

MINUTES
of the meeting of the
BOARD OF DIRECTORS of SOMERSET ACADEMY OF LAS VEGAS
September 15, 2016

The Board of Directors of Somerset Academy of Nevada held a public meeting on September 15, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. at 4650 Losee Road, North Las Vegas, Nevada 89081.

1. Call to order and roll call.

Board Chair Cody Noble called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. Present were Board Members Cody Noble, Will Harty, Carrie Boehlecke (arrived at 6:15), Travis Mizer, John Bentham, and Eric Brady (left at 10:40), and Sarah McClellan.

Also present was Executive Director John Barlow, Principal Gayle Jefferson, Principal Andre Denson, Principal Elaine Kelley, Principal Francine Mayfield, Principal Sherry Pendleton, Principal Dan Phillips; as well as Academica Nevada Representatives Ryan Reeves, Crystal Thiriot, and Colin Bringham.

2. Public Comments and Discussion.

No members of the public wished to comment at that time.

3. Review and Approval of Minutes from the August 4, 2016 and August 25, 2016 Board Meetings.

Member Bentham Moved to Approve the Minutes from the August 4, 2016 and August 25, 2016 Board Meetings. Member McClellan Seconded the Motion, and the Board voted unanimously to Approve.

4. Review and Approval of the Academica Nevada Contract.

Mr. Ryan Reeves addressed the Board and offered congratulations to the Board regarding the approved renewal of their charter at the recent SPCSA meeting. Mr. Reeves noted that what had been previously signed as an agreement, would now be considered a contract, which would be circulated once it was created by the SPCSA.

Mr. Reeves explained that Somerset's contract with Academica was written to run with the term of the charter and, as such, Academica had put together an information packet illustrating what Academica does and what they charge for what they do. Mr. Reeves pointed to the growth depicted in the packet and noted that with 6,550 current students, there were 8,756 students on the Somerset waitlist. Mr. Reeves continued through the packet where the list of services that Academica provided could be found, explaining the various cost savings as well. Mr. Reeves explained the comparison between the differing EMOs, noting that it was nearly impossible to directly compare each EMO with Academica as they all offer a variety of services. Mr. Reeves stated that the final page of the packet displayed just how far Somerset had come and also how much work there still was moving forward, including bond issuances and future campuses.

Mr. Reeves stated that as far as the contract goes, they would like to renew the partnership between Somerset and Academica for an additional charter term. Member Mizer asked if there were detailed amounts for Academica's insurance liability limits, to which Mr. Reeves replied that he did not have the policy in front of

him; however, he believed it to be a one million dollar basic limits and a five million dollar umbrella, clarifying that the limits were determined by the Board. Member Noble asked if that was adequate, to which Mr. Reeves stated that it would come into play if there was a failure on Academica's part resulting in a professional liability claim against Academica, adding that a five million dollar umbrella would essentially cover Somerset's cash on hand. Member Noble asked if that would be adequate given what Somerset brings in over the course of a year, to which Mr. Reeves replied that it would cover Somerset's assets in the rare case that it would be needed, adding that the Board could vote to increase the limits at any time. Member Noble asked if the limits had increased with Somerset's growth, to which Mr. Reeves replied in the affirmative. Member Bentham asked if Academica carried Error and Omission insurance, to which Mr. Reeves replied in the affirmative.

Member Brady asked why there was such a long term to the agreement, to which Mr. Reeves replied that it was to run concurrent with the charter contract, much as the Somerset charter received six years' worth of trust from the State, Academica was asking for six years of trust from Somerset to be a partner. Mr. Reeves added that there was a provision which would allow Somerset to terminate the contract for cause should Academica fail to do what they proposed to do. Member Brady asked if there would be a discount for size, to which Mr. Reeves replied that the increase in size had allowed Academica to not increase its fee at all and shrink in the overall percentage of budget year to year, even though Somerset's revenues had increased through significant grant funding and DSA increases. Member Noble asked if Somerset had received significant grant funding, to which Mr. Reeves stated that they had received the Great Teachers in Leading, Read by Three, Social Worker Grant, 21 Century Technology Grant; to name a few. Member Noble stated that those funds were earmarked for specific uses and really did not add to the school's overall revenue. Mr. Reeves stated that the funding had gone to staffing, teachers, and equipment; and grant funding also had gone to staffing, teachers, and equipment, adding that the increase in grant funding actually creates more work for Academica in state reporting and accounting. Member Noble stated that grant facilitation was in the Academica contract and should not be looked at as something more than was offered from the beginning, to which Mr. Reeves replied that they were simply giving what they were charging for and maintained that the charges were fair, adding that he was in no way complaining about the additional work and was, in fact, very happy to do it; however, his response stemmed from the question of a reduction in fee, which would not be reasonable with the number of students and growth in the school in order to support the Somerset system.

