

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

June 14, 2023

2:00 PM

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Rd.	Las Vegas	Board Room #114
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Battle Born Conference Room
Department of Education	Virtual/Livestream	Virtual	N/A

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Felicia Ortiz, President

Joe Arrascada

Rene Cantú

Maggie Carlton

Tamara Hudson

Tim Hughes

Michael Keyes

Summer Stephens

Mike Walker

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Kristofer Huffman, Chief Strategy Officer

Barbara Bidell, Education Program Professional

David Brancamp, Director, Office of Standards and Instructional Support (OSIS)

Ann Marie Dickson, Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement

Craig Statucki, Director, Office of Career Readiness, Adult Learning, and Education Options

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

Dr. Kim Metcalf, Boys Town of Nevada

John Etzell, Executive Director, Boys Town

Julie Duran, Opportunity 180

Dana Roseman, Senior Director, Boys Town

Tamara Shear, Chief Program Officer, Opportunity 180

Ann Binder, Education Advocate

Darlene Anderson, Child Advocate

Rocio Hernandez, Reporter for the Nevada Independent

Susan Keema, Executive Director, NASS

Reggie Grisham, Community Member

Sabrina Jones, Community Member

Brittany Adams, Community Member

Kathryn Bervin-Mueller, Community Member

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

President Felica Ortiz called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Quorum was established. President Ortiz led the Pledge of Allegiance and provided a land acknowledgement.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

There was no in-person public comment in Las Vegas, and there was no public comment submitted via e-mail.

Susan Keema, NASS Executive Director, provided an in-person public comment in Carson City.
(A complete copy of their statement is available in Appendix A.)

3. APPROVAL OF FLEXIBLE AGENDA

Member René Cantú moved to approve a flexible agenda. Member Tim Hughes seconded. Motion passed.

4. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

President Ortiz thanked the departing student member, Malia Poblete, for her participation, effort, and willingness to travel for Board meetings and attend workshops. She welcomed Michael Keyes, the new student board member, to the State Board and provided some background information on him. Member Keyes gave a short overview on himself which included the fact that he will be a junior at Pahrump Valley High School this coming year.

President Ortiz shared a Nevada Portrait of a Learner update and reported the opportunity to represent the State Board on the Portrait Perspective Panel and described the makeup of the panel. She gave an overview of the panel’s approach to the work involving the Nevada Portrait of a Learner and stated the panel had synthesized the feedback that had been received from a wide range of community stakeholders and finalized the updated Portrait which is now available at <https://www.portrait.nvfutureoflearning.org>. She explained the next steps on the project and reported there are already 13 teams of educators from across the state that are aligning high-level concepts to determine what language reflects the true wants and wishes of the State of Nevada students. She asked the Board for questions on the Portrait and next steps.

Superintendent Ebert added that the Nevada Association of School Superintendents (NASS) conference was very well attended and included a variety of education partners such as Knowledge Works and ed.Xtraordinary. She stated several of the schools that had been mentioned previously actually brought their work product to the conference. She noted that she was impressed with the networking and collaboration that happened at the conference.

Member and Superintendent Summer Stephens from Churchill County School District and current president of NASS also voiced her happiness with the positive energy and enthusiasm that was in the conference room. She noted that she had several people come up to her wanting to show her their work product.

Superintendent Ebert added that Mineral County School District was among the groups that presented at the conference. She stated the attendees with Schurr Elementary in Mineral County felt like this work had helped bridge their communities together.

Member Hughes reiterated the excitement about this work and stated from what he has observed even with all the divisive rhetoric that is heard these days, the states that have participated in Portrait of a Learner have been agreeing on similar things. He stated that he is concerned about the data infrastructure that is in place or needs to be in place when all the competencies for Portrait of a Learner are created and asked will there be a way to measure whether the competencies are working as projected.

President Ortiz reported that the State of Nevada has one of the most robust state systems in the country, however, where the State has fallen short is in pulling the data together and then being able to report on it. She stated that the Nevada Department of Education has money allotted to expand and shore up the state's data systems and noted there are other parallel efforts going on in the state that will help strengthen the systems.

Superintendent Ebert stated fortunately, because the work in Nevada is just kicking off, they can learn from other States' mistakes. She pointed out that Nevada is data rich but information poor, and they need that layer or dashboard that turns data points into usable information. She explained that the Department is writing another State Longitudinal Systems grant and will also be using ESSER funds to build out the system to track those competencies.

Member Hughes asked if it's a state mandate that districts must follow the Portrait and was informed by Superintendent Ebert that there isn't a mandate regarding participation. Member Hughes voiced some concerns by saying if they're aligning resources, they could do a lot of work, and the districts could then decide to go in different directions.

Superintendent Ebert explained there are lots of moving parts that are being worked on simultaneously, including the Commission on School Funding, Portrait of a Learner, and the competencies that are linked together. She went on to talk about the accountability work that the Department has been doing and stated now that they have gone through the pandemic and the recent legislative session, the Department will delve back into that work. She reiterated that while there is a lot of moving parts to this work, the final product will be state-focused on specific items, but there are also school districts that are creating their own Portrait of a Learner focus that will align with the state.

Member Stephen stated she feels that over the last five years, NASS and its members have truly developed a clear understanding of this work and are on the same page as the Department of Education on how important Portrait of a Learner is to what they want students to be when they graduate. She stated she strongly feels that the Portrait is the next step in learning.

Member Walker added he feels that this work goes hand-in-hand with districts and their schools developing a multi-tiered system of support that truly takes into consideration the social emotional needs of each child.

President Ortiz stated that she feels they have the most phenomenal team on board because of the different viewpoints around this work.

5. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

Jhone Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, introduced the Department's new Deputy Superintendent, Ann Marie Dickson who will be leading the Student Achievement Division and then provided a short background on Deputy Superintendent Dickson.

Deputy Superintendent Dickson stated that she was very glad to be with the Department and looks forward to learning everything around her new position.

Superintendent Ebert gave an update on the legislature special session and then went over the status of the legislative bills having to do with education, including AB 54 and AB 65, both signed by the Governor. She announced that Deputy Superintendent McGill's team had done a great job of cleaning up the definitions for bullying and reporting and stated that the school districts had asked the Department to clean up that language, and additional guidance will be going out the districts. She stated the approval of the work-based learning plans will be going out and SB 9, which eliminates end of course exams, is waiting for the Governor's signature. She noted there are constituents that have concerns around this bill and reminded the Board that they were doing proficiency exams, went to end of course testing, and are now back at proficiency exams. She explained that when the ACT was introduced in Nevada, the problem with the ACT

was that the testing outcomes never rolled up to the Nevada State Department of Education.

Superintendent Ebert informed the State Board of the other work that the Department is partnering with State Board members and other organizations on to complete and stated Dr. Broughton will be doing a deep dive on these bills at the July 26, 2023 State Board meeting. She closed her report by giving an account of the June 2023 NASS meeting that several Department staff attended.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

President Ortiz stated she trust that their board members have had ample opportunity to review the consent agenda and support materials and stated as a reminder, board members review the materials and request clarification in writing. She stated those questions and subsequent responses are then added to the meeting materials and posted for public comment prior to the board meeting. She stated they're doing this as a new addition and because they want the general public to get to see the questions and answers prior to the meeting. She stated that all of their questions as board members, especially on consent agenda items, are submitted to the Department of Education ahead of time so that the Department has time to properly prepare a response. She stated in addition, the questions and responses are posted for the public to see and have access to so that they can be more transparent and ensure that their meetings are also more efficient.

