

**MINUTES OF THE MAY 23, 2023
WORK SESSION OF THE
WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

May 23, 2023

1. Opening Items

1.01 CALL TO ORDER

The work session of the Board of Trustees was called to order at 9:08 a.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.

1.03 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Tristan McElhany, Director of Behavior Hearings and Placement, led the meeting in the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

2.01 PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION TO UPDATE THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES ON THE PROGRESS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE DISTRICT'S BEHAVIOR MANUAL AND POSSIBLE ACTION FOR THE BOARD TO CONSIDER, APPROVE, AND/OR AMEND THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE CONTENTS OF THE BEHAVIOR MANUAL, COMMUNICATIONS PLAN, AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE 2023-24 SCHOOL YEAR

Dr. Paul LaMarca, Chief Strategies Officer, explained the objectives for the presentation were to provide the Board with an update on where the District was in terms of revision to the Behavior Manual and allow the Board to provide recommendations regarding the manual contents, communication plan, and implementation plan. Based on the feedback received from staff, students, and others in the community, the District was able to determine the challenges associated with the manual were more based on appropriate implementation and District-wide consistency rather than the manual itself;

however, it was critical a better manual was created so it would be used. Additional information on legislation currently being considered was provided.

Superintendent Enfield highlighted that Dr. LaMarca had worked with the Governor's Office and various legislators to ensure the bills related to progressive discipline were appropriate and fixed the problems seen in the current law. She was impressed with the work because it demonstrated he knew how important it was to get the process right.

Jennifer Vantress, Associate Chief, Specialized Instruction, reviewed federal legislation for student discipline under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Under IDEA, behavior problems were addressed through the Individualized Education Plan (IEP), with the goal to always instruct students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment (LRE), which was primarily in general education classes. Information on when students with an IEP could be suspended or placed in an Interim Alternative Educational Setting (IEAS) and for how long was included as part of the presentation. The "Big 3" violations were reviewed: possession of a dangerous weapon, battery causing severe bodily injury, and distribution of controlled substances. The process to determine if a change of placement was warranted was explained. It was important to note that if a behavior was related to a student's disability, the IEP team would need to determine if the IEP was implemented with fidelity or if changes had to occur prior to a student with a disability being suspended for more than 10 days in a school year. If a behavior was not a manifestation of a student's disability, the disciplinary rules that applied to general education students would then apply to that student. Nevada law did not allow a student with a disability to be suspended for 5 days straight.

Trustee Westlake asked if injuries requiring a hospital stay and/or physical therapy were considered permanent bodily injury. Ms. Vantress indicated that it would depend on the severity and/or long-term impacts of the injury.

Trustee Nicolet wondered who made the determination of the severity of an injury. Ms. Vantress mentioned the Special Education Department would work with various departments to review records and make the final determination.

President Smith inquired if parents of students with disabilities were encouraged to show how or if they were seeking resources outside of the school day to support the student. Ms. Vantress responded in the affirmative. She noted it was rare for schools to see behaviors that were not occurring in the home, so it was important for the schools and parents to work together.

Trustee Mayberry requested clarification on if a student could be placed elsewhere if a behavior was caused by a student's disability. Ms. Vantress commented that location of

a student was in the purview of the District and placement was the purview of the IEP team. Location could be another classroom in the same school and placement could be another school. Some of the questions the IEP team would need to ask included: what should occur if the IEP was being followed with fidelity; and if the behavior(s) were not improving. It was important for the family to be part of all conversations, including if a student needed to be moved to a different classroom.

Trustee Westlake asked if the District had the ability to be proactive in addressing behavior problems. Ms. Vantress provided additional information on behavior plans and behavior interventions used by schools. She used an example of needing to provide an elementary school student a break every 8 minutes to reset themselves and how the team was able to continue to increase the time between breaks until the time aligned between changes in the classroom.

Trustee Church wondered if distance learning could be used in place of out of school suspension. Ms. Vantress stated the student would need to be provided with their IEP services. If an IEP did not include distance learning, then the law would not allow distance learning to be used to provide specialized instruction.