Member Harty pointed out that, even with inflation, Academica had not increased its fee over the years and stated that there was something to be said for the decrease as a percentage of the budget.

Mr. Reeves noted that, although the contract only required that Academica to only identify, work with, and supervise the Somerset payroll service provider, Academica would begin with this contract to pay the \$120,000 per year service fee, adding that this should be considered additional savings.

Member Noble asked if, with economies of scale, there should be some sort of break as Somerset grew, or would Academica always take their fee off the top. Mr. Reeves replied that over the next six years with the projected growth and the additional bonds that would be needed, they would not look to make a change; however, years down the road when Somerset becomes a completely mature system, then perhaps that day will come.

Member Brady addressed the Board and stated that they might need to take more time to consider this contract as, in his business experience, he had never taken so short a time to consider a contract of this magnitude, adding that he felt Academica was doing a good job and he wanted them to make a profit, he just wanted to do his due diligence in ensuring that the profit was not excessive. Member Brady stated that it was not uncommon to ask that the financials be opened and analyzed to make sure that the Board was being responsible toward the teachers and students, summing up that the contract length and no reduction in fees were his primary concerns. Mr. Bob Howell addressed the Board and stated that there had been a reduction in fees by the simple fact that they had not raised it, adding that more personnel had been hired and there would be a 5% reduction through payroll as well. Member Brady asked if they would be willing to open their financials to support that, to which

Mr. Howell replied that they were showing that Somerset received a competitive fee versus the competitors and was actually the lowest fee in the country for the services provided. Mr. Reeves stated that they were required to submit a report to the State with the total cost of expenses, to which Member Brady asked where that could be accessed. Mr. Reeves stated that the Board could request it at any time and it would be provided. Member Noble asked if this was split up by school, to which Mr. Reeves replied that it was a lump sum for the entire system, adding that it was these combined services that allowed them to charge less. Member Brady asked if all of the other schools were charged the same \$450 per student, to which Mr. Reeves replied in the affirmative. Member Brady asked if the Somerset contract was the first to be renewed, to which Mr. Reeves replied that all of the contracts began as an initial two-year period and then renewed for the term of the charter.

Member Harty noted that they could not understate the success they have had in their partnership with Somerset; however, it was their due diligence to ask questions, and asked if Mr. Reeves could explain the size of the schools for which the EMO comparisons were made. Mr. Reeves described the various schools and EMOs, emphasizing the fact that each was different in many ways, making it difficult to make a direct comparison and was therefore was a best estimate. Member Brady asked if the \$450 per pupil was negotiable, to which Mr. Reeves replied that Florida and Nevada had serviced tens of thousands of students based on that rate without raising it, adding that even with increasing responsibilities and reductions in payroll costs they were not raising it. Mr. Reeves further stated that they were offering the best rate according to industry standards taking into account all of the contracts they were able to obtain through Open Meeting Law requests, which was available in the presented graphs. Some discussion ensued regarding the comparisons between the various EMOs, including the estimated sizes of the schools associated with those EMOs.

Member Noble stated that he was satisfied with the services provided by Academica and the partnership they had with Somerset, adding that he hoped that once Somerset was a mature system they could look at a reduction in the rate; however, he would support the contract as written. Member Brady stated that he did agree; however, he would like to contract term reduced to three years, adding that if a lower fee was negotiated with another school, Somerset would be stuck with the \$450 rate for the length of the contract. Mr. Reeves stated that the State was trusting Somerset for the next six years and that Academica was asking for that same trust, adding that they would not be reducing their rate with the other schools. Mr. Reeves further stated that there was a "for cause" clause in the agreement which would allow for termination of the contract. Member Brady stated that most likely nothing would change in just three years and the contract would be renewed then. Member Bentham asked if they would be willing to add a "most favored nation" clause which would allow for Somerset's rate to be reduced if they reduced a fee with another school, to which Mr. Reeves replied in the affirmative. Member Harty asked if that should be applicable where there might be differing services provided at the other schools in comparison to Somerset, asking specifically if Academica was taking on the payroll costs for the other schools, to which Mr. Reeves replied in the negative, although they most likely will once they become the size of Somerset. Member Harty stated that a lot can happen in six years and he would be comfortable with a shorter contract.

