

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
NOVEMBER 1, 2023
2:00 PM**

Office	Address	City	Meeting
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo	Las Vegas	Room 114
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson	Board Room
Department of Education	Virtual/Livestream	Virtual	Virtual

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Felicia Ortiz, President
Dr. Katherine Dockweiler, Vice President
Tamara Hudson, Board Clerk
Rene Cantu
Tate Else
Tim Hughes
Michael Keyes
Angela Orr
Mike Walker

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT EXCUSED

Joe Arrascada

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Ann Marie Dickson, Deputy Superintendent for Student Investment Division
Lisa Ford, Chief Strategy Office
Christy McGill, Deputy Superintendent for Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement
Megan Peterson, Deputy Superintendent for Student Investment Division
Joseph Baggs, Administrative Assistant
Angie Castellanos, Administrative Assistant
Jessica DeLallo, Title I Director for the Office of Student and School Supports
Kathleen Galland- Collins, Education Programs Supervisor
Sean Goff, Management Analyst
Kevin Highey, Education Programs Professional
Kristofer Huffman, Strategic Consultant
Laronica Mauer, Education Programs Professional
Christopher McAnany, Education Programs Supervisor
Maria Sauter, Education Programs Director
Craig Statucki, Director of Career Readiness, Adult Learning, and Education Options
Karl Wilson, Education Programs Supervisor

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

Dr. Ashley Greenwald, Project Director of the Positive Behavior Support – Nevada
Patricia Haddad, CCSD Government Relations Director
Dr. Pam Salazar, Teachers and Leaders Council Chair

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Meeting called to order at 2:02 P.M. by President Felicia Ortiz. Quorum was established. President Ortiz led the Pledge of Allegiance and provided a land acknowledgement.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

- a. Sylvia Lazos, community member, provided written comment regarding agenda item 10.
(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)

3. APPROVAL OF FLEXIBLE AGENDA

Member Cantu moved to approve a flexible agenda. Member Hudson seconded. Motion passed.

4. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

- **Introduction of new Board Member**

President Ortiz welcomed Angela Orr the newest Board member. She introduced her, provided the Board with some background information, and gave her the opportunity to say a few words to the Board. Angela Orr thanked the Board and mentioned that she looks forward to learning a lot from the Board meetings. President Ortiz also mentioned that she will be scheduling time with Member Orr to go over onboarding information.

- **Board Member Updates**

Member Cantu mentioned that he had the opportunity to present to the Commission on School Funding Board about the workforce programs under his nonprofit role. He also mentioned that other nonprofits and Workforce Connections were also in attendance. President Ortiz had a follow-up question, she wanted to know if CSF is responsible to find funding for the Board or if it was to show value on what the Board is doing right now or if the Board needs to do more. Member Cantu mentioned that the CSF Board members are all fiscal people, and it was on how to find the fund and support on initiatives that work. He went on to say that it was an excellent opportunity to connect with the fiscal people.

5. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

Deputy Superintendent Ann Marie Dickson provided the Board with the Superintendent's report.

- **Nevada Future of Learning Network**

Ann Marie Dickson, Deputy Superintendent, mentioned that on October 13th and 14th Superintendent Ebert attended the celebratory launch event Nevada Future of Learning Network at Spring Valley High School. She mentioned that the event featured inspiring students and showcased educators across the State on their ongoing work to bring the portrait of the Nevada learner concepts and personalized the Competency Based learning in classrooms.

- **School Visits**

Ann Marie Dickson, Deputy Superintendent, stated that Superintendent Ebert was able to visit schools in Elko and Humble County to see the amazing work that is being done. She went on to state that as the year progresses the Superintendent will be conducting a Listening Tour across all districts to hear schools on how they connect with the Nevada portrait of the learner.

- **Career Technical Education Course Catalog**

Ann Marie Dickson, Deputy Superintendent, informed the Board that the 2023-2024 Nevada Career and Technical education (CTE) course catalog is available on the Nevada Department of Education's website. She went on to mention that the CTE course catalog was developed to provide a resource that consolidates all secondary CTE courses in Nevada and it is to be used as the sole resource for school districts and public charter schools.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

Member Dockweiler moved to approve the consent agenda. Member Hudson seconded. Motion passed.

7. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE EDUCATOR SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS *(Information/Discussion/Possible Action)*

Director Jeff Briske and Dr. Sean Goff provided information regarding the current available funds for scholarships awards and requests for fiscal year 2024 pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 391A.550-90, Assembly Bill (AB) 400 (2023), and AB 515 (2023). They provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the [Educator Scholarships](#) and the [Annual Report on the Teach Nevada Scholarship Program for Fiscal Year 2023](#).

President Ortiz mentioned that she would like to vote on each motion separately because a few members will have to abstain.

Director Jeff Briske and Dr. Sean Goff presented a PowerPoint presentation regarding the Educator Scholarships. Director Briske went on to present the strategic improvement plan alignment that included the goal, input, output, and outcome. He also mentioned to the Board the purpose of the Teach Nevada Scholarship, the eligibility requirements for the TNS and the financial disbursements. He also provided the Board with FY2023 report overview per Assembly Bill 400 Sec. 56, the report of recipient status and report of recipient employment. He went on to present to the Board the summary of available award funds for TNS. He went on to present the next slide which included the TNS request of \$7.9 million dollars and then moved on to slide 9 which included information on the possible motion for the Board.

Member Cantú moved to approve the Teach Nevada Scholarship. Member Hudson seconded. Motion passed. Member Hughes and Member Dockweiler abstained.

Director Jeff Briske and Dr. Sean Goff continued with their PowerPoint presentation on slide 9, the Incentivizing Pathways to Teaching (IPT) Purpose. He went on to state the purpose of the IPT and presented the Board with the eligibility requirements and financial disbursements. He also presented the Board with the IPT available award funds, IPT requests, suggested summary of IPT total awards reduced by 14.04%, and presented the Board with the slide that contained the IPT possible motion information.