Trustee Church clarified students without an IEP could be moved to distance learning. Ms. Vantress responded in the affirmative, though it was important to note students with 504 plans were also included as a student with a disability for purposes of discipline. A 504 was put in place when a child had a disability and required accommodations to be made for learning but did not require specialized instruction.

Trustee Mayberry commented he would often hear from school staff that there was nothing they could do in terms of disciplining students with IEPs. The statement frustrated him because he believed that to be an unacceptable response. Ms. Vantress stated there was always something that could be done. It was important for everyone to think outside the box in terms of options for a student with behavioral challenges that would continue to provide the student access to Tier 1 instruction.

Superintendent Enfield inquired if the District had seen the number of 504 plans increase. Dr. LaMarca explained the District had seen an increase in the number of 504 plans since the beginning of the pandemic. The number of plans had outstripped the ability of the District to provide services.

Superintendent Enfield remarked it was important for the District to be able to support students with 504 plans. She expressed desire in increasing resources for the program because she felt the current level of support was inadequate for students with a 504 plan.

Trustee Westlake asked if the data showed any disproportionality in terms of special education students and discipline. Dr. LaMarca noted students with disabilities were disproportionately more likely to act out and be suspended. He cautioned that these were also students who were disproportionately bullied and students who had disproportionately not been served well academically.

Dr. LaMarca presented the proposed revisions and recommendations for the contents of the manual. Staff wanted to emphasize the priority of Safe and Respectful Learning Environments, any guiding legislation, and District policy. Staff also wanted to include a dedicated section related to special education, notification requirements, threat assessments, and transitions to and from temporary placement. Sections of the manual to be significantly revised included discipline strategies for both traditional approaches and restorative practices, a tiered continuum of behavior management, and delineation of administrative latitude in disciplinary action, with an appropriate balance between consistency and professional judgment. As a part of the Behavior Manual, the Behavior Matrix would also be revised to include clear guidance on recommended consequences for different offenses, and guidance on interventions and supports.

Superintendent Enfield highlighted one area for improvement in terms of placement was providing more options where a student could be placed if they needed to attend an alternative location. One of her long-term goals was to create a safe, alternative location where any student, PreK – 12, who needed to be removed from their home school, could go and receive high quality instruction, as well as counseling and intervention services, no matter the length of time the student was there.

Trustee Church provided information on what he was interested in seeing included in the Manual. He appreciated that student and staff safety was the priority because disruptions of the educational environment should not be tolerated. He felt minor infractions became major infractions, so it was important to address minor infractions immediately. He rejected the idea of restorative discipline and practices because students believed they were able to get away with the minor infractions. He would like to see the teacher's opinion come first in terms of removing a student from a classroom, unless there was clear and convincing evidence a student should not be out of the classroom. He expanded on where he was interested in seeing language changes and instructing all students on school and classroom expectations. Dr. LaMarca explained additional information in the packet provided a delineation of major and minor infractions, including how repeated minor infractions could become a major infraction. Additional information on the threat assessment process was presented.

Trustee Nicolet remarked both students and teachers had requested help from the Board of Trustees. It was important to have appropriate alternative placements for all students that needed them to help students work through whatever it was they needed to work through. She was concerned that many school administrators only had a

working knowledge of the Manual and that very few teachers knew the Manual existed. She wanted to ensure all employees were trained appropriately and continuing professional development opportunities provided.

Dr. LaMarca concluded the presentation with a review of the proposed communication plan to various District communities, including the creation of discipline guides for teachers and staff, site administrators, and parents and students. The timeline for implementation of the Manual was reviewed.

President Smith appreciated the communications plan and felt it would be important to look at different guides for the different school levels for students and families since context would be important. She reviewed the intent of the agenda item and how the Board would move forward to include the Board's goals and values in the new Behavior Manual.