Member Noble suggested an automatic renewal after three years if no one contested it. Mr. Howell stated that they would not accept three years, and one of the reasons was because they would be issuing bonds in the coming years and that the bank was comforted by the fact that Academica was backing the Somerset system in a six year contract. Mr. Howell further stated that these third-parties out there who bought Somerset's debt want to know that Academica was there as long as Somerset was. Member Noble stated that those lenders bought the debt knowing that the contract with Academica would need to be renewed. Mr. Reeves stated that there were lower interest rates and such that Academica negotiated that simply could not be negotiated otherwise, asking the Board to vote on the contract as it was. Mr. Reeves pointed out that he has a staff of thirty people who service the Somerset system and he was obligated to offer them stability as well.

Mr. Bentham asked about the out clause, to which Mr. Reeves replied that it was for cause in that if Academica was not doing their job well enough, Somerset could bring a letter of cause before Academica and, if they did not cure the problem, could terminate the contract. Member Harty stated that he had no doubt that

Academica would continue to perform well; however, the market rate could change within six years. Mr. Reeves acknowledged that some things could change, specifically with facilities funding, which would actually lower Academica's percentage to five or even three percent of the budget, adding that there was nothing in the contract that would allow Academica more money if funding for the school increased, even though more time and effort would need to go into that management. Mr. Howell stated that, within the contract, Academica could raise their fees; however, they would be willing to add a clause stating that they would not. Member Harty asked if they could have escalated the price if they had chosen, according to the contract, to which Mr. Reeves replied in the affirmative, adding that they had never raised it due to economies of scale.

Member Brady acknowledged that those arguments made sense; however, he questioned as to what would happen if neither Mr. Howell nor Mr. Reeves were still employees of Academica and whether what they were stating would be honored. Mr. Howell stated that the Board would then have cause to terminate the contract with Academica if the service deteriorated. Mr. Reeves stated that the State would not terminate the charter contract with Somerset and that he hoped the Board would have the same faith in Academica. Member Noble stated that the State could pull Somerset's charter at any time, to which Mr. Reeves replied that, because the State had moved to a contract model, they could not pull the charter as long as Somerset was performing according to the contract. Some discussion ensued regarding the idea of trust between the Board and Academica. Member Noble asked if they would change to contract to state that "cause" included a change in ownership at Academica, to which Mr. Howell replied in the affirmative. Mr. Howell also pointed out that within the next few years the Board could change drastically and would not have an institutional memory of what had gone on.

Member Boehlecke stated that education was her field that that six years was a blink, adding that this had grown as a partnership and to change that at this point would be problematic. Member Noble agreed, but also stated that six years was a long time for a contract.

Member Bentham stated that he understood that it was agreed that the "most favored nation" clause as well as a clause about a change in ownership being cause to terminate should be added to the contract. Member Harty requested that a broad line about market conditions also be added, to which Mr. Reeves replied that there was already a line about the fee putting the school in financial stress; however, they could look into additional wording if the Board was looking to go beyond that. Member Harty stated that he would be fine with supporting a six year contract if those additions were made and further make it clear that the fee would not escalate. Member Noble asked if there was a motion, to which Members Brady and Bentham stated that they felt it should be represented with the changes. Member Harty stated that if they pushed it to another meeting that would give the Board a chance to look at the cost and revenues that were available. Member Mizer also asked that the five million in insurance also be added in writing to the contract.

This item was Tabled.

5. Discussion Regarding Parent/Teacher Survey Results.

This item was discussed in conjunction with item #6.

6. Review of Administrators: Principal Andre Denson, Principal Reggie Farmer, Principal Gayle Jefferson, Principal Elaine Kelley, Principal Francine Mayfield, Principal Sherry Pendleton, and Principal Dan Phillips.

Member Noble Moved to enter into a closed session for a review of the administrators. Member Harty Seconded the Motion, and the Board voted unanimously to Approve.

Member Boehlecke Moved to enter into an open session. Member Bentham Seconded the Motion, and the Board voted unanimously to Approve.

Member Harty Moved to Approve the administrative salaries as discussed in the closed session. Member Bentham Seconded the Motion, and the Board voted unanimously to Approve.