Member Hudson moved to approve the Incentivizing Pathways to Teaching. Member Hughes seconded. Motion passed. Member Dockweiler abstained.

Director Jeff Briske and Dr. Sean Goff continued with their PowerPoint presentation on slide 16 regarding the Nevada Teacher Advancement Scholarship (NTAS) which included information on the purpose, eligibility, and financial disbursements. The next slide included information regarding the NTAS available award funds, the NTAS requests, the NTAS recipients reduced by 5.5%, and the NTAS possible motion.

Member Hughes did want to know if director Briske had some insight on why the legislative enacted the scholarship to come from the districts and not the University systems. Director Briske was not sure.

Member Hudson moved to approve the Nevada Teacher Advancement Scholarship. Member Cantu seconded. Motion passed. Member Dockweiler abstained.

8. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING A REVIEW OF THE NEVADA EDUCATOR PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK YEARLY DATA (*Information/Discussion*)

Kathleen Galland-Collins and Dr. Pam Salazar provided information regarding the Nevada Educator Performance Framework summative evaluation ratings and survey data from the annual Monitoring for Continuous Improvement (MCI) educator surveys for the 2022-23 school year. They provided the Board with a PowerPoint presentation regarding [Nevada Educator Performance Framework 2022-23 Summative Evaluation and Monitoring for Continuous Improvement Data Review](#).

Kathleen Galland-Collins started the PowerPoint presentation with the outcomes and moved on to the next slide which included the STIP Alignment. Next slide presented the monitoring of the NEPF, which included information on NRS 391.48, annual review of statewide performance evaluation system; annual review of the way schools carries out evaluations pursuant to system. She presented to the Board the NEPF Summative Ratings data overview, which included the following educator groups: Audiologists, School Administrators, School Counselors, School Nurse, School Psychologists, School Social Workers, Speech-Language Pathologists, Teacher-Librarians, and Teachers.

President Ortiz wanted to receive some clarification if there has been discussion on the anticipated trend of teachers being exempted, specifically if it will grow overtime or level off at a certain percentage. Kathleen Galland-Collins mentioned that no conversations with TLC or internally within the department around percentages but offered to put together a chart with last few years exemptions. She went on to the next slide, number 7, which included the overview of NEPF summative ratings with class size adjustments and who is eligible. Kathleen Galland-Collins mentioned that research shows that the data will fluctuate over time, and you will see growth. Member Walker wanted to state that he used to work in TLC and that data is reviewed and it is a continuous process. Member Hughes mentioned that it would be helpful to see the trend on student outcomes as well. President Ortiz mentioned that it would be nice to see an overly and see if there is any correlation.

Member Orr agrees that it would be nice to see the student outcome data lined up with the Teacher trend data. Kathleen Galland-Collins continued with the presentation and showed slide number 13 regarding the Board the Administrator Score Distribution chart.

Member Orr asked how many administrators are receiving highly effective or effective evaluations in a one- or two-star school. Dr. Pam Salazar answered her question and mentioned that even though a school can be classified as a low performing school it is not a one-to-one and it's difficult to isolate an individual, but the research is happening. President Ortiz asked if any other profession receive performance rating to have something to compare. Dr. Salazar mentioned that there have been those comparisons but that in education it is different since the schools don't get to select their clients, and are not in control of certain circumstances, and that there's too many external factors.

President Ortiz mentioned that what if a name change happened instead of Educator Performance how about Educator Development Framework, since educators are still developing. Member Dockweiler asked if it's possible to get trend data on the next three years in the early years from educators. Dr. Salazar mentioned that unfortunately that information is not available since there is no funding for it and that they're still working using excel worksheets. Member Else mentioned that a larger discussion of accountability needs to happen, and the implementation process has been a long road. Member Cantu wanted to clarify that both Educator Performance and Educator Development are important.

Kathleen Galland-Collins continued with slide number 14 regarding the Administrator Student Learning Goal Score Distribution, which included information on data limitations. She went on to continue with slide number 17 and mentioned that NEPF MCI Survey Data, the information included the percentage of responses from administrators and teachers. She moved into slide number 18 which included information on NPF MCI Survey Trend Data – Feedback, which she elaborated to the board on the chart of the Educator Feedback Three Year Trend Data. On slide 19 she mentioned that NEPF MCI Survey Trend Data – Growth and explained to the Board the chart. She moved into slide 20 and went over the NEPF MCI Survey Data – Impact on Time and elaborated to the Board what the chart meant. On slide 21, she mentioned what the survey data limitations are and went over the local control of survey distribution. On the next slide she went over the NEPF MCI Interview Data which included information on the process of the interviews.

Member Hughes asked if families have any right around the NEPF Terms, for example knowing the individual teacher rating. Kathleen Galland-Collins answered that not at this time since most of the evaluation data is HR specific. Superintendent Ebert stated looking at the data that looking at the chart it does seem like the feedback is positive. Kathleen Galland-Collins mentioned that it is the first session that no changes from the legislation has happened.

President Ortiz asked Kathleen Galland-Collins and Dr. Pam Salazar if they needed any help to advocate for any bill to help with the technology road map. Member Walker stated that he would like to see a better way to show success and growth and mentioned that growth should be encouraged and celebrated.

9. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING CHANGES TO THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT DESIGNATIONS AND THE CURRENT STATUS OF SCHOOLS

(Information/Discussion)

Director Maria Sauter, Director Jessica DeLallo, and Christopher McAnany provided information regarding changes to the criteria for entrance and exit to school improvement designations, and received an introduction to the new designation, More Rigorous Interventions (MRI). In addition, the Board received a power point presentation on the [2023-24 status of Nevada schools](#).

