



## **WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT COUNCIL ON FAMILY RESOURCE CENTERS**

Wednesday, November 28, 2018 at 6 p.m.  
WCSD Administrative Building  
425 E. 9<sup>th</sup> St., Board Room  
Reno, NV 89512

### **AGENDA**

#### **1. OPENING ITEMS**

- 1.01 Call to Order – 6:00 p.m., WCSD Administrative Building, 425 E. 9th St., Board Room, Reno, NV
- 1.02 Roll Call
- 1.03 Public Comment - Comments from the public are invited at this time on topics not specifically addressed elsewhere in the agenda. A "Citizen's Request to Speak" card should be filled out and submitted to the Recording Secretary before speaking during the Public Comment section. All persons are limited to 3 minutes per item. In accordance with Open Meeting Law and on the advice of legal counsel, the public body is discouraged from discussing and precluded from deliberating and/or acting on items raised by Public Comment which are not already on the agenda. The public body may impose reasonable content-neutral restrictions on public comment such as willfully disruptive comments that are irrelevant, repetitious, slanderous, offensive, inflammatory, irrational, or amounting to personal attacks or interfering with the rights of other speakers. Correspondence or written materials submitted for public comment by the general public shall be attached to the minutes of the meeting.

#### **2. DISCUSSION, PRESENTATION AND ACTION ITEMS** - Public comment: any individual may address the public body concerning any item listed below. A completed "Citizen's Right to Speak" card must be submitted to the public body at the meeting. During the discussion of each item on the agenda, the Chair will invite the individual to come forward to speak. Individuals are limited to three minutes per item.

- 2.01 ACTION TO ADOPT THE AGENDA (For Possible Action) – Items on this agenda may be taken out of order; the public body may combine two or more agenda items for consideration; and the public body may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time.
- 2.02 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL ON FAMILY RESOURCE CENTERS DATED AUGUST 22, 2018 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)
- 2.03 DISCUSSION OF THE MISSION AND PURPOSE OF THE COUNCIL ON FAMILY RESOURCE CENTERS, AS STATED WITHIN THE COUNCIL BYLAWS AND DEFINED BY NEVADA REVISED STATUTES (NRS) 430a.140, AND THE ROLE OF THE COUNCIL MEMBERS IN REACHING THOSE GOALS. (FOR DISCUSSION ONLY)
- 2.04 DISCUSSION OF WAYS IN WHICH THE WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT FAMILY RESOURCE CENTERS CAN INCREASE VISIBILITY WITHIN THE

COMMUNITY, TO INCLUDE WAYS TO SEEK ADDITIONAL FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES (FOR DISCUSSION ONLY)

- 2.05 PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FAMILY RESOURCE CENTER YEAR-TO-DATE DATA AND OUTREACH EVENTS, INCLUDING FUTURE COMMUNITY EVENTS THAT COUNCIL MEMBERS MAY ATTEND (FOR DISCUSSION ONLY)
- 2.06 PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FAMILY RESOURCE CENTER PARENTING PROGRAMS - APPLE SEEDS AND PARENTING WISELY (FOR DISCUSSION ONLY)

**3. CLOSING ITEMS**

- 3.01 Announcement of Next Meetings – February 27, 2019, and May 22, 2019. Location to be determined.
- 3.02 Public Comment - Comments from the public are invited at this time on topics not specifically addressed elsewhere in the agenda. A "Citizen's Request to Speak" card should be filled out and submitted to the Recording Secretary before speaking during the Public Comment section. All persons are limited to 3 minutes per item. In accordance with Open Meeting Law and on the advice of legal counsel, the public body is discouraged from discussing and precluded from deliberating and/or acting on items raised by Public Comment which are not already on the agenda. The public body may impose reasonable content-neutral restrictions on public comment such as willfully disruptive comments that are irrelevant, repetitious, slanderous, offensive, inflammatory, irrational, or amounting to personal attacks or interfering with the rights of other speakers. Correspondence or written materials submitted for public comment by the general public shall be attached to the minutes of the meeting.
- 3.03 Adjourn Meeting

Forum Restrictions and Orderly Conduct of Business: This public body conducts the business of the Washoe County School District during its meetings. The presiding officer may order the removal of any person whose statement or other conduct disrupts the orderly, efficient or safe conduct of the meeting. Warnings against disruptive comments or behavior may or may not be given prior to removal. The viewpoint of a speaker will not be restricted, but reasonable restrictions may be imposed upon the time, place and manner of speech. Irrelevant and unduly repetitious statements and personal attacks which antagonize or incite others are examples of speech that may be reasonably limited.

Members of the public wishing to request supporting materials for this meeting or who are disabled and require special accommodations at the meeting should contact Lisa Scurry, Board Services Department. Ms. Scurry can be contacted in writing at PO Box 30425, Reno, Nevada 89520-3425, by telephone at 775-789-4621, or by email at [committees@washoeschools.net](mailto:committees@washoeschools.net).

This agenda and supporting materials, when appropriate, have been posted at the following locations:

[www.washoeschools.net](http://www.washoeschools.net)

[www.boarddocs.com/nv/washoe/Board.nsf/Public](http://www.boarddocs.com/nv/washoe/Board.nsf/Public)

State of Nevada website (notice.nv.gov)

WCSD Central Administrative Building

Washoe County Administration Building

Washoe County Courthouse

Reno City Hall

Sparks City Hall

Sparks Library

Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe Administration Building

Reno Sparks Indian Colony Administrative Office

**MINUTES OF THE  
WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT (WCSD)  
OTHER POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS (OPEB)  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING  
Thursday, August 30, 2018**

**1.01 CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting of the Washoe County School District Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Board of Trustees was called to order on Tuesday, August 30, 2018 at 1:03pm in the Board Room located at 425 E. 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Reno NV 89512

**1.02 ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Chairman Mark Mathers, Danny Kitts

ABSENT: Tom Marshall

**1.03 PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**1.04 On Motion by Danny Kitts, second by Mark Mathers, the OPEB Trustees Committee approved the agenda as presented** (Yea: Mark Mathers, Danny Kitts). Final Resolution: Motion Carries 2-0

**2. DISCUSSION, PRESENTATION AND ACTION ITEMS**

**2.01** APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE OPEB TRUSTEES MEETING ON JUNE 13, 2018.

**On motion by Danny Kitts, second by Mark Mathers, the OPEB Trustee Committee approved the minutes of June 13, 2018 as presented** (Yea: Mark Mathers, Danny Kitts). Final Resolution: Motion Carries 2-0

**2.02** DISCUSSION OF OPEB TRUST FUND FY2018 FOURTH QUARTER FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (For Discussion Only)

Robert Carson led the discussion.

Comparative financial statements from June 30, 2018 and June 30, 2017 were presented, showing a decrease of \$4 million versus this time last year. The decrease was due to the retiree expenses and the earnings were not quite as good as last year.

The income statement shows realized gains of \$1.3 million and unrealized gains of \$3.6 million year to date, with total revenues of just under \$5 million versus \$7 million last year, which accounts for the decrease in the fund balance.

The summary of the RBIF account shows net assets of \$58 million in June, with minimal gains with a realized gain of \$73K. Increase in total assets of \$33K in June.

**2.03** DISCUSSION OF THE QUARTERLY PUBLIC EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT SYSTEM ("PERS") RETIREMENT BENEFITS INVESTMENT FUND ("RBIF") REPORT, FOR THE PERIOD ENDED JUNE 30, 2018 (For Discussion Only)

Robert Carson led the discussion.

The market return on the S&P index was over 14%. The market return on International Stocks was 7% netting out to 8.3% market return.

**2.04** ANNUAL AFFIRMATION BASED ON THE OPEB TRUST AGREEMENT THAT INVESTMENT INCOME EARNED BY WCSO OPEB TRUST FUND FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2018 WILL BE USED FOR THE PAYMENT OF FUTURE BENEFITS OF THE TRUST (For Possible Action)

Robert Carson led the discussion, explaining that the corpus and the interest must stay with the trust according to article 4.5 of the OPEB Trust Agreement.

**On motion by Danny Kitts, second by Mark Mathers, the OPEB committee that all future income will be used for the payment of future benefits of the trust** (Yea: Mark Mathers Danny Kitts). Final Resolution: Motions carries 2-0.

**3. CLOSING ITEMS**

**3.01** Announcement of Next Meeting: November 29, 2018

**3.02** No public comments

**3.03** Meeting adjourned 1:10 pm

**ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT**  
**of the**  
**RETIREMENT BENEFITS INVESTMENT FUND**  
(a Component Unit of the State of Nevada)

For the Fiscal Year Ended  
June 30, 2018

## Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Independent Auditor’s Report .....	3
Management’s Discussion and Analysis .....	5
Financial Statements:	
Statement of Net Position .....	8
Statement of Changes in Net Position .....	9
Notes to Financial Statements .....	10
Supplementary Information:	
Participating Entities as of June 30, 2018 .....	20

*Casey Neilson*  
**Accountants and Advisors**

**INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT**

To the Retirement Benefits Investment Board  
Carson City, Nevada

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the Retirement Benefits Investment Fund, a component unit of the State of Nevada, as of and for the year ended June 30, 2018, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the Retirement Benefits Investment Fund's basic financial statements as listed in the table of contents.

**Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements**

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America; this includes the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

**Auditor's Responsibility**

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor's judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the entity's preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion.

**Opinion**

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Retirement Benefits Investment Fund of the State of Nevada, as of June 30, 2018, and the changes in financial position for the year then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.



## **Other Matters**

### *Report on Summarized Comparative Information*

We also have previously audited, in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, the Retirement Benefits Investment Fund's basic financial statements for the year ended June 30, 2017, which are not presented with the accompanying financial statements of the component unit and we expressed an unmodified opinion on the financial statements. That audit was conducted for the purpose of forming an opinion on the financial statements that collectively comprise the Retirement Benefits Investment Fund's basic financial statements as a whole. In our opinion, the summarized comparative information presented herein as of and for the year ended June 30, 2017, is consistent, in all material respects, with the audited financial statements from which it has been derived.

### *Required Supplementary Information*

Accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America require that management's discussion and analysis on pages 5 through 7 be presented to supplement the basic financial statements. Such information, although not part of the basic financial statements, is required by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, who considers it to be an essential part of financial reporting for placing the basic financial statements in an appropriate operational, economic, or historical context. We have applied certain limited procedures to the required supplementary information in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, which consisted of inquiries of management about the methods of preparing the information and comparing the information for consistency with management's responses to our inquiries, the basic financial statements, and other knowledge we obtained during our audit of the basic financial statements. We do not express an opinion or provide any assurance on the information because the limited procedures do not provide us with sufficient evidence to express an opinion or provide any assurance.