Member Noble stated that there had been some concerns raised in the closed session regarding the North Las Vegas campus and suggested that the Board continue the discussion to ensure that measures were taken to make improvements on that campus. Member Noble stated that in looking over the information they had, it appeared that some of the issues that had been at that campus for years had not been corrected and were, perhaps, worsening. Member Harty stated that, as a Board, they could not be at the campus on a daily basis and were relying on the teacher and parent evaluations, as well as the number of failing classes, which showed a concerning trend; adding that they would like to look into ways of doing something differently. Member Harty stated that they did not know if it was the administration or the demographics, the teachers, the building; however, they needed to do something differently to ascertain whether or not a change was possible or, with all of the various moving parts, these things would always be an issue at North Las Vegas.

Member Noble suggested that another administrator go to the campus to help figure out what was going on and help institute procedures to the extent that they need to be instituted. Member Noble invited Principal Mayfield to address the Board. Principal Mayfield stated that she would not comment; however, she did want copies of the proceeding, both in open and closed sessions. Principal Mayfield stated that the Board did not know what the procedures were and they were basing their opinions on something they did not know, adding that the Board had not done its due diligence. Member Noble stated that they were basing their opinion on the information provided and reminded Principal Mayfield that no action had been taken. Principal Mayfield stated that Board was saying that no changes had occurred at the North Las Vegas campus; however, the Board did not know because they had not investigated the situation. Member Harty asked what Principal Mayfield suggested they to, to which Principal Mayfield replied that she did not know and it was not for her to say. Member Harty stated that he agreed and, in order to do their due diligence, it would be best to ask the Executive Director to get more involved at that campus. Principal Mayfield stated that she had all the confidence in the world in Mr. Barlow; however, to imply that no changes had been made at the campus was libelous. Member Noble stated that the Board was not implying that things had not been done, but that the changes had not produced results that were evident in the reports they had received. Principal Mayfield stated that they did not have all the information. Member Noble asked if she would like to present additional information, to which Principal Mayfield replied that she could not at that time due to it being a very complex issue with complex solutions which were already in place, adding that if the Board would like to ask specific questions for which they would like information, she would be happy to provide it. Principal Mayfield further stated that no one had been to her campus and, furthermore, asked how many of the Board members had pulled their kids from her campus.

Member Harty stated that he would like to clarify that it was not really an investigation but an allocation of resources where they were needed most, adding that teacher and student retention were not where they should be and that was not necessarily an administration issue; however, he would like to see more resources allocated in an effort to make those determinations and help the situation. Principal Mayfield stated that they did not necessary need more resources at that point, but to know why, adding that the Board could not determine “why” based on the evaluations the Board had read. Principal Mayfield stated that the Board needed to look into the evaluations of each teacher who left to determine what kind of teacher he or she was. Principal Mayfield further stated that she took severe umbrage to the fact that the Board implied that there was a new face at North Las Vegas and nothing had changed, adding that the school had employed two extremely competent and experienced principals and needed to look at the common variable. Principal Mayfield invited them to have someone come in and see what was in place and then decide if things need to change, because the Board did not have any evidence as yet. Member Harty stated that this was precisely what the Board was saying. Member Noble stated that he had information before him that did not show much of a change from three years ago. Principal Mayfield stated that

she would invite Mr. Barlow to come to North Las Vegas and go over all of her procedures and present them to the Board and, if the Board still believes not enough has been done, she will listen to the Board's action steps. Member Noble stated that that was a good start; however, whoever goes into the school should have some authority to work together to implement something, to which Principal Mayfield replied that he was assuming things had not been implemented, adding that the results before the Board did not measure those things. Member Noble asked if there was some other data the Board should be looking at, to which Principal Mayfield replied that she had loads of data, and that she would like the Board to have a more thorough understanding of what was happening at the school. Member Harty stated that he agreed.

Member Noble stated that he believed they were on the same page and asked if she was suggesting that she did not want a person to come in and work with her to implement anything that needed to be implemented, to which Principal Mayfield replied that the Board did not know that anything did need to be implemented. Member Boehlecke stated that they all wanted the same thing which was why they were asking for a more investigatory work. Member Bentham stated that the Board was going off of one particular set of data that they had for each administrator and agreed that Mr. Barlow should come in and look at things more in-depth and visit with Principal Mayfield, and come back with a full report as to what was the full scope of issues at North Las Vegas, and perhaps they could work together to find some solutions. Principal Mayfield stated that the process they were using was very flawed and that she would respond through her attorney, adding that a principal should not be evaluated in this way. Principal Mayfield stated that of course Mr. Barlow could come; however, she felt she should be the one to bring information to the Board because assumptions were being made that were not based on any kind of evidence. Member Noble stated that the Board was not taking any negative action at that time.

