

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
NOVEMBER 3, 2022
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	n/a	n/a

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Felicia Ortiz, President
 Mark Newburn, Vice President
 Joe Arrascada
 Dr. René Cantú
 Malia Poblete
 Dr. Katherine Dockweiler
 Tamara Hudson
 Tim Hughes
 Dr. Summer Stephens
 Katie Coombs

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Dr. Jonathan Moore, Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement
 Craig Statucki, Interim Deputy Superintendent for Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement
 Jose Silva, Chief Strategy Officer
 Peter Zutz, Administrator, Office of Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management (ADAM)
 Jeff Briske, Director, Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement (EDLiFE)
 Dave Brancamp, Director, Office of Standards and Instructional Support
 Karl Wilson, Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Student and School Supports
 Anabel Sanchez, Education Programs Professional, EDLiFE
 Christy McGill, Director, Office for a Safe and Respectful Learning Environment (OSRLE)
 Laronica Maurer, Education Programs Professional, OSRLE
 Dr. Gunes Kaplan, Education Programs Supervisor, ADAM
 Tina Statucki, Education Programs Professional, EDLiFE
 Kathleen Galland-Collins, Assistant Director, EDLiFE

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

Lorna James-Cervantes, Chair, English Mastery Council
 Dr. Pam Salazar, Chair, Teachers and Leaders Council
 Kyle Rogers, Instructor, University of Nevada Las Vegas
 Gil Lopez, Executive Director, Charter School Association of Nevada
 Dan Sadler, Associate Superintendent of Human Resources, Carson City School District
 David Blodgett, Executive Director, Nevada Prep Charter School
 Bill Hanlon, community member

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

Meeting called to order at 2:10 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

Kyle Rogers, Instructor, University of Nevada Las Vegas, provided public comment regarding agenda item 9. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Gil Lopez, Executive Director, Charter School Association of Nevada, provided public comment regarding agenda item 11. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*.

Minetta Slattery, community member, provided public comment regarding agenda item 12. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*.

Jill Mohlman, community member, provided public comment regarding agenda item 12. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*.

Melanie Hall, community member, provided public comment regarding agenda item 12. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*.

3. APPROVAL OF FLEXIBLE AGENDA

Member Katherine Dockweiler moved to approve the flexible agenda. Vice President Mark Newburn seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

4. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Ortiz reported that she was able to attend the inaugural convening of over 200 stakeholders from across the State to discuss the Nevada portrait of a learner. President Ortiz noted a few highlights from the convening. The first being a panel of students and community stakeholders discussing what education could look like in the realm of personalized competency-based learning. The second that she was able to participate in a panel with other community members titled Painting the Portrait. The third is that there were several breakout sessions. One pertaining to policy and advocacy to better understand the opportunity analysis to evolve Nevada's PreK-12 education system. One designed for educators/classroom and school and district leaders who would like to better understand what piloting would look like and what the benefits are. The third one was designed for NDE leaders and community members to better understand what competencies are and what it will look like to build these out in alignment with the Portrait of a Nevada Learner. President Ortiz noted that there are still opportunities for those that are interested in the work to take part. President Ortiz noted that there is a survey that went out to participants after the convening to gauge interests in continuing the work.

President Ortiz reported that the next Board meeting on December 15th will be the annual stakeholders meeting to discuss statewide goals and benchmarks. Per State Statute, at one meeting each year the Board must invite stakeholders from across the State to discuss its efforts to improve student achievement and educator effectiveness. President Ortiz noted that the Department will be sending out the invitation to stakeholders across the State very soon and asked her fellow Board members and the audience to encourage the stakeholders in their social circles to attend.

President Ortiz noted that State Superintendent Jhone Ebert was named the University of Nevada Las Vegas College of Education Alumni of the Year. President Ortiz noted that since Superintendent Ebert was not present at the meeting, she will congratulate her at the December meeting.

President Ortiz invited Member Joe Arrascada to provide an update regarding the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) Board of Regents. Member Arrascada reported that the Fall 2022 enrollment is slightly down for the system based on the preliminary figures. Specifically, full time equivalent is down 1.2% from fall of 2021 and head count is flat. The NSHE Board's ad hoc committee on the roles and responsibilities of the chancellor was held during last month's meeting on October 14. During the December quarterly meeting, the NSHE Board will consider certain revision to the Chancellor's job description, and it is anticipated that a search for a new chancellor will begin after the first of the year. Member Arrascada noted the NSHE is awaiting the Governor's recommended budget for the next biennium and the system is in the process of preparing for the 2023 legislative session.

5. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement Dr. Jonathan Moore reported that Dr. Katherine (Katie) Broughton has been appointed as an Education Programs Professional in the Office of the Superintendent. Katie has spent the previous decade teaching middle and high school English and, most recently, working as a district level MTSS coach.

The ADAM Office is pleased to announce the appointment of Dr. Gabriel Hill to the position of Education Program Professional in the Accountability Team. Gabriel has a MA in Medieval History from Marquett and a PhD in Medieval History from the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities. He has worked for NDE in various roles since 2018, most recently as the EPP for CTE Data and Accountability where he helped ensure the implementation of Perkins V.

Dr. Jess Delallo has been appointed to the Title I team in the Office of Student and School Supports. Jess is an Education Programs Professional who will be supporting the Title I program and serves as our Title I, D State Coordinator. Jess is coming to the Department from California by way of the Tahoe Truckee Unified School District. She is a former teacher and has taught K-Jr. College.

Dr. Tina Winqvist has been appointed to the position of Education Programs Supervisor/Assistant Director supporting the Title I Team. Tina's passion and background in systems evaluation as well as school, district, and state level leadership in Nevada and Hawaii is noteworthy. But her work here at NDE over the past four years leading school improvement efforts for CSI, TSI, and ATSI school along with supporting other major NDE initiatives makes her the ideal person to help advance work touching Title IA, Title I 1003(a), Title ID, Foster Care, Title V, and McKinney-Vento.

The Office of Early Learning and Development is excited to welcome Education Programs Professional Sara Kharrat to NDE. She will lead the quality rating and improvement system team as the new QRIS State Administrator. Sara has almost two decades in the Education industry, engaged in educational reform and management, consulting for private and public sectors, providing innovative solutions, and supporting the advancement, accreditations, and quality assurance journeys of Preschool-12 schools overseas. She also worked within the QRIS in Nevada as a coach and classroom environment assessor.