## **Other Information**

Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming an opinion on the financial statements that collectively comprise the Retirement Benefits Investment Fund, State of Nevada's basic financial statements. The supplementary schedule of participating entities on pages 20-21 is presented for purposes of additional analysis and is not a required part of the basic financial statements.

The supplementary schedule is the responsibility of management and was derived from and relates directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements and certain additional procedures, including comparing and reconciling such information directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements or to the basic financial statements themselves, and other additional procedures in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. In our opinion, the supplementary schedule of participating entities is fairly stated, in all material respects, in relation to the basic financial statements as a whole.

The supplementary schedule of participating entities has not been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements and, accordingly, we do not express an opinion or provide any assurance on it.

*Casey Neilson*

Carson City, Nevada

October 11, 2018

RETIREMENT BENEFITS INVESTMENT FUND  
2018 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

---

**MANAGEMENT’S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS**

This Management’s Discussion and Analysis (MD&A) of the financial performance of the Retirement Benefits Investment Fund (RBIF or Fund) provides an overview of the Fund’s financial activities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2018. The MD&A is designed to focus on the current year’s activities, resulting changes, and currently known facts. Readers are encouraged to consider the information presented in conjunction with the financial statements as a whole, which follow the MD&A.

RBIF was created during the 2007 Legislative Session, was effective July 1, 2007, and received its first investment contribution in January 2008. The purpose of the Fund is to invest contributions made by participating entities to support financing of other post employment benefits at some time in the future. Monies received by the Fund from participating entities are not held in a fiduciary capacity. At June 30, 2018, there were twelve participating entities: Public Employees’ Benefits Program of Nevada, Washoe County School District, Truckee Meadows Water Authority, Washoe County, City of Las Vegas, Tahoe Douglas Fire Protection District, Clark County, City of Reno, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, Truckee Meadows OPEB Trust, North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District, and Carson City OPEB Trust.

**Overview of Financial Statements**

The basic financial statements consist of: the Statement of Net Position, the Statement of Changes in Net Position, and the Notes to the Financial Statements.

The **Statement of Net Position** includes all of the Fund’s assets, liabilities, and the net position at the end of the fiscal year.

The **Statement of Changes in Net Position** reports additions to and deductions from the Fund during the fiscal year presented. Over time the increase or decrease in net position serves as a useful indicator of the health of the Fund’s financial position.

The **Notes to the Financial Statements** provide additional information that is required by generally accepted accounting principles.

**Financial Highlights**

- Total contributions were \$14,061,024 during fiscal year 2018, a decrease of 31.4% from fiscal year 2017.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS INVESTMENT FUND  
2018 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

---

**MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS**

- There were distributions of \$8,466,166 in fiscal year 2018 as compared to \$6,500,000 in fiscal year 2017.
- Net investment gain was \$34,992,776 during fiscal year 2018, as compared to a gain of \$44,856,531 during fiscal year 2017.
- Total investments at fair value as of June 30, 2018, were \$454,796,793, an increase of 9.1% from fiscal year 2017.

**Financial Analysis**

The following are summary comparative statements of the Fund:

**CONDENSED STATEMENTS OF NET POSITION**

	As of <u>June 30, 2018</u>	As of <u>June 30, 2017</u>	Increase/ (Decrease) from 2017 to 2018	Percentage Increase/ (Decrease) from 2017 to 2018
Cash and cash equivalents	\$ 2,892,549	\$ 4,905,090	\$ (2,012,541)	(41.0) %
Receivables	4,111,656	4,713,384	(601,728)	(12.8)
Investments, at fair value	<u>454,796,793</u>	<u>416,719,709</u>	<u>38,077,084</u>	9.1
Total assets	<u>461,800,998</u>	<u>426,338,183</u>	<u>35,462,815</u>	8.3
Accounts payable and accrued expenses	36,176	32,015	4,161	13.0
Pending trades payable	<u>2,848,233</u>	<u>7,933,697</u>	<u>(5,085,464)</u>	(64.1)
Total liabilities	<u>2,884,409</u>	<u>7,965,712</u>	<u>(5,081,303)</u>	(63.8)
Net position held in fund	<u>\$ 458,916,589</u>	<u>\$ 418,372,471</u>	<u>\$ 40,544,118</u>	9.7 %

RETIREMENT BENEFITS INVESTMENT FUND  
2018 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

**MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS**

**CONDENSED STATEMENTS OF CHANGES IN NET POSITION**

	<u>As of</u> <u>June 30, 2018</u>	<u>As of</u> <u>June 30, 2017</u>	<u>Increase/ (Decrease) from 2017 to 2018</u>	<u>Percentage Increase/ (Decrease) from 2017 to 2018</u>
<b>ADDITIONS</b>				
Contributions	\$ 14,061,024	\$ 20,507,320	\$ (6,446,296)	(31.4) %
Net investment gain	34,992,776	44,856,531	(9,863,755)	(22.0)
Other income	164	304	(140)	(46.1)
Total additions	<u>49,053,964</u>	<u>65,364,155</u>	<u>(16,310,191)</u>	(25.0)
<b>DEDUCTIONS</b>				
Distributions	8,466,166	6,500,000	1,966,166	30.2
Administrative expense	43,680	42,512	1,168	2.7
Total deductions	<u>8,509,846</u>	<u>6,542,512</u>	<u>1,967,334</u>	30.1
Change in net position	40,544,118	58,821,643	(18,277,525)	(31.1)
Net position, beginning of year	<u>418,372,471</u>	<u>359,550,828</u>	<u>58,821,643</u>	16.4
Net position, end of year	<u>\$ 458,916,589</u>	<u>\$ 418,372,471</u>	<u>\$ 40,544,118</u>	9.7 %

The net position increased by \$40.5 million during fiscal year 2018. This can be attributed primarily to three items: contributions of \$14.1 million, a net investment gain of \$35.0 million, and distributions of \$8.5 million.

In 2018 the Fund experienced an investment gain of \$35.0 million compared to \$44.9 million in 2017. The Fund generated a 8.35% return (gross of fees) for fiscal year 2018 compared to a 12.33% return for fiscal year 2017. Since inception (2008) the Fund has generated an annualized return (gross of fees) of 6.36%.

**RETIREMENT BENEFITS INVESTMENT FUND**  
**2018 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT**

---

**STATEMENT OF NET POSITION**

June 30, 2018

(With Comparative Totals for June 30, 2017)

	<u>2018</u>	<u>2017</u>
<b>ASSETS</b>		
Cash and cash equivalents	\$ 2,892,549	\$ 4,905,090
Receivables		
Accrued investment income	1,597,695	1,139,939
Pending trades receivable	2,513,961	3,573,445
Total receivables	<u>4,111,656</u>	<u>4,713,384</u>
Investments, at fair value:		
U.S. bonds	129,306,528	108,472,759
U.S. stocks	223,867,699	212,210,903
International stocks	101,622,566	96,036,047
Total investments	<u>454,796,793</u>	<u>416,719,709</u>
Total assets	<u>461,800,998</u>	<u>426,338,183</u>
<b>LIABILITIES</b>		
Accounts payable and accrued expenses	20,093	18,019
Management fees payable	16,083	13,996
Pending trades payable	2,848,233	7,933,697
Total liabilities	<u>2,884,409</u>	<u>7,965,712</u>
<b>NET POSITION</b>		
Net position held in fund	\$ <u>458,916,589</u>	\$ <u>418,372,471</u>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS INVESTMENT FUND  
2018 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

---

**STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN NET POSITION**

For the Year Ended June 30, 2018

(With Comparative Totals for the Year Ended June 30, 2017)

	<b>2018</b>	<b>2017</b>
<b>ADDITIONS</b>		
Contributions from participating entities	\$ 14,061,024	\$ 20,507,320
Investment income:		
Net appreciation in fair value of investments	24,958,551	35,973,616
Interest and dividend income	10,098,438	8,938,204
	35,056,989	44,911,820
Less investment expense	64,213	55,289
	34,992,776	44,856,531
Total net investment gain		
Other income:		
Other income	164	304
Total other income	164	304
	49,053,964	65,364,155
<b>DEDUCTIONS</b>		
Distributions to participating entities	8,466,166	6,500,000
Other expenses	43,680	42,512
	8,509,846	6,542,512
Total deductions		
<b>CHANGE IN NET POSITION</b>	40,544,118	58,821,643
<b>NET POSITION HELD IN FUND:</b>		
Beginning of year	418,372,471	359,550,828
End of year	\$ 458,916,589	\$ 418,372,471

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS INVESTMENT FUND  
2018 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

---

**NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

**NOTE 1 – Summary of Significant Accounting Policies and Fund Asset Matters**

Financial Reporting Entity

The Retirement Benefits Investment Fund (RBIF) is governed by a seven-member Board. The Board consists of the members of the Public Employees' Retirement Board ex officio and serve without any additional compensation.

The Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2018, consisted of the following members:

Mark R. Vincent	Chair	2018
Katherine Ong	Vice Chair	2019
Lee-Ann Easton	Member	2021
Scott Gorgon	Member	2019
Yolanda T. King	Member	2021
Timothy M. Ross	Member	2022
Brian A. Wallace	Member	2021

Terms expire on June 30 of the year noted.

Board members remain on the Board until they have been replaced or reappointed.

The Fund has developed criteria in accordance with standards issued by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) to determine whether participating state or public agencies, boards, and commissions should be included within its financial reporting entity as component units. A component unit is defined as a legally separate organization for which officials of the Fund are financially accountable. In addition, component units can be other organizations for which the nature and significance of their relationship with the Fund are such that exclusion would cause the Fund's financial statements to be misleading or incomplete.

In accordance with GASB, the following criteria are used when evaluating financial accountability: the ability of the Fund to appoint a voting majority of the organization's governing body and (1) the ability to impose its will on the other organization, or (2) the potential for the organization to provide specific financial benefits to or impose specific financial burdens on the Fund. In addition, RBIF may be financially accountable if an organization is fiscally dependent on the Fund regardless of whether the organization has a separately elected governing board, a governing board appointed by a higher level of government, or a jointly appointed board.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS INVESTMENT FUND  
2018 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

---

**NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

RBIF has no relationship with another entity that meets the above criteria and has not included any other entity as a component unit of its financial reporting entity.

RBIF is classified as a component unit of the State of Nevada for financial reporting purposes in accordance with the provisions of GASB.

Basis of Accounting

The accompanying financial statements of RBIF have been prepared in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) in the United States of America. RBIF has adopted the pronouncements of GASB, which is the accepted standard-setting body for establishing governmental accounting and financial reporting principles.

The Fund uses the economic resources measurement focus and the accrual basis of accounting. Revenues are recorded in the accounting period in which they are earned and become measurable. Expenses are recorded when the corresponding liabilities are incurred, regardless of when payment is made.