President stated if anyone has any items to pull for discussion, they can do that. She stated that she is going to pull items 6a and 6b and move those to the July 26 meeting. She stated there were a couple of other documents that needed to be uploaded per Open Meeting Law that were not uploaded in time, so in order to follow the law, they are going to move those two items, which were the license revocations. She stated they don't have to read through that material again in July because she knows it's always disturbing for them to read those.

Member Carlton apologized if these questions were supposed to be posed earlier and asked if it would be appropriate to ask now. She stated a question was asked of her and she did not forward it to the Department, so she did have a quick question on items 6g and 6m. She stated that some members of the industry reached out to her. She apologized to the Board and stated next time she will try to get in the questions earlier, but she just heard the concerns.

President Ortiz stated they will go ahead and pull those for discussion, but she does not know if the staff members will be available to respond to them because the staff is also in the middle of equity training today, so that was the other reason why they asked for questions to be posed ahead of time. She stated if staff can answer the questions, they will. Otherwise, worst case scenario, they can move those to next month's agenda.

Member Hughes stated he also did not get the memo about early submittals but did have a couple of questions that came up. He stated he had a quick question about the class size reduction report, the ELA materials, and the CTE in lieu of high school course credit from several different districts, which is a process question.

President Ortiz stated as long as they're process questions, she thinks the Superintendent or Deputy Superintendent could probably respond to those, so she will go ahead and open it up on the items that have been pulled and then they will decide whether or not they need to be pulled altogether and then they will proceed to vote. She asked Member Carlton to proceed with her questions.

Member Carlton stated that items 6g and 6m are basically the same questions and asked if the welding technology and the building trades construction technology are both certificate programs and if those certificates align with apprenticeship programs so that courses don't have to be repeated and there's an extra cost towards getting your apprenticeship.

Member Carlton stated they understand a certificate is great, but the apprenticeship is what really gets you

in the door and gets you earning money, so if those could get answered, she'd appreciate it. President Ortiz asked Interim Deputy Superintendent Statucki to respond to Member Carlton's questions.

Deputy Superintendent Craig Statucki replied those students earn a skill attainment certificate that is currently in the Nevada Administrative Code, which he can send her the exact code later on. He stated they lead to articulated credits with the post-secondary institutions, and each school district has a separate agreement with their community college or their region, and so they do their best to make sure that they're not duplicating coursework for those students. He stated one of the things that they are currently working on is smoothing out the pipeline between their K-12, whether it's construction, welding or any of the other programs, into a pre-apprenticeship and the apprenticeship program. He stated they've been working with the Labor Commissioner, the Director of the State Apprenticeship Council and the Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation to help streamline those processes to make that transition between K-12 education and post-secondary a little smoother, whether it's an apprenticeship or post-secondary institution. He stated that with the change in their standards to focus on two-year programs to study provides more opportunities during a student's junior and senior years to participate in the work-based learning and pre-apprenticeship programs, and they're currently working on a pilot through ESSER funds with both Clark and Washoe counties to start a pre-apprenticeship program in construction trades.

President Ortiz stated as a daughter of a contractor, that makes her super happy, and she was telling their student member that she wishes they had these opportunities when she was a kid because she would have probably taken the welding class. She asked Member Carlton if that answered her questions.

Member Carlton replied it did and stated she's glad to hear that the conversations are happening with the Labor Commissioner and the Apprenticeship Council. She stated they know when their apprenticeships journey out, they like to have them have that Associates and be able to finish those. She stated with the prospect of a lot of different jobs coming to the state in the near future, there's a lot of opportunities for apprentices, and they're building mandatory apprenticeships into a lot of these projects at 10% and 15%, so they want to make sure that the certificate doesn't require extra work on the backend. She thanked them for coordinating it and stated she looks forward to it but still has some concerns about pre-apprenticeships with folks younger than 18 being on job sites, but that's her own personal perspective.

President Ortiz stated she read an article the other day and wanted to give a shoutout to Elko County School District for having a program where they're building tiny houses in the schools, monetizing it and paying for the program themselves.

Member Hughes stated his question is about the class size reduction report, which he thinks they are going to dig into some of the technicalities of it a little deeper at a future meeting. He stated obviously, it's a requirement of the State Board to approve this, and there's a process, and the whole thing is predicated on the idea that this is going to lead to better outcomes. He asked do they have data and do they know what the impact is where they have been able to reduce class sizes because he feels they look at the numbers but don't look at the actual intent of why they did this in the first place and asked are they seeing that play out or not.

Superintendent Ebert replied they will have a presentation for them in July. She stated almost every school is asking for variances now, so she pulled the data on the schools that have the largest class sizes and their current proficiency scores, and she will present that to the Board next month, as well as provide them with some options they may want to consider in regards to the class size. She stated that was one of the bills that did not move forward, so they will continue to have quarterly reports from the school districts. She stated she knows the Board has felt that they did not have any options, and that the Board had to approve these items. She stated that is not the case, and so they will go through a deep dive in July on this topic.

Member Hughes stated if they could also include in that presentation if the data is there, not just what it

currently is, but to see did this actually have the intended impact, they would have to look at change over time. He stated he knows the pandemic got in the way, so the data is a little murky in the middle, but across the board, before they implemented this, do they actually see having any kind of moving student outcomes at all.

Member Hughes stated the second quick item is more of an FYI. He stated he thinks in the private school consent agenda, he didn't have any concerns there, but he thinks there were two schools, International Christian Academy and Shenker Academy, that said the recommendation was for two years, but the dates that were listed were four years, so he thinks that was just a clerical error. He stated he doesn't know if it was two or four, but they probably need to clean that up.

Member Hughes stated the next question was the ELA material that was talked about in the March meeting when they approved the initial list of recommended ELA materials. He stated it was his understanding that ELA education was not approved in the last round, but now it's coming back saying it is approved. He asked if somebody could explain what changed between the last approval process and then why these two additional add-ons later.

Dave Brancamp, Director of the Office of Standard and Instructional Support, replied in the instructional materials process, when the committee reviews the initial materials and sends out their comments to all the vendors, they have a 30-day time period in which they can respond back to the committee to correct or possibly show them materials they might not have seen or additional resources for them. He stated these are two that had the 30 business days to turn it around, and then their team has to review that again, and with timing, that's how this item is coming back to be put on the website as approved.

Member Hughes thanked Mr. Brancamp and stated that is good to know, in terms of their process. He stated he was surprised to not see it on the list initially since it's a pretty strong program and was just curious what changed.

Member Hughes stated the last question he had was also a process question, and he may have dug deeper than he should have as a former science teacher, but he knows there was approval of district saying they want to use the CTE course to take the place of some of their science courses that were required, and when he looked at the standards alignment, he thought there were some pretty big stretches of equating one CTE standard with what their science content standards actually are. He asked how precisely should that alignment be to give students credit for a course from a different course and what's the NDE review process for that because it seemed like when he went through the standards, he could understand the connection of 60% to 70% of them, and some were connecting life science standards to a mechanical engineering standards, which felt like a stretch when he looked at the CTE materials in regards to the science course standards.

Superintendent Ebert thanked Member Hughes for the question and replied what's really nice about this process is it's a very robust collaborative process with the school districts and content area specialists for science and then also their CTE program leads. She stated Dave Brancamp is going to give the details behind Member Hughes' question.