EDLiFE is excited to welcome Education Programs Professional Kristofer Huffman to NDE. He will be lifting the new statewide learning management system and ensure it is fully functioning and self-sustainable. He has 20 years of experience in education, having served the last 15 years in the Clark County School District. He has worked as an elementary school teacher, assistant principal, and principal, in addition to his work as an adjunct professor at Touro University.

Lastly, the Superintendent's office is happy to announce that Elizabeth Callahan has been appointed as the new Public Information Officer. Elizabeth has 15 years of experience in television news as a tv news producer, a reporter, and an anchor.

Deputy Superintendent Moore reported that the Association for Career and Technical Education (ACTE) is hosting its annual national CareerTech Vision Conference in Las Vegas from November 30th – December 3rd at the Las Vegas Convention Center. At the same time, the National Association of Agricultural Educators hosts their annual conference in coordination with the ACTE conference at the same location. It is expected that ACTE will have approximately 6,000 attendees which is record attendance over the attendance for the last 20 years. The conference is an amazing networking event to learn and share from CTE colleagues across the nation with over 300+ breakout sessions, 200+ exhibitors, and two keynote speakers (Daniel Horgan, Founder and CEO of CoLabL - youth and talent development programs - and Damu McCoy, Vice President of Talent Acquisition at Target Corporation). The state is well-represented with breakout sessions, a pre-conference workshop presented by a member from GOED, school and business tours, and we have several educators across the state that serve on the Nevada ACTE Board, regional ACTE committees, and on National ACTE committees. In addition, this year we have two Nevada educators running for positions on the National ACTE Board of Directors. Registration is still open and Nevada ACTE members and non-members will still receive the early-bird registration rate.

Deputy Superintendent Moore reported that Nevada was one of just 7 states recently selected to attend the National P-3 Institute based on our competitive application and commitment and participation from our State Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent of Student Achievement along with several other members that have been committed to this work including the Chief Academic Officer of the largest school district (Clark), University Nevada—Reno, Regional Professional Development Program, NDE OELD, school board trustee and district representation from our second largest district (Washoe) and rural representation. This team will work together to better align state and district policy and practices and believe this key group of stakeholders will collaborate to create the conditions for effective P-3 implementation at the ground level. To support alignment of DAP Kindergarten practices and Administrator support, Nevada is working on a joint DAP policy statement to be signed by the NDE State Superintendent, the State ECAC, and/or any other supporting entities and will be shared with the State Board of Education to create a unified voice and endorsement for what DAP kindergarten looks like to support teachers and administrators to align practices and implementation. The State team created the following “Pillars to the P-3 Promise” to help guide this work forward:

- *Name the Priority:* State to District Superintendent intentional communication about and the importance of P-3; Press conference on NDE’s support for the foundations of learning
- *Professional Learning Modules:* Develop and disseminate high-quality online learning modules for initial training on the science of learning and child development for K-3rd teachers and elementary principals.
- *Lighthouse Schools:* Cultivate model schools in each district that have embedded principles of the science of learning and child development in their teaching practices and have aligned practices across the P-3 grade levels.
- *Kindergarten Promise Transition to Kindergarten Summer program:* As a steppingstone on our pathway to Universal PreK, we will facilitate kindergarten transition by piloting a 3–4-week transition to K across the state, embedding PL for teachers, family engagement, MLL practices, and centering DAP strategies and learning environments.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

President Ortiz pulled item g the FY23 Annual Class Size Reduction Plans for discussion. President Ortiz noted that the fact that 99% of the variances that were requested from school districts were due to a funding shortage and this is caused from three major things. The first is that there are not enough rooms to split up the students into smaller class sizes, the second is that there is not enough money build new rooms, and the third is the teacher shortage.

Vice President Mark Newburn moved to approve the consent agenda. Member Tim Hughes seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

7. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE ENGLISH MASTERY COUNCIL FINAL REPORT

Lorna James-Cervantes, Chair, English Mastery Council, and Karl Wilson, Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Student and School Supports, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the [English Mastery Council Final Report](#).

Member Katherine Dockweiler noted that she appreciated the distinction between a policy and an implementation plan and asked if there are intervention plans in place. There are multi-tiered systems of supports (MTSS) for academics and social emotional behavioral supports and asked if there was a way to add language supports because the framework and structure is something schools are familiar with. Ms. James-Cervantes responded that this was exactly what the council was envisioning that school should be using a model such as the MTSS and including the language development framework into the work with all students. Ms. James-Cervantes noted that idea behind the English language development standards framework is that all teachers can use the work to understand where their students are in their English language development and how to best meet their needs at grade level.

Member René Cantú asked what a set of guidelines look like to help districts avoid overidentifying EL students into special education because not knowing a language is not an indication of a lack of intellectual ability to excel in AP or honors courses. Mr. Wilson responded that one of the initiatives the Department has had is to partner with the office of inclusive education in developing training materials and guidelines to assist teachers in distinguishing how to assess language and disability and not confound the two. At the heart, the concept is that MTSS is an integral part of working with the classroom teacher in addressing the abilities and the needs of students and helping to prepare for the appropriate identification.

President Ortiz asked if there is any policy or regulations that need to be implemented in order to change the coursework for ELAD or Bilingual education endorsements to be effective for NSHE institutions. Dr. Alain Bengochea, Program Coordinator for English Language Learning & Early Childhood Education Programs, Dept. of Early Childhood, Multilingual, & Special Education, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, responded that his recommendations are based on the changes that were made for the endorsement. The council would like to clean up the language for the bilingual endorsement. The current bilingual endorsement requests that teachers complete multiple methods courses. In fact, there are three on the current endorsement whereas the ELAD endorsement only requires one. Another piece that is missing from the bilingual endorsement is that there is a need for practicum experience. President Ortiz confirmed with Deputy Superintendent Moore that some of those changes would have to go through the Commission on Professional Standards.

Member Tim Hughes asked if there were any recommendations regarding accountability. Ms. James-Cervantes responded that the Council looked at parallels to work already being done in the State. For example, she worked closely with the Zoom schools in the Clark County School District for several years, those schools were all held accountable for a specific set of metrics that they had to meet and if they did not then they were placed on a corrective action plan. So, the recommendation that the school that are in the lowest 25% have a corrective action plan in place that is closely monitored by the Department.

