

**MINUTES OF THE MARCH 14, 2023  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

March 14, 2023

**1. Opening Items**

**1.01 CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Board of Trustees was called to order at 2:04 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 Beth Smith and Board Members Jeff Church, Adam Mayberry, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, Colleen Westlake, and Alex Woodley were present. Superintendent Susan Enfield and staff were also present. Student Representative Ivy Batmale was present via video conference.

**1.03 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Dr. Kristina Mason, Chief Talent Officer, led the meeting in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2. Consent Agenda Items**

Trustee Church requested Consent Agenda Item 2.15, Possible Action to Provide Preliminary Approval to Draft Board Policy 5120, Arrest of Students on School Property, be pulled for additional discussion.

President Smith opened the meeting to public comment.

Valeria Fiannaca spoke to Consent Agenda Item 2.14, Acceptance of the "Budget Transfer Report 2/1/2023-2/28/2023." She questioned why the District was transferring \$30,000 out of the State Special Education Fund. She had a grandchild who received special education services and believed it was improper for any funds designed for special education to be used for anything else.

It was moved by Trustee Woodley and seconded by Trustee Rodriguez that **the Board of Trustees approves Consent Agenda Items 2.02 through 2.14 and 2.16.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jeff Church, Adam Mayberry, Diane Nicolet, Joe

Rodriguez, Beth Smith, Colleen Westlake, and Alex Woodley.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

- 2.02 The Board of Trustees approved the minutes of the January 24, 2023 Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees.
- 2.03 The Board of Trustees approved increasing the contract amount by an estimated amount of \$61,823 for Request for Bid (RFB) #054-24-03-20, District-wide Fire Sprinkler and Emergency Eye Wash/Shower Testing, Maintenance, and Repair, for the current term expiring on May 14, 2023 for an estimated revised contract total of \$158,823.
- 2.04 The Board of Trustees approved the award of Request for Bid (RFB) #71-B-11-23-GS, Copier Parts & Supplies, as follows in the estimated amounts: Coplite Products \$27,257.07; GCS Imaging Inc. \$140,660.38; and Ram Discount Computer Supplies \$21,448.03 for an estimated combined total of \$189,365.48 for a term of 2 years beginning March 15, 2023 and ending March 14, 2025 with three (3) optional 1 year renewals.
- 2.05 The Board of Trustees approved the award of Request for Bid (RFB) #84-B-12-23-GS, Custodial Paper Products, as follows in the estimated amounts: Brady IFS. \$16,225.50, Inland Supply Co. \$204,424.00, for an estimated combined total of \$220,649.50 for a term of 1 year beginning March 15, 2023 and ending March 14, 2024 with four (4) optional 1 year renewals.
- 2.06 The Board of Trustees declared the items identified as surplus property so they may be disposed of in accordance with the Statutes of the State of Nevada.
- 2.07 The Board of Trustees approved the award of Request for Bid (RFB) #23-35-B-01-AA, Drainage and Irrigation Improvements at Brown Elementary School, to Garden Shop Nursery Landscape Division, Inc. in the amount of \$245,825.
- 2.08 The Board of Trustees approved the awards of Request for Bid (RFB) #23-37-B-01-DA, Bernice Mathews Elementary School, Rollan Melton Elementary School, Robert Mitchell Elementary School, and Marvin Moss Elementary School in the amount of \$2,585,483 and Pavement Rehabilitation at Kate Smith Elementary School and North Valleys High School, to Gradex Construction Company in the amount of \$652,390, for a total of \$3,237,873.

- 2.09 The Board of Trustees approved the award of Request for Bid (RFB) #23-39-B-01-DA, Chiller Enclosure at Darrell C Swope Middle School, to Don M. Lazorko Construction, Inc. in the amount of \$222,123.
- 2.10 The Board of Trustees approved the award of Request for Bid (RFB) #23-40-B-02-AA, Replacement of Boiler and Building Controls at the Washoe County School District Administration Building, to Ryan Mechanical, Inc. in the amount of \$682,900.
- 2.11 The Board of Trustees approved Amendment #3 for Professional Architectural Design Services with Architects + LLC for the Darrell C. Swope Middle School Expansion/Remodel Project for \$283,900.
- 2.12 The Board of Trustees approved Amendment #2 for Professional Architectural Design Services with Collaborative Design Studios for the Incline High School Expansion and Athletic Field Improvements for \$88,000.
- 2.13 The Board of Trustees approved the Gift Agreement & Letter of Understanding for the Incline High School Expansion & Athletic Field Replacement Project funded by Fidelity Charitable, a donor-advised fund advised by Dave & Cheryl Duffield for up to \$35,230,293.
- 2.14 The Board of Trustees accepted the Budget Transfer Reports and provide authorization to include budget transfers between functions or programs for the General Fund and State Special Education Fund for the period February 1, 2023, through February 28, 2023, and approved the transfers from the District's General Fund Contingency Account to the Superintendent's budget for costs related to strategic plan events (\$24,553) and other community events (\$6,500), in the official Board minutes as required by Nevada Revised Statute 354.598005.
- 2.16 The Board of Trustees approved removal and/or deletion of Administrative Regulation 7087, School Closure.
- 2.15 **POSSIBLE ACTION FOR THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES TO PROVIDE PRELIMINARY APPROVAL TO DRAFT BOARD POLICY 5120, ARREST OF STUDENTS ON SCHOOL PROPERTY, AS REQUIRED BY NEVADA REVISED STATUTE 391.283, AND INITIATION OF THE 13-DAY PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT PERIOD**

Jason Trevino, Chief of School Police, explained proposed Board Policy 5120, Arrest of Students on School Property, was required by Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS). School districts in Nevada were required to have a policy for peace officers to follow if a pupil

were to be arrested on school grounds during school hours. The draft of the policy outlined the principles behind the requirement. The School Police Department worked with other local law enforcement agencies to ensure the agencies were able to adhere to the guidelines in the policy. There were no questions or concerns raised as the proposed guidelines were similar to all standard practices used in Washoe County related to arrests.

Trustee Church believed the policy should be sent back to staff for additional edits. He understood other law enforcement agencies were consulted; however, the District did not have the ability to tell them what to do and not all law enforcement in the area were consulted, such as state police and marshals. He also did not see anything related to notification to the Superintendent or Board of Trustees regarding the arrest of a pupil. The policy did not cover citizens' arrests, severity of the alleged crime, or even notification to the public. He would like the parents to be notified as soon as possible (ASAP) of an arrest and not within 24 hours. He had questions regarding which parent(s) were notified and the issuance of citations, since those were also arrests. Neil Rombardo, Chief General Counsel, stated the language in the draft policy came directly out of NRS 391.283. The communication protocols of an arrest would be covered under Board Policy 9052. He noted that citations were not arrests, but similar to criminal complaints, which indicated someone had been charged with a crime but were not in the custody of a law enforcement officer or a civilian who was making a civil arrest. Additionally, someone was free to leave if issued a citation, but not free to leave if placed under arrest. Finally, NRS 62H prohibited the disclosure of an arrest of a juvenile so the District would not disclose any arrest, even if instructed by the Trustees to do so because that would be in violation of state law.

President Smith asked if the other law enforcement agencies would have raised concerns if they believed there were issues with the proposed policy related to them being able to perform their duties. Chief Trevino responded in the affirmative. The policy was not designed to "get into the weeds" in terms of notifications. NRS was specific to what the policy was required to include. The language included in the policy was standard to how arrests were made in Washoe County by all law enforcement agencies. He agreed with Trustee Church in that School Police did not have the authority to direct other law enforcement agencies; however, NRS required school districts to have the policy.

