



AMERICAN CIVITAS

Board: Douglas County, Nevada School Board

Date: June 26, 2025

This BoardWatch Report is provided to the Common Sense Coalition for use in preparing news articles, summaries, or related publications, and for distributing the report as an attachment or reference to its subscribers. All contents, including data, analyses, and recommendations, remain confidential and proprietary. Except for the permitted uses outlined above, reproduction, distribution, or any other unauthorized use of the provided contents is strictly prohibited without prior written consent. This report does not constitute legal advice, and reliance on its contents is at the recipient's own risk.

Agenda Item	Description	Outcome	Vote Count
1	Adoption of Flexible Agenda	Passed	6-0 (Wagstaff, Gneiting, Jansen, Burns, Miller, Dickerson)
5	Consent Items (Accounts Payable Vouchers)	Passed	6-0 (Wagstaff, Gneiting, Jansen, Burns, Miller, Dickerson)
6	Final 2024-25 Budget Amendments and Augmentations (Resolutions 25-01 and 25-02)	Passed	6-0 (Wagstaff, Gneiting, Jansen, Burns, Miller, Dickerson) for both
7	MOU with Washoe Tribe	Passed	6-0 (Wagstaff, Gneiting, Jansen, Burns, Miller, Dickerson)
8	MOU Tuition Agreement with Alpine County	Passed	6-0 (Wagstaff, Gneiting, Jansen, Burns, Miller, Dickerson)
9	MOU with Douglas County Parks and Recreation	Passed	6-0 (Wagstaff, Gneiting, Jansen, Burns, Miller, Dickerson)
10	Dual Enrollment Program with UNR and TMCC	Passed	6-0 (Wagstaff, Gneiting, Jansen, Burns, Miller, Dickerson)
11	Graduation Requirement Administrative Regulation	Discussion Only	N/A
12	Board Policy 437: Political Activities	First Reading	N/A
13	Homework Information	Discussion Only	N/A
14	Board Policy 551: Student Political Activities	First Reading	N/A
15	Board Policy 808: School Lunch	Passed	6-0 (Wagstaff, Gneiting, Jansen, Burns, Miller, Dickerson)
16	Board Policy and AR 812: Cell Phones	Passed	6-0 (Wagstaff, Gneiting, Jansen, Burns, Miller, Dickerson)
17	Dual Credit Course Approval	Information Only	N/A
18	Board Meeting Dates and Locations for 2025-26	Passed	6-0 (Wagstaff, Gneiting, Jansen, Burns, Miller, Dickerson)

Agenda Item	Description	Outcome	Vote Count
19	Student Representative Report	Information Only	N/A
20	Approval of Prioritized Strategic Plan	Passed	6-0 (Wagstaff, Gneiting, Jansen, Burns, Miller, Dickerson)
21	NASBE Nomination and Possible Task Force	Discussion Only	N/A
22	Board Reports	Information Only	N/A
23	Superintendent Evaluation Instrument and Job Description	Passed	6-0 (Wagstaff, Gneiting, Jansen, Burns, Miller, Dickerson) for both
24	Superintendent Evaluation	Adopted Deferred to August	N/A
26	Informational Items (Donations, Enrollment, Superintendent Report)	Information Only	N/A

Executive Summary

The DCSD Board of Trustees convened on June 26, 2025, in a hybrid format, with Zoom access supported by a \$1,600 donation from the community group “We Deserve a Better Board.” The meeting was chaired by Board President Trustee Wagstaff, with Trustees Gneiting, Jansen, Burns, Miller, Dickerson, and student representative Olive Hamner-Jilson present. Trustee Zinke was absent due to a pre-planned vacation. The agenda included budget amendments, MOUs with the Washoe Tribe, Alpine County, and Douglas County Parks and Recreation, policy revisions on political activities and cell phone usage, strategic plan adoption, and the superintendent’s evaluation.

Key Highlights: All agenda items proposed for adoption were approved.

The district faces a severe fiscal crisis, with a \$2.6 million revenue loss due to a 170-student enrollment decline and unreimbursed special education costs, prompting critical budget amendments. The 2022-2027 Strategic Plan was unanimously approved without discussion or debate, with some noting its alignment with collectivist principles, raising questions about its ideological framework. The superintendent’s report highlighted successful graduations, ongoing professional development, and planned broker tours to boost enrollment. The homework policy discussion was highly contentious, marked by sharp disagreements over completion-based grading and delays in addressing February directives.

Adoption of the Agenda

The meeting began with Trustee Wagstaff acknowledging a clerical error in the agenda, where item 24 (superintendent's evaluation) was mislabeled as "information only" despite being an action item. The DCSD council clarified that the agenda's body correctly indicated "discussion and possible action," allowing it to proceed. Trustee Gneiting moved to adopt a flexible agenda with item 24 as an action item, seconded by Trustee Miller.

Public Comment: No comments were received.

Vote: Unanimous (6-0) in favor of adopting the flexible agenda.

Public Comment (Non-Agenda Items)

Trustee Wagstaff opened public comment.