Director Maria Sauter started with an overview of what the Board will hear with slides 1 – 3. She went on to slide 4 which went over the Targeted Support and Intervention (TSI) information and stated that the only change was the exit criteria and that the benefit of the change is that the districts are the closest to the schools and the community to best understand their needs and the new criteria allow local education agencies to target their supports to a specific identified student group. She went on to the second group, Additional Targeted Support and Intervention (ATSI), she went on to mention that this group is identified by the CSI and went on to state the benefits of the change. She moved on to the next group, Comprehensive Support and Intervention (CSI) and mentioned the benefits of the change. She moved on to the next slide which went over more rigorous intervention in schools' information and the benefits. She went over the six essential steps for improvement categories for the more rigorous interventions schools.

President Ortiz wanted some clarification on where it states principals and their teams, and whether this includes all their teachers and not just administration. Director Maria mentioned that yes, it is intended to include all teachers and not just administration. President Ortiz mentioned that maybe the wording should be changed to instructional team. Director Maria mentioned that category six does state this. She moved on to the next slide which included the 4 domains for rapid school improvement. President Ortiz wanted to know where parents or family involvement would fall under. Director Maria answered by mentioning that it would fall under Culture Shift and elaborated that it is a very brief indicator structure.

Member Hughes wanted to know is the expectations is for ELAs to align with this framework. Director Maria mentioned that the answer is currently no but are looking into it. Member Orr asked if schools get

more flexibility in hiring if designated in one of these designations. Director Maria mentioned that it is a local decision. Superintendent Ebert clarified that it would local districts that would make that determination.

Director Maria continued her presentation on the 302 Designated Schools slide, highlighting the exit and mentioned to the Board that all categories have schools' exit. She continued with the slide titled A System of Support and went through the multiple step tier support systems. She moved on to the next slide which consisted of information on Federal funding for the most at-risk schools and mentioned federal funding sources for Title I – Title IV.

President Ortiz asked for some clarification on whether the funding source from the Federal government the state or the district portion. Director Maria mentioned that it is both but there's different categories for all the grants and criteria. She continued to show the Board what support and professional learning opportunities the Department is providing and mentioned that schools can pick and choose what best support they would like to receive from the Department. President Ortiz mentioned that she would like to know how this is being marketed to the schools as an asset. Director Maria mentioned that data is being collected to have the correct information on how to share the best practices. President Ortiz mentioned that she would like to encourage the shift of the misinterpretation that the Board has and wants schools to feel that the state is their partner. Director Maria presented the Board with the timeline for implementation which included the breakdown of dates and the support the schools can receive. President Ortiz mentioned that she would like in the future for some MSI schools to share with the Board their performance improvement plan, what are the enduring challenges, and what are the schools doing with the Departments help and how can the Board help.

Member Hudson elaborated that she would like to see how some schools are collaborating with other grade levels to align the goals. Director Maria mentioned that she agrees with Member Hudson and aligning the help and resources. Member Hudson also mentioned that she would like to see accountability in kindergarten – 2nd Grade, and if preschool is an option also included them as well.

Member Hughes asked if the six categories are using the old or the new business rules. Director Maria mentioned that it is using the new business rules. Member Hughes asked if the breakdown for the old business rules is available and how that would change the chart. Director Maria mentioned that she would need to speak with Director Zutz and get the data because it was done. Member Hughes wanted some clarification on the financial part and calculations. Director Maria mentioned that there is no lag time and adjustments are only made to one section once a school existed those funds are no longer available to that school, but the Department does try to fill in that gap. Member Hughes wanted clarification on if the Department had more schools in a severe designation would the Department receive more Federal funding. Director Maria clarified that no, if there were more schools allocated to the categories then each school would receive a less.

Member Orr asked if there was a way to see the information on why exiting schools believe they were able to exit. President Ortiz mentioned that the Board would like to see exit surveys. Member Hudson also stated that an evaluation piece is needed to be able see accountability and alignment on how the goals are being meet.

10. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING DISCIPLINE DATA AND RESTORATIVE JUSTICE (*Information/Discussion*)

Deputy Superintendent Christy McGill, Laronica Maurer, and Dr. Ashley Greenwald provided information regarding the 82nd Legislative Session bills AB 285 and AB 330 changes to progressive discipline and

restorative practices, and an update on the discipline data. They provided a power point presentation on the [2022-23 Discipline Data Report and Restorative Practices](#).

Deputy Superintendent Christy McGill started the presentation and provided the Board with the presentation outcomes and mentioned the basic changes in Assembly Bill (AB) 300 (2023) and AB 285 (2023). She continued with the progressive discipline based on restorative justice information. During the next slide Laronica Maurer went over the suspensions and expulsion rates by race/ethnicity for the 2022-23 school year. Laronica went over the breakdown of the chart with the Board she continued to the next chart which had a breakdown on expulsions, suspensions, and enrollment by student group and mentioned that one concern is this category is that the students on free and reduced lunch account for 80.65% of the Nevada student population and have the highest rates in both expulsions and suspensions but saw a decrease in both this school year. She went on to the next slide which included the breakdown of the state percentages by gender. The next slide contained information from the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 385A.650, and she mentioned what school improvement plans must include. She continued to the next slide and went over the Nevada School Climate Data, which was attained using the student school climate survey data including a three-year comparison chart. The next slide included information on how many schools participated, number of students completions, total number of students in participating schools, and final submission rate. During the next slide she went over the staff school climate survey data and the three-year comparison and provided the Board with the information on the number of participating districts, number of participating schools, and number of surveys started. She continued to the next slide which highlighted information on how to build positive relationships. The next slide continued with information on the new school climate standards for excellence and she mentioned that this will help schools to identify if they need improvement, are adequate, or are excellent based on expert-review of the content of the survey.