President Smith inquired if the 24-hour parental notification was included in NRS. Chief Trevino indicated it was not. The District wanted to include a reasonable timeframe in terms of notification of parents and ASAP was not clear to all parties. The 24-hour timeline allowed officers to contact the parent when it became reasonable to do so and account for circumstances beyond the control of the District. In most cases, parents were notified within an hour, but there could be extenuating circumstances that might not allow that to occur. Parents were not notified ahead of an arrest because law enforcement did not want the parent showing up at the school before they had the chance to transport a student. Mr. Rombardo added other law enforcement agencies would

contact the parents as well since a juvenile would not be able to be questioned without consent.

Trustee Rodriguez spoke, as a current law enforcement officer, in support of the proposed policy. He felt the language was more than sufficient and if a juvenile were arrested, the Jan Evans Juvenile Justice Center would also contact the parent(s). There were numerous mechanisms in place to notify the parents.

Trustee Westlake believed it was critical for parents to be involved if there were behavior issues. She wondered if parents would be notified of only arrests or if they would also be notified if a citation were issued. She wanted to ensure parents were notified and brought into the discussions. Chief Trevino explained there were different mechanisms related arrests, citations, and referrals. The proposed policy was only related to arrests as required by NRS. When the paperwork was completed for a citation or referral, the parents were notified and often times, there was a related school discipline issued as well so the parents would be notified by the school. He clarified that the school would usually collect all the information from School Police and the school counselor prior to notifying the parents so all information could be provided at once.

Trustee Nicolet asked if an administrative regulation would be developed to accompany the policy. Mr. Rombardo noted language was not included in the current draft to develop a regulation; however, at the direction of the Board, the standard language could be added. The intent of the policy was just to provide what was required under NRS.

Trustee Church asked where the chief administrative officer, as per the law, was notified. Chief Trevino called attention to Section 3 which stated School Police must notify the school site administrator of the student's school of the charge as soon as practical.

Trustee Church disagreed with how citations were defined by General Counsel, citing NRS 171.1773 and 171.124. He believed if a law enforcement officer issued a citation, but the person refused to sign it, law enforcement was required to arrest them. He reiterated his concerns related to notification and which parent would be notified if the parents were divorced. Mr. Rombardo indicated the notification process would be handled through the normal channels currently included as part of Infinite Campus. There were also federal and state laws the District was required to follow in terms of notification, so it did not matter if a list was included in the policy.

President Smith opened the meeting to public comment.

Paul White expressed disappointment in the comments made that the District would not violate state law because he believed the District continually violated state law by allowing students to be truant and having drugs on school grounds. He also claimed there were School Police Officers who knew laws were being broken and chose to ignore it. He felt

the District needed to enforce current laws and create a safe environment through the discipline of students.

John Eppolito claimed the Board did not want members of the community to come speak at their meetings by holding their meetings in a small venue. He expressed concern over the issues raised by Mr. White because the Superintendent and some Trustees did not want to hear what was actually occurring or do anything to prevent it. He agreed parents should be notified as soon as possible if their child were arrested. He also believed parents should be notified when any information was entered into their child's record in Infinite Campus.

Margaret Martini recalled hearing that School Police could do more with more resources and then the Board approved over \$600,000 for 3 administrative positions. She believed those funds would have been better spent on more School Police officers. She felt the priorities of the Board were not consistent with what was actually needed in the schools. She disagreed with the 24-hour notification timeframe and felt there was no reason why the parents should not be notified within an hour.

Darla Lee agreed with the previous comments. She was a resident near the new Procter R. Hug High School and was frustrated that prior to the school opening, the residents were told the campus would be closed, but that had not occurred. She claimed students were regularly hanging out in the neighborhoods especially during lunch hours. She believed if the District enforced the rules and did something about the minor infractions that occurred, then the District would not need to have a policy related to the arrest of students. She wondered what chance "good" students would have in a school where disruptions were the norm.

Pablo Nava Duran was a substitute in the District and had worked at many Title I schools. He spoke of his experiences as a substitute and the behavior challenges he faced with the students. He had numerous challenges with classroom management because of the poor behavior of students and not knowing what should be done.

Renee Rezentes wondered if parents were made aware of the referrals referenced by District staff. She claimed to have witnessed a fight in the parking lot across from Edward C. Reed High School and the police were called, but after they left, the same behavior by the student continued. She felt there needed to be additional consequences because students would continue to push boundaries if there was not enforcement.

Mike Croghan noted the Trustees were presented with options for a policy by those who would enforce the policy, which he believed was a good thing. He also felt it was important for the Board to talk to those who would be impacted by the policy. As a former teacher, he knew there were times when parents should not be immediately informed of a child's actions because that could put the child in more danger.

Julie Osburn agreed the notification period should be much less than 24 hours. She believed if there were extenuating circumstances that prevented such notification, then there should also be a policy related to a multi-casualty incident (MCI) that would supersede all other policies.

President Smith moved the discussion to possible revisions to the draft policy. She began with a possible revision to the 24-hour timeframe.

It was moved by President Smith and seconded by Trustee Rodriguez that **the Board of Trustees revises section 3 from 24 hours to "as soon as practical and within 24 hours."**

President Smith opened the motion for discussion.

Trustee Church stated he would prefer to just send the draft policy back to staff to revise because he would be bringing up some of the other issues he had with the policy, such as language regarding citations, changes to the title, and citizen's arrests.

President Smith noted the draft policy dealt with a specific topic and was required under NRS. If the Board wanted to see additional policies related to other topics, such as citations or citizen's arrests, then they could request those policies. She would prefer the Board make the changes they wanted to see in the policy before them and then send that out for public review and comment prior to final approval.

Trustee Woodley indicated he could support the motion. His concern was the safety of the students. He agreed with Mr. Croghan, that there were times when the safety of the student being arrested and others in the school could be compromised if a parent was notified prior to transporting the student.

The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jeff Church, Adam Mayberry, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, Colleen Westlake, and Alex Woodley.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

President Smith asked if there were concerns from staff related to changing the notification from just the school site administrator to the school site administrator and District leadership. Mr. Rombardo maintained the language was consistent with NRS. He felt it should be up to the Superintendent to direct staff if she wanted to be notified of an arrest.

Superintendent Enfield emphasized that both School Police and the Communications Department knew when an issue should be reported to her and District leadership. She trusted staff to continue their professionalism and use their judgement.

Trustee Church quoted the requirements of the policy under NRS, which included notification to the chief administrative officer of a school, not school site administrator. Mr. Rombardo highlighted the chief administrative officer of a school was the same as a school site administrator. School districts were allowed to have language and terms that were appropriate for them.

Trustee Westlake asked if school site administrator should be defined to provide clarity. Chief Trevino remarked that the District was cautious in the wording because they wanted to provide flexibility if the principal was off-site or unavailable.

Superintendent Enfield suggested principal or principal designee be used instead of school site administrator for clarification.

Trustee Nicolet indicated she was uncomfortable with the use of principal because the principal or other school administrative staff might not always be on campus for some events, such as football games. Chief Trevino stated there was always a principal designee or school site administrator at school events. In terms of discipline, the principal was not always the person who would be informed of an arrest which was often a vice principal in charge of discipline, especially at the high school level. Mr. Rombardo clarified the policy would only apply on school property and during school hours because that was when the student was in the direct control of the school and school district.

It was moved by Trustee Westlake and seconded by Trustee Mayberry that **the Board of Trustees revises the language throughout section 3 from "school site administrator" to "principal or principal designee."** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jeff Church, Adam Mayberry, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, Colleen Westlake, and Alex Woodley.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

Trustee Church believed "parent" should be replaced with "parents/guardians" and authority provided for the Superintendent to create regulations related to the policy.

President Smith requested clarification on if such a change in language was legally needed. Mr. Rombardo stated the District and individual school sites would follow current federal and state laws in terms of who was to be contacted for any student. The contact information for each student was already available in Infinite Campus.

Trustee Church moved to revise section 3(a) to read "parents/guardians" as opposed to "parent/guardian." The motion died for lack of a second.

Trustee Church explained he was interested in clarifying that the policy was only applicable during school hours and felt there was some confusion based on the language in the purpose section.