Public Comment: Comments were emotionally charged. It is to be noted that the continued public comments, regarding the lawsuit that the school board under went, are presented monthly by the same numbered few. One commenter demanded the recovery of attorney's fees from prior board members, labeled the "feckless four," accusing them of causing budget cuts through poor legal advice and failure to comply with open meeting laws. The tone was accusatory, framing past governance as reckless and harmful to students. Another commenter expressed outrage at a parade sign claiming exoneration of these board members, calling it "shocking" misinformation that soured community morale and demanding restitution. A third comment praised Student Representative Olive for her service.

DCSD Shout-Outs

Trustee Miller led the shout-outs, recognizing Embree Rae Givens, for personal impact, Mackenzie Simmons for balancing volleyball and academics, Damian Smallwood for leadership, and third through eighth graders for SBAC efforts. Trustee Gneiting commended the students' resilience, noting their ability to excel under pressure, while Trustee Jansen highlighted third graders' dedication, emphasizing their foundational role. Trustee Burns expressed inspiration from student efforts, linking them to district recovery, and Trustee Dickerson underscored the importance of recognizing student voices. Trustee Dickerson praised the SBAC efforts, calling them a testament to student diligence and teacher support.

5. Consent Items

Trustee Jansen moved to approve consent items, including accounts payable vouchers (5B), seconded by Trustee Dickerson.

Public Comment: No comments were received.

Vote: Unanimous in favor of adopting Consent Items.

Final 2024-25 Budget Amendments and Augmentations

Key Highlights: The district is grappling with a dire fiscal crisis, facing a \$4 million deficit in the new fiscal year, driven by a 170-student enrollment decline resulting in a \$2.6 million revenue loss, unreimbursed special education costs, and unadjusted overspending from prior years. District Business Manager Sue Estes warned that budget projections may have been overstated, as expenditures exceeded planned reductions, placing the district in a corrective action status with the Nevada Department of Education and at severe risk of financial collapse pending the December 2025 audit's outcome. Estes highlighted that the district's failure to reduce staff positions as planned before the school year, compounded by a mass administrative exodus, left the district unable to adapt to declining enrollment, with no other Nevada district facing a comparable 4.75% enrollment drop. The unexpected requirement to treat SB 231 funds (now SB 500) as a separate grant, necessitating \$1.2 million in budget adjustments, further strained resources, threatening employee salaries and program continuity. Additionally, Estes noted that the district's inability to meet the 5% hold harmless threshold for state funding exacerbated the crisis, as the state denied relief due to the district's 4.75% enrollment decline, unlike other districts with losses around 3–3.15%. The high cost of substitute teachers, with 400 timesheets processed per payday and \$200,000 over budget, further strained finances, driven by post-COVID attendance issues and a lack of proactive staff flexing. Estes emphasized that without significant reductions or new revenue sources, the district faces potential insolvency, with critical decisions deferred until the audit clarifies the full extent of the shortfall.

Trustee Comments:

- **Trustee Burns:** Expressed profound shock at being unaware of the 2023 shortfall during his presidency, revealing past communication failures. He pressed Estes for clarity on timing, noting \$4 million losses in prior years and demanding accountability for previous oversights.
- **Trustee Miller:** Proposed using teachers to cover classes instead of substitutes to cut costs, a suggestion Estes countered would still incur expenses. Miller pushed for creative solutions, expressing impatience with the district's reactive approach and urging proactive planning to mitigate employee impacts.
- **Trustee Wagstaff:** Sought audit timeline details, ensuring deadlines were clear (December 2025). Her questions were measured, aiming to anchor the discussion in actionable steps.
- **Trustee Jansen:** Questioned enrollment trends, linking declines to economic factors like high living costs reducing kindergarten enrollment. She advocated for long-term planning, expressing concern about the district's sustainability.
- **Trustee Dickerson:** Supported lobbying to adjust the 5% hold harmless threshold, aligning with Estes' suggestion. She emphasized collaboration with state officials to address systemic funding issues, showing a strategic mindset.

Public Comment: Comments were laden with frustration and urgency. One commenter urged regular budget updates, citing tracked enrollment declines and demanding transparency. Another noted drops in enrollment as being linked to social engineering and vaccine effects. A third suggested combining grades to address enrollment, drawing from historical practices, offering a practical but nostalgic solution. A bus driver criticized wasteful practices (e.g., discarded books

and furniture) and expressed financial strain from pay cuts, conveying a sense of betrayal and fear about job security. The collective tone was one of distrust, with commenters feeling sidelined by district decisions.

Votes: Unanimous in favor of adopting Resolution 25-01 (General Fund Amendment). Unanimous in favor of adopting Resolution 25-02 (Fund Augmentation).

Memorandum of Understanding with Washoe Tribe

Superintendent Alvarado, Chairman Smoky, and Megan Newman presented an MOU to support Native American students through tutoring, IEP/504 advocacy, and truancy interventions, requiring annual parental consent for compliance. An error in item 1B6 (termination without cause) was corrected to require negotiation, following legal counsel's advice.

Trustee Comments:

- **Trustee Dickerson:** Enthusiastically supported the MOU, praising its culturally relevant support for Native American students. She emphasized the importance of re-establishing tribal relationships, noting their potential to enhance student outcomes and expressing excitement about community collaboration.
- **Trustee Burns:** Highlighted disparities in test scores for Native American, African American, and Hispanic students, framing the MOU as a critical step toward equity
- **Trustee Wagstaff:** Expressed appreciation for the tribal representatives' presence, emphasizing partnership.
- **Trustee Jansen:** Asked detailed questions about services, such as tutoring locations and accessibility, showing a practical interest in implementation. She supported the MOU but urged clear communication with families to ensure effectiveness.
- **Trustee Gneiting:** Praised the MOU's legal compliance, noting the correction as a sign of diligence, and supported its student-centered approach.
- **Trustee Miller:** Voiced strong support but expressed concern about ensuring equitable access across all schools, questioning whether resources would reach underserved areas.

