

**MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 25, 2021  
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE  
WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

October 25, 2021

**1. Opening Items**

**1.01 CALL TO ORDER**

The special meeting of the Board of Trustees was called to order at 4:00 p.m. in the Board Room of the Central Administration Building, located at 425 East Ninth Street in Reno, Nevada.

**1.02 ROLL CALL**

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

**1.03 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chris Reich, Deputy Chief General Counsel, led the meeting in the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

**2.01 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO CORRECT A POTENTIAL VIOLATION OF THE OPEN MEETING LAW (OML) PURSUANT TO NEVADA REVISED STATUTE (NRS) 241.0365 FOR CONSIDERING THE CHARACTER, ALLEGED MISCONDUCT, AND/OR THE PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE OF THE DISTRICT'S CHIEF GENERAL COUNSEL, NEIL A. ROMBARDO, REGARDING WHETHER THE CHIEF GENERAL COUNSEL KNEW OF THE RESIDENCY OF A FORMER TRUSTEE AS ALLEGED DURING BOARD REPORTS AT THE SEPTEMBER 28, 2021 MEETING WITHOUT PROVIDING NOTICE PURSUANT TO NRS 241.033; AND/OR CORRECT A POTENTIAL VIOLATION OF THE OML FOR POSSIBLY DELIBERATING THE ISSUE OF A FORMER TRUSTEE'S RESIDENCE WITHOUT PLACING THE ITEM ON THE AGENDA PURSUANT TO NRS 241.020(3)(d); THE BOARD INTENDS TO TAKE ACTION TO CORRECT THESE POTENTIAL OML VIOLATIONS BY: 1) ACCEPTING THE FINDINGS OF THE GUNDERSON LAW FIRM INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION REGARDING KNOWLEDGE OF A FORMER TRUSTEE'S CHANGE IN RESIDENCE; AND 2) REMOVING BOARD REPORTS FROM BOARD OF**

**TRUSTEES' FUTURE AGENDAS AS RECOMMENDED IN THE OPEN MEETING LAW MANUAL FROM THE NEVADA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE PURSUANT TO NRS 241.033, THE BOARD MAY CONSIDER THE CHARACTER, ALLEGED MISCONDUCT AND/OR PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE OF CHIEF GENERAL COUNSEL, NEIL A. ROMBARDO, BOARD PRESIDENT ANGELA D. TAYLOR AND/OR TRUSTEE JEFFREY CHURCH**

Trustee Church requested a recess to allow the Trustees and community time to read the report provided by the Gunderson Law Office, since it had just been given to staff, the Trustees, and posted for the community.

President Taylor mentioned the report was not provided to either staff or the Trustees until just prior to the meeting to ensure the integrity of the report.

It was moved by Trustee Nicolet and seconded by Trustee Church that **the Board of Trustees recesses for 45 minutes to review the report from the Gunderson Law Firm.**

President Taylor opened the motion for discussion.

Trustee Smith asked if the attorney who compiled the report would still be available to present the report if a long recess occurred at the beginning of the meeting. Chris Reich, Deputy Chief General Counsel, indicated his understanding was that Mr. John Funk of the Gunderson Law Firm would be available.

Trustee Rodriguez expressed his appreciation for the additional time to review and reflect on the report.

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

*President Taylor recessed the meeting for 51 minutes.*

Trustee Church wondered what was meant by the term "intends to take action" that was included in the agenda title. He remarked that he was part of the Board and was never asked what he intended to do related to the item. Additionally, he had members of the community comment that there was little point in showing up to provide public comment because the Board already "intended" to take certain specific actions. Mr. Reich explained the word "intends" was used to allow the Board to potentially to take action to avoid violations of Nevada's Open Meeting Law (OML).

Trustee Church stated he continued to find the wording troubling. He was also concerned with the reference to the Nevada Open Meeting Law Manual because he did not believe the Manual recommended that a conversation should not occur, only that a conversation not lead to action. He remarked that he had looked at other local government agency agendas and their boards were all provided the opportunity to provide open comments. He did not believe it was appropriate for the Board to move forward with the agenda item if the title contained false information. Mr. Reich stated the Nevada Open Meeting Law Manual did include the following under Section 6.02: "Generic items, such as 'reports' or 'general comments by board members,' invite trouble because discussion spawned under them may be of great public interest and may lead to deliberations or actions without the benefit of public scrutiny or input. Generic items should be used sparingly and carefully and actual discussion should be controlled tightly. Matters of public interest should be rescheduled for further discussion at later meetings."

Trustee Church commented that the wording in the Manual did not include "recommend" but did include the term "sparingly and carefully." Mr. Reich believed that was semantics and the Board could proceed with the current agenda item as written without concern.

Trustee Church wondered what the Board could "consider" in terms of character and alleged misconduct of those listed in the agenda title. Mr. Reich indicated no administrative action had been listed as part of the title so the Board would not have the ability to recommend any action be taken against those individuals included in the title. The intent of the statute was to ensure individuals were properly noticed before a governing board could speak of their character, professional competence, or alleged misconduct.

Trustee Church continued to believe the item was vague. He mentioned there were numerous individuals who had told him during the break that the overflow room was full and people were waiting outside. He felt the District had been properly noticed that a large number of people were interested in attending the meeting and the meeting was still conducted in a smaller venue. He asked if there was an OML violation. Mr. Reich remarked that he had not seen any of the other rooms. Governments were afforded a reasonable expectation standard in terms of where their meetings were conducted. The Board had held numerous high-profile meetings in the Board Room, to include the hiring and dismissal of superintendents, and provided members of the community the ability to live-stream the meetings and provide public comments electronically throughout the meeting. He felt the District had met the reasonable expectation standard.

Mr. Reich introduced the agenda item with a review of the discussion that had occurred during the Board Reports section of the meeting between President Taylor, Trustee

Church, and Chief General Counsel Neil Rombardo regarding who knew what and when of the residency of former Trustee Jacqueline Calvert. During the discussion Mr. Rombardo indicated the Trustees were in violation of Nevada Revised Statute 241 because he had not been properly noticed his character, professional competency, and/or alleged misconduct was discussed. Trustee Rodriguez then indicated the conversation had gotten off topic and Present Taylor remarked that she would include an agenda item once the final report on the residency question was ready. Gunderson Law Firm was retained to conduct an independent investigation as to who in the District Leadership knew when Trustee Calvert had moved and if they were aware it was outside of her electoral district.

John Funk, Legal Counsel, Gunderson Law Firm, explained he was the primary investigator of the report and able to respond to questions. He stated he reviewed over 300 pages of emails and those he had interviewed as part of the investigation. All work was conducted independently, with no influence or direction from the District's Office of General Counsel, to include Chief General Counsel Rombardo. Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 283 required elected officials to reside in the electoral district they were elected to represent. If an incumbent refused to vacate a seat after being asked to do so, the matter could be referred to the Nevada Office of the Attorney General or county district attorney, who may institute legal proceedings to declare the seat vacant. A summary overview of the report, including a timeline of events leading to the resignation of former Trustee Jacqueline Calvert, was provided. Based on the investigation, Mr. Funk concluded that Trustee Church was the first person in the District to know of concerns about former Trustee Calvert's residency on August 9; Trustee Church did not report the information to anyone in the District until August 19 and the information he did provide was vague; and by August 24, the issue appeared to be resolved by President Taylor, Trustee Church, and others in District Leadership, until President Taylor reviewed an email from a member of the community, Mr. Bruce Parks, on September 8. The information in the email sent by Mr. Parks to President Taylor appeared substantially similar to the information provided to Trustee Church on August 9, but the same amount of information was not conveyed to District staff or President Taylor at that time by Trustee Church. President Taylor began investigating the concerns after receiving the email, which led to the resignation of former Trustee Calvert on September 13.

Trustee Church expressed concern that President Taylor and Mr. Rombardo continually stated that the Office of the General Counsel was not responsible, nor would they conduct an investigation into the information provided and that they continually recommended others contact the Attorney General or Secretary of State. Mr. Funk noted the information he reviewed showed President Taylor and Mr. Rombardo both stated the Washoe County School District's Office of the General Counsel was not the proper authority to prosecute the residency claim. He felt that if an office could not prosecute a case, then they also did not have the authority to investigate the case.

Trustee Church continued to request clarification on various points of information included in the report. He believed it was important to note Mr. Parks continued to look into the claims and contacted different agencies so the characterization that Trustee Church did not believe Mr. Parks would follow up on the matter was mistaken. Mr. Funk remarked that his belief was that Mr. Parks was frustrated when he did not see anything being done related to his claims and began contacting different government agencies.

Trustee Church mentioned he believed the press release issued by the District when Trustee Calvert resigned pointed to someone wanting to cover up when she moved because it contained the word "recently," when the District had information that she had filed a change of address form in 2019, which was discovered during an investigation conducted by Mr. Rombardo. He wondered why, at some point, Mr. Rombardo decided there was enough information for him to investigate the matter. Mr. Funk indicated that, after President Taylor read the email from Mr. Parks, the quality of the information provided to Mr. Rombardo had changed. Prior to then, the information provided by Trustee Church to Mr. Rombardo was vague. His understanding was there were numerous complaints filed against various Trustees for various reasons over the course of a year and that the Office of the General Counsel did not have the capacity to investigate all of them, so they focused on those complaints where specific information was provided.

Trustee Church expressed frustration over the fact that former Trustee Calvert had not been interviewed as part of the investigation. He wondered why others in the District were not included as part of the investigation. Mr. Funk stated he did not believe any other Trustees or employees of the District would provide any additional information that what had already been given, so he did not conduct any additional interviews.

Trustee Church continued to question Mr. Funk on how the investigation was conducted and the scope of the investigation. He was concerned that no one in the District had asked him for more information once he reported it to Mr. Rombardo.

President Taylor noted she had responded to an email that included Trustee Church requesting additional information; however, the response back from Trustee Church was that the issue had been resolved.

Trustee Church provided remarks regarding how the investigation was conducted and that it lacked veracity. He felt he should have been protected by whistle-blower status and that everyone former Trustee Calvert interacted with on a regular basis in the District should have been investigated as to who knew what and when. He did not believe that there appeared to be no one either in the District or other governmental agencies that were willing to conduct a thorough investigation into the matter and if

any criminal conduct occurred. Mr. Reich cautioned that only those included as part of the agenda item could be included as part of the discussion on their character, professional competency, and/or alleged misconduct under NRS 241.

Trustee Nicolet mentioned the agenda item was placed on the current meeting because based on the prior actions on September 28, the Board only had 30 days to take corrective action. The agenda item was not about the report, but correcting the Board's OML mistake. She stated the Board had not completed their investigation into who knew what and when.

Trustee Smith agreed with Trustee Nicolet. Numerous accusations and insinuations were made on September 28 and the agenda item was specific to correcting the possible OML violations from that meeting only. She believed the report included the information requested from that meeting specifically but the investigation should continue to determine if there was additional information that might come to light. She indicated one of the questions that needed to be answered was if Mr. Rombardo conducted himself in a professional manner when he was first informed of the allegations. Mr. Funk stated he could not provide any information or opinions on the standard of care conducted by Mr. Rombardo.

Trustee Smith remarked that, based on the report, there appeared to be a straight line as to who knew what and when. The confusion seemed to come between Trustee Church and Mr. Parks as to what would occur next with the information and who was following up. She did not believe Mr. Rombardo acted unprofessionally or against the expectations of the Board.

President Taylor stated that, as Board President, she received numerous accusations against Trustees. She did not respond to allegations and when the information regarding former Trustee Calvert was first provided to her, it was an allegation. Once additional information was provided, she spoke with Trustee Calvert the next day and within 3 days Trustee Calvert had resigned. She was frustrated with the accusations and noted that Trustee Church had initially been provided with more details, but chose not to disclose those to either herself or Mr. Rombardo in the conversations. Additionally, she followed up when information was provided and was offended by implications that she did not. She stressed it was inappropriate for anyone to imply or provide false information about what happened, not only against her, but against any other Trustee. It was extremely problematic to make statements implying the Board or District was covering up or hiding information when the report showed that was not the case at all. Prior to an independent investigation being requested, the Office of the General Counsel had begun an investigation, which she had informed all Trustees about.

Trustee Church commented that there was a lot of room for opinion as to who knew what and when. He did not believe a criminal investigation should occur whenever an allegation was made, but did feel that the President, or another Trustee, should ask the individual about the allegation. He believed any OML violation could be fixed by having a hearing on what the topic was specifically about, which was the residency of former Trustee Calvert in the current case. He reiterated that nothing in the OML Manual stated Board Reports should be removed and that all other governing bodies in the area had some kind of report or open comment section for the elected officials.

Trustee Nicolet stated she would second a request from Trustee Church regarding Board Reports being placed on the agenda.

President Taylor noted part of the corrective action the Board could take and include in the report to the Attorney General was to remove Board Reports from the agenda.

Trustee Church requested Mr. Parks be allowed to come forward and provide his comments and clarify information in the report and that Mr. Parks be provided additional time, not just the 3 minutes for public comment. Mr. Reich indicted Mr. Parks should be allowed 3 minutes, just as any other member of the community.

President Taylor expressed concern over changing the rules to allow a member of the community additional time to speak on agenda topics. If she provided additional time for one individual, she would have to provide additional time to all other members of the community.

Trustee Nicolet thanked Mr. Parks for participating in the investigation. She believed she had all the information she needed to make a decision on the report.

Trustee Smith reiterated the agenda item was specific to the possible OML violations that occurred on September 28 and not about the larger issue of where former Trustee Calvert resided.

Trustee Minetto expressed appreciation the information provided in the report because it was thorough and based on the scope of work requested.

Trustee Rodriguez agreed there were pieces missing from the report but understood the scope of the investigation was narrow. He asked why Mr. Funk did not interview former Trustee Calvert. Mr. Funk believed, based on the interviews and information he had received from others, it was unnecessary to interview her based on the scope of the investigation he was hired to conduct. Multiple interviews conducted provided similar information and all those who were interviewed were able to provide a clear timeline. He was comfortable that he was able to provide conclusions based on the information without requiring her to sit down for an interview.

Trustee Rodriguez requested clarification on what Mr. Parks provided during his interview and who the first person was to learn of the change in residency. Mr. Funk explained he had an oral interview with Mr. Parks, where the timeline was reviewed, what information he provided to Trustee Church, and when the information was provided. Based on the investigation, Mr. Park's wife was the first to discover former Trustee Calvert was using a Post Office Box in filings with the Nevada Secretary of State, which led them to conduct additional research with the Washoe County Registrar's Office. They relayed the information to Trustee Church on August 9.

Trustee Rodriguez asked if any other Trustee was provided the information. Mr. Funk stated he asked Trustee Church if he had told the information to anyone and Trustee Church stated he had not provided anyone with the information, until his meeting with Mr. Rombardo on August 19.

Trustee Church wondered if Mr. Parks first reached out to Mr. Funk or if Mr. Funk first reached out to Mr. Parks. Mr. Funk noted Mr. Parks had shown up at his office and provided his contact information to his assistant. A phone interview was later set up.

Trustee Church asked how Mr. Parks knew who was conducting the investigation. Mr. Funk mentioned he did not ask Mr. Parks, but assumed he was informed by Trustee Church.

Trustee Church expressed concern over the conclusion of the report that he had information that was not reported to the District because it painted him in a bad light, which was why he was interested in having Mr. Parks provided his remarks and respond to questions.

President Taylor opened the floor to Mr. Bruce Parks to allow for his comments since they were relevant to the discussion.

Bruce Parks stated the Board did not have all the facts because the investigation conducted was shotty at best. He did not provide all the facts to Mr. Funk because he believed Mr. Funk was only trying to cover for President Taylor. He stated he did not give Trustee Church all the information he had because he felt if he did, Trustee Church would be the one in trouble. He claimed that an officer of the court had an obligation to conduct an investigation when they knew a crime was being committed. He felt it was apparent the Registrar's Office was incompetent and the Deputy District Attorney he spoke with would refuse to do anything. He stated President Taylor only needed to email him and ask for more information, which he would have been willing to provide, but instead the Board was conducting an exercise in how to cover themselves.