It was moved by Trustee Church and seconded by Trustee Westlake that **the Board of Trustees removes "or at District sponsored events" from the purpose section.** The result of the vote was 6-1: (Yea: Jeff Church, Adam Mayberry, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, Colleen Westlake, and Alex Woodley. Nay: Diane Nicolet.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

It was moved by Trustee Westlake and seconded by Trustee Church that **the Board of Trustees adds the standard language related to allowing administrative regulations.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jeff Church, Adam Mayberry, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, Colleen Westlake, and Alex Woodley.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

It was moved by Trustee Rodriguez and seconded by Trustee Mayberry that **the Board of Trustees provides preliminary approval to draft Board Policy 5120, Arrest of Students on School Property, as amended and initiates the 13-day public review and comment period.** The result of the vote was 6-1: (Yea: Adam Mayberry, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, Colleen Westlake, and Alex Woodley. Nay: Jeff Church.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

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

#### **3.01 APPROVAL OF THE GUARANTEED MAXIMUM PRICE 1 (GMP1) FROM Q&D CONSTRUCTION (Q&D) AS THE CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT RISK (CMAR) FOR THE REPURPOSING OF EXISTING PROCTER R. HUG HIGH SCHOOL INTO A HIGH SCHOOL CAREER & TECHNICAL EDUCATION (CTE) ACADEMY (NOW KNOWN AS DEBBIE SMITH CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACADEMY HIGH SCHOOL), CMAR #20-100-C-05-MS, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$29,532,453 AND APPROVAL OF OWNER'S CONTINGENCY IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2,000,000 FOR A TOTAL OF \$31,532,453**

Trustee Westlake disclosed under Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 281.420, she had an interest in a private capacity with Q&D Construction. Because of her private relationship, she would abstain from the discussion, deliberation, and vote on the item so as not to influence the outcome.

Tami Zimmerman, Chief Facilities Management Officer, and Andrea Sullivan, Director of Procurement and Contracts, provided background information on the Debbie Smith Career and Technical Education Academy. The initial bid on the project was not approved based on the direction of the Board to move to a phased delivery approach to try to save money since the initial bid came in \$35 million over the approved budget. The guaranteed maximum price (GMP) for the initial phase of construction was what

the Board would be voting on at the present time. The owner's contingency was higher than prior projects due to of Trustee feedback related to the project and possible asbestos abatement. The bidding and contract process was reviewed.

Trustee Church requested clarification on the amount of the previous bid and if approval of the bid would force the Board to approve all future bids related to the project. Ms. Zimmerman stated the previous bid for the same work was \$1,432,000 higher than the current bid. Future bids were not guaranteed because the Board could decide to re-phase the project, remodel existing buildings, or look at cutting additional scopes of work. Ms. Sullivan added that the District could bid out future projects themselves instead of using a construction manager at risk.

It was moved by Trustee Nicolet and seconded by Trustee Mayberry that **the Board of Trustees approves the Guaranteed Maximum Price 1 (GMP 1) from Q&D Construction as the Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) for the Management of Construction for the Repurposing of Existing Procter R. Hug High School into a High School Career & Technical Education Academy, CMAR #20-100-C-05-MS, in the amount of \$29,532,453 and approves an owner's contingency in the amount of \$2,000,000 for a total of \$31,532,453.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: The result of the vote was 5-1-1: (Yea: Adam Mayberry, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, and Alex Woodley. Nay: Jeff Church. Abstain: Colleen Westlake.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

### **3.02 PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON LEGISLATION INTRODUCED DURING THE 2023 NEVADA LEGISLATIVE SESSION RELATED TO NEVADA REVISED STATUTES 392.4601 THROUGH 392.472, PUPILS: BEHAVIOR AND DISCIPLINE**

President Smith stated the remaining agenda items surrounded school safety. The Board had been working on various issues related to school safety for months. The Board, Superintendent, and District leaders knew how important school safety was for students, staff, and the community and they did not need to be told by anyone that concerns related to safety impacted both the learning and working conditions. The intent of the remaining agenda items was to allow open and honest conversations about what was occurring in the schools and some of the ways the District, to include the Board, was addressing issues.

Dr. Paul LaMarca, Chief Strategies Officer, provided a presentation on current and past legislation related to student behavior and discipline. In 2019, Assembly Bill (AB) 168 introduced restorative justice requirements and made changes to suspensions and expulsions as related to two of "The Big 3" behaviors: battery on staff with bodily harm, distribution of controlled substances, and possession of a dangerous weapon. No changes were made regarding the immediate removal of a student for possession of a

dangerous weapon, but students were to remain in the school with a restorative plan for the other two behaviors. AB168 also distinguished between students 11 and older versus students 10 and under and prevented the removal of students from a school who were 10 and under unless there were extraordinary circumstances. In 2021, AB67 and AB194 were approved and strengthened language regarding restorative justice and provided definitions for suspension, expulsion, and permanent expulsion. Additionally, Senate Bill (SB) 354 limited the suspension of a student protected under the McKinney Vento Act to no more than 24 hours. Currently, there were four bills in the Nevada Legislature that would make various changes to the 2019 legislation, including changes to language from restorative justice to restorative practices or approaches, introduction of "Acts of Violence," elimination of age-based distinctions, and establishment of a commission related to the safety of teachers. The District continued to work with legislators and the Governor's Office on the significant changes they wanted to see related to AB168, including the immediate suspension of a student for battery with injury or distribution of controlled substances, flexibility in the use of restorative practices, more latitude regarding disciplinary actions for students 10 and younger and suspensions for students under McKinney Vento, and additional clarity regarding the appeal process for suspensions. Information on the District's advocacy on transition plans from alternative education settings was highlighted.

President Smith thanked staff for providing the information. The presentation showed the District knew changes needed to occur to the law to improve student and staff safety. She appreciated that the District was not only willing to join in the conversations, but interested in leading the way in terms of advocating for change. Part of the governing process was being able to recognize unintended consequences of well-intended legislation and make necessary revisions to make laws better.

Superintendent Enfield agreed with President Smith's comments. She appreciated that the Governor's Office was reaching out to school districts to gain an understanding of the challenges and possible changes. Safety had to be kept in the forefront, but there needed to be a commonsense approach taken and schools had to have the flexibility to keep everyone safe. She somberly noted that there were 5-year-olds who could clear a classroom, but the District also had an obligation to ensure the other 5 year olds and the teacher. Consequences were extremely important and should be imposed, but consequences rarely changed behavior. Schools had to be able to impose consequences but also had to be able to address the underlying causes of the behavior. So, while conversations on consequences were important, equal conversations on the interventions and help students and families needed also should occur to prevent behaviors in the first place.

Trustee Westlake felt it was important to provide students and families with additional tools if there were behavioral challenges that led to a suspension. The Care Solace program was such a tool and would allow families to access the help a student needed.

Trustee Church voiced his disappointment that the agenda item was not listed for possible action because that would allow members of the community the opportunity to provide public comment. He felt he was wasting his time because the item was not listed for action. He expressed frustration over the cancellation of the Safe and Healthy Schools Commission meeting because he knew members of the community were interested in attending and providing comments there. He wanted to be able to provide motions supporting the information included in the presentation or motions removing restorative justice. He was frustrated over just finding out information on the number of violent incidents that occurred in the schools. He stated that if he was a parent, he would never allow his children to attend public schools.

President Smith emphasized the information provided in the presentation were actions staff was already taking, so there was no need for the Board to direct that action occur. The conversations with legislators and the Governor's Office were on-going.

Trustee Westlake noted restorative justice requirements were put in place in the District through legislative action, not by the Board of Trustees so the Trustees could not take action to make changes. She admitted she did not know that until becoming a member of the Board. She encouraged everyone who was frustrated over the requirements to take their voices to the Legislature because that was where the change had to occur. It was important to bring ideas forward on what changes were needed and not attack others.

Trustee Woodley thanked staff for the information. He appreciated the passion shown by Dr. LaMarca in wanting to protect students and staff from violence.