Public Comment: None received.

Vote: Unanimous in favor of adopting MOU with Washoe Tribe

MOU Tuition Agreement with Alpine County USD

The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Alpine County, approved during the Douglas County School District (DCSD) Board of Trustees meeting on June 26, 2025, formalizes a three-year tuition agreement for Alpine County students attending DCSD high schools, specifically Douglas High School (DHS). Superintendent Alvarado presented the MOU as a renewal of an existing agreement to provide educational services for Alpine County students attending DCSD high schools. The agreement sets tuition based on the district-wide average cost per student, calculated using Nevada's funding formula, which includes costs for instruction, facilities, and administration. Alvarado stated that the three-year term eliminates the need for annual negotiations, reducing administrative workload and ensuring consistent revenue for DCSD. The transcript confirms that the MOU continues a long-standing practice, as Alpine County lacks a local high school, requiring

its students to attend schools in neighboring districts. The agreement ensures these students receive educational services while DCSD is reimbursed for associated costs.

Trustee Comments:

- **Trustee Burns:** Sought confirmation that the agreement was a renewal, asking about past payment structures to ensure fiscal clarity.
- **Trustee Jansen:** Supported the MOU, noting its role in maintaining educational access for Alpine students.
- **Trustee Dickerson:** Echoed Jansen, emphasizing cross-district collaboration benefits.

Public Comment: None received.

Vote: Unanimous in favor of adopting MOU Tuition Agreement with Alpine County USD

MOU with Douglas County Parks and Recreation

Superintendent Keith Alvarado presented the MOU as a formal agreement to facilitate transportation of DCSD students to after-school programs, such as Kids Club, operated by the Douglas County Parks and Recreation Department. The agreement stipulates that DCSD buses will transport students from school sites to designated program locations, with the Parks and Recreation Department reimbursing DCSD based on a mileage rate for the transportation services provided. Alvarado emphasized that the MOU formalizes an existing practice, ensuring clear financial and logistical arrangements between the two entities. The agreement aims to enhance student access to extracurricular activities while leveraging DCSD's transportation resources, with reimbursement ensuring no net cost to the district. The MOU seeks to align with DCSD's broader goal of supporting student engagement through community partnerships, particularly critical given the district's fiscal challenges.

Trustee Comments:

- **Trustee Burns:** Inquired about bus logistics and reimbursement rates, ensuring fiscal and operational clarity.
- **Trustee Jansen:** Praised the collaboration, noting its value for student extracurricular access and community engagement. She pushed for clear communication with parents about program availability.
- **Trustee Wagstaff:** Emphasized the MOU's straightforward benefits.
- **Trustee Gneiting:** Supported the MOU, highlighting its alignment with district goals for student support.
- **Trustee Miller:** Expressed mild concern about bus driver workload, given pay cut discussions, but supported the agreement.
- **Trustee Dickerson:** Backed the MOU, noting its role in strengthening community ties.

Public Comment: None received.

Vote: Unanimous in favor of adopting MOU with Douglas County Parks and Recreation.

Dual Enrollment Program with UNR and TMCC

The MOU for the Dual Enrollment Program with the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) and Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC) establishes a framework for DCSD high school students, primarily at Douglas High School (DHS), to earn college credits through courses offered by these institutions. Superintendent Alvarado presented the MOU as a formalization of an existing partnership, enabling students to take college-level courses (e.g., general education subjects like English and math) either on UNR/TMCC campuses, online, or potentially at DHS, depending on scheduling and instructor availability. The program aligns with Nevada System of Higher Education standards, ensuring credits are transferable to most colleges. Alvarado highlighted a critical issue: only one or two students are currently enrolled, attributing low participation to limited awareness, potential tuition costs, or scheduling conflicts. The MOU clarifies administrative responsibilities, with DCSD handling student enrollment and coordination, and UNR/TMCC providing instructors and materials. The program is cost-neutral for DCSD, as tuition is covered by students, families, or scholarships, avoiding strain on the district's \$4 million deficit budget. Alvarado noted plans to collaborate with UNR/TMCC to boost participation through outreach, such as parent information sessions, to enhance college readiness and DCSD's academic reputation, a priority amid a 170-student enrollment decline.

Trustee Comments:

- **Trustee Burns:** Expressed significant disappointment with the low participation (one or two students), questioning Alvarado on barriers such as cost, awareness, or accessibility. He urged aggressive outreach, like parent sessions or assemblies, to boost enrollment, emphasizing the program's potential to prepare students for competitive colleges and address educational gaps.
- **Trustee Miller:** Clarified the program's distinction from Jump Start (a Western Nevada College initiative), ensuring policy accuracy. She supported Burns' promotion call, noting benefits for college-bound students, particularly underserved ones, and asked about current marketing efforts, suggesting counselor collaboration.
- **Trustee Wagstaff:** Encouraged Alvarado to address participation barriers. She suggested using newsletters or parent-teacher conferences to promote the program.
- **Trustee Gneiting:** Supported the program's college readiness potential but echoing Burns' concern about low enrollment. She asked about logistical barriers, like scheduling or transportation.
- **Trustee Jansen:** Backed the MOU, highlighting its role in advanced learning opportunities. She asked about course types (e.g., general education vs. specialized), ensuring alignment with student needs.
- **Trustee Dickerson:** Supported the MOU, noting its alignment with student success goals and community partnerships. She asked about scholarship availability for low-income students, emphasizing equity.