Trustee Westlake requested additional information on the school site progressive discipline committees. Dr. LaMarca stated the school committees were led by the principal or principal designee, two teachers that were elected to sit on the committee, an elected classified staff member, and a couple of back-ups. He noted a teacher always had the ability to remove a student from the classroom if that student was disrupting the class and steps would then be put in place for returning to the classroom.

Trustee Church clarified the Board would have the opportunity to review the Manual and make any necessary changes during the school year. Dr. LaMarca indicated that was correct and while it might not happen in a meeting, the disciplinary data would be provided to the Trustees quarterly.

Trustee Rodriguez wondered if staff had the ability to appeal a decision of the principal or site administrator if the staff member felt they were not being supported. Dr. LaMarca responded in the affirmative and highlighted parents also had the ability to appeal a disciplinary action. The school disciplinary committee would review the desires of the principal and the teacher then make a final decision. Additional appeals were also available.

Trustee Rodriguez asked if the Manual would also apply to non-classroom settings, such as buses. Dr. LaMarca mentioned that was an opportunity for improvement because different principals had different relationships with bus drivers.

Trustee Rodriguez inquired as to the amount of discretion principals and site administrators would be provided in disciplining a student. He understood the desire to provide discretion, but also wanted to ensure there was consistency and uniformity through the District so students, families, teachers, and other staff would know what the expectations were no matter their location. Dr. LaMarca stressed that one of the

main changes to the Manual was to provide guidance on what type of disciplinary action should be taken and when. He provided different examples of the type of guidance included in the current draft.

Superintendent Enfield added part of the reasoning for hiring additional associate chiefs was to ensure consistency in implementation at the District-level by reviewing data on a regular basis. Ms. Vantress provided information on what was already occurring in terms of developing common language around classroom expectations.

President Smith opened the meeting to public comment.

Calen Evans, President, Washoe Education Association (WEA), expressed his appreciation for the work Dr. LaMarca had been doing with legislators because they were listening. He also appreciated the responsiveness of Ms. Vantress and her willingness to work with schools. The WEA had provided input on the Manual and continued to offer their recommendations. The expectation was that teachers would see their ideas incorporated in the new Manual and that there would be continued collaboration to ensure their needs were met. While he appreciated there would be an emphasis on consistency, he mentioned that as a teacher he had never received training on the Behavior Manual or disciplinary practices. He urged the District to prioritize professional development.

Nichelle Hull felt parents had finally been heard because there now seemed to be agreement from the Trustees that disciplining students was a priority. She urged the Board to charge all their committees with finding a location for an alternative school site because there were plenty of community centers and vacant commercial sites that could be used and put in place by the start of the next school year. She believed training should be provided throughout the summer so teachers would be prepared, and student expectations should be posted throughout the school buildings.

Cliff Nellis spoke in support of what the Board was trying to do; however, he believed the entire endeavor would fail because it was not based on the truth in the Bible. He was interested in seeing rewards for good behavior and punishments for bad behavior, but total obedience with the rules would not be achieved because the rules were not based on the Gospels. He urged the Board and District to use the threat of Hell as the ultimate punishment since fear was the only way to ensure compliance.

President Smith provided some background information on why she had originally pulled approval of the Behavior Manual from the Consent Agenda in November 2022. She appreciated the work everyone had put into the changes because she knew it was not a small task. While she was comfortable with what was presented, she wanted to ensure all Trustees were comfortable, especially with the balanced disciplinary approach with recommended discretion in the use of traditional and restorative approaches

outlined on slide 12 of the presentation, which included a more conservative approach when behavior was violent and raised safety concerns.

It was moved by Trustee Woodley and seconded by Trustee Rodriguez that **the Board of Trustees approves the balanced discipline plan with recommended discretion in the use of traditional and restorative approaches related to violent, disruptive, and procedural violations.**

President Smith opened the motion for discussion.

Trustee Mayberry requested clarification on what “a more conservative approach” meant. Dr. LaMarca explained exclusionary practices should be used if safety was a concern.