Financial Statement Presentation

Comparative data shown for the prior year has been extracted from the June 30, 2017, audited financial statements and has been presented to facilitate financial analysis but is not considered full disclosure of transactions for that year.

Fund Oversight

The Fund was established per NRS 355.220 and is administered by the Retirement Benefits Investment Board (RBIB or Board). An annual financial report, which includes the independent auditor's opinion, is presented to and accepted by RBIB. RBIF is not registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) as an investment company, nor is it so required, as it is a public fund.

Cash and Cash Equivalents

Cash and cash equivalents include both operating cash on deposit with our commercial bank and cash on deposit with our custodial bank. Cash on deposit at our custodial bank includes investments in Invesco Treasury Portfolio Short-Term Investments Trust. This fund invests in short-term, high credit quality money market instruments. These instruments are direct obligations of the U.S. Treasury and repurchase agreements backed by Treasury obligations.



RETIREMENT BENEFITS INVESTMENT FUND  
2018 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

---

**NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

Investments

The Board serves as the administrator of the Fund. RBIF's assets are managed in accordance with RBIF's investment objectives and policies. In general, the authorized investments include: U.S. bonds, U.S. and international stocks, money market funds, and cash equivalents (other short-term investments).

Realized gains and losses on securities are calculated by subtracting the security cost from the price of the asset at the point of sale. The calculation of realized gains and losses is independent of the calculation of the net change in the fair value of the investments (unrealized gains/losses). Unrealized gains and losses are calculated by subtracting the cost of the security from the fair value of the asset. Realized gains and losses on investments are included as a net change in the fair value of the investments in the year they are sold.

Earned Income and Expenses

RBIF is designed to value participants' shares in the Fund according to the contributions of each entity. Specifically, on a pro-rata basis for each entity's participation, RBIF allocates earnings (which include realized and unrealized gain or loss, interest, and other income) and expenses (both administrative and investment) to each entity according to their proportional share in the Fund. As of June 30, 2018, twelve entities participated in the Fund. A schedule of participating entities is reported in the Supplementary Information section of this report.

**NOTE 2 – Fund Description**

History and Purpose

The Nevada Legislature established the Fund with an effective date of July 1, 2007. The purpose of the Fund is to invest contributions made by participating entities, as defined in Section 355.220 of the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS), to enable such entities to support financing of other post employment benefits at some time in the future. Per NRS 355.220(2) monies received by RBIF from participating entities are held for investment purposes only and not in any fiduciary capacity. Each participating entity acts as fiduciary for its particular share of the Fund.

Contributions

Contributions received by the Fund are for investment purposes only and are not held in any fiduciary capacity by RBIF. Any money in the Fund must be invested in the same manner as money in the Public Employees' Retirement System of Nevada (PERS) Investment Fund is invested.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS INVESTMENT FUND  
2018 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

---

**NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

To enable maximum investment return and consistent reporting on such, participating entities are required to provide advance notification to RBIF of the amount of contributions or distributions the entity wishes to make during any given month. RBIF has no direction or control over amounts the participating entities choose to contribute or distribute.

**NOTE 3 – Deposit and Investment Risk Disclosures**

NRS 355.220(2) requires that any money in the Fund must be invested in the same manner as money in the PERS Investment Fund is invested. The PERS Investment Fund is governed primarily by the “prudent person” standard. The prudent person standard, as set forth by NRS 286.682, authorizes the Retirement Board to invest PERS’ funds in “every kind of investment which persons of prudence, discretion, and intelligence acquire or retain for their own account.”

Given the Fund’s significantly smaller size than the PERS Investment Fund, there are differences in structure between the two portfolios. However, both portfolios maintain a similar statistical return and risk profile.

Investment Policy

The Fund’s policies\* which determine the investment portfolio target asset allocation are established by the Board. The asset allocation is reviewed annually and is designed to meet the future risk and return needs of the System. The following was the Board’s adopted policy target asset allocation as of June 30, 2018:

<u>Asset Class</u>	<u>Target Allocation</u>
U.S. stocks	49%
International stocks	21
U.S. bonds	30
Total	<u>100%</u>

\*RBIF’s current Investment Objectives and Policies may be found on the PERS website [www.nvpers.org](http://www.nvpers.org).

Rate of Return

For the year ended June 30, 2018, the annual money-weighted rate of return on investments was 8.33%. The money-weighted rate of return expresses investment performance adjusted for the changing amounts actually invested.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS INVESTMENT FUND  
2018 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

**NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

The majority of the Fund's investments are held by the Depository Trust Company (DTC) in DTC's nominee name, and trading is conducted through DTC's book-entry system. The holder of record for the Fund is The Bank of New York Mellon (BNYM).

A summary of investments as of June 30, 2018, is as follows:

<u>Investment Type</u>	<u>Par Value/ No. of Shares</u>	<u>Maturity Date Range</u>	<u>Interest Rate Range</u>	<u>Fair Value at June 30, 2018</u>
Cash and cash equivalents				
Commercial bank				\$ 5,932
Custodial bank				193,479
Short-term treasuries*	2,693,138	8/2018		<u>2,693,138</u>
Total cash and cash equivalents				<u>\$ 2,892,549</u>
Investments				
U.S. bonds	131,007,000	7/2019 to 5/2048	1.000% to 8.125%	\$ 129,306,528
U.S. and International stocks	10,089,154			<u>325,490,265</u>
Total investments				<u>\$ 454,796,793</u>

\*Short-term treasuries include \$2,693,138 investment in Invesco Treasury Portfolio Short-Term Investments Trust.

Custodial Credit Risk – Deposits

*Custodial credit risk for deposits* is the risk that, in the event of the failure of its depository financial institution, the Fund will not be able to recover its deposits.

At June 30, 2018, the carrying amount of the Fund's commercial cash deposits and commercial bank balance was \$5,932. The bank balance was fully insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC). Amounts reported as cash and cash equivalents on the accompanying statement of net position also include \$193,479 of amounts held in custodial accounts by BNYM, as well as \$2,693,138 of short-term treasuries at June 30, 2018. The commercial bank balance is, according to a depository pledge agreement between the Fund and the Fund's commercial bank, collateralized at 102% of the collected funds on deposit (increased by the amount of accrued but uncredited interest, reduced by deposits covered by FDIC). These collateral securities are held by the Fund's agent in the Fund's name.

Custodial cash is swept nightly from the custodial bank to an overnight short-term investment fund held outside the bank. Monies arriving at the bank after the overnight sweep deadline are part of the custodial bank cash reserve and are covered up to the FDIC limit of \$250,000. Any amount in the cash reserve in excess of \$250,000 is subject to custodial credit risk.

## NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The custodial bank also carries insurance covering destruction of cash or securities on or off premises (including securities or others held in custody) with a limit of \$850,000,000 per occurrence.

### Credit Risk - Investments

*Credit risk for investments* is the risk that an issuer or other counterparty will not fulfill its obligations to the Fund and *custodial credit risk for investments* is the risk that, in the event of the failure of the counterparty to a transaction, RBIF will not be able to recover the value of investment or collateral securities that are in the possession of an outside party.

RBIF policies provide protection from undue investment credit risk as follows:

- Direct obligations of the U.S. Treasury, including bills, notes, bonds, and repurchase agreements secured by those obligations.
- U.S. Treasury money market mutual funds that are SEC registered 2(a)-7 and AAA rated by at least two of Moody's, Standard & Poor's or Fitch whose investment guidelines are substantially equivalent to and consistent with the Fund's overall short-term investment criteria.
- Short selling and the use of leverage are not permitted

There is no credit risk assigned to U.S. Treasury securities as these are explicitly guaranteed by the U.S. Government. It is important to note, however, that the value of U.S. Treasury obligations fluctuate based on non-credit-related factors, such as interest-rate movements, which could cause future price declines despite government backing.

### Quality Rating

The Standard and Poor's (S & P) credit quality ratings of the Fund's investments in U.S. bonds as of June 30, 2018, have been provided by the Fund's custodial bank, The Bank of New York Mellon and are as follows:

Cash equivalents consist of \$2,693,138 investment in Invesco Treasury Portfolio Short-Term Investments Trust and are not rated. The Fund additionally holds \$129.3 million in treasury securities which are explicitly guaranteed by the U.S. Government.

*Concentration of credit risk* is the risk of loss attributed to the magnitude of the Fund's investment in a single issuer. No concentration of credit risk exists in the portfolio as RBIF policy requires 100% of the U.S. bond portfolio be invested in U.S. Treasury bonds.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS INVESTMENT FUND  
2018 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

---

**NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

Investment policy requires that the combined RBIF, Judicial, Legislators', and PERS' assets shall not permanently constitute more than 30% of any firm's assets within the asset class (equity, bonds, real estate, or alternative investments) managed. Staff shall provide an annual report of combined assets to the Board consistent with this policy.

*Interest rate risk* is the risk that changes in interest rates will adversely affect the fair value of an investment or a deposit. The Fund mitigates interest rate risk through portfolio diversification. The Fund's investment policy permits investment only in bonds within the Barclays U.S. Treasury Index.

The following table shows the fair value of U.S. bonds and the applicable investment maturities, as of June 30, 2018.

**INVESTMENT MATURITIES**

(in years)

<b>Investment Type</b> (in thousands)	<b>Less than 1</b>	<b>1 to 5</b>	<b>6 to 10</b>	<b>More than 10</b>	<b>Total</b>
Cash equivalents	\$ 2,693.2	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,693.2
U.S. treasuries	-	69,200.4	38,308.0	21,798.1	129,306.5
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$ 2,693.2</u>	<u>\$ 69,200.4</u>	<u>\$ 38,308.0</u>	<u>\$ 21,798.1</u>	<u>\$ 131,999.7</u>

*Foreign currency risk* is the risk that changes in exchange rates will adversely affect the fair value of an investment or a deposit. The Fund mitigates foreign currency risk through portfolio diversification as discussed previously. Foreign currency forward contracts (to hedge currency exposure) are not permitted.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS INVESTMENT FUND  
2018 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

---

**NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

The Fund's exposure to foreign currency risk in U.S. dollars as of June 30, 2018, is summarized in the following table.

**CURRENCY BY INVESTMENT AND FAIR VALUE**

<b>Currency Type</b>	<b>Equity</b>	<b>Cash</b>	<b>Total</b>
Australian Dollar	\$ 6,451,735	\$ 1,037	\$ 6,452,772
British Pound Sterling	16,693,626	10,938	16,704,564
Danish Krone	1,576,485	1,945	1,578,430
Euro	30,127,722	40,117	30,167,839
Hong Kong Dollar	3,016,721	18,223	3,034,944
Israeli Shekel	258,205	756	258,961
Japanese Yen	22,397,773	109,336	22,507,109
New Zealand Dollar	175,302	762	176,064
Norwegian Krone	685,991	1,491	687,482
Singapore Dollar	1,138,445	4,775	1,143,220
Swedish Krona	2,397,882	1,747	2,399,629
Swiss Franc	7,321,008	1,022	7,322,030
Total	\$ <u>92,240,895</u>	\$ <u>192,149</u>	\$ <u>92,433,044</u>

*Derivatives*

RBIF held no derivatives in the portfolio as of June 30, 2018.