Mr. Brancamp replied they meet with the science CTE folks from the district as well as their own side to look at each of these and these recommendations are for that third year of science, like computer science could classify, so it's opening options for their students after they've taken their biology or initial chemistry course. He stated they had some similar concerns and what was powerful when they sit down with the districts is to actually see the material they're using, so they can see that alignment in the application of the standard given was very strong, and that's why they're comfortable with that recommendation.

Member Hughes asked if NDE has signed off on this and are comfortable with this in their own review with their content experts and why it's on the consent agenda. Superintendent Ebert replied yes, that is correct

and stated there are other courses that they continue to work with school districts on that are not in their purview and not ready for the Board approval, but if they've been asking a lot of process questions, they could ask to have it on the agenda item, and at that moment in time, they would, as a Department, note if they are supportive, if they see the alignment or if they do not.

Member Hughes stated he thinks it's great in general that they're thinking about flexible pathways for students, and so he appreciates not having a rigid one size fits all approach. He stated he also wants to make sure that students are moving on beyond K-12, that colleges, careers, know what they're getting and what kids have experienced, and he thinks it becomes harder as an employer or university to say they have all these swap outs and this is in place of this science course, but when you actually dig in, a student might not have the requisite skills because it was focused on something slightly different. He cautioned that they want to make sure what they're sending out into the world is representative of what people have on transcripts and what people think they're getting, and that the alignment isn't so far off that it would be called into question, but he appreciates the collaboration that has happened.

President Ortiz thanked the Department of Education and Member Hughes for those really good questions. She stated that she would be curious to see what their transcript looks like nowadays since it's been 25 years since she's had to see one and stated she would like to discuss it with Member Walker offline. She stated she thinks higher education institutions nowadays get this data transfer and things are all aligned or should be. She stated she recently had a discussion with someone about how their NSHE institutions don't always have the same understanding of what an English 101 is from one to another, and there are cases where students going into undergrad are having to take remedial courses or they think they passed in high school and take them again in college, so she thinks this is an opportunity for them to get super aligned to what it means from high school to college and make sure that even course numbering is consistent across all of their institutions. She suggested that maybe she and Member Arrascada discuss offline and asked if he has any thoughts on that from his perspective.

Member Arrascada replied this is an issue that will be unquestionably spoken with all of the admissions and records departments, and he wants to make sure that everybody is going to be speaking on their behalf; however, they have had a pretty good alignment in matriculation from high school to college to university, and they have approximately a 97% transfer rate for classes that are taken in college at one of the communities transferring it to the universities, so that's one of the opportunities that they are also providing. He stated in looking at today's consent agenda for items N, O, and P, the dual enrollment programs are items in which they're strong components of because it provides high school students the opportunity to take college-level courses instructed by college-level teachers in which they can acquire that English 101 or the one they're referring to that will transfer directly to a college or university-level. He stated he will follow-up more on President Ortiz's question to make sure she has an 100% accurate answer.

President Ortiz thanked Member Arrascada and stated that's the benefit of having all of the good voices on the table. She stated she believes all of the questions have been asked and answered and opened it up for a motion to approve the consent agenda.

Member Hughes moved to approve the consent agenda. Member Hughes seconded. President Ortiz amended the motion to exclude items A and B. Motion passed.

7. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING COMMUNITY PARTNER ACCOMPLISHMENTS

John Etzell, Executive Director of Boys Town Nevada, introduced Dana Roseman, Senior Director of Education Services, and Board Member, Dr. Kim Metcalf, former Dean of Education at UNLV, and current professor and presented a PowerPoint presentation on their 2022-2023 accomplishments.

Mr. Etzell stated they are going to talk about what Boys Town is currently doing in the education landscape, primarily in Clark County, and they're look forward to expanding outside of Clark County in the near

future. He stated Boys Town is a residential-type facility that has been in Vegas for just over 30 years, and starting in 2015, through a grant with the Engelstad Family Foundation, Boys Town Nevada and the Latin Chamber of Commerce started to do more work in education, such as provide training for teachers that's ESSA approved for a number of years, and they've been able to grow and expand that. He stated starting in 2015 with that grant, they were supporting a handful of schools with teacher training, and they've seen that program grow to where they've added additional components to it, and they call it, "LIFT Together with Boys Town," with the goal of lifting entire communities together, but utilizing teachers, parents, and administrators and other community members, knowing that it is not just the schools that are doing the work, but there are many organizations that are doing it, which is a little bit of what they will talk about today.

Dana Roseman continued the presentation and stated she wanted to make sure that it was clear when looking at their student's social, emotional well-being, they, as the external provider, really lend support to schools. She stated she feels she can say that firsthand as a former principal with the Clark County School District, and former leader for the last 11 years at an elementary school. She stated she knows the work that organizations like both of theirs do and they really support the needs that are in the schools.

Ms. Roseman provided the following objectives: 1) Provide insight into the services Boys Town Nevada provides in their local community; and 2) to meeting the needs of the various stakeholders through behavioral interventions, skill building and family services. Ms. Roseman presented the LIFT Together with Boys Town diorama, which illustrates how they do it and is an overview of what Mr. Ezzell shared.

Ms. Roseman spoke on educational services provided and played an animated video for presentation slide number 6. She stated there were 57 schools in Clark County School District that they contracted with to provide support. They did a pre-assessment of their school staff to see what their main needs were, and some of the two lowest needs were the student and peer relations and parent and family engagement, and their school support specialist model really addresses those needs well.

Mr. Ezzell continued with the presentation and stated in regard to the school support specialist model, that's something that they didn't start until the 2019-2020 academic year because the feedback that they were getting in the first few years was positive, but they were still struggling overall as a school with some of the behaviors and the opportunity to have somebody in the school working directly with the kids. He stated in 2019-20, they made the decision to start that school support specialist role that was essentially a behavior interventionist in the school trained in their model and then working directly with those students, mostly tier one and tier two level behaviors, with the goal of getting teachers and administrators a bit more time in their schedules back.

Ms. Roseman spoke on the levels of support they're providing in the schools at four schools: one at the high school level, one at the middle school level and two at the elementary school level. She stated at the end of the year, they did another satisfaction survey of their schools to get their thoughts in regard to how the school support specialist did in the schools, and the results showed they did okay overall with a 3.80 total satisfaction score. She presented a slide on the relationship between satisfaction with the school support specialist and school climate, which showed there is a significant positive correlation. She stated this is a good thing in regard to what they want to make sure that they're doing over the course of this next school year. She presented a pie chart on hours spent and students served with school support specialists providing over 32,000 supportive events consisting of one-on-one, official referral, classroom mini lesson, observations, parent contact non-TPOP and parent contact TPOP and stated it's important to know they are hands-on, doing the work that schools oftentimes don't have the personnel or the time to be able to do, and it's building relationships with students and their families that really tie that line for schools.

Mr. Ezzell stated the sheer number of hours that are being put into supporting students and teaching those social skills that have been absent, especially as they're continuing to come out of COVID, for kids that

were not necessarily continuing to get those social skills during those 12 to 18 months of online instruction. He stated this has been really important and an area that they continually hear from teachers and administrators in their data sweeps that have been the most effective, teaching the skills to students as to how they can get along better.

Ms. Roseman stated Mr. Etzell did a nice job summarizing what they're doing in schools and how they are addressing those domains and the amount of time that's spent proactively supporting students. She stated it goes without saying that if you have teachers who are satisfied and students who feel as though they have someone who can relate to them, then that increases overall school climate.