Public Comment: None received.

Vote: Unanimous in favor of adopting MOU with UNR and TMCC

Graduation Requirements Administrative Regulation (AR 513)

The discussion on Administrative Regulation (AR) 513, addressing graduation requirements, homework, and grading policies, was presented as an information-only item during the DCSD Board of Trustees meeting on June 26, 2025. Superintendent Keith Alvarado introduced the item, noting that AR 513 outlines the academic credits and standards required for high school graduation, as well as policies governing homework assignments and grading practices across DCSD schools. The regulation aligns with Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) to ensure compliance with state educational standards. A key focus of the discussion was the differing GPA weightings for courses taken at two-year (4.025) versus four-year (4.05) institutions, which raised questions about fairness and clarity in student evaluations. Alvarado acknowledged that the regulation requires further review to ensure alignment with NRS requirements, particularly regarding weighted GPA calculations for advanced courses. The discussion highlighted the need for clear, consistent grading policies to support student success, especially in the context of DCSD's broader challenges, including a 170-student enrollment decline and a \$4 million budget deficit. No action was taken, as the item was for discussion only, with Alvarado committing to clarify NRS requirements and report back to the Board.

Trustee Comments:

- **Trustee Burns:** Questioned the differing GPA weightings for two-year (4.025) versus four-year (4.05) institutions, expressing concern that the discrepancy could disadvantage students applying to competitive colleges. He pressed Alvarado for clarification on whether the weightings complied with NRS, emphasizing the need for fairness in how student achievements are evaluated. Burns' tone was insistent, reflecting his broader commitment to educational equity and ensuring policies support all students, particularly those from underserved backgrounds.
- **Trustee Miller:** Supported Burns' inquiry, raising concerns about potential student confusion caused by inconsistent GPA weightings. She asked whether the regulation clearly communicated expectations to students and parents, noting that unclear grading policies could undermine trust, especially given recent public frustration with educational outcomes. Miller's tone was critical, aligning with her focus on scrutinizing district practices to address systemic gaps.
- **Trustee Wagstaff:** Facilitated the discussion, ensuring focus on the regulation's implications for student success. She encouraged Alvarado to prioritize clarifying NRS requirements, emphasizing the need for regulatory compliance to avoid future disputes. Wagstaff's tone was measured, aiming to balance Burns' and Miller's concerns with a constructive approach.
- **Trustee Gneiting:** Backed Burns' call for clarity, stressing the importance of standardized grading policies to ensure equity across schools. She asked whether the regulation's current structure aligned with state expectations, expressing support for a thorough review to prevent discrepancies. Gneiting's tone was supportive but pragmatic, reflecting her focus on policy alignment.
- **Trustee Jansen:** Advocated for aligning AR 513 with NRS standards, noting that inconsistent weightings could create barriers for students seeking college admissions. She urged

Alvarado to expedite the review process, emphasizing the need for policies that support academic rigor and fairness. Jansen's tone was positive but firm, focusing on student-centered outcomes.

- **Trustee Dickerson:** Remained silent during the discussion but later indicated support for revising the regulation to ensure clarity and equity. She noted in follow-up comments that consistent grading policies are essential for maintaining community trust, aligning with her focus on stakeholder engagement.

Public Comment: None taken, as the item was for discussion only.

Vote: No vote was taken, as the item was discussion-only, with no formal action proposed.

Board Policy 437: Political Activities (First Reading)

Board Policy 437 (BP 437), presented as a first reading, establishes guidelines for employee conduct regarding political activities in DCSD classrooms, emphasizing impartiality to prevent bias in educational settings. Superintendent Alvarado introduced the policy, noting that it requires employees to distinguish personal views from instructional content, avoid using district resources for political advocacy, and foster critical thinking among students when discussing political topics. The policy aligns with Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) and aims to ensure a neutral learning environment, particularly in light of a reported classroom incident involving biased media exposure. Alvarado emphasized that the policy applies to all instructional staff, with site-level administrators responsible for enforcement to address violations promptly. The discussion highlighted concerns about consistent application across programs and the need for clear enforcement mechanisms, especially given DCSD's broader challenges. As a first reading, no action was taken, with further revisions planned before a second reading.

Trustee Comments:

- **Trustee Dickerson:** Expressed significant concern about a reported incident where a teacher exposed students to 30 minutes of biased news content, describing it as potential indoctrination. She pressed Alvarado for details on how the policy would ensure accountability, urging robust site-level oversight to prevent similar occurrences
- **Trustee Miller:** Inquired whether BP437 applied to Jump Start program teachers (a dual enrollment initiative with Western Nevada College), expressing skepticism about the policy's reach across all instructional settings. She asked Alvarado to clarify enforcement consistency, noting that unclear application could undermine the policy's effectiveness.
- **Trustee Jansen:** Praised the policy's clarity in balancing employee free speech with the need for neutrality, noting that it provided clear guidelines for teachers to foster critical thinking without imposing personal views.
- **Trustee Wagstaff:** Encouraged Alvarado to refine enforcement details for the second reading.
- **Trustee Burns:** Supported Dickerson's concern, emphasizing the need for strict oversight to prevent bias in classrooms. He linked the policy to his broader equity focus, arguing that biased instruction could disproportionately affect underserved students.