The Fund had no derivative transactions during the current fiscal year.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS INVESTMENT FUND  
2018 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

---

**NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

**NOTE 4 – Fair Value**

RBIF holds investments that are measured at fair value on a recurring basis. RBIF categorizes its fair value measurements within the fair value hierarchy established by generally accepted accounting principles. Investments measured and reported at fair value using Level inputs are classified and disclosed in one of the following categories:

Level 1 – Quoted prices are available in active markets for identical investments as of the reporting date. The types of investments included in Level 1 include U.S. Treasuries securities and listed stocks.

Level 2 – Quoted prices for similar instruments in active markets; quoted prices for identical or similar instruments in markets that are not active; and model-derived valuations in which all significant inputs and significant value drivers are observable.

Level 3 – Valuations derived from valuation techniques in which significant inputs or significant value drivers are unobservable.

The following table presents fair value measurements as of June 30, 2018 (in thousands):

	<u>6/30/2018</u>	<u>Level 1</u>	<u>Level 2</u>	<u>Level 3</u>	<u>Total</u>
U.S. Treasuries	\$ 129,307	\$ 129,307	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 129,307
Stocks	<u>325,490</u>	<u>325,490</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>\$ 325,490</u>
Total Investments by Fair Value Level	<u>\$ 454,797</u>	<u>\$ 454,797</u>	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ 454,797</u>

No securities measured at the net asset value (NAV).

Stocks and bonds classified in Level 1 of the fair value hierarchy are valued using prices quoted in active markets for those securities. All securities are classified in Level 1.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS INVESTMENT FUND  
2018 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

---

**NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

**NOTE 5 – Subsequent Events**

Management has evaluated subsequent events through October 11, 2018, the date on which the financial statements were available to be issued.

Mark R. Vincent served on the Board through August 8, 2018. Dawn Huckaby was appointed to the Board and will be serving from August 9, 2018, through June 30, 2022.



RETIREMENT BENEFITS INVESTMENT FUND  
2018 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

---

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

**PARTICIPATING ENTITIES**

<b>Participating Entities</b>	<b>Net Contributions from Inception through June 30, 2018</b>	<b>Market Value as of June 30, 2018</b>
Public Employees' Benefits Program (PEBP)	\$ 1,348,775	\$ 1,602,029
Washoe County School District (WCSD)	24,346,602	58,036,639
Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA)	4,929,356	10,954,033
Washoe County (WCOT)	142,991,402	234,083,609
City of Las Vegas (LVOT)	10,000,000	16,570,802
Tahoe Douglas Fire Protection District (TDFP)	7,500,000	10,686,677
Clark County OPEB Trust (CCOT)	82,880,000	102,898,085
City of Reno OPEB Trust (RENO)	6,630,433	7,753,129
Las Vegas Metro Police Department (LVMPD)	11,830,000	13,323,644
Truckee Meadows Water OPEB Trust (TMWA II)	806,855	967,546
No. Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District (NLTFPD)	951,287	1,084,214
Carson City OPEB Trust (CC)	<u>840,000</u>	<u>970,343</u>
Totals	<u>\$ 295,054,710</u>	<u>\$ 458,930,750</u>

Net Contributions equals contributions less distributions for each participating entity from the inception of the Fund through the end of the current fiscal year.

The market value for each participating entity includes the market value of all assets held at the custodial bank, The Bank of New York Mellon (BNYM), based on their net contributions.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS INVESTMENT FUND  
2018 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

---

<u>Reconciliation of Market Value to Net Position</u>	
Market value as of June 30, 2018	\$ 458,930,750
Cash in commercial bank	5,932
Accounts payable and accrued expenses	<u>(20,093)</u>
Total net position as of June 30, 2018	<u>\$ 458,916,589</u>



**Washoe County School District**

425 East Ninth Street \* P.O. Box 30425 \* Reno, NV 89520-3425  
Phone (775) 348-0200 \* (775) 348-0304 \* [www.washoeschools.net](http://www.washoeschools.net)

Board of Trustees: Katy Simon Holland, President \* Malena Raymond, Vice President \* John Mayer, Clerk  
\* Debra Feemster \* Verónica Frenkel \* Scott Kelley \* Angela Taylor \* Traci Davis, Superintendent

Date: November 29, 2018

To: Washoe County School District OPEB Board of Trustees

From: Robert Carson, Accounting Manager

Subject: Fiscal Year 2019 Transfers from OPEB Trust Fund

At the July 24, 2018 meeting of the Washoe County School District (WCSD) Board of Trustees, the Board formally authorized a request to the OPEB Trust Board to transfer/expend money from the WCSD OPEB Trust Fund for the purposes of making payments for retiree benefits for the fiscal year 2018-19. This request is being made to the WCSD OPEB Board of Trustees as allowed by Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 287.792. The total maximum amount requested for the fiscal year 2018-19 is \$6,010,019 and will be used for the following:

- \$3,600,000 for payments to Nevada Postemployment Benefits Program
- \$20,000 for external audit of the OPEB Trust Fund
- \$1,640,019 for WCSD retiree medical subsidies
- \$750,000 for WCSD retiree life insurance subsidies

Attached you will find the final approved budget for fiscal year 2018-19 and the minutes showing the approval of the WCSD Board of Trustees. Your approval of this request is hereby requested.

**WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
OPEB TRUST FUND  
FY 19 TENTATIVE vs FY 19 FINAL BUDGET**

	<b>Tentative FY19</b>	<b>Final FY19</b>	<b>Change</b>
<b>Additions</b>			
Contributions by Employer	\$ 500,000	\$ 2,140,019	\$ 1,640,019
Earnings (loss) on investments	4,000,000	4,000,000	-
<b>Total Additions</b>	<u>\$ 4,500,000</u>	<u>\$ 6,140,019</u>	<u>\$ 1,640,019</u>
<b>Deductions</b>			
Benefits	\$ 4,350,000	\$ 6,010,019	\$ 1,660,019
<b>Total Deductions</b>	<u>\$ 4,350,000</u>	<u>\$ 6,010,019</u>	<u>\$ 1,660,019</u>
<b>Net Increase</b>	\$ 150,000	\$ 130,000	\$ (20,000)
<b>Net Assets Held in Trust for OPEB</b>			
Beginning July 1	60,513,651	60,513,651	0
Ending June 30	<u>\$ 60,663,651</u>	<u>\$ 60,643,651</u>	<u>\$ (20,000)</u>

**MINUTES OF THE JULY 24, 2018  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

July 24, 2018

**1. Opening Items**

**1.01 CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Board of Trustees was called to order at 2:04 p.m. at the Washoe County School District's Central Administration Building, 425 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada.

**1.02 ROLL CALL**

President Katy Simon Holland and Board Members Debra Feemster, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, Malena Raymond and Angela Taylor were present. Board Member Veronica Frenkel was absent from the meeting. Superintendent Traci Davis, Deputy Superintendent Kristen McNeill, Chief of Staff David Lasic, and staff were also present.

**1.03 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Washoe County School District Police Chief Jason Trevino led the meeting in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**1.04 PUBLIC COMMENT**

Charlene Marks mentioned that she had provided public comment last year because she was concerned with the number of students in her 6<sup>th</sup> grade class. She stated she had received a teacher's assistant in January and was able to spend more time providing high quality instruction because of the help. She remarked that she had retired at the end of the 2017-18 School Year and believed that most employees, especially teachers, did not come to the Board with concerns because they felt there could be retaliation against them for complaining. She hoped anyone providing public comment would not be made to feel guilty and there would not be negative consequences to speaking out.

President Simon Holland stated the Board welcomed teachers, and all employees, to provide comments. The hope from the Board was that any employee would first speak with their direct supervisor about any concerns prior to bringing an issue to the Board and Superintendent.

Pat Dannenberg was the field director for the area Boy Scout Council. He requested the Board reconsider changes made to Board Policy 1140 pertaining to community organizations being able to distribute flyers in schools. The new language had been interpreted by many organizations to mean that no group could send home materials with the students, even though principals at the individual schools were allowed to send home education related materials. It was his understanding that the District believed the expense and time it took for the flyers to be distributed was not appropriate; however, he knew most organizations would make their own copies of flyers, count out the appropriate number for each school and class, and then deliver them to the schools themselves. Some schools would even allow a representative of the organization to place the flyers in the teachers' mailboxes. He felt the District could strengthen the language related to for-profit groups sending home flyers, rather than impacting non-profits that provided programs and services to students and families. The public schools were owned and operated by the community and he would like to see the District work with area non-profits on language that would work for everyone.

Jeff Church wondered where the money would come from to pay for the new staffing at the three schools scheduled to open for the 2019-2020 School Year. As a candidate for the Board, he would be asked questions all the time on where the District would find the teachers because there was already a teacher shortage in the District. He knew there were additional positions that would cost the District as well, such as bus drivers, custodians, and secretaries. He also spoke in support of the District hiring, either internally or externally, an independent auditor dedicated for capital projects. He urged the Board to provide clarification to the Capital Funding Protection Committee on what the duties of the auditor would be and the ability of the auditor to access information freely.

#### 1.05 ACTION TO ADOPT THE AGENDA

It was moved by Trustee Taylor and seconded by Trustee Kelley that **the Board of Trustees approves the agenda as presented.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: Pass (Yea: Debra Feemster, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, Malena Raymond and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

## 2. Consent Agenda Items

President Simon Holland opened the agenda item to public comment.

Pam Berek spoke against Consent Agenda Item 2.10, which would allow the District to appeal a recent court decision to the Nevada Supreme Court. She was the parent of a non-verbal child and believed it was important that the District was transparent when it came to issues related to the Special Education Department. Since the District wanted

to appeal the decision to release the information, it made her wonder if the District had anything to hide.

Amelia Cole was the grandparent of a child with disabilities in the District. It was distressing to her that the District was willing to spend \$50,000 to investigate alleged misconduct by school officials who oversaw Special Education and then not release information to the families whose students might have been impacted. She felt the additional cost to the District to appeal the case was not worth it and the money could be better spent elsewhere. She urged the Board to not waste taxpayer money on an appeal.

Mary Beth Collins agreed with the remarks of the prior speakers. She would also like the District to not appeal the court case and be more transparent with what had occurred in the Special Education Department. She felt the District had some amazing personnel in the schools working with Special Education students, but parents and families needed to know if there were problems with the leadership of the Department because that could impact everyone below them. She claimed she had a right to know what happened because she was a taxpayer.