Member René Cantu moved for the creation of a Subcommittee to follow up and push forward the recommendations from the English Mastery Council. Member Tamara Hudson Seconded. Motion passed unanimously. Members Cantú, Dockweiler, and Hughes volunteered to join the Subcommittee.

8. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE TEACH NEVADA SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS

Jeff Briske, Director, Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement (EDLiFE) and Anabel Sanchez, Education Programs Professional, EDLiFE provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the [Teach Nevada Scholarship Awards](#).

President Ortiz asked if there were any indication as to why CCSD is no longer accepting students into the ARL and if that is the justification for reducing their award by 50%. Director Briske responded that the reason for the reduction is because there was a time earlier this summer where they said they were going to discontinue their ARL program and then put it on pause for reconsideration. This Board did award 12 scholarships in April, and they did not use those funds, so we were able to reclaim them as you saw on the slide. Recently the Department is confident Clark would use 12 for five years if awarded because they have given the Department 12 student names that they are requesting at this point.

Vice President Newburn asked what the impact of the scholarship is, if it is working and getting teachers in the classroom. Director Briske responded that there have been over 900 teachers so far who have been impacted and used this scholarship since the inception in 2016. That figure combined with potential awards this round and the 172 awarded in April, that will be over 1300 teachers who have been affected by the scholarship. President Ortiz asked how many out of the total affected are still teaching in the State of Nevada. Director Briske responded that he does not have that number, but he will follow up with those figures.

Member Hughes noted that he will abstain from this item as he has a conflict of interest.

Vice President Newburn moved to adopt recommendation award number 2. Member Katie Coombs seconded. Member Tim Hughes abstained. Motion passed.

9. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING DISCIPLINE DATA DISAGGREGATED BY POPULATION

Christy McGill, Director, Office for a Safe and Respectful Learning Environment (OSRLE), Dr. Gunes Kaplan, Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management (ADAM), and Laronica Maurer, Education Programs Professional, OSRLE, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding [SY 2021-22 Discipline Data as Collected and Reported According to NRS 385A](#).

Member Hughes noted that the Board has discussed in the past how adult decisions and actions have implications for students. Member Hughes noted that it was striking that there was not any adult data in this presentation and suggested that in the future looking at the nuances to break up some of the broad categories to help find solutions and be more targeted as well as where the discipline situations are happening and which adults in the system are making the decision for how to categorize and resolve them. There seems to be another layer in the offences and the adult data that would be helpful to review to think about how to address the root causes.

President Ortiz asked how the data in the presentation is being collected from districts. Dr. Gunes Kaplan responded that districts are entering this information into their information systems, but they are submitting an Excel file to the Department's data collection application. President Ortiz asked if there is a way to compare the data to infinite campus data that would show student behavior reporting. Director McGill responded that the Department is in phase two of refining the discipline data. The first thing the Department needed to do was to achieve consensus between the districts around the definitions of discipline. Therefore, there may be some differences in infinite campus and what is reported to the State. Lower-level offences may not be reported to the State. When this data is captured in Infinite campus, there will be more consistent and specific data. President Ortiz asked if there is a way to report on the loss of instructional time for a student. Director McGill responded that she believes it is possible but there is another tool that many

districts are implementing called SWISS that tracks the lower level of discipline for school improvement planning.

President Ortiz asked if there is tracking of participation by district in multi-tiered systems of support and restorative justice trainings in a way that is not adding an additional workload to teachers. Ms. Maurer responded that this is a huge concern. The Department wants to train more but they do not want to add another burden on teachers. There is a community of practice for restorative justice and social emotional learning. There is a training request form so that the Department can go out to provide training at the school site. Director McGill noted that the Department's goal is to increase the capacity of the districts to train themselves. What this looks like is hosting trainer models that districts can attend and the district gave out significant pots of money around restorative practice training that the districts could apply for and boost their own training capacity. Director McGill noted that the State is in year two of a five-year implementation plan that was disrupted by the pandemic.

10. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE 2021-22 NEVADA EDUCATOR PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK (NEPF) RATINGS AND MONITORING FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT (MCI) SURVEY DATA

Tina Statucki, Education Programs Professional, EDLiFE, Dr. Pam Salazar, Chair, Teachers and Leaders Council, Dan Sadler, Associate Superintendent of Human Resources, Carson City School District, and Kathleen Galland-Collins, Assistant Director, EDLiFE, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the [Nevada Educator Performance Framework 2021-22 Summative Evaluation and Monitoring for Continuous Improvement Data Review](#).

Vice President Newburn noted that during the inception of the NEPF it was projected to be transformational for student achievement and asked has it in anyway been transformational and effected student outcomes and adult behaviors. Dr. Salazar responded that she believes that NEPF practices are the practices that get students to learn. It has been a huge challenge to recognize that it is not just teachers focusing on teaching it is asking if the students are learning. This conversation is going on across the country. The NEPF is focused on the impact of action and practices everyday as a teacher. Ms. Galland-Collins noted that the Department and the Council have been doing NEPF liaison interviews and there has been a shift in the thinking. In the beginning there was not a whole lot of connection to professional learning and now it is automatic.

Member Stephens noted that there have been trainings for leadership and teachers to take in Canvas to convey information on NEPF practices to new teachers and existing staff to become better and understanding the tool. Ms. Statucki added that the there are ten NEPF Canvas courses available on the NDE website on the NEPF page so educators from across the State can access them. Ms. Statucki noted that Ms. Galland-Collins and herself are facilitating four virtual webinars on student learning goals and how teachers can use and implement them effectively in their classrooms to measure their impact on students.

11. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPOINTMENTS TO THE STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY GOVERNING BOARD

President Ortiz noted that Jeffrey Geihs, Ismail Kocabiyik, and Jessica LeNeave have withdrawn their application to serve on the SPCSA Governing Board. President Ortiz noted that each applicant will be interviewed, and one will be chosen to sit on the SPCSA Board.