- **Trustee Gneiting:** Backed the policy, noting its alignment with legal requirements and its role in maintaining a neutral educational environment. She urged Alvarado to clarify enforcement mechanisms, particularly for addressing violations, to ensure consistency across schools.

Public Comment: None received.

Vote: No vote was taken, as the item was a first reading with no formal action proposed.

13. Homework Information (Discussion Only)

The homework information discussion focused on a survey of 83 middle and high school teachers, with 42 assigning homework, 95% graded for completion rather than accuracy. Assistant Director Peters presented the findings, noting that homework often extends classwork or supports absent students, with advanced placement (AP) and honors courses requiring more assignments due to rigorous content. The discussion was highly contentious, reflecting frustration over the district's slow progress since February 2025, when the Board directed administrators to address homework policies within Administrative Regulation (AR) 513. Administrators were visually agitated that the Board would attempt to give specific direction to teachers regarding homework instructions. Trustees debated the effectiveness of completion-based grading, its impact on learning, and the need for teacher collaboration to align expectations across grade levels. Peters acknowledged that grading for completion was common but raised concerns about its educational value, prompting calls for a task force or stronger implementation of AR 513. The discussion occurred amid DCSD's broader challenges, including a \$4 million budget deficit and a 170-student enrollment decline, which heightened scrutiny of educational practices. No action was taken. The homework policy is expected to begin review mid-fall.

Authors Note: The Board asked for a report regarding homework in February 2025. The significant delay in ascertaining this information has caused an inability to enforce new homework measures beginning 2025-2026 school year. It should be little wonder why the DCSD continues to see steep declines in enrollment, test scores, and student participation.

Trustee Comments:

- **Trustee Jansen:** Advocated strongly for teacher collaboration across grade levels to align homework expectations, arguing that inconsistent middle school preparation leads to high school academic gaps. She cited teacher feedback about unprepared students, expressing frustration with the lack of standardized practices, and urged a structured approach, such as a task force, to address the issue.
- **Trustee Miller:** Criticized completion-based grading, recounting parental feedback about students receiving high homework scores but failing tests, which she argued undermined learning. Drawing from her experience as a parent, she expressed exasperation with the district's reliance on completion metrics and demanded grading tied to mastery.
- **Trustee Burns:** Emphasized the need to address educational gaps, sharing an anecdote about teaching algebra to unprepared ninth graders due to inconsistent homework

practices. He argued for teacher-driven expectations, expressing frustration with systemic failures and urging immediate action to prevent further academic decline.

- **Trustee Wagstaff:** Directed Peters and Alvarado to discuss homework policies with administrators in July/August and report back in August, aiming to resolve delays since February. She demonstrated impatience with the slow progress and a desire to address trustee and public concerns promptly.
- **Trustee Gneiting:** Supported incorporating teacher voices in policy development, cautioning against top-down mandates that could alienate educators. She advocated for a task force to balance perspectives, noting that homework policies must consider student needs and parental feedback.
- **Trustee Dickerson:** Advocated for balanced homework policies, expressing concern about overburdening students with excessive assignments, particularly those with extracurricular commitments.
- **Olive Hamner-Jilson:** Provided a student perspective, noting that completion-based grading is appropriate for some assignments (e.g., AP practice tests) but less effective for others requiring mastery.

Public Comment: Comments reflected significant stakeholder frustration. One commenter supported ungraded homework followed by class discussions, arguing it fosters learning without penalizing errors, drawing from personal experience as a parent. Another demanded greater parental involvement in policy development, highlighting the burden of monitoring completion-based homework, especially for students with diverse learning needs, and expressed frustration at being sidelined by the district.

Vote: No vote was taken, as the item was discussion-only, with no formal action proposed.

Board Policy 551: Student Political Activities (First Reading)

Board Policy 551 (BP 551), presented as a first reading, establishes guidelines to support student political speech during non-instructional time, ensuring it does not disrupt the educational process or imply district endorsement. Superintendent Alvarado introduced the policy, noting its alignment with Board Policy 437 (employee political activities) and Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS), which protect student free speech while maintaining a neutral educational environment. The policy applies to activities such as student-led discussions, clubs, or events outside instructional hours, with clear boundaries to prevent classroom disruptions. Alvarado emphasized that the policy includes parent groups (e.g., PTA) to ensure community involvement, responding to concerns about stakeholder inclusion. The discussion focused on clarifying enforcement and ensuring inclusivity, particularly in light of recent public concerns about bias in schools (e.g., the BP 437 incident). As a first reading, no action was taken, with revisions planned to address trustee feedback before the second reading.

Trustee Comments:

- **Trustee Dickerson:** Confirmed the inclusion of parent groups like the PTA, seeking assurance that the policy fostered community involvement while protecting student rights.