Trustee Church remarked he was likely a “no” vote because he believed the motion was vague and the Legislature was still in session so there could be changes to what was currently being considered. He also did not feel enough input from teachers had been included in the new version of the Manual.

President Smith mentioned the motion would only apply to areas where the District had discretion in terms of discipline based on any federal or state laws. If the law were to change, then the motion would continue to hold because it was only related to where discretion could be applied. She believed the motion was also drawing a bright line to show the Board wanted to see the safety of students and staff as a top priority.

Trustee Westlake mentioned it was important for the Board to do something in terms of addressing the violence occurring in schools. She understood the concerns, but trusted staff to start making those changes.

Trustee Nicolet stated she would also be a “no” because she would prefer the language related to a more conservative approach to be firmer and clearer.

The result of the vote was 5-2: (Yea: Adam Mayberry, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, Colleen Westlake, and Alex Woodley. Nay: Jeff Church and Diane Nicolet.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

President Smith called for a final motion to approve the building out of all the new and revised sections to the Manual, the communication strategy, and the implementation plan.

Trustee Church indicated he could not support such a motion because he felt it did not include what the Board had discussed during the meeting.

It was moved by Trustee Rodriguez and seconded by Trustee Mayberry that **the Board of Trustees approves the recommended contents to the 2023-24 Behavior Manual, the communication strategy, and the implementation plan.** 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 11 minutes.

2.02 PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND PUBLIC HEARING ON THE FISCAL YEAR 2023-24 TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR ALL DISTRICT FUNDS; CONSIDERATION OF POSSIBLE DIRECTION TO THE SUPERINTENDENT AND STAFF; AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE THE FISCAL YEAR 2023-24 FINAL BUDGET

Mark Mathers, Chief Financial Officer, and Jeff Bozzo, Budget Director, provided a presentation on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2023-24 Tentative Budget. The requirements for the hearing on the tentative budget, approval of a final budget, and adoption of an amended final budget during legislative session years were reviewed. The presentation would provide updates on legislation with fiscal impacts and the Economic Forum, a final review of the General Fund Budget based on current estimates, fiscal analysis of Trustee requests, possible new programs linked to a new strategic plan, and options for employee compensation increases. Based on known cost increases, the current estimated surplus had gone from \$68 million in March to \$63.5 million. It was important to note the \$68 million was based on the Governor's Recommended Budget, not other discussions occurring in the Legislature. Staff was requesting the Board provide direction on the areas of fiscal analysis if the Board wanted to move forward with them, which would then decrease the current estimated surplus. The costs related to the different areas of fiscal analysis were annual, ongoing costs because they all had additional staff members associated with them. The presentation was concluded with information on the General Fund's Ending Fund Balance.

Superintendent Enfield emphasized that the possible increase in state funding for the current biennium was not guaranteed during the next biennium. Mr. Mathers agreed and provided additional information on some of the reasons for the historic increase in revenue growth.

President Smith opened the public hearing on the FY24 Tentative Budget. She called for public comment.

Nichelle Hull believed the District would retain more teachers if they felt comfortable speaking out against either principals or the administration when they disagreed. She claimed students were being sent to the principals' offices to be disciplined, but instead

were given coloring books or toys. She felt the teachers were being silenced and afraid of retaliation if they spoke out against what was occurring in the schools.

Freeman Holbrook, President, Washoe Schools Principals Association, thanked the Board for considering eliminating stand-alone principals. He explained it was almost impossible for stand-alone principals to be a building administrator and high-quality instructional lead. He noted stand-alone principals did not have the ability to be away from their buildings, even if they were sick, because there would be no one to support staff and therefore students.

Cliff Nellis remarked, that as a former businessman, he would fire half of the administrators and give teachers a 20% raise with the savings. He ran through different budget scenarios of how the District should be paying the teachers more. He believed there was too much infrastructure and not enough focus on paying teachers more.

President Smith closed the public hearing on the FY24 Tentative Budget.

