

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
March 16, 2023
2:00 PM**

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

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

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

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Craig Statucki, Interim Deputy Superintendent of Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement
Kristofer Huffman, Chief Strategy Officer
Mark Rincon, Education Programs Professional, Office of Standards and Instructional Support
Barbara Bidell, Education Programs Professional, Office of Student and School Supports
Karl Wilson, Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Student and School Supports
Martha Warachowski, Administrative Assistant IV, Office of the Superintendent

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

Ed Gonzalez, SOT member, Hickey Elementary School
Silvina Jover, Dual Language Educator, Desert Pines High School
Hezekiah Israel, Bnai Or Congregation
Heidi Hoshibate, Clark County School District
Dr. Yuhsun Edward Shih – Wharton School
Patrick Collins, Clark County School District
Jessica Jones, Clark County School District

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

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

2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

Silvina Jover, Dual Language Bilingual Education Social Studies teacher at Desert Pines High School in Clark County, provided public comment on agenda item #9. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A).*

Ed Gonzalez, SOT member, Hickey Elementary School, provided public comment regarding agenda item

#8. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A).*

Erin Smith, Educator, provided public comment regarding agenda item #10. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A).*

3. APPROVAL OF FLEXIBLE AGENDA

Member Timothy Hughes moved to approve the flexible agenda. Member Tamara Hudson seconded. Motion passed unanimously. President Ortiz stated that she will be exercising her right to move items on the flexible agenda by moving item #10 above item #7 to accommodate Nevada Department of Education staff and their work schedules.

4. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

President Ortiz reported that the Board will be holding the second of three workshops regarding High School Start Times. The first one was held March 6th, 2023, in Las Vegas and was poorly attended. She went on to say that the Board makes every effort to allow people to participate in the process and give the Board feedback. The next workshop will be held in Carson City NV on March 30th, 2023. Ortiz went on to say that the third one will be held back in Las Vegas on April 15th, 2023. President Ortiz and the Board has secured a larger meeting location in anticipation of a bigger audience.

President Ortiz invited Member Joe Arrascada to provide an update regarding the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) Board of Regents. Member Arrascada reported that the Board of Regents has had some very productive meetings. Member Arrascada went on to say that during the March quarterly meeting they secured through academic research and student affairs several new degree options throughout the NSHE state system. Member Arrascada also informed the State Board that NSHE system level staff are currently working with representatives from the Nevada Department of Education and the academic officers from our core community colleges to update agreements on college level credit articulation, he went onto state that all seven of the teaching institutes are actively engaged and offering dual and concurrent enrollment opportunities to Nevada high school students and are continuing to build new partnerships with high schools and school districts throughout the state. State Board President Ortiz went on to thank Member Arrascada for his report and informed him that if there is anything that the Board can do to help ensure that our work in the K 12 system is aligned with what’s happening in the entry system to let the State Board know.

5. SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT

Jhone Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction gave an update on the new NDOE staff members and the positions that they have filled. Superintendent Ebert went on to report that The Advisory Council for Family Engagement will review the parental involvement and family engagement policy pursuant to NRS 385.620. The last time this policy was updated was in 2015. The Department is pulling folks together to review the policy and to look at our six essential standards to enhance parental involvement and family engagement. Alberto Quintero, Education Programs Professional for Family Engagement, will help support the work, alongside the Council. The Department wanted to keep the State Board aware of the work that is transpiring and give State Board members the opportunity to participate in this process if interested.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

President Ortiz pulled item g from the January 20, 2023 meeting minutes because they were not completed in time. President Ortiz asked if there were any other items to be pulled for discussion.

Member Hughes stated that he had some questions/thoughts regarding item a, Instructional Materials for English Language Arts and item d the 2023 STIP addendum.

President Ortiz stated that she had some questions regarding item b Private School Consent Agenda. President Ortiz started the discussion with item b, she asked the presenter, Education Program Professional (EPP), in the Office of School Supports, Barbara Bidell, why the two new Primrose schools (Primrose School of Las Vegas at Silverado Ranch and Primrose School of Las Vegas at Lone Mountain had received provisional licenses instead of full licenses.

EPP Bidell explained to the Board that the two Primrose schools are new and that’s why they were only given provisional licenses.

President Ortiz followed up on EPP Biddell's answer by asking about Wharton School and why in the recommendation document it says that the license is provisional when they have had a full license in the past. EPP Bidell explained that it was a mistake, and that she will get it changed to full license immediately.

President Ortiz noted that the Board would approve item b with the revised recommendation language President Ortiz then indicated that she was moving on to item a, the approval of instructional materials for English Language Arts and invited Member Hughes to ask his questions regard item a.

Member Hughes stated that he knows and appreciates that a lot of work goes into curriculum selection and how important it is to the school districts. He stated that he feels selecting high quality grade aligned curriculum is one of the most important things that is done by the system, and that it is one of the discrepancies that we see across Nevada. Member Hughes stated that there are high variances in curriculum and materials that is being used from district to district, school to school within a district, and even classroom to classroom within a school building. He went on to say that when the Board thinks about our goal of improving student outcomes and that the STIP and English Language Arts materials are a huge lever to improve outcomes. Member Hughes reminded the Board that in previous conversation that have been held around curriculum implementation or adoption and making sure that we have a process that helps us select the best tools. Hughes stated that one of the concerns that has been raised in the past is about using an agnostic content rubric to make these important decisions. He thinks that there should be a broader discussion around this because it is so important. He went on to say, for example, our read by grade three and science reading work is all predicated on having strong foundational skills built into a K-5 curriculum. He also feels that the way that the rubric score is compiled it is too broadly aligned under standards.

