

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATEWIDE COUNCIL FOR THE
COORDINATION OF THE REGIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS
APRIL 30, 2018
10:00 A.M.**

Meeting Locations:

The meeting will be video conferenced from both locations

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	9890 S. Maryland Pkwy	Las, Vegas	Board Room (2 nd Floor)
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St	Carson City	Board Room

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

Dena Durish
Kathleen Galland-Collins
KellyLynn Charles
Sylvia Figueroa

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Las Vegas:

Jeff Zander
Dr. Wendi Hawk
Brent Husson

Carson City:

Nicolette Smith

MEMBERS PRESENT BY VIDEO/TELEPHONE CONFERENCE:

Pam Teel

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

Las Vegas:

Alberto Quintero
Nathalie Brugman
Jerrad Barczynszyn

Carson City:

Kirsten Gleissner
Sondra Neudauer

1. Call to Order; Roll Call: Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Zander called meeting to order.

Roll call was taken and is reflected above. It was determined that quorum was met.

2. Public Comment #1

No public comment in Carson.

No public comment in Las Vegas.

3. Flexible Agenda Approval (Discussion/For Possible Action)

Motion: Member Hawk made a motion to approve for a flexible agenda.

Member Husson seconded the motion

All in favor

Motion carried unanimously

4. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes for January 26, 2018

Motion: Member Husson moved to approve the January 26, 2018 meeting minutes

Member Smith seconded the motion

All in favor

Motion carried unanimously.

5. Nevada Department of Education Updates (Information/Discussion)

Members will hear updates from NDE regarding items of interest that may impact the work of the Council.

- Kathleen Collins-Galland *NDE Education Programs Supervisor for Office of Educator Development & Support* gave staffing updates and introductions of new Administrative Assistant, Sylvia Figueroa, that will help support the council and introduction of KellyLynn Charles, Education Programs Professional, and will be technical assistance for the council, Great Teaching and Leading Fund, and other teacher recognition programs. Kathleen introduced the first Teacher Leader in Residence, Stacey Dallas Johnston. The position is not an official NDE position, but is on loan from Clark County School District for about 18 months and will be the liaison between the Nevada Department of Education and teachers in the field. She can help with policy questions and help communicate to the teachers in the field. She will be helping to support the superintendent's teachers' cabinet that will be starting soon.
- *Dena Durish, NDE Deputy Superintendent for Educator Effectiveness & Family Engagement* gave *GTLF* updates on suggestions from before, multiple year awards. *Dena confirmed the Teacher Leader in Residence is not an official NDE state position. In the legislative session, the legislators approved to have educators in residence through either fellowships or teachers in residence. This summer some "LE fellows" will be brought on board for about six to eight weeks. Great Teaching and Leading Fund was one of the programs that was reviewed by an external evaluator in 2015. The program was determined to be going great but there were some suggestions. Award multiple year awards which was done this last round. The state board determined the priorities; review team determined there was a large amount and some carryover that was given out for FY18 and a little money that was awarded to those that did do a two year application for FY19 to ensure consistency and planning. There are some funds that have not been expended from FY18. For those that do not have a two year grant and we did not award all the FY19 funds, KellyLynn has been working with our finance office on creating a spreadsheet on what has been encumbered and what has been drawn down. Hopefully to be released later this week the Great Teaching and Leading application for FY19 funds. That will be going out on our grant's website and will be sent out to all the RPDP's and everyone that is eligible for that award. The review process and recommendations will be presented to the board in June and once the money becomes available in July it will go out.*
- *Dena spoke on the Commission on Professional Standards and stated SB474 committee from 2015 session made several recommendations one of which was to revisit licensure and looking at professional development and renewal requirements. For the past year, and more particularly past several months, Jason Dietrich, Director of Licensure and Matt Borek who was the Programs Professional for approving professional development, help put together regulations that were sent through to the Commission on Professional Standards, will change the renewal process to become*

more meaningful based on the recommendations on that task force. The idea is educators would work with their supervisors, look at their NEPF areas of need and take course work embedded professional development on an annual basis and then submit that and uploaded. There is now an online educator licensure system. Apply, renew, update addresses online, and create a portal for the license can be done in the educator licensure website. The educator look-up site has changed. The site will show employment history, degree history and other items that are also public record on licensees which will be able to be used for a lot more data. ESSA plan requires that every year we report on the number of not fully certified teachers and the number of not experienced teachers and the number of not effective teachers and the extent to which students in high poverty and high minority communities are being served at disproportionate rates. That system which is not just an online application system but truly a management system will allow us to be more thoughtful on all the data collection when it comes to educators.