Member Harty suggested that they should define the scope of what they were asking of Executive Director Barlow, in that it would be either investigatory or supervisory. Member Noble stated that he thought Executive Director Barlow should have the authority to make necessary changes; however, at a minimum they should work together to the extent that they could come up with some common solutions, adding that Executive Director Barlow might come back and report that nothing needed to be changed. Member Noble stated that they would have to wait until the Board met again before any action was taken if Executive Director Barlow was not given the authority to make changes. Member Harty also did not want to limit the scope to investigatory, and hoped that two seasoned administrators could work together. Principal Mayfield asked if this was only based on the information the Board had before them. Member Boehlecke asked what other data they could use, to which Principal Mayfield stated that it was inappropriate to ask that question as the Board had already made their decision. Member Boehlecke stated that they were just having a conversation and this was a perfect time to ask questions. Principal Mayfield stated that the Board was unfamiliar with the teacher evaluations as well as the procedures for handling due process, which the Board should certainly be familiar with because it was the law and the reason that students would not be suspended immediately following a bullying situation, adding that the statements in the survey were being taken at face value even though they were not true statements. Member Boehlecke stated that the Board was aware of that, which was why they wanted to investigate a little deeper.

Member Bentham stated that they were having this dialogue in order to ask questions, to which Principal Mayfield replied that forty-five minutes was not long enough for her to give all the necessary information, adding that she had no idea what questions were going to be asked because this process had been different from previous years. Principal Mayfield stated that there was data that was given to the Board that she was not privy to until it reached the Board. Member Harty asked to which information she was referring, to which Principal Mayfield stated that it was the data regarding the failure rates. Member Harty stated that Principal Mayfield had been copied on the email when the Board received the data. Principal Mayfield stated that it had only been two days ago, which did not give her enough time to provide the Board with the in-depth answers required. Member Harty stated that he agreed with her assessment; however, the step would be to investigate more deeply and see what could be accomplished with the help of Mr. Barlow, adding that no negative action was being taken. Principal Mayfield stated that they were taking negative action in that it would be Mr. Barlow's assessment that there was something

wrong, adding that he was not her supervisor, and they were changing his job description, and that if he wanted to change something he would need to have to approved by the Board as it was their responsibility.

Principal Mayfield stated that she had a lot of respect for Mr. Barlow and would certainly take his assessment. Principal Mayfield further stated that in respect to resources she had not been sent any when it came to the roof that had been leaking for three years and had not been fixed. Principal Mayfield stated that she was not going to answer questions now because she was forced to defend herself, adding that in the closed session she had begun to answer the question of what the Board could do, but she never got any answers as to what they were going to do to help, although there was a good suggestion regarding class-size reduction that would probably not get past Academica. Principal Mayfield stated that her numbers in middle school should be 120; however, they had 125 enrolled which resulted in over 32 students in some of the core classes, adding that they just kept sending more kids over. Principal Mayfield stated that she knew the Board did not know these things and added that they had not given her a chance to answer to any of this. Member Boehlecke stated that they were trying to delve deeper now based on the data they had been given, which was their responsibility as a Board. Member Noble asked why they were hearing about all of these concerns now instead of asking for help previously; adding that he knew about the leak in the roof and had believed that it was fixed. Principal Mayfield asked how they would get that information, to which Member Noble replied that it should come from Principal Mayfield. Principal Mayfield stated that there was procedure to follow and that she had gone through the facilities manager. Ms. Crystal Thiriot addressed the Board and stated that there had been a leak and that the facilities manager had been on campus that day to take care of it. Member Noble stated that he did not have a way of knowing about these issues if he was not told, to which Principal Mayfield replied that that was why the procedure was flawed. Member Boehlecke stated that the information they received indicated a need for more information, which was what they were trying to gain.