Trustee Church remarked he wanted the Board to err on the side of safety and protect the students and staff. He would like to see the teachers supported in terms of what they wanted to have happen with a behavioral problem because they were the ones who knew the students best. He advocated for allowing parents in the classroom. He wondered if the District was able to use Inspire Academy or distance learning as an alternative school setting. Dr. LaMarca explained the District did use alternative education settings and more information on them would be provided under agenda item 3.03.

*President Smith recessed the meeting for 20 minutes.*

**3.03 PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO CONSIDER, APPROVE, AND/OR AMEND THE PROJECT PLAN FOR REVIEW AND REVISION OF THE STUDENT BEHAVIOR MANUAL FOR THE 2023-24 SCHOOL YEAR**

Dr. Paul LaMarca, Chief Strategies Officer, and Tristan McElhany, Director of Behavior Hearings & Placement, provided a presentation on the comprehensive review occurring on the District's discipline plan, as directed by the Board in November 2022. The draft project plan for the review process was provided. The project plan was developed with the Student Behavior Task Force and reviewed by teachers, school site administrators, counselors and school psychologists, parents, students, and the Equity and Diversity Task Force. A work session with the Board would be scheduled soon to allow Trustees the opportunity to provide their input in what they were interested in seeing included in the new plan. Data trends of behavior events from 2018-19 School Year to present were reviewed, including definitions and examples of what violent, disruptive, and procedural behaviors were. The District had seen an 8% increase in the number of violent behavioral events from the 2018-19 School Year to the 2022-23 School Year; however, there was also a 15% decrease in the total number of major behavioral events during the same time frame.

Dr. Susan Enfield, Superintendent, mentioned, in terms of the data, there were staff members who did not believe the data was accurate because some of the processes currently in place for reporting behavior incidents were onerous. It was important for the District to develop systems that inspired a high level of credibility in staff, that the processes and procedures were clear, and that there was follow-through by central administration. She wanted to acknowledge there were challenges for staff and that the administration was working on them.

Trustee Rodriguez requested clarification on the numbers provided related to the major behavioral events and if they represented the number of students or the number of events. Dr. LaMarca stated the data showed the number of events. A single student could have been involved in more than one event.

Trustee Mayberry asked what school year the restorative practices went into effect. Dr. LaMarca noted the restorative practices provisions of Assembly Bill (AB) 168 from the 2019 Nevada Legislative Session went into effect for the 2019-20 School Year.

President Smith wondered if the individual schools had any discretion in how behavior events were categorized. She was concerned some schools were not categorizing events appropriately or at all based on the comments from Superintendent Enfield. Dr. LaMarca affirmed the site-based administrators had to use their best judgement in how they were categorizing behaviors. He provided examples of how certain behaviors considered disruptive or procedural were subjective in nature, such as dress code violations or use of language.

Trustee Church asked what the end date was for the time period the information was collected. Dr. LaMarca indicated all data was for the first 110 days of school, which would have ended in mid-February.

Dr. LaMarca reviewed suspension data for the same time frame. Both in school and out of school suspensions numbers were presented. The total numbers provided represented the number of suspensions. The District saw a 33% increase in the number of out of school suspensions from the 2018-19 School Year to the 2022-23 School Year, but there was a 5% decrease in the total number of overall suspensions.

Superintendent Enfield requested the data on suspensions be broken down by demographics which would allow the Board to see if there were disproportionality concerns that had to be addressed. Dr. LaMarca commented that staff was not prepared to report on that at the present time; however, the information had been reported to the Board in the past and there was disproportionality occurring.

President Smith asked if all comprehensive high schools had the ability to provide in school suspension. Dr. LaMarca responded in the affirmative. He had been told by school staff that with the staffing shortages it was more difficult to run in school suspensions, which could account for the increase in out of school suspensions.

President Smith requested additional information on what the in school suspension experience was like. Dr. LaMarca mentioned different schools approached the process differently so it was difficult to provide a simple answer. He provided an example based on a personal experience with in school suspensions, where the student was in a room by themselves for the day. School staff would check on the student regularly and the student was provided work throughout the day. For students with disabilities, there was a requirement that any specialized instruction included in an individual education program (IEP) was to be provided during an in school suspension. The in school suspension process would look different and could be a small group of students in a classroom.

Trustee Westlake wondered if the data could be broken out between middle school and high school numbers as well. Dr. LaMarca stated staff would work on providing additional reports on the data.

Dr. LaMarca continued with the presentation. Additional information on how suspensions were defined was reviewed. The Trustees were reminded that for students with an IEP or children in transition there were limitations on the number of days a suspension could last.

Trustee Mayberry wondered if the data could be skewed because of the limitations on suspension for students with an IEP. Dr. LaMarca indicated he was not prepared to answer at the present time.

Trustee Nicolet requested additional information on the transition process to and from Inspire Academy. Dr. LaMarca reviewed the transition process. The move to Inspire began with a behavioral hearing, which involved the student, family, and school. The move to Inspire was a short-term change, lasting no more than 180 days. The District also used Inspire to transition students who had been in a detention facility or on probation back into traditional schools. Other considerations impacting the decision to move a student from Inspire back into their zoned school were explained.

Dr. LaMarca and Mr. McElhany presented data on the violations that had students either expelled or placed on a long-term suspension from the same time period and sent to an interim alternative education setting, such as Inspire. The impacts of AB168 were evident in some categories because it showed that for a first offense, a student was not automatically placed on a long-term suspension. The length of time a student spent at Inspire was dependent on the offense. The federal requirements related to a long-term suspension or expulsion of a student with an IEP were explained and limited the time a student could be removed from their home school to 45 days. The number of expulsions was highlighted because there had been information in the community that the District did not expel students.

President Smith clarified that a student with an IEP could commit a major infraction, such as bringing a dangerous weapon to school or committing battery causing bodily injury, and if the reason they committed the infraction was a manifestation of their disability, the student was disciplined differently. Dr. LaMarca responded in the affirmative.

Trustee Mayberry asked what constituted a weapon. Dr. LaMarca remarked that Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 202.265 defined dangerous weapons. The District relied on School Police to make the final determination.

Trustee Mayberry inquired who determined if the behavior was a manifestation of a disability or special need. Mr. McElhany indicated the IEP team would make the determination. Parents were part of the IEP team so the families were included.

Trustee Church asked if any of the actions taken by the District would prohibit criminal charges from being filed or a staff member obtaining a restraining order against a student. Dr. LaMarca mentioned he was not clear on the ability of a staff member to obtain a restraining order; however, a student would be trespassed from their home school if they were placed on any out of school suspension. If law enforcement became involved in a situation at any point, the District would defer to law enforcement and take any administrative action after law enforcement had completed their review. The administrative actions reviewed as part of the presentation were the measures a school could take.

Trustee Westlake wondered if the decrease in the total number of events correlated to the decrease in enrollment over the same time period. Dr. LaMarca believed there was a correlation, but the percent of the decrease in events was greater than the percent of decrease in student enrollment.

President Smith asked if appeals in favor of the student were reflected in the data. Dr. LaMarca remarked they were not.

Dr. LaMarca and Mr. McElhany concluded the presentation with information on how staff would be involving the Board in the review process and the desire to have the new Student Behavior Manual approved sooner in the school year moving forward.

President Smith explained the agenda item would allow the Trustees to provide feedback on the plan to move forward with revisions to the Student Behavior Manual. The plan would include a future work session with the Board where recommendations on what the Trustees wanted to include would be provided.

Trustee Nicolet urged staff to reach out to Education Support Personnel, as well as teachers and administrators, for feedback.

Trustee Church requested clarification on the Student Behavior Task Force. Dr. LaMarca explained the Task Force was created to implement the requirements of AB168 in 2019. The Task Force was comprised of 6 teachers, 6 site administrators, and several central office administrators. It was not a Board Committee and not subject to Nevada's Open Meeting Law requirements.