Mr. Reich reviewed the potential OML violations and the actions the Board could take to correct the violations. The first was the removal of "Board Reports" from the agenda. He indicated that he had been with the District for over 15 years and the Office of the General Counsel had consistently advised the Board of Trustees the agenda item should not be on Board agendas or committee agendas because generic items could be problematic under OML. He reviewed what had occurred at the September meeting during the Board Reports, which then led to a short exchange between two Trustees. The issue with generic items was that they were not clear and complete in their description to the public of what topics could be discussed. The recommendation was to remove reports moving forward to avoid any potential OML violations in the future.

Trustee Smith requested clarification on the recommendation and that it meant the Board would be acknowledging that at least one OML violation occurred. Mr. Reich remarked the items listed on the agenda were potential violations. Additionally, statements were made against Mr. Rombardo that were not very flattering and he was not noticed that his character or professional competency could be discussed prior to the meeting. The District had not received any notices that a complaint or complaints had been filed.

Trustee Smith indicated that based on her understanding of OML and what had occurred at the meeting, it was appropriate for the Board to "self-report" what occurred and take corrective action so it would not occur in the future. She asked if the Board accepted the recommendations, would the Nevada Attorney General's Office dismiss any complaints for those instances if they were filed in the future. Mr. Reich mentioned that could happen but it was not guaranteed.

Trustee Nicolet noted she appreciated having Board Reports on the agenda because she liked sharing with her colleagues and the community what was occurring in the schools during her visits. She understood the concerns raised by Legal Counsel because the Board had moved away from the intentionality of the agenda item. She wondered if the Board could consider ways to keep Board Reports with guardrails added, such as a policy.

Trustee Minetto agreed with Trustee Nicolet. She would be interested in revisiting how Board Reports were conducted; however, she was concerned there could be Trustees who believed any policy or other guardrails did not apply to them.

Trustee Church remarked that there was no where on any agenda for the individual Trustees to talk about items that were not on the agenda, aside from Board Reports. He would be interested in seeing Future Agenda Items also added back to the agendas. He indicated the OML Manual also stated that generic items should not be listed as action items. He believed the emphasis was that the items are not listed for action, not that they should not be included on agendas. He spoke to his point of view of what

had occurred at the September meeting when he provided his Board Report and that Mr. Rombardo had interrupted him during his report, which he felt he was authorized to do, and then President Taylor jumped into the conversation. He asserted that what he talked about during his Board Report was completely proper and appropriate because it was his report. He believed the only reason the Board had an attorney present at the meetings was to ensure the Board complied with OML. He expressed frustration that it was Mr. Rombardo who possibly violated OML through the interruption. He believed Mr. Rombardo waived his right to notice when he began to engage in conversation.

President Taylor read a transcription of the comments made by Trustee Church on September 28. She believed as soon as Trustee Church raised the names of former Trustee Calvert and Neil Rombardo, their rights under NRS 241 were violated because they had not been informed their character, alleged misconduct, and/or professional character would be discussed. The possible deliberation occurred when she engaged in the conversation. It was important to note that since Mr. Rombardo was not a public official, he could not violate OML.

Trustee Church recalled former Trustee Calvert's name was raised during public comment and Mr. Rombardo interrupted public comment, then provided additional remarks on the issue. His Board Report was based on what had occurred during the meeting and that others had brought up the topic before him.

*President Taylor recessed the meeting for 35 minutes.*

President Taylor opened the meeting to public comment.

Murray Kane remarked that if the Board had committed an OML violation, it was up to the Nevada Attorney General to make that determination and what should be done to correct it, not the Board. He believed the meeting was a persuasive exercise, but the document associated with the agenda item was not included with the posting. He was unclear as to why the Board would have agreed to post an agenda with a recommended action to accept the report, when they did not have the report when the agenda was posted. He claimed the Board was continuing to violate OML by not providing the information prior to the meeting and not providing appropriate accommodations for the number of anticipated members of the community.

Val White agreed the meeting should be held in a larger venue and that the Board was in violation of OML because they did not move the meeting. She believed if she had to sit in the overflow room or watch the meeting at home, she would only be able to see what the camera showed and not anything else that was occurring in the room. She wondered who approved the contract with the Gunderson Law Firm because it did leave out anything related to investigating where former Trustee Calvert lived. She claimed

President Taylor was silencing Trustee Church's voice and in turn the voices of those who voted for him.

Bill Scrimpf was born and raised in Reno and the parent of students in the District. He had never attended a Board meeting before and felt the fact he was present represented a failure on the part of the Board. He believed it was more important for all the Trustees to think about the students in the District and not their politics, ego, or personal ambition and was frustrated that the Board was focused on OML and not what was best for students.

Valerie Fiannaca wondered if attorneys with knowledge of a crime were ethically bound to report that information. She expressed concern that the Board was not interested in investigating vague claims and wondered if anyone of the Trustees would investigate if some provided information that a teacher was a pedophile. She stated she had also contacted the Washoe County District Attorney regarding former Trustee Calvert but never heard a response; then she spoke with the Washoe County Sheriff and the next day Ms. Calvert resigned. She believed the only investigation that needed to occur was that President Taylor or Mr. Rombardo needed to contact Human Resources.

Bev Stenehjem remarked that the community did not care about who knew what and when, only that they had been defrauded. She felt the only focus of the meeting had been on painting Trustee Church in a negative light, which was why the community did not trust the Board and only trusted Trustee Church. She provided examples of what she believed were circumstances when the Board had lied to the community, including the illegal votes cast by former Trustee Calvert. She questioned why the Board would not take action against what had occurred and told people to speak to other government agencies who, she claimed, did not care about the people. She believed all the other Trustees were "going after" Trustee Church to try to remove him from the Board because he was the only conservative on the Board.

Trustee Minetto stated, for the record, she was a conservative Republican.

Pablo Nava Duran indicated he wanted to see the Board and community treat each other respectfully and as adults. He felt the investigation had been conducted fairly and independently from the District and that if there was criminal activity, then the information should be prosecuted criminally. He was sorry to hear that Mr. Parks had not provided all the information he claimed to know to the investigator because that was disrespectful to the entire process.

Vicki Schnabel had been a resident of the area for over 30 years. She mentioned her husband had taught at Reno High School and her children graduated from the District. She noted she had provided the information because she wanted the Trustees to know she was invested in the community. She remarked the Board should not focus on social

issues for students, but providing the best education possible to students. The OML complaint should never have come about because processes should have been put in place where Trustees should have to report their residency every 6 months. She did not want someone she disagreed with being allowed to vote when they should not have been on the Board.

John Eppolito, Protect Nevada Children, remarked the venue for the meeting was too small and the public had been asking the Board to have meetings in larger places for months. He believed the report was a "joke" and intended to cover those in District leadership and the Board, not provide information on who knew what and when. The Board and District leadership were the ones to blame because former Trustee Calvert had provided information on where she lived in March 2019 and they did nothing about it.

Cindy Martinez had lived in Washoe County for 27 years and believed Trustee Church was "taking a beating" from those without integrity, honesty, or an ounce of purpose. She agreed with others that the report was inadequate and incomplete. She claimed the comments from other Trustees showed that they actually knew what had occurred but were trying to cover themselves. She believed only Trustee Church was honest and understood the duty he had taken to the Constitution because he was a veteran.

Janet Butcher agreed the report was incomplete because it did not include who selected Gunderson Law Firm and why Gunderson was selected. She expressed concern over the money spent on the report because that could have been spent on students. She remarked that if the Board was serious about correcting OML violations, then they would work with the public to correct all the violations that had been reported to the Attorney General's Office and never investigated.

George Lee felt the report was lacking the primary evidence that wrong-doing had occurred, which was the email from former Trustee Calvert to the District with her new address. He claimed the public would never know if Ms. Calvert asked anyone if the new address was in her electoral district because the "independent" investigator did not believe the email was relevant enough to include as part of the report. He did not think there was an OML violation because Board Reports was not an action item and in order for there to be a violation, action had to have occurred. He claimed the Board and District had paid Mr. Funk to create a report that was favorable to them and not Trustee Church and that a cover-up was occurring. He asserted any vote cast by former Trustee Calvert, including actions to appoint Trustee Rodriguez and hire Superintendent McNeill, were illegal and needed to be reconsidered.

Mark Sutton spoke in support of Trustee Church and requested the Board conduct a more thorough investigation into the votes cast and money spent by former Trustee

Calvert. He was frustrated the Board continued to ignore the number of people who attended the meetings and force them to stand outside.

Melanie Sutton felt it was the duty of former Trustee Calvert to know if she was living in the electoral district she was supposed to be representing. She felt the Board should at least look into getting any money back that was provided to her.

Morgan Liddick expressed frustration over the lateness of the release of the report because it did not allow for adequate analysis of the information. He believed the report showed a profound disinterest in conducting business, with failures to investigate, follow-up, or even have a conversation about what occurred. He would like to know when former Trustee Calvert moved, how much money did she receive, how many votes did she participate in, and what was being done to invalidate the votes and get the tax-payer money back. He disagreed that the solution to what happened was to remove Board Reports from the agendas.

Monica Stabbert, aka Monica Jaye, stated she and her listeners knew former Trustee Calvert lived outside of her electoral district, even before Trustee Church knew, and she was never contacted to be part of the investigation. She claimed it was the responsibility of the individual Trustees to know where the lines of their electoral district and was appalled the voters continued to elect people who did not know where they lived. She believed if Legal Counsel was not interested in researching the concern or that Nevada Revised Statutes did not include something regarding what should do when an elected official moved.

Eugene Gerscovich remarked he came to the meeting with an open mind and based on what he had heard, the report was worthless because it did not provide any insight into when the Board had any information. He expressed frustration that the Board was focused on the report and not the children's education. He felt everything the Board had been talking about lately was political.

Debbie Hudgens felt the Board was trying to create a distraction to point people away from the problems they had with not knowing where former Trustee Calvert lived and instead they were trying to bring Trustee Church up on charges because he tried to do the right thing. She indicated she would find people to be on the Board who were interested in serving the children and not threaten Trustee Church.

Troy Ross mentioned the community had been listening to the Board for hours about nothing substantial, when it was a member of the public who had to find out where former Trustee Calvert lived and then hire an attorney that did not provide any information to the public. He believed the Board was not doing anything meaningful since the community had to do their jobs.

J. Tyler Balance did not believe there was any violation of Nevada Revised Statute 241 on September 28. He claimed the Open Meeting Law Manual was only guidance and was not the law, so the Board did not have to follow the language in the manner, just the law. He provided a handout to the Trustees with his comments on why he believed there was no violation.

Nicol Herris expressed frustration over the amount of time the public had spent listening to the Board. She indicated she was not clear about what the agenda item intended to do and how the Board would fix the problems. She believed the Board continued to show a pattern of inaction because they refused to come out into the community. She claimed she represented a lot of people in the community and could rally them to either support or oppose the Board.

James Benthin expressed concern that the current meeting should have been postponed because the report was not available 3 days prior to the meeting and the venue was not large enough to accommodate everyone who was present at the start of the meeting. He expressed his support for Trustee Church and what he was trying to do in the District.

The Board received emails from the following:

Laurie Agnew	Benjamin Nash
Bev Stenehjem	Cynthia Miller
Nicol Herris	Bruce Foster
Nicholas St. Jon	Nathan Noble
Cindy Martinez	Danielle O'Connor
Cindy Sassenrath	Roger Edwards
Claudia Fisher	Nicholas Maier
Janet Butcher	Ralph Coppola
Jim Verner	Eugene Gerscovich
Maria Skolnick	Susan Howell
Brad Kroshus	Robert Beadles
Jerry Coughlin	Ian Gallagher
Ryan West	Elaine Grimes

Trustee Rodriguez requested clarification on if there would be additional information forthcoming on the investigation.

President Taylor indicated there would be more to the investigation. The intent was to focus on what had occurred on September 28 because the Board had 30 days to take corrective action related to the potential OML violation.

Trustee Church stated he would be interested in learning more about some issues that had been brought up during public comment, such as if there was a violation since no action was taken and that Board Reports was a way for the community to find out what the Trustees were doing. He believed the removal of Board Reports was also a violation of Board policies and the duty of the Trustees to proactively engage the public.

Trustee Smith asked if the District had done any work with the Gunderson Law Firm in the past. Mr. Funk stated neither he nor the Law Firm had ever been hired by the Washoe County School District.

President Taylor mentioned an important consideration in hiring Gunderson Law Firm was that they had not previously worked with the District.

Trustee Smith wondered if it would be acceptable to report to the Nevada Attorney General's Office the potential violation and the self-correction was that the Board would have a deeper conversation regarding Board Reports in the future. Mr. Reich remarked the conversation between President Taylor, Trustee Church, and Mr. Rombardo on September 28 was related to who knew what, and when. If the Board chose to accept the report, that was one self-correction, because that would correct the discussion and possible deliberation that occurred at that time. The reason for the recommendation to remove Board Reports was because that was where the potential violation occurred. The opinion of the Attorney General was that items, such as Board Reports, were troubling because they could lead to deliberation and sometimes action.

Trustee Smith agreed with the intent that the Board should self-report any potential violation. She noted no one had disagreed with the contents of the report and that the information was not correct. She was interested in learning more and understood an additional investigation would occur. She could support accepting the findings of the report and then having an additional conversation regarding Board Reports.

President Taylor agreed with Trustee Smith's comments. Board Reports, as intended, was an opportunity for the Trustees to provide the public with information on school visits they had conducted and events they attended; however, it had morphed to allow Board members to talk about whatever they chose. She remarked an option could be to remove Board Reports for a period of time, until the Board had the opportunity to have a deeper conversation. She understood other boards had an item on their agendas that were similar to Board Reports, but it was the Washoe County School District Board of Trustees that committed the potential violation and since OML complaints had already been filed with the Attorney General's Office, it was important, to her, to correct possible concerns.

Trustee Church disagreed with the removal of Board Reports from the agenda. He could not accept the report because he believed the agenda item was not properly noticed.

It was moved by Trustee Smith and seconded by Trustee Minetto that **the Board of Trustees accepts the findings of the independent investigation conducted by the Gunderson Law Firm, based on the scope of the investigation.**

President Taylor opened the motion for discussion.

President Taylor requested a friendly amendment to include "and understanding there is additional information forthcoming." Trustees Smith and Minetto accepted the friendly amendment.

Trustee Church requested "from other sources" also be added because he was not interested in the Gunderson Law Firm continuing to conduct the investigation. Trustees Smith and Minetto accepted the friendly amendment.

Trustee Nicolet expressed concern over possibly excluding the Gunderson Law Firm from continuing the investigation or providing additional information.

Mr. Reich mentioned it was not in the scope of the agenda item for the Board to contemplate further action. The agenda item allowed the Board to either accept or reject the investigation. A future agenda item would be necessary for the Board to contemplate what they wanted to do next, including continuing the investigation.

Trustee Church expressed frustration in how the agenda item was worded because he believed it painted the Board into a corner and did not allow any other considerations. Mr. Reich countered the agenda item was intended to correct a possible OML violation related to the discussion that occurred between President Taylor, Trustee Church, and Mr. Rombardo. The scope of the investigation was related to that discussion, which was who knew what, between the three individuals, and when as to former Trustee Calvert's residence.

Trustees Smith and Minetto rescinded all friendly amendment language.

Trustee Church requested clarification on the definition of "accept," and if it meant agree with the content of the report or take possession of the report. Mr. Reich stated a yes vote to accept the report by a Trustee meant they agreed with the findings and conclusions of the investigator.

The result of the vote was 5-1: (Yea: Ellen Minetto, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, and Angela Taylor. Nay: Jeff Church.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.



