

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
APRIL 6, 2023
2:00 PM**

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

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Felicia Ortiz, President
 Dr. Katherine Dockweiler, Vice President
 Tim Hughes
 Tamara Hudson
 Maggie Carlton
 Mike Walker
 Dr. Summer Stephens
 Joseph Arrascada
 Malia Poblete

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction
 Christy McGill, Interim Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement
 Barbara Bidell, Education Programs Professional
 Kris Huffman, Chief Strategy Officer
 Dr. Katie Broughton, Legislative Liaison
 Martha Warachowski, Administrative Assistant IV

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

Christyan Mitchell, Smarter Balanced
 Jeff Kaye, Red Rock Strategies

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, AND LAND ACKNOWLEDGMENT

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

There were no in-person public comments in Carson City or Las Vegas. The following are public comments submitted via email. A complete copy of their statement is available in Appendix A.

- a. Sarita Tunstall provided a public comment regarding high school start times.
- b. Tina May provided a public comment regarding high school start times.
- c. Nathan Watson provided a public comment regarding College and Career Readiness testing.
- d. Wendy Powell provided a public comment regarding later school start times for high school.
- e. Rosa Martinez provided a public comment regarding College and Career Readiness testing.

President Ortiz asked Ms. Warachowski to respond to Ms. Martinez to get the student’s name, so they can send him a congrats.

- f. Poojah Thakur provided a public comment regarding College and Career Readiness testing.
- g. Farhad Ghassemi provided a public comment regarding College and Career Readiness testing.

3. APPROVAL OF FLEXIBLE AGENDA

Vice President Dockweiler moved to approve a flexible agenda. Member Hudson seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

4. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Ortiz stated they have had two of three workshops regarding their high school start times and discussion started back in December. She said they decided to give the public and stakeholders more time to come back with suggestions, ideas and challenges to help the board make a decision on this item. They've had the two workshops: one in Carson City and one in Las Vegas, and there will be one more workshop in Las Vegas, on April 15, 2023, at Desert Pines High School at 9:00am. She stated they hope to have a significant number of participants at the next workshop where they will dig deeper and start evaluating some options that have been talked about in previous workshops. The general public that attend will have the opportunity to place public comment. She stated that if one cannot attend the meeting in person, please submit your comments, thoughts and ideas to the board email at nvboarded@doe.nv.gov. They will take comments to be read into the record on that meeting from now until April 15.

President Ortiz provided an update on Portrait of a Learner. She stated they have made great strides in preparing their teachers and educators for moving towards a more competency-based instructional model. She stated that part of that is defining what they want students coming out of school knowing what they want them to be able to do and that is where that portion of a Portrait of Learner work comes into play.

President Ortiz stated the Nevada of Future of Learning Networks Competency Fellowship has been put out to the general public, and they now have a large group of fellows and stakeholders that are actually going to work on putting together the competencies that will backup this Portrait of a Learner. She stated that will be a heavy lift, and she gave kudos to everyone that raised their hand to be part of this work. She stated they will continue throughout the spring and hopefully give us some feedback closer to the beginning of the next school year.

President Ortiz stated this process has been a true collaborative effort with parents, students and community members, workshops and interviews. She gave credit to the team at ed.Xtraordinary, Knowledge Works, and the Department of Education and everyone else that has been involved in getting this done because it's a heavy lift but will be a really good thing for our state. She stated they will continue to keep their eyes and ears open for all of the thoughts and ideas that come from the community. She stated that everyone that she has spoken to so far that has seen the draft Portrait is excited. She stated that their kids have been begging them for a long time to stop focusing on the core subjects and see them as a whole child and teach them Adulting 101, the life skills that they need to succeed post-high school, which is the number one request she gets from high school students and is a key component of Portrait of a Learner.

President Ortiz invited everyone to check out the draft and provide them feedback. She stated there is a survey to get feedback on the draft portion of it, which will be open until April 15, and she encouraged everyone to take it. She stated the website is portrait.nvfutureoflearning.org, which is also in their Board docs.

President Ortiz stated besides the conversations she's had with students, she has talked to a lot of parents and business owners in which she is one of them, and it is refreshing to hear their feedback as well. She stated one of the things business owners and parents are asking for, is to make sure that their students are coming out of their K-12 system with the soft skills that will make them very marketable in the economy, such as communications skills, critical thinking skills, empathy, the ability to communicate in multiple modalities, which are super important to employers. She stated that seeing them presented on their Portrait of a Learner is making that community very happy. She stated this is only going to get better with the continued feedback and collaboration of the community, so she invited everyone to continue to be involved.

President Ortiz stated there are a couple of board seats available and four sessions coming up that will guide the work and think through what policy they need to change in order to make this actually happen. She encouraged everyone to check their emails and sign up if you have the time in your schedule to do so. She is looking forward to them getting this work to the finish line. She stated Virginia, South Dakota, and a few others have already done this work, and it's going really well for them, so they have some lessons learned to pull from. She stated she has a really good feeling about this and thinks it will kind of change the mindset and perspective of how they look at measuring their success of the system to go beyond a piece of paper and often times a diploma that does not necessarily reflect the skills and knowledge they expect students to have. President Ortiz asked everyone to feel free to reach out to her for any questions.

Member Hughes asked to get clarification on where start times come from and what the mechanisms are to adjust it to give people the framework they're working under.