Member Hughes went on to share that he had heard that some of the people on the selection committee feel that there isn't enough emphasis on the content specificity that is needed. That raised some alarm bells for him although he thinks that some of the materials on the list are high quality, while some of them are of more medium, based on some reviews that they had read. So, it's not a judgement of what is on the list but again just to reiterate that this is such a critical thing to student outcomes that everybody should feel good about districts choosing any of them and that they're all going to be set up students for success. He also mentioned that all though the Board has talked a lot about support for Multilingual learners, it wasn't emphasized in the revised rubric as a particular thing that was being looked at. Member Hughes closed by saying that because getting Language Arts curriculum right, is so important he would like to have a broader discussion around it. President Ortiz added that she had also noticed that Multilingual supports was missing but had assumed that because English Language Arts was included that Multilingual supports wouldn't be. She then turned it over to the Office of Standards and Instructional Supports (OSIS) team that did the work to address Member Hughes's concerns and help us understand why there might be some gaps in the rubric. Then the Board can decide whether we need to pull the item all together or can potentially vote on it.

Director Brancamp of Office Standards and Instructional Support (OSIS) introduced Mark Rincon who is a E.L.A content specialist in the Las Vegas office and Heather Moyle from the Lyon County School District (LCSD). Director Brancamp stated that they are part of the team that did the full review and that he would ask Heather Moyle to answer the Multilingual piece. Heather began by saying that throughout our review committee discussions, Multilingual supports were brought up throughout the process. The review team ensured that those supports were embedded in all the curricula that was approved. President Ortiz asked why the rubric didn't include those supports. She went on to say that she remembers asking for them to be included in a past meeting.

Director Brancamp clarified by saying that the Multilingual Support language is included more in the second rubric around the equity and access piece. The one that is being discussed now deals with the standards themselves. Director Brancamp went on to went on to say that in the last legislative session a bill was passed having to do with Multilingual Standards revisions in the future at which time those standards would be added to Language Arts. President Ortiz was wondering if she needed to pull the item or if the board could come to an agreement so they could potentially vote on the item.

Member Hughes followed up his question by saying that he has some concerns and wanted to know more about content specificity and did not think that a general rubric should be applied to all content areas. Member Hughes noted the importance of having strong foundational skills for K5 literacy and the tools to ensure we are offering high

quality grade aligned curriculum. Member Hughes also stated that he had been hearing from some of the people on the selection committee who also had concerns about the actual content specificity. Member Hughes is hoping to have a broader discussion to make sure we are executing the process correctly. President Ortiz stated that she also had noticed the absence of content on Multilingual supports. Director Brancamp invited Education Program Professional Mark Rincon, English Arts content specialist (OSIS) and his team to address these concerns. EPP Rincon and selection committee member Heather Moyle explained that the committee had looked at all of the curriculums to ensure that only the highest quality curriculum that ticked all of the boxes on the rubric were moved forward. EPP Rincon went on to answer a question from President Ortiz regarding how many companies responded to the RFQ which was 14 and how many companies are moving forward on the committee's recommendation which is 8. Member Hughes stated that he still had some concerns with the process. He stated that he feels that there needs to be more precise in making these decisions. He went on to say that when looking at this from a districts point of view when all of the curriculum is rated at a 2 but actually one of them only partially meets the 6 grade academic content standards however all of the curriculum offerings are averaging out as a 2 on the rubric. Member Hughes noted that there are states that have gone through this process that have created free rubrics to be used to score curriculum that are more precise than what we are using.

President Ortiz reminded the Board that they need to stay in their lane when it comes operational duties. She suggested that Member Hughes could work with Director Brancamp's team to review some additional rubrics. President Ortiz also noted that school districts in Nevada have a choice whether or not to use the list of curriculums that the Board provides. President Ortiz also stated that Nevada is a local control state, and it is up to the school districts to pick the curriculum that's best for the children in that district and ensure that it is aligned to our standards and provides all of the supports that our Children need in order to succeed and to achieve all that we're expecting of them in our school system. President Ortiz moved on to discussion around consent agenda item d STIP that Member Hughes had asked to be pulled. Member Hughes asked some clarifying questions around the STIP data and how it is being used. Member Hughes explained about what he would like to see in future reports is specifics on how this data is being used to make progress towards our goals and closing the opportunity gap in graduation by 75% across all groups by 2025. Hughes also had some specific questions around goal one and the starting point percentage 59.2%. Superintendent Ebert requested that CSO Huffman come up and answer the Member Hughes questions. Chief Strategy Office (CSO) Huffman explained that the 59.2% was listed in the original success strategy and was calculated based on ASPAC data from that particular time. Member Hughes went on to say that he's trying to understand the data that the department and board is putting out to the public. He asked CSO Huffman if the subsequent data comes from map scores and if the map scores were being used to demonstrate progress towards goal based on ASPECT.

CSO Huffman noted that there may be a misunderstanding because they were looking at map scores themselves are showing the progress towards the information and goals. He also explained that it could be an issue in comparing them since they are using different criteria. President Ortiz also asked CSO Huffman about Brigance measurements around development delays and reducing gaps. Ortiz stated that she is thinking that the board needs training on testing and data. That topic needs to go on the future agenda items list. President Ortiz went on to say that she feels that the Board needs to dig in some more on their goals and interim goals including the STIP. The STIP goals belong as interim goals for the State Board of Education to show that we're actually achieving our two top goals. Member Walker pointed out that some of these same challenges in monitoring the data to use and that this is what schools struggle with as they're looking at their school improvement process. He went on to outline when schools get the ASPECT data they need to show if their making any progress. He went on to say that map data is consistent and that is what they use to track progress. Member Walker also stated that these processes need to be simplified.