President Ortiz invited SPCSA Applicant Debra Guedry to the podium to introduce herself. Ms. Guedry noted that she is a lifelong Nevadan and she attended and graduated from CCSD schools. She also attended and graduated from UNLV with a Bachelor of Science degree in education. Her early career was in real-estate. She later went back to school and obtained her bachelor's degree in education which led to her teaching at Jacobson Elementary School. She had the opportunity to work in a year-round school system

that was a thematic instruction and micro society school. Within a few years she had the opportunity to teach multi aged children and manage the micro society model. Ms. Guedry noted that she wrote a grant that was able to enable her school to create software to manage the micro society model to lessen the work hours that the teachers were putting in. This grant allowed students in 2001 to sign into their own bear-buck accounts to apply for licenses to create their own business and sign up for university day where they could select what classes they wanted to hear about or what business they wanted to learn about. Due to the priority of family, Ms. Guedry chose to step away and look at advocacy as her next challenge. Ms. Guedry served on the PTA organization, so she became more familiar with school finances and where the extra money needed to go to meet the needs of the school. Ms. Guedry served as the secretary for the Business and Educational Alliance for the Children of Nevada (BEACON) Board. The BEACON Board served the district with the superintendent search as a stakeholder group. From 2016-2019 Ms. Guedry along with the various chambers in southern Nevada and the Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance hosted an annual summit called “Be Engaged” about bringing the business community and education community together with the non-profits in the community. There were fifty-five non-profit organizations that ran over one hundred and ten programs in the community that were connected with education.

Vice President Newburn asked Ms. Guedry her views on expanding access and equity on the Charter Authority. Ms. Guedry responded that she had a great opportunity to explore the opportunities available to her grandsons in education. She was able to get them into a wonderful school thanks to open enrollment that are no longer available. In looking at what is available now, she looked into the charter schools. Ms. Guedry is very impressed with academic and demographic needs assessment for 2022 and the fact that it addresses the needs of the most at-risk students and there are areas that are targeted to meet the needs of the underserved populations.

President Ortiz asked what Ms. Guedry’s priorities would be around evaluating potential new charter schools and holding accountable the existing charter schools. Ms. Guedry responded that she was really thrilled to see that there are a certain number of items that Nevada stands very strongly on when it comes to measuring and evaluating charter schools and where they should look to go. There is no cap on charter growth. Since July of 2021 there is a new funding model. Ms. Guedry noted that she would ensure effective leadership and accountability measures in all of the charter schools. Additional funding would be essential to attracting other charter schools to Nevada.

President Ortiz invited Amy Nelson to the podium to introduce herself. Ms. Nelson noted that she is a fourth generation Nevadan who has been actively involved in community and nonprofit organizations her entire adult life. Ms. Nelson recently retired after thirty years in education. Her time was split between Washoe, Lander, and Humboldt Counties. She started in the early nineties as an instructional aide with class and lunchroom duties. She then became a teacher and a math instructional coach. For 17 years she served as a building principal with half her time in elementary and the other half in secondary. For the last three years she was the director of innovation for the Humboldt County School District. In her last three years Ms. Nelson became familiar with the charter schools in Nevada. Some of her responsibilities those last three years were adult education, corrections education, alternative education, and distance education. It is because of these responsibilities that she became familiar with and sat in on meetings with charter personnel.

President Ortiz asked what Ms. Nelson’s priorities would be around evaluating potential new charter schools and holding accountable the existing charter schools. Ms. Nelson responded that she would focus on strong academic focus, engagement with parents, solid transparency, and clear expectations. Working with the best practices that are used by existing charter schools and public schools.

Vice President Newburn noted that the Board is looking to appoint someone who will hold the system accountable and asked what might convince Ms. Nelson to turn the proposal down. Ms. Nelson responded

that severe fiscal discrepancies, a lack of direction and goals, a lack of strong leadership, a lack of transparency, a lack of cohesion with the board, and a lack of checks and balances would convince her to reject a proposal.

President Ortiz invited Kim Paris to the podium to introduce herself. Dylan Fuson, Administrative Assistant to the State Board of Education informed President Ortiz that Kim Paris respectfully withdrew her application.

President Ortiz invited Cindi Rivera to the podium to introduce herself. Ms. Rivera noted that she is a founding member and Associate Executive Director/Vice Principal of Futuro Academy Charter School in East Las Vegas. As the Associate Executive Director Ms. Rivera handles testing administration. She also handles accounting for operations of the building, facilities, and all vendors. Ms. Rivera acts as the LEA for special education and ELL programs. Ms. Rivera supports enrollment, family engagement, the coordination of grant processes, and any site audits that the State of Federal agencies come into the school to ensure compliance. Ms. Rivera handles school policies, procedures, and coordination with the executive director with regards to manuals of standard operating procedures anything from arrival to dismissal. Ms. Rivera maintains personnel files for the staff and train, hire, and terminate employees. Ms. Rivera serves on the leaders and training board which is a nonprofit organization that offers and empowers first generation college graduates who return to their communities as leaders to work on emptying systemic inequities.

Member Hughes asked what the greatest areas of challenge are the charter sector faces at large in Nevada. Ms. Rivera responded that the major challenge is location. It is the main reason why Futuro Academy is in the east side of Las Vegas to serve a diverse population of students who are most in need. Member Hughes asked Ms. Rivera if she were a SPCSA Board member, how would she impact the challenge of location. Ms. Rivera responded that building acquisition is very difficult. Working closely with realtors to find the location and property that is going to suit the needs of building a school. President Ortiz asked what emphasis Ms. Rivera would put on potential charter school in the rural communities of Nevada. Ms. Rivera responded that family and community outreach is important when a charter school is entering a rural community.

President Ortiz invited Victor Salcido to the podium introduce himself. Mr. Salcido noted that he was raised in a small border town in Arizona. His father is an immigrant who grew up in Guadalajara Mexico. Mr. Salcido noted that his father left school at the age of 12 to work full time at a soda bottling company. Mr. Salcido's mother graduated from high school in San Diego California, barely speaking the language. Because of that, she did not get any further in her education. Mr. Salcido noted that his parents did not know the difference between an ACT, SAT, GPA or FASFA, but what they lacked for in familiarity with acronyms they made up for in wisdom and sacrifice. Because of that, they prioritized and knew that education was the way to get forward in this county. They sacrificed so that he and his brother would have those options. Mr. Salcido was able to graduate from law school. Mr. Salcido said that he was telling this to the Board because he thinks it is relevant to this appointment. His story is the same for thousands upon thousands of families in Nevada share. He believes this perspective is valuable to the SPCSA Board. Mr. Salcido was fortunate enough to be on the ground in the opening of two different public charter schools in Reno Nevada. These two charter schools were vastly different in their neighborhoods and their challenges. Mr. Salcido noted that he served as the Executive Director of the Charter School Association of Nevada, and he is very well versed in the challenges from a legislative, legal, and fiscal standpoint.