President Ortiz stated she appreciates the question and had reached out to DAG Gardner when the topic originally came up to ask if they had the authority to make the change. She stated their authority comes into play from a regulation that states the State Board of Education must approve all the schedules from the school districts. She stated the school districts have operational control on how they manage their schedules, but because they have to come to them for approval, that's where their authority comes in. She stated they are proposing setting guard rails around, such as start time cannot start before X time in order to still allow that flexibility and decision by the school districts but keep students' health first and foremost.

Deputy Attorney General David Gardner stated there is no place in statute that specifically says start times and specifically says that this Board has the authority to do that, but this Board has a couple of places, one of them being NRS 385.80, which is just one of their generalized power over regulations. One of the laws that they were talking about is, as this body has the ability to approve calendars, there have been in the past some adjustments that they are required, such as doing an alternative calendar and things like that have to go through the Department. He stated that it is not a slam dunk that they have this authority, but they have a good argument that they do. The argument is that as calendars are already something in front of this body, this body would then use that same power to try and set a start date. He stated the easiest and cleanest way to get this done is get the legislature to pass the bill saying they have this authority. He stated this is something that they could go forward with and then it would come down to a discussion with LCB legal where they would explain their legal reasoning, and LCB legal could push back and say they do not have this authority, based on some of the other regs that have already been approved regarding calendars. He stated this is not 100% guaranteed as LCB will still have their option in this.

President Ortiz thanked DAG Gardner and asked if there were any other questions, and there was none.

5. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

Jhone Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, stated she is happy to be there with everyone and stated she would normally give them additional information on the legislative session, but they have their great staff that is going to be doing that, so she is going to stick with a celebration this afternoon. She stated she's always proud of the whole entire team, but when others, outside their organization recognizes their staff, she thinks it's really important that they share.

Superintendent Ebert stated the National Association of Federal Education Program Administrators is a national organization that represents federal programs directors, coordinators, and supervisors who work in the education agencies across the United States. The state leadership award is presented to outstanding educational leaders who make a significant contribution to the administration of federal programs in their state. The Nevada Department of Education is proud to announce that Dr. Silvana Gorton, their own state director for Title II, part A, has been named as the state leadership award recipient. In her role at NDE, Dr. Gorton plays a critical role in improving teacher quality and student achievement by helping school districts and individual schools with their professional development support through funding of grants and subgrants. She's known for building strong relationships with their district leaders and individual school leaders across the state. She provides guidance, support and technical assistance to school leaders to ensure district and local priorities are aligned with their state priorities. She asked everyone to give Dr. Gorton a round of applause.

Superintendent Ebert stated Interim Deputy Superintendent Statucki received an email that said that one of their own State Board members also received this award, Dr. Summer Stephens. She stated they also have someone from the Clark County School District, Sarah Nick, who also received this award. She congratulated all those who have been recognized.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

President Ortiz stated she is going to pull item j, the board meeting minutes from the last meeting, because they were not posted in time. She stated they will review and approve them at their next meeting. She asked if any board member had any item they would like to pull for discussion; otherwise, she will accept a motion for approval of the consent item.

Member Hudson moved to approve the consent agenda items. Vice President Dockweiler seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

7. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING EXECUTIVE ORDER 2023-003

Kristofer Huffman, Chief Strategy Officer, Nevada Department of Education, provided a presentation on Executive Order 2023-003, which freezes the issuance of new regulations and requires a review of existing regulations by all executive branch agencies, departments, boards, and commissions. It was enacted on January 12, 2023. A culminating report detailing the review process, including recommendations, is due no later than May 1.

Mr. Huffman went over the five sections of the Executive Order: 1) Report detailing how regulations subject to enforcement can be streamlined, clarified, reduced, or otherwise improved; 2) Provide a list of not less than ten regulations recommended for removal; 3) Hold a public hearing; 4) No new regulations; and 5) Exemptions to section.

Mr. Huffman stated that to collection information from stakeholders and staff, a form was created that captured required elements of the report, including the recommended revisions. He stated the information was shared to district leadership as well as education stakeholders in February. He stated as of April 3, there were 39 submissions: 20 to streamline, clarify, or otherwise improve; 3 to reduce/remove; and 16 to remove. He stated the Department is currently reviewing regulations to determine next steps as they relate to the Executive Order.

Mr. Huffman noted as stated in Section 3 of the Executive Order, there is a required public hearing for key stakeholders to vet their recommended changes, solicit input as to the merits of those changes and identify other regulation changes that stakeholders feel are worthy of consideration. With this understanding, the Department, in conjunction with the State Board of Education and the Commission on Professional Standards, will hold a public hearing on Saturday, April 15, 2023 at 11:15 a.m. at Desert Pines High School. He stated this event will be livestreamed, and it will be the final opportunity for public comment and feedback on the regulation revisions prior to this submission of the report.

Mr. Huffman thanked the Board for providing the opportunity to update the Board on the status of Executive Order 2023-003. He stated he is available for questions.

Member Hughes thanked Mr. Huffman for giving them the outline, which was super helpful. He stated that he knows they're adding it on to the school start time meeting and asked if the Board will get a briefing or is that where they will find out the set of proposed changes would be. Mr. Huffman replied at this time, they're reviewing the recommendations to see which ones they're going to bring forth to the public hearing because at this time, most of the submissions are from within the Department. He stated the plan is to get that information to them as they post the information related to the public hearing as well, which is quite extensive.

President Ortiz asked what the count was, and Mr. Huffman replied currently, there are 39 recommendations for regulation revisions that are directly related to either the State Board or the Department. He stated there are additional recommendations for the Commission on Professional Standards. He stated one of the recommendations for removal is a combination of several regulations that have currently been revised in other regulations, so that particular piece is only one submission, but it's currently at 23 pages because of the number of regulations that have been revised.