President Ortiz stated that she is putting Member Walker's statement around assessment data and professional development in analyzing as an action item for the Board. Member Hughes asked a question regarding the chart in the previous presentation language from page 9 about gap closure opportunities and gap closure in different subgroups. He went on to say that he would like to not use the phrase "word gaps were closed" because when you dig into the data sometimes the gap was reduced or grew instead of closed. She stated for the consent agenda vote they're going to remove the word provisional from approval for licensure language and then on item D page 9 we're going to change the word closure to reduction of gaps just to be very clear and transparent. She explained that she wanted to see anywhere it says closure, edit it to say a reduction on pages 9 and 10 with those edits. She explained on the consent agenda we will be voting separate on item and voting on all the rest of the consent agenda items at once.

Member Hudson made a motion to approve item a on the consent agenda. Member Walker seconded. Motion was passed unanimously.

President Ortiz asked for a motion to approve the other consent agenda items minus item g which was pulled and including the other edits that were discussed.

Member Hughes has moved to approve the remaining items with two addition changes for the Wharton School for the private consent agenda and for changing the naming of closure to reduction in the STIP addendum, Member Hudson second, motion was passed unanimously.

7. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING ELECTION OF OFFICERS OF THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

President Ortiz stated that the Board will review and have a discussion about potentially taking action on a proposed language for the Board Clerk position, which is potentially a new officer position. They are by statute required to hold elections for Board President and Vice President after each major election, but they wanted to build some succession planning in and give other people an opportunity to have some leadership roles and also spread the work around, so they proposed the Board Clerk position. This position would review draft agendas from materials that are submitted, capture and ensure all future agenda items declared during the meeting are reflected in future agenda, finalize agenda agendas and materials in collaboration with the Board Secretary, monitor the Silver State governance process of training and setting goals, and doing Board evaluations on a timely basis.

Member Hudson asked if the Board Clerk position would get guidance on the whole process, and President Ortiz replied yes, the person taking on the role would have guidance from the Department of Education and from those that have already done the work.

Member Dockweiler asked how the records would be stored to ensure timely flow of information, and President Ortiz asked deferred to Superintendent Ebert to respond.

Superintendent Ebert stated that they have workflow and processes in place that will be shared with the newly elected member to make sure they're successful.

Member Hughes stated that if somebody were interested in the position, that would be awesome. He asked how useful the position would be and stated he thinks it would probably reduce the workload of folks who absorbed it. He added that he loves the idea of succession planning and is open if folks want and/or need this position. He suggested that if they feel like they don't need it, they could implement building routines into the last agenda section of every meeting and have a quick conversation to make sure those that were things named in the role were addressed.

President Ortiz stated Member Hughes provided good feedback. She asked Member Carlton for feedback based on her experience as a member of other bigger bodies.

Member Carlton stated she understands a lot of non-profit type boards, they would have someone who would be their Secretary and/or Clerk. When they get to a higher-level board along this line, that would be more of a staff function, knowing full well that this Board doesn't have the staffing that she believes it deserves or should have in the future to be able to address some of the issues. If a member of this Board, like herself, brand new coming on, had a question, there is no policy or research analyst that the Board has. It all falls on the Department of Education, which is totally overworked to begin with, so having a position like this to coordinate and so some succession planning is good. Member Carlton stated that a lot of major organizations will have a first and second vice president or a secretary treasurer so that they have a larger leadership group, so if something happened, they would have some continuity in leadership. She stated she was initially confused by the term clerk, but now she understands a little bit better because some school boards have clerks that basically sign off documents and things along that line. She stated the description is a good first step towards providing resources to the Board and having another person step up and help, but she thinks in the future, there should be a discussion about this Board having its own resources so that they're not impeding or getting in the way of the Department of Education trying to get their work done also.

Member Rene Cantu moved to approve the new position on the State Board of Education called Board Clerk. Member Tamara Hudson seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

President Ortiz stated that they will be electing President, Vice President and Clerk for the State Board of Education. She turned it over to Deputy Attorney General (DAG) David Gardner to run the election. DAG Gardner explained the election process to the board members.

Member Dockweiler nominated Member Ortiz for President. All were in favor. Nomination passed unanimously and Member Ortiz was elected as President.

Member Cantu and Member Hughes nominated Member Dockweiler for Vice President. All were in favor. Nomination passed unanimously and Member Dockweiler was elected as Vice President.

President Ortiz nominated Member Hudson for Clerk. All were in favor. Nomination passed unanimously and Member Hudson was elected as Clerk.

President Ortiz thanked DAG Gardner for conducting the voting and thanked the Board for voting her again for President. She stated she feels blessed to have a team that is diverse and focused on what's best for kids, and she appreciates working with all of them.

President Ortiz called a recess at 3:35 p.m. and reconvened at 3:45 p.m.

8. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING DATES AND START TIMES

President Ortiz stated Board meetings currently occur on the first Thursday of every month, excluding May and August at 2:00 p.m. She opened it up for discussion on possible day and time changes.

Member Carlton stated that she would love to be able to participate in some school district meetings also, but they conflict. She asked if there was any interest in trying to alternate if those wanting to attend school district meetings.

President Ortiz replied they had their meetings at 9:00 a.m. up until two years ago, so there was never a conflict and their meetings never went that late. However, she and other board members received lots of feedback from the community, especially teachers, that they were not able to attend because the meetings were during the day. It also made it difficult for their teacher and student board members to attend because they needed to be at school, which is obviously a priority. Therefore, they moved the meetings to 2:00 p.m. to accommodate more people coming and participating. They also simultaneously started livestreaming the meetings, so they did not see the number of people attending increase, but rather, they saw a decrease. She believes it was Member Arrascada that requested this agenda item, which was why they moved it to 2:00 p.m. She's never considered moving the meeting to a different day because it wasn't an issue before moving it from a Thursday to a different day, so that's open for discussion.