Vice President Newburn asked Mr. Salcido to elaborate on his time as the Executive Director of the Charter School Association of Nevada (CSAN). Mr. Salcido responded that he was fortunate to serve as the Executive Director for an entire legislative cycle. One of the advantages that this provided him was a statewide perspective on the issues surrounding charter schools. CSAN serves as the advocacy organization

for charter schools. Charter schools on their own do not have a legislative or lobbying group that advocates on their behalf much like an internal school district might have a government affairs representative. CSAN tries to fill that void for public charter schools throughout the State. Mr. Salcido noted that his task was twofold. First, members services which afforded him the opportunity to get familiar with the individuals running these schools and the challenges they have. Second, advocacy at the State Legislature on behalf of the charter schools.

President Ortiz asked what Mr. Salcido would change, do differently, or see more of. Mr. Salcido responded that we should be proud as a State of the work charter schools are doing. The credit for this goes to the school leaders, families in those schools, and the charter authority and their staff. Mr. Salcido noted that the most recent rankings from the national public charter school advocacy group had Nevada ranked in the top ten for climate. Mr. Salcido noted that he would focus on quality and access. Mr. Salcido believes that these are the roles of the charter schools ensuring both quality and access simultaneously. Mr. Salcido would ensure that from the beginning of the application process for a new charter school those two would serve as the north star.

Member Hughes asked Mr. Salcido his thoughts on charter management organizations (CMO) and education management organizations (EMO). Private business that makes profit to handle back-end functions for schools. Mr. Salcido responded that there is confusion over who runs the show at the school. Each one of these public charter schools operates in a way that the top of the food chain is the school board. They are tasked with hiring their personnel and some choose to hire a CMO, or an EMO and others task those responsibilities to the principal or the executive director. Mr. Salcido noted that he believes there is room for both types of scenarios and the State benefits from having both because of innovation and responding to the needs of the local community. For some local communities it is better to have the principal focus on everything that goes on in the classroom and a CMO or EMO focus on the back-office support, the accounting, the personnel issues, legal, facilities etc. The key to all of this is that they all answer to the governing board of the school.

Vice President Newburn noted that facilities and acquiring a building for a charter school seems to be a big issue and asked all the applicants how they would address this issue. Ms. Guedry responded that this is one of the areas that could be encouraged with additional capital funding. It is one of the shortfalls that we have in the State of Nevada. It is an issue trying to get a building. Most of the charters have to go to a private contractor and build their buildings for about a third of the cost of what the district builds. Ms. Guedry believes that in this particular case with the needs that we have in our districts that we need to look for additional funding and something needs to be put in the budget for the charter schools as well to provide more equity, opportunities, and choices for our students.

Ms. Rivera responded that facilities is a major problem with regards to attainment. We have been very creative in what type of buildings we look at. We found a supermarket that had laid dormant in the east Las Vegas area for many years and even when we found it and put our proposals in for acquiring it, we had a lot of pushbacks regarding why we wanted that particular building and then what we wanted to do with it. There was a lot of red tape we had to go through with regards to acquiring the building. When we talk about facilities and funding for charter schools, facility maintenance is not part of the funding. So, we must find additional funding, and this could become a hindrance for a potential new charter school to come to Nevada.

Ms. Nelson responded that she has had conversations with individuals in Elko, Humboldt, and Lander Counties and the building is the number one obstacle. Part of the process that they are struggling with is their cycle of being accepted and the authorization from the charter academy.

Mr. Salcido responded that charter schools in Nevada do not receive any facility funding. So, when we see those scores and what these public charter schools are doing, my hats off to them because I know what the challenges are to make that happen. This means your rent or lease payment is coming out of you operations fund.

President Ortiz asked the Board to provide their top three choices for appointment. Vice President Newburn noted that his top three would be Debra Guedry, Cindi Rivera, and Victor Salcido. Members Hughes, Dockweiler, Coombs, Poblete, Cantú, Stephens, and Arrascada had the same top three. President Ortiz and Member Hudson noted that their top three were Ms. Rivera, Mr. Salcido, and Ms. Nelson were her top three. President Ortiz then asked each member to provide their top two choices. Vice President Newburn's top two were Cindi Rivera and Debra Guedry, Members Hughes and Poblete noted their top two were the same. Member Coombs noted that her top two were Vitor Salcido and Cindi Rivera, Members Dockweiler, Hudson, Arrascada, Stephens and President Ortiz noted their top two were the same. Member Cantú top two were Victor Salcido and Debra Guedry. President Ortiz noted that There were three votes for Debra Guedry, eight for Cindi Rivera, and seven for Victor Salcido.

Member Katherine Dockweiler moved to appoint Cindi Rivera to the Stat Public Charter School Authority Board. Member Tim Hughes seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

12. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS HIGH SCHOOL ASSESSMENT RFP SURVEY

President Ortiz noted that this is the [Nevada College and Career Readiness Assessment Stakeholder Survey](#) will go out to stakeholders prior to the RFP being released again. The Board does not have the authority over the procurement process itself. President Ortiz stated that she agrees with the fact that there should be a well-rounded evaluation team and hopes that the Department will take that message back to the procurement office. It is unknown who will respond to the RFP so the Board cannot allude to that in any way in the survey as it would give an unfair advantage.

Deputy Superintendent Moore noted that at the October meeting, the Board decided to create a subcommittee to collect feedback from the entire Board and provide feedback and revisions to the draft survey which part of the meeting materials for today's meeting. The Department is seeking feedback to be able to move forward to release the survey electronically to begin receiving public comment.

Vice President Newburn asked to implement career readiness questions under section two of the survey. Dr. Moore suggested members of the Subcommittee weigh in on their methodology for aggregating and internalizing the feedback that contributed to this draft. Member Hughes noted that the entire Board provided feedback and the Subcommittee then reviewed the feedback and implemented the updates from the feedback. There were conflicting suggestions in which case the Subcommittee did not implement those changes and determined that those changes needed to be made after the Board could hold a discussion. There was consensus across the Board that the survey needed to be significantly simplified to reach a broader audience.