President Taylor moved the conversation to the question of Board Reports and if the Board had a desire to act to remove the items from future Board meeting agendas. The Trustees had already provided some different options to consider during the previous discussion.

Trustee Nicolet mentioned she would prefer not to remove Board Reports, but would like to see something that would have the Board review the procedures for Board Reports so there would not be concerns in the future. Mr. Reich indicated the Board could choose to keep Board Reports on the agendas and at a future meeting have a conversation surrounding the procedures.

Trustee Rodriguez agreed with Trustee Nicolet. He appreciated having an opportunity to provide information to the community on what they did outside of Board meetings. He was also interested in seeing something in the future on developing procedures and/or guidelines.

Trustee Minetto felt, at this time, Board Reports should be removed from the agendas, at least for a certain amount of time.

It was moved by Trustee Church and seconded by Trustee Rodriguez that **the Board of Trustees does not remove "Board Reports" from future agendas of the Board of Trustees.** The result of the vote was 4-2: (Yea: Jeff Church, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, and Beth Smith. Nay: Ellen Minetto and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

*President Taylor recessed the meeting for 15 minutes.*

2.02 **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION, PURSUANT TO BOARD POLICY 9051(4)(G), TO CENSURE TRUSTEE JEFFREY CHURCH BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR POTENTIAL VIOLATIONS OF BOARD POLICY, INCLUDING THE FOLLOWING BOARD POLICIES: BOARD POLICY 9050; BOARD POLICY 9051; BOARD POLICY 9052; BOARD POLICY 9055; BOARD POLICY 9081; BOARD POLICY 9088; AND/OR BOARD POLICY 9115, BOARD PROTOCOLS, AND/OR THE DUTIES A TRUSTEE OWES THE DISTRICT, FOR EXAMPLE, THE DUTY OF CARE, LOYALTY, AND FIDUCIARY DUTY; PURSUANT TO NEVADA REVISED STATUTE (NRS) 241.033 AND NRS 241.034, THE BOARD WILL CONSIDER THE CHARACTER, ALLEGED MISCONDUCT AND/OR PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE OF TRUSTEE JEFFREY CHURCH AND MAY TAKE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION AGAINST TRUSTEE JEFFREY CHURCH**

President Taylor opened the agenda item and explained that, as Board President, it was her duty to inform individual Trustees if they were in violation of Board Policy and then, if needed, bring any possible action to the full Board of Trustees for consideration. She explained the process that would be followed during the meeting.

President Taylor provided a presentation to the Board on alleged violations of Board Policy by Trustee Church. She reviewed the purpose of a school board and how the Balanced Governance model was utilized by the Washoe County School District Board of Trustees to set standards for how business was conducted and how the Trustees should conduct themselves as members of the Board. She indicated there were three areas of focus that led her and Board Leadership to bring forth the current agenda item: multiple and consistent violations of Board Policies and Protocols by Trustee Church; duty of care and loyalty owed by "Trustees" to the District; and deliberately propagating distrust, disruption, and disinformation. The questions the Board needed to determine were (1) if there were violations of Board Policies and Protocols by Trustee Church and (2) if his actions were the manner in which a member of the Board of Trustees should conduct himself/herself. She presented evidence of the alleged violations and prior actions taken by the Board Leadership Team to discuss the violations and impart change; however, it had become increasingly evident the behavior would not change and additional action was required.

Trustee Church countered the claims made by President Taylor. He stated he stood by all the information he posted on his website and offered anyone to fact-check his information. He did not believe the meeting had been noticed properly and that the venue should have been larger to accommodate those who said they were not able to be in the room. He claimed he did not receive any notices of possible violations until September 12, 2021. He stated he had been acting in his duty as an elected member of the Board of Trustees and was working for the taxpayers, students, and constituents not the Washoe County School District. He believed the Board policies were too vague and allowed President Taylor the ability to make general accusations against any member of the Board she did not agree with. He noted the United States Supreme Court was currently litigating a similar case. He mentioned employees had the legal right to sue, so he wondered why it was improper for him to threaten to sue the District. He provided examples of what he believed were instances when other Trustees had violated the same Board Policies but were not censured. He claimed the only reason for the possible censure was because he reported the concerns related to where former Trustee Calvert lived after he was told to "let it go" and that any censure was a violation of his First Amendment rights.

Stephanie Rice, representing Trustee Church, remarked Trustee Church was elected by the people and they were present to voice their support. She noted the Board had not previously censured any other Trustees for providing statements against actions taken by the Board, supporting candidates for the Board, or any of the other alleged violations

Trustee Church had been accused of. She believed the only reason Trustee Church was being attacked was because of his positions, which were also the positions of his constituents who felt they were not being listened to or heard by the Board. She mentioned any action taken during the meeting would not change anything and that the Board Policies needed to be changed.

President Taylor opened the meeting to public comment.

Murray Kane stated President Taylor should recuse herself from the proceedings. He claimed the District was required to follow the Constitution and could not tell a member of the Board that they were not able to speak their mind on the issues. He believed the Board President was relying on unconstitutional policies and were in violation of their own policies because they were criticizing him.

Jack Burbridge remarked Trustee Church was trying to represent the people who elected him and were now considered "domestic terrorists" for speaking out against the District. He believed the Board was trying to silence Trustee Church because he disagreed with the proposed social justice curriculum. He wondered why Trustee Church was denied access to teacher trainings. He appreciated that Trustee Church was representing him and his family.

Valerie Fiannaca spoke in support of Trustee Church. She felt the Board had forgotten their primary responsibility of educating the children and that only Trustee Church had been trying to improve education in the District. She claimed to have been in the audience when District staff made derogatory comments against Trustee Church because he questioned how money was spent or why a program was necessary, which she found disrespectful. She also believed many staff did not speak to him in a respectful manner when responding to his questions.

Dr. J.S. McElhinney had been a resident of the area for over 40 years and had been married to two former teachers in the District. He had been disgusted by the policies of the District for years because the schools were not teaching students the basics, but their personal political and sexual beliefs. He claimed teachers no longer taught facts but propaganda. He spoke in support of Trustee Church. He believed each Trustee should speak on behalf of the people they represented and should not be punished for speaking out based on arbitrary rules.

Pablo Nava Duran felt the intent of the agenda item was to correct the actions of Trustee Church through his violations of Board Policy. He believed President Taylor focused on what those violations were, whereas Trustee Church only focused on his politics. He hoped the Board would find a way to work together and not focus on politics. He believed there were limits to Free Speech and it was important for the Trustees to speak the truth.

Vicki Schnabel spoke in support of Trustee Church. She believed if the Board Policies were proper and appropriate, then the Trustees should be able to disagree with each other without violating the Policies. She claimed the newspaper had placed Trustee Church on trial and the Board allowed it to happen. She felt the Board was not allowing anyone to disagree with them and the Board was failing in their duty to educate the children of the community. She mentioned the Board should not be teaching any social justice curriculum.

John Eppolito spoke in support of Trustee Church and noted he lived in District A. He believed the Board had already censored the parents by removing the first public comment period and that they were also censoring students who wanted to speak against the District. He provided examples of ways students had tried to speak out and what they claimed happened to them. He indicated the parents and community had already stated they were against teaching Critical Race Theory, but the Board went ahead and created a task force to find a way to implement the curriculum anyway. He believed only Trustee Church was listening to what the parents wanted.

Cindy Martinez spoke in support of Trustee Church. She claimed she had faced discrimination and investigations in her workplace because she spoke out against "group think." She stated the Constitution allowed the people to speak without restrictions and President Taylor was being unconstitutional in the placing of restrictions on what people were saying. She believed the Board was comprised of liberals and they wanted to silence the people in the community who were conservatives.

George Lee wondered if President Taylor and the Board were the ones behind the article in the *Reno Gazette Journal* to "save" their public image. He believed there was no way to win a policy argument in the press. He remarked that Trustee Church was interested in improving education, but he had not seen anything related to education on the agenda in a very long time.

Darla Lee read a statement from Ellen Shaw in support of Trustee Church, which claimed the Board was trying to censure Trustee Church based only on his views and not conduct. Ms. Lee also spoke in support of Trustee Church and claimed he had never lied to her or anyone. She believed Trustee Church was a good and honest man who was only doing what was best for the students in the District.

Morgan Liddick believed the Board, as a whole, was in violation of their own policies and that they had failed the students of the District. He claimed, based on the arguments presented by President Taylor, all Trustees should resign. He wondered if anyone believed the actions of the Board at the present meeting would improve the relationships between the Trustees or the community. He remarked that Trustee

Church was elected by the people and the other Trustees should be concerned because many others in the community supported him and his views.

Melanie Sutton believed President Taylor was silencing the community and Trustee Church with the censure.

Mark Sutton spoke in support of Trustee Church. He believed Trustee Church had always conducted himself professionally and when he supported the students. He claimed Trustee Church had also supported the police and students in the community and never lied. He would like to see the Board censure President Taylor and Superintendent McNeill in order to find out what they really knew about when former Trustee Calvert had moved and the amount of money she stole from the taxpayers.

Eugene Gerscovich remarked that the community expected the Board to rescue the students from being last in education. He believed Trustee Church's ideas and views had been ignored by the rest of the Trustees and they were attempting to silence him. He urged them to follow a more constructive path forward.

Roger Edwards spoke about the commitment to community engagement included in Board Policies, but not being followed by all Trustees. He believed the Board was in violation of many Policies because they would not listen to the views of Trustee Church. He stated Trustee Church deserved an award for reporting where former Trustee Calvert lived and not a censure.

Kimberly Clark spoke in support of Trustee Church because she believed he was the only one interested in listening to the community. She claimed Trustee Church should file a hostile work environment since she believed none of the Trustees would ever support his views.

Bruce Parks stated the First Amendment trumped any Board Policy. He believed all Trustees had violated their Policies but did not have the time to present the information. He claimed he would never had provided Trustee Church with the information related to former Trustee Calvert if he would have know the Board would try to censure him, but would have reported the information elsewhere. He believed President Taylor had shown her disgust for the community by manipulating the agenda and her dysfunctional leadership was the reason for the length of the meetings. He stated there had been others who had tried to silence members of the community but they were now gone.

Janet Butcher wondered if President Taylor was the one to create the presentation or if she had District staff create it. She noted any time spent on the presentation took time away from the children. She did not believe the "duty of loyalty" elected officials owed was to the president of a body, but to the organization and that the Trustees should not

have to go along in order to get along. She claimed school boards in other parts of the country did not have the same problems Washoe County had.

Maria Skolnick expressed frustration that two agenda items were taking 7 hours to complete. She spoke in support of Trustee Church and believed if the Board censured him, then they would also be censuring the parents. She felt he was the only person on the Board who spoke for parents, like herself, and was also the only one who had been honest with his constituents. She did not believe the Board was focused on the children or fiscal responsibility.

Troy Ross urged the Trustees to listen to the people who were speaking because they were "the District." He wondered if there had been any complaints filed against Trustee Church from someone who resided in District A and if not, then there were absolutely no grounds for a censure because Trustee Church was representing the interests of his constituents. He expressed concern over the fact that two of those who would be voting on the possible censure were appointed to their positions and not elected by the people.

Debbie Hudgens believed the presentation provided by President Taylor was just an angry rant that was not becoming of her position. She also believed Trustee Church had been tried in the newspaper and that the only thing that had been accomplished was to anger the people of District A. She claimed the Board did not really want to censure Trustee Church, but instead censure those who spoke out against what was happening in the schools.

Jean Kramer had been a resident of Washoe County for over 50 years and had three children go through the District. She stated she was ashamed of what the Board of Trustees had become because they were more concerned about gender issues, LGBTQ+, and teaching Critical Race Theory than educating children. She claimed the Board only wanted to censure those who did not agree with them. She spoke in support of Trustee Church because he spoke in support of the will of the people.

Nicol Herris presented a list of 33 affidavits in support of Trustee Church and requested they be entered into the record. She believed she could produce thousands more if needed and noted the majority in the room had spoken in support of Trustee Church.

James Benthin spoke in support of Trustee Church. He did not believe the Board's use of Balanced Governance Policies was appropriate and that those policies would not stand up in court. He cited an article from 2016 that showed Nevada's ACT scores were the worst in the nation, which he felt proved the Balanced Governance Policies did not work. He urged the Board to listen to Trustee Church and implement a quality of education committee.

Robert Beadles claimed to be one of the largest landowners in Reno and had numerous successful businesses throughout the United States. He felt what he had witnessed was akin to a kangaroo court that had been funded by George Soros. He stated the Board of Trustees should be the ones on trial, not Trustee Church, because they had not done anything for the kids in Washoe County. He stated he would do anything he could to remove the Trustees from office.

Monica Stabbert believed what she had witnessed was a circus, especially since only one person stood in support of President Taylor. She claimed Trustee Church had continually provided accurate information to her on the City of Reno, the Reno Police Department, the Reno Fire Department, and the Washoe County School District. She wondered why no one had ever called into her show to dispute anything Trustee Church had said. She believed the Board had supported a superintendent that had lowered graduation standards and they had wasted money on a superintendent search by selecting someone not on the list.

The Board received emails from the following:

Joe Morabito	Christina Sherbrook
Karl Sweder	Ellen Shaw
Mr. and Mrs. Van Cleve	Anonymous
Dr. Ronda Tycer	Ric and Carol Winter
Mr. and Mrs. Stan Jolliffe	Julie Lee
Dinah Maher	Tom and Judy Romans
James and Judith Covert	Jane McCarty
Russ Gronert	Alyssa Wagner
Jim Verner	Joseph Schulz
Selena La Rue Hatch	Ethan Pettipiece
Rachel Fisher	Jerald Balance
Stephen Hatch	Victoria Myer
Morgan Liddick	Elizabeth Parsons-Lenz
Jacqueline Wiebe	Lee
Anna Jones	Dr. Kimberly Allcock
Beth Martin	Suzi Burkett
Carol Revers	Jerrie Katz
Ken Schleimer	Jenni Bishop
Jacquelyn McCloskey	Yolanda Knaalk
Julie Duvall	Pam Payne
Nancy Carlson	

President Taylor clarified that the issues related to the possible censure had nothing to do with exposing a wrongdoing of where former Trustee Calvert lived. She did not believe anyone on the Board of Trustees believed it was appropriate to not live in the

district someone was elected to represent. The censure was about the behavior and unfounded allegations of illegal conduct against other Trustees and District staff. The processes and protocols outlined in Board Policy 9051 had been followed with other Trustees in the past, but those processes and protocols had never been tested to this extent while she had been a member of the Board of Trustees. She asked Trustee Church who on the Board had encouraged him to "let it go" in terms of the issue related to former Trustee Calvert.

Trustee Church claimed it was Trustee Nicolet.

Trustee Nicolet countered that at the time, she had believed that, but had changed her mind and believed her position was clear.

Trustee Smith requested clarification on what exactly was the support of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) was in terms of Trustee Church, since it had been raised during both presentations. She specifically asked if the local or national ACLU was in support of Trustee Church related to the censure.

Trustee Church stated he had never been represented by the ACLU. He did not feel it was appropriate to answer for them on their opinion related to his censure.

Trustee Smith mentioned she wanted to be clear because Trustee Church's presentation included a reference that the ACLU supported "Wilson" and Trustee Church, but President Taylor's presentation included a letter from the ACLU that appeared to say the opposite.

Trustee Church remarked that the ACLU had supported Wilson in a national court case and he had inferred from that they would also support him. He acknowledged the ACLU had not taken a position related to his possible censure as far as he knew.

Trustee Nicolet did not believe the case involving Wilson was the same as the issues surrounding Trustee Church because in the Wilson censure, the duties of the board member were taken away. She had read the brief and the entire scope of the Wilson case was predicated on the fact Wilson was not able to perform his duties.