Member Walker asked if they are consulting with superintendents and getting their feedback because these regulations are dictating a lot of things the districts are doing.

Mr. Huffman replied they have been working closely with NASS and meeting with all of the state superintendents to inform them of the opportunity. He stated they met with them in February and March to let them know that the stakeholder input opportunity was there. He stated that they have received none from individual districts.

Vice President Dockweiler asked if there will be a second opportunity for the public to hold that meeting after Saturday. Mr. Huffman replied at this time, they only have the one public hearing available because of the time of the report itself. He stated they did have the opportunity for public input through the survey available for approximately two months prior to going to the public hearing.

Member Carlton stated she knows when NRS is drafted and enacted, the enabling section at the very end will list regulations that shall be promulgated by a certain date and then the enacting clause on the actual bill, so this is more of a process question. She asked if he is going to crosswalk the recommendations back to the original NRS to make

sure the drafting of regulations wasn't actually mandated in the NRS because at one time, they went through the same situation, so the legislators started putting that enabling clause at the very end of the NRS to make sure that regulations were enacted, so the bills would actually function at the level that they were supposed to.

Mr. Huffman replied at this time, they are looking for recommendations, so the report that will be provided to the Governor's office are just recommendations from different agencies that are involved. He stated there has not been any information about what will happen once that report is submitted to them, but as they're going through, they're looking at the different dates that are in there and looking at those statements that Member Carlton just referenced. He stated in terms of the report itself, this is just a recommendation report; it is not enacting any regulation changes at this time.

Member Carlton asked for clarification that the process will not happen, and they're not going to crosswalk at all and only forward them and go from there. She asked even if it can't be repealed, it could possibly still be forwarded.

Mr. Huffman stated if he's understanding the question correctly, when they are going through the public hearing process, they're still taking in suggestions, and then they will have that process where they go through and make sure they clearly understand which ones are required. He stated part of the report will be looking at what the recommendations are because they do need to address what any public comments and recommendations were, but they would also on their end create those reports. He stated there's a report that's required from the Department of Education, State Board of Education and Commission on Professional Standards.

Member Carlton thanked Mr. Huffman and stated that was much clearer.

President Ortiz reiterated that they will be having the hearing on this after their workshop on April 15 and asked everyone to make sure it's on their calendars so that they know they have to stay a little bit later on that date. She stated they did that for coordination purposes.

8. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE COLLEGE AND CAREER READY ASSESSMENT RFP, RUBRIC, AND COMMITTEE ENTITIES

President Ortiz stated they heard a lot on this topic during public comments, and she did check the board materials and it looks like that item that was mentioned in public comments has been corrected. She asked if Member Stephens was going to present, and Member Stephens stated that she was hoping it was going to be a team effort.

Member Stephens stated at the last meeting, they presented the draft of the scope of work, the scoring rubric and the makeup of the committee. She stated they heard some public comments at this meeting and previous meetings, and some board members have also received additional public comments over the last few months, which they greatly appreciate receiving. She stated they fully understand the public comments made regarding the importance of the top priorities identified with the goal of meeting both the state's requirements that they have for College and Career Readiness assessment as well as the federal accountability requirements for assessing students in high school in reading, math, and science. She stated the approach has been that they're trying to do this in one effort versus two separate assessments, which she thinks is commendable. She stated the reason why they asked the public is they wanted to know what the public prioritized or felt was extremely important about the assessment.

Member Stephens stated also important is the requirement to meet the federal accountability guidelines, which are things most stakeholders don't have at their fingertips knowing how that all plays out. She stated they felt their job was to present the scope of work and scoring tool to reflect both parts that she's going to call the will of the people, and also meeting the demands of high-quality assessment and accountability design. She stated the scope of work has done a good job honoring the input from the stakeholders as well as the other elements that go into a high-quality assessment system for a state. She stated they did use 20% for the cost; however, she doesn't think the committee was set on 20% and proposed they use a 10% weight, stating that coupling the cost with the desire of the stakeholders and the best practice and accountability, the test cost does matter because they don't have unlimited state funds, so it's a balance that this Board would want to weigh. She stated that she would contend that they consider looking at 10% and then increasing the functional and technical requirements to 60%. She stated if they score each item independently, all of those items within that scope of the functional and technical requirements gets weighted to 60%, which honors both the ask of the public but also really puts the emphasis on school districts and the Department and what goes into an assessment model value and know has to be true in a high-quality assessment model.

Member Stephens stated if folks from the Department have additional input today, she's feeling pretty solid on putting this out there with that potential change to the weighting. She asked Member Hughes and Member Cantu if they had any input.

Member Hughes thanked Member Stephens for the summary. He stated she did a great job summarizing their work and the balance they tried to make. He stated they have a lot of mathematicians out there who sent them lots of thoughts and ideas of different scoring scenarios and what might happen, so there were some compelling cases to be made where they could make a decision with the lesser quality tool that could be the margin of difference between the cost that he would feel comfortable. He stated this is not the situation where they are choosing the actual assessment, but it's their jurisdiction through the procurement and RFP process, which is what they've been working on. He stated he wanted to name that because he thinks there's still a little bit of a confusion of folks saying don't get rid of the ACT when they don't actually have the ability to make that decision. They do have the ability to run a thorough, comprehensive process that aligns to the will of their constituents.