Trina Olsen also requested the Board not authorize the appeal to the Nevada Supreme Court. She had previously worked as an assistant principal at Procter R. Hug High School and felt the release of the information would help ensure a safe and respectful learning environment for all employees. She believed the complaint process in the District was broken and parents, community members, and employees were left frustrated when concerns were raised because nothing appeared to ever happen. The media had previously reported that student records were used in the investigation so it was clear to her that leadership problems were impacting the children. She urged the Board to release the information and reassure the community that the District was fully transparent and accountable.

Toni Richard was the parent of two special needs children in the District, both of which had problems with District personnel. She had one non-verbal child and one extremely verbal child. The verbal child was able to tell her about what happened at school, which was a mystery with her non-verbal child. Her non-verbal child had previously come home with bruises and the District would not do anything until she fought for a lengthy investigation to occur, including hiding a recorder in her child's backpack. She felt that parents should not have to go to such lengths to determine if there are concerns and problems with District personnel that needed to be addressed.

Neil Rombardo, Chief General Counsel, stated he was in full support of an appeal and that the appeal was related to workplace harassment and that the harassment did not involve students. Any further comments would require the Board to waive attorney-client privilege.

President Simon Holland added that there times when alleged victims' rights needed to be protected. She felt all public employers and employees in the State of Nevada deserved clarification on how the rights of victims could and should be protected related to harassment claims. She believed that if all information was released, there would be a chilling effect of people willing to come forward with concerns and complaints. She agreed with Legal Counsel that the allegations did not involve students.

It was moved by Trustee Raymond and seconded by Trustee Kelley that **the Board of Trustees approves Consent Agenda Items 2.02 through 2.25**. The result of the vote was Unanimous: Pass (Yea: Debra Feemster, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, Malena Raymond and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

- 2.02 The Board of Trustees approved the minutes of the April 24, 2018 Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees.
- 2.03 The Board of Trustees approved the minutes of the May 22, 2018 Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees.
- 2.04 The Board of Trustees approved the minutes of the June 12, 2018 Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees.
- 2.05 The Board of Trustees approved the minutes of the June 26, 2018 Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees.
- 2.06 The Board of Trustees approved the payment of the 2018-19 annual membership dues to the Nevada Association of School Boards in the amount of \$23,073.91.
- 2.07 The Board of Trustees approved the payment of the 2018-19 membership fees to the National School Boards Association Council of Urban Boards of Education in the amount of \$12,975.
- 2.08 The Board of Trustees approved the Memorandum of Agreement between the Washoe County School District and Washoe Education Association for Learning Strategists stipends of \$7,000 to be awarded to certain classroom teachers at Donner Springs Elementary School, Libby Booth Elementary School, Alice Smith Elementary School, Double Diamond Elementary School, Spanish Springs Elementary School, Natchez Elementary School, Grace Warner Elementary School, Gerlach K-12, and North Star Online, for the 2018-19 School Year pursuant to Nevada Revised Statute 388.159.



- 2.09 The Board of Trustees approved the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC) for dual credit technical courses for the Academy of Arts, Careers & Technology (AACT) students and TMCC use of technical classrooms for the 2018-19 School Year.
- 2.10 The Board of Trustees authorized District staff to appeal to the Supreme Court of Nevada the June 26, 2018 order granting petition for writ of mandamus filed in Second Judicial District Court of Nevada in and for the County of Washoe, Case No. CV18-00252 styled Reno Newspapers, Inc. v. Washoe County School District.
- 2.11 The Board of Trustees approved the independent contractor agreement with Connections Speech and Language, LLC. to provide speech and language pathology services for Natchez Elementary School and Gerlach Schools from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019 in the amount of \$126,840.
- 2.12 The Board of Trustees approved the Memorandum of Understanding with the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education, to support the dual enrollment and participation of Washoe County School District students with Intellectual/Developmental Disabilities (IDD) in the Path to Independence (P2I) Program at the University of Nevada, Reno during the 2018-2019 School Year in the amount of \$52,540.
- 2.13 The Board of Trustees approved the service agreement with the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education for the evaluation period of September 1, 2018 to June 8, 2019 for the amount of \$79,800.
- 2.14 The Board of Trustees approved the contract for up to two (2) Certified Occupational Therapist Assistants (COTA) with Ardor Health Solutions for the Fiscal Year 2018-2019 for the amount of \$150,000.
- 2.15 The Board of Trustees approved Renewal 2 of Request for Proposal (RFP) #16-005, Commercial Purchasing Card Program, with Commerce Bank with an estimated revenue generating amount of \$355,000.00 for an additional one (1) year term beginning July 31, 2018 and ending July 30, 2019.
- 2.16 The Board of Trustees awarded Bid #60513A, Irrigation Valve Replacement at Earl Wooster High School, to Garden Shop Nursery Landscaping Division, Inc. in the amount of \$245,790.
- 2.17 The Board of Trustees awarded Bid #60185E, Re-Bid of Single Point of Entry at Incline Elementary School, to Bruce Purves Construction in the amount of \$133,647.

- 2.18 The Board of Trustees approved and authorized the submission of the Statement of Debt Affordability and Management and Statement of Indebtedness, for the Washoe County School District to the Nevada Department of Taxation.
- 2.19 The Board of Trustees requested the Board of Trustees for the Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Trust Fund to transfer/expend money from the OPEB Trust Fund for the purpose of making payments for retiree benefits for the Fiscal Year 2018-19, as allowed by Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 287.792, in an amount not to exceed \$6,010,019.
- 2.20 The Board of Trustees approved the Master Attachment to the Affiliation Agreement between Washoe County School District and the University of Nevada, Reno School of Medicine to fund Psychiatric Fellows to conduct the evaluation of students with significant emotional and behavioral problems in the amount of \$34,587 for the 2018-2019 Fiscal Year.
- 2.21 The Board of Trustees approved Renewal 1 of Request for Proposal (RFP) #17-003, Comprehensive District-wide Middle School and High School Athletic Uniforms and Related Apparel, to Athletics Unlimited, BSN Sports, and East Bay in the estimated amount of \$1,600,000 for an additional one (1) year beginning August 9, 2018 and ending August 8, 2019.
- 2.22 The Board of Trustees approved the professional Services Agreement between the Washoe County School District and the University of Nevada, Reno School of Medicine for funding of a board-certified psychiatrist to support the evaluation of students with significant emotional and behavioral problems in the amount of \$27,500 for the 2018-2019 Fiscal Year.
- 2.23 The Board of Trustees approved the Renewal of the Master Services Agreement with Progressus Therapy, LLC for education and education-related services in connection with the Nevada Department of Education's Social Workers and other Licensed Mental Health Workers grant program in an amount not to exceed \$1,435,096.
- 2.24 The Board of Trustees approved the award of Request for Bid (RFB) #094-05-05-18, Light Truck, Bus and Snowplow Parts, to the following in the estimated annual amounts: Bryson Sales and Service \$14,364.27; Bus West, LLC \$2,008.30; Chalks Truck Parts \$14,195.00; Creative Bus Sales \$77,617.62; Factory Motor Parts \$5,543.35; NFC/School Bus Parts \$30,304.10; O'Reilly-Ozark Automotive \$137.20; Silver State International \$67,447.53 and Tec Equipment \$42,808.96 for an estimated total of

\$254,426.33 for a term of two (2) years beginning August 1, 2018 and ending July 31, 2020.

- 2.25 The Board of Trustees awarded Bid #62505B, Re-Bid of Repair of Windows for Water Intrusion at North Valleys High School, to Don M. Lazorko Construction, Inc. for \$692,849.

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

#### **3.01 PRESENTATION AND OVERVIEW OF THE WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT'S LOCAL PLAN PERTAINING TO SPECIAL EDUCATION FUNDING REQUIRED UNDER PART B OF THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT (IDEA)**

Dr. Byron Green, Chief Student Services Officer, explained the intent of the presentation was to provide the Board and community with information on the sources of revenue used by the District for Special Education services and programs. Background information on the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) was presented. IDEA was a federally funded grant program that was passed to school districts through the states. All school districts were required to follow Part B of the federal legislation, which dealt directly with the education of children ages 3 through the end of the year a child reached 21. Part B was based on 6 principles: 1) every child was entitled to a free and appropriate public education (FAPE); 2) a student was entitled to a complete comprehensive evaluation when a school professional or parent/guardian believed the student might have a disability; 3) creation of an individualized education plan (IEP); 4) the education of students with disabilities should be provided in the least restrictive environment (LRE); 5) input from the student and parents should be considered when an IEP was created; and 6) if a parent/guardian feels an IEP is inappropriate, they have the right to challenge the plan. For any school district to receive IDEA grant money, they had to ensure the requirements of the 6 principles were met.

Dr. Green commented that when Part B was adopted by the United States Congress, Congress understood the cost to educate a student with a disability could easily be double the cost of a general education student and the intent was that the federal government should cover an additional 40% of the cost, with the states covering the remaining 60% increase. However, that funding had never been realized, and the federal government had only provided about an additional 15% for Part B in Nevada, with the state and local school districts covering all remaining costs. The District would be submitting the grant application for Board approval at the next scheduled meeting, which would include how the District would meet the 6 principles and the budget for IDEA funds. He noted that IDEA monies were not restricted and could be spent in any manner, as long as they were used in direct support of the education of students with disabilities.

Mark Mathers, Chief Financial Officer, remarked that there were three funds used by the District to pay for Special Education services. The first fund was the IDEA grant, which was actually a small fraction of the overall cost of Special Education in the District. IDEA funding amounted to around \$10 million for the District.

Dr. Green interjected that a small portion of Part B funding was used for early childhood education and went almost exclusively to staff since it was such a small amount. He added that a line item in the budget related to IDEA was for early intervention, which provided services and programs to students without a disability. The intent behind the interventions was to provide programming and supports for students in elementary and/or middle school so the student did not have to be identified with a disability or have an IEP issued. If early intervention services were provided, a student and families were able to develop the skills necessary for success without a formal IEP being required. Sometimes a 504 program was developed instead.

Mr. Mathers explained the second source of Special Education funding came from the reimbursement of Medicaid eligible services provided to Special Education students. The District would initially pay for the services, then bill the state. For Fiscal Year 2018-19, the District was estimating they would receive about \$2.4 million in reimbursements. To help ensure the District was receiving reimbursements for all services provided, a new vendor had been found to assist with the billing process. The hope was that the new vendor would be able to bring in additional money by identifying services that had not been reimbursed previously. The final source of funding directly related to Special Education came from the state, through the Distributive School Account (DSA). The DSA contained a separate guarantee for Special Education students that was above the standard per pupil amount provided for general education students. The formula used by the state was complicated but it was important to note that the state paid about an additional \$3,300 per pupil amount for Special Education students, up to 13% of the District's total enrollment. Washoe County School District had more than 13% of student with an IEP, so any students over the 13% only received an additional \$1,700 and not \$3,300. The money from the state amounted to over \$29.15 million.