Trustee Church noted 41 names were called for public comment and did not respond. He believed all those people had been disenfranchised and their voices not heard because of the lack of space and the timing of the meeting. He also claimed there was a First Amendment part of the Wilson case and it had not been decided by the United States Supreme Court. He did not believe it was appropriate for anything he had on his website before April 28 to be discussed because he had already been "spanked" for that by the Board. However, he maintained the Board Policies were too vague and lacked regulation. He believed he had behaved professionally at all meetings, with the



exception of the exchange during the September meeting. He did not believe it was fair to the people when meetings went after midnight and the meeting should be recessed and reconvened at an appropriate hour. He claimed there was enough presented in his rebuttal to vote against the censure. He noted he would continue to maintain his website and would not be taking it down so he did not know what the plan was if he was actually censured.

President Taylor stated she hoped that no matter what happened at the current meeting, everyone took a step back and began to move forward in a more positive manner because the Board still had a lot of work to do for the students.

Trustee Nicolet agreed the Board needed to focus on improving academic performance and the many, many needs of the students. She agreed it was important for Trustee Church and those who supported him to have their voices heard; however, she also believed it was important to consider the voices of those not present, for whatever reason, including her constituents. She claimed she had also received numerous emails from members of the community who did not have a desire to come to the meeting to speak out against Trustee Church because they were not interested in being in a room filled with hate. She expressed frustration over those in the audience causing a disruption over her remarks because they did not like what she was saying. It was important to remember the Trustees represented 500,000 people in Washoe County and their job was to listen and represent all of them. She stated her constituents were tired of hearing that Trustee Church was the only member of the Board who cared about children because it was not true. Teachers and parents were tired of hearing that as well. She even had students mention it to her while she was visiting the schools. She read comments from some of the emails she had received that provided a different view than the majority of those who had come to speak in person. Each Trustee received hundreds of emails and they were very diverse, so the Trustees had to take into account all of the voices. She noted in the newspaper article, Trustee Church had indicated he was willing to compromise. She wondered what that meant and what a compromise would look like to him.

Trustee Church mentioned he was regularly the only nay vote on various issues, that he would continue to speak his mind, and post on his website. He felt if someone did not like what he was posting, they could just not visit his website, but he was willing to test his First Amendment rights in court. He would be willing to meet with President Taylor to find a compromise.

Trustee Nicolet requested Trustee Church really think about what compromise would mean. She was unclear as to why it seemed to bother him that he was the only no vote because she had lost votes before as well and that was the process. The Board had to find a way to move forward on behalf of the students. She noted she had previously sought out Trustee Church's support to have agenda items he appeared to

be interested in, such as Infinite Campus and quality of education, but he had refused, so she was not clear as to why he would publicly advocate for these items to be on an agenda, but then privately refuse to be the second Trustee in a formal request.

Trustee Church apologized because he had “dropped the ball” due to illness, vacations, the censure, and all regular Board business.

President Taylor explained the reason the censure was brought forward at a public meeting was because that was the process outlined in Board Policy 9051.

Trustee Rodriguez requested clarification on if Trustee Church had posted the quote on his website that was falsely attributed to Superintendent McNeill regarding the 64,000 social justice warriors.

Trustee Church stated no he did not post the quote and did not know when that was on his website. He claimed if the information was posted, then it was included as an article someone else wrote that he had posted on his website.

President Taylor noted the quote she included as part of her presentation was a screen shot of the website, not an article included on the website. The information was in a box next to some information regarding diversity and equity training.

Trustee Church remarked that if the information was taken prior to April 28, 2021, then he should not be held accountable because he had “scrubbed” his website. He claimed it did not look like something he would post. He commented that his webmaster was an elderly gentleman who would post information without his knowledge and that there had been times he was required to call the individual had have information removed. He added if someone had told him the information was on there, he would have removed it immediately because he knew it was not true.

Trustee Rodriguez agreed with Trustee Nicolet that what was on his website was his business. He felt Trustee Church and the other Trustees were able to get along collegially and have discussions on the issues. He did not understand why Trustee Church or others felt Trustee Church had been “gagged” because from what he could tell, Trustee Church was able to ask all the questions he needed to and have meaningful conversations on topics. He asked how Trustee Church felt gagged.

Trustee Church mentioned the gag for him was the removal of Board Reports and for the community it was the removal of the first general public comment period. He also believed removal of the agenda approval was also a form of gagging.

Trustee Rodriguez expressed that the first time he had heard the concerns was during the presentation. He wondered why Trustee Church had not mentioned this to him before.

Trustee Church noted Board Reports had been included as part of the agenda during his first two meetings with the Board, though the item was not called during the second meeting. After that, the item was removed and he believed he was being gagged because of that.

President Taylor clarified the Board Leadership Team had held a discussion on how to try to make the meetings shorter because they were ending after midnight. Since Board Reports were held at the end of the meeting, the item had been skipped for a few months because of the lateness of the meetings. She had informed all Trustees through an email that because of the length of the meetings, the Board Leadership Team had decided to take certain steps to tighten everything up, which included the removal of Board Reports because they had not been heard in months anyway. It was important to note the intention of Board Reports was to provide the community with information on what the Trustees had been doing in the community, especially related to school visits, and not as an opportunity to share thoughts and perspectives. She felt the challenge was that Trustee Church took it personally and shared his perspective with the community that "Angie took it off the agenda" and did not include information from the email as to what and why that occurred. It was not the statement that "Angie took it off the agenda," it was the behavior as to not providing all the information as to why and who decided to remove the item.

Trustee Smith shared that she believed anything a Trustee posted on a website be accurate and that was extremely important to her. Anything a Trustee posted should be correct, they should be aware, and they should be responsible. She encouraged differences of opinion, but the information provided to the public had to be factual.

Trustee Church believed he had the right to post something and say he agreed with 99% of what was included in a link or a letter or anything else. He noted he tried to walk back the 99% comment to something less, such as 90%, but the rest of the Trustees would not let that go. He claimed to welcome a fact checker and stood by everything that was now posted on his website. He expressed frustration that he had been called a liar because of what was on his website that no one was willing to conduct a fact check.

President Taylor felt it was important for Trustees to ensure what they posted was true first and not post, then ask for a fact checker. The voice of any Trustee carried a lot of weight in the community and received more attention than others. Because of that, it was critical any information a Trustee provided be correct. The opinion or which side of the issue someone came down on was not the concern because it was important to

allow for differing views so all perspectives were heard. If the Board disagreed with any of their policies, they had the opportunity to change that through the current process.

Trustee Nicolet expressed she would like to see the Board continue the discussion of the agenda item to allow the Trustees to review Board Policies and find ways to better work together. The Board currently utilized the Balanced Governance model and if they wanted to make a change, the majority of the Board had to agree, but in the mean time, it was important for the Trustees to work on how to support student academic success.

It was moved by Trustee Nicolet and seconded by Trustee Church that **the Board of Trustees continues the discussion as it relates to how the Trustees can compromise to work better as a team.**

President Taylor opened the motion for discussion.

Trustee Rodriguez indicated he would like to see the issue resolved prior to the appointment of a new Trustee.

Trustee Smith wondered what needed to be compromised. As the newest Trustee, she was not confused over the Board Policies, requirements included in them, and that if staff members were being accurately portrayed. She felt the motion was vague and not clear on how and what the Trustees were being asked to compromise on. She explained she was committed to working with all her colleagues and was seeking clarification on the intent of the motion.

Trustee Church remarked that the Board would not know what compromise was until they tried and, unfortunately, the agenda item was not worded properly to allow for something specific for the Board to do. He indicated he had compromised by seconding the motion because he would now be blasted by the right since they wanted to see a vote on the censure.

Trustee Minetto expressed concern over what staff had been already put through. She felt the community wanted to see a resolution, either way.

Trustee Nicolet clarified she was interested in having a deeper conversation with everyone. She would like to continue the conversation because there seemed to be certain approaches to how business was conducted that would not change.

Trustee Rodriguez wondered how long the Trustees would need to wait before the item was brought back to the Board. Neil Rombardo, Chief General Counsel, indicated a deadline could be placed on the motion.

The result of the vote was 4-2: (Yea: Jeff Church, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, and Beth Smith. Nay: Ellen Minetto and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

### **3. Closing Items**

#### **3.01 PUBLIC COMMENT**

John Eppolito, Protect Nevada Children, spoke about Infinite Campus and his concerns related to the data collected and stored by the company. He claimed the United States government paid states to have massive databases on student information that were compatible with each other; Nevada selected Infinite Campus. He was concerned over the amount and types of information stored in Infinite Campus since parents were not told what information was collected and stored, nor did they have access to a lot of the information.

Janet Butcher mentioned she had previously asked the Board what the schools would do on Constitution Day because each educational institution that received public funds was required to hold an educational program on the Constitution during the year. She claimed the District did not conduct any programs on the Constitution during the current school year and that the only thing the students would do was recite the Pledge of Allegiance. She remarked that the lack of programming highlighted how the District was failing the students. She mentioned the current meeting was the first time she had seen someone in the audience threaten someone else and they were not asked to leave.

Monica Stabbert claimed the Board had cost her over \$1,000 in business because she chose to be at the meeting at 4:00 p.m. instead of attending other appointments. She thanked Trustee Church for everything he did for the District. She urged the Trustees not to approve the renewal of dues to the National School Board Association because of a letter they sent calling parents who spoke against school districts "domestic terrorists." She claimed more and more parents would become involved and they were not going away because they did not want Critical Race Theory and social justice taught in the schools.

Bruce Parks felt the other Trustees were "cherry-picking" their emails because he believed there were more emails in support of what Trustee Church was doing than against. He claimed the Board was not doing anything to graduate students who were not functionally illiterate. He remarked the current agenda had taken close to 9 hours and that showed how ineffective the Board was. He believed Trustee Church would never be able to get anything on an agenda because every other Trustee was ostracizing him.

Nicol Herris urged the Trustees to attend the community meetings she hosted. She was interested in seeing the Trustees have a conversation with the community and ask what the community wanted. She believed the Trustees should vote on what was important for all the students and schools and not just those in their individual electoral districts. She hoped the Board began questioning who they were paying due to and figure out what the District was receiving in return.

Cindy Martinez read from the Declaration of Independence and claimed the Board was violating the peoples' right to peacefully assemble and address their grievances with the Board because the location of the meeting was too small. She claimed the Trustees were cowards for not conducting their meeting in a larger location.

Pablo Nava Duran expressed appreciation for the willingness of the Trustees to try to compromise and begin to work together.

The Board received emails from the following:

Joe Morabito  
Ralph Coppola  
Sean McCaffrey

### 3.02 **ADJOURN MEETING**

There being no further business to come before the members of the Board, President Taylor declared the meeting adjourned at 12:53 a.m.

---

**Angela D. Taylor, President**

---

**Diane Nicolet, Clerk**

---

**From:** Morabito, Joe  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 20, 2021 9:58 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Censure of Jeffrey Church - Angela Taylor Must Resign

**Be advised that any School Board Member who votes to censure Jeffrey Church, the only White Male Conservative on the Board will face major opposition if running for reelection.** Our check books are already open and ready to go. **Further, Angela Taylor, an admitted Democrat Socialist as the ringleader of this racist effort for this reason and many more must resign.** Her vendetta against Mr. Church, supported by legal counsel and the Superintendent is unacceptable. The Jackie Calvert matter speaks of corruption. We must find out who knew what and when. Any Board Member or district staff member who was aware of this fraud over a two-year period must resign from office as complicit to the crime. **Ms. Calvert must repay monies owed the district that she received and perhaps even be prosecuted for fraud. It may be that a Grand Jury investigation is needed to get to the truth. Joe Morabito**

**Joseph Morabito SCRP**  
**President/CEO**  
Paragon Global Resources, Inc.

This email and any files and other information transmitted with it are considered private, may be confidential and proprietary information, and are solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, you may not disclose, distribute, copy, print or otherwise use the information in this transmission. Please destroy it immediately and notify the sender by telephone or email.

---

**From:** Morabito, Joe  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 20, 2021 3:09 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Bigger Venue For The Board Meeting

Given the topics, I suggest a bigger venue for the upcoming Board Meeting. This meeting will be well attended. People should all be allowed into the Meeting. JMb

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)



---

**From:** Karl Sweder  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 21, 2021 1:11 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Jeff Church

The pending action to censor Jeff Church is a disgrace. All of you, and in particular Angela Taylor, have continually tried to silence Mr. Church and ban his input on the Washoe Co. School Board of Trustees. The Socialist policies of Angela Taylor are opposed by the majority of the parents and grandparents of Washoe Co. students and Jeff Church should be applauded for his efforts to expose this and other corruption in our districts. If anyone is to be censored, it should be Angela Taylor for allowing a trustee to serve illegally and not pursue any punitive action.

Thank you

Karl Sweder

Sparks, NV. 89441

---

**From:** Ralph "Stephen" Coppola  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 21, 2021 2:33 PM  
**To:** McNeill, Kristen; Church, Jeffrey; Minetto, Ellen; Rodriguez, Joseph M; Smith, Elizabeth A; Taylor, Angela; Nicolet, Diane M; Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] October 25, 2021 School Board meeting comment and need for larger facility

Dear School Board:

**LARGER FACILITY.**

1. Please move the meeting to a larger facility to accommodate the anticipated larger audience.

**REMOVE TAYLOR.**

2. It is A. Taylor who should be censored - if not removed - for her unconstitutional (it interferes with suffrage) interference with our vote by not allowing Jeff Church to speak. What a tyrant! Of what is she afraid? The truth?

**END MASKS.**

3. End the ridiculous mask mandate. It has done nothing in almost two years. CV19 is real but masks don't work, and filthy, and are creating depression.

Ralph Stephen Coppola

Reno, NV 89509

Dear School Board Trustees:

I am writing a personal letter to express my support for Trustee Jeff Church who represents my district, District A. I believe that he represented my district, my younger sister, and myself accurately when he voted to oppose the participation of transgender individuals in women's sports. Science shows that, despite attempts to transition, the transgender individual remains of his biological birth sex. To allow transgender persons to compete with females puts undue strain on women competitors; and, therefore, I support Mr. Church's stance.

Other accusations against Trustee Church have not been transparently detailed to the public, and, more importantly, to his constituents. I believe it ~~wrong~~ of the Board to censure a trustee for merely fulfilling his duty to represent his constituents. To do so is discrimination against the constituents of District A and myself. Furthermore, as a matter of precedent, it is inappropriate to censure a trustee for any reason that is not fully disclosed to his constituents.

In closing, I oppose your censure of Mr. Church and request that this proposed censure be rejected.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Katriel J. Vanllive &  
Ariel L. Van Cleve

---

**From:** rondatycer  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 21, 2021 5:40 PM  
**To:** Public Comments; BoardMembers  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Do Not Censure Jeff Church

TO: WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

FROM: Ronda Tycer, PhD  
Incline Village, NV

RE: Censure of Trustee Jeff Church

**I do not know Mr. Church nor do I subscribe to his websites.** I have read the *This Is Reno* news article and the *change.org* petition

**Mr. Church has the right to express his minority opinion on the WCSD Board.**

**I disagree that Mr. Church should be censored for statements he made representing his view on important issues as a member of the WCSD Board.** He has the right to responsibly present his minority views on the Board, especially when they oppose the *united* majority view of Board members.

In the functioning of any agency Board, there is value in having more than one opinion and to having a robust conversation considering all pros and cons. Welcoming the minority voice—whether pro or con—ensures better decisions. Mr. Church may have not been artful in how he expressed his opposition to the majority opinion, but that does not make his minority opinion any less useful to the final Board decision.

Mr. Church may present opinions others dislike, but the proper action is to argue against them, not to censure his membership on the Board. It appears what Mr. Church said during Board meetings—while possibly derogatory in part—was not legally defamatory. It was not slanderous or libelous. Thus, there doesn't appear to be any legal rationale to censure him as a Board member.

**The Internet is not a Board meeting and different rules apply.**

**Citizens say what they want on Internet platforms**—especially if they are the moderator and sponsor. If someone reading what Mr. Church writes on his Internet websites believes it is “dangerous lies and disinformation,” that person can stop reading, or post to the website and disagree with what Mr. Church says. That’s how the Internet works.