Member Hughes stated that the other thing he wanted to name and apologize for was the concern about some of the language, which he doesn't think was intentional. He stated there was a transcription error on one of the four survey questions where they said compare student progress year-over-year, and they would give an example in parentheses how 11th graders do over the course of time. When they transcribed that into a previous board meeting that was actually taken off, but now, is reflected back in there as mentioned and no ill intent was happening there. He stated Member Stephens might have a record of the last time they had talked about graying out or indicating on the rubric places that were a yes/no. He stated that was the only change he did not see reflected in the current set of materials. He stated that they would want to address that plus costs before they give a final signoff.

Member Stephens stated she only had one item that was specifically a yes/no, which she believes was vendor's history of service is free of litigation or censure and stated that was number three under project management. She stated they could certainly entertain other items. When they said yes or not, what they were going to say was it was an M or an I, which would have been two or zero points.

Member Hughes replied that was his memory as well and stated he thought another one could have been number eight under project management, and Member Stephens concurred. President Ortiz thanked them for the recap and addressing all of the concerns and feedback they got from the general public and stakeholders.

President Ortiz stated she will entertain a motion to approve these documents with the changes that were requested by the subcommittee: 1) reducing the cost from 20% to 10% and moving that 10% up to functional and technical requirements making it 60% instead of 50%; and 2) making items under project management criteria on the rubric items on number three and eight; a yes/no instead of the four choices.

Vice President Dockweiler motioned to approved what was just outlined by President Ortiz. Member Hudson seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

President Ortiz reiterated and reminded the public and Board what Member Hughes stated earlier that it is their role to set the criteria and the emphasis in this RFP process, not to decide who is selected. She stated this process now goes to the procurement office where the procurement team will put out a new RFP with this rubric. That RFP will go out on the street, vendors will respond, and the procurement team will convene a group of reviewers who will use this rubric to review the responses from vendors. She stated the procurement office will then bring to them a recommendation of a specific vendor to award this contract to, and at that point, they will decide if they will approve that vendor. She stated they went through this entire process last year, and because there wasn't enough transparency into the process at the time and some things were not clear to them, they rejected the original recommendation of the procurement team and started over. She stated this is Round 2, and hopefully, that's not going to happen again, and at this point, according to state law, they are behind in getting this particular task rebid in the public bid process.

9. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CURRENT LEGISLATIVE ITEMS

Dr. Katie Broughton, Legislative Liaison, Nevada Department of Education, stated she will be presenting an update on bills from the 82nd session of the Nevada legislature, which began on February 6, 2023 and will conclude on June 5, 2023. He stated today marks the 60th day of session, and there are several bills that are specifically relevant to the work and makeup of the State Board of Education that she will be sharing with them today.

Dr. Broughton stated she will begin with three measures related to the work of AB469 from the 2017 session, then move on to bills relevant to purview of the State Board, and then end with an update on bills from the Nevada Department of Education and the Office of the Governor. Dr. Broughton presented a PowerPoint presentation of the 82nd Session Legislative Update.

President Ortiz stated she has so many questions but will hold back because none of this is final yet and things change frequently up there. She stated that she speaks for the whole Board when she says how grateful they are that Dr. Broughton has been providing them with these weekly updates. She stated there is so much happening and so much that impacts their authority and work they've spent a lot of time on, and they are all volunteers doing full-time jobs, so having her help dig through all the various bills and point out what is important for them to know if so much appreciated.

Member Carlton stated their newly elected and very quick with the keyboard Clerk is looking for the bill number for her, but she remembers listening to Assemblywoman Dr. Angie Taylor's bill on restorative justice also, and she didn't see that noted in the presentation. She asked if there was a reason why it's not included.

Dr. Broughton replied she tried to focus on the bills that are specific to the work of the State Board of Education to give them all an opportunity to speak about them and then also focus on the NDE and Governor's bills, so no it was not intentionally left out. She's just trying to synthesize nearly 1000 bills.

Member Carlton stated she appreciates that, but they have one restorative justice bill mentioned, which is a large issue and she knows there are probably three or four restorative justice bills and being able to track them all and figure out what pieces of each one of them is going to end up in the final bill. With Member Hudson's assistance, she confirmed that it was Assembly Bill 285. She stated she totally understands; she can't keep up with it all and thanked Dr. Broughton for watching all of this for them.

President Ortiz thanked Member Carlton and stated she made her think of another question she had. She asked Dr. Broughton if she was mistaken in thinking it wasn't just one of the previous two sessions that they were given the authority to recommend teacher/class ratios and now there's a bill to take that away.

Dr. Broughton replied she doesn't know which session it came in but, in that bill, which is NRS 387.1234, the K-3 ratios are set in NRS, but the section requires the State Board of Education to establish by regulations the maximum pupil-teacher ratios for the other grades.

President Ortiz replied she's fairly certain that bill was passed by Assemblywoman Miller just in the last two sessions, so now it's being proposed that they take that away if she's understanding that correctly.

Dr. Broughton replied it was passed in 2019 and confirmed Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch with Assemblywoman Brittany Miller as co-sponsor would be removing that authority.

Member Walker stated he's curious to know what Member Arrascada's thoughts are about them removing the regents from being a representative on the Board of Education, and he also noticed that it said the University of Nevada and asked if it's Reno or Las Vegas because that's contentious. He stated that he thinks it's important to have a regent on a board like this just like it's important to have a trustee, a student and a superintendent because that ensures all voices are truly being represented. He stated he thinks that would be a disappointment if they took a regent off of the State Board of Education.

President Ortiz asked if Member Arrascada would like to answer Member Walker's question because the way she understood it was the Board of Regents would go away altogether.