Mr. Etzell stated one thing that was not necessarily listed, but they have looked at the early childhood education side and partnered with Acelero training with their teachers, and what introduced him to Dr. Metcalf at UNLV while he was still Dean there was an opportunity to teach their well-managed school curriculum to the grad and undergrad-level students as a non-credit course. He stated they did that for about two years, and they're hoping to rekindle that opportunity again. He stated the feedback they received from the UNLV College of Education students who were going through the process was they're able to use this within a week of learning it, and as a former high school principal in Colorado, with professional developments and trainings, if you're not using it within a week, you're not going to. He stated that Dr. Metcalf has been instrumental in their ability to be able to have that level of opportunity at the higher education side of things.

President Ortiz asked Mr. Etzell to give them a brief synopsis of the curriculum or learning objectives of the well-managed classroom.

Mr. Etzell replied that a well-managed school is ESSA-approved, and Boys Town, as a national organization, has been using this for the better part of 20 to 25 years across the country in small, medium and large school districts. He stated it is focused on giving teachers the control and opportunity to manage their classrooms from a positive behavior perspective. He stated they're using a lot of praise statements, and they want to see the praise to correction ratios go from a negative where usually they've got more negative interactions than positives, such as correcting them more than recognizing them for the good things that they are doing, by seeing that flipped. He stated that's done in a variety of fashion, in particular, proactive teaching and effective praise-level teaching where you're praising the little things that kids are doing in order to see that happen. He stated the curriculum is really focused around that social skill acquisition and the ability for teachers to be proactive in their classrooms to see the behaviors that they want to see.

Member Hudson asked how can school reach out to receive services or is there a waiting list or do they already have contact for the next school year.

Ms. Roseman replied they actually have a waiting list of schools that are in line to get the school support specialist, which is the additional piece. She stated this coming school year, they have 20 schools with whom they will be providing wraparound services, and they have one more slide that talks about what those wraparound services detail. She stated there's a list but they can always reach out to them, and she would be more than happy to continue to compile that list for schools. She stated they're actually working with the Clark County School District to try to make sure they have the schools that really need the help to give them the help that they need.

Mr. Etzell added that he and Ms. Roseman are always available and willing to talk to folks and figure out if there are ways that they can fit folks in, and he can provide their emails to the presentation. He stated for the 23-24 academic year, they are relatively full from their direct services, and wraparound would be their best opportunity. He stated they do have a digital version of their well-managed school's curriculum that they have just rolled out as a national organization. He stated with the support of Superintendent Ebert and NDE, they are looking to roll that out to 25 schools in the rurals and charters over the next two years, thanks to

their support, so they are excited about that. He stated they can get on that list by getting in touch with him or Ms. Roseman

President Ortiz stated she had a few asks and would love if they would coordinate with the Department of Education to make sure their trainings get on their master PD catalog so that they can be available to anyone that wants to take the trainings. She stated the Department is in the midst of putting together a catalog of all of the PD that's offered across the state so that would be awesome to see theirs added. She stated the other thing she would like to ask is they look into the opportunity of creating a micro-credential for teachers that offers them a CU raise, so they would get steps towards their raise, but also, it's another piece of evidence that they're doing the work to improve their craft. She stated thirdly, she loves the idea of the well-managed classroom, but she feels there's a piece missing. She stated maybe there are organizations in the community that are already doing it that they can partner with, but the trauma-informed, so that teachers are thinking through how kids might react if they have massive A scores.

President Ortiz stated she just went through some training about that a couple of months ago, and it was super eye-opening. She stated she's one of those kids, and she has a high A score and the PBIS model does not work for all kids that have high A scores, so she thinks that adding that piece onto it or maybe overlaying that over the well-managed classroom would be a really huge add. She stated perhaps there's already organizations in the community they could partner with to do that.

Mr. Etzell replied he appreciates President Ortiz's question and stated the training does have trauma-informed care elements to it, especially in regards to PBIS, they have found through the feedback around the country that their well-managed school's curriculum and different versions of it called specialized classroom management that really works with schools who want to create an expulsion school within their own school. He stated they had the opportunity to pilot that this year at Western, but for PBIS in particular, they really add the behavior component to it and very actionable items. The feedback that they typical hear around the country is that it's not specific enough, but when folks add the Boys Town well-managed school component to it, then they say it makes sense. He stated when they marry the two, that seems to work a whole lot better.

President Ortiz stated she is going to move to the Opportunity 180 presentation.

Tam Shear, Chief Program Officer at Opportunity 180, introduced herself and Julie Duran, Director of Fellowships and Programs, who leads their talent work. She stated they are excited to be there today and talk to them about how they activate a network of innovative ideas and leaders. She stated Opportunity 180 works towards the North Star where every kid graduates high school and are college and career ready to live the life they dreamed. She spoke on the five key ways in which they do this: good governance, great ideas in action, good data, engaged community and more great schools.

Ms. Shear stated they are going to talk about what is the strategy around their talent work, give them some examples of the type of fellowships they offer and then hopefully, spread the work so that they can continue to make investments and provide opportunities for their local educators. She spoke on how they activate a network to spread innovative ideas.

Ms. Duran spoke on their first fellowship called Transcend and stated they have great schools for the future and is a 7-month fellowship for aspiring and current school and educational program leaders that really encourage educators to think expansively about what schools can be. She stated they use their elites for equitable 21st century learning and its key ways in which the student experience can be shifted so students can thrive in school and out of school. She stated fellows also explore who they are as leaders and really redefine what leadership can look like in their communities and even translate that to their students, letting them know that they're also leaders in the spaces that they take up, and they also develop clear visions for what equitable learning environments can look like.

Ms. Duran spoke on Design to Erupt and stated it is a multi-stage fellowship and geared towards aspiring or current school leaders, leaders of educational programs or future founders of schools or educational programs. She explained what Design to Erupt's program is focused on and who should apply.

Ms. Shear took over the presentation and spoke on the National Fellowship for Black and Latino Male Educators (NFBLME) and stated this fellowship really seeks to build community and coalition around Black and Latino male leaders in Las Vegas. She explained what NFBLME is focused on and who should apply.

Ms. Shear spoke on the Surge Academy in Las Vegas, which is a national fellowship that takes executive-level leaders, such as Assistant Principal and above, and helps them figure out what their legacy is and what they want to do with it as well as working on themselves as educators of color. She continued explaining about the fellowship, what they are focused on and who should apply.

Ms. Shear spoke on School Accelerator, which is a cohort experience for principals and leadership teams to establish multi-year strategic plans with clear goals, metrics and capacity-building among leaders. She continued explaining about the fellowship, what they are focused on and who should apply.

Ms. Duran took over the presentation and spoke on the Accelerate and Propel programs in the Great Ideas lever and stated these two have various providers and explained what . She stated the Accelerate component is getting to understand the community and venture, trying to put out into the space and really thinking about the iterative cycle that goes into developing their idea and developing it with the community, so it's not them in isolation. She stated the Propel component is a residency experience that develops a mission and vision, gathers ideas from the community, and gets into the nitty gritty about what it takes to be a school leader or open up their own school or educational program. She stated they are so grateful to share what they do in the Great Ideas lever and are open to any questions they may have and to please reach out to them if they are interested.

Ms. Shear stated this is not an exhaustive list of opportunities, but just a sample of some of the things they try to be adaptive to, as they meet people who say they have a need, they try to find providers who will fill that need.