Member Hughes stated that he agrees that they didn't see a difference. He suggested that if they kept it on Thursdays, they could alternate evenings and mornings. He stated that now that they have a clerk, they could be strategic with which items may be in the evening sessions versus the early sessions, but also being mindful that their Board also has a student on it.

Member Walker stated that the majority of superintendents and himself have board meetings on Tuesdays, so he would encourage them to stay away from Tuesdays because that will limit participation from their NASS representatives unless they're from Clark County as well as their superintendents.

President Ortiz thanked Member Walker for his feedback.

Member Stephens stated that depending on what board it is, there are also Tuesday and Wednesday meetings in the evenings, and whoever is going to be the superintendent representative may need a different day. President Ortiz asked when does the superintendent member term end, and Member Stephens stated the next person would be starting at the July meeting.

Member Carlton asked if during the summer months, it would be better to do mornings and go from there rather than having people come out when it's 120 degrees in Las Vegas at two o'clock in the afternoon. President Ortiz replied that is a good point, and they could potentially do morning meetings for the June and July meetings because the student and teacher members would then be available unless there's summer school.

President Ortiz asked if Member Arrascada had any thoughts since this is he's request. Member Arrascada replied he's just absorbing everyone's input and thinks it's all very practical, especially, the input of Las Vegas in June, July, and August. He stated that having everyone's input and having a disability to collaborate, to come up with a confirmed time, will just provide an opportunity for them to attend the meetings in which they are passionate about, which is education. He thinks they can come up to a consensus at the end of this meeting or sometime in the very near future.

Superintendent Ebert asked if most the Regent meetings are on Thursdays and Fridays, and there was nodding in the affirmative. She stated that she believes there is one school district that has board meetings on Wednesdays, Clark County has theirs on Thursdays, and she believes everyone else is on Tuesdays. She stated NSHE is on Thursdays and Fridays.

Member Hudson asked if they could change their meetings to Mondays, making sure it's not on a holiday.

Member Hudson motioned to move their meeting dates to Mondays avoiding holidays.

Member Cantu stated that in light of the fact that their student and other school administrators cannot make morning meetings, they should keep nine months of afternoon meetings as much as possible and to have two or three summer meetings in the mornings because of the heat. He stated that Monday meetings are fine.

Member Hudson amended her motion to move their meeting dates to Mondays, avoiding holidays and keeping the meeting time in the afternoon for nine months and meeting in the morning during June, July and August. All were in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

President Ortiz proposed to make the meeting changes effective in June since they're already on the calendar. She asked Superintendent Ebert for her feedback.

Superintendent Ebert stated they will draft a new meeting dates and times for everyone to consider, making sure that holiday Mondays are not included, and the a.m. start time for June and July. She stated they do not traditionally have an August meeting.

President Ortiz added that they don't typically have meetings in February, August and May and it works out very well for those of them who are WestEd board members as their meetings are usually Thursdays and Fridays.

9. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION/ENGLISH MASTERY COUNCIL WORKGROUP

President Ortiz stated the Board will receive a presentation from the English Mastery Council Subcommittee workgroup.

Member Dockweiler stated she will be helping to facilitate the presentation of this item. She stated that back in November, the State Board of Education heard a presentation from the English Mastery Council and one of the recommendations from that meeting was to dive in deeper into the different recommendations that were made to determine which of the recommendations may require regulatory change prescribed by this body and which items might have other work that may be associated with it. As part of the workgroup, she participated with Member Cantu and Member Hughes, along with Karl Wilson and Blakely Hume from the Department of Education. She expressed appreciation for their work, guidance, and leadership because their historic perspective was very important to guiding the work.

Member Dockweiler described the three subcommittee workgroups: TSL, Teaching English as a Second Language, EP&AA, English Proficient in Academic Achievement, and District Policy, which is the District Policy and Criteria

Planning workgroup. She stated that these are the original three workgroups that each proposed recommendations that they took a deeper dive into. Member Dockweiler stated they will be sharing from the 12 original recommendations, which are broken down into four categories: regulations for the State Board to consider; follow-up work from the Nevada Department of Education; LEAs from the local school districts following up with support from the state, if needed; and then no further action.

Member Dockweiler presented recommendations from the TSL workgroup, which was to amend the regulatory language for endorsements to teach a program of bilingual education. She stated the thought was to revise the endorsement language so that it reflects curricular expectations of the ELAD endorsement and shows the bilingual perspective rather than a second language English learning perspective, which provides an asset-based approach and falls under the regulatory category to revise NAC to make the format and expectations of bilingual endorsement similar to the ELAD endorsement. She stated that this recommendation will move forward in collaboration with representatives from NSHE to support through the research and regulatory process as it moves through COPS because they want to ensure alignment with what's happening at their higher education level with what's happening in their districts with their teachers.

Member Dockweiler presented item number two, which is also from the TSL workgroup and similar to item number one, which is to amend the regulatory language for endorsements to teach a program of bilingual education. She stated the ELAD endorsement is required for hiring purposes, and the recommendation is the bilingual endorsement will also satisfy that same requirement. She stated this recommendation would require a revision in NAC, related to that ELAD endorsement.

Member Dockweiler presented item number three, which is also from the TSL workgroup that recommended that the legislature provide funding for an annual stipend competitive with other states for teachers who earn a bilingual ELAD endorsement. She stated they felt this one fell more under the purview of the Nevada Department of Education right now because they felt their workgroup didn't have enough information at that time, so they proposed that the recommendation might align with other more comprehensive State Board supported educator recruitment and retention initiatives, and that information collected would be sufficient to support some type of change that it might be more statutory in nature as recommended by the original workgroup than regulatory and under their purview.