Dr. Greenwald continued the presentation and started with the slide that included information for the Board on whether behavior problems were a system or student problem. She continued with the slide, and it contained a model on the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support and Restorative Practices and provided the Board with a breakdown of each tier. She started the next slide, and it included the Tier I information and gave the Board information on this tier.

President Ortiz asked if Dr. Greenwald was able to provide the Board with a list of schools that are in tier 1. Dr. Greenwald mentioned that she does not have a list available for the Board right now but that she would send the information.

Dr. Greenwald continued with the next slide that discussed the Tier 2- Targeted Interventions for students at risk breakdown. Tier 3 – Individualized support for a few students was provided by Dr. Greenwald and went over the information for the Board. President Ortiz wanted clarification on the part where it states skill deficits and whether it pertains to students only or students and the adults dealing with them as well. Dr. Greenwald mentioned that it's for both and she went on to clarify that it was being deficit in both academics and behavior.

Member Cantu needed some clarification between tier two and three students at risk versus individualized support and the 5% at 3% versus what is that at in tier 2. Dr. Greenwald mentioned that they identify this by the number of behavior or academic referrals are received and when the data is received, what is looked at is if 15-20 % of students have their needs meet at tier 2 and 3-5% of students would need individualized intensive intervention at tier 3 and she mentioned that when a student is not successful in tier 1 by identifying markers, student needs, and local control by the advanced tier 2 or 3 team. She also mentioned that there are entry criteria and explained to the Board the criteria for behavior and academic, she also mentioned that there are exit criteria as well. Member Cantu had a follow up question on how the MTSS correlates to the weighted funding. Superintendent Ebert mentioned that all the components that Dr.

Greenwald mentioned is the criteria for the identification of at-risk students and that the funding that is allocated is for the 20th percentile for the students that are not on track to graduate with their peers. She also mentioned that not all schools are currently using MTSS so that report would not be possible.

Member Cantu asked if this report, where the money and the intervention match would be available in the future. Superintendent Ebert mentioned that it is a goal. Member Dockweiler wanted to know if teachers or administrators that are currently present how MTSS is working in the schools. Member Else mentioned that they don't use MTSS, but they do have a tier system like MTSS, the benefits are the resources that come with it. Member Hudson mentioned that staffing is a concern but is on the right track with support groups and parent support, and she sees the progress.

Dr. Greenwald continued with the presentation and started with the professional development and MTSS training highlight reel, which included the breakdown of training for each tier. She went on to the next slide on Nevada student level outcomes with bullying trends and gave the Board the breakdown in data for non-participating schools, participating schools, and high-fidelity schools.

President Ortiz wanted to know which schools are missing from the chart since the chart only lists 500 schools instead of the almost 775 schools. Dr. Greenwald mentioned that the external evaluator pulls schools that have comparable indicators to the implementing sites and mentioned to the Board that if they would like the specific indicators used, she can later provide the information to the Board. President Ortiz mentioned she would like this information added to the slide so that the public is aware that not all schools are listed, and she also wanted to receive some clarification from the chart since it seemed like the non-participating schools are performing at the same or better. Dr. Greenwald shared with the Board that the data that was used was collected from school sites were selected as part of federal funds and as high needs LEAs and mentioned that typically these schools have more challenging behaviors.

Member Dockweiler wanted to know where the schools are geographically. Dr. Greenwald mentioned that the schools are Statewide. She continued to the next slide on the Nevada Student Outcomes which included information on trends in disciplinary incidents related to violence and possession. President Ortiz did recommend for this slide to be removed since the data is inconsistent and has a couple of years missing. Dr. Greenwald offered to remove the dotted data line from the pandemic year since students were not on campus and confirmed with the Board that a new report would be submitted, she continued with the slide and only mentioned the first three years. She continued to inform the Board of the breakdown of incidents in disciplinary incidents with high-fidelity schools, participating schools, and non-participating schools.

Laronica Maurer continued the presentation with the professional development and implementation from the Office of a Safe and Respectful Learning Environment and their continuation on working on a systematic approach to students and staff behavior. She also went over the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) and how \$2 million in ESSER III funds are dedicated to creating and implementing district and charter Progressive Discipline Plans, she also mentioned that funding goals. President Ortiz asked where schools and LEAs can apply for the funds. Laronica Maurer mentioned that the deadline was October 16th and currently reviewing applications.

President Ortiz mentioned that this should be excluded from the slide to avoid any confusion, since it is no longer an opportunity. Member Dockweiler did have a follow-up question for Deputy Attorney General regarding the Board's authority to assist implementation guard rails monitoring mechanisms training and asked if the Board should determine that some additional regulation is needed to support the laws. Deputy Attorney General mentioned that under NRS 385.085 it allows the Board to do so. President Ortiz asked if both Laronica Maurer and Deputy Superintendent Christy McGill to provide the Board, where there is

language that is too vague and open to interpretation to help set regulation that better clarifies the expectations and how to setup guardrails of MTSS and restorative practices.

Member Hughes had a follow-up question on the funding goal to eliminating disproportionality at the suspension and expulsion data and what are the steps that are in place to assure that schools are reporting all students that are being removed from a classroom. Deputy Superintendent Christy McGill mentioned that there are systems in place when a child is removed from a classroom for any reason and are currently looking at the data definitions and making sure the wording is the same across all districts. President Ortiz had a follow-up question on what the mechanisms in place are to ensure that when a student is removed that student is still receiving a quality education. Laronica Maurer answered this question by stating AB 285 requires all students that are expelled or suspended receive an individualized restorative plan and mentioned this is a bill that contains some ambiguity.

President Ortiz had a question for Superintendent Ebert and asked that with the groups that are currently working on the portrait of a Nevada learner to make sure this is a consideration on the implementation. Superintendent Ebert stated that yes, fidelity with implementation.