President Ortiz stated that her mind is blown, and she knew they were doing a ton of great work, but she had no idea it was this much. She thanked Opportunity 180 for coming and enlightening them and for all the work that they're doing. She stated she can tell it's intentional and very targeted, and she thinks it's going to have some pretty awesome impacts, if it's not already having some pretty awesome impacts. She opened it up for questions from the Board.

Member Hughes thanked them both for being there and stated it's awesome to hear about the great work happening from both organizations. He stated one of the things that stood out for him that he really appreciates is that they all are thinking about those who are closest to the challenge being the ones who are solving the challenge, which is an important point to make. He stated oftentimes, policymakers and boards with good intent try to do that with not the nuance and understanding that those are in the field, everyday experience. He asked from their vantage point, if there are policy things that get in the way of developing these leaders or make the environment tougher to see some of these programs or any thoughts about how that impacts the work that they do and what would make the work take root even more, if those policies were different.

Ms. Shear replied they have seen certification and degrees potentially be a barrier to move on to leadership roles and stated most of the educators they invest in are the first in their family to go to college, and a lot of them do not come from an affluent background, and so obtaining those degrees required to get certain levels of certification, can really be a barrier for them. She stated they try to work around it to support them in navigating through the system so they can grow and figure out what grants and opportunities they can get to

cover some of the cost. She stated a lot of them have families at home, so it's also a time commitment to do that. She stated sometimes that also makes them feel they are not a leader, so they work really hard to change mindsets about that and just because they don't have the title of principal or assistant principal, does not mean they are not a leader and they cannot expand their impact with kids and communities.

Member Hudson stated she is a product of Opportunity 180, so she wanted to thank them for their support because she feels, as teachers, they don't really get professional development that's tailored to their goals and needs and that's something that their organization does to ensure that they still have that fire underneath them, and they're making those impact into their classrooms, so she really does want to say thank you for all their work.

President Ortiz stated there's an organization she just learned about recently that does some of that high-quality coaching in schools, and there's a local guy that's been doing it in Texas with really good outcomes, but she can't remember their name and will tell them when they finish the meeting because they would be an amazing partner for them with a really great program around envisioning their goals for the school and how to set strategic plans and tactical actions to make it happen. She stated she really loves the program that they're offering, but they're just not doing it here, so that's another opportunity to connect.

President Ortiz asked for those on the Board and people that are listening or are in the room, if they hear of opportunities that can help Opportunity 180 connect educators to additional high-quality PD or opportunities for fellowships and things like that or if they know of phenomenal educators that would be good candidates for these programs, to please share. She stated she's so thrilled with all the work that they're doing and thinks the community is benefiting greatly. She stated she personally has used their website for a lot of her constituents to go look at school data just because it presents really well, and she appreciates them. She stated their work is helping them to deliver on the promise that their missions are perfectly aligned, so she's grateful.

President Ortiz asked if there were any questions from the Board and there were none. She asked the Board if they know of any other really phenomenal community organizations that are doing good work to support their education system, please let her know. She stated they've been asking them to come present for a couple of reasons. She stated first and foremost, it's because she feels like it's important for all of them to know how their work is being supported out in the community, and she thinks it's important for their constituents and the general public to know that they don't do this work alone as much as they like to take credit for all of the great things that are happening across their state, it's a community effort, and so she wants to make sure that they're recognized for all of their amazing hard work.

8. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REGULATION LANGUAGE FOR SCHOOL START TIMES

President Ortiz stated she had asked all of the Board members to go through all of the public comments that were submitted from students and parents, and notes that came out of their three different workshops around this topic, and the research gathered by the Department of Education and others, as well as all of the notes taken at some of the workshops for potential solutions. She stated that she decided the best way for them to proceed to get a jumpstart on this language is to do a round robin for each of the Board members to tell them what their top three points that they took out of it were and/or any proposed language or thoughts around language, and then they will coalesce that and hopefully get to something that's a little bit more solid by the time LCB is available to work on language so that they can have a regulation hearing.

Member Hudson stated one of her concerns is she still feels like it should be left up to the school community to assign that start time. She stated if they're going to say they can't start no earlier than eight o' clock, then the school has the authority to make that judgment. She asked if that made sense.

President Ortiz asked Member Hudson if the Board would be setting the guardrail, but they would set the

actual time, and Member Hudson confirmed yes.

Member Hudson added when they set that time to have to include all stakeholders, so it can't be left up to the principal. She stated they should have parents, teachers, like the SOT team, involved with that as well. She stated those were her main concerns when it comes to start times because the other stuff is more adult issues.

Member Hughes stated that he had similar things on his mind as Member Hudson. He stated in reviewing the materials from attending a bunch of the meetings and getting lots of emails about this topic from people who are very passionate, which is great, he understand the importance of local control as they heard from the NASS statement through public comment, and yet the actions that districts are taking, in his perspective, do not seem fully aligned to what they are hearing from their communities, which is a little bit troublesome. He stated they can leave it and listen to the community and do what they want, and yet what they're hearing, by and large, is people say it's skewed more towards being dissatisfied with super early start times. He stated people have made that decision, and so he thinks it's a delicate balance of how do they set those guardrails. He stated he agrees with Member Hudson to set a "not before X time" so that gives flexibility, but also it does not make it super ridiculous, so that might be a guardrail they can set for an appropriate start time, or a middle group between what people are doing now and what the research says would be ideal, which he thinks they're probably not going to get to, but they probably should set it a little bit later than what some schools are operating under.

Member Hughes stated the other thing is he thinks they should, if possible, codify in the regulation the frequency in which LEAs should be getting input from community members. He stated he thinks at least every three years, each LEA should gather input from a representative group of students and caregivers that mirrors the LEA student demographics regarding school start times based upon the feedback trends, LEAs should adjust their start times accordingly. He stated that may not be the exact approach but something that tells LEAs they need to regularly be soliciting feedback, which doesn't need to be representative feedback, not just from the folks who are the loudest in the room, and that they're continually reevaluating. He stated he feels like there's something not just setting the guardrails but also giving guidance around the process by which folks should continually reevaluate to make sure they are listening to the community. He stated they could still do that in a lot of different ways, and he doesn't think they want to micro-manage how people do that, but just naming stakeholder engagement in a regular interval felt important.

President Ortiz stated that could also be a good requirement for requesting a waiver, so if they've gotten stakeholder feedback, and stakeholders have said no, this works well for them, then that would be a good justification for a waiver as well.

Member Carlton stated along the lines of a waiver, her brain went more towards the conversations about implementation because she sees roadblocks, people wanting to say, there's a lot of flexibility in a number of school districts right now, but they know one particular school district is very inflexible, so she was more on the implementation side of it, whereas in the regulation, she believes there needs to be couple of "shalls" along with the waiver issue that if the school decides that they want to be one of the pilots for this and start working towards it, that the school district can't be obstructive and slow them down. She stated they need to give them an opportunity to succeed to come up with that zero hour as they talked about if students need that zero hour and give them the flexibility.

Member Carlton stated she sees the largest school district in the state not wanting to implement this and she thinks they really need to give those communities an opportunity and some place to stand firmly and they support them, so that if they do decide to move forward, and if they're brave enough to do it, and then when other schools see how it's working for them, hopefully, they will be able to get more and more schools on board. She stated it's going to take time to do it, but she sees some obstructions, and she wants to put as much in the regulation as possible to support the schools that do want to move forward.