Trustee Church remarked the information he had provided from the state showed there had been zero expulsions in the Washoe County School District due to bullying or cyber-bullying. He wanted to ensure he had the correct information related to bullying suspensions and expulsions. Dr. LaMarca stated the District expelled students or placed them on long-term suspensions based on legislative requirements, which included weapons possession, battery, distribution of drugs, habitual discipline, and threats. If a student bullied on multiple occasions, that could be considered habitual. The District had not expelled a student or placed them on a long-term suspension for a single bullying event.

President Smith opened the meeting to public comment.

Sandee Tibbett expressed frustration over what she believed was the Board answering to the Superintendent and not the other way around. She claimed Superintendent Enfield was implementing a "woke agenda" in the District and ignoring the violence, chronic absenteeism, and gang problems. She did not feel the District was adhering to Goal 5 of the current strategic plan related to student and staff safety. She claimed the

best solution was to have all teachers wear body cameras, but that the Board and District did not consider it because it was too costly. She remarked that discipline had to be restored to the classroom and a culture of respect modeled.

James Benthin mentioned the Student Behavior Manual was important and dealt with important issues. He requested the Board include more parental involvement related to behavior issues because parents were responsible for the students and their education. He suggested a parental bill of rights be added to the Manual that would help guide parents in dealing with issues related to their children. He was interested in seeing aspects such as easier access to curriculum and the ability to opt out of classes included as part of the bill of rights.

Pablo Nava Duran expressed concern for what the teachers continued to face in the classrooms. He was frustrated by the behavior of the students and supported changes to the Behavior Manual to make it easier for teachers curtail bad behavior. He mentioned it would also be important to include something related to substitute teachers and spoke of the challenges he faced while a substitute. He supported more inclusion of parental rights, but cautioned there were parents who were also disrespectful to teachers and school staff.

John Eppolito wondered if the members of the Student Behavior Task Force were paid to be part of the group or if they were volunteers. He expressed surprise that not all behavior incidents were being reported and believed the District's IT Department should be able to create an app for teachers and others to easily enter information. He spoke about some of the information he received from Education Crusade and believed the District needed to act on what the group was reporting on. He agreed with the creation of a parent's bill of rights.

Margaret Martini wondered why the District was making the reporting of incidents so onerous that teachers felt it was easier to just not file a report. She believed the presentation provided by staff was erroneous and that the Board should approve a teacher's manual so they knew what they could and could not do in terms of discipline, with the support of the Board and Superintendent. She felt a student should be removed after the first offense, so they understood there were serious consequences to their actions. She was interested in seeing a whistle blower program to allow additional reporting.

Jean Kramer was a retired teacher from North Valleys High School. She was disappointed in what had been occurring in terms of discipline because it appeared that the District was being weak in terms of what they were doing. She knew many students would see a suspension as a "mini vacation" because the parents were not at home with the students so they could do whatever they wanted during the day. She was interested in seeing the District develop a class that taught students how to

appropriately deal with conflict. She urged the Board to bring back Saturday school as a punishment as well.

Calen Evans, President, Washoe Education Association (WEA), thanked the Board for the meeting because nothing the Board and Superintendent wanted to do in terms of academic success would be achieved unless challenges in learning and working conditions were addressed. He appreciated that the data was shared; however, one of the challenges with restorative practices was how data was reported, shared, and interpreted. He stated incidences had to be reported accurately or the data would be skewed. The WEA looked forward to continued collaboration with the District on the Student Behavior Manual, but it was critical that the schools implement the Manual with coherence and consistency for it to have the intended impact.

The Board received emails from the following:

Graeme Reid

Suzanne Lewis

President Smith thanked staff for the information. She expressed her appreciation and believed it was critical for the Board to address the issues the teachers and other school staff had raised because they should not have to face violence or intimidation to do their jobs. She believed the violence seen in the schools was a reflection of the violence occurring in the community. The challenges the schools were facing were not something the District could or should address on their own but had to be addressed with the parents, families, and community. The District was continuing to provide supports where they could, such as the approval of the Care Solace program to allow families the ability to have access to mental health services. If the District truly wanted to address what was occurring in the schools, they had to acknowledge why the behaviors were occurring and provide supports to the students, staff, and families to change the behaviors, in addition to any consequences for the behavior. She was interested in seeing where the Board and District had discretion in terms of the Behavior Manual and what was legislatively required. She would like the Board and District leadership to use discretion in the decision-making wherever possible to deliver on the commitment safety and respect to students and staff in schools. Dr. LaMarca noted that was a key part of the project plan. The District did have a lot of discretion in terms of how they dealt with major behavior incidents.

President Smith mentioned the consistency in the implementation of the Behavior Manual was also important. She supported site leaders having some discretion; however, there had to be an equal expectation of behavior among staff and students. One of the reasons she supported the additional associate chief positions was because it was her expectation, they would be assisting the schools in the consistent application of District processes and procedures. Superintendent Enfield agreed that consistency of practice was an issue in the District. Later in the meeting, information would be

provided on some of the professional development and training opportunities occurring in the schools. These opportunities would no longer be by invitation, but mandatory so everyone was aware of the expectations. She believed the teachers, administrators, and other school staff were doing their best, but she wanted to ensure there was consistency.

Trustee Church remarked the information provided showed an increase in violent events, even with the decrease in enrollment. He believed what was occurring was a crisis and an issue specific to the Washoe County School District, not a national issue. He expressed frustration in the level of violence occurring in specific schools and stated the Board should act immediately to address what was occurring. He reiterated that he would not want his children or grandchildren in the schools and added he would also urge them not to become teachers. He was interested in seeing something similar to a lack of confidence action in the military applied to principals and area superintendents so they could be quickly removed if needed. He was interested in seeing additional supports provided to teachers. He was additionally frustrated because he did not feel he was able to take the actions he wanted to in related to the Behavior Manual and could only provide ideas. He indicated he would like to see in the Manual the following: removal of a disruptive student, teachers had to be listened to and backed in terms of what they wanted to see occur because they knew the student best, increased use of Inspire and distance learning, mention of criminal referral depending on the action, drug testing, parental bill of rights, and any battery should result in suspension. He was also interested in seeing changes to how code yellows and code reds were used in schools because he did not believe they were being used appropriately.

Trustee Westlake expressed an interest in having appropriate consequences for even first offenses. She felt it was important for the District to trust what processes had been put in place to help students, including the use of Inspire Academy and Care Solace. She did not want to allow any of the violence that was occurring to go any further because it was important to protect all the students from not only physical harm, but the mental and emotional effects that also resulted from witnessing the violence.

President Smith recalled that one of the reasons Trustee Westlake had voted against Care Solace was because of her belief the students were being placed in therapy without consulting the parents. She wondered what Trustee Westlake believed the role of the parents should be in the process when needing to remove a student from a classroom or other disciplinary actions.

Trustee Westlake mentioned her advocacy for parental rights meant ensuring parents were brought into the conversation. She was interested in seeing language included in the Manual that parents were required and responsible to be part of the conversation. She believed as long as parents knew expectations and that the District would not

tolerate even a first offense of violence and the student would be removed from the classroom, the parents would be willing to be part of the conversation and work to help their children.

Trustee Woodley stated he knew the violence and other behavior issues were a community problem because he experienced the same challenges in the community as a public employee for the City of Reno. The District was not exempt from what was occurring in the community; they were just a much smaller world. He appreciated the desire to have a low tolerance for disruptions in the classroom and believed it was important that where the District had discretion that they should lean towards enforcement and removing the disruption.

Mr. Rombardo explained the District was required to provide students with a free appropriate public education (FAPE) under federal law. He understood the desire of the Trustees, but there were certain steps that had to be followed before a student could be removed and not provided an opportunity to return. Also, the District could not legally randomly drug test students without parental consent or probable cause for a crime.

Trustee Nicolet indicated pathways and coherence would be important aspects of revisions to the Manual. She was also interested in seeing a deeper dive into site-based management because even though each school was unique, good processes should be the same everywhere.