- *Statewide Improvement Plan (STIP) required by statute that every year the department submit to the board. ESSA plan and strategic plan says that all students are served by effective educators. We have broken things up underneath that an objective that is related to educator readiness with regard to preparation and licensure. We took the work around the NEPF....Strategy 2 which is high quality standards, curriculum, instruction, and support. Great opportunity to find out what is evidence based instruction materials, how do we align those with the standards and how are we ensuring that educators have instruction methods that are aligned with the NEPF that are meeting those requirements. There will be some upcoming conferences this summer to help meld those items together. Member Husson had questions for Dena Durish. Regarding the SB474 task force recommendations that were given in the January 2017 report, have they been presented to COPS yet or what's the process going forward with those? If not when will it? Do they then take all that information and decide what they want to do with it? Do they adopt it or have to adopt it? Member Husson wants some understanding on that. Dena Durish answered that not all recommendations go in front of COPS. Some recommendations went to this group, some went to the legislature and some went to COPS, and some go to the department for policy things. One example is the changing of the reporting around professional development and that was some statutory changes which led into AB77 and added some changes where districts and RPDPs are not creating duplicate reports. COPS had nothing to do with that. That was a legislative statutory thing. Maybe 2/3 of the items are in motion. Dena Durish will create a spreadsheet to show what we have done, what the next steps are, and what is holding up the others.*

6. Update on RPDP Statewide Family Engagement Program

(Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Members will hear an update on the statewide parental involvement and family engagement training program to be established by the RPDP Council in collaboration with the Office of Parental Involvement and Family Engagement (PIFE) pursuant to NRS 391A.135. This may include, but is not limited to, module content, topics, format and planning development, implementation timelines, and possible action may include program recommendations.

- *Nathalie Brugman of SNRPDP gave an update on Family Engagement Training program. Based on feedback received and from survey questions some adjustments were made to the program. This will be a comprehensive program that will train teachers on the national standards for Parental and Family partnerships as well as the NEPF professional standards. There will be an introduction module that will anchor the educator's learning, provide background on Nevada policy and expectations with those standards and also the implantation of what the educators*

are learning. The design is based around that anchor. Goal is to have the teachers and educators take what they have learned in each individual module and connect it to a plan. The hope is to identify things they can do tomorrow, next month, or next year. There will be six additional modules within the program and each module will have its own learning cycle and will be replicated within each module and is very consistent. The content will change depending on what standard they are working on. Within each learning cycle there will be an introduction. The next step is "What do the standards say?" They will consider the goals as well as the indicators for each standard. The next step is for best practices. During this part of the module, they will be able to explore research behind the standard as well as best practices. There will be video, articles, possibly scenarios to add into that portion. The final step is the resources section that will support further learning that educators can go through on their own. Those would involve content, some case studies, team community building workshops and activities and resources for parents. The format will be an online platform using Soft Chalk. The intent of the program is for teachers and educators to design the path that they want to go through. There will be a statewide website that will have all the handouts and facilitators guide as well as the links to each module. The content development will go out May and June and taking all the content and building the platform will be June/July. It should be ready to launch the entire program in August.