Member Walker stated after attending the meeting in Vegas and talking about it with some of his colleagues on NASB, he thinks there's an understanding of the research and best practices. He stated as a group, they largely all believe that this is a local control issue and districts should be able to make that decision for themselves with stakeholders, which is what they currently do. He stated there are a lot of moving pieces to this, and some of his concerns that he's talked about in Carson, in speaking with their assistant associate superintendent who has pointed out how there's a lot of schools who do not have adequate lighting for their fields, so if they push those secondary schools later, these student athletes are going to miss more academic time in their day. He stated safety-wise, in Carson City, 395 turns into Carson Street, so pushing the middle schools and high schools later is going to require elementary schools to get pushed earlier, and they're going to end up with young children crossing Carson Street in the dark without lit streets. He stated a lot of their schools in the rural communities don't have sidewalks, and there's safety issues and concerns of building capacity for childcare and support for elementary families when elementary school students are getting out of school at 1:30-2:00 in the afternoon. He asked who's going to be there to greet those kids at home and stated they also have the economic factors with a lot of employers in their communities who are relying on their teenage employees to do those 1 to 3 o'clock shifts and now won't be available, so he thinks there's a lot of moving pieces and concerns and thinks they haven't adequately addressed this with the elementary families to let them know the realities of what would be coming with this. He stated they need to really look at ways to support communities as they move towards best practices and would like to see a way they bring support communities, build capacities and help districts do what's best for students without saying this is what has to be and interfering with what's really the responsibilities of the school boards.

Member Stephens stated she would love to echo and reiterate Member Walker's points and she thanked him for that. She stated it is imperative that she shares, as the representative of the superintendents of the state, around the great concern to something like this being written into a regulation. She stated their school districts really support local control, and they do understand that there could be some districts that do start all students early, but by putting some of these things into place, it really starts to tie the hands of the school district who is offering some multitudes of pathways and options for students. She stated speaking for herself, they're very mindful of their zero hour not being required and not putting it as the only time something's offered, but some families want to have that option. She stated their high school and middle school start later than their elementaries, and they start closer to best practice, but the reality is they are a district that is only able to run one bus route, and so their students who are high school students, even though starting late, still get on the bus at 6:30 in the morning. She stated that's unavoidable if they're going to offer busing to their kids that are high school students because they just do not have the capacity and have a 400-square-mile district that they're not going to run two routes, which is impossible. She stated it would be important to actually know what time everybody actually starts and ends, and they are still up against the hours they must be in school to meet the calendar, so it does impact that in terms of flexibility. She stated she would contend, be it good or bad, that it would run up against some fight, if it's the Board's purview, too, which she knows it came up before and the Attorney General's office weighed in some, and she thinks they would have attorneys that would weigh in that as well if it's the State Board's purview. She stated she believes local control is important, but she would love to see some sort of policy statement or something that the Board took that direction on, like this is best practice, and guiding individuals, students, and family members to go to their local boards if, in fact, it's a problem in their district. She stated that's where she stands as a superintendent and speaking for all superintendents that believe that is how it should be.

Member Stephens stated that she appreciates Member Hughes' comment on the input from the community. She stated this is just one of many things that they should be receiving community input on. She stated the entire school performance plan and district performance plan process requires community input, and obviously, it would be difficult to put in your input on every topic known to man, but that's also why they have school board meetings in districts because that's an opportunity, as a citizen and stakeholder, to weigh in on things that are concerning them. She stated that she loves the idea that they continue to push for input on all things school and learning related of their communities, including, most specifically, students and

families which could also be the policy statement is what she's saying. She thanked everyone for letting her share.

Member Keyes stated that unfortunately, he was not able to attend any of the workshops because he didn't necessarily know he would be in this position, but he feels like from what he's heard from all of the public comments and the workshop notes that the biggest thing here is choice, and he feels like it is necessary that they need to get those children more sleep. He stated it's just undeniably a fact that these kids aren't sleeping enough, so he thinks a good way of going about this would be to give the choice to districts, students and parents. He stated maybe if they have a school in their district, then they would have to have one that starts later than 8:00 and then the other one can start at 7:00. He stated there has to be that choice for the students to make that decision for themselves with their parents.

President Ortiz stated that she loves that and thanked Member Keyes. She stated to her earlier point, this is exactly why they need so many of the voices at the table.

Member Cantu stated he hasn't had a chance to provide feedback. He stated President Ortiz had asked about some of the ideas out of the listening town halls that they've had that stood out, and he appreciates what people are saying in regard to districts and local control, and he knows with smaller districts and rural communities, there's a great need for flexibility, and they're very special needs. He stated that as they make a decision, they need to look at what is best for students. He stated they've talked about many other stakeholders and constituents, and they're all very important, but as the State Board of Education, their purview is to safeguard and work for what is best for students in their district. He stated it would seem that having small districts retain local control and larger districts be subject to NDE regulation start times may be something they can consider. He stated at the listening sessions, they had a suggestion from more than one group of switching K-5 and high school. He stated very often, they're told this cannot be done, that to ask transportation experts and leaders, but rather than shoot down any concept of changing bus times, to come up with some solutions to later start times. He stated that's his two cents, if they could walk some middle path.

President Ortiz thanked Member Cantu and stated that he hit a couple of points for her. She stated she wants to synthesize what she's heard and to move them into the direction of eventually doing something about this. She stated with all due respect to Member Stephens and Member Walker, they would never have taken up this item if school districts were actually doing what's best for kids. She stated the only reason they're talking about it is because they're not, and they wouldn't even have to have this discussion if that wasn't the case.

President Ortiz stated she agrees with Member Cantu that their rural and smaller school districts have other challenges and have found ways to make that work, whether it's that 4-day school week or because of the busing schedule that Member Stephens mentioned. She stated she thinks there's an opportunity here for them to potentially exclude rural school districts from this regulation, but she likes the idea of setting guardrails and enforcing flexibility and choice, to Member Keyes' point. She stated she thinks that is probably the most palatable direction that they can go, so they say that they require schools to offer maybe X percentage of their schools starting at a later start time in year one and offer choice to their students and an opportunity for students to transfer school if it makes sense for their schedules, but by whatever date, no more than X percentage of schools can start before 8:00 a.m., so it creates some opportunity for flexibility and choice and a runway for transportation to figure out their challenges and come up with a really creative solution. She stated it also enable schools to jump on the bandwagon early if they want to pilot it, if they see that's going to work for their communities, and then she thinks having a waiver option is a good idea. She stated having language in there to say if a school district wants to ask for a waiver because they can't meet that percentage, there are specific criteria for them to be approved for that waiver. For example, if they have surveyed their school community and the school community said, no, this works for them, and it's a nice enough sample set like Member Hughes stated, that might be one of the criteria for getting a waiver.

President Ortiz asked for everyone's thoughts on that approach. Member Stephens asked for clarification that the Board collected all of the start and end times of all high schools in Nevada, and President Ortiz replied they did request that information from school districts, and most of them did send it in.

Member Stephens stated that President Ortiz made the comment earlier that districts were choosing not to do what was best for kids, and she doesn't have that in front of her, but she does believe that most schools are taking that tact and very few school districts don't start before eight o'clock, so in regard to this whole conversation, she's a supporter of the best practice related to this, and she is concerned this is really a Clark County issue and if it is, she would hate for there to be something coming out of this Board that ends up somehow impacting that.