Member Dockweiler presented item number four, which is also from the TSL workgroup that recommended to the notion of reciprocity and teachers who are coming from out of state. If they have that endorsement on their license out of state, then they, as a state, work to reduce barriers with respect to that reciprocity to enhance availability of qualified educators to meet Nevada's needs while ensuring they meet the professional expectations of the license. The recommendation falls under guidance with Nevada Department of Education to provide additional information to follow-up and work closely with existing initiatives for reciprocity and that avenue versus a regulatory avenue.

Member Dockweiler presented item number five, which falls under recommendation of working with the Department of Education over any regulation work in order to meet the needs of students performing in the lowest 25th percentile of English language academic achievement that targeted funding for students equivalent to that provided for EL students. She stated that this recommendation falls under work previously taken by the State Board of Education relative to the definition of "at risk," which fits into the larger conversation and thought that they could support additional funding for students who are not on track to graduate with their peers. At this time, the recommendation is to work with NDE to work on the definition and see where things fall once that is determined.

Member Dockweiler presented item number six and stated this recommendation is to create and implement an English language policy and plan to require each district to create a policy and implementation plan for meeting the needs of those students performing at the lowest 25th percentile. She stated the EMC workgroup recommendation was to implement the requirement that districts integrate that EMC recommendation of those required components, including a new provision for wraparound services to meet the needs of students throughout that emerging or developing level academic performance into their district performance plans. She stated these district performance plans are already something that exist, so if they could integrate these new components, specifically related to wraparound services, into that plan, it might be the most efficient path forward to getting students those supports.

Member Dockweiler presented item number seven, which also falls into the lowest 25th percentile for academic achievement and having a corrective action plan. She stated if the requirement is not met, the recommendation is instead of recommending a new corrective action plan for the schools in the lowest 25th percentile for those ELA academic achievement, they would look at the existing school improvement plan process by addressing the root cause for low academic achievement for those impacted students and provide support instead of penalizing the work and students. This support will come from the Department of Education.

Member Dockweiler presented item number eight, which falls under potential follow-up at the district level, so all school districts must create these plans for ELs, even if there are no ELs identified in that district. She stated this speaks to their smaller school districts and aligning systems of supports within those ELAs for developing and implementing an effective plan as required by NRS and NAC to help those ELs and multilingual learners to achieve. She stated that depending on what findings are monitored at the local level, then it might support change at the statutory level.

Member Dockweiler presented item number nine, which also falls at the district level and speaks to the English language curriculum development recommendation that the curriculum materials and instructional methods that support language development contain these different components. She stated the current recommendation is to provide state funding that enhances data systems and staff to support the monitoring and technical assistance of the districts, which is not within the purview of the State Board of Education, but just acknowledging that this type of work may require some sort of funding source to help support it.

Member Dockweiler presented item number 10, which speaks to the over identification for students in special education and who are EL and then the under identification of EL students in the GATE program. She stated that the majority of Nevada students are identified for GATE programming at the end of second grade. With their second language acquisition process, it can take up to five years for students to develop those basic informal communication skills, which are fixed just for everyday language and then up to seven years for those cognitive academic language skills to develop. She stated that for a lot of students who are EL students, they are asked to take these tests for gifted and talented education when they've only been exposed to the English language for three years, which is not necessarily sufficient for them to even perform well on these tests. She stated one of the recommendations that was made at the district level was to build educator capacity to use assessment tools properly and accurately for GATE to identify the strengths and needs of EL students to provide them with appropriate education services to maximize their outcomes. She stated that another piece that came out of this conversation is to support the development of special education testing, which are typically conducted by school psychologists, so if they have more bilingual school psychologists, they may be able to identify students more accurately for special education.

Member Dockweiler presented item number 11, which they felt was currently covered and no action was requested on this. She stated they felt the recommendation to build educator capacity and to provide recruitment and retention incentives had already been addressed through the other recommendations previously mentioned.

Member Dockweiler presented item number 12, which is the last recommendation and has a very important perspective. She stated currently within family engagement, there is a component where current EL policy includes parent engagement but there is no mention about receiving and responding to parent input, so this would be another proposed regulatory change that would require districts to include in their EL policy a plan and process in which to receive and respond to parent input.

Member Dockweiler stated in summary, of the 12 recommendations, three were of a possible regulatory nature, five were for the support and follow-up under NDE, three were for possible district follow-up and one of the recommendations was no further action. She stated it's the recommendation of their workgroup for the State Board of Education to consider possible regulatory work surrounding items one, two and 12, should that be something that the larger board feels is important to move on. She welcomed additional information from Members Cantu and Hughes and a discussion with the full board.

President Ortiz thanked Member Dockweiler and asked if Member Cantu, Member Hughes, or the Department had anything to add.

Karl Wilson responded that it was a privilege to work with the State Board of Education workgroup to revisit the recommendations of the English Mastery Council. He stated that as the workgroup identified, there are a number of existing requirements or regulations related to district English learner policy and plans that the recommendations from the EMC are addressed and asked are they being implemented with fidelity. He stated that the recommendations that they saw from the workgroup was charging the Nevada Department of Education to continue to monitor the development of those policies and plans and their implementation. He stated some would require regulatory change, and others the implementation of regulations, and it was a productive opportunity for them.

President Ortiz stated there's a charge to better hold districts accountable for their plans and actual implementation of those plans and asked what the timing is for submitting those plans to the Department of Education. Mr. Wilson replied that the regulation states that those policies and plans are to be updated and submitted annually. He added under the period that the English Master Council was in place, they reviewed those policies and plans on an annual basis and with the ending of the English Master Council, they will continue that same practice.