Member Cantu asked what the status is on reducing the disproportional number of disciplinary actions towards members of groups that are overrepresented and disproportionately impacted by behavioral interventions. Deputy Superintendent Christy McGill stated that the separation of the two is very difficult. Member Cantu had a follow-up, if MTSS system is the approach to help address the long-term issue are LEAs and districts required by law, regulation, or voluntary of implementing MTSS with fidelity. Laronica Maurer mentioned that there is a requirement in NRS 392.472 that a progressive discipline plan based on restorative justice that a Statewide framework is established, and she continued to state part of the framework. Member Cantu wanted to receive more clarification if MTSS implementation is legislative mandated or voluntary. Deputy Superintendent Christy McGill answered the question and mentioned that an integrated approach is in NRS but that districts use MTSS that is not required.

Member Orr mentioned that she would like to make a request when staff is presenting on opportunities for teachers, schools, or districts that the Board receives some statistics and demographics on who is taking part in the resources that are being provided by the Department.

11. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE STATEWIDE PLAN FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF PUPILS (*Information/Discussion*)

Lisa Ford, Chief Strategy Office and Kristofer Huffman, Strategic Consultant provided the Board with an update on evidence and data related to the STIP in addition to a plan to develop a revision for 2024. They provided the Board with a PowerPoint presentation [Nevada Statewide Plan for the Improvement of Pupils \(STIP\) Update](#).

CSO Lisa Ford started the presentation with the general information and objectives, which included the staff of the NDE Coordinating Council. She continued with the next slide and gave the Board a recap of the 2020 STIP and 2023 Addendum, which included 6 goals, 6 values, and 36 strategies.

Kristofer Huffman presented the next slide where he mentioned the shift in focus and included the final addendum for 2020 STIP. He continued with the next slide which focused on the clarity of vision, mission, values, and goal, he elaborated to the Board that the vision and mission would not change. During the next slide he mentioned the values and mentioned that it would not be changing but the approach to the demonstration of the values will and provided the Board with a comparison. He continued to the next slide and went over the changes, which included the goal, and the office supports and mentioned to the Board that the goal is to provide a broad goal but identify action items and metrics that can be monitored and

influenced by changes in the educational political and physical landscape.

President Ortiz asked about the goal and how it is affective. Kristofer Huffman mentioned that during the next slide he can address this concern. He continued to the next slide and provided information regarding the purpose statement and actions and metrics in every level and mentioned that this goal focuses on the actions and every role within the department will have a clear charge. He went on to say that over the last several years smart goals have been mentioned and stated that having the flexibility of the new goals will help in how we develop the actions and metrics.

President Ortiz wanted to know if the new plan includes moving into a smart goal. Kristofer Huffman answered yes. Member Hughes stated he would like to make sure that this also includes not overly focusing on in-puts. Kristofer Huffman mentioned that with the previous STIP had a lot of indirect influences but with the new plan we are shifting the focus.

Member Dockweiler wanted to mention a point of consideration if maybe the wording is changed from goal to overarching purpose or objective. Kristofer Huffman thanked Member Dockweiler and mentioned that this would align with the additional purpose statement that the Department is currently working on and mentioned that he would meet with the council and Superintendent Ebert to discuss a shift in the vocabulary.

Member Orr had a follow up statement regarding not building goals that are not aligned with the belief in making change and why the Department is not changing the missions and values if the Department does not believe it can impact and wanted to know if the Department had discussed changing the mission and vision.

President Ortiz mentioned that the vision and mission are defined by the Board of Education and not the Department of Education and clarified that it will stay the same for the entire system. Kristofer Huffman continued with his presentation and gave the Board a timeline of STIP 2020/2024, this included the Office and Division meetings for 2020 STIP information in Oct-Nov '23, purpose statement and actions and metrics developed in Nov '23 – Jan. '24, stakeholder input and draft development in Jan.-Feb. '24 and presentation of the 2024 STIP in Mar '24.

12. 4:00 P. M. PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE PERKINS V STATE PLAN REVISION *(Information and Discussion)*

Public hearing started at 5:46 pm, Director Craig Statucki provided the Board with a power point presentation on the revisions to the [Perkins V State Plan](#) to receive feedback on statewide career and technical education (CTE) strategic goals, funding priorities, and state-determined performance levels.

Director Craig Statucki started his presentation with Nevada's CTE vision and provided the Board with an overview about Perkins V which included information on FY24 allocations. He continued with slide number 4 which provided the Board with a brief outline of the revision timeline, and he mentioned that these revisions are due by May 10th to the US Department of Education. He clarified with the Board that the mentioned dates on slide number 4 do not include all stakeholder engagements and do not include virtual tours. He mentioned continued which the intent and explained to the Board the revision of goals, revisions and additions of performance indicators, and collaboration between districts and boards. He moved on to the next slide which listed the 35 goals in the current State Plan. He stated that the smart goal is to reduce the goals down to three and he presented the Board with its focus on the three areas. During the next slide he presented Nevada's industry base chart which included in demand occupations in Nevada and went through the breakdown of each sector. He continued with the next chart, slide number 10, which included information on the ten largest employers in Nevada by industry. During the next slide he went over the in-demand occupation rankings and mentioned that they're similarly ranked regardless of the region in Nevada

and provided the Board with the information on Southern Nevada rank, Northern Nevada rank, Northeastern Nevada rank, and Central Nevada rank. The next slide had the typical entry level education for in-demand jobs in Nevada and Director Statucki mentioned went through the data. He moved on to the next slide regarding Career and Technical Education Concentrator and what it refers to. The next slide mentioned the secondary core performance indicators which started with 1S1 and went through 5S2 and during the next slide her went over the post-secondary core performance indicators.

