
From: Morabito, Joe
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2022 9:17 AM
To: Public Comments
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Improving the Quality of Education in Washoe

Still waiting to see an agenda item specifically on improving the Quality of Education in Washoe. Half the kids in the district cannot read or do math at grade level. Inner city kids are way below grade level. Most schools in Washoe are rated 5 or lower out of 10 on the Great Schools Ratings system. Yet, you hired a new Superintendent Susan Enfield who was a miserable failure in her last job as Superintendent in Washington state. After 10 years as Superintendent, the school district that she managed has even worse academic achievement, scores, ratings etc. than Washoe. Why should anyone believe that Enfield can improve the Quality of Education, scores, ratings etc. in Washoe when she did not do it in her current job. **Many in our community will call for termination Day One on the job because we can't afford failed Superintendent number 4. The clock is ticking for kids in the district and in Nevada that ranks 49th in the nation related to academic achievement. We don't have years to get this right. The current School Board and various Superintendents own the district's horrible ratings. Take it personally. It is your collective failure. Joe Morabito**

Joseph Morabito

Concerned Citizen, Taxpayer, Grandparent, Former Public School Teacher, Patriot

From: Fry, Jessica
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2022 5:10 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: WESP Compensation

I noticed the board is discussing adjustments to WESP compensation but only for specific departments. Working 14 years in the school district as a Teacher Assistant, I only made \$24,616.27 last year. My net pay was only 15,646.84 after payroll deductions.

Per the US Department of HUD, my income puts me within range of income limits to qualify as less than very low income.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HUD
 STATE: NEVADA

		----- 2021 ADJUSTED HOME INCOME				
	PROGRAM	1 PERSON	2 PERSON	3 PERSON	4 PERSON	5 PERSON
Carson City, NV MSA						
	30% LIMITS	16600	18950	21300	23650	25550
	VERY LOW INCOME	27650	31600	35550	39450	42650
	60% LIMITS	33180	37920	42660	47340	51180
	LOW INCOME	44200	50500	56800	63100	68150
Las Vegas-Henderson-Paradise, NV MSA						
	30% LIMITS	16550	18900	21250	23600	25500
	VERY LOW INCOME	27550	31500	35450	39350	42500
	60% LIMITS	33060	37800	42540	47220	51000
	LOW INCOME	44100	50400	56700	62950	68000
Reno, NV MSA						
	30% LIMITS	17550	20050	22550	25050	27100
	VERY LOW INCOME	29250	33400	37600	41750	45100
	60% LIMITS	35100	40080	45120	50100	54120
	LOW INCOME	46800	53450	60150	66800	72150

My take home pay is only 1,549.75 higher than the federal poverty thresholds.

Poverty Thresholds for 2021 by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years

Size of family unit	Related children under 18 years						
	None	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six
One person (unrelated individual):							
Under age 65.....	14,097						
Aged 65 and older.....	12,996						
Two people:							
Householder under age 65.....	18,145	18,677					
Householder aged 65 and older.....	16,379	18,606					
Three people.....	21,196	21,811	21,831				
Four people.....	27,949	28,406	27,479	27,575			
Five people.....	33,705	34,195	33,148	32,338	31,843		
Six people.....	38,767	38,921	38,119	37,350	36,207	35,529	
Seven people.....	44,606	44,885	43,925	43,255	42,009	40,554	38,95
Eight people.....	49,888	50,329	49,423	48,629	47,503	46,073	44,58
Nine people or more.....	60,012	60,303	59,501	58,828	57,722	56,201	54,82
Source: U.S. Census Bureau.							

I have dedicated 14 years of my working life to this school district and I feel disregarded, every day. I have gone above and beyond, been seen as exemplary in my skill set, considered highly effective in all of my yearly evaluations yet I am required to work a second job, just to be able to afford to live. Working in the school district used to be considered a highly sought after position that was respected but now we deal with even more difficulties in the classroom with students and parents, less staffing, and increased work demands while being persecuted under the public eye for not working hard enough, not teaching enough children, not doing the right thing. My program has had an open teacher aide position for 3 years that no one has done anything to fill, beyond the basic job posting. We aren't the only program facing these concerns.

It seems disheartening to me that the school board continues to not address a livable wage for ALL school employees and make staffing a larger priority going forward. We need a competitive rate of pay to be able to afford to do jobs that we are passionate about and skilled in, to service our future. Our students.

From: Veronica Valli
Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2022 9:25 AM
To: Public Comments
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public comment about SHARE material

I would like to make a public comment about the SHARE material for schools.

I agree that the curriculum needs updating. There is much to like about the updates. I like that you have added some information about consent and what that means. I think it's important for kids to learn about this at elementary school. The majority of it is pretty good.

But I have two issues with the curriculum. The first one is the language. 'Bodies with vulvas' and bodies with penises.' Obviously this curriculum was guided by someone who wanted to use 'gender neutral' language. As a parent, I want all children to feel safe and comfortable in school and I want difference to be celebrated and acknowledged. But we can't do that by denying basic facts. Using gender neutral language to describe biology is a current trend and someones opinion. It's not based on any research. It is also, in my opinion unhelpful to children and potentially harmful, particularly to girls. Because of their biology girls and boys have very different experiences. This was reflected in the fact that when my 4th grader did this module the boys and girls were separated by their sex when it was taught. Can you see the confusion?

I understand that the aim here is to be as inclusive as possible. We wholeheartedly support inclusiveness. We try to use gender-neutral terms when discussing future relationships my sons may have. Instead of assuming they will have a girlfriend, we use the word 'partner' etc., so they know we don't care who they fall in love with. We don't want to impose hetero-normative assumptions on them.

But by eliminating science-based education about biology and differences, you are erasing women and the experience of womanhood. I feel erased. That I am now a body with a vulva, and that's it. I know there are no easy answers to this, and we are all navigating this new landscape. But by using this language, I believe you harm women and girls. It's an opinion and a belief system imposed without discussion or explanation. What is the research behind this? Are we teaching children according to a current trend? There is a lot happening right now that is not sitting comfortably with me. I want to be clear we that love and accept all Trans people. And I believe we can and should work to find a way that doesn't erase the biological reality of sex and women and creates a space for trans gender children to be included just as they are. I have listened to many trans voices who believe the same thing. Although there is some good stuff in the new SHARE materials the gender-neutral language is inappropriate.

My second concern is in the material my son was given there was a full page on why abstinence is best and that they should wait until they are in healthy committed relationship like marriage before having sexual intercourse. Please understand I am not advocating for the opposite of this (promiscuity) but again this is an opinion not based on facts or research. It is also extremely sexist and homophobic (the opposite of inclusive) in it's undertones. As the implication is that sex should take place within marriage for the purposes of procreation - that's not very inclusive is it? I accept that there is no hope of changing this as it has no doubt been inserted by politicians. But I would like it noted that I believe there is ample research that shows this kind of messaging actually harms young people by demonizing sex and sexual behavior and that the harm done is far greater to girls than boys. It makes the previous messaging in the SHARE materials just seem bonkers.

As a parent I would love to be included on any committees that discuss this material and what is included.

Thank you
Veronica Valli