From the petition it appears what Mr. Church said on his website is that WCSD is promoting “anti-religious indoctrination, gender identity, mandatory racist indoctrination.” On this basis, petition creator Rachel Fisher characterizes Mr. Church as “racist, homophobic, and transphobic.” That is her opinion and she is equally protected by the First Amendment to give it on the Internet platform of *change.org*.

Questioning whether DNA males should be allowed to compete with DNA females is a concern of many WCSD parents and is not in and of itself “homophobic, transphobic, or racist.” That some parents of DNA females might worry about the safety of their daughters being in the same locker room or competing on the same team as DNA males is understandable. Likewise, questioning whether the curriculum adopted by the WCSD is a version of *Critical Race Theory* is also a parents’ prerogative, and they too have the right to give their opinion without being labeled “homophobic, transphobic, or racist.”

**The WCSD’s supposedly inclusive “valuing of the religious and racial diversity of students, families, and staff” is the antithesis of censoring or “gagging” people whose opinions differ from their own.**

---

**From:** Stanley Jolliffe  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 23, 2021 7:14 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Jeff Church

We support our First Amendment rights. Jeff Church has his constitutional and God given right to speak and agree or disagree with School Board policy, as we do.

We do not live under a dictatorship. You civil servants represent WE THE PEOPLE! You work for us. You have no business censoring FREE SPEECH.

Our school system has gone crazy teaching terrible theories to our children. Teach them the Declaration of Independence. Teach them reading, writing, arithmetic and science. Educate them!!!!

Mr and Mrs Stan Jolliffe

---

**From:** Dinah Maher  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 24, 2021 7:49 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Agenda Item 2.02

Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees  
Oct. 25, 2021

**2.02 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION, PURSUANT TO BOARD POLICY 9051(4)(G), TO CENSURE TRUSTEE JEFFREY CHURCH BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES.**

The arbitrary and subjective censure of Jeff Church is contrary to the will of the people who elected him to his position on the WCSD Board of Trustees. If indeed there are board policies that would prevent a duly elected member from expressing his or her point of view, it is the board policy that needs to be reviewed not the behavior of the board member. I would expect that freedom to apply to every board member regardless of whether I agree with their position or not. Perhaps if the public had a greater understanding of board members legitimate views, there would be an elected board that more accurately reflects the majority will of their constituents. You can put a stop to this nonsense immediately and each of your votes will, if nothing else, provide valuable insight into this board's respect, or lack thereof, for the First Amendment rights that should apply to every citizen.

Sincerely,  
Dinah Maher

---

**From:** Judy Covert  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 24, 2021 10:48 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Agenda Item 2.02 Oct 25 2021

Dear Board Members,

As a residents and taxpayers of Jeff Church's district we want you to vote no to censure him. We and others do not feel he has done anything wrong and everything he said said is his right to free speech. We elected him to voice our concerns. Just because you don't agree with what he says or does is no reason to censure.

If you vote for this you are inhibiting free speech.

James and Judith Covert

---

**From:** russ gronert  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 24, 2021 12:00 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Jeff Church

Stop wasting your time and our money going after Jeff Church and attempt to improve the learning of students and raising NV educational standing to something presentable without critical race theory and gender fluidity.

Russ



---

**From:** Jimbobv  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 24, 2021 2:26 PM  
**To:** Minetto, Ellen; Rodriguez, Joseph M; Smith, Elizabeth A; Taylor, Angela; Nicolet, Diane M; Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Censure of Jeff Church

As a long time District A resident of Washoe County I am distressed about the upcoming meeting planned for the sole purpose of censuring Jeff Church. As a police sergeant and an air force officer, Jeff has given a lifetime of service to his country and community. As a Board member, he is doing exactly what we elected him to do - change the status quo. We have a top heavy, extremely expensive school system that continuously cranks out graduates at or near the bottom of the national academic rankings. We would like things to change for the better, and Jeff is trying to do just that.

I have been privy to the numerous harassments he has suffered during his tenure and the roadblocks placed in his path by Angie Taylor and the other Board members over the past ten months. His crime - he disagrees with their views and policies. How do you deal with a troublemaker like that? You simply cancel him. You block his attempts to speak out, then you do your best to destroy him personally and professionally. How dare he disagree!

I urge all of you to vote against censuring Jeff Church. I think such an action would be an embarrassment to the Board and would weaken your individual positions as Board members - especially those of you running for reelection. I and most of my friends feel your time would be better spent in addressing some of the real issues facing your organization.

Jim Verner

---

**From:** Selena La Rue  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 24, 2021 3:29 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Censure of Trustee Church

I am writing to support the censure of Jeff Church. Further, I encourage this board to use its power to remove Jeff Church from office as he has violated his fiduciary responsibilities and actively harms the students in this district. Mr. Church's behavior on this board has been atrocious from the start. He refuses to learn from his past mistakes and makes a mockery of our democratic process.

We have all seen his newsletters filled with disinformation which have whipped a small minority of this community into a frenzy and we have heard the insanity and misdirection which pours from his lips every board meeting. Rather than try to tamp down on misinformation and ease the tension which he has helped create, he has inflamed it through his newsletters, his comments to the media, his actions during board meetings, and his coordination with the mob that he incites at every meeting.

I have been an active member of the community and participant in many board meetings for years now, and I have reached the point where I cannot stand to watch these board meetings any longer as his behavior makes me sick and embarrassed for our district. Further, I no longer feel safe attending board meetings to give my comments in person thanks to the actions of Mr. Church and his followers. In the meetings I have attended over the past year, I have been physically intimidated and verbally harassed by his followers simply for being a teacher in the district. In fact, most community members I speak with have told me they no longer feel safe at these meetings due to the hostility and threats of violence from the crowds at these meetings, and I agree. Following Mr. Church's election to the board I have actually received hate mail at my home based on comments I have given at the meetings. Now, I understand that Jeff Church did not physically intimidate me, nor did he send the hate mail to my home (to my knowledge at least - it was anonymous). However, his words and his lies have whipped this small segment of our community into a frenzy and the resulting anger and hate which has been directed at our staff lies directly on his doorstep.

Beyond his misinformation and hate mongering, Mr. Church has not acted professionally as a board member. As a social studies teacher I encourage my students to contact the Trustees and send in public comment about issues that concern them. Usually they send in comments to the public comment email and that is the end of it. However, Mr. Church has taken it upon himself to reply directly to public comments, even when individuals have not emailed him personally. Both myself AND my students have received rambling, angry emails from him in response to public comments that were never sent directly to him. He is using his district email to do this. He is even sending attachments and links to his random case studies, which have nothing to do with the topic of our original comments. As an adult and an individual with a history of interaction with our Trustees, I was shocked and confused by these responses. My poor students felt downright attacked. They did not know what to do when an adult and an elected official started sending them angry emails out of the blue, just because they practiced their civic duty and sent in a comment on an agenda item. This is so far from acceptable and I am still angry on their behalf. These students put themselves out there in a major way and were slapped down by Mr. Church and his immature and irresponsible behavior.

I know these two anecdotes are only drops in the sea of evidence against Jeff Church. This board has been more than patient and almost too accommodating to this antics. I implore you to take action against his reckless behavior before he causes more harm to this district. We are struggling enough with a global pandemic and all the other chaos in the world today. We do not need leaders who are actively attacking students, lying about staff, and trying to tear apart the institutions which are keeping our kids safe and learning.

Thank you for taking this brave stand. Please don't be intimidated by the vocal minority which has bombarded you of late. Your community sees what is happening, we are disgusted by this behavior, and we support you in taking action against it.

Respectfully,

~Selena La Rue Hatch  
Teacher

---

**From:** Rachel Fisher  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 24, 2021 6:59 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Support of Censure; Special Meeting 10-25-2021  
**Attachments:** Church Transphobic Image.JPG; Church Disinformation Image.JPG; Page 2 Church Newsletter.jpg; Page 1 Church Newsletter.jpg

Dear Board of Trustees,

I am writing today as a community member and educator within WCSD in support of the urgent need for censure on Trustee Jeff Church.

While he has supporters who are alleging that the censure is in retaliation for the removal of Trustee Calvert, the many issues and unethical behavior of Jeff Church has been a concern of the community since he first began his term. The petition I created pointing out Church's troubling behavior that has garnered nearly 850 signatures pre-dates the removal of Calvert by 6 months (<https://chng.it/nLvWDym>), and the nearly 200 pages of evidence for violations of district board policy and behavior unbecoming of a trustee that was gathered by the district also show that the censorship of Trustee Church is long overdue.

Trustee Church should be censured for malfeasance in office, for divisiveness, for violations of the open meeting law, for working behind the backs of the board to pursue his private agenda, for spreading disinformation about covid, masking, vaccines, and curriculum, as well as for unprofessional conduct in and out of board meetings. While he has since removed much of the content from his personal websites attacking WCSD and spreading disinformation and erroneous claims of data to discredit the board and school district, I have included images captured from his sites as well as a newsletter he personally wrote to his supporters promoting legal action against the school board of which he is supposed to be a serving member of.

Trustee Church does not only do an incredible disservice to the board on which he is a member, but his behavior creates an environment of violence within our board meetings that have profoundly harmful effects on our students, staff, and schools. No trustee should be on the board who feels it is appropriate to attack fellow board members, educators, groups of students, and community members. I urge you to take action by censuring Trustee Church today.

Thank you,  
Rachel Fisher



**Did you know this Policy is  
in Place Now? (Facilities means  
locker rooms and showers)**

Administrative Regulation 5161

**GENDER IDENTITY AND GENDER NONCONFORMITY –  
STUDENTS (April 3, 2019)**

- Staff shall not disclose information that may reveal a student's transgender or gender non-conforming status to others, including parents/guardians
- Students shall have access to the restroom that corresponds to their gender identity
- Students shall have access to use facilities that correspond to their gender identity
- Transgender and gender nonconforming students shall be permitted to participate in physical education classes and intramural sports in a manner that is consistent with their gender identity.

Here's a sample of **current and proposed training** for students, teachers, and staff

- "We want 64,000 Social Justice Warriors"  
-Kristen McNeill, Superintendent of WCSD
- Revisionist Anti-American History  
USA and Constitution founded on slavery and racism
- Critical Race Theory  
The color of your skin determines whether you are an oppressor or victim
- Equity (vs Equality)  
Equal results - Not equal opportunity
- Equity Action Plan aka Restorative Justice  
Take from those who have, and give to alleged victims
- White Privilege / White Shaming  
Students forced to take a "Privilege Walk"
- **Warning!** McNeill and most Board members deny socialist and Marxist underpinnings of their indoctrination

Views are mine) Nevada Constitution: Section 9: Every citizen may freely speak, write and publish his sentiments on all subjects being responsible for the abuse of that right; and no law shall be passed to restrain or abridge the liberty of speech or of the press.

## The ABC's of Saving Our Schools

**A: We need good folks to run in 2022 and we will be fielding good candidates with an eye on improving the Quality of Education.**

**B: Concerned citizens should weigh in at [BoardMembers@WashoeSchools.net](mailto:BoardMembers@WashoeSchools.net)**

**C: Donate to Legal Fund, it "ain't" free folks. Attorney Joey Gilbert and even the ACLU agree. Know any lawyers? Court may award attorney fees.**

[www.WatchDogJeff.com](http://www.WatchDogJeff.com) [RenoTaxRevolt@Sbcglobal.net](mailto:RenoTaxRevolt@Sbcglobal.net)

From: Jeff Church Trustee, WCSD (views are mine)

The Washoe County School District (WCSD) has their knee on the neck of Free Speech and has imposed "Martial Law" on our freedoms while promoting Anti-Religious indoctrination, Gender Identity, mandatory racist indoctrination while our schools fail.

Upon my election, the Washoe County School District (WCSD) has engaged in on going systemic violations of free speech and "muzzling" including the following:

1. Ending Open Public Meetings with active public input with no vote of the Board.
2. Removing two long standing agenda items: Board Reports and Request for Future Agenda Items from the WCSD agenda with no Board Vote. In essence gagging Trustee Jeff Church
3. Holding Press Conferences and removing/ not admitting persons with whom they did not agree. "The WCSD media briefings are by invitation only, and the law does not require us to invite all members of the media." Victoria Campbell  
- Holy Smoke- WCSD is a govt agency not a Golf Club. See Pen American Center v. Donald J Trump # 18CV 9433 and Toll v Gilman (NV Sup Ct)

In short, the actions of WCSD are designed to oppress and deny free speech and transparency to those they disagree with including legally elected Trustee Jeff Church. If and when WCSD returns these rights, no doubt, they'll promote their benevolence when they should be condemned. To be clear, see below, WCSD has closed Board Meetings to all forms of Active Public Comment, falsely claiming that a large number refused to wear masks when photos show otherwise while showing WCSD personnel ignoring the rules.

"PEN declares for a free press and opposes arbitrary censorship. It believes that the necessary advance of the world toward a more highly organized political and economic order renders free criticism of governments, administrations, and institutions imperative." —PEN Charter, 1948

The people of this state do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve them. The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people insist on remaining informed so that they may retain control over instruments they have created.

Once the right to speak has been granted by the Legislature ... the full panoply of First Amendment rights attaches to the public's right to speak. The public's freedom of speech during public meetings is vigorously protected by both the U.S. Constitution and the Nevada Constitution. Freedom of expression upon public questions is secured by the First Amendment. Nevada A.G. OML Manual Sections 8.01 and 13.03.

United States Supreme Court, 1936, "Since informed public opinion is the most potent of all restraints upon misgovernment, the suppression or abridgement of the publicity afforded by a free press cannot be regarded otherwise than with grave concern."

**GENDER IDENTITY:** Current WCSD Policy: (Without Parental notification): Simply "Identify" as female and use female restrooms and locker rooms (full nudity), sleep with females on fieldtrips, compete in female sports (contact sports too- injuries certain), apply for female colleges & scholarships.

#### HOW IS WCSD DOING?

ACT Scores (100 means they test 100% of students) Nevada 100: 17.9 (Washoe 18.2)  
Alabama 100 18.9 / Arkansas 100 19.3 / Kentucky 100 19.8 / Louisiana 100 18.8  
Mississippi 100 18.4 / Montana 100 19.8 / Nebraska 100 20 / North Carolina 100 19  
Ohio 100 20 / Oklahoma 100 18.9 / Tennessee 100 19.4 / Utah 100 20.3  
Wisconsin 100 20.3 / Wyoming 100 19.8 Bishop Monogue (Private HS in Reno) 23  
Approx Average ACT Nationally 22, UCLA Average: 31, Max Score Possible 36  
\*Note: Utah, North Carolina and Mississippi all spend less PP but out score us in ACT  
These are the 15 states that test 100% of students in ACT.

Spending per pupil: K-12 schools \$12,612 per pupil, annually. Nevada: 9.4K, Utah: 7.6K (Ranks top 10 or 20 in school ranking in spite of low spending), for example ACT 20.3 vs 17.9 NV, Texas spends about the same as NV and has ACT is 20.5. One Study listed Nevada 44 but add at least \$750 pp Washoe Sales Tax for schools. (\$46M yearly)

WCSD's own reports list our per pupil spending at \$11,833  
Another view: WCSD Budget 9.1 Million for about 61,000 students = \$14,918

The 2019 State of Nevada "star" NSPF Ratings report that of 109 Washoe Schools rated on the one (poor) to 5 (excellent) star rating system, WCSD leaves plenty of room for improvement. WCSD has 38 schools rated high as 4 to 5 stars. However 31 were rated as "3" (average) and 40 as below average with (29) 2-stars and (11) 1 star.

#### DRUG USE OUT OF CONTROL WITH HS STUDENTS

(Raises Issue of Drug Use with Staff) Admitted marijuana use in the last 30 days among Washoe High School Seniors was over 27%! That's just admitted use. We know it's higher. Now factor in alcohol abuse and hard drug use and it's an epidemic.  
In fact, a survey of teachers and staff, 51% reported drug use was a moderate to major problem.