President Ortiz wanted some clarification on the secondary core performance indicators specifically when using the ACT if it was prescribed by Perkins or is the Department deciding. Director Statucki clarified that the yes, it is the same as Perkins. During the next slide he mentioned the current Perkins V State determined performance levels (SDPL) this chart included the breakdown of Secondary and Postsecondary Performance Indicators starting from 2020 till 2023-24.

Member Cantu asked how non-traditional enrollment is captured, post k-12 in which schools no longer track. Director Statucki stated that the Department currently uses empower to connect the data with employment data that is received from DETR, NSHE, student survey results. Director Statucki continued with his presentation and moved on to the next slide with included Perkins V projected SDPL included data from 2024-25 till 2027-28 and mentioned that growth goals are compared with other states as required by the US Department of Education.

President Ortiz stated that she would like to see Nevada comparison to happen with similar sized states on CTE programs. Director Statucki mentioned that once the growth goals are submitted then the Department can see how other states define their numerator denominator for each of the indicators and student counts, he continued to state that the Department will be looking at the 12 states that are closest to Nevada. Director Statucki continued his presentation and moved on to the next slide which included the potential program quality additional indicators. During the next slide included the secondary performance indicators to consider and continued with the next slide and provided the Board with the Perkins V funding to support the goals which included information on the reserve funding, the subrecipients use of local formula allocations, and special populations and non-traditional student funding.

President Ortiz had a question regarding the competitive grant process and mentioned that it doesn't work well for rural districts, she wanted to know if the Department look at making rural consortia beyond Perkins that can help rural school districts.

Member Else mentioned that it would depend on the funding source but there might be avenues we can investigate.

President Ortiz adjourned the public hearing at 6:10 P.M

13. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS *(Information/Discussion)*

- Read by Grade 3 Cut Score
- Event planning for recognition/award ceremonies

14. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association, provided a written comment regarding the Annual Class Size Reduction Report.

Cristal Villalpando, paraprofessional, provided a written comment regarding GPA CCR Diploma requirements.

Kristi Kelly, Dora Kyler, Jaculin Kehl, James Huff, Kimberly Beatty, Kristina Anne Mooney, Rut Laureano, provided a written comment regarding changing of school times.

Jennifer Vobis and Yvette Kagan provided written comments regarding school bus transportation.
(A summary of the above statements is available in Appendix A)

15. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 6:28 P.M.

APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS GIVEN DURING PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Sylvia Lazos, community member, provided public comment regarding agenda item 10.
2. Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association
3. Cristal Villalpando, professional
4. Kristi Kelly, Activities and Operations Secretary, Las Vegas Academy of Arts, provided a written comment regarding changing of school times.
5. Dora Kyler, teacher, Von Tobel Middle School, provided a written comment regarding time change.
6. Jaculin Kehl, community member, provided a written comment regarding new school start times.
7. James Huff, teacher, John W. Bonner Elementary School, provided a written comment regarding early high school start times are the right thing to do.
8. Kimberly Beatty, teacher, Basic Academy of International Studies, provided written comments regarding school start times.
9. Kristina Anne Mooney, school counselor, Gibson Leadership Academy, provided written comments regarding later school times.
10. Jennifer Vobis, Executive Director of Transportation, Clark County School District, provided written comments regarding school transportation.
11. Rut Laureano, School Counselor, Bonanza High School, provided written comments regarding change of school start times.
12. Yvette Kagan, Central Kitchen Manager, provided written comments regarding bus schedule hardship.

APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS GIVEN DURING PUBLIC COMMENT

APPENDIX A, ITEM 1: SYLVIA LAZOS

I urge the Nevada Board of Education and Superintendent Ebert to ensure the successful implementation of Restorative Justice.

1. The Nevada State Board of Education should exercise its “superpower” and adopt regulations that implement AB 285 and AB 330 with sufficient clarity and specifics to guide school districts in this difficult work. Please recall that the consensus critique during Legislative Session 2023 was that the original restorative justice bill was never implemented, educators never received adequate training, and school districts were not held accountable. The responsibility for implementation of laws falls on the Executive, and his designers, in this case the Superintendent of Education under the policy direction the the Nevada State Board of Education. The attached memo, submitted to the Nevada State Board of Education, in August 2023, contains areas where regulation is necessary, either mostly because the law is overly general or not sufficiently specific for implementation.
2. The Legislature widely anticipated that the implementation of Restorative Justice would require educator training. As the attached memo details, training or educators is a huge lift and should be directed by NDE. In the past, some school districts have put forward only minimum effort to train educators. For example, one school district has understood educator training in restorative justice as sending a handful of educators and administrators to training outside of Nevada and then assuming that the returning trainers could train the entire large district. Yet research shows that training educators is a “deep,” involved process, with appropriate supportive leadership that can take up to two years (see Rand study cited in memo).
3. Unfortunately, we should anticipate racial disproportionality. The data currently in the Nevada Report Card are insufficient to ensure that this aspect can be monitored. Under the new laws the Nevada Superintendent has responsibility to monitor and take remedial action, Nevada Board of Education should adopt guidelines, improve data collection, and spell out what are the standards that would cause a school district to miss the mark in racial disproportionality. Due process requires that school districts have proper notice of the expectations of the Superintendent and the Nevada State Board.
4. The term “progressive discipline plan based on restorative justice practices” does a lot of work in the law, and the meaning will need to be filled out in regulation. Of particular importance is what “progressive” infractions and under what circumstances justify suspension and expulsion (apart from what is explicitly set forth in law). Re-entry based on restorative justice practices may require services for children who exhibit behavioral issues based on conditions at home, trauma, or special education status. To implement ‘based on restorative justice’ would likely require that the school provide support to remediate identified factors so that the child can overcome these conditions and then be held accountable for her behavior.
5. Will the process of restorative justice require additional resources? The Legislature is more likely to provide additional resources if the Board and Superintendent can identify the needs and how resources could solve specific situations. Does Nevada Legislature need to go beyond the funding already provided under the formula? This is a necessary feedback loop to the current ongoing work of the School Funding Commission and should be part of the work that the Board undertakes as a key part of the implementation of Restorative Justice.