Trustee Mayer asked if there were plans for anyone to request the Nevada Legislature eliminate or raise the 13% cap during the 2019 Legislative Session. Superintendent Davis explained that the District sponsored a bill during the 2017 Legislative Session to eliminate the 13% cap. The final version of the legislation allowed for additional funding for students exceeding the 13% cap, but the students were not funded at the same amount as students who fell within the 13%. While school districts were now receiving additional funds, the formula was weighted and the process could be skewed because it was based on percentages instead of actual numbers. For example, in the rural counties, the addition or deletion of only one or two Special Education students could change the percentages. It was important for all school districts to look at how all students were provided with services and how that information could be communicated to the

Legislature to ensure all students that needed additional services were able to receive them at the same funding amount.

Mr. Mathers continued with the presentation. The difference between the amount the District received from the three primary fund sources and the cost to education all Special Education students for Fiscal Year 2018 was \$43.6 million. The cost was covered by the District's General Fund and amounted to a little more than half of the Special Education Fund.

President Simon Holland asked what the total General Fund for operations in the District was. Mr. Mathers stated the General Fund was about \$470 million.

President Simon Holland noted the transfer to the Special Education Fund was about 10% of the District's total operating budget.

Trustee Kelley requested additional information on how staff felt the District would be able to receive additional Medicaid reimbursements. Dr. Green explained that the District had seen an increase in reimbursements over the past few years due to more efficient tracking methods of services. With a new vendor in place, the District anticipated seeing the ability to capture even more services that were eligible for reimbursement. For example, the largest reimbursed services were related to speech/language pathology. It was important the services were document for the IEP, as well as so the District could receive the reimbursement. The District would also be reviewing the reimbursement requirements to ensure they were appropriately staffing the services to receive the full reimbursement. Not only were the federal requirements being reviewed, but the state requirements as well.

Trustee Raymond asked if the funds received for students over the 13% cap helped to offset costs for Special Education programming. Mr. Mathers commented that the District received a total of about \$500,000 for students over the 13% cap, which did reduce the amount transferred from the General Fund to the Special Education Fund so that did help; however, the costs of special education continued to increase year after year.

Trustee Raymond wondered if the amount was based on the prior year numbers and if the state was supplementing with the additional funds over the 13% or supplanting from other programs. Mr. Mathers noted the funds over the 13% were in addition to what the District received related to IDEA and were based on the prior year funding, as well as adjusted for inflation. The funds were a supplement to what was being provided from the state.

President Simon Holland inquired if there were any concerns from staff related to Medicaid funding at the national level. Superintendent Davis mentioned that the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) had recently conducted their

annual lobbying event in Washington, D.C. AASA would work with members of Congress on key initiatives for the coming school year. Medicaid funding was not considered a top priority for the upcoming year because it appeared to be stable; however, priorities in the federal government could change so national school board and superintendent organizations would continue to monitor developments.

Trustee Feemster asked if the teachers were receiving training related to the new system so they could input the information into the IEPs. Dr. Green indicated that teachers were receiving training and professional development. He would be presenting the Board with an update on changes to Special Education based on the WestEd report at an upcoming meeting and would provide additional information at that time regarding the training teachers and other site staff were receiving. The changes made to Special Education programming were intended to be proactive in the supports provided with the goal of increasing outcomes because the District was not reacting to concerns.

Trustee Feemster wondered what happened to services if a student was absent. Dr. Green remarked that the goal was that the student would still receive the required services even if they were absent. The new tracking system would allow the Office of Student Services and principals to see if services were missed and when so once the student returned, the services could then be provided.

Trustee Mayer asked if the new system increased the workload on teachers. Dr. Green explained that the system should not be increasing the workload. Teachers and aides were already required to document the services provided to students within the IEP. By utilizing a computerized system, the District was able to ensure required services were provided and the information was not stored in a notebook, which could be misplaced.

### **3.02 PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE ISSUANCE OF UP TO \$300 MILLION IN GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS (ADDITIONALLY SECURED WITH PLEDGED REVENUES) TO FINANCE THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, AND RENOVATION OF FACILITIES**

President Simon Holland opened the public hearing on the issuance of up to \$300 million in General Obligation Bonds.

Mather Mathers, Chief Financial Officer, explained the Board had provided a notice of intent to the Debt Management Commission and a resolution of intent to issue up to \$300 million in bonds. The next step in the process was to conduct a public hearing on the issuance of the bonds.

President Simon Holland called for public comment. No public comment was received. The public hearing was closed.

*President Simon Holland recessed the meeting for 17 minutes.*

**3.03 PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE APPROVAL OF THE FINAL LANGUAGE FOR THE PRIORITIES/GOALS (“RESULTS”) AND METHODS/PROCESSES (“DEFINITIONS”) TO BE USED AS PART OF THE PRIORITY BASED BUDGETING PROCESS FOR THE 2018-19 FISCAL YEAR, TO INCLUDE REFERENCES TO PRIORITIZING RESOURCES TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC GROWTH, CAREER AND COLLEGE READINESS, A SAFE AND SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT, AND A WELL-ROUNDED STUDENT EXPERIENCE**

Mark Mathers, Chief Financial Officer, reviewed the results and definitions discussed by the Board at the prior meeting related to the Priority Based Budgeting (PBB) process. The results had been placed into internal and external categories. The results related to the external categories was what he wanted to review with the Trustees. The external results tracked closely with the goals of the Strategic Plan. The definitions aligned to the results were intended to be descriptions for how the District would achieve the results. Based on the feedback from the Board at a prior meeting, changes had been made. He wanted to confirm all intended revisions were included in the new document.

Trustee Taylor wondered if the language under well-rounded student experience could be changed from “culturally unbiased” to something that was more positive in nature. She would like to see something more along the lines of “culturally diverse” or “culturally inclusive.”

President Simon Holland asked if the results and definitions were scored equally or if there were some that were considered more important than others. Mr. Mathers explained all programs would be scored based on how essential the program was to the result. The definitions would provide additional information to staff on what the intent of the result was. The PBB process was meant to show how essential a program was to the goals of an organization and what the impact would be on a goal if a program were eliminated. The idea was not to rank the programs in order of importance, but to show how the programs impacted the goals of the District and the implications of eliminating programs.

President Simon Holland clarified that the results were intended to be inclusive and not listed in terms of rank. Mr. Mathers agreed with the clarification. The intent was not to rank the programming but show the impacts of the programming. Some programs might cover one category under the results, while another program might touch on each of the external goals. All of the goals/results were weighted the same, though additional external goals were added related to academic growth so there was a greater importance placed in that area than in community partnerships. The idea behind expanding the goal of academic growth for PBB was to ensure programming related to the whole child was

included as part of academic growth. For example, music and art programming provided opportunities for academic growth for students but might not show a direct link to test scores.

President Simon Holland thanked staff for the information. Since the Board would soon finalize the superintendent evaluation process, it would be important to align goal prioritization with the evaluation process to ensure consistency. She urged staff to inform the Board if the PBB process were to change in terms of the weighting of programming.

It was moved by Trustee Taylor and seconded by Trustee Feemster that **the Board of Trustees approves the final language as revised for the "Results" and "Definitions" to be used in the Priority Based Budgeting Process for Fiscal Year 2018-19.** The result of the vote was Unanimous: Pass (Yea: Debra Feemster, Katy Simon Holland, Scott Kelley, John Mayer, Malena Raymond and Angela Taylor.) Final Resolution: Motion Carries.

**3.04 WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT STRATEGIC PLAN DISCUSSION AND REPORTING OF METRICS RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING OBJECTIVES: OBJECTIVE 1.3, STRENGTHEN TEACHING AND LEARNING THROUGH TECHNOLOGY AND 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES; OBJECTIVE 1.5, PROVIDE AND CONTINUOUSLY IMPROVE THE PATHWAY TO COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS THROUGH AN ALIGNED PRE-K-16 SYSTEM; OBJECTIVE 2.2, PROVIDE AND CONTINUOUSLY IMPROVE MEANINGFUL HIGH QUALITY PROFESSIONAL LEARNING TARGETED TO CONCRETE LEARNING OBJECTIVES AND DESIRED PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES; OBJECTIVE 3.2, INCREASE MEANINGFUL PARTNERSHIPS BETWEEN THE DISTRICT AND FAMILIES FOCUSED ON STUDENT SUCCESS; OBJECTIVE 3.4, STRENGTHEN THE ASSISTANCE OF VOLUNTEER SERVICES TO SCHOOLS AND DEPARTMENTS WITH A FOCUS ON SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE; AND OBJECTIVE 5.1, PROVIDE AND CONTINUOUSLY IMPROVE A CLIMATE OF BELONGINGNESS AND SELF-WORTH AMONGST STUDENTS, FAMILIES, STAFF, AND THE COMMUNITY THAT IS CENTERED AROUND AN INCLUSIVE, COLLABORATIVE, AND ENGAGING LEARNING ENVIRONMENT BY PROVIDING EQUITABLE PRACTICES, STRATEGIES, AND MATERIALS**

Erica Olsen, OnStrategy, explained the agenda item was the second of three strategic performance reports for the 2017-18 School Year based on the Goals, Objectives, and Initiatives in the Strategic Plan. The final report would be presented in October 2018. Since the item was only the second time the Board would be receiving the information, OnStrategy was present to help facilitate the discussion and provide clarification if



needed. She reminded the Board that many of the metrics were new and the 2017-18 School Year would provide a base-line number.

Robert Sidford, Chief IT Officer, presented information related to Objective 1.3, Strengthen teaching and learning through technology and 21<sup>st</sup> Century instructional strategies. The first metric was related to the number of teachers completing 21<sup>st</sup> Century Badge classes. The baseline for the metric would be established during the 2017-18 School Year and the District had a target of 120. He believed the Board would need to relook at the metric since he believed it was not tracking the type of information the Board was interested in seeing. At the present time, 144 teachers had completed the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Badge classes, as well as 533 teachers and administrators becoming 21<sup>st</sup> Century "Practitioners" and 123 becoming 21<sup>st</sup> Century "Leaders." He believed the Board and District should be looking at the number of teachers and administrators practicing 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning practices to ensure the students were receiving the instruction needed to be successful. Learning practices were directly related to initiative 1.3.2, related to the percentage of teachers providing 21<sup>st</sup> Century instructional practices. Currently, about 37% of teachers who had received 21<sup>st</sup> Century instructional strategies, used the practices in their classes. One of the largest challenges related to both metrics was that the Nevada Department of Education continued to implement changes to the licensure requirements, which required changes to be made to the District's professional development. He would like to see the metric changed so that the District could better track how technology was used for instructional practices because more was occurring in the schools than was being tracked.