Member Stephens stated there will also be unintended consequences with this particular approach. She stated for example, unless there's going to be more regulation and components, she could see if a district had to adapt in such a way as directed by this regulation that they could potentially stop busing high school students because they can't make that part work, and she doesn't want that to be the case. She stated like she told them, she has kids that get on the bus at 6:30, and they're going to continue to get on the bus at 6:30 regardless if their school starts at 8:00, 8:30 or 7:45 because she runs one route in Churchill County. She stated she doesn't have enough drivers to run the routes that they have, so she really just wants to reiterate that the local control piece is important, and she is concerned.

Member Stephens stated she did not attend the sessions, but it's kind of like when they did the ACT thing the first time. There were 194 responses, which is next to no one in the State of Nevada, so until they get a better sense from each individual school district, she would be concerned that their public wants something different than what's happening, so she feels like she would be remiss if she didn't share that on behalf of the superintendents of Nevada.

Member Hughes stated he wanted to jump in with a few thoughts and pushes for the group. He stated he completely appreciates everyone's perspectives, and he has personally spent a lot of time in rural communities across the state and knows the challenges and assets are very different, which is true within pockets of the urban areas as well, so he does think that flexibility and the idea of local input feedback makes tons of sense to him. He stated the other thing that he wants to push this on is a couple of thoughts. He stated that whenever they have this conversation, they all can list 1000 reasons why this is going to be hard and challenging, and yet they know other communities across the country figured it out, and they've done this, and the world did not end, and things are fine. The other thing that is frustrating him personally when he hears the litany of reasons why something can't happen, is he hears Nevadans aren't capable of doing hard things and Nevadans aren't capable of solving complicated challenges, and he fundamentally disagrees with that. He stated he thinks they are capable of doing hard things, and they can figure out solutions to very challenging nuanced, complicated issues, and he doesn't want them to let the laundry list of things prevent them from doing something that's hard but maybe better for kids. He stated all that is to say is that he thinks they, as a community in the state, are better and smarter than that, and he thinks they can figure it out and have full confidence in their people to be able to figure it out.

Member Carlton stated just for clarification purposes, the whole nexus of this conversation to start was that this Board has the authority to review the documents sent in by individual districts on their start times, so if a district sends something in that Board agrees with, they're done and there's no problem, and that regulation would not necessarily apply to them. She stated that if the district sent in the start time that the Board had concerns about, then that's where she believes is the jumping off point to make some of these changes. She stated in her mind, just thinking about the districts that she knows and being on public lands and a number of different committees in the state and traveling, she thinks this regulation would probably only apply to maybe two school districts in the state. She stated with that ramp up they were talking about, she thinks there's an opportunity for those individual rural districts, when they submit their documents to the Board, that may be just a done deal right there where they're approved, they move on, and things stay

the same. She stated she can't say that absolutely for every one of them, but it seems to her that they're forgetting about the beginning of this process and only taking talking about the last part, so there are different ways of still having those conversations with individual districts as they make the changes and adjustments.

President Ortiz stated Member Carlton is absolutely correct, which was the impetus or reason they were even able to bring this forward is that it is their responsibility to approve the schedules that schools create. She stated they're required to submit them to the Board for approval per Nevada Revised Statutes.

Member Hudson stated she had a comment to piggyback on Member Hughes' comments because she agrees with everything that he said and feels they're making somewhat excuses to better serve their students. She stated she feels like because they don't have anything in place, they're not coming up with actual strategies to help serve their kids. She stated if something is in place, and she hates to bring COVID back up, but COVID happened, and they basically had to make sure their students' needs were met. She stated it was something that happened to them, so she feels like with this policy or whatever they draft up, it's also just giving schools guidelines. She stated that she understands what everyone is saying, and she kind of agrees, but at the same time, she sees in one school district, 13 elementary schools starting between 7:00 and 7:45, which are from kindergarten all the way to fifth grade, and they're starting before high school. She stated when it comes to middle school, there are about 10, and she can keep on going of how many kids are starting at 7:00, even though they're getting out early, and then the rest of the schools are starting between 8:00 and 9:00, so it is doable, and it's not many schools that would have to change; it's just some little tweaks that would have to be done. She stated that she feels like by them not putting something in place that will support their students, they're going to continue to be there, and they're going to continue to be failing their students at some point.

Member Cantu stated a remark was made earlier about whether this Board has the purview to issue regulations related to this topic, so he would like to ask DAG Gardner for his input on this because they need to move beyond the scare tactic of you can't do this or they're going to challenge it in court to whether they're on solid ground to do this.

President Ortiz thanked Member Cantu and asked DAG Gardner to respond to the question.

DAG Gardner stated based on their previous discussion, the impetus for the authority for this Board to have any dealings regarding the start times is that all calendars that the schools have to issue are submitted to the Department, and based on that, in his conversations with President Ortiz, he believes that this Board has the authority to then put requirements regarding start times for those calendars. He stated it could be challenged in court because everything can be, but he's mentioned that when they discussed this with LCB, they may have a different opinion, so he will say this is not as easy as pointing to a statute and saying this is where your authority is. Based on his read of the statutes, he believes they have the authority, but other attorneys can disagree, and different courts could disagree, but his read of the statutes say that they have the authority to do this as part of their powers over the calendars that schools submit.

President Ortiz thanked DAG Gardner and stated that was some really good input, and she thinks they have some pretty solid stuff to start working off of to start drafting some language that they then can bring back to the Board and discuss around guidelines within the regulation that says when they submit their schedules to them, they must meet these specific guidelines or they must take these into consideration. She stated they will regroup, work with the Department of Education and their team that drafts language because they're much better at this than they are, and they will come back to the Board with some draft language to look at probably in July, which once they vote on it, will then go to LCB for their opinion and finesse. She stated once the language is finalized, they will have a regulation hearing, which is just another opportunity for the public to opine before it goes LCB to be finalized.

President Ortiz asked if there were any other questions about this particular topic before they move on.

Member Carlton stated she has a process question and asked if they have a draft regulation that they work on, before they would do any other workshops and have input, would they get it formally drafted or would they do some workshops first, narrow it down, then get it drafted and go back. She stated she gets confused because some folks do pre-workshops just to get more community impact, even though they've done a number of workshops, so she's just not sure if DAG Gardner could clarify that. She stated she thought there was another set of workshops, but she might not be remembering correctly.

DAG Gardner stated he thinks Member Carlton is talking about the process under NRS 233B to create a regulation. He stated one of the first things to do is the workshops, and then they would hold a hearing afterwards where they officially start adopting language. He stated they have to kick that off, create their language, send it off to LCB, and then LCB will give them official language that the Board would have to vote on. He stated they would probably get two cracks at this language because they're going to have the language that they will create, and then also will get the language the LCB will create, which is the official language that will be in the regulation.

9. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

President Ortiz stated as they mentioned earlier during their consent agenda discussion, they're going to have a presentation on class size reduction, a legislation debrief, which is a deep dive on all of the legislation that was passed, and the Milken Award recipients.

President Ortiz asked if there were any other future agenda items that any board member would like to bring up, and Member Hughes indicated he does.