President Ortiz suggested that they put it on their agenda to get an update from the Department of Education after the evaluation of those plans has happened to evaluate whether those recommendations have been implemented and that the Department include in their evaluation these things specifically, so that any plans that are submitted going forward are evaluated for these specific topics as noted on the presentation for items eight, nine and 10.

Member Hughes thanked and recognized the English Mastery Council and stated they thought they were very thoughtful proposals and recommendations as they dug in and thought about what is the pathway that makes the most logical sense to have these things actually happen. He stated that with all of them except for the one that was already covered, they thought they were strong proposals and that's why they rounded them differently and send the things back to NDE staff who had a very methodical process for them to go through some meaty topics, so it was very much appreciated.

President Ortiz stated that on item number three, every time she hears English learner or English language learner, she cringes because across the country, that language is changing to emerging multilingual, which is a more asset-based approach to speaking about children's assets that they're bringing to the table. She asked that they very intentionally, as a Department, start using that language and eventually consider where they need to change NAC or NRS and who's responsible for doing that to get that language changed statewide so that they're not using deficit language when they're talking about their children.

Superintendent Ebert provided feedback to President Ortiz's suggestion and stated that they agree that with the asset-based language, however, they do have federal requirements and language in reporting, so she wants to make sure that they're mindful when they're reporting to the Feds that this Board is aware that they're reporting an alignment to what the federal government requires them to do and then they will also work on their state as a whole with the asset-based language.

President Ortiz thanked Superintendent Ebert and stated hopefully, the Federal government will take their lead and see the example that the states are putting forth and eventually change the language, too.

President Ortiz stated that on item number three with the stipends, she thinks there's a bill going through the legislature right now that includes \$10 million towards funding towards the 33 dual language program. She asked is that an opportunity for them to embed language that could potentially offer a stipend to teachers that are teaching dual language programming, which would cover item number three.

Member Carlton stated that her concern would be that when they start offering different stipends and pay, a lot of those are covered by collective bargaining agreements and they're different for each district. She stated that for state funds, the district makes those decisions, so if that is a state appropriation going towards a certain thing, it may have guardrails or corrals around some of those dollars because typically pay has to come from separate budget accounts. She stated she is not familiar with the bill, and the frustrating part about it is they want to do more for teachers and reward them for all the extra things that they do, but it's really not within the legislature's purview. She stated that those dollars go to the district and then the district goes to the teachers, so they can only send messages and try to incentivize, but actually trying to put something in can be very difficult.

Member Hughes thanked Member Carlton for her feedback and stated their thinking strategy for this item, was they agreed in principle but they were thinking there are various incentives that districts already provide for various reasons that they agreed to in their CBAs, so their thought was these data was the motivator and seeing what people are actually doing and incentivizing and make that more public and lift that up and does that help them understand if this is already being incentivized or not, what else may be incentivized, and that could lead further to from folks who have the ability to do that if they understood the landscape. That was step one of what hopefully would lead to what the recommendation was. President Ortiz stated they will attack this from multiple different avenues.

President Ortiz asked on item number five, how do they ensure that the new at-risk rubric or algorithm takes into account the lowest 25th percentile in English language academic achievement and if that is something they would have to do officially or is that something they need to notify Infinite Campus so that they change the algorithm.

Superintendent Ebert stated that in pulling up the data, it is something that they can do. She stated it's a query that is with the system.

President Ortiz replied if they included in query that any student that was in the lowest 25th percentile for English language acquisition, that would allow them to include them in the at-risk category, which then would allow them to get that weight down to the school district.

Superintendent Ebert stated that there are two different things that they're talking about. She stated that if they're identifying students in the lowest 25th percentile for English Language Arts that are not ELL students, that would just be running the data through the system. She stated that the piece for the at-risk not on track to graduate, they've used the amin broad categories of academic success, behavior, the transition of students of what was presented to Board, she believes that she would need to back it up with data that the at-risk that are identified within our state already are inclusive of this group of students, so it's a subset of what they already identified as a Board as students not on track to graduate, but she can verify that through pulling the data.

President Ortiz stated she would like to modify the recommendation to confirm with the Department if they bumped up the list of students that are currently identified as at-risk for the people's under-funded plan against the list of students that are in the lowest 25th percentile, they would assume that they're already captured.

Member Walked suggested looking at terminology for academically at-risk because there are students who are at-risk because who are at-risk because they don't have food at home or they don't have parents in the household or their parents are incarcerated. He stated that the muddier they make that water, it's already hard enough for schools to identify those students who are truly at-risk at the school level and he would hate to see kids start to be under-identified because they've altered the definition. He stated they need to be really careful and work with different departments and makes sure they're identifying kids that need to be identified.

President Ortiz agreed that she doesn't want to change the definition. She just wants to make sure that they're not missing children that meet this criteria according to the EMC recommendation for the additional financial support because, clearly, they need the additional supports in order to achieve the level of English mastery that they're hoping they have.

Mr. Wilson stated it may be helpful to refer to those three members of the State Board who had this discussion, but in looking at the recommendation from the EMC, it was the perception that anything that would provide additional funding to a certain group of students would take strong legislative action but that the option to redefine at-risk under the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan may be the way to concentrate additional funds in that part of the weighted formula. He stated they currently have it for English learners, at-risk, and gifted and talented, but the number that is used for determining the amount for funds for at-risk is almost 250,000 students in the state, and the definition is those that qualify for free or reduced lunch. He stated that with the transition to moving to a new definition, that it would reduce the number of students that are identified as at-risk, and thus, generate more funding per pupil and concentrating that in the schools for those students. He stated that he believes that was the thinking of the State Board members.