Trustee Mayberry stated school safety was just as important to education as academics. He believed, fundamentally, schools were safe places, otherwise he would not be sending his children to school in the District, but there were obviously areas for improvement. He agreed there had to be consistency and if alternative education settings needed to be used, then they should be used. He requested clarification on what defined habitual behavioral problems and when a student would ultimately be removed from a classroom. Dr. LaMarca mentioned some of the legislation discussed in the previous agenda item would better define habitual behavior problem because the current standard was very high. It was important to remember there was a balancing act in terms of removing a student because the outside options were not always the best. The District had to have consistency application of the Behavior Manual, consistent expectations within the classrooms, consistent levels of tolerance among staff, and a good foundation within the buildings so when issues escalated, everyone knew what to do and how to address the problem. He appreciated the feedback because it validated some of the areas the District was already working on and provided some additional areas to consider.

Trustee Mayberry commented that the data from other school districts would be an interesting piece for the Board to have because it would allow for some perspective.

President Smith appreciated part of the plan included working with the employee associations. She knew the conversations would be challenging, but it was critical to have that “lived experience” of what was occurring in the schools.

Trustee Rodriguez requested additional student involvement be part of the plan because their perspective was critical. He would like to see additional language on consequences related to promoting fights or other actions on social media. He urged arson be included in the Manual.

Student Representative Batmale mentioned the Student Advisory Counsel had been having conversations regarding violence in the schools. The challenge for her, coming from Incline and for another student from Gerlach, was that their communities were much smaller and removed from a lot of what was occurring in the majority of schools in the District. That being said, school safety and discipline were key elements of the learning environment and when another student was disruptive of that it was challenging for everyone. She did worry about what was going on in the other schools because she had a personal connection with students throughout the District. She believed other students would agree that discipline was important but so were second chances.

Superintendent Enfield remarked that it would be important to have the Student Advisory Counsel provide their input on the Manual as well. She agreed it was important to remove a child from the school community if they were a danger to themselves or others; however, it was also important to remember the numbers were not just data points, they were children who were hurting and in crisis. They were children for whom the public schools were a safe haven. Not only were conversations surrounding discipline important, but it was just as important to spend an equal amount of passion and time on the corollary conversations of how to provide the appropriate help, supports, and interventions.

It was moved by Trustee Nicolet and seconded by Trustee Rodriguez that **the Board of Trustees approves the project plan and directs the Superintendent to integrate the feedback and direction of the Trustees from the discussion into the process.**

President Smith opened the motion for discussion.

Trustee Church requested a friendly amendment to direct the Superintendent to develop within the Student Behavior Manual an emphasis that threats and violence are not to be tolerated and strong actions are to be taken.

Trustee Nicolet believed that concept had been part of the conversation and she trusted everything discussed would be incorporated into the plan. If what the Trustees wanted to see in the Manual was not included, then they did not have to approve the final version. She did not agree to the amendment.

The result of the vote was Unanimous: The result of the vote was 6-1: (Yea: Adam Mayberry, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, Colleen Westlake, and Alex Woodley. Nay: Jeff Church.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

*President Smith recessed the meeting for 10 minutes.*

### **3.04 PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION FOR THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES TO ADOPT GOALS FOR THE SAFE AND HEALTHY SCHOOLS COMMISSION TO ADDRESS SCHOOL SAFETY ISSUES**

Scott Benton, Chair, Safe and Healthy Schools Commission, and Natalie Sanchez, Vice-Chair, Safe and Healthy Schools Commission, provided background information on the Safe and Healthy Schools Commission (SHSC). The SHSC was comprised of 15 members of the community, including representatives from the Jan Evans Juvenile Detention Center, mental health professionals, parents, and emergency services representatives. While the SHSC had focused primarily on building safety when it was initially formed, the COVID pandemic shifted the priorities to the social and emotional health of students, staff, and families. The goals and activities for 2023 were reviewed. Both presenters believed the topics discussed throughout the meeting by the Trustees fit into what the SHSC was currently focusing on. The five goals were as follows: (1) build the capacity of schools and educators to partner with and engage families on the emotional safety and physical safety of students; (2) build an understanding of the relationship between factors including student connectedness, and school safety; (3) review yearly and biannual training for crisis and emergency management including parent/family reunification, threat assessment, prevention, and recovery; (4) conduct an annual safety forum; and (5) review District policy and programming.

President Smith requested clarification on Goal 2 and the types of recommendations that could come to the Board related to this goal. Mr. Benton mentioned measures that would enhance both the physical safety of a school and the social and emotional safety of students. He believed the recommendations would be similar to what had been provided to the Board in 2018, such as secure perimeter fencing and single point of entry projects at all elementary and middle schools.

Trustee Church asked why the March meeting was cancelled because he knew there were many people in the community who were interested in attending. Dr. Paul LaMarca, Staff Liaison, Safe and Healthy Schools Commission, explained there had been problems with the posting for the March 6 meeting and the District was out of

compliance with Nevada's Open Meeting Law. Staff attempted to rescheduled the meeting but it was determined a quorum would not be present so the meeting was cancelled.

Trustee Nicolet wondered what the role of the SHSC was in terms of reviewing trainings if the District had an emergency manager. Mr. Benton mentioned the District's Emergency Manager would attend the meetings of the SHSC to provide information on trainings and other activities related to safety that the District was involved in. The SHSC would review the information on the trainings and compare against best practices, as well as work to ensure the necessary trainings were occurring and in compliance with Board policies.

President Smith opened the meeting to public comment.

Renee Rezendes wondered if a Code Yellow was ever called at Edward C. Reed High School for the fight she had witnessed off campus. She felt it was important for the Board to take action regarding violence off campus because that was likely due to bullying that was occurring on campus. She believed the Board should have a serious conversation regarding closing high school campuses at lunch so the students could be supervised. She provided examples of ways parents could help the District.

John Eppolito, Protect Nevada Children, stated he had sent emails to the SHSC and was frustrated because he had never heard back from the group. He had provided information on screen addiction, students accessing pornography on District devices, and other topics related to technology use in schools. He thought the SHSC would want to research the topics but had never heard back from anyone on the Committee.

Mike Croghan told a story about a family friend wanting to put her child in private school. He had told her to visit a school and walk the halls to see what was actually going on before making any decisions. He concluded by noting that the child ended up attending public school and family friend had gone on to become a teacher, recently retiring after 25 years.

J.S. McElhinney remarked the Board had at least two police officers supervising an audience of senior citizens, yet there was violence occurring in the schools. He was interested in seeing 6 police officers assigned to those schools with the worst cases of violence, a gang task force created to get to know the students, and at least two officers at schools where the violence was not as great. He asked additional questions regarding Inspire Academy since he had not heard about the school until the meeting.

Margaret Martini stated there were enough law enforcement agencies in the area that the first defense should not be the Washoe County School District School Police Department. She believed it was the responsibility of the police to handle the assaults

that were occurring so they could take the students to the juvenile detention facility. She felt the Board was not taking appropriate action in terms of what was happening and they needed to let the professional law enforcement agencies handle what was happening.

Trustee Rodriguez clarified that officers of the Washoe County School District School Police Department were Category I police officers in Nevada and the officers were armed. The District had two officers on the regional gang unit and one officer assigned to the human trafficking team. If someone in the schools were to call 911, the call would be transferred to the District's dispatch office. He spoke about serving with members of the School Police Department during the riots in downtown Reno.

Calen Evans, President, Washoe Education Association, felt the District should highlight the work of the SHSC more to engage parents and families. He agreed the issue of violence in the schools was a community issue and the SHSC provided an opportunity for staff and families to become more involved in the issues. He was frustrated over the negative comments about School Police because they were just as understaffed as every other department in the District. He did not believe members of the community who had provided comments knew what was occurring in the schools and were painting a very broad brush of what they thought was happening based on comments from a newsletter. He knew every member of school site staffs were working as best they could with a broken system.