Member Arrascada replied his understanding is that it will not go away altogether. He stated he's not going to speak on behalf of the entire board, nor is he going to diminish the strong work that their Acting Chancellor has been doing throughout Carson City, but in following-up with Member Walker, it's imperative to have that conduit between the Board of Education and the System of Higher Education primarily because one of the items they already discussed this afternoon was the dual enrollment program. He stated it's an imperative part of the community college's enrollment structure and having that somehow removed or eliminated would cause great damage to the enrollment numbers of the colleges and be detrimental to the students also. He stated it's a strong benefit.

Member Arrascada stated in regard to the Assembly Bill in which he's referring to, he does not believe the Board of Regents is going to be completely admonished and they're not going to be gone. He firmly believes the Board of Regents in having the elected officers, having the voice of the people, is imperative throughout state of Nevada. He stated it is important to have appropriate representation and the appropriate constituents regardless if you're urban or most importantly, rural, having the representation for the voice of the people is most important.

President Ortiz thanked Member Arrascada for his response and asked Member Walker if that answered his question, and he indicated to President Ortiz that it did. President Ortiz apologized and stated she reread it and she misread the language. She stated if she understands correctly, they would be splitting it up into a separate body over community colleges versus universities.

Member Hughes stated he had one comment and one question. He stated it's great important work with lots of interesting ideas and one push for the Board is some of these are a result of folks not actually knowing what their regulatory authority is currently and some of them are likely because they do know and they are actively trying to change that. He stated where they land on that is it's probably a push for them to have close communication with folks because he's even surprised sometimes of folks who say, for example, they didn't even know the Assembly or Senate has an appointment ability for the State Board of Education. He stated it's some interesting stuff like that that he's heard come up that they can probably proactively clarify a bit more.

Member Hughes stated his question about potentially creating an additional school district and he's not sure if it's a question for Dr. Broughton or DAG Gardner. He stated it's his understanding there's currently law that requires them to go by county and asked if this is proposing they change that law and then add on or would this go around that law. He asked how that would work functionally with what's currently on the books in terms of how school districts are created in the state.

Dr. Broughton replied she does not know the law of the creation of the school districts, but it would take off essentially a chunk of Clark County School District and make it its own school district, and that bill has not been heard yet.

President Ortiz asked DAG Gardner if he was familiar with the actual NRS that dictates the school districts in Nevada. She stated she thought it was actually in the constitution.

DAG Gardner replied he's trying to find and he's pretty sure it's in NRS 386, but it says it has to be of the same boundaries of a county in the statute, so that would be a tweak to that statute. He stated he assumes that's what they're doing.

Member Walker stated he thinks it's important that the members of the community have representation on local school board, so he would hope that instead of just adding additional tasks onto all of their plates that they allow their community to select representation because as a school trustee, it's a big job in addition to what they already are doing would be pretty taxing.

President Ortiz replied she could not agree more and stated while she is a rural kid, she's not currently a rural resident, so she thinks they're better served by their rural community representing them. She stated that brings up the fact that as a Board, if they were to take a position on any of these bills, they would have to vote on them and then go take a position as the Board. They do not have another board meeting until June, which is right at the end of session, if not after session, so they're kind of in a bit of a pickle in that they don't know how these bills are going to play out, and some of them will affect this body, so they don't necessarily have the time to come back together and take a position and then go advocate for their position. She stated she is going to look at DAG Gardner for some advice on how they might handle this. For example, the class size issue where they have recommended teacher-pupil ratios of 25 pupils per teacher based on the existing law. If that is taken away from them, that could negatively impact students and educators, so that might not be something they want removed from their authority. She asked DAG Gardner how would they advocate on behalf of the body most effectively.

DAG Gardner replied to do anything as a body, they have to vote as a body, so they would have to agendaize it, have a discussion and have a vote saying this is their statement, as President Ortiz did earlier before the session. He stated they could hold a special meeting or a meeting of some sort so that they could actually hold that. He stated each of them have 100% ability to go there by themselves and say they're a member and not speaking on behalf of the Board,

but speaking on behalf of themselves, which they're allowed to do, and there's nothing prohibiting them from doing that. He stated the statute is NRS 386.010, sub-1, for the boundaries of the school districts.

President Ortiz stated to Member Walker's point, nobody has ever asked them if they want to take on all this additional responsibility of being a trustee for a school board. She stated for a school district, that is whole other level. She thanked Member Walker for all that he does.

Member Walker stated to the Deputy Attorney General's point, he thinks something like that is going to really alter the work of the Board that might warrant a special meeting so that they do have one voice that is providing feedback for the legislature. President Ortiz stated that was a great point.

President Ortiz asked Dr. Broughton to keep extra attention on that one bill and let them know if it goes beyond initial hearings so that they can be prepared to call a special meeting if necessary and take a position on it.

Dr. Broughton asked if the request is to alert her if it's passed out of the Assembly Education Committee, and President Ortiz stated correct. Dr. Broughton stated she can happily do that.

President Ortiz stated that would at least give them enough lead time to post and hold a meeting and discuss their position and obviously go speak with the legislative representatives that are putting forth the bill. President Ortiz also requested that Dr. Broughton alert her on the bill on class size. She stated those are the two hot ones that they would like to keep an eye on, and Dr. Broughton stated she can do that.

President Ortiz asked if there were any other questions and there was none. She thanked Dr. Broughton for all of her work and stated they appreciate her.

10. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING STATE BOARD MEETING DAYS AND TIMES

President Ortiz opened a discussion regarding the State Board meeting schedule. Ortiz reminded the board members that changing the dates and times of meetings had previously been discussed. She went on to say that the changes were primarily being made to avoid any conflicts but also to discuss if the current meeting times were working or not working for everyone. President Ortiz explained that over the last couple of years the dates and times had been changed to see if the meetings could get more input from the public. She also noted that Nevada Department of Education had done an impact statement regarding how changing days and times might conflict with other meetings. They also looked at the work process for getting all the different elements that go into the State Board meetings done. President Ortiz stated that we are shooting for having all the meeting materials posted two weeks before the meeting so that the Board can review all of the materials and submit any questions on those materials back to the Department a week in advance of the Board meeting. She explained that this allowed for greater transparency for the public around the questions being asked by the Board and the answers from the Department. President Ortiz offered two options for changing the meeting schedule. A Wednesday works better for the Department because it gives them time to get questions answered and materials posted. She went on to say that the other meeting option is for Monday. Ortiz opened the meeting up for discussion. Vice President Dockweiler stated that she appreciated the thoughtful options for Monday and Wednesdays and felt that the Wednesday option would work out better for both the Department and any of the public who goes out to town for long weekends and might not get back until after Monday. She feels that the Wednesday might increase public participation.

Member Poblete offered a student's standpoint with Wednesday being the better option. Member Hughes stated that he is flexible and doesn't have a strong opinion one way or the other. Hughes went on to say that he thought at one time it was suggested that during the summer the meeting times could be at 9:00AM.

President Ortiz thanked the Department for all their work on the impact analysis. Ortiz asked for a motion to change the State Board meeting day/time to either option 1 Mondays or option 2 Wednesday.

Vice President Dockweiler made a motion to change the meeting day to Wednesdays. Member Hudson seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

President Ortiz stated that the Department will put out a press release and calendar invites with the new date.

Member Arrascada asked about what the confirmed times were for the meetings, and President Ortiz confirmed that during the summer months, June and July, the meetings will start at 9:00 a.m. During the school in session dates of September through April the meetings would start at 2:00 p.m.

11. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE MONTH OF THE MILITARY CHILD AND THE NEVADA PURPLE STAR SCHOOL AWARD PROGRAM

Education Programs Professional KellyLynn Charles shared with the State Board a presentation on the purpose of the Month of the Military Child and why Nevada Department of Education thinks it's important to have a Nevada Purple Star School Award Program. Ms. Charles went on to report that the purpose of the month of the military child and the Purple Star School Program is to increase educator awareness and understanding of the experiences of military children.

Ms. Charles highlighted Program goals 2 and 3 which align with the STIP. Ms. Charles went on to say that April is celebrated as the month of the military child. Ms. Charles reported on the different ways that families and communities can celebrate this important month. Ms. Charles went on to talk about the academic and social emotional challenges that military connected children can experience as they relocate with their families. Ms. Charles went on to say that the Purple Star Schools Program is designed to help schools respond to and support their military connected children during these challenges. The Purple Star Schools Award helps identify the schools that have taken the extra steps to fully support military connected children and their families.

Ms. Charles went on to talk about 2020 research that had been done by the Military Child Education Coalition which is the national advocate for military children and the 2022 follow up research. She reminded the audience that most of the Purple Star School Programs in the United States are less than 4 years old and that a great amount of that time was during the pandemic. Ms. Charles went on to say that the follow up 2022 research showed the positive impact that a Purple Star School Program can have on the children, staff and parents that attend or are associated with these schools and gave statistics on the positive impacts that were highlighted in the 2022 follow up research. Ms. Charles went further with her presentation by explaining the Nevada Purple Star Schools application process. Ms. Charles highlighted some of the requirements on the application such as required and optional activities, resources and staff education for schools that wish to become Purple Star Schools. Ms. Charles also listed all the Nevada schools and districts that received the Purple Star School status since the beginning of the program in 2021. Ms. Charles reported that in November of 2022 NDE staff and points of contact for several of the Purple Star Schools attended Aviation Nation at Nellis Airforce base where we talked to hundreds of attendees about Purple Star Schools and handed out purple bracelets.

President Ortiz asked about what the State Board could do to help get the Purple Star Schools Program in front of more parents, schools, and community members. Ms. Charles asked that everybody share out on social media any NDE updates that mention the program and any information that come from the Purple Star Schools social media. Ms. Charles went on to suggest that as the Board members are out talking in public that they also mention the program.

President Ortiz also asked about Assembly Bill 185 which would allow students that wish to apply at magnet schools use their associated military base address. Ms. Charles stated that that bill had dropped and that there had been one hearing on it. President Ortiz asked about military students only being self-reported during the school registration process and whether that was just a Nevada thing. Ms. Charles answered by saying that self-reporting during registration where the parent is checking the box that says military connected is very common way to gather that data. President Ortiz suggested that when board members are communicating with stakeholders and constituents that they remind them of the importance of checking that box if it applies.

Member Hughes thanked Ms. Charles for the great presentation and went on to ask about the research and data that was reported on and how the program is ensuring that all the great activities that earned a school its Purple Star School designation are still happening? Ms. Charles explained that even though the Nevada's Purple Star Schools Program is in its infancy, now that it is growing one of the program's next steps is gathering the data that is available and surveying the schools to ensure that the schools are following through year after year.

Member Stephen's gave a shout out to the program regarding all the great work that has already been done and is looking forward to seeing how the program builds on that work.

President Ortiz asked Ms. Charles for statistics around the number of Purple Star Schools in Nevada.