President Ortiz stated that what she was concerned about in looking at the new definition and the new set of students that are being identified for that weight is that they're not missing the children under this recommendation for the 25th

lowest percentile of English mastery. She asked if they could just get that data and make sure that they're not missing any of those students, that would be helpful. She stated if they are, then the next step would be to rethink potentially the definition or the algorithm that determines those students that qualify for that weight.

Member Hughes added that they didn't know how much overlap authority was or not because this was targeted toward English Language Arts, not specifically geared toward multilingual learners, so they felt some of the other definitions may already account for this. President Otiz replied that's completely understandable.

President Ortiz moved onto item number seven, which was specifically asking the districts to collect additional data, so if they're already identified as a Title I, TSI/CSI or ATSI school, there was a request to additional data asked Mr. Wilson to expand on that and provide information on what additional data might they need and is that data readily available or are they causing more work for school districts.

Mr. Wilson stated recommendation of the English Mastery Council was originally that that schools that were in the lowest performing part of the state in terms of students would develop a corrective action plan and members of the State Board felt that it would be more prudent to recommend that those schools used the school improvement processes that are already in place, but that they take a closer look at the student who have not achieved success and then look at root causes related to those students. He stated that instead of creating an additional school improvement plan, let's take advantage of the systems they have in place and require those schools to take a closer look at the students who aren't achieving success.

President Ortiz thanked Mr. Wilson for the clarification and stated that makes a lot of sense.

Member Walker stated that one of the concerns he had was that at his school, he had to create one of these plans, and so they were identified, got notification over Winter break, and they got technical assistance through Zoom meetings, and then they had to submit it in January. He stated his concern is had they had been identified from the very beginning, this could have been a conversation for their school improvement right from the get-go, so waiting until the second semester, they lost valuable time. By the time it's February, they're gearing up for state testing and then the end of the year, so they've lost real valuable ground. He stated that they need to make sure that the data is in the schools in a timely fashion so that they truly can address these performance issues.

President Ortiz asked Mr. Wilson to help them understand the process for identifying TSI/CSI schools and the timeline for notifying and providing a corrective action plan and how they go about holding them accountable, especially because they have a few new members.

Mr. Wilson stated that he believes Member Walker is referring to a different requirement related to Assembly Bill 219, which required schools that are in the lowest 30% of performance of English learners for academic achievement to create a corrective action plan, so that was part of the thinking. He stated that was a corrective action plan that was built into legislation back in 2019. He addressed Member Walker and stated that the timing this year was less than the best in terms of when they received the data about which schools, which delayed the planning process. He stated it is their intent in the future, if this requirement stays in place to provide that data earlier on, so yes, this could be incorporated into the annual school performance planning process for English learners. He stated that this recommendation is to say, let's look not just at the English learners but other students who are struggling in terms of academic performance and let's build into that school performance planning process a really good review of the data and root causes for students who aren't able to achieve the level of success that they dreamed for all of their students.

President Ortiz stated TSI/CSI is based on the Every Student Succeeds Act, which is a federal thing, and now, they have AB 219, which is a state thing requiring any school that's in the lowest 30% of academic achievement, do another corrective action plan. She asked if there a conflict here, or could it be that they have a school that's not a TSI/CSI but falls under AB 219.

Mr. Wilson stated the CSI/TSI designation is a federal requirement and does look at Title I schools that are in the lowest 5% for the state. AB 219 does include a clause which they have encouraged schools to use and that is if there is another school improvement plan that the school has developed, that they can use that to address their corrective action plan and that's why they encourage schools this year to use the school performance plan, but the timing was

not good, and so many schools submitted an addendum to their school performance plan for this year. Their hope is that in the future, it becomes just one improvement plan that looks at all students in their school and their academic and mental and social needs.

President Ortiz asked Member Walker if that addressed his concerns and Member Walker replied yes and no. Member Walker stated that he and Superintendent Ebert are comparing notes and because it did feel like a separate report and it felt redundant, so part of what they were discussing is how to streamline that for the schools. He stated that the more steps you have to plan improvement, the less time you have to work with students and improve achievement. He stated they want to streamline these processes so that schools could say here's a need for my school, here's what we're going to do and let's start doing it, but the more steps that they have to do and the more that they have to revisit and revise, the less time they spend on interventions for students and that's just a reality. He stated in that corrective action plan, tutoring started in late February for his school instead of in the beginning of the year when they made a plan to address those kids. He stated they identified the kids who are underperforming and they're getting additional time in school, but they lost over a semester of time going through this process, which just adds more bureaucracy. He stated he's not blaming anybody, but he's frustrated because the more time he spends on this, the less time they spend truly addressing student needs.

President Ortiz stated that she would highly recommend he go tell that to the legislature because oftentimes, these requirements come through the legislature, and they end up stacking things that could not necessarily be stuck but could be done in collaboration with other things they're already doing.

President Ortiz stated for item number nine, the recommendation was to provide state funding that enhances data systems and staff to support the monitoring and technical assistance in development and implementation of curriculum and instruction. She asked someone to explain.

Member Walker stated in his district, they use Elevations, which not only has data for student achievement, but it also has instructional techniques and strategies that teachers could use within their classroom, so in his mind, he's wondering if this would be a program like Elevations.

President Ortiz asked if any of the committee members can speak to this item.

Member Dockweiler replied yes and addressed Member Walker's comment. She stated that having some sort of data system or something that could align the work to then document and show how it's all working together. She stated to the previous conversation, how they're not creating these stacked work but that everything is actually an alignment and facilitating ease and efficiency versus multiple things going on that really impede the work instead of help support the work.