Pablo Nava Duran mentioned it was important for the Board to focus on safety, but there was only so much they could do with the limited amount of funds provided by the state. He believed the Board was doing their best under state law and that the law needed to be changed so it worked for everyone. He urged the Board to look for ways to pay School Police officers more as well.

Edwin Starbuck was a native Nevadan who had attended school in the District from kindergarten through college. He mentioned he always understood Nevada was ranked at the bottom of national lists in terms of academics. He noted his wife was a teacher and he was hearing more and more stories of violence and disrespect towards teachers than ever before. He remembered being told when he was in school that if he was bad, he would be sent to Washoe High School and not be able to graduate with his class. He believed there should be more consequences for students who broke the rules.

The Board received an email from Brian Erbis related to this item.

President Smith appreciated the information provided and the goals presented. She believed her requests would fall under Goal 2 presented by the SHSC but wondered if that goal was too vague. She would like the SHSC to research and provide the Board

recommendations on bathroom safety in secondary schools to include vaping detection devices.

Trustee Westlake agreed with the need for the SHSC to look into the topic. She knew vaping was causing more problems than just being unhealthy or illegal. Secondary schools were having to lock bathrooms because students were vaping in the bathrooms, which then cut off bathroom access to other students.

President Smith asked if members of the SHSC believed the topic would fit under Goal 2. Mr. Benton responded in the affirmative. He stated the issue could also be part of Goal 4 and part of the annual safety forum.

It was moved by Trustee Westlake and seconded by Trustee Rodriguez that **the Board of Trustees adds the following to Goal 2: research and recommendations on secondary school bathroom safety, to include vaping detection.**

President Smith opened the motion for discussion.

Trustee Mayberry expressed full support of the motion. He added that the issue of vaping went beyond the bathrooms, with his daughter telling him of students vaping in classrooms.

The result of the vote was Unanimous: The result of the vote was 6-1: (Yea: Adam Mayberry, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, Colleen Westlake, and Alex Woodley. Nay: Jeff Church.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

Trustee Church expressed disappointment over a motion that was related to vaping when fights were occurring in schools on a daily basis. He did not believe the SHSC should be the ones addressing school violence but that it should be the Board. He was disappointed there was no policy related to the SHSC and wondered how it was formed and why there were 15 members. He would like to see the SHSC a group of 7 individuals, appointed by the Trustees. He would prefer any members of the justice system attend the meetings as presenters, but not as members of the committee. He was concerned the goals did not appear to address violence, gangs, drug, discipline, or absenteeism. He was told by staff that at no time were meetings cancelled because of lack of a quorum, but there were 3 members who missed 3 or more meetings and he would like the Board to take action to remove those members.

President Smith stated the agenda item was related to the goals of the SHSC and not the make-up of the group.

Trustee Church stated if he was unable to make a motion related to the structure of the group so it could be more effective, then he believed the agenda item was “an exercise in futility.”

Dr. LaMarca mentioned whenever staff had sent items to the Board related to the appointment or reappointment of members to the SHSC, there was a section with background information on the group. When the SHSC was initially formed, the Board created the group through Board Policy 9036, which included the make-up of the group. The Policy had since been deleted and SHSC was now governed by Board Policy 9100. The information that had been provided related to quorums and attendance were for the 2021-22 School Year, not the current school year.

Neil Rombardo, Chief General Counsel, added Board Policy 9036 was combined into Board Policy 7700, Emergency Management, a number of years ago. Then in 2022, the Board removed SHSC from that policy and stated, on the record, they would wait to determine next steps in terms of the SHSC.

Trustee Westlake asked if the SHSC was a governing body or if they were a body that conducted research and provided recommendations to the Board.

President Smith noted they were a public body that conducted research and provided recommendations to the Board.

Trustee Nicolet reminded the Trustees that if the Board charged one of the public bodies with a task, staff would also do the work. She was also interested in having a topic for the safety forum on how to keep children safe on-line.

President Smith felt that topic was also appropriate under Goal 1 and the development of courses for Parent University. She believed that could be expanded to include cyber-bullying and social media safety. Dr. LaMarca indicated the Department of Family School Partnerships was aware of Goal 1 and interested in collaborating with the SHSC.

Trustee Mayberry commented that he was interested in seeing the SHSC explore single point of entry for high schools and/or security check points. Mr. Benton highlighted single point of entry had been an on-going conversation for the SHSC since it was formed. It was an easier solution at elementary and middle schools since they generally only had one entrance. The District’s Emergency Manager had explored various options for consideration, which had been discussed and additional considerations sent back for further review by staff. The conversation would remain on-going.

Trustee Rodriguez suggested the SHSC research additional technology that could detect weapons, knives, and drugs. He was interested in seeing the District be as progressive

as possible in terms of providing effective options for School Police. Superintendent Enfield indicated she would prefer staff conduct the research on technology topics because the Board was already charging the SHSC with a number of topics.

It was moved by Trustee Nicolet and seconded by Trustee Woodley that **the Board of Trustees recommends the Safe and Healthy Schools Commission work with Family School Partnerships to embed information on keeping students safe on-line into Parent University programs and adding similar information to the May 2023 Safety Forum.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jeff Church, Adam Mayberry, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, Colleen Westlake, and Alex Woodley.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

Trustee Westlake inquired if there should be a similar motion regarding screentime.

President Smith believed that was part of the prior motion, though she appreciated the clarification.

It was moved by Trustee Mayberry and seconded by Trustee Rodriguez that **the Board of Trustees approves the goals of the Safe and Healthy Schools Commission, to include recommendations as discussed and approved.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: The result of the vote was 6-1: (Yea: Adam Mayberry, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, Colleen Westlake, and Alex Woodley. Nay: Jeff Church.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

### **3.05 DISCUSSION AND UPDATE ON SPRING STAFF TRAINING ON ADDRESSING STUDENT BEHAVIOR ISSUES INCLUDING AN UPDATE ON TRAINING FOR CARE SOLACE IMPLEMENTATION**

Trish Shaffer, Coordinator of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, and Katherine Loudon, Coordinator of Counseling and Social Work, provided an overview of the staff training related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and Care Solace. MTSS provided different levels, or tiers, of supports and interventions to students depending on their individual needs to address behavioral concerns early. Classes on MTSS were provided to families through Parent University. Information on the community collaborations used to support the physical, mental, and emotional health needs of students was reviewed, including Signs of Suicide and anti-vaping programming. The importance of social and emotional learning's connection to school safety was highlighted. Care Solace was an additional tool the District would be able to use to support the mental health of students. Since receiving approval by the Board a month ago, over 300 staff members had been trained on Care Solace.

Superintendent Enfield noted the District was leading the way for the community in terms of mental health care by providing Care Solace. Other local governments were looking for opportunities of how to provide the program to everyone in the community.

President Smith asked where families would be able to find information on contacting Care Solace. Ms. Loudon provided additional information on how students, families, and staff were able to connect with care providers. Care Solace could be contacted in a variety of ways, were able to support over 100 different languages, and work with various insurance providers.

Trustee Nicolet wondered if Care Solace had enough service providers they were able to refer people to. Superintendent Enfield stated they did not know at the present time, but they would be able to provide information on where there were gaps in the system.

Trustee Woodley thanked Superintendent Enfield and staff for the use of different tools to address challenges. He appreciated the holistic approach taken to caring for the students.

**3.06 APPROVAL OF THE AGREEMENT WITH CENTEGIX TO INSTALL CRISIS ALERT EQUIPMENT AND SOFTWARE IN WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT SCHOOLS AND ADMINISTRATION BUILDINGS USING THE AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN (ARP) ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL EMERGENCY RELIEF FUNDS (ESSER III) FOR \$4,580,800, AND THE GENERAL FUND FOR \$100,000**

Jason Trevino, Chief of School Police, and Adam Searcy, Chief Operations Officer, presented an overview of the Centegix system. The system was intended to be another layer of safety in the schools and District facilities. The District began reviewing the system after it was installed in the Clark County School District. An alert-based system was something the District had been researching for a number of years, but staff were not satisfied with the limitations of app-based programs on cell phones. They noted the Nevada Department of Education had approved the District's request to utilize Elementary and Secondary School Relief (ESSER) funding. The installation process was reviewed, which could begin within weeks if the Board approved the agenda item. The hope was that the system would be installed throughout the District by the start of the school year. The Trustees were shown how the touch card system worked. The system would work outside the schools so could be used at athletic events.