She emphasized the importance of clear guidelines to prevent misinterpretation, reflecting her focus on stakeholder engagement

- **Trustee Wagstaff:** Invited student representative Olive Hamner-Jilson's perspective to incorporate youth input, though Olive declined to comment. Wagstaff emphasized the policy's student-centered focus, encouraging Alvarado to refine enforcement details for clarity.
- **Trustee Gneiting:** Supported the policy, noting its alignment with BP 437 and NRS requirements for legal compliance. She asked Alvarado about mechanisms to monitor student activities to ensure they remained non-disruptive, reflecting a pragmatic approach to implementation.
- **Trustee Jansen:** Backed the policy, highlighting its role in protecting student rights to express political views outside instructional time. She urged Alvarado to ensure clear communication with students and parents about permissible activities.
- **Trustee Burns:** Remained silent during the discussion but later indicated support, noting in follow-up comments that the policy aligned with his equity focus by ensuring all students could express their views safely.
- **Trustee Miller:** Expressed mild concern about enforcement clarity, questioning how the district would handle violations, such as disruptive student protests. She urged Alvarado to specify consequences in the policy, reflecting her broader scrutiny of policy details

Public Comment: None received.

Vote: No vote was taken, as the item was a first reading with no formal action proposed.

Board Policy 808: School Lunch (Second Reading)

Detailed Summary: Board Policy 808 (BP 808), presented for its second reading, revises guidelines for school lunch programs to align with current federal nutritional standards and accommodate high school lunchtime activities. Superintendent Alvarado introduced the policy, noting that it updates outdated references (e.g., Michelle Obama's MyPlate initiative) to comply with U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) requirements, ensuring healthy meal options while supporting student engagement during lunch periods. The policy addresses meal preparation, nutritional content, and scheduling to balance educational and extracurricular needs, particularly at high schools like Douglas High School (DHS). Alvarado confirmed that the revisions were reviewed by district nutrition staff to ensure compliance, with no additional costs to DCSD's \$4 million deficit budget, as federal funding covers meal programs. The discussion focused on verifying compliance and addressing concerns about restrictive food policies, with the policy ready for approval after incorporating prior feedback.

Trustee Comments:

- **Trustee Burns:** Questioned whether the policy relied on outdated guidelines, expressing concern that overly restrictive food policies (e.g., MyPlate's portion controls) could limit student meal options. He pressed Alvarado for confirmation that the revisions aligned with current USDA standards.

- **Trustee Jansen:** Supported the policy, praising its clarity in aligning with federal standards and ensuring nutritional quality for students. She noted the importance of balanced meals for academic performance, asking Alvarado about student feedback on meal options.
- **Trustee Wagstaff:** Encouraged swift approval, confirming that prior feedback from the first reading was incorporated.
- **Trustee Gneiting:** Backed the policy, emphasizing its alignment with USDA health goals and its support for student nutrition without budget impact. She asked about implementation timelines to ensure smooth adoption.
- **Trustee Dickerson:** Supported the policy, noting its role in promoting student well-being through healthy meals and structured lunch periods. She emphasized the community benefits of compliant meal programs.

Public Comment: None received.

Vote: Unanimous in favor of adopting BP 808.

Board Policy and AR 812: Cell Phones (Second Reading)

Board Policy and Administrative Regulation 812 (BP and AR 812), presented for their second reading, proposed suspending the district's provision of cell phones to administrators, saving approximately \$36,000 annually by transitioning to Google Voice on personal devices. Superintendent Alvarado and IT Director Jesse Bates presented the proposal, noting that Google Voice provides a cost-effective alternative for communication, with logs accessible for public records compliance. The policy addresses connectivity concerns, particularly in dead zones like parts of Douglas High School (DHS), by leveraging Wi-Fi networks, and includes provisions for recycling district-issued phones. Bates confirmed that Google Voice logs are discoverable without accessing personal devices, ensuring transparency. The discussion focused on fiscal savings, operational feasibility, and emergency reliability, critical given DCSD's \$4 million budget deficit and 170-student enrollment decline. The suspension was proposed to reduce costs without compromising communication, with prior staff feedback addressed from the first reading.

Trustee Comments:

- **Trustee Miller:** Raised concerns about connectivity in dead zones, particularly at DHS, questioning whether Wi-Fi reliance was sufficient for reliable communication. She also asked about plans for recycling district phones, expressing skepticism about the operational impact on administrators, especially given recent pay cut concerns.
- **Trustee Burns:** Sought clarification on how personal phones would integrate with Google Voice and ensure public records access, emphasizing transparency in light of the district's fiscal scrutiny. He supported the cost savings but pressed Bates on emergency reliability, citing potential safety risks in crisis situations.
- **Trustee Jansen:** Enthusiastically supported the fiscal benefits, noting that the \$36,000 savings aligned with the district's need to address its budget deficit. She praised the innovative use of Google Voice, asking about training for administrators to ensure smooth adoption.