Member Hughes stated he does not know the exact timing that would make sense, but in the next couple of meetings, there's a few follow-up items that could be helpful. He stated they had some committee work a while back on AB469, and there's a bunch of work happening and he's not sure where the district's at, how that's going, so he would love an update there. He stated similarly, around College and Career Readiness assessment, he's sure they're doing that at some point and thinks it's in the RFP process right now, but just whenever it makes sense to get an update on where they're at in the process. He stated that on the third item, he feels that maybe he missed this a few meetings ago, but NDE staff had previewed some STIP updates to them that were coming, but he doesn't know that they've dug into what those actual updates were, but he could have been misunderstanding that. He stated if there was something that was more substantially changed there, understanding what those changes are would be helpful.

President Ortiz asked Superintendent Ebert to correct her if she's wrong, but they would have had to vote on any changes if they made them, and Superintendent Ebert indicated yes.

Member Carlton stated she doesn't know if the Board has done this in the past, but they're in different rooms, they have people remotely, and she's not sure if the Board would be interested in it, but she thinks it's worthy of discussion of this Board taking it on the road and maybe visiting some of those smaller districts and asking if they can borrow their boardrooms for an afternoon and take community input from those individual communities, and being in town with them, even as simply as going to Boulder City. She stated they've noticed with some of the committees that she's served on that just going to the location creates a lot more input, and they just want to come meet you in person because they just see you on the screen, so she thinks that's something worthy of the Board discussion, and she's not sure if it's in the budget. She stated when they're talking about community impact and reaching out, she thinks it's incumbent upon them to go where the folks are sometimes, not just have them come to the Board.

President Ortiz stated it's funny she mentioned that because they are actually going to have their July meeting in Carson City, so all of them will be in Carson City, in-person in July. She stated Martha is going

to be sending out information to everyone, so they can save the date, book travel, and all that fun stuff.

Member Cantu stated he thought they might have a discussion after the legislative movement that they've seen this past session on restorative justice, and President Ortiz replied she will add it.

Member Arrascada asked to put on the future agenda items a presentation by the Nevada System of Higher Education in regards to the longitudinal statistics that they have regarding the data dashboard and the Career and College Readiness. He stated a presentation on that would be great.

Member Hudson stated she does not know if this is the time that she says the recurrent items they need based off their calendar.

President Ortiz replied no, those are automatically added by the Department of Education and stated the recurring calendar is on the website right beneath their meeting minutes, so if anyone is curious and wants to know what items they typically talk about on a recurring basis, that schedule of items is on their website, but they definitely are due to be updated, and they will probably have updates based on this legislative session.

President Ortiz stated she has one last announcement before they go to their final public comment period. She stated today's meeting is the last meeting for Superintendent Stephens. Not only is she rolling off of the Board, but she is retiring and moving out of state, so they want to thank her for all of her time and dedication to their students in Churchill County, NASS, and this Board. She stated they appreciate her so much and will miss her greatly and wishes they could clone her a few dozen times over and just keep all of the clones there. She asked Member Stephens if she had any parting comments.

Member Stephens stated she wanted to say how grateful she is for this amazing opportunity. She's probably one of the weird people of the world because she's the person that is volunteering to be on this Board and loves being able to be at the forefront of the work that's happening and have a voice on all things learning and teaching, and so it has been a great year. She stated it's gone really fast, and she's thankful to everyone on the Board as well as past board members for welcoming her and allowing her to share her ideas and voice because sometimes it's in conflict to the other voices, but that's the point of the Board is to be able to share that, so she's really looking forward to her next position and seeing her family more, and she's excited about that. She stated it's also her anniversary, so she's there with them today, but her husband is in Nebraska, but she's just grateful for the opportunity, and she is so excited for the continued work that happening for kids there.

President Ortiz thanked Member Stephens and wished her best of luck and happy anniversary.

10. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

There was no in-person public comment in Carson City or written statements via e-mail.

Darlene Anderson provided an in-person public comment in Las Vegas.
(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)

President Ortiz thanked everyone for their time and stated the next full board meeting will take place on Wednesday, July 26 at 9:00 a.m. She reminded everyone that the board meeting will be held in Carson City, and they are hoping to have every member there in-person. She stated she specifically asked for this a while ago because she wanted them to meet all of the staff that's up in Carson City and feels it is important for them to also understand what the Department of Education is responsible for and what each of the departments actually do. She stated she knows she saw some eyes open wide when it was mentioned today that they managed 800 grants, which is a massive lift, and she felt it was also an opportunity for them to celebrate the staff at the Department of Education, not only to learn about what they do, but to celebrate them. She stated they're hoping to do the same thing this fall down in Las Vegas so that they get their entire

board together at least twice a year. She thanked Member Carlton for the suggestion and stated she and Superintendent Ebert will have to see how far they can stretch the budget because it's super tiny. She stated it may have grown a little bit with this session, but it's been an impossibility prior to this year. She thanked Superintendent Ebert for going to bat for them to get a little bit more money to be able to do these things.

11. ADJOURNMENT

President Ortiz adjourned the meeting at 11:39 a.m.

APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS GIVEN DURING PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Susan Keema, NASS Executive Director, provided an in-person public comment.
2. Darlene Anderson, a community member, provided an in-person public comment.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 1: SUSAN KEEMA – PUBLIC COMMENT #1

Per our NASS meetings with Superintendents, we believe that start times should be local control. Each district, each community is different, and this is something that should be set by local citizens and their local boards as well as the school districts.

Thank you.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 2: DARLENE ANDERSON – PUBLIC COMMENT #2

I've seen many of you online. I try to keep up, but I've lived here in Las Vegas for four years. I was involved in public education in Sacramento. I don't understand the process that's utilized here. There's no identified money for the rural schools, so everything is shared. But when everything is shared, not everybody is on the menu or maybe everybody is on the menu. There are far too many children in the justice system and it's just us. It's unfortunate that most people don't understand the value of freedom and liberty. As I understand sitting at the table who's generating those dollars, and it's the children who are underprivileged qualifying for free and reduced lunch. Let's talk about at risk for a minute because I've heard several different definitions of at risk, but when you put children on the bus, it's difficult because by the time they get there, are they really ready, and how much time are we utilizing? And when they're moving children to those prime six wonderful schools and moving children and moving children away. What's happening to Nevada because our home lives are being destroyed. People can't get their children to the bus, but when a young man who would be dreaded and looking like he's super cool dad couldn't get his head on the bus, well, he challenged the driver and the driver challenged him, but he ended up in jail, but he had already had a record in regards to his child, and so I'm saying the number of children who end up in the foster care system is unacceptable. I could not imagine losing my child. I'm 65 and?? alive, and I went through the system. I had one gifted in GATE, one non-specific, and one severely mentally retarded. They all graduated. They all got something. In America, we all get something. It's the offer of what's free and appropriate here in Nevada, and it's not public education. People with money show up and they advocate and they're really disturbed by receiving EBT cards, but it really doesn't matter because we understand what that meant. Let's understand what local control is. Local control means the governing board has provided training for local school districts to ensure that we're meeting the federal guidance, and when we understand the power and flexibility and utilizing federal dollars because no state is required to follow the federal regulations and that's just the bottom line. But in the end, I hope you have your civil rights data because I know schools were told that they didn't have to do it. When they chose not to do it, the punishment is to the state, and since everything here is project-based, you're meeting your basic needs for the projects that you're continuing, but you still don't have the data for the manifestation data for the IFC Committee, perhaps. There's a lot of resources that are connected to the children and the children harvest but thank you. I'm just hoping that we can come to a change and understand that our children are valuable and everybody's worth something. But why are we committing children at the age of 11 to doomsday?