---

**From:** Stephen Hatch  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 24, 2021 7:20 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Jeff Church Censure

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to urge the board to censure Jeff Church and remove him from his position on the Washoe County School District Board of Trustees. He has violated his fiduciary responsibility to the Washoe County School District and continues to violate board policies as well as the law. He has stoked hatred and anger in our district and sets a terrible example for our children as well as a terrible precedent for any public official.

Thank you for your consideration in this serious and urgent matter.

-Stephen Hatch

---

**From:** morgan liddick  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 24, 2021 8:04 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Upcoming censure motion: Trustee Jeff Church

Please excuse the lateness of this comment re: the censure of WCSB Trustee Jeff Church. It took me a while to wade through the supporting documents, redacted and repetitive they were.

That done, I can say: this is a shameful episode. It is undertaken by parties who seem to think that an elected representative to a public board is there not to vigorously represent his constituents or, in the case of a board of education, the interests of the district's students, but instead to be a sort of bobble-headed yes-man to the majority of the board.

I suggest that it is this majoritarian authoritarianism – expressed by the emphasis on the “shut up and agree” policies under which the board operates – that is largely responsible for the failure of the WCSB to create a school system that brings students to “achieve academic success, develop personal and civic responsibility and achieve career and college readiness.” The Board's principal goal, according to its own policies.

Jeff Church is insightful, if grating. But his insights are more correct than not. The WCSB Board of Trustees, in attempting to censure him, have proved themselves once again to be exactly the opposite. It is they, not he who bear the responsibility for the district's ongoing dismal performance: everyone should look at the results of both the “National Report Card” and Nevada's SBAC and ask themselves, “Is this the best we can do?”

Then we should all, taxpayers and parents alike, demand that the WCSB Board of Trustees should, in the title of the 1943 Nat King Cole hit tune, “Straighten Up and Fly Right.”

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

---

**From:** Jacquie Wiebe  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 24, 2021 8:19 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Urgent Censure of Trustee Church

Esteemed Trustees,

Trustee Church is a bad fit on the board of a growing, forward-thinking school district. I'm astounded at his actions and want to be sure you are aware that community members DO NOT support his despicable agenda.

I urge you to consider the following reasons for censure:

- 1- for his lack of empathy for the LGBTQ+ student community
- 2-for bullying fellow members
- 3-for violations of the open meeting law and for working behind the backs of the board to pursue his private agenda
- 4- for divisiveness
- 5-for spreading disinformation about covid and masking
- 6-for unprofessional conduct in and out of board meetings
- 7-for malfeasance in office

As a longtime community member, a parent of students who attended their entire K-12 career here in Washoe County, and a caring human being, I demand that you ask for Church's resignation.

Thank you for your excellent work in a difficult setting.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Wiebe

---

**From:** Anna Jones  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 24, 2021 10:18 PM  
**To:** Public Comments; Church, Jeffrey; Minetto, Ellen; Rodriguez, Joseph M; Smith, Elizabeth A  
**Cc:** Taylor, Angela; Nicolet, Diane M  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] No Censure of Jeffrey Church

Dear Washoe School District,

I am a resident of Nevada and am writing to tell you NOT to censure Jeffrey Church. I don't know what's going on with these crazy left people running our schools, but you work for us and we will stop you. Do you want as much negative attention as Loudoun County is getting? I would hope not. By the way, WHO is giving the orders anyway?

Anna Jones  
Las Vegas, Nevada

---

**From:** Beth Martin  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 4:16 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Public Comment 10/25

Dear members of the board,

I am writing again in support of censuring trustee Church. Trustee Church has repeatedly violated board policy, in fact he refused and voted to oppose honoring his commitment to follow Board Policy. The steps taken to help trustee Church have proven ineffective as his behavior continues to worsen. This has a negative impact on our board, our employees, and most importantly our students.

Trustee Church continues to prove to not be a steward of the district. He does not support board decisions, speaks half-truths to employees and members of the public, and spreads misinformation about the district and our schools on multiple platforms. In fact, there have been instances where trustee Church has had the opportunity to visit our schools to learn more about them but will not accept invitations to visit. How can he know about our school needs and our students if he does not visit them? If he doesn't learn about our district? If he doesn't connect with employees? If he doesn't take a minute to see our students? If he doesn't even attempt to notice the hard work employees put forth, and all the amazing things students do in school every day?

I expect that board trustees act and represent our district in a way that makes our district even better than it was the day before, not in a way that is divisive and intimidating.

His lack of integrity, accuracy, and transparency in his methods of communication prove to be damaging to the institution. As a member of the board he should be representing our district in a positive manner.

I hope that you take his actions seriously and follow through with censoring trustee Church.

With respect,  
Beth Martin

---

**From:** Carol Revers  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 6:18 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Jeff Church Support

Today is an important date in Washoe County! Today you will decide whether or not to censure Jeff Church. Please, DO NOT!!!!!!

Jeff Church should be listened to and his opinions should be allowed to be voiced. The track record for Nevada education is AWFUL and if you all continue on your myopic journey by refusing to listen to conservative ideas or ideas other than your own, you cannot expect to see the numbers rise. Silencing someone because you do not agree with them accomplishes absolutely nothing and is exactly why our county, our state and our nation is in such trouble. You are ignoring Mr. Church's First Amendment right to free speech and your policies and practices are doing MAJOR harm to our children, our schools and our community.

Please DO NOT CENSURE Jeff Church!!!!!!!  
Sent from my iPad

---

**From:** Laurie Agnew  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 8:29 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Calvert Investigation

I intend to attend the WCSB meeting today and would like to see the supporting documents on the Calvert investigation prior to the meeting. Please email this information ASAP: [REDACTED]

Thank you,

Laurie Agnew

- "Throughout history, it has been the inaction of those who could have acted; the indifference of those who should have known better; the silence of the voice of justice when it mattered most; that has made it possible for evil to triumph." us

---

**From:** Bev Stenehjem  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 8:50 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Cc:** Church, Jeffrey  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Copies of Calvert investigation

Please send/email me a copy of the investigation report about Jackie Calvert. It is the first agenda item for today's school board meeting and I would like time to review the materials before the meeting starts.

Thank you,  
Bev Stenehjem

Sent from my iPhone



---

**From:** Ken Schleimer  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 8:58 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Jeff Church

Jeff Church should not be censured. He is a legitimately elected representative and has a right to his opinions...just as you do...

k.

---

**From:** Jacquelyn McCloskey  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 9:15 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Freedom of Speech

The First Amendment of our Constitution is FREEDOM OF SPEECH. It does not not qualify or designated, to whom, this privilege is given. This board doesn't not have the purview to dictate who does or does not have this privilege, and it is audacious that they think they have that authority. Any member, who supports suppressing, our Constitutional Rights needs to immediately be dismissed and sanctioned from ever holding an authoritative position again.

Jacquelyn McCloskey

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

---

**From:** Sean McCaffrey  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 9:25 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request for public documents ahead of the 4p meeting today

Good morning!

My name is Sean McCaffrey and I'm requesting any and all public documents, or at least a link to, regarding the agenda items for discussion this afternoon.

I am disappointed that negative headlines continue to plague our school district. Much of these headlines seem to be self-induced. I continue to be dismayed at the lack of professionalism and lack of collaboration demonstrated by this body. There are very important issues requiring the board's attention and, in my opinion, the board continues to invest in actions like these that do not move education forward, which is disheartening.

As a private citizen, I recognize I am not privy to the discussions or decorum happening behind the scenes. What I do see in the public light leaves much to be desired. Civility and respect cross party lines, yet that does not seem to be the ethos of today's Board.

I'm not at all looking forward to today's meeting as I believe this should have been prevented with the proper leadership and focus.

Thank you,

Sean McCaffrey

---

**From:** Nicol Herris  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 9:26 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Cc:** Church, Jeffrey  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Copies of Calvert investigation

Please send/email me a copy of the investigation report about Jackie Calvert. It is the first agenda item for today's school board meeting and I would like time to review the materials before the meeting starts.

Thanks a Million,  
Nicôl

Nicôl Herris  
S.0182720  
Coldwell Banker Select Real Estate

"Making Your Real Estate Dreams Come True!"

I do NOT send wiring instructions for real estate transactions via email. Please contact your title company for wiring instructions. Please do not convey your financial information via email to me. Contact me via telephone regarding any suspicious or inconsistent communications you receive from my email. The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation to the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

Begin forwarded message:

---

**From:** julie duvall  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 9:18 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 2.02 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION, PURSUANT TO BOARD POLICY 9051(4)(G), TO CENSURE TRUSTEE JEFFREY CHURCH BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR POTENTIAL VIOLATIONS OF BOARD POLICY

To the members of the Washoe County School Board,

You are making a dire mistake by trying to censure Trustee Jeffrey Church. Despite what you newer Nevadans may think, Washoe County has many conservatives, who have been sitting quietly, watching our children's rights to breath and learn freely get trampled on by mask mandates, watching our children's sense of belonging and community pulverized by critical race theory, and watching our children's education minimalized by the standards being lowered in the name of equity.

Jeffrey Church is the lone conservative voice for the quiet MAJORITY of Washoe County citizens. By censuring Jeff, it will be very apparent to our citizens, regardless of political party, that the Board's prime objective is POWER. Without Jeff asking critical questions, having you reevaluate your opinions, and bringing our concerns to the board, you would pass everything which your puppet masters request. What surprises me is how blatantly this is being done! Beware, it's all in the spotlight now, as are all of you, appearing to lack any self dignity, bending the knee to your socialist dictators.

The only School Board members who should not only be censured, but should lose their seats are all of you, leaving Jeffrey Church as the sole Board Member. You WILL be held accountable for allowing Jackie Calvert to sit on the Board, when both the General Counsel and the Board President knew she was not a legitimate Board Member. You are all complicit in a crime! You were all aware of the illegality of her position, yet did nothing to stop the fraud.

I've lived in Washoe County my entire life and have personally known past School Board members. I must say, this is the most corrupt board I have ever witnessed. It hurts me deeply to witness all of you letting the needs of our children fall wayside in your incessant pursuit of power. I am utterly disgusted.

Shame on you,

Julie Duvall

---

**From:** Nicholas St Jon  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 9:27 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Cc:** Church, Jeffrey  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request Gunderson report on Calvert incident

I am requesting the report so I can review it before the meeting this afternoon.  
Please email a copy to this email address.  
Nicholas St Jon

--

=====



"Everyone dies, not everyone lives." ~ William Wallace

---

**From:** Cindy M  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 9:33 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Cc:** Church, Jeffrey  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] FOIA Request for Complete Investigative Report Regarding Jacqueline Calvert, Angela Taylor & Neil Rombardo Investigation

Good morning, WCSD & Board of Trustees,

I respectfully request the investigative report with the complete findings of the Jacqueline Calvert investigation. The report should also include the investigative findings about the involvement of Board of Trustees President Angela Taylor & WCSD Legal Counsel Neil Rombardo.

I will need to see these documents and findings in order to thoughtfully provide public comment at today's Special Meeting of the WCSD Board of Trustees.

I reasonably expect the electronic file will be provided as requested as this is a legal public records request.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cindy Martinez  
Sparks, NV

---

**From:** Nancy Carlson  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 9:34 AM  
**To:** McNeill, Kristen; Church, Jeffrey; Minetto, Ellen; Rodriguez, Joseph M; Smith, Elizabeth A; Taylor, Angela; Nicolet, Diane M; Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] STOP the Censure of Jeff Church!

Dear Washoe County School Board:

I am frustrated and upset at your attempts to censure our School Board Member, Jeff Church. Jeff was elected by his constituents and is doing his best to represent our views. He cannot be censured because he is representing us AND because censure would restrict his freedom of speech. This is unconstitutional. We believe in Jeff and appreciate his attempts to make our views known. STOP this censure!

You should be focusing your efforts on the abysmal academic performance of students in our state, not in retribution of School Board Members who have views different from your own. Parents are pulling their children out of our public schools partly because of the academic performance of our schools, but also because of your efforts to implement non-academic indoctrination of our children.

Signed - An EXTREMELY concerned taxpayer and VOTER!

Nancy Carlson

Incline Village, NV 89451



---

**From:** Cindy Sassenrath  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 9:43 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Where's the beef?

Please send/email me a copy of the investigation report about Jackie Calvert. It is the first agenda item for today's school board meeting and I would like time to review the materials before the meeting starts.

Sincerely,  
Cindy Sassenrath

---

**From:** Claudia Fisher  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 9:48 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Calvert Investigation

Please send me a copy of the Calvert investigation ASAP for this afternoon's meeting at 4!  
Claudia Fisher

Sent from my iPhone

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 9:51 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Cc:** Church, Jeffrey  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Availability of Copies of Calvert investigation

I see that the first agenda item for today's Special School Board meeting has to do with the Jackie Calvert investigation - Please email me a copy of the investigation report about Jackie Calvert.  
I would like the courtesy of time to review the materials before the meeting starts.

Thank you,  
Janet Butcher

---

**From:** Jimbobv  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 9:59 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Calvert Investigation

WCSD:

Please send me an e-copy of the investigation before the meeting. Thank you.

Jim Verner

---

**From:** Maria Skolnick  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 10:33 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Calvert Investigation

Good morning,

I would like to review the findings on the Calvert investigation prior to attending the meeting this afternoon. Can you please email me a copy of the report.

I would great appreciate it.

Sincerely,

Maria Skolnick

---

**From:** Brad Kroshus  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 10:37 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Cc:** Church, Jeffrey  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Calvert Investigation Report

Please send/email me a copy of the investigation report about Jackie Calvert. It is the first agenda item for today's school board meeting and I would like time to review the materials before the meeting starts.

Thank you,  
Brad Kroshus

---

**From:** jerry Coughlin  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 10:43 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Cc:** Church, Jeffrey  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Calvert report

As a parent of student in the school district i am requesting a calvert investigation report.

Also I am against the censure of Jeff Church.

Sincerely,  
Jerry Coughlin

---

**From:** Ryan West  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 10:45 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Cc:** Church, Jeffrey  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Calvert Investigation Report Request

Hello,

Please provide a copy of the Calvert Investigation Report as soon as possible for adequate time to review prior to today's WCSD meeting.

Thank you,  
Ryan

West



---

**From:** Christina Sherbrook  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 10:56 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] The censure of Jeff Church

Dear board members of our community,

NO on censuring Mr. Jeff church.

Mr. Church speaks out on the concerns of a lot of families and people in our community.

Mr. Church has every right to speak out about our concerns on the teaching the CRT program in our schools that we do not agree with.

I will be at the school board meeting today in his support.

Sincerely,

Christina Sherbrook

Sent from my iPhone

TO: Washoe County School Board  
Board Room  
425 E. 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Reno

FROM: Ellen M Shaw, citizen  
Reno 89511

DATE: October 25, 2021

SUBJECT: Mr. Jeff Church Censor

Thank you for allowing me one minute of your time. I have come here to say that:

We elected Jeff Church to this school board and we are very proud of the job he is doing to protect our children's education. That you don't agree with him is Not a punishable offense. The last time I checked we are still in the United States of America and we are still allowed to have differences of opinion.

Your actions to censor Mr. Church for doing his job, the job for which he was elected, is based upon POTENTIAL violations and ALLEGED misconduct. Shame on you! This hearing is an embarrassment to each of you. Your threats are meaningless, a waste of time and money.

You serve at our pleasure and we elected Mr. Church to protect our children's education. Since it is we who elected him his efforts are on our behalf. Mr. Church has an equal say on this school board and therefore, it is OUR say that you are attempting to censor.

There is NO misconduct by Jeff Church.!

---

**From:** Benjamin Nash  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 11:14 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Cc:** Church, Jeffrey  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Calvert Investigation Report

Hello Washoe County School Board,

This is an email requesting the Calvert investigation report. You know, the woman who moved out of the district she was representing then had to resign. I understand this is item #1 on the agenda today. Do the people of Washoe County get to read/review? Please send me a copy ASAP.