President Smith explained the process the Board would follow for the next part of the discussion which would focus on making some decisions on the fiscal analyses conducted by staff. The decisions did not have to be final since many Trustees were interested in seeing the final budget from the state, but it was important to provide staff guidance if the Board was interested in moving any of the analyses forward. She highlighted just because an area of analysis might not move forward, it did not mean that item was not important, just that the Board was not interested in moving forward with it at the present time.

Trustee Rodriguez requested additional information on the District's Fund Balance. Mr. Mathers explained the FY22 Budget ended with a Fund Balance of slightly less than 12% and the FY23 Budget was forecasted to end with a Fund Balance of 10.6%. The projected Fund Balance for FY24, if the Board approved the proposed balanced budget, was 9.2%. Board policy had a target Fund Balance of 12%. A fund balance of 8% represented 1 month of expenses.

Trustee Mayberry wondered what the ending fund balance was for the Clark County School District. Mr. Mathers noted their unrestricted fund balance was lower than Washoe County School District's; however, their restricted fund balance was higher.

Trustee Westlake mentioned she heard from a number of principals that they were interested in having flexibility to determine if they would like an assistant principal, dean, or learning facilitator position.

President Smith emphasized Option A related to the elimination of stand-alone principals would provide that flexibility. She expressed her support for the option because it allowed the principal to determine which position was appropriate for their school. She agreed with Mr. Holbrook's remarks that it was impossible for stand-alone principals to implement new programs and support their staff without a second administrator in the building.

Trustee Nicolet agreed with President Smith. She appreciated the flexibility of Option A and was also interested in seeing a strategic phased in approach because she worried about pulling 24 teachers from classrooms.

Superintendent Enfield added it was difficult for stand-alone principals to conduct effective and efficient staff evaluations because they were not able to fully observe people in their positions.

Trustee Mayberry agreed with the prior comments. He indicated it would also be important for the Board to have a real conversation regarding staff compensation because he wanted to see the Board go as high as they could in terms of any cost-of-living adjustment (COLA).

Trustee Rodriguez asked how much money would the District receive if they changed the proposed FY24 Ending Fund Balance to 8% instead of 9.2%. Mr. Mathers noted that was a roughly \$5 million change.

Trustee Westlake expressed concern over taking any teachers out of classrooms, but believed a phase in approach was the most appropriate way to implement Option A, if that was approved. She wanted to ensure all buildings were operated safely and with as much support as possible.

It was moved by President Smith and seconded by Trustee Westlake that **the Board of Trustees provides tentative approval to Option A related to the elimination of stand-alone principals, with a phased in approach.**

President Smith opened the motion for discussion.

Trustee Rodriguez asked what the on-going, annual cost for Option A. was. Mr. Mathers commented that the annual commitment was a little less than \$3.7 million.

Trustee Church requested clarification on if the motion was funding assistant principals or deans and not taking teachers out of classrooms.

President Smith explained the motion would allow stand-alone principals in elementary schools to determine if they would prefer an assistant principal, dean, or learning

facilitator to support their school. The positions would need to be filled and the motion recommended that occur through a phased in approach so 24 teachers would not immediately be pulled out of classrooms if they accepted the positions.

Superintendent Enfield noted the District did not necessarily need to fill the positions with teachers. While she was supportive of developing leadership pathways for current employees, the District would advertise and recruit externally, as well as internally, to fill the positions.

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 moved the conversation to additional school police officers. She highlighted the Board could approve the options as presented or make changes to the options.

It was moved by Trustee Woodley and seconded by Trustee Westlake that **the Board of Trustees provides tentative approval to Option D related to additional school police officers.**

President Smith opened the motion for discussion.

Trustee Woodley noted Option D was recommended by Chief of School Police Jason Trevino.

Trustee Rodriguez wondered if a lieutenant position would be more appropriate than a sergeant position. Chief Trevino remarked that was an option that could be beneficial and provide additional administrative support for the department.

Trustee Rodriguez requested a friendly amendment to change the sergeant position to a lieutenant position.