President Ortiz noted that there is nothing in the survey that talks about providing the test in a student's home language. Member Stephens noted that the Board knows the importance of providing the test in a student's native language so it could be expected to be part of the RFP and may not need to be on the survey. President Ortiz agreed.

Member Hughes asked if the first survey that was sent out was sent out in multiple languages and if there are plans to send out the new survey in multiple languages. Deputy Superintendent Moore responded that the first survey was not sent out in any other language besides English as there was not the capacity to do so.

The Department can certainly look into translating the survey into multiple languages, but it will delay the release of the survey especially since it is significantly shorter. President Ortiz noted that it should be a requirement to translate into multiple languages as there are as many as 72 languages spoken in Clark County alone.

Deputy Superintendent Moore noted that the Department will implement question from Vice President Newburn and prep the survey into being translated into different languages and is confident that it can be translated into at least Spanish and then release the survey once it is translated. President Ortiz noted that the third most spoken language in Nevada is Tagalog so if it can be at least translated into Spanish and Tagalog that would be sufficient.

13. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION'S POSITION STATEMENT FOR THE 82nd LEGISLATIVE SESSION

President Ortiz opened up the discussion regarding the [Board's Draft Position Statement](#).

Vice President Newburn noted that we as the State Board are about student outcomes and achievement and the legislature should be able to tell that about us by the position statement. Vice President Newburn noted that he didn't disagree with anything that was in the statement but though all the sections should start with something that ties it directly to student achievement. Member Newburn provided his recommendations for revisions to the draft. President Ortiz asked Vice President Newburn to provide his draft of the statement to the secretary to then work from his draft.

President Ortiz noted that "consistently low and inexcusable" was highlighted because we felt like inexcusable might be a little harsh. I like calling it how it is but we also don't want to make enemies. President Ortiz noted that she wanted to bring it to the Board to decide as a team. President Ortiz noted that the bottom sentence that is highlighted was added in an effort to get to what Vice President Newburn has suggested by focusing on how this will impact student outcomes.

Member Dockweiler noted that she supports and agrees with the recommendations that Vice President Newburn has put forth. In addition, the number referencing 740 more school based mental health professionals that 740 is just the number needed for school psychologists this year. So, if we go back to the April 2020 presentation we received, the State of Nevada is actually short 2863 school psychologists, social workers, and school counselors. Member Dockweiler suggested changing the figure to reflect the actual need of the school based mental health professionals.

Member Hughes expressed concern that the problem is being oversimplified. For example, the push for increased investment in educator preparation and pipeline programs. Member Hughes stated that this is necessary but when looking nationally, there are other systems in other States that have invested a lot more, have higher salaries etc. and they are still facing similar challenges as Nevada. Member Hughes stated that we need to recognize the complexity of the challenge that is more than what is in the draft position statement. Member Hughes suggested a push on the State Legislature to explore all the possible factors that we have at our disposal inclusive of additional funding. President Ortiz suggested an addition to the last paragraph of the draft that reads "the following State of Nevada representatives are committed to the action steps required to increase funding with accountability and explore other innovative ideas which will improve Nevada's delivery of a high-quality education to all students and thus improve our national education ranking."

President Ortiz noted that since the Board will be meeting in person in Las Vegas in December, all edits and revisions can be made, and the draft can be approved and signed.

14. 4:00 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING FOR TEMPORARY REGULATION #T005-22

President Ortiz called the hearing for T005-22 to order at 6:58 P.M.

Peter Zutz, Administrator, Office of Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management (ADAM) provided an overview of the proposed temporary regulation [T005-22](#).

No public comment.

Member Hughes asked what the time horizon for the temporary regulation and when would the full decision be made about staying the course or reverting to the previous. Administrator Zutz responded that the temporary regulation would be for this school year 2022-23 and at this time there may be conversations about how this might better be handled outside of the regulation process moving forward based on the stakeholder feedback the Department has received.

Vice President Mark Newburn moved to approve temporary regulation T005-22. Member Katherine Dockweiler seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

15. 4:05 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING FOR TEMPORARY REGULATION #T007-22

President Ortiz called the hearing for T007-22 to order at 7:05 P.M.

Dave Brancamp, Director, Office of Standards and Instructional Support, provided an overview of the proposed temporary regulation [T007-22](#).

No public comment.

Vice President Newburn noted that there was an article published where CCSD had some questions regarding this temporary regulation. Deputy Superintendent Moore responded that the Department did receive inquiry regarding this proposed temporary regulation. Deputy Superintendent Moore noted that it is his understanding that the CCSD has already begun implementing consistent weight with dual credit courses. There was nothing in regulation or statute that would have prevented the work from moving forward but the Department did hear from stakeholders that as the legislation passed during the previous session, it would help them in conversations with their community and stakeholders to ensure that the regulation move forward. The Department of has not received any feedback in conflict or opposition, it was an inquiry as to Clark County already begun equating dual credit with their advanced and honors courses, so with the proposed regulation, other school districts will be required to move in that direction. Member Stephens noted that Churchill County has been equating dual credit with their advanced and honors courses for two years now as well.

Vice President Mark Newburn moved to approve temporary regulation T007-22. Member Katherine Dockweiler seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

16. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

President Ortiz noted that the December meeting will be the annual stakeholders meeting to discuss Statewide goals and benchmarks.

17. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

David Blodgett, Executive Director, Nevada Prep Charter School, provided a public comment regarding the pupil centered funding plan. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A.)*

Bill Hanlon, community member, provided public comment regarding student math performance. (*A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A.*)

Jennifer Crane and Sheryl Bennett, MSN RN, provided public comment regarding the December 15th SBE meeting (*A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A.*)

18. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 7:21 P.M.

APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS GIVEN DURING PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Kyle Rogers, Instructor, University of Nevada Las Vegas, provided public comment regarding agenda item 9.
2. Gil Lopez, Executive Director, Charter School Association of Nevada, provided public comment regarding agenda item 11.
3. Minetta Slattery, community member, provided public comment regarding agenda item 12.
4. Jill Mohlman, community member, provided public comment regarding agenda item 12.
5. Melanie Hall, community member, provided public comment regarding agenda item 12.
6. David Blodgett, Executive Director, Nevada Prep Charter School, provided a public comment regarding the pupil centered funding plan.
7. Bill Hanlon, community member, provided public comment regarding student math performance.
8. Jennifer Crane and Sheryl Bennett, MSN RN, provided public comment regarding the December 15th SBE meeting.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 1: KYLE ROGERS

Dr. Kyle Rogers for the record. I am a part time instructor over at UNLV teaching the multicultural Ed class. I am also a CCSD teacher who teaches at the juvenile detention center here in Clark County. I'm speaking as an individual though. I am very passionate about issues in regard to the school to prison pipeline and I am deeply concerned with type of data that is being tracked. And also, the accuracy of the data being provided to the State by CCSD. I recently got a hold of 500 pages worth of data in regard to discipline from CCSD that directly contradicts some of the data being presented tonight. For example, for the last school year from the data they showed to me on this document that I can share with the board, and I did share with the presenters tonight. My data shows that the number of black students suspended are actually several hundred more than what's presented here. So, in Clark County and several hundred more than what we have for the entirety of the State. My other major concern is that suspensions is the major way in which discipline is being tracked when suspensions actually make up the minority of ways students are being removed from classrooms. According to the data I have from CCSD, if we combined RPCs (required parent contacts) and in house suspension, suspension, and suspension with instruction, the entire all of those combined equate to for the last school year over 100,000 instances of exclusionary discipline where kids are not allowed in their school classroom. So, I'm very concerned that the data being tracked isn't maybe the best data to track. I would love to have continued conversations about this is that I feel CCSD is not addressing these and may be that is happening across the State, and I have also major concerns about accuracy in regards to this data I have because it also contradicts some of the data on the Nevada report card website. I used my only personal day I get as a CCSD teacher for the entirety of the year to come here and make this comment because I am deeply concerned that these issues are not being taken seriously and that the numbers are being shifted into these other categories because officials know that those categories aren't the categories being tracked like RPC, in house suspension, and suspension with instruction. Thank you for your time.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 2: GIL LOPEZ

Hello president, members of the Board, my name is Gil Lopez. I am the executive director of the Charter School Association of Nevada here representing over 62,000 students throughout the State. I do want to applaud the slate of candidates that have come forward for the charter authority including our previous executive director and a couple school leaders from our member schools. CSAN is looking forward to working with the new appointment to further the level of education not only in the public education system within the public charters but within education system as a whole for here in Nevada. So we are very happy to have the opportunity to meet the new candidates and hopefully it is going to be a great process. Thank you very much.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 3: MINETTA SLATTERY

For the decision about whether to keep or change the statewide ACT test, please modify the survey and ask the Nevada stakeholders a few simple questions about which test they would prefer, and why they'd prefer it. The survey presented in the last meeting was so long and confusing, and very few of the questions had anything to do with students. If you ever send out a survey to over 350,000 high school students, parents, principals, teachers, and counselors and you only get 165 responses, that's a major hint. Those people weren't apathetic. There was something really wrong with that survey. Which test Nevada uses is a really big deal to so many students trying to get into college. But fewer than 1 in 1,000 people responded to that survey last time because it was so confusing and irrelevant. If you simply ask Nevadans what you want to know: "Which of the 4 tests would you prefer, and why?" I bet you'll get 20 times as many responses and will actually know what Nevada families and educators want this time when deciding whether to keep or ditch the ACT.

Dan & Minetta Slattery

APPENDIX A, ITEM 4: JILL MOHLMAN

Dear Assessment Division and DOE,

I grew up in CCSD and am now a teacher. I don't know how the bid process works for picking the test that all 11th graders take, but does it require that everyone put on blinders and pretend they have no outside knowledge about any of these testing companies? Maybe that's the rule. It just seems nuts. A couple meetings ago the DRC/SBAC test people had the audacity to come into your meeting and claim they saved the day from Nevada's 2015 testing debacle. They conveniently forgot to mention that when DRC got the \$50 Million Nevada testing contract in 2016 for elementary school testing, they dropped the ball even worse and failed to return scores for months and months beyond the due date. Nevada Superintendent Steve Canavero and Nevada Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott had to go after DRC for breach of contract until the DRC's CEO Susan Engeleiter (the same one still in power) finally just ghosted our entire state. DRC basically swiped 50 Million dollars from Nevada, and yet we have to seriously consider them as a possible test vendor again?

Pearson is widely considered the laughing stock of the testing industry, with widespread massive failures and 20-30 test questions being considered invalid on each of their official tests according to New York public schools and multiple news outlets around the country.

I understand the bid process probably needs to seem somewhat unbiased, but do we have to play dumb and ignore the obvious? If you're looking to hire an employee out of four possible job candidates, and one of them embezzled \$50 Million from you the last time they worked for you, and the other applicant is too incompetent to even halfway do the job according to multiple news sources, are you really going to waste time interviewing those two? Or can you just leave it to the other two actual reputable job candidates?

Jill Mohlman

APPENDIX A, ITEM 5: MELANIE HALL

To the Nevada Board of Education,

Regarding the College & Career Readiness Exam:

We are concerned that the statewide assessment test bid process might once again leave dozens of highly informed and talented school officials sitting on the bench. In addition to the NSHE folks left out last time, there are so many high school principals, assistant principal testing coordinators, & high school counselors wanting to have a voice in this process and wanting to join the evaluation committee to advocate for their students and schools, and to make a fair and informed decision to select the best test. While the Board and DOE generally do a fantastic job of transparency, this seems to be the one area that was extremely opaque. Nobody seems to know who is on the test evaluation committee or how it even works. Is it one person? A few? Is the committee composed entirely of Department of Ed. employees? If so, that's not a lot of diverse perspectives. Why not expand the group to bring in some additional perspectives and give some additional seats at the table to people in the educational trenches this time?