- **Trustee Dickerson:** Emphasized the importance of public records compliance, expressing confidence in Google Voice's accessibility based on Bates' assurances. She asked about safeguards to protect administrator privacy, reflecting her focus on community trust and transparency.
- **Trustee Wagstaff:** Encouraged Bates to confirm implementation details.
- **Trustee Gneiting:** Backed the suspension, noting its fiscal prudence and technical feasibility in the context of budget constraints. She asked about the timeline for transitioning to Google Voice, emphasizing minimal disruption

Public Comment: Comments reflected cautious support mixed with concerns. One commenter endorsed the switch to Google Voice for cost savings but stressed that administrators must carry radios during emergencies, citing a past lockdown incident where cell service was unreliable. Another demanded guaranteed cellular access for emergencies, expressing distrust in Wi-Fi reliability, particularly in rural school areas. A third supported the policy's transparency, confirming that Google Voice logs ensure public records access, but urged careful implementation to avoid communication gaps. The tone was pragmatic but underscored worries about safety and reliability.

Vote: Unanimous in favor of suspending BP and AR 812.

Dual Credit Course Approval (Information Only)

The dual credit course approval discussion, presented as an information-only item, focused on proposed additions to the list of dual credit courses offered through partnerships with higher education institutions, requiring State Board of Education approval. Superintendent Keith Alvarado introduced the item, noting that the additions expand opportunities for DCSD high school students to earn college credits, primarily through existing agreements like the UNR/TMCC MOU. A specific course, "Making of a Murderer," raised concerns due to its provocative title, but Alvarado clarified it as a psychology course examining criminal behavior, not a sensationalized topic. The discussion emphasized aligning courses with student interests and college readiness goals, with no additional cost to DCSD's \$4 million deficit budget, as tuition is covered by students or scholarships. The need for streamlined state approval processes to ensure timely course offerings was made apparent, with trustees expressing support but raising concerns about course appropriateness and promotion, especially given low participation in similar programs (e.g., one or two students in the UNR/TMCC program).

Trustee Comments:

- **Trustee Burns:** Questioned the appropriateness of the "Making of a Murderer" course, expressing unease about its title and potential perception as unsuitable for high school students. He pressed Alvarado for justification, seeking assurance that the course was academically rigorous and not sensationalized.
- **Trustee Miller:** Supported the course additions, emphasizing their value for student advancement and college readiness. She echoed Burns' concern about the course title, urging better communication to avoid public backlash, and pushed for broader promotion to increase participation, referencing the low enrollment in the UNR/TMCC program.

- **Trustee Wagstaff:** Ensuring clarity on the course's academic nature. She asked Alvarado about the state approval process, emphasizing the need for efficiency to expand offerings.
- **Trustee Jansen:** Backed the course additions, noting their alignment with college readiness goals and student interests. She asked about the range of proposed courses, seeking assurance they met academic standards.
- **Trustee Gneiting:** Supported the program, emphasizing its potential to enhance student opportunities without budget impact. She asked about timelines for state approval, reflecting a pragmatic focus on implementation.

Public Comment: None received.

Vote: No vote was taken, as the item was information-only, with no formal action proposed.

Board Meeting Dates and Locations for 2025-26

Detailed Summary: The discussion on the 2025-26 board meeting schedule proposed a calendar of meeting dates and locations, with a potential reduction to 10 meetings by eliminating July 2026, as permitted by Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS). It was noted that the schedule maintains regular meetings to ensure public access while considering trustee workload. The transcript indicates a commitment to revisit the July 2026 elimination in January 2026 to assess scheduling conflicts and community feedback.

Trustee Comments:

- **Trustee Wagstaff:** Proposed reviewing the July 2026 elimination in January 2026, emphasizing flexibility to balance board workload and public access. She noted the importance of maintaining transparency, given community concerns about governance, and urged careful consideration of scheduling conflicts.
- **Trustee Burns:** Supported flexibility in the schedule, arguing that retaining the option for a July meeting prevents conflicts and maintains accessibility. He expressed concern about public perception of reduced meetings, referencing past governance critiques.
- **Trustee Jansen:** Noted the need to check scheduling conflicts, particularly for community engagement events like town halls, to ensure public participation. She supported the proposed schedule but urged proactive planning.
- **Trustee Gneiting:** Supported supporting its alignment with NRS and flexibility for future adjustments. She echoed Wagstaff's emphasis on revisiting the July elimination.
- **Trustee Miller:** Expressed mild skepticism about reducing meetings to 10, citing potential transparency concerns given public distrust in governance. She asked about mechanisms to ensure community input if meetings were cut.
- **Trustee Dickerson:** Backed the schedule, noting its compliance with NRS and support for public access through hybrid formats. She emphasized the importance of community engagement.

Public Comment: One commenter recommended checking scheduling conflicts before reducing meetings, expressing concern about limiting public access to board discussions, particularly amid fiscal and governance controversies.

Vote: Unanimous in favor of adopting the 2025-26 meeting schedule.

Student Representative Report

The student representative report was delivered by Olive Hamner-Jilson, who highlighted key student achievements, including 400 high school graduates across DCSD schools, successful scholarship nights awarding funds to college-bound students, and a student-led thrift shop initiative to promote sustainability and community engagement. As her final meeting before attending Dartmouth College, Olive emphasized the importance of student voice in shaping district policies.

Approval of Prioritized Strategic Plan

The 2022-2027 Strategic Plan, revised and presented for approval on June 26, 2025, outlines actionable goals for student success, staff development, and community engagement. Superintendent Alvarado introduced the plan, noting that it was refined based on stakeholder input from a prior month's presentation. Alvarado asked if there were any questions. There were none. The board further declined for to receive another reading of the strategic plan. The discussion was brief, with trustees referencing the thorough prior presentation and expressing support for the plan's comprehensive approach.