Trustee Woodley, as the maker of the motion, and Trustee Westlake, as the seconder, agreed to the friendly amendment.

Trustee Mayberry inquired as to the difficulty in hiring eight additional officers in a year. Chief Trevino commented that it would be challenging, but having all positions approved would provide leeway for the department to recruit laterally from other law enforcement agencies. Additional information on the hiring timeline for a recruit who was in the academy.

Trustee Nicolet expressed support for the work of School Police because of the way they were able to build the relationships with students and staff, but she also believed it was important to have additional people in the schools, with either a resource position or campus supervisor. She remarked that she would like to see a phased in approach and wondered how the process would work. Mr. Mathers stated there were different approaches, including budgeting three to four positions the first year and the remaining positions the next year. Any savings realized from open positions would go back to the District's General Fund.

Superintendent Enfield requested clarification on what the Trustees meant by "phase in" and if it referred to the budgeting of the positions or the staffing of the positions. She would like to see, for the staffing of the positions, and understanding that the phase in would be as or if needed because the District might be able to recruit for the positions.

President Smith confirmed phase in was related to the staffing of the positions. The expectation should be that the District would recruit for the positions, but that it would take time to fill those positions. She recommended a friendly amendment to include a phased in approach.

Trustee Woodley, as the maker of the motion, and Trustee Westlake, as the seconder, agreed to the friendly amendment.

Trustee Church indicated he would be a "no" vote because police officers cost a lot of money. He believed the money would be better spent on campus supervisor positions.

The final motion was that **the Board of Trustees provides tentative approval to Option D related to additional school police officers, changing the sergeant position to a lieutenant position, with a phased in approach.** 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 moved the conversation to other options associated with additional school police support in middle schools, including the campus supervisor positions. She liked the idea of campus supervisors or field support positions in middle schools and would be interested in hearing about other options School Police was considering.

Trustee Nicolet asked if the campus supervisor positions were under the School Police Department. Chief Trevino noted the campus supervisor positions were school-based positions and did not report to School Police. The field supervisor positions did report to School Police and would assist officers in tasks that did not require a sworn law enforcement officer, such as documenting vandalism.

President Smith indicated she was interested in continuing the conversation regarding campus supervisor positions in future budget conversations.

It was moved by Trustee Church and seconded by Trustee Nicolet that **the Board of Trustees provides tentative approval for 17 campus supervisor positions at a cost of \$646,000, with locations for the supervisors to be determined by the Superintendent.**

President Smith opened the motion for discussion.

Trustee Woodley remarked he could not support the current motion. He felt the community, families, and staff were clear in their desire for more school safety efforts and believed the motion conflicted with the ability of the District to recruit for eight additional school police officers from the prior motion.

President Smith mentioned that, while she supported the idea of the campus supervisor positions and would likely support such an idea in the future, she could not support the motion at present because she would like to see the final budget numbers first.

Trustee Mayberry agreed with President Smith. He was interested in seeing the final budget numbers before making a final decision on campus supervisors.

Trustee Westlake urged others to support the motion based on the desire for more security in the schools from the community and bolstering School Police.

Trustee Nicolet felt the campus supervisor positions would not compete with the recruitment of additional school police officers but provide additional support and assistance to teachers and school-site staff in monitoring the hallways, bathrooms, and other areas of the schools.

The result of the vote was 3 – 4: (Yea: Jeff Church, Diane Nicolet, and Colleen Westlake. Nay: Adam Mayberry, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, and Alex Woodley.) Final Resolution: Motion Fails.

Trustee Nicolet mentioned she was interested in seeing more data on the efficacy of learning facilitators in the schools.

President Smith recommended the staff continue their analysis on learning facilitators and provide additional information at the June 13 scheduled meeting.

President Smith moved the conversation to the possible reduction of walk zones in elementary and middle schools. She noted staff had provided additional information on

the negative impact of decreased bus eligibility on economically disadvantaged students. While she was passionate about the topic, she could understand if the other Trustees wanted to continue to hold the item until additional information on the final budget was known.