- *Dena Durish gave comment on the Office of Parental Involvement and Family Engagement Curriculum. The Family Engagement council was created along with we received a position and the office within the agency was created and the family engagement work was added to the RPDPs and the council in creating a statewide program. The Family Engagement council was supposed to work with the department and with COPS to adopt regulations around course work that each individual would take for licensure. This was passed in 2011. The recommendations from the council were to COPS that every licensee would have a three-credit family engagement course. There was a lot of debate around that especially in our in-state programs talking about that family engagement was in vetted in all of the courses they were taking. The group felt strongly that that was not evident in seeing it in the classroom or seeing it in the syllabi. They felt very strongly that it would be a standalone class. All of our institutions in-state created a class and upon being eligible for licensure all of the graduates have now met that requirement. As a result from 2015, it created a provision on out of state licenses. We received national recognition. We are one of the few states that was on the forefront of requiring family engagement and an alignment with the six standards which created some unintended consequences. Alberto Quintero, Jason Dietrich and Dena Durish spent time recognizing that there are hundreds of educators that have moved here from out of state who have not yet met that provision and as a result would not been able to continue in the classroom in the fall. In contacting institutions, it was found out that many have now enrolled in that course. As a result an emergency regulation came about. Governor Sandoval asked for an emergency regulation and is valid for 120 days only. It allows for everyone who is issued a license this year is now extended to a 3-year provision. In addition to that, anyone who is issued a license during that 120 day period will be given that 3 years as that provision. Essentially anyone moving here from out of state will be given 3 years to meet those provisions which the majority for them is the family engagement class. The law states within that 120 days whatever agency the governor has directed to do this emergency regulations, it must revisit these regulations to determine if it needs to become a permanent regulation. Alberto Quintero will be working with the family engagement members and with the Commission of Professional Standards to determine whether or not 3 credits is the right amount, is the 3-year provision the right amount, or the group can choose to go back to the one-year provision or possibly choose two years. When initially passed, the intent was a 3-credit course or professional development that was the equivalent*

of a 3 credit course. If COPS were to approve this the RPDP approved course could be taken to fulfil those requirements to the extent that it would not need to be taken in a college or university. This is all on hold until the update in the fall meeting.

7. FY18 Budget Amendments & FY19 Draft Budgets (*Information/Discussion/For Possible Action*)

- There are no FY18 budget amendments at this time.
- FY19 draft budgets are in the process with everyone meeting with the local boards to develop those budgets and then bring them back to this board for approval.

8. RPDP Council Administrative Training Fund Budgets (*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*)

Based on requests made by the regional RPDP Directors and Governing Boards, previous Council actions included approval of equal distribution of one-third of FY18 \$100,000 administrative training funds to be allocated to each of the RPDPs. Members will hear updates regarding the implementation of preliminary FY18 budgets, and possible action may include the approval of amended budgets, with remaining funds reallocated to other regions.

- *Sondra Neudauer , Grants Analyst stated that at the October/November meeting it was passed to continue to do the 33-33-33 for FY18. Each RPDP would submit their budget based on that. Award letters went out, budgets were submitted, and council approved them at the prior meeting. The discussion at the prior meeting that one of the three was not going to use the entire amount. It was requested that since the amount was already approved in the 33-33, an amended budget be submitted. Dena Durish spoke with Sondra and appears Elko will be keeping the original 33-33 award. Clark County School District will retain the \$14,304.40 award. Washoe County has submitted an amended budget and the total amount would be \$52,333.33. A revised budget was submitted. A revised award form needs to be done and after that request for funds can be submitted with changes in the narrative, and asking the council at the next meeting to do some strategic planning around the \$100,000.00 that it would not be distributed in the way the 33-33. This group will hear presentations from the regional boards and Teachers and Leaders council regarding use of funds for that. There is Title II-A money that is a 3% set aside just for admin. There is discussion to combine the \$100,000.00 with the 3% set aside just for administrator training. To be discussed in the next meeting in May will be what the \$100,000.00 be used for. Those would be separate sub awards, not just the 33-33-33 and may go to Fiscal agents or if approved might go to NASA. It would be a sub award. It would have a budget and it would go directly out of the account with its own budget and go directly to NASA. FY19 would be a reset to that. Chair Zander agrees it is a good idea to look at that funding at what we feel is important such as guidelines and principals. Member Hawk had a question to Dena. What is the option in having NDE people doing submissions of ideas where they could utilize those funds to give us recommendations? What are the options with that? What are the timelines look like and is this something worth considering? Dena answered that this group would determine or come up with proposals. Member Hawk asked Dena if we would need a motion on that or is it a discussion item. Dena does not believe a motion is needed on that, but will look at the statute. Chair Zander clarified with Dena for this year's monies there will be revised grants going out to everyone. Dena referred question to Sondra. Sondra answered regarding modifications that need to be made before they can request funds. For Southern Nevada, when doing the narratives, the information on back needs to be put into the budget and put into the narratives. There should not be any attached paperwork that can get lost. Water and food items are not allowed under state grant. Any questions regarding budget or request for funds, Sondra can be reached by phone or email address. The more information listed, the easier it is*