Trustee Comments: None were given.

Public Comment: None received.

Vote: Unanimous in favor of adopting the 2022-2027 Strategic Plan.

NASBE Nomination and Possible Task Force

The NASBE (National Association of State Boards of Education) nomination discussion proposed forming a task force to nominate DCSD candidates for national recognition, citing past success with Cade Balagad's award. Trustees Wagstaff, Gneiting, and Dickerson, would identify staff or programs exemplifying excellence in education. The discussion focused on leveraging recognition to boost district morale and visibility. The task force aims to prepare nominations for NASBE's annual awards, with no immediate budget impact. Trustees expressed support for the initiative but raised concerns about workload and selection criteria, with no formal action taken as the item was discussion-only.

Trustee Comments: None given.

Public Comment: None taken, as the item was for discussion only.

Vote: No vote was taken, as the item was discussion-only, with no formal action proposed.

Board Reports

- **Trustee Miller:** Detailed her attendance at multiple events, including Carson Valley Middle School (CVMS) promotion ceremonies, Douglas High School (DHS) scholarship night, and a community concert, but struggled with specifics, requiring corrections for misstated details.
- **Trustee Jansen:** Highlighted the charm of kindergarten graduations, noting the joy of celebrating young students' milestones. She emphasized the events' role in fostering community connection.
- **Trustee Hayes:** Praised student communication skills at literacy fairs, noting their confidence as a district strength. She highlighted the events' role in showcasing academic progress..
- **Trustee Burns:** Expressed enjoyment of lake-area graduations, commending Superintendent Alvarado's speeches for inspiring students. He linked the events to student motivation and equity.
- **Trustee Wagstaff:** Noted her discussions with county commissioners about monthly highlights to promote DCSD's achievements, emphasizing community engagement and positive visibility. Her tone was strategic.
- **Trustee Gneiting:** Supported Wagstaff's focus, praising student achievements at graduations and concerts as evidence of DCSD's resilience. She noted the importance of board visibility.

Superintendent Evaluation Instrument and Job Description

The superintendent evaluation instrument and job description, presented for approval on June 26, 2025, were aligned by a board officer committee (Trustees Wagstaff, Gneiting, Dickerson) with Superintendent Keith Alvarado to ensure consistency with district goals. The instrument outlines five evaluation domains: Vision and Strategic Leadership, Management and Organizational Leadership, Collaboration with Families and Stakeholders, Ethics and Integrity, and Governance and Advocacy Leadership. The job description details responsibilities like strategic planning, fiscal management, and community. The discussion focused on the alignment process, rating terminology (e.g., "developing" vs. "effective"), and the need for broader board input, as the officer-led process limited full trustee involvement. The approval aimed to formalize the evaluation framework.

Trustee Comments:

- **Trustee Wagstaff:** Explained the alignment process, noting it was grounded in Dr. Gore's evaluation training and the job description. Noting the entire board was given an individual opportunity to provide input or raise questions.

Public Comment: One commenter criticized the lack of full board discussion, arguing that approving the instrument and evaluating back-to-back undermined transparency, creating procedural tension.

Vote: Unanimous in favor of adopting the evaluation instrument and job description.

Superintendent Evaluation

Detailed Summary: The superintendent evaluation assessed Superintendent Alvarado across five domains: Vision and Strategic Leadership (3.89, Highly Effective), Management and Organizational Leadership (4.0, Highly Effective), Collaboration with Families and Stakeholders (3.71, Highly Effective), Ethics and Integrity (4.64, Excellent), and Governance and Advocacy Leadership (4.4, Highly Effective). Trustee Wagstaff led the evaluation, with Trustee Gneiting compiling scores based on trustee assessments. The discussion highlighted Alvarado's strengths in transparency, community engagement, but also raised concerns about first-year challenges, including communication gaps and resource management. The evaluation was deferred to August for final approval.

Trustee Comments:

- **Trustee Wagstaff:** Rated Alvarado highly effective/excellent, praising his strategic leadership in aligning district goals and transparency in addressing fiscal challenges.
- **Trustee Burns:** Consistently rated Alvarado excellent/highly effective, lauding his oversight, transparency, and motivation of staff despite budget constraints. He challenged critics to identify ethical flaws, defending Alvarado's integrity.
- **Trustee Hayes:** Rated Alvarado excellent/highly effective, praising his collaboration with stakeholders and leadership in professional development initiatives. She highlighted his school visits as a strength.
- **Trustee Dickerson:** Rated Alvarado highly effective, commending his community engagement and presence at school events, though noting room for broader outreach to diverse stakeholders.
- **Trustee Jansen:** Rated Alvarado highly effective, highlighting his proactive leadership through school visits and training programs. She noted improvements in communication.
- **Trustee Miller:** Rated Alvarado effective/developing in instructional programs and resource management, citing first-year challenges like communication gaps from departments and the budget crisis.

Public Comment: One commenter criticized the evaluation timeline, arguing that limited board input and back-to-back approval with the instrument undermined transparency, intensifying procedural concerns. Another suggested adding elementary achievement metrics to future evaluations, offering a constructive critique amid broader distrust.

Vote: No vote was taken, as the evaluation was deferred to August for final approval.