Ms. Charles reported that there are currently 25 schools that have been rewarded their designations with more being announced at the end of April 2023.

12. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

President Ortiz stated in the June 2023 meeting, the Board will discuss the outcomes of the School Start Time Workshops. She asked that everybody be prepared to come to the meeting with their creative hats on so the Board can come up with some great ideas to put forth on this item. Ortiz feels that students will be the ones that come up with the best ideas around this item.

President Ortiz stated during the June 2023 meeting, the Board will also be talking about a couple of temporary regulations regarding provisional licenses and international teachers.

President Ortiz asked the Board if there were any other items that needed to be added the Future Agenda Items.

Vice President Dockweiler asked that since the June meeting will be post-session if there a way of getting an update on past statutes that would impact future board work.

President Ortiz asked Superintendent Ebert if Dr. Katherine Broughton would be available to provide them with this information even though the June meeting is only seven days after the session ends, and Superintendent Ebert confirmed that NDE staff can pull together the information that Vice President Dockweiler requested.

13. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

There were no in-person public comments in Carson City or Las Vegas.

Sherri Roos, a community member, provided a public comment via email regarding school start times.
(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)

14. ADJOURNMENT

President Ortiz adjourned the meeting at 4:02 p.m.

APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS GIVEN DURING PUBLIC COMMENT

APPENDIX A, ITEM 1: SARITA TUNSALL – PUBLIC COMMENT #1

The following statement was submitted via email:

Let the record show that the workshop starts at 9am. Not 7am. 9am.

Think about why that is.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 2: TINA MAY - PUBLIC COMMENT #1

The following statement was submitted via email:

To Whom It May Concern,

I followed this link from a news report on the App for Channel 13 News. My youngest of 5 children attends Green Valley High School in the Clark County School District. The topic of a letter start time for High School students has typically come down to parents work schedules, school bus availability, and finally what is best for the students. Children of mine have attended schools with a rotating schedule in middle school an attempt to counteract lower math learning levels in the earlier class schedules. We all know a later start time is what is best for our students. Let's make that our priority this time around. Attendance is better, tarries are fewer, and learning is optimized with later start times. Put the students first! Adults should be capable of fixing their individual issues. We are adults let's create the optimal environment for learning.

Thank you,
Tina May
702-378-4513

APPENDIX A, ITEM 3: NATHAN WATSON – PUBLIC COMMENT #1

The following statement was submitted via email:

To the College and Career Readiness test committee,

Please consider changing the cost to be a lower percentage of the pie than 20%. As someone who has been involved in purchasing for much of my career, I know that a lot of questions on these bids are almost gimme questions. Almost every company will score the maximum points on most questions. Things like do they meet the legal requirements, are they properly licensed, have some experienced staff, etc. They will all get near perfect scores on these easy questions. That usually accounts for half the points. With so few earn able points remaining, the difference between your best and worst company might be as small as 10% on the questions that really matter and show the differences between companies (or in this case tests).

A relative weight of 20% will make cost the biggest factor by a significant margin, and it will probably be the deciding factor. If you get bids back and you evaluate the best company at 80 points, and the worst at 65 or 70 points. Then you'll bring in cost at 20 points, and your worst or second worst company (no coincidence they are usually the cheapest) will get the full 20 points for cost and win the contract. At that point your hands will be tied. Those will have been the terms you sent out into the business world and you'll have to honor them. You will have to face the fact that your evaluators ranked a test the worst or second worst quality for students, and that it will leapfrog all the other options with a last second 20 points added for being the cheapest. You will have to honor that and sign a 4 year contract with the worst company. Please look forward and prevent yourselves and all the students and teachers in the state from ending up in that situation.

Nate Watson

APPENDIX A, ITEM 4: WENDY POWELL – PUBLIC COMMENT #1

The following statement was submitted via email:

Good Morning,

I understand that you will be having a meeting this afternoon in Carson City, and will cover, in part, high school start times. As the mother of current 9th and Nationally, Nevada is ranked 5th in the top 5 states with the earliest high school start times. Here in Clark County, that 5th ranked start time is even earlier!

The ranking shows Nevada with a high school start time of 7:45am, but ours is 7:00am - even earlier than the #1 ranked State of Louisiana at 7:30am. We are also among the lowest in education. There is no doubt that these two statistics are related.

A quote I read this morning: "According to the CDC, a lack of sleep is associated with several health risks including weight gain, drinking alcohol, smoking, doing drugs and poor academic performance." In addition, the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) recommends that middle and high school students start school no earlier than 8:30am to give them enough time to rest. Getting enough sleep, according to the AAP, can protect physical and mental health, reduce unsafe behaviors, advance academic performance, and improve overall quality of life.

Our kids are struggling each day with pressures and situations that we didn't have growing up, including school shootings, a pandemic that kept them home for over a year, and social media. The effects of these pressures can be intensified when you add in a lack of sleep. Many high school students also play sports, participate in extracurricular activities and have jobs after school - not to mention homework. If they are supposed to be in their seats at 7:00am, which means getting up before 6:00am, how are they expected to get enough rest? They need time to decompress and sleep to maintain overall physical and emotional health. The depression, anxiety and suicide rates among teens are off the charts right now. I, and countless other concerned parents, are asking that you please give our students the later start time that they need, which has been proven to boost mental & physical health as well as academic performance.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

With Kindest Regards,

Wendy Powell

(702) 981-2021

APPENDIX A, ITEM 5: – ROSA MARTINEZ – PUBLIC COMMENT #1

The following statement was submitted via email:

My name is Rosa. My son is a CCSD senior. He works very hard in school and scored a 35 on the ACT on the statewide test last year. That helped him get into every university he applied to, some with full tuition scholarships. Thank you for sponsoring the test. Due to family circumstances it would have been hard for me to pay and get him to a school to take the test on a Saturday. I'm asking you to not take away that opportunity for his younger siblings or their classmates. Choose parameters that will make it more likely the state will keep sponsoring the ACT or SAT tests. I would've found a way to get the \$60 for him to take the ACT anyway, but instead he was able to take the test for free in school and put that money towards the application fees to a couple additional colleges. Despite the way people bad mouth education here, I'm grateful for the doors that were opened for him as a CCSD student.

