standard 7: Board Communication

President Raymond appreciated the almost daily communication with Dr. McNeill and that she constantly made herself available.

Trustee Minetto appreciated that Dr. McNeill planned what they would discuss during their meetings instead of waiting for her to raise an issue or concern.

Trustee Caudill thanked Dr. McNeill for her attentiveness and always getting back to everyone as soon as possible. He mentioned he would sometimes wait to send an email because he knew she would respond, no matter the day or time. He expressed his appreciation for her interest in what the individual Trustees were working on and providing information on their specific areas of Washoe County.

Trustee Simon Holland added that Dr. McNeill treated all Trustees equally in her communication so they all had the same information. She also appreciated the forward thinking and determining when items should be heard by the Board based on when information was available. She recommended the Board be provided with some additional notice if a sensitive recommendation were going to be provided.

Standard 8: Operational Leadership

Trustee Caudill mentioned school districts across the country were faced with challenges in terms of recruitment and retention, so it would be important to think outside the box in terms of what could be done to attract teachers.

Trustee Kennedy remarked that during the initial stages of the pandemic, the communication came very fast and at times contradicted prior information, so it was confusing to staff. She understood the challenges were not solely on the District, but felt it would be important in the future to try to provide information in such a way that allowed for more consistent messaging.

Trustee Simon Holland expressed her appreciation for how the downsizing of Nutrition Services was handled and the compassion Dr. McNeill showed to everyone involved during that time.

Standard 9: Fiscal Leadership

Trustee Caudill felt the fiscal responsibility under Dr. McNeill was strong and that she was working to find solutions during challenging times.

Trustee Taylor appreciated that Dr. McNeill understood the challenges and responsibilities of the Board in their approval of financial items. She remarked that the Business Office was provided with enough flexibility to offer solutions and provide information on possible up-coming challenges.

President Raymond hoped future budgets would align more with student achievement and priorities included in the Strategic Plan.

President Raymond opened the floor to general comments from Trustees.

Trustee Simon Holland congratulated Dr. McNeill on navigating all the challenges she had worked through over the past year and half. She appreciated all the work and dedication Dr. McNeill had shown while interim and during the pandemic.

Trustee Kennedy noted she was an employee during the period of the evaluation and was impressed with the leadership shown by Dr. McNeill.

Trustee Caudill thanked Dr. McNeill for her willingness to confront challenges herself and not send someone else to deal with problems. He appreciated her putting students first during school visits and looked forward to continuing working with her.

Trustee Taylor remarked that if Dr. McNeill could get through the pandemic as a first-year superintendent, then she could get through anything.

President Raymond mentioned there had been some in the community who questioned the appointment of Dr. McNeill and believed it was more of convenience than anything else, but she believed Dr. McNeill had proven that she was the right superintendent for the District at the right time.

Dr. Kristen McNeill, Superintendent, thanked the Board for their comments and suggestions they had provided. Their praise was not for her, but for her entire team because they were the ones who worked to make everything happen. She appreciated the positivity that there was light at the end of everything and the District would move from good to great. The District was front and center in so many aspects of education nationally, but they did not take the credit they should. She was looking forward to the rest of the school year and continuing to work with and for students.

It was moved by Trustee Simon Holland and seconded by Trustee Kennedy that **the Board of Trustees accepts the evaluation of Superintendent Kristen McNeill for the 2019-2020 School Year.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jacqueline Calvert, Andrew Caudill, Katy Simon Holland, Sharon Kennedy, Ellen Minetto, Malena Raymond, and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

6. Reports

6.01 BOARD REPORTS

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

6.02 SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

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

7. Closing Items

7.01 FUTURE AGENDA ITEM REQUESTS

There were no requests for agenda items at this time.

7.02 PUBLIC COMMENT

Hunter Rand was the video production teacher at Spanish Springs High School. He expressed his frustration and sadness in the remarks from the Washoe Education Association (WEA) regarding unqualified teachers. He believed that according to the standards of the WEA, he was considered an "unqualified" teacher because he received a degree in Business and Industry that required 10,000 hours of work. But according to the association representing him, he was not qualified, nor was the auto shop teacher, nor was the diesel shop teacher. He felt the WEA and many of their members treated teachers and other employees without a degree as less important than themselves. He was frustrated with how he saw custodial staff treated or how parents were laughed at by some teachers because they spoke with an accent.

The Board received comments from the following:

Selena La Rue
Michele Amundson
Jennifer Mirich
Carlyn Perona
Riley Wing

7.03 NEXT MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT

The next Regular Meeting would take place on Tuesday, January 12, 2021.

7.04 ADJOURN MEETING

There being no further business to come before the members of the Board, President Raymond declared the meeting adjourned at 10:57 p.m.

Malena Raymond, President

Andrew Caudill, Clerk