Trustee Rodriguez asked how the system would work for staff who travelled to different sites and what the battery life was of the cards or if they needed to be charged. Chief Trevino mentioned the cards were not site specific and could be used at any District property. The system had "geo-fences" surrounding each District facility. The battery life for the cards was 5-years and they did not need to be charged.

Trustee Westlake wondered how anyone would know when the battery was dying. Dean Olds, Centegix, stated there were ways to be proactive and monitor the cards to determine battery life. The maintenance contract would allow the District to swap out cards as needed if the batteries were to die.

Trustee Church wondered what the monthly cost of the system was. Chief Trevino highlighted that the agreement was all-inclusive for 5 years.

Trustee Church asked if the District would mandate that staff wear the cards. Superintendent Enfield indicated the cards would be made available to all staff and staff would be encouraged to have them on, but she was not interested in mandating that staff be required to wear them.

Trustee Church wondered what would happen if a student was able to get hold of the card and start pressing the button. Chief Trevino remarked that would be a behavior issue that would need to be addressed and the discipline would likely depend on the severity of the response. In conversations with other school districts, they had not had a lot of false alarm issues.

Trustee Rodriguez inquired if staff would have the ability to cancel an alert if one was accidentally initiated. Chief Trevino commented that the user was not able to cancel an alert, but the school would be able to contact School Police and explain the situation.

Trustee Mayberry wondered how the system would work outside of the buildings where strobe lights were not available. Mr. Searcy confirmed there would be strobe lights outside of the buildings, but still on District property.

Trustee Nicolet requested clarification on the anticipated completion date. Mr. Searcy noted the expectation was that the system would be fully operational in all school systems by the start of the 2023-24 School Year.

President Smith opened the meeting to public comment.

Valerie Fiannaca was impressed with the system and glad the District was considering it. She was hopeful the system would keep everyone safe. She was concerned about what would happen if the power went out and that students could choke teachers with the lanyards.

Chief Trevino responded at the request of President Smith. The system would continue to operate if there was a power failure, and the lanyards had a quick release.

Nichelle Hull believed parents should look at homeschooling as an option to sending their children to the Washoe County School District. She agreed with Trustee Church's comments that he would not put his children in the District. She wondered why any parent would send their children to any school in the District. She claimed that since the schools were not providing effective boundaries and leadership, chaos was occurring. She did not believe staff having panic buttons would address the root problems causing the disruptive behavior.

John Eppolito thanked staff for the information. He expressed his support for the agenda item.

Pablo Nava Duran urged the Board to approve the Centegix system. He was frustrated that he was unable to help the teacher who was attacked at George Dilworth Middle School and hoped the system would help teachers when there were fights in the schools.

It was moved by Trustee Rodriguez and seconded by Trustee Mayberry that **the Board of Trustees approves the agreement with Centegix to install crisis alert equipment and software in Washoe County School District schools and administration buildings at a total cost of \$4,680,800 with the District's General Fund paying the portion of contract costs not approved by the Nevada Department of Education to be covered by ESSER III.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: The result of the vote was Unanimous: (Yea: Jeff Church, Adam Mayberry, Diane Nicolet, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, Colleen Westlake, and Alex Woodley.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

#### **4. Reports**

##### **4.01 STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE REPORT**

This item was not heard.

##### **4.02 BOARD REPORTS**

Members of the Board of Trustees reported on their activities, meetings, and events.

##### **4.03 SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT**

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

#### **5. Closing Items**

##### **5.01 PUBLIC COMMENT**

John Eppolito apologized for making comments during a previous meeting personal. He explained why he was passionate about screen time for children and what happened when he had requested his child not participate in on-line learning through free education technology vendors. He was frustrated over the data breaches and that the District was not providing parents with the information. He believed staff had provided misinformation to the Board and no one was ever held responsible for damages done to children.

Margaret Martini agreed with the comments from Mr. Eppolito. She was dismayed there were over 500 vendors the District provided information to because she believed the vendors were asking the District to act as "agents" for the parents. She felt the District was not doing anything to protect the students and should never act on behalf of the parents. She expressed concern over Administrative Regulation 5161 because parents were not notified of a student's gender identity choices in schools. She urged the Board to stop talking and take action to fix the issues she and Mr. Eppolito had raised.

Sandee Tibbett read from an article co-authored by Superintendent Enfield. She claimed Superintendent Enfield was implementing a "woke" agenda in the Washoe County School District based on the articles and was using the "scamdemic" to show why that agenda should move forward. She believed that her son had never received any favoritism because he was white and that he had to work hard for everything.

Nichelle Hull alleged that in the discussion by the Board when Care Solace was approved, President Smith and Mr. Rombardo disparaged parents when they said the language referring to the District acting as the parents' agent was nothing concerning and standard. She felt the language that allowed the District to take the place of parents and that language should be concerning because the parents should always know what was occurring with their children. She felt the District should focus on removing all the anti-parent "junk" otherwise they would all be sued.

Valerie Fiannaca expressed concern over the salary of the Superintendent and her commitment to social justice because she did not believe that was working anywhere. She believed Superintendent Enfield should collaborate with Paul White because he had a proven track record of working with the worst students and making them successful. She wondered if the District was afraid Mr. White would be able to make the students successful. She claimed multiple Trustees had been extremely disrespectful to Trustee Church throughout the meeting.

Leina Starbuck was a teacher at Archie Clayton Middle School. She wanted to tell the Board about the behavior problems occurring by students to staff members at the school, such as teachers being punched, flipped off, and cursed at. She stated there were so many students not going to class that the teachers would lock their doors so the students

would not go into their room and disrupt their classes. She spoke of the stress teachers were facing because of the challenges with some of the students. She provided information on how some students were also threatening and injuring other students. She spoke of the large number of students in her classes which did not allow for effective classroom management to occur.

Edwin Starbuck continued to speak on his wife's behalf. He mentioned he was scared when he dropped his children off at school. He was frustrated over the lack of funding available for teachers and School Police officers. He appreciated that the District was willing to do something in the form of a panic button, but would have rather seen those funds go to increasing teacher and officer salaries. He believed School Police would be overwhelmed with the number of calls they would be sent on because of the panic buttons. He reiterated his desire to see increased discipline and consequences.

Pablo Nava Duran spoke in support of Superintendent Enfield and the work she was doing in the District. He was frustrated with the violence occurring in the schools and agreed additional staff would help. He urged the District to work with the Legislature to rework the law related to restorative discipline and increase funding for schools.

Calen Evans, President, Washoe Education Association, thanked the Board for the conversations that occurred throughout the meeting. He appreciated the Board and District were interested in making positive changes, but noted those changes had to come with the support and resources necessary. He believed Superintendent Enfield was willing to make the necessary changes; however, it was important to understand that the District had been operating under certain principles for a long time and change would not happen overnight. He spoke about how his daughter was loving school because of her teacher, which was how it should be. He urged everyone to work together.

The Board received emails from the following:

- Amber Hayes
- Mon Bertolucci
- Brian Erbis
- Stephanie Harnes
- Elizabeth Gebhardt

## 5.02 **NEXT MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT**

The next Regular Meeting would take place on Tuesday, April 11, 2023.

## 5.03 **ADJOURN MEETING**

There being no further business to come before the members of the Board, President Smith declared the meeting adjourned at 9:28 p.m.

---

**Elizabeth Smith, President**

---

**Joseph Rodriguez, Clerk**