President Simon Holland asked about the digital citizenship program and what type of information was presented to students. Mr. Sidford explained the digital citizenship program was intended to help students learn to act appropriately while on-line. The District looked at national and international best practices surrounding digital citizenship education and provided resources to help support what teachers were doing to help students learn to act appropriately on-line. As part of the process, the District was interested in finalizing a technology strategic plan that would include a curriculum portion, as well as the service portion related to technology.

President Simon Holland wondered if someone would observe the teachers providing the 21<sup>st</sup> Century instructional practices or if teachers self-reported the information. Mr. Sidford mentioned a teacher on special assignment, who provided the instruction related to 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning, would be the person to observe the teachers and students, then record if the students were utilizing the information provided.

Superintendent Davis remarked that, as Mr. Sidford indicated, the District would be interested in reviewing and adjusting the metrics related to Objective 1.3 because staff believed there were better methods of capturing the data the Board was interested in seeing regarding 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning.

Dr. Mike Paul, Professional Growth Systems Director, reported metrics related to Objective 2.2, Provide and continuously improve meaningful, high quality professional learning targeted to concrete learning objectives and desired performance outcomes. The first two metrics were related to professional learning engagement in MyPGS by administrators and by teachers. The 2017-18 School Year would provide a baseline for both metrics. The 2017-18 School Year was the first year the District was able to incorporate all professional learning offered by the District into MyPGS. The data showed 99% of administrators engaged and completed a professional learning opportunity and 96% of teachers engaged and completed an opportunity. The challenge for future years would be to maintain the percentages and engage those who did not participate. The District would also be monitoring licensing changes from the Nevada Department of Education to ensure course offerings were consistent with licensure renewal, as well as the evaluation process since that was now linked within MyPGS for all employees.

Dr. Paul presented information related to the final metric from Objective 2.2, which was the percentage of staff implementing what they learned from MyPGS. Staff was disappointed to see 15% of teachers and administrators had implemented practices they learned, but in looking more closely they realized that the metric might not be tracking what the Board was interested in seeing related to implementation. The results were based on a survey sent out by the facilitator of the course asking about implementation. Staff determined that the data was basically showing if a survey was returned and that not all facilitators sent out the surveys when the course was completed. The District would be reviewing the wording of the surveys and processes to ensure the surveys were actually sent out.

President Simon Holland expressed concern in having staff complete more surveys. She wondered if there were ways to simplify the process to determine if practices were being implemented. Dr. Paul agreed that the District should look at alternatives. The challenge was the surveys were sent out 30 – 60 days after a class to determine if the practices were implemented. It would also be important to determine which courses needed the information. For example, Special Education teachers were required to take CPR training and the hope was always that the teachers would not need to implement the training, but it would be important to determine the effectiveness of the course in some other manner.

Trustee Feemster asked if substitutes were able to receive the training in MyPGS because there were times when a school year began with a long-term substitute in the classroom. Dr. Paul stated that once an individual became an employee they had access to the courses in MyPGS. Substitutes did have access and were also required to take some courses as part of the interjectory and orientation to the District.

Trustee Mayer requested a course list. Dr. Paul remarked that he would provide a list to the Board.

Trustee Mayer asked who came up with the courses and if those individuals received additional pay. Dr. Paul noted the courses were created by individuals in the District, such as mentor teachers or departments like Curriculum and Instruction, whose position required them to assist or develop the professional development offered by the District. Superintendent Davis cautioned that if the District were to look at spending more resources on professional development then a conversation needed to occur on where those resources would come from because funding was a barrier to providing stipends or other types of incentives.

Trustee Mayer felt that the Education Alliance could work with the various Partners in Education to come up with some type of reimbursement or stipend.

Lisa Marie Lightfoot, Volunteer Services Coordinator, presented metrics related to Objective 3.4, Strengthen the assistance of Volunteer Services to schools and departments with a focus on supporting student success and school performance. Unfortunately there had been a decline in the number of parent volunteers of about 4,500, but the number of community volunteers had increased slightly. The number of volunteer hours amounted to about \$25 million. The Volunteer Services Department was continuing to work with community groups and parents on processes to ease the new requirements for fingerprinting and background checks, as well as meeting with businesses to see if they would be interested in assisting to off-set the costs for the volunteers. The Department was also partnering with community organizations and non-profits to provide trainings, increase recognitions for outstanding volunteers, and providing information to schools on how to bring in more volunteers.

Irene Payne, Chief Communications and Community Engagement Officer, added they were also looking at additional ways to retain existing volunteers and making them part of the Washoe County School District family. The goal was to increase volunteer hours by 3%, but it could be a challenge to meet the goal because of the new fingerprint requirements.

Trustee Taylor wondered why there was such a large decrease in the number of parent volunteers. Ms. Lightfoot mentioned a new procedure was implemented during the 2016-17 School Year that required the schools to conduct manual sex offender checks and input the information into Infinite Campus. The additional workload was overwhelming for some schools so they were not able to perform the requirements. The Department was able to work with community groups who supplied a lot of volunteers to all schools, but it was challenging for the individual schools to conduct the checks on parents. She believed the number of parent volunteers would continue to decrease because there would be some not interested in paying \$45 to volunteer a couple times a month. She

did know that some schools were looking at fundraisers or other options to pay the fingerprinting fees for parents so they did not lose the help.

President Simon Holland noted that the intent behind the legislation was important because the goal was to ensure the safety of students, but the time and cost it took to volunteer was putting up barriers for parents to be regularly involved in the children's education.

Dr. Kristen McNeill, Deputy Superintendent, introduced staff who would present metrics related to Objective 1.5, Provide and continuously improve the pathway to college and career readiness through an aligned pre-K-16 system.

Debra Biersdorff, Chief Academic Officer, explained the baseline for the metric related to the number of students earning career and/or college endorsement on a diploma would not be available until the completion of the 2018-19 School Year. The reason was that the state had not completed their portion of the new requirements until February 2018. School districts throughout Nevada had worked on ways to access the information themselves and how the information would be collected. The Washoe County School District was close to completing the internal systems needed to track the information and would provide information on the number of college and career endorsement seals earned by students in about a year.

President Simon Holland asked how the District would be able to determine if a student was college and/or career ready. Ben Hayes, Chief Accountability Officer, mentioned that the District tracked a number of different metrics related to college and career readiness. One of the best measurements was the number of advanced and honors diplomas students received. Another measurement was development in collaboration with the Nevada System of Higher Education to determine the number of students requiring remedial classes when entering college.

Ms. Biersdorff presented the data related to the number of students enrolled in Signature Academies and/or Career and Technical Education (CTE) classes. The Nevada Department of Education had set a goal for the number of students in Nevada involved in CTE, with Washoe County School District's portion being 1,550 students annually. The District had increased the number of students enrolled and completing CTE classes since the 2013-14 School Year by 146%. The District was working with the schools to provide opportunities for teachers to see the benefits of CTE programming for students.

Trustee Kelley wondered if staff felt the numbers for Signature Academies and CTE classes would drastically increase once the District was able to repurpose Procter R. Hug High School into a CTE Academy. Ms. Biersdorff believed that there would be an increase in students with the repurposing of Procter R. Hug High School. It would be important to provide information to not only the other high schools, but the community as well, on

how CTE could benefit students. The pathway for a new signature academy had not been decided at the present time.

Trustee Mayer mentioned that some high schools offered six periods in a day, while other high schools offered seven periods. He was concerned that students were not being provided equal opportunities to access CTE classes since they did not have as many periods to take classes that might interest them. Ms. Biersdorff remarked that, as a former principal, she knew that schools were able to offer more options if they had an additional period during the school day. However, the schools also needed the ability to look at their own needs and determine their master schedules based on their individual data. Some schools might need to provide additional time for students in core subject areas because their data showed the additional time was required to improve achievement gaps, the allocations only allowed for six periods a day, or the school community liked having a block schedule instead. The District wanted to ensure the principals were allowed to make those decisions based on the individual needs of the school communities and not dictate how each school set their schedules.

Dr. Byron Green, Chief Student Services Officer, presented information on the number of early childhood education classrooms in the District. For the 2017-18 School Year, the District had 18 pre-K classroom and they were able to increase that number to 20 for the 2018-19 School Year. He noted that the District had combined the pre-K and Special Education Pre-K programs, with pilot classes being conducted to ensure the inclusionary classrooms were appropriate and effective. The largest challenge to increasing the number of classrooms was that the District was heavily reliant on grant funding for all their pre-K programming.

Mr. Hayes explained the Board had asked staff to develop an additional metric related to improving the pathways to college and career readiness to ensure students were ready to access high school curriculum. The metric developed was intended to track the number of students leaving 8<sup>th</sup> grade who were achieving at least a Level Two score on Smarter Balanced Assessments and, if applicable, had exited English Language Services or had shown enough growth that they would be able to exit services by the end of high school. The baseline for the metric was established with data from the 2016-17 School Year at 57%, with the goal of increasing that percentage by 3% annually through the 2021-22 School Year.

Dr. Green presented information related to Objective 3.2, Increase meaningful partnerships between the District and families focused on student success. The current data was taken from the District's Annual Climate Survey and showed 88% of families self-reported high levels of access to information and resources from the schools. The baseline would be re-established during the 2018-19 School Year since staff did not believe the current metric was measuring the information accurately since the response rate on the Climate Survey from families was not as high as the District would like to see

and was a District-wide composite. Staff was interested in looking at the information related directly to the school sites to ensure all families were able to access the information and resources they needed to help their students. The next metric was related to participation in Parent University and the satisfaction of the information. The baseline for the metric was established during the 2017-18 School Year and showed 89% of families that attended Parent University classes were impressed with the quality of the class. The data was based on exit surveys and while high, the District wanted to ensure parents throughout the District had access to the classes since the classes were specific to the individual schools. The District was concerned that there could be a decrease in the metric due to budget cuts to Parent University. Staff was working with the Washoe K12 Education Foundation to determine if they could provide additional resources for the program.

Dr. Paul LaMarca, Chief Ombudsman and Strategies Officer, reviewed the data related to decreasing chronic absenteeism under Objective 5.1, Provide and continuously improve a climate of belongingness and self-worth amongst students, families, staff, and the community. The goal was to decrease chronic absenteeism rates by 2% annually. The baseline was set during the 2017-18 School Year and stood at 19%. Part of the reason for the metric was due to changes during the 2017 Nevada Legislative Session surrounding the definition of chronic absenteeism. The District had revised the attendance policy and procedures and communicated the information to families so they would have a better understanding of the changes. Multiple departments in the District were collaborating on the metric since there were a variety of barriers related to student attendance and determining how best to support the families in removing the barriers.