Thank You.

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 11:27 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Censorship

Please rethink your censorship of Jeff Church. It's important to have a diverse group of trustees on the school board. It would also be great to give parents a choice in masks. Thank you

Sent from my iPad

---

**From:** Cynthia Miller  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 11:41 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Cc:** Bev Stenehjem; Church, Jeffrey  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Jackie Calvert not punished but Jeff Church is being censured? NO

I am a concerned Christian Nevadan Citizen. It appears that Jackie Calvert, Trustee was paid a monthly salary of \$700/month for 2 and a half years while she was **not a resident of her District**. Why was this allowed? That is 30 months X \$700 = \$21,000. As a School Board with an annual budget of *1 BILLION US DOLLARS* why are you not more careful with how you spend **OUR MONEY?**

Is this another LAWLESS EVENT in our Upside-Down Country where GOOD IS BAD and EVIL IS GOOD?

I pray that the Holy Spirit speaks to everyone of your hearts today and removes the wool from your eyes.

I do not want to live in a World where the Children do not think rationally. Critical Thinking, not Critical Race Theory where White children are taught that **they are RACIST** and must not be proud of being born how God created them.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Miller  
Concerned Nevadan Citizen

---

**From:** BRUCE FOSTER  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 12:01 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Cc:** Church, Jeffrey  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Jackie Calvert Investigation  
**Attachments:** NRS281.050.doc

To whom it may concern:

Wish to request copy of the complete Calvert investigation once completed and time to review.

The attached NRS code should be applied in this investigation.

Respectfully,

Bruce Foster  
Sparks

employment > § 281.050

## Nevada Revised Statutes 281.050 – Residence for purposes of eligibility for office is actual residence; effect of temporary absence; vacancy in candidacy upon moving actual residence; preelection actions challenging actual residence; legal standards ...

Current as of: 2020 | [Check for updates](#) | [Other versions](#)

The residence of a 1. **person** with reference to his or her eligibility to any office is the **person's** actual residence within the State, **county**, district, ward, subdistrict or any other unit prescribed by law, as the case may be, during all the period for which residence is claimed by the person.

### Terms Used In Nevada Revised Statutes 281.050

- **county**: includes Carson City. See [Nevada Revised Statutes 0.033](#)
- **Evidence**: Information presented in testimony or in documents that is used to persuade the fact finder (judge or jury) to decide the case for one side or the other.
- **Jurisdiction**: (1) The legal authority of a court to hear and decide a case. Concurrent jurisdiction exists when two courts have simultaneous responsibility for the same case. (2) The geographic area over which the court has authority to decide cases.
- **person**: means a natural person, any form of business or social organization and any other nongovernmental legal entity including, but not limited to, a corporation, partnership, association, trust or unincorporated organization.

See [Nevada Revised Statutes 0.039](#)

Except as otherwise provided in subsections 3 and 4, if any person absents himself or herself from the 2. **jurisdiction** of that person's actual residence with the intention in good faith to return without delay and continue such actual residence, the period of absence must not be considered in determining the question of residence.

If a person who has filed a declaration of candidacy for any elective office moves the person's actual residence out of the State, 3. **county**, district, ward, subdistrict or any other unit prescribed by law, as the case may be, in which the person is required actually, as opposed to constructively, to reside in order for the person to be eligible to the office, a vacancy is created thereby and the appropriate action for filling the vacancy must be taken.

Once a person's actual residence is fixed, the person shall be deemed to have moved the person's actual residence for the purposes of this section if: 4.

The person has acted affirmatively and has actually removed himself or herself from the place of permanent habitation where the person actually resided and was legally domiciled; (a)

The person has an intention to abandon the place of permanent habitation where the person actually resided and was legally domiciled; and (b)

The person has an intention to remain in another place of permanent habitation where the person actually resides and is legally domiciled. (c)

Except as otherwise provided in this subsection and 5. [NRS 293.1265](#), the district court has jurisdiction to determine the question of residence in any preelection action for declaratory judgment brought against a person who has filed a declaration of candidacy for any elective office. If the question of residence relates to whether an incumbent meets any qualification concerning residence required for the term of office in which the incumbent is presently serving, the district court does not have jurisdiction to determine the question of residence in an action for declaratory judgment brought by a person pursuant to this section but has jurisdiction to determine the question of residence only in an action to declare the office vacant that is authorized by [NRS 283.040](#) and brought by the Attorney General or the appropriate district attorney pursuant to that section.

Except as otherwise provided in 6. [NRS 293.1265](#), if in any preelection action for declaratory judgment, the district court finds that a person who has filed a declaration of candidacy for any elective office fails to meet any qualification concerning residence required for the office pursuant to the Constitution or laws of this State, the person is subject to the provisions of [NRS 293.2045](#).

For the purposes of this section, in determining whether a place of permanent habitation is the place where a person actually resides and is legally domiciled: 7.

It is the public policy of this State to avoid sham residences and to ensure that the person actually, as opposed to constructively, resides in the area prescribed by law for the office so the person has an actual connection with the constituents who reside in the area and has particular knowledge of their concerns. (a)

The person may have more than one residence but only one legal domicile, and the person's legal domicile requires both the fact of actual living in the place and the intention to remain there as a permanent residence. If the person temporarily leaves the person's legal domicile, or leaves for a particular purpose, and does not take up a permanent residence in another place, then the person's legal domicile has not changed.



Once the person's legal domicile is fixed, the fact of actual living in another place, the intention to remain in the other place and the intention to abandon the former legal domicile must all exist before the person's (b) legal domicile can change.

Evidence of the person's legal domicile includes, without limitation: (c)

The place where the person lives the majority of the time and the length of time the person has lived in that place. (1)

The place where the person lives with the person's spouse or domestic partner, if any. (2)

The place where the person lives with the person's children, dependents or relatives, if any. (3)

The place where the person lives with any other individual whose relationship with the person is substantially similar to a relationship with a spouse, domestic partner, child, (4) **dependent** or relative.

The place where the person's dogs, cats or other pets, if any, live. (5)

The place listed as the person's residential address on the voter registration card issued to the person pursuant to (6) [NRS 293.517](#).

The place listed as the person's residential address on any driver's license or identification card issued to the person by the Department of Motor Vehicles, any passport or military identification card issued to the person by the United States or any other form of identification issued to the person by a governmental agency. (7)

The place listed as the person's residential address on any registration for a motor vehicle issued to the person by the Department of Motor Vehicles or any registration for another type of vehicle or mode of transportation, including, without limitation, any aircraft, vessels or watercraft, issued to the person by a governmental agency. (8)

The place listed as the person's residential address on any applications for issuance or renewal of any license, certificate, registration, permit or similar type of authorization issued to the person by a governmental agency which has the authority to regulate an occupation or profession. (9)

The place listed as the person's residential address on any document which the person is authorized or required by law to file or record with a governmental agency, including, without limitation, any (10) deed, declaration of homestead or other record of real or personal property, any applications for services, privileges or benefits or any tax documents, forms or returns, but excluding the person's declaration of candidacy.

The place listed as the person's residential address on any type of check, payment, benefit or reimbursement issued to the person by a governmental agency or by any type of company that provides insurance, workers' compensation, health care or medical benefits or any self-insured employer or third-party administrator. (11)

The place listed as the person's residential address on the person's paycheck, paystub or employment records. (12)

The place listed as the person's residential address on the person's bank statements, insurance statements, (13) mortgage statements, loan statements, financial accounts, credit card accounts, utility accounts or other billing statements or accounts.

The place where the person receives mail or deliveries from the United States Postal Service or commercial carriers. (14)

The (d) evidence listed in paragraph (c) is intended to be illustrative and is not intended to be exhaustive or exclusive. The presence or absence of any particular type of evidence listed in paragraph (c) is not, by itself, determinative of the person's legal domicile, but such a determination must be based upon all the facts and circumstances of the person's particular case.

As used in this section: 8.

'Actual residence' means the place of permanent habitation where a person actually resides and is legally domiciled. If the person maintains more than one place of permanent habitation, the place the person declares to be the person's principal permanent habitation when filing a declaration of candidacy for any elective office must be the place where the person actually resides and is legally domiciled in order for the person to be eligible to the office. (a)

---

**From:** Ric & Carol Winter  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 12:06 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fwd: JEFF CHURCH CENSURE

JEFF CHURCH CENSURE

Cc: <[jeffrey.church@washoeschools.net](mailto:jeffrey.church@washoeschools.net)>, <[EMinetto@washoeschools.net](mailto:EMinetto@washoeschools.net)>, <[Joseph.Rodriguez@washoeschools.net](mailto:Joseph.Rodriguez@washoeschools.net)>, <[Elizabeth.Smith@washoeschools.net](mailto:Elizabeth.Smith@washoeschools.net)>, <[ATaylor@washoeschools.net](mailto:ATaylor@washoeschools.net)>, <[DNicolet@washoeschools.net](mailto:DNicolet@washoeschools.net)>

ATTN: WCSD Board

We are writing this letter expressing our full support of Jeff Church! Jeff is the only one who seems to be listening to the parents/grandparents expressing their concerns as to the direction the trustees have taken toward indoctrinating our children with Critical Race Theory, instead of focusing on the quality of their education.

You were elected to help direct the education of our children. You are not listening! We are starting to take back OUR schools and the quality of our childrens' education by electing Jeff Church and in the near future, other like-minded people.

Ric & Carol Winter  
Sparks

---

**From:** Nathan A Noble  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 12:14 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Public Comment

Esteemed members of the Board,

It is with a heavy heart that I write to you today. The gravity of these items cannot be overstated, and as such, I felt it essential to speak on each point

Beginning with item 2.01: Although I cannot speak on the factual merits of this item, I can speak on behalf of Mr. Rombardo's character. Having worked with him on numerous occasions, I can attest to his professionalism, his diligence, and his commitment to serving the students of this district. Through all the turmoil that has rocked this district, the legal services that Mr. Romabardo provides have been an essential anchor, a source of stability, and a point of clarity in truly uncertain circumstances. I believe that his service and tenacity are commendable, and that moreover that his work is essential to the functioning of our district. I urge you to hold these qualities in high regard as you render your decision.

As for item 2.02: Regarding the serious matter of the potential censure of Trustee Church, I have only this to say: Consider the factual merits of these grave allegations with all due seriousness, as these charges are not levied lightly; Believe those who come before you in good faith, ESPECIALLY students, as I can attest that coming before a governing body as a teenager is not easy; lastly, and most importantly disregard all else as, be it slander, distortions, ad-homonys, indignant opining, or vicious recriminations.

Trustees, you are presenting with a highly unenviable situation. Yet all the same, it now falls to you to deliver a just and expedient decision. Remember that first and foremost you serve the interests of our students, that your judgment and decency are your greatest assets, and that it is of no use to anyone to second guess yourselves. Today, justice is yours and yours alone.

Stand strong, and you've got this!

Best,

-Nathan Noble

**Nathan Noble** *(He/Him)*

*Senator, College of Liberal Arts*

Associated Students of the University of Nevada

3rd Floor Joe Crowley Student Union

The University of Nevada, Reno

Reno, NV 89503

---

**From:** Danielle OCONNOR  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 12:58 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Public Comment for Special Meeting 10/25/2021 Agenda Item 2.01

Hello,

I would like to know why the investigative report, that will be voted on during agenda item 2.01, is not available for the public to review?

When will this report be available to the public?

In regards to the “who knew what and when”:

Will President Taylor and/or District’s Chief General Counsel, Neil A. Rombardo be held accountable if this report finds evidence that they knew about the change of residency months (or even years) before the trustee in question resigned and intentionally chose not to act on it?

Thank you for considering my questions.

Best,  
Danielle O’Connor  
Sparks, NV

---

**From:** Julie Lee  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 1:02 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] agenda 2.02 censuring of Jeff Church

Board Members,

Please vote No to the censuring Jeff Church. Mr Church was elected to the board to represent his district and speak on the concerns many families and people in our community have with what is being taught in our schools.

Julie Lee

---

**From:** Judy Romans  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 1:28 PM  
**To:** McNeill, Kristen  
**Cc:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Censure

If it wasn't for the inclement weather we would be in attendance at this afternoon meeting. We cannot believe that the board is attempting to censure Jeff Church. He was duly elected and represents us. Censuring him would not only be unconstitutional, but it also restricts his freedom of speech.

Please focus more on what is best for our children rather than your political agenda.

Anyone voting to censure Jeff Church will not have our support or vote in any coming elections.

Respectfully

Tom and Judy Romans

Incline Village

Sent from my iPhone

---

**From:** Jane McCarty  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 2:08 PM  
**To:** McNeill, Kristen; Church, Jeffrey; Minetto, Ellen; Rodriguez, Joseph M; Smith, Elizabeth A; Taylor, Angela; Nicolet, Diane M; Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL]

*Dear Washoe County School Board:*

*I am frustrated and upset at your attempts to censure our School Board Member, Jeff Church. Jeff was elected by his constituents and is doing his best to represent our views. He cannot be censured because he is representing us AND because censure would restrict his freedom of speech. This is unconstitutional. We believe in Jeff and appreciate his attempts to make our views known. STOP this censure!*

*A concerned taxpayer (and voter)*

--

Jane

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail transmission (and/or the attachments accompanying it) may contain confidential information belonging to the sender which is protected by the attorney-client privilege. The information is intended only for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. Any unauthorized interception of this transmission is illegal. If you have received this transmission in error, please promptly notify the sender by reply e-mail, and then destroy all copies of the transmission. Thank you.



---

**From:** nvedwards47  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 2:15 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request copy of backup documentation on Jacky Calvert investigation sent to this cell phone. Thanks

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

---

**From:** Nicholas Maier  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 2:24 PM  
**To:** Public Comments; Reno Tax Revolt  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request for Copies of the Calvert Investigation

The Board of Trustees must provide copies of the Gunderson Investigation to the public at the meeting or at the same time as said material is given to other Trustees otherwise the Board is in violation of Open Meeting Law statutes specifically:

OML Manual:

**(11) As to materials that were not available on the agenda posting date, a member of the public is justified in asking for such materials at the meeting, and the public body must interrupt its meeting to provide the requested copies.** See NRS 241.020(7)(b) and AG File No. 00-025

I am making a request that such material is delivered to me electronically prior to the Board of Trustees discussing such material.

If this is not done, you must move the agenda item to a future meeting.

Nicholas Maier

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

---

**From:** Ralph "Stephen" Coppola  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 2:38 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request for a copy of the investigation for Jackie Calvert

I would like to request a copy of the investigation for Jackie Calvert be provided to me by email prior to today's meeting.

Warmest regards,

Ralph Stephen Coppola

Reno, NV 89509

---

The important thing for me, then, is not the "work," but my life. **Life is not the means for the achievement of an esthetic ideal of perfection; on the contrary, the work is an ethical symbol of life.**

[Apologies for "Auto-Correct" and dictation errors.]

THIS EMAIL AND ATTACHMENTS IS FOR THE EXCLUSIVE USE OF THE INDIVIDUALS AND ENTITIES ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION PROTECTED BY THE ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS AND PRIVACY ACT (18 USC §§ 2510-2521), THE ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PRIVACY ACT (18 USC § 2701 ET, SEQ.), AND NRS §§ 179.425-179.450, 200.620 AND 205.320, OR ATTORNEY-CLIENT, WORK PRODUCT OR OTHER PRIVILEGE. REVIEW BY ANYONE OTHER THAN THE INTENDED RECIPIENT(S) SHALL NOT CONSTITUTE A WAIVER OF ANY ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE OR ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT PROTECTION. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT ANY DISSEMINATION OR COPYING IS PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS TRANSMISSION IN ERROR PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE (775-815-5304) OR EMAIL, AND DELETE/DESTROY THE ORIGINAL AND ALL COPIES. LICENSED AS AN ATTORNEY ONLY IN CALIFORNIA; NOT LICENSED IN NEVADA.