Trustee Church felt the Board had made promises to the community when the walk zones were extended due to financial challenges, and he would like to revisit the topic as well. He could agree to wait for additional information but was also interested in seeing additional analysis on having the topography of an area considered as one of the determining factors, as well as distance.

Trustee Woodley remarked he was one of those economically disadvantaged students, so he understood the challenges of being able to get to school if there was no transportation. He believed reducing the walk zones by even 0.25 miles would have a positive impact and could support such a motion.

Trustee Rodriguez agreed that the Board had made a promise that the topic would be reviewed and wanted to ensure that promise was kept.

It was moved by President Smith and seconded by Trustee Westlake that **the Board of Trustees provides tentative approval of the reduction of walk zones for elementary and middle schools by 0.25 miles, with a phased in approach.**

President Smith opened the motion for discussion.

Trustee Church mentioned he could support the agenda item, but believed additional research needed to occur on other challenges to walk zones, such as lack of sidewalks and hills.

Trustee Nicolet expressed an interest in learning more about what phased in would mean and which schools would be impacted. Scott Lee, Director of Transportation, explained how the change would impact the transportation structure and why any new routes would not take effect until after the fall and winter breaks.

President Smith felt the District had appropriately implemented a needs based approach to adding transportation routes and she was confident the same process would be used.

Trustees Mayberry and Nicolet indicated they could not support the motion at the present time because they were interested in seeing the final budget numbers first.

The result of the vote was 5 – 2: (Yea: Jeff Church, Joe Rodriguez, Beth Smith, Colleen Westlake, and Alex Woodley. Nay: Adam Mayberry and Diane Nicolet.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

It was moved by Trustee Woodley and seconded by Trustee Rodriguez that **the Board of Trustees approves the Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2023-24**. 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.

3. Closing Items

3.01 PUBLIC COMMENT

Nichelle Hull read from a flyer inviting parents and families to a conference on alternatives to the Washoe County School District.

Cliff Nellis spoke on his knowledge of how education emerged in Western culture and his belief that education came out of Christianity's desire for common people to read and write. He claimed the founders of education believed there had to be a moral aspect to education but that the current education system in the United States had moved away from that aspect. He recommended the District split itself into two school districts that would not receive any federal funding so they could teach moral foundations.

The Board received an email from Pablo Nava Duran.

3.02 ADJOURN MEETING

There being no further business to come before the members of the Board, President Smith declared the meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Elizabeth Smith, President

Joseph Rodriguez, Clerk

Dear Adam Searcy, Paul Mills, and Board Members,

I saw the PowerPoint from the last FMP meeting in Sparks, talking about making from three middle schools to two and from 12 elementary schools to six if they were built today.

Phase 1: Rebuild Vaughn MS (2023-26)

WCSD board of trustees approved to build new Vaughn MS which will be open by the 2026-27 school year. This new Vaughn MS will have a capacity of 1400 and the groundbreaking will be ranging from Fall 2023 to summer 2024. The Zoning Advisory Committee will have an agenda by the Fall of 2024 to rezone from Pine MS and Traner MS to the new Vaughn MS beginning 2026-27 school year

Phase 2: Closing Pine MS, Traner MS, Lemelson ES, Duncan ES, and Drake ES (2026-2031)

Middle School: Pine MS and Traner MS

After the building of the new Vaughn MS, both Middle School (Pine MS and Traner MS) is expected to close by 2026.

Pine Middle School

Since Pine MS has low enrollment, these neighborhoods have an opportunity to attend a middle school that goes together through high school (Herz to Galena; Depoali to Damonte; Vaughn to Wooster, or Swope to Reno). It is too early to rezone as right now, but this will be agenda by Fall of 2024.