Rosa Martinez

APPENDIX A, ITEM 6: – POOJAH THAKUR – PUBLIC COMMENT #1

The following statement was submitted via email:

Regarding the CCR test, it is unfair for the board to retroactively change the wording of one of the top priorities everyone in Nevada had a chance to vote on in the recent survey. I know myself and many other teachers and parents picked that option as our top priority. We believe sticking with the ACT is the best option for students (since it's widely accepted by colleges) in addition to providing consistent data for the state as we try to recover academically from Covid. Changing the metric is a common tactic used by those in power to avoid accountability by not using the same measuring tool (in this case the ACT). We wanted the ACT for consistency so we can see how Nevada's 11th graders dropped off academically, and see how we're progressing towards getting them back to where they were. Many of us picked that question as our top priority because it consistently measures the progress of 11th graders across the state from year to year, which basically screams "keep the ACT!" It's demonstrably unfair, and one could argue unethical, for a few people to change the wording so that it no longer resembles the question thousands of people picked.

When you get to this agenda item, please read the question exactly as written when it was voted one of the top priorities by Nevada stakeholders. Here it is for your reference:

"Provide consistent data to compare student progress year over year (i.e. how 11th graders across the state have performed over time)."

Now read the two completely altered versions now showing in the RFP Scope and the scoring rubric. They barely even resemble the original choice. Don't try to claim they're basically the same or they're "close enough." If you really believe they're basically the same, then leave them exactly the same as the original wording! But we suspect someone meant to alter these because they thought they knew better than everyone who voted.

Imagine if our legislature sent out ballot measures for citizens to vote on, then decided after the vote to change the wording of the ballot measure because "they think this is what people really meant." No. We know what we meant. We picked that option for a reason. It's not your place to change and try to correct what we voted on retroactively.

Poojah Thakur

High school teacher and parent

APPENDIX A, ITEM 7: – FARHAD GHASSEMI – PUBLIC COMMENT #1

The following statement was submitted via email:

I think all of you would agree that having to redo the bid process for the CCR test last year was unpleasant. I'm sure the goal this time is to have such a good process that you can happily live with whatever the outcome is when the test is selected next time. Now I ask, which of the two possibilities are you likely to regret more? If you pay a little more for a test that aligns beautifully with all the priorities Nevada's stakeholders chose? Or would there be more regret if the lowest price determines the outcome and you end up with a test that doesn't remotely match the values of Nevada stakeholders from the CCR test survey? Think of who your stakeholders were: teachers, counselors, superintendents, test administrators, parents, students, principals. You received a presentation showing their top 5 priorities. If you do the math on the current scoring rubric, each of those 5 priorities is worth about 6% of the test decision. Cost is more than 3 times that much. That is so insanely backwards. The #1 priority Nevadans picked was that the test be "widely accepted in college admissions and scholarships." That #1 priority currently counts for just 6% of the evaluation score. Cost is 20%. Why??? Why not reverse those two and make Nevadans #1 priority worth 20% of the decision and move cost to 6%?

In several months I predict you're going to be sitting in another meeting facing the hard fact that you now have to sign a contract for a test that scored a O on what all Nevada education stakeholders said was their highest priority. Thousands of Nevada stakeholders weighed in and their #1 priority, by far, was for this board to pick a test that is widely accepted in college admissions and scholarships. But you'll have to look them in the eyes and admit that you're going with a bargain basement test that isn't accepted by a single college in the US or internationally. Why? Because cost is weighted so much heavier than that #1 priority right now. If none of you speaks up to amplify the voices of all those survey respondents and Nevada stakeholders during this meeting today, you might look back on this meeting many months from now and wish you had said something before you begrudgingly give some questionable testing company millions of dollars for a test that doesn't align with Nevadans' priorities.

-Farhad Ghassemi

APPENDIX A, ITEM 8: – SHERRI ROOS – PUBLIC COMMENT #2

The following statement was submitted via email:

Schools should not be able to harm children. And yet, that is exactly what CCSD has done.

Early start times have been proven to harm children Yet CCSD has ignored the science, ignored the data and the guidelines issued by every major medical association, and have made the decision to have unhealthy school hours anyway.

Our school officials have CHOSEN to make decisions which they KNOW are causing harm to the children entrusted to them. Why would they do this? It's simple: Because they can. Because hurting our kids is the easiest solution to their problems.

I do not believe that our school officials purposely want to harm children. However, they have a mountain of problems on their plate, and early start times are an option which is available to them.

It's' time to take that option away. We need laws and regulations in place in Nevada to protect our children.

I respectfully ask you to put our children's health first, and to do the difficult work of finding other solutions to our problems. School districts across the country are finding solutions, and so can we.

Let's adhere to the guidance of the major medical and scientific communities and make Healthy School Hours mandatory in Nevada.

Because harming a child should never be an acceptable solution to an adult problem.

Thank you for your time,

Sherri Roos