for Sondra to go through it. Budget amendments can always be made and revisions to change the funding. The sooner those are done, the sooner the awards can go out. Northwest Washoe County breaks down travel very well and clear which is good because legislature wants to see where the money is being spent. Dena had a question for Sondra. An email was received regarding carryover but more specifically related to the admin funds but also applies to both. Dena does not believe we are in a base year and carryover is not permitted for either of the two. Sondra confirmed that is correct. It cuts off at the end of the fiscal year. Whatever money that is not spent, it still comes out of the budget and a new budget would need to be re-done. For example for Great Teaching even if there is money left over from FY18 and even though a budget has been submitted, that money does not carry over to FY19. It's the budget that has already been approved for which will be getting that amount. If there is a lot leftover, it might be better to submit a new budget. Kathleen Galland-Collins, KellyLynn Charles and Sondra to discuss further. The ones that did submit the two year budget, those were the funds that have been allocated for FY19. If there are funds in FY18 leftover, those will be lost and will go back to the state. All funds do revert back to the State. Clarification is needed on what can be rolled over, what is allowed, and what is not allowed when rolling over funds. The concern is losing it in the base year. Dena had a question regarding unauthorized use of funds for food and water. Sondra stated no food is an allowable expense for any state grant. Dena spoke about an approval to amend the Southern Nevada and Northwest RPDP to reflect the updated amounts. An updated motion that the Northern Nevada RPDP admin funds would stay the same, the \$33,333.33. The Washoe Northwest RPDP would be changed to \$52,333.34 and Southern Nevada RPDP would stay at the previously approved \$14,304.40 and change amount.

Motion: Member Husson motioned Dena's previous statement.
Member Smith seconded the motion
All in favor
Motion passed at 11:09 AM

9. Future Meeting Dates and Agenda Items

Information/Discussion) Jeff Zander, Chair

- Next meeting will be 5/21/18 at 10:00 AM
- Agenda items for next meeting: FY18 budget amendments and FY19 budget
- Talk about the administrative funds
- Dena Durish spoke with updates regarding the report on SB474 status and sharing the renewal regulation language that was one of those recommendations, No PIFE recommendations at that time. There will be follow-up with the directors. This will be the opportunity to do three things:
 1. Any final FY18 budget amendments
 2. Approval of FY19 budgets
 3. Our FY20-21 budgets are due. Ours are being worked on now, but some clarification is needed. To our understanding the directive from the Governor is it is still flat budget with 5%. FY20-21 budget projections will be going back to the council. Flat budget means a cut budget because of the salary adjustments. A budget enhancement request could be submitted that would request whatever that difference amount would be. A flat budget would still be submitted but also a budget enhancement request would be submitted that would cover the difference in that salary. That is what would need to be approved at the next meeting or whether or not the council supports those budget enhancement requests.

- Chair Zander added that we have had relatively flat budgets for the last two bienniums for RPDPs and the issues that facilitators and coordinators that are working within the RPDPs are paid based upon the salary schedule for their local school districts. As we hire those people that have those roll-up clauses in their salary annually, we have flat budgets. Some of the things that RPDP was able to do before to help facilitate additional training from a regional nature such as paying for substitutes or paying for travel is dwindling and we are 90% salaries and benefits for those facilitators. This has happened over the last three bienniums. It would be important to go over and look at that. The intent behind RPDP is regional in nature and to be able to provide those incentives, it allows school districts to have higher participation levels to provide reimbursements.

10. Public Comment #2

No public comment in Carson.

No public comment in Las Vegas.

11. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 11:15 AM.