Traner Middle School

Traner MS enrollment is projected to have less than 400 students, which is the smallest middle

school in WCSD, compared to Sparks and Dilworth MS. Here are options to rezone Traner MS to nearby middle schools:

Option 1: rezone from Traner MS (Matthews ES, Duncan ES, Lemelson ES, and Cannan ES) to Sparks MS exception from North of North McCarran Ln to Desert Skies MS

Option 2: rezone from Traner MS (Matthews ES, Duncan ES, Lemelson ES, and Cannan ES) to Sparks MS with rezone from Sparks MS (Kate Smith ES and Mitchell ES) to Dilworth MS

Option 3: rezone from Traner MS (Matthews ES, Duncan ES, and Cannan ES) to Sparks MS and from Traner MS (Lemelson ES) to Clayton or new Vaughn MS.

This option should allow having vacant in Traner MS to tear down and rebuild a new middle school that has 1400 capacity.

Elementary School: Traner feeder schools

Since Duncan and Lemelson ES have low enrollment, these elementary schools should either consideration or close schools. Here are the options:

Option 1: Closing Duncan ES and Lemelson ES: Rezone from Duncan ES to Matthew ES and rezone from Lemelson ES to Cannan ES.

Option 2: Closing Cannan ES: Rezone from Cannan ES to Duncan ES, Matthews ES, and Lemelson ES.

Since Matthew ES is a newer school, this school doesn't need to be rebuilt, there will be retained as it is. All four elementary schools are Traner feeder schools and will likely go to Sparks MS temporarily until the new Traner MS is built. With a vacant elementary school, it will likely either be rebuilt into a new elementary school with 700 capacity or closed.

Elementary School: Dilworth feeder schools

Since Drake ES enrollment is very low, this will have the best opportunity for the community to rezone from Drake to Greenbrae Es, Lincoln Park ES, or Dunn ES while Drake ES should rebuild into a new elementary school, at 700 capacities. Since Dunn ES is at better condition, there should not need to rebuild at Dunn ES.

Phase 3: New Traner MS and closing Sparks MS or expand Dilworth MS (2031-2036)

After building a new Traner MS, Sparks are expected to continue, close, or consideration into new Elementary schools in the Sparks MS site. Dilworth MS could be closing to rebuild or expand like Swope MS at 1200 capacity. Here are options for Dilworth or Sparks MS:

Option 1: closing Dilworth MS: rezone from Dilworth to Sparks MS and new Traner MS.

Option 2: expanding Dilworth MS: rezone from Sparks MS to new Traner MS and expand Dilworth MS. This will allow Sparks MS to be consideration for a new elementary school in the Sparks MS site.

New ES at Northeast Reno and Drake ES

After building a new elementary school on either Duncan, Lemelson, or Cannan ES, most of Traner feeder schools will likely be closed. After building a new Drake ES, Greenbrae ES, and Lincoln Park ES could be rezoned to new Drake ES, since Greenbrae ES and Lincoln Park ES capacity is very low.

Phase 4: New elementary school at Sparks MS and new Lincoln Park ES (2036-41)

After building a new elementary school on the Sparks MS site, Maxwell ES and Risley ES could be rezoned to new elementary schools and repurposed Risley and Maxwell ES. Since Kate Smith ES and Mitchell ES site is too small, they should build a new elementary school on a Lincoln Park Es site. After they build, Kate Smith ES and Mitchell ES could be rezoned to the new Lincoln Park ES while Kate Smith and Michell Es could be repurposed.

Conclusion:

I will support option 2 on PowerPoint in the Sparks meeting. I think Traner MS should be rebuilt into a new middle school and Dilworth MS should be either rebuilt or expanded into 1200, like Swope MS. Sparks MS should be consideration into a new elementary school. The new elementary school in Northeast Reno should be either on Duncan, Lemelson, or Cannan ES site, new Drake ES, new Lincoln ES, and new elementary school in Sparks MS site. Dunn ES and Mathews ES should continue running as elementary schools since they are newer compared to elementary schools in the Sparks area. They should build at least four elementary schools, and one middle school, and maybe expand Dilworth MS in Northeast Reno and Sparks area.

Sincerely,

Pablo Nava Duran