Implementation of this ambitious concept is serious work that I trust this Board and Superintendent will support and direct going forward. I am looking forward to supporting your collective work as best I can.

Respectfully submitted,
Sylvia Lazos

APPENDIX A, ITEM 2: CHRIS DALY

The Nevada State Education Association has been the voice of Nevada educators for over 120 years. Our vision aligns with the State Board of Education, to lift up every Nevada student. That is why NSEA has raised concern about Nevada's largest-in-the-nation class sizes and why we are interested in item 6g on today's calendar, the 2023 Annual Class Size Reduction Report.

We all agree reducing class size has real benefits. For students, smaller class sizes can help close the racial achievement gap, lead to earlier identification of learning disabilities, improve high school graduation rates, improve student behavior, and allow for more engagement in lessons. For educators, smaller class size improves educator morale, allows for more individual and differentiated instruction, means less time on paperwork, and facilitates stronger classroom management with teachers becoming more familiar with each student. Smaller class sizes also mean safer schools.

NSEA engaged every day of the 2023 Legislative Session, calling for average class sizes of 20 students. We supported AB335 sponsored by teacher and NSEA member Selena La Rue Hatch to decrease the maximum ratio of pupils per licensed teacher and require districts to negotiate a pay increment for teachers who teach in overcrowded classrooms, similar to a program in the Washoe County School District. Unfortunately, AB335 failed to receive a hearing with legislative leadership concerned about the budget impacts. However, similar budget concerns did not stop the legislature from authorizing \$380M to subsidize a stadium project by a California billionaire. Nevada educators believe this speaks to Nevada's misplaced *priorities*.

In her October 12th class size reduction memo, Deputy Superintendent Peterson wrote.

If Nevada were to limit each of its existing district classrooms to their respective target ratios, 17% of K-3 students across Nevada – 19,331 students – would not have a classroom. This does not account for K-3 students enrolled in charter schools that make up an additional 17% of the Nevada K-3 population. While educators are not the only need represented by the count of classrooms, as many districts additionally cite facility limitations, the most conservative estimates – not accounting for the number of substitutes filling vacancies or in long-term positions – cite the need for an additional 1,174 educators at minimum to begin to address target class size ratios. 91% of all variance requests for class size reduction cite funding limitations, with 93% further citing difficulty hiring.

NSEA believes Nevada's large class sizes are one of the biggest issues facing our public education system, requiring the attention of every state leader to effectively address. We would encourage the Nevada State Board of Education to conduct a full hearing on this issue.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 3: CRISTAL VILLALPANDO

Hello,

My name is Cristal Villalpando and I am a paraprofessional who is working with the special population at a high school level. My job is to work with students one on one, this enables students to succeed academically. I have attended several meetings this past week. I have heard incredible news on how Great Basin College is looking to better help special populations. Heather Steel is working intensely to improve the chances of success for **ALL** CTE students. I have worked with ELL students since October 2019 and this is the first year I have heard of pathways. Typically this is advertised more to the general population. In the previous three years I have always steered students away from CTE classes because of the difficulty and there was no support for special populations. What changed this school year 2023-2024 was that I was hired through a grant. I am now working closely with these students and again, due to our miracle worker Heather Steel; a new job opportunity has been posted to hire an additional paraprofessional to help the expanding special population of secondary students. We are now in week 7 of the school year and in that short amount of time I have had the opportunity to get to know more students with IEPs/504s. Hearing this news of making changes and wanting to make a 3.25 GPA a requirement for the CCR diploma blows my mind. We are supposed to go forwards and not backwards in

education. Aside from current high school students wanting to further their education after high school, in ONE day; I was able to get 3 ELL students who had absolutely zero interest in attending college, to now have all the intention to go.

In order for me to be able to efficiently and successfully do my job, this **CANNOT** happen. Now, being part of the CTE department; my job is not only about getting these students to graduate. I am motivating, supporting, and encouraging these students to obtain their CCR diplomas. These students in special services are working diligently to make this happen. Great Basin College has a vast amount of opportunities for students who want to remain local. Do not put one more road block on their path. Do not prevent these students from reaching success. They are learning the skills and they should be passing all their general ed classes. Employers do not care if they had an A or B average in math, english, history, or science. The Nevada Board of Education shouldn't either.

Sincerely,
Cristal Villalpando

APPENDIX A, ITEM 4: KRISTI KELLY

I agree with all the points that Justin Scanson and Mike Campbell have brought up in the article that they wrote in The Point on Oct. 10. I believe that changing times for High Schools will cause more harm in the present and future.

- Students will stay up later because they can sleep in longer, thus not helping their sleeping situation.
- If students have to start their jobs later because they get out of school later, they will more than likely be getting off later which means getting to bed later.
- If buses are not allowed to pick up magnet school students, there will be less students going to magnet schools of their choice since parents won't be able to bring them if they work.
- There's no doubt that there will be less participation in school sports and other activities after school, especially when it gets darker earlier. I can see more overweight, depressed students and more crime, etc. with them not having time after school to do the activities they enjoy doing.
- There will be many parents that will need to leave for work before their children do, which leaves their children home to fend for themselves and get to school on their own.