---

**From:** Alyssa Wagner  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 2:45 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Support of Censure, Special Meeting 10-25-2021

Good Afternoon,

I urge you to censure Jeff Church for the harm he has caused to this school board and district in his short time as trustee. He has spread misinformation about COVID, masks, and vaccinations. I truly believe he is the root of the issue with the negativity and violence ya'll have had to deal with during board meetings. He is tied to insurrectionists such as Joey Gilbert. Most importantly is that he does not truly believe in the well being and health of ALL of our students. He clearly does not support LGBTQIA+ students, especially trans students. Please, for the health and safety of our students and staff censure Jeff Church.

Thank you,  
Alyssa Wagner  
Former classroom teacher

--  
Alyssa Wagner

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 2:58 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Please, provide copies of Calvert Investigation before today's meeting.

Thank you.  
E.Gerscovich  
Reno 89523

---

**From:** Susan Howell  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 3:15 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Copy

I am requesting a copy of Jackie Calverts investigation please Sent from my iPhone

---

**From:** joseph schulz  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 3:15 PM  
**To:** McNeill, Kristen; Church, Jeffrey; Minetto, Ellen; Rodriguez, Joseph M; Smith, Elizabeth A; Taylor, Angela; Nicolet, Diane M; Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Board Member Jeffrey Church

*Dear Washoe County School Board:*

*We are frustrated and angry at your repeated attempts to isolate and now to censure our School Board Member, Jeff Church. Jeff was elected by his constituents and represents our views, not the views of the majority of the school board, nor the policies of the teachers unions and not a political party.*

*He must not be censured as he represents us. Restricting his freedom of speech as a resident of Nevada and more importantly as an elected official is unconstitutional.*

*We have faith in Jeff and appreciate his attempts to make our views known. STOP this censure!*

*Joseph Schulz*

*Cretia Eyster*

*Putter Court, Incline Village NV*

---

**From:** Ethan Pettipiece  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 3:40 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Agenda 2.02 Vote to potential Censure Jeff Chruch

Dear Washoe County School Board,

I am a resident of district A, Jeff Church's district, and I am in favor of him being censured. If he didn't want to be censured then he shouldn't have broken the Boards policies. Play stupid games win stupid prizes.

Sincerely,  
Ethan Pettipiece



---

**From:** Jerald Ballance  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 4:16 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Cc:** Church, Jeffrey; Batchelder, Jennifer  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] No violation of NRS Chapter 241 Open Meeting Law Occurred 9/28/2021

[https://ag.nv.gov/About/Governmental\\_Affairs/OML/](https://ag.nv.gov/About/Governmental_Affairs/OML/)  
<https://www.leg.state.nv.us/nrs/nrs-241.html>  
[https://admin.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/adminnv.gov/content/Boards/Women/Meetings/2020/2019-03-26\\_OML\\_12TH\\_AGOMANUAL.pdf](https://admin.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/adminnv.gov/content/Boards/Women/Meetings/2020/2019-03-26_OML_12TH_AGOMANUAL.pdf)

The statute NRS 241 does not prohibit elected officials from reporting on new business or news as was done by Mr. Church during the Board Reports portion of the meeting held on September 28, 2021. The Board has both the right and responsibility to include in its Agenda a place for reports from Trustees. Since the items reported on during Board Reports are not action items their content is not required to be previously published as part of the Agenda. The Board Reports category is similar to the New Business category that has been used as part of meeting agendas since the founding of our nation and one expects to hear or read news, opinions and observances during such portions of any agenda.

The case law relevant to open meetings here in Nevada has unfortunately obfuscated rather than clarified the matter of what constitutes a violation of the Open Meeting Law (OML). In *Sandoval v. Board of Regents (2003)* the Nevada Supreme Court held that the Board of Regents violated the Open Meeting Law because the agenda statement was too broad to place the public on notice that the Board would take informal action on the items discussed. In *Schmidt v. Washoe County (2007)* the Nevada Supreme Court discussed what constitutes a, "clear and complete" agenda item and concluded that an agenda item that gave the public adequate notice of what was to be discussed (as in the Schmidt case) met the, "clear and complete" standard.

In both cases the question was if the agenda provided adequate information regarding a matter that would be discussed and acted upon. Neither NRS 241, nor case law has established any restriction on an elected official's ability to make a report or state an opinion, especially when such statements were made during a properly scheduled agenda segment; in this case, Board Reports.

While no violation of the OML occurred, the Chair erred by allowing a discussion to ensue while Mr. Church was presenting his report on September 28, 2021 (video 3.26.32). The language used for the agenda line, Board Reports, states that there is to be, "No discussion" during Board Reports:

**4. Reports No discussion among the Board of Trustees will occur under these items**

4.01 BOARD REPORTS – Each Trustee will have 3 minutes to provide the community with an u activities related to Washoe County School District. No discussion among the Board of Trustees item

From the Nevada OML Manual (a documents that provides guidance but that is not legally binding on our elected bodies):

"j. Generic agenda items such as “President’s Report,” “Committee Reports,” “New Business,” and “Old Business” do not provide a clear and complete statement of the topics scheduled to be considered. Such items must not be listed as for possible action items as they do not adequately describe matters upon which action is to be taken. See OMLO 99-03 (January 11, 1999)

It appears that those who advise the Board have omitted the passage that a Reports section "...must not be listed as for possible action items..." The Agenda line, Board Reports allows for Trustees to announce their activities, observances and opinions on events since the last meeting. Since there is nothing in those reports that will be acted on by the Board of Trustees at the current meeting, then no violation of the OML occurred.

I encourage the Board of Trustees to retain the Agenda item, Board Reports, since it serves as a useful place in the meeting for me and my fellow citizens to hear about (or read about) what the various Trustees have been doing and sometimes to hear of relevant news

regarding the respective districts and our schools. The only modification that I would recommend is that the Chair more carefully enforce the rules of the meeting by not allowing ad hoc discussions to occur during Board Reports and to prevent Trustees or staff members from interrupting or interjecting their ideas or opinions out of order.

I am registered here as a Democrat and I voted for Mr. Church to be my representative on the Board of Trustees. Based on my close observations, he has conducted himself honorably in every respect and I will gladly vote for him again.

**Tyler**  
*J. Tyler Ballance*

---

**From:** V Myer  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 4:57 PM  
**To:** McNeill, Kristen; Church, Jeffrey; Minetto, Ellen; Rodriguez, Joseph M; Smith, Elizabeth A; Taylor, Angela; Nicolet, Diane M; Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Trustee Church

Superintendent McNeil,

Regarding the meeting today, which is very well attended and now delayed, rest assured the support in favor of dropping all procedures and censuring of Trustee Church is tremendous. The delaying of this meeting does not change the support. Trustee Church has been thoroughly vetted regarding all charges against him and they have been found to not only be fallacious but may also be retaliatory in nature. This will not go unnoticed or unchecked.

Jeff Church is our representative, he has tried to do everything possible for our kids, unlike this board. If you all spent this time focusing on improving education in Washoe County instead of consuming massive amounts of time regarding masks, testing, censoring, coercion and trying to control the students, our students wouldn't be last in the nation. You are not doing the jobs you were elected to do.

You all need to resign and make way for local qualified citizens to run this school board and district.

Regards,  
Victoria Myer  
44 year voting resident of Washoe County

---

**From:** Elizabeth Parsons-Lenz  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 6:52 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Censure of Jeffrey Church

To the Washoe County School Board,

In response to the move to censure Trustee Jeffrey Church, please note these points:

- Trustee Church is representing his constituents successfully in that he has communicated the tone, the messaging, the exact voice of his frustrated constituents.
- The fact that Trustee Church is in opposition to the viewpoint of other Washoe County School Board member opinions is irrelevant and action against him will be construed as punitive or retaliatory action.
- The move to censure Trustee Church is a move against the numerous constituents that have sent him as their elected representative. This is evident by the number of supporters that have shown up for today's meeting this October 25, 2021.
- Accommodation was not adequate for the number of people that arrived as evidenced by the addition 12 -15 people standing in the cold in the parking lot.
- Adequate accommodation was not provided as required by the lack of social distancing.

As a resident of Washoe County, member of the Sparks Charter Commission, Vice President of the Sparks Republican Women's Club, and public sector consultant with a Master's in Public Policy from Rutgers University, I do not consent to the censure of Trustee Jeffrey Church.

Respectfully,

*Elizabeth Parsons-Lenz*  
*Sparks, NV*

---

**From:** leelee  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 10:08 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Jeff Church Censure - Board Policy 9050-9052; 9055;9081; 9088

Good morning,

It is absolutely abhorrent that Angela Taylor, would be driving this witch hunt towards a school board member, when she can't even remember her oath, which she publicly stated in a LIVE meeting. We have the video of her stating this and she will be next in line if this is how she conducts herself with other members. Looks like we will need to request a meeting to illustrate this violation of NRS 241.033 by Angela Taylor as it relates to her competence.

Please see: 4-20-21: marker: 2:04:10 and 2:16:00 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tJ2Vec1Vd4M> why is this video no longer available to the public? This violates NSR 241.035. The board WILL be held accountable for removing this content of a board meeting. This public body has violated NRS 241.035 as this information as it is being withheld from the public.

**NRS 241.033 Meeting to consider character, misconduct, competence or health of person whose character, misconduct, competence or health is to be considered**

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.

---

**From:** Robert Beadles  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 10:31 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Calvert Report

Send me a copy of the report as it's first item on agenda. Thank you.

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS

---

**From:** Ian  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 11:06 AM  
**To:** Public Comments; Church, Jeffrey  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] RE: Calvert investigation report

To Whom it May Concern,

I implore Washoe County School District to provide the Calvert investigation report to all interested parties in the interest of transparency ASAP for proper time to read and review.

Regards,  
Ian Gallagher



---

**From:** Kimberly Allcock  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 11:21 AM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] I am a Washoe County parent and I strongly support CENSURE for Jeff Church

I am writing in support of censure for Trustee Jeff Church. He has NOT done his job, he does not have the best interest of our students in mind, and he continues to push misinformation and cause discord and disruption.

Trustee Church should be censured for his actions, including malfeasance in office, working behind the backs of the rest of the board to pursue his private agenda, and for spreading disinformation (indeed propagating bald faced lies) about covid, masking, vaccine and important curriculum. I strongly agree that he should be censured. Even better, request Church's resignation for bullying fellow members and for his unprofessional and dishonest conduct both in and outside of board meetings.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Kimberly Allcock (Ph.D)

---

**From:** Suzi Burkett  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 11:55 AM  
**To:** McNeill, Kristen; Church, Jeffrey; Minetto, Ellen; Rodriguez, Joseph M; Smith, Elizabeth A; Taylor, Angela; Nicolet, Diane M; Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Censorship

*Dear Washoe County School Board:*

*I am frustrated and upset at your attempts to censure our School Board Member, Jeff Church. Jeff was elected by his constituents and is doing his best to represent our views. He cannot be censured because he is representing us AND because censure would restrict his freedom of speech. This is unconstitutional. Therefore it is illegal. You will be held accountable.*

*We believe in Jeff and appreciate his attempts to make our views known. STOP this censure!  
A concerned taxpayer (and voter)*

Suzanne Burkett  
Incline Village

---

**From:** Jerrie Katz  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 1:05 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Do NOT censor Jeff Church

To all WCSD board members,

Jeff Church was elected by his constituents to represent their views. Censoring mr. Church will only cause more discourse. If his constituents want new leadership they can elect a different person.

Regards,

Jerrie Katz

incline Village, Nevada

Sent from my iPad

---

**From:** Elaine Grimes  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 2:41 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Jackie Calvert Investigation Request

Please send me a copy of the investigation for Jackie Calvert.

Thank you,  
Elaine Grimes  
Concerned Washoe County resident.  
Sent by Elaine Grimes

---

**From:** Jenni Bishop  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 3:43 PM  
**To:** Public Comments  
**Cc:** Church, Jeffrey; Taylor, Angela; McNeill, Kristen  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Proposed censure of Trustee Church

Dear Trustees of the Board for Washoe County School District,

With respect to the proposed censure of Trustee Jeff Church; this walks and talks and looks and smells like local government seeking to punish an individual for exercising his Constitutional rights to A) form and hold his own opinions, and B) publicly state them out loud.

'Board protocol' is being used as constructive speech code, a gag order between trustees and the people they serve, swiftly moving into Loyalty Oath territory.

Stop. Becoming a Washoe County school board trustee does not also mean giving up one's rights to speech and expression.

WCSD does not need yet another civil suit to pay for.

Mr. Church was duly elected, voter disenfranchisement has nothing to do with one side or the other failing to put up a candidate for an election.

Washoe County schools have serious problems but having an opposing point of view on the board isn't one of them.

Get used to the idea there are thousands who disagree with the direction and performance of our schools and have every right to say so. Get back to the work you were hired to do.

Sincerely,  
JH Bishop  
Reno, NV.

---

**From:** Yolanda Wiehe  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 7:22 PM  
**To:** McNeill, Kristen; Church, Jeffrey; Minetto, Ellen; Rodriguez, Joseph M; Smith, Elizabeth A; Taylor, Angela; Nicolet, Diane M; Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Please do not censure Jeff Church

Dear Washoe Co School Board,

Please do not censure Jeff Church. He is my representative and if you take away his voice, you are taking away MY voice. Plus censuring Jeff Church is taking away Jeff's first amendment rights.

Thanks, Yolanda Knaak Incline Village resident

---

**From:** Pam Payne  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2021 8:36 PM  
**To:** BoardMembers; Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Trustee church

Dear Board Members,

This censure has been a long time coming. Since joining the WCSD school board, Trustee Church has used his platform as a member of the board to work to constantly undermine the ability of that board to do the work it is charged to do. Trustee Church uses his pulpit, Next-door and other social media venues to promote blatantly false information, such as the notion that masks are child abuse and CRT is taught in elementary schools. In addition, Trustee Church regularly steps off the dais in the middle of meetings to fan the flames of his supporters through his own public comment. Trustees are supposed to act for their zone, not their own personal beliefs as Trustee Church does. All of these actions directly undermine the work of the board. The board that Trustee Church is supposed to be working with to better our schools. If this trustee is unable to put his personal bias aside, as he has clearly shown, he should resign.

Since his joining the board, the meetings have become increasingly hostile. I used to feel comfortable attending meetings and even bringing my WCSD elementary student to observe the process, but no longer. The last meeting I attended, supporters of Trustee Church under his direction harassed, asked for rank at the university where I work, threatened to notify my superiors, and made the meeting generally unsafe. This is unacceptable. As a parent and educator, it pains me to watch WCSD Board meetings because the hate is palpable. People wear yellow stars on their clothing, and that is okay? Do we really allow the comparison of anything to the Holocaust? This is wholly unacceptable and this board needs to take steps to make these meetings, schools, and community safe.

Trustee Church and the group of individuals supporting him that don't have children in our district are intent on pushing a political national agenda to undermine science, ignore our nations history and simply 'white-wash' everything will have implications for our community for generations. Those like Trustee Church with no interest in our schools or the safety of our youth should no longer have the ability to railroad our school board to acting on false information and turn its nose at science. Policies like the ones that Trustee Church opposes (LGBTQ+ sex education, ELA) will save the lives of our young people. We know that when schools do NOT have inclusive environments young people are at risk for mental health problems and suicide. By including these policies in our teaching, we can save lives, yet Trustee Church fans the hate suggesting that this will damage youth. No research shows this is the case. Please stand up to this hate and false narrative.

We need the remainder of the board to stand up to Trustee Church and those who intend to create political divide in board meetings, where hate and false information are the norm. Please at the very least censure Trustee Church so it can be known that this board will stand up for truth and against blatantly false narratives.

Thank you,  
Pamela B. Payne, Ph.D., CFLE  
Parent of a 4th grader at Winnemucca Elementary

--

Pamela B. Payne  
Pamela B. Payne, PhD, CFLE  
Sent from my iPhone