Dr. Green noted the District had been working with Renown Medical Group over the past few years to provide options for students related to healthcare, since the health of a student was a common reason for absences. Telemedicine opportunities were available in many schools and a pilot program would be conducted at two high schools to provide opportunities for the students, parents, and health professionals to connect on-line to receive possible diagnosis and treatment without the parent having to miss work. If there were insurance concerns, the District would work with Northern Nevada Hopes and other agencies to cover payments. The causes for chronic absenteeism was complex so the solutions had to be as flexible as possible and meet the needs of the students and families.

President Simon Holland appreciated the work staff had done related to chronic absenteeism. She understood there were a variety of reasons students were absent and hoped the multi-faceted approach would help to remove more barriers for students to be able to attend school.

Trustee Mayer mentioned that the community could also help with chronic absenteeism by showing students they cared. He would always ask why a student was not in school

and let them know that there were people in the community who cared about their education. He wondered if there were students in the system that had moved and not informed the District and how long the District had to keep those students in the system. Mr. Hayes indicated the Office of Accountability had a variety of triggers related to students that were not in school for long periods. After 10 days, a student would be marked as "whereabouts unknown" and then after 20 days, the student would be unenrolled from the District. The District did not have to keep the student in the system until their scheduled graduation date if the student was no longer showing up at all.

Trustee Feemster agreed with Trustee Mayer that the community could become more involved in ensuring students were in school. She would like to see the neighborhoods become more of a community and provide information to the schools if they saw children at the store or elsewhere when they should be in school. She wondered if a "parent hotline" could be developed that would allow community members to call in and let someone know if they saw a student. Dr. McNeill mentioned that the District did partner with a number of community organizations to provide public service announcements on the importance of students being in school. The intent was to not only inform the students and parents, but the community as well. Mr. Hayes added that many District departments were looking at new and innovative ways to inform parents and students if there were concerns about attendance. For example, a text-messaging program was being researched to determine the possible benefits.

Dr. LaMarca presented the next metric related to Objective 5.1. The metric was intended to measure the District's efforts in combating disproportionately and narrowing gaps in access and achievement. The goal was to ensure that the percentage of subpopulations in all programming matched what that percentage was throughout the entire District. The tracking was not only related to participation of groups in specific programming, such as Gifted and Talented or sports, but also looked at discipline and suspension information as well. The goal was that each group was as close to one (1) as possible because if the number was less than one, the group was underrepresented and if the number was over one, the group was overrepresented. The baseline for all programming would be completed using data from the 2017-18 School Year.

Trustee Feemster thanked staff for the information. The overrepresentation of African Americans under suspension data was glaring and she hoped there would be a large training component for staff related to the data. She believed the District would be able to lower the number with better training and if the District looked at what some other school district in the United States were doing related to the same concerns. She knew the District was aware of the problem and appreciated that it was finally being acknowledged.

Trustee Mayer agreed with Trustee Feemster and felt that it was because of the current District leadership, under Superintendent Davis, that the problem was finally being addressed.

Dr. McNeill reviewed the final metric for the current reporting period, which was related to improving the composite measurements for surveys. The Board and District was interested in hearing from the students, staff, and community on issues and how they felt about the District. The data was a composite for the entire District and tracked a variety of topics from engagement with the schools, to social and emotional health.

Superintendent Davis concluded the presentation. She was proud of the work occurring in the District, and acknowledged there were areas for improvement. One of the biggest improvements was surrounding Student Voice and the ability of the students to provide input into what was occurring in the District. It was by listening to the students that allowed some of the increases in measurements over the years because the students were the ones who were able to provide ideas on improvements. Additionally, District staff was able to participate in state-wide task forces and committees on improvements that could be made to the schools. Staff was able to not only present information on what the Washoe County School District was doing, but learn from other school districts in Nevada. That did not mean that there were not challenges that the District needed to address, such as chronic absenteeism. The District was working on changing the mindset of not only staff, but the community to improve graduations rates by focusing on every child. She presented information on what various programs were doing to increase graduation rates and continue to engage students. She cautioned that one of the biggest challenges for the District was funding and that while a specific program might be doing good work, the results could drop because there was not the personnel or funding to fully implement all components of a program that needed to occur. Additionally, changes to state law could also create barriers for students, families, and the community so a goal might need to be revised to just break-even, instead of see an increase or decrease in the percentages. She appreciated that staff was willing to look at all metrics and provide feedback when they felt the metric was not tracking what it should. She thanked staff for the information and the Board for presenting a renewed focus on the measurements for the Strategic Plan.

President Simon Holland thanked Superintendent Davis and the staff for providing the information. She also appreciated that staff was willing to speak up if changes should occur to the metrics so the Board was actually looking at the correct information.

#### **4. Reports**

##### **4.01 BOARD REPORTS**



Board Members reported on their attendance at District and community activities and shared announcements of dates and times of upcoming events.

#### **4.02 SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT**

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

### **5. Closing Items**

#### **5.01 FUTURE AGENDA ITEM REQUESTS**

President Simon Holland requested information on the number of teacher vacancies in the District during the first week of school, how operations and staffing would be handled at any new schools opening for the 2019-2020 School Year, and discussion and possible direction to provide clarification to the Capital Funding Protection Committee on an auditor dedicated for Capital Projects.

#### **5.02 PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment at this time.

#### **5.03 NEXT MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT**

The next Regular Meeting would take place on August 14, 2018 beginning at 2:00 p.m. in the Board Room at the Central Administration Building.

#### **5.04 ADJOURN MEETING**

There being no further business to come before the members of the Board, President Simon Holland declared the meeting adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

---

**Katy Simon Holland, President**

---

**John Mayer, Clerk**

**WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NET POSITION  
OPEB TRUST FUND  
AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2018 AND 2017**

	SEPTEMBER 30, 2018	SEPTEMBER 30, 2017	Increase (Decrease)
<b>ASSETS</b>			
Current Assets			
Cash	\$ 1,419,535	\$ 465,983	\$ 953,552
RBIF participation units	24,007,874	63,225,096	(39,217,222)
RBIF investments accounted for in health insurance fund	34,279,184	-	34,279,184
Total Assets	59,706,593	63,691,079	(3,984,486)
<b>NET POSITION</b>	<u>\$ 59,706,593</u>	<u>\$ 63,691,079</u>	<u>\$ (3,984,486)</u>

**WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT**  
**STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES AND CHANGE IN NET POSITION**  
**OPEB TRUST FUND**  
**FOR THE PERIODS ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 2018 AND 2017**

	FY19 Budget	September 30, 2018	Variance to Final Budget	September 30, 2017	FY2019-FY2018 Variance
<b>REVENUES</b>					
Earnings on investments	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 173,266	\$ (826,734)	\$ 342,058	\$ (168,792)
GASB 31 gain/(loss)	3,000,000	2,077,686	(922,314)	1,816,146	261,540
Contributions by employer	2,140,019	-	(2,140,019)	-	-
<b>Total revenues</b>	<b>6,140,019</b>	<b>2,250,952</b>	<b>(3,889,067)</b>	<b>2,158,204</b>	<b>92,748</b>
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>					
PEBP expenditure	3,600,000	829,545	2,770,455	860,776	(31,231)
Other professional services	20,000	-	20,000	-	-
Retiree medical	1,640,019	-	1,640,019	-	-
Retiree life insurance	750,000	-	750,000	-	-
<b>Total expenditures</b>	<b>6,010,019</b>	<b>829,545</b>	<b>5,180,474</b>	<b>860,776</b>	<b>(31,231)</b>
Change in net position	130,000	1,421,407	(9,069,541)	1,297,428	123,979
<b>NET POSITION - July 1</b>	<b>60,513,651</b>	<b>24,006,002</b>	<b>(36,507,649)</b>	<b>62,393,651</b>	<b>(38,387,649)</b>
<b>Add: Assets accounted for in health insurance fund</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>34,279,184</b>	<b>34,279,184</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>34,279,184</b>
<b>NET POSITION - September 30</b>	<b>\$ 60,643,651</b>	<b>\$ 59,706,593</b>	<b>\$ (937,058)</b>	<b>\$ 63,691,079</b>	<b>\$ (3,984,486)</b>

**WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT**  
 Summary of Changes to WCSD RBIF Account  
 For the Period Ended September 30, 2018 and 2017

	September 30, 2018	FY19 YTD	September 30, 2017	FY18 YTD
Net Assets - Beginning of Period	\$ 58,169,084	\$ 58,036,639	\$ 62,392,763	\$ 61,067,199
Changes to Net Assets				
Investment Gain/Loss	-	8	-	81
Realized Gain/Loss	86,024	161,456	964,081	986,730
Interest Income	29,471	90,431	28,053	84,152
Dividend Income	77,211	230,720	78,765	259,741
Change in Unrealized Appreciation	(74,131)	1,771,534	(237,918)	829,336
Trust Expenses	(915)	(4,044)	(741)	(2,236)
Total Changes to Net Assets	117,660	2,250,105	832,240	2,157,804
Disbursements	-	2,000,000	-	-
Net Assets - End of Period	\$ <u>58,286,744</u>	\$ <u>58,286,744</u>	\$ <u>63,225,003</u>	\$ <u>63,225,003</u>

## Retirement Benefits Investment Fund

September 30, 2018

Performance

Asset Class	Market Value	Target Allocation	Actual Allocation	FYTD Return	One Year	3 Years	5 Years	10 Years	Since Inception (2008)
U.S. Stocks- S&P 500 Index	\$ 250,506,285	50.5%	52.0%	7.7%	17.9%	17.2%	13.9%	12.0%	9.6%
<b>Market Return</b>				<b>7.7%</b>	<b>17.9%</b>	<b>17.3%</b>	<b>14.0%</b>	<b>12.0%</b>	<b>9.6%</b>
Int'l Stocks- MSCI World x US Index	\$ 97,582,852	21.5%	20.3%	1.3%	2.9%	9.4%	4.6%	5.4%	2.8%
<b>Market Return</b>				<b>1.3%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>9.2%</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>2.6%</b>
U.S. Bonds- U.S. Bond Index	\$ 129,343,157	28.0%	26.9%	-0.6%	-1.6%	0.2%	1.6%	3.3%	2.9%
<b>Market Return</b>				<b>-0.6%</b>	<b>-1.6%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>
	\$ 4,249,738	0.0%	0.9%						
<b>Total RBIF Fund</b>	<b>\$ 481,682,032</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>8.9%</b>	<b>10.6%</b>	<b>8.4%</b>	<b>8.2%</b>	<b>6.6%</b>
<b>Market Return</b>				<b>3.9%</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>10.4%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>6.7%</b>