Member McClellan stated that she too would be very frustrated to have her evaluation based on statements from various and potentially disgruntled sources, adding that she thought they should give Principal Mayfield a chance to respond in a way she was prepared for. Member McClellan stated that by bringing Executive Director Barlow in, they could gain a better understanding of the situation. Member Noble clarified that Principal Mayfield did not want Executive Director Barlow to come in as a supervisor, but instead bring information back to the Board, to which Principal Mayfield replied that it was premature to bring Mr. Barlow in as they Board did not yet have all the information, adding that the Board was her supervisor and direction should come from them. Principal Mayfield stated that the Board was way out of line in that they had not done their due diligence and did not have the information they needed in order to make a sound and wise decision. Member Noble stated that, with more information, they might not need to make any changes; however, based on their visibility, this was the conclusion they had drawn, to which Principal Mayfield replied in the affirmative and added that “visibility” was the operative word.

Principal Mayfield asked what the parameters of this investigation would be, to which Member Noble stated that he would not be coming up questions, but would trust a seasoned administrator to identify issues or find that there were none. Member Bentham stated that there were many items that Principal Mayfield had brought up in the closed session that Executive Director Barlow could further bring to light. Principal Mayfield stated that the Board had still not fulfilled their fiduciary responsibilities because they had not been in the school doing their own measurements and making assessments. Member Boehlecke stated that she would keep returning to the fact that Board was not passing judgement as it seemed they were being accused of; however, they were looking to gather data. Member Boehlecke stated that it was the Board’s responsibility to discover why the data looked like it did and, as a principal, she would assume Principal Mayfield would like to know why also. Principal Mayfield stated that she knew why and she could give all the data to Mr. Barlow to make his assessment.

Member Mizer requested that the motion stipulate that Executive Director Barlow was not going in as a supervisor.

Member Noble moved to give Executive Director Barlow the responsibility of visiting the North Las Vegas campus in a non-supervisory role as many times as necessary in order to assess the procedures and report recommendations to the Board regarding possible changes. Member Bentham Seconded the Motion, and the Board voted unanimously to Approve.

Member Bentham asked if the roof was still leaking, to which Principal Mayfield stated that they had not received substantial rain as yet, so it remained to be seen, adding that the only part of the roof that had been fixed was the part that was owned by Somerset, although the leased portion was still leaking. Ms. Thiriot stated that the problem was that we did not own that portion. Principal Mayfield stated that that was not her problem. Ms. Thiriot stated that Jacob Smoot had been working with the roofing company. Member Bentham asked if someone was responsible for the leased side. Ms. Thiriot stated that she would look into the situation.

Member Noble thanked Principal Mayfield for coming back out, to which Principal Mayfield replied that she was not done because she would not leave without the tapes of the proceedings. Member Noble stated that there were no tapes and that it was recorded digitally on a device. Principal Mayfield stated that she would wait for someone to download her portions so that they could not be transcribed before she received her copies. Ms. Thiriot stated that the portion from the closed session would not be transcribed but was only stored, to which Principal Mayfield stated that she wanted her copy of it, adding that she knew there was a way to transcribe it; however, she wanted the copy before it was transcribed. Ms. Jennifer Elison addressed the Board and stated that she would give Principal Mayfield a copy of just her portion of the closed session, to which Principal Mayfield asked to receive it before she left. Ms. Thiriot stated that she did not think that was possible, to which Principal Mayfield stated that they would then give it to her at their own risk. Member Bentham stated that it would have to be downloaded and the other evaluations would need to be edited out. Ms. Thiriot clarified that it would be edited in that Principal Mayfield would only receive her portion of the closed session. Principal Mayfield stated that she understood what was being said.

7. Review of Executive Director John Barlow.

Member Noble Moved to enter into a closed session. Member Boehlecke Seconded the Motion, and the Board voted unanimously to Approve.

Member Noble Moved to enter into an open session. Member Boehlecke Seconded the Motion, and the Board voted unanimously to Approve.

Member Noble Moved to Approve the salary amount for Executive Director John Barlow that was discussed in the closed session. Member Boehlecke Seconded the Motion, and the Board voted unanimously to Approve.

8. Public Comments and Discussion.

Ms. Kristie Fleisher addressed the Board and clarified that the target enrollments for 6th, 7th, and 8th as approved by the Board at the North Las Vegas campus were 155, and that was what had been reported to Principal Mayfield. Ms. Fleisher stated that currently there were: 149 students in 6th grade; 147 students in 7th grade; and 137 students in 8th grade. Ms. Fleisher added that the largest class size of any core or elective class at the North Las Vegas campus was 32 students in a Computer Literacy class; as well as six classes with 31 students.

9. Adjournment.

Member Noble adjourned the meeting at 1:25 a.m.

Approved on: 11-3-16



Secretary of the Board of Directors
Somerset Academy of Las Vegas