I'm sure there are a lot more reasons that school times shouldn't change. These are just a few.
Thanks.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 5: DORA KYLER

I hope the times stay the same as this year. High school kids have part time jobs in afternoon to help with family and college expenses (savings). Teachers will be affected as well at the middle school. The times for middle school starting at 8 am is perfect. I hope you don't interfere and schedules stay the same

APPENDIX A, ITEM 6: JACULIN KEHL

We are writing to express our concern regarding the proposed new school start times in Nevada. We are grandparents who provide care for our 2 grandchildren while our daughter and son-in-law work. Our grandson has cerebral palsy, he attends a ECSE Pre-K class in the Clark County School District and will be in Kindergarten next school year. Because of his hemiplegic spastic cerebral palsy he receives private physical, occupational and speech therapy in the community. With the NDE proposed school start time for elementary schools in Nevada starting at 10 and school dismissal at 4 there is no way our grandson will be able to receive his physical, occupational and speech therapy. Our grandson is 4 years 9 months and is just starting to walk independently using a cane (shakily) after 4 years of intensive weekly physical therapy. He uses a reverse

walker at school to access the school campus. He is now able to use his right arm and right hand after 4 years of intensive occupational therapy. He has made great progress with his receptive and expressive speech after 3 years of intensive speech therapy. Now with the NDE proposal of later ES start time our grandson's progress will be stalled because no community physical, occupational and speech therapy providers offer therapy appointments before 9 am and not after 4 pm in Clark County. There is no way community therapy providers will be able to accommodate all of the Clark County children who require therapy in these hours. So our grandson and other children with special needs will be be adversely affected by your decision that High School students need to start school an hour later.

Anthony and Jaculin Kehl

APPENDIX A, ITEM 7: JAMES HUFF

To Whom it may concern:

I support later high school start times. High school kids get less sleep because they play sports and work late. CCSD has this backwards to say that high school kids are less likely to play sports or work. They won't work or play sports if they have to get up extra early for school the following day.

To add, the early start times waste time for highschool students who have to wait to start their practices 2 hours after the school day begins. My daughter plays flag football and has to wait 2 hours after school for practice to start because the angle of the sun at that time creates a cooler environment for them. Then we have to pick her up from school, then take her back and she can't get much done between. This really is wasting our time and her time. And our money for gas to drive her. If they just started school later and the kids could go right into their sports, it would be so much better.

Now CCSD wants everyone to go at the same time? They can't even pay teachers and want to spend money on all the additional buses that will be needed and manpower. In addition they want to make this 5 mile rule. They really don't seem to care about accommodating people and are just making things more difficult for families.

Thank you for your time.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 8: KIMBERLY BEATTY

I am a high school teacher within the district. There have been a large amount of discussion about changing start times of schools. Based on all conversations I have been a part of, there will be unanimous voicing of a negative vote for changing the start times of high schools to later than they are currently starting.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 9: KRISTINA ANNE MOONEY

I think it is a great idea for high schools to start later. As stated in US News and World Report:

When school starts later, "mood, academics, attendance and graduation rates all improve," says Harris.

For instance, one study by the National Sleep Foundation found that both attendance and graduation rates "significantly improved" in schools that delayed their start times to 8:30 a.m. or later.

In addition, many of our teens go home to empty houses and have too many unsupervised hours. This one hour could help keep teens out of trouble.

As a counselor, I approve the later start times.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 10: JENNIFER VOBIS

Good afternoon, Members of the Board,
Jennifer Vobis, Executive Director of Transportation, Clark County School District. Prior to the pandemic, it was a national standard for school transportation to provide service to students living outside of a 2-mile walk

radius. Upon returning from the pandemic, school districts nationwide experienced a severe driver shortage that had previously never been seen. As a result, districts were forced to respond by cutting transportation services for students. At that time, CCSD had a vacancy of 250 drivers. However, we were committed to retaining a level of service we had always provided and looked at different solutions to address our labor shortage, including school start times. CCSD was able to resolve the driver shortage while not eliminating service and is one of the few districts nationwide that are not currently experiencing a driver vacancy or operating with limited services to mitigate a vacancy issue. As a former teacher, I understand it is incumbent under my purview that transportation services remain as operationally efficient as possible. Unnecessary growth and inefficiency will only divert funding away from the classroom. Inefficiency equates to irresponsibility with vital money for Nevada's students. Unfortunately, transportation is limited in the options we can provide should there be a mandated change to high school start times. The reality is that changing high school start times will require growth in transportation operations beyond the current funding and put our youngest students out on the corners waiting for buses as early as 6 o'clock in the morning. Shifting to a 2-tier bell schedule comes with an astronomical cost. The cost-neutral option of moving all start times to a later schedule will inhibit elementary students from accessing breakfast until 10 o'clock in the morning. Districts will have no other choice but to begin eliminating services to mitigate growth. Something all districts in Nevada worked hard to avoid in the last few years. These scenarios are not specific to CCSD. I have spoken to my peers in other districts within Nevada, and they agree this will not only cause growth in operations, but impact the level of service that Nevada students are currently receiving. The reality is transportation services are the underpinning for students to access the education they are entitled to and deserve. Mandating the change in high school start times leaves districts no choice but to cut transportation service thus limiting that access.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 11: RUT LAUREANO

Hello. I am both an educator and a parent. I cannot believe the email CCSD put out opposing the change in school start times. It is clear that the district is not putting our kids first, completely counter to what the district says is its #1 priority. Instead, CCSD complains about the fiscal and logistical impact instead and doesn't even address the positive impact it would have on students' learning. CCSD added the NV Board of Ed's contact info I believe in an effort to send the NVDOE messages of opposition, but you have my support in the efforts to change school start times. It is what is best for the majority of our students!!
Regards

APPENDIX A, ITEM 12: YVETTE KAGAN

Changing schedule start times would be a hardship for our family and many others like us. If all schools start at the same time, how are we to get to 3 different schools at the same time? Where is the money for more buses, drivers, aides, mechanics, payroll clerks, and human resource people to hire the staff needed coming from? Where are we going to store all the buses when we buy more? I can see how this would work in the rural counties where they have one or 2 buses. Maybe the start times should be left to the county and what works best for them???