Please open the door to these professional educators from around Nevada who would like to volunteer to be on the test evaluation committee. The prior evaluations had some errors and knowledge gaps about high school testing & college admissions that these people could help fill. Let them sit in on the test vendor presentations and give their analysis. Their real world high school testing experience working with students, combined with the Office of Assessment's high level expertise in psychometrics would complement each other well. Imagine an evaluation committee with around a dozen members. They could include a few Office of Assessment professionals, a couple NSHE regents, a handful of high school principals, assistant principal testing coordinators, counselors, and experienced teachers,... each bringing their unique perspective and expertise. Then you'd know that any test decision had been considered from every angle.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

~Melanie Hall

APPENDIX A, ITEM 6: DAVID BLODGETT

Good evening, President Ortiz and members of the Board. I'm actually here to speak about the plan itself but the difficulty in getting the funds from the monthly payments. So, I lead a school in Las Vegas imperfect by any measure but doing what I believe you would say are important is important work. In the two years that we have growth data for our math growth percentile has been a median of 68 or sorry, 88th percentile 69th percentile respectively any lather that 71st and 60th percentile. I believe that part of the reason we've been successful is because we have a different set of priorities than this Board and our charter authorizer in some important ways. I love hearing the discussions tonight, but I often feel like as a school leader our objective is to be successful in spite of rather than in partnership with these bodies. I'm going to share one example about how difficult it has been to receive our supposedly guaranteed monthly funding over the past two months. So, there is no opinion here. This is just a timeline of events. On or before September 1st another school received our payment for the month of September. We were not notified at that time, but the other school was and was asked to return the funds. On September 1st we received the PCFP workbook showing the correct payments. We didn't receive ours, so we figured it was just a delay from the holiday. On September 6th we wondered if there was an issue because even after Labor Day, we had not received it, so I followed up. On September 7th, I emailed again and asked for a response to the September 6th email which was very urgent on our end. We received a reply that we should expect our payment by Friday September 9th. That did not happen. So, on Friday September 9th, I followed up again because the deposit had not hit. On September 12th, the payment did hit our account and the school submitted an updated vendor registration form hoping to have funds deposited to a different account the next month. On September 30th, the final business day to receive our October payment, we reached out to the Department because we learned other schools had received theirs, but we had not. By October 3rd, I found and applied to an email in our spam folder from the controller's office. I know it's not this body, but it is related. The email was only three business days old, so I replied to it immediately and provided the information which was to confirm the exact same content that was on the format submitted on September 12th. On October 3rd I again followed up with NDE and the controller's office asking for a response to that email. Between the third and the fifth, I called the controller's office many times and attempted to visit their office because they were so nonresponsive. I took photographs while I was there because other schools advised me this is a CY environment, and you need to do that. On October 5th I received an email reply form the controller's office confirming that they should resolve the issue within 5-7 business days. So, we patiently waited those 5-7 business days. On October 7th however, we received a trial deposit of \$0.00 which seemed to indicate to us that the account was set up and the connection was active. On October 12th we followed up with controller's office again because their stated 5-7 business day timeline had been missed. On October 13th, I reached out to NDE and the SPCSA for support. At which point, SPCSA jumped in again and helped us, advocated for us. On October 13th, I also emailed the controller's office asking for another reply. I visited the office again in person with nobody there because they were quote "working remotely". I attempted to visit the Governor's office upstairs at Grant Sawyer building as well and was given a printout of the phone numbers for the controller's office. None of them worked. None of them got responses. I did receive an email the end of that day saying the record could not be released until the new account was active for payment, which was activated yesterday. Based on our account it seems like that was actually not accurate. The record is open for payment and all payments will go to the new account on file. On October 21st, I followed up again by email to the NDE and SPCSA because no payment had been received. The SPCSA jumped in again and was able to confirm for us that a check was mailed but to our former school address that we had updated on the at least on the form from September 12th. The school follow up again on October 24th. On October 27th we did receive our October payment in conjunction with our November payment.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 7: BILL HANLON

My name is Bill Hanlon. I've taught math for 20 years. I was a school administrator, director of the southern Nevada RPDP for over ten years, was elected member of this Board. I've worked as a consultant all over the country providing professional development in math for teachers and administrators. Math is a concern. We know our students are performing extremely poorly in math. Math is unlike other subjects. Unfortunately, it is not treated like other subjects. In history, you can teach WWII before or after WWI or before or after the Vietnam War, doesn't make any difference. You can teach biology before or after chemistry, before or after physics not gonna make much difference in terms of achievement. In math, mastery is important. Sequencing is important and so is fluency. If kids can't multiply and subtract, they can't do division. If they can't do polynomial factoring, they can't solve a graph hydro Greek equation. Bottom line is what we are facing in our schools is a problem because we have so many underqualified teachers. We have had a math teacher shortage of documented math teacher shortage since 1985 in the State. So, if you are under 45 years of age, you were probably taught by an underqualified teacher. The PDI offer I strongly suggest that when new topics are introduces, they link that to prior knowledge and use simple straightforward examples that work that don't distract kids with needles arithmetic. That linking allows teacher to review, reinforce, and address student deficiencies and using simple straightforward examples, keeps kids engaged in terms of learning the concept and not being confused with the arithmetic. My frustration is this, teachers are telling me in a professional development that I am offering that they are being required to use scripted programs of books purchased by the district that don't use simple straightforward examples to help clarify the instruction. When teachers ask why that is occurring, the principal tells them the district says we have to use it. When you call the district, they say that the principal has that decision. Somebody is not telling the truth. I believe the principals are being coerced by suggesting that following the district directives will result in poor evaluations of them or lack of opportunities from the promotion. As I understand the law and our teachers need help and our students need help more. That principals and the SOTs are supposed to be able to purchase the programs they need to meet the needs of their students. Not having a one size fits all. What I am going to say to you right now is what you're addressing. We are going to lose good teachers who know the **** content and how to teach it when they are being forced to use scripted programs. We have a law in place that says the district is not supposed to be the one that decided what the programs and books are. That is supposed to be done by the SOTs in the school level. I'm hoping that you will somehow use your authority on this Board, so we have the opportunity to provide students pretty good instruction and we are following the law. Thank you.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 8: JENNIFER CRANE AND SHERYL BENNETT

This public comment is a request to include Providing Nevada Public K12 School Nurses with Readily Available Interpretative Services when Communicating with Students and Their Families from Limited English Proficient Households in the Thursday, December 15, 2022, meeting agenda. This is a timely request, because the Nevada Department of Education is in the process of creating a Language Access Plan to improve access to government services, programs, and information for Nevadans with limited English proficiency as required by Senate Bill 318. School nurses in Nevada report a lack of resources to overcome language barriers. When a language barrier is present, a school nurse is not able to effectively communicate with students and their families with limited English proficiency about health problems or medical emergencies. Language access is a civil right to access federally funded programs and services, including school nursing. Supporting the school nursing function with interpretative services is vital to improving health and educational outcomes for the vulnerable population of students and families with limited English proficiency.