Member Hughes stated previously, they talked about rolling the EL specific plan into the broader improvement planning process. He stated that the recommendation was predicated on having a separate plan, so they thought some of the things they outlined would be incorporated into that embedded plan and this is then an additional recommendation around the monitoring systems to help make sure the integration happens. He stated he doesn't know the actual mechanism for that, but it seems like since they're not controlling funding, that's where they left off.

President Ortiz stated that she's struggling with this one because they don't have any control over state funding and when she thinks data systems, she thinks of data they're capturing about students or their performance and not necessarily data about how they're deploying curriculum and she's still confused. She asked Member Walker to describe Elevations again.

Member Walker stated Elevations is a database that their students' information is uploaded into that can bring up academic progress. They can also break it down by strands to look at where they need to focus on, which is speaking, listening, reading and writing. They can click on speaking and it brings up a number of ready-to-go lesson strategies because they would have to plan their content, but it could go with anything. He stated he use some of those for professional development with teachers just to show them they can grab this, which can even work for the adults. They could click on a listening lesson and embed that into their reading program or writing assignment, so they're building those competencies. He stated it's very impressive and more than once, he and his colleagues have said they

wish they had a database like that for all of their students, not just the ELL students.

President Ortiz asked if Elevations is a tool that is purchased district to use with their emerging bilinguals. Member Walker replied he believes it is and he could dig in a little bit deeper, but he knows that Carson City and Lyon County use it. Member Stephens stated that Churchill also uses it.

President Ortiz stated that would be an example of a literal software that they would buy that provides the data to be able to help elevate the instruction and the outcomes for kids. She stated that she now she understands the through line of funding and she thanked Member Walker.

President Ortiz thanked them for all of their hard work and gave a big shout out to the English Mastery Council for their decade of work on all of this. She's hopeful that it doesn't die here and she's assuming that they will begin to set workshops to hear the policy to change recommendations and get those moving on the path towards getting that language changed in their regulation language.

10. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS ASSESSMENT SUBCOMMITTEE RFP

President Ortiz provided a background on the College and Career Readiness Subcommittee RFP and stated that the Subcommittee will be presenting their findings.

Member Stephens thanked President Ortiz and stated that they should have access to three documents that they will be going over during the presentation: the scope of work draft, a proposed rubric for the CCR assessment, and a document discussing the request for the Procurement Committee entities. She stated that the subcommittee, consisting of her, Member Cantu and Member Hughes, met February 2, 21 and March 10. She thanked Peter Zutz, Mike Pacheco, Gideon Davis and the DAGs who participated and then proceeded with her presentation.

Member Stephens stated there were five specific items that came from the top of the list that came from stakeholder surveys. They wanted to ensure those items were in the scope and scoring rubric explicitly, including aligning widely accepted college admissions requirements and scholarship criteria assessment that predicted college and career preparedness, and providing consistent data over time for each student.

Member Stephens stated that one of things the Board needs to discuss is, are they interested that this assessment has a way to measure a student's progress over time in some capacity with either crosswalk scores or that it's the same assessment or was it more intended that this assessment tool could be used to measure programmatically 11th grade performance over time. Member Stephens stated they also would like to discuss the weights that they subcommittee finalized.

Member Stephens stated that they determined 10 represented groups to elicit names and select members to participate. She stated that Peter Zutz shared that there is a state law that there also has to be an outside entity, such as someone from another state entity, has to also sit on the committee, which may not be represented here.

Member Stephens asked Member Cantu and Member Hughes if they had any additions to the presentation, and Member Cantu stated that Member Stephens covered it eloquently.

Member Hughes thanked Member Stephens for leading their efforts and putting the presentation together and stated that they discussed providing robust training for the 10 or more representatives to give them more specificity of the categories. Member Hughes added that they made a slight change to the language around the reduction in the number of tests. He also stated that he was not sure if there would be any issue in adding back in the language to the 11th grade adjustment that Member Stephens mentioned per the first public comment.

President Ortiz thanked the subcommittee and stated that as a Board, they have done more subcommittees and workshops than they have in the past, and she wanted to appreciate their time and effort as they all have full-time jobs. President Ortiz opened it up to the Board for other questions or comments regarding the work of the subcommittee, and there was none.

President Ortiz stated that she had a question regarding the public comment mentioning using the word, “process” instead of “progress,” which she believes has been corrected; however, in number four, it says progress over time and asked if someone could double-check if that was a typo. Member Stephens stated that before their last meeting on Friday, she thinks that was an error that they have corrected.

President Ortiz asked about the cost factor that was mentioned in the public comment. She asked if they could remind her what was the percentage on the previous rubric for cost, and Member Stephens replied they may want to defer to procurement or NDE, but she believes that particular section was weighted pretty high. She shared that they were not necessarily committed to 20%, so they would be open to a different conversation about cost.

Superintendent Ebert stated that they have Gideon Davis from Purchasing on the phone and requested that they not only revisit the percentages for cost but also for each of the sections in the previous RFP.

Gideon Davis apologized that he is in the process of driving to pick up his kids from school, so he does not have that information directly in front of him at the moment. He stated that he believes cost was about 20% on the previous RFC, but ultimately that decision is the Board’s to make. He added that there is not a requirement in the law about exactly what percentage cost needs to be, but they think they need to consider cost to some of them.

Member Hughes asked Mr. Davis to explain to the Board what he explained to the subcommittee in regard to a state process that typically happens with cost regardless of how it’s included in the rubric, including a ranking system for all the vendors.

Mr. Davis stated that when they evaluate cost, the Purchasing Division attempts to do so quantitatively, and in most situations, they evaluation cost from a formula so that it is comparable to each other. The vendor that submits the lowest cost price proposal, comparing apples to apples, is given the highest cost score and then each other vendor is given a proportionally lower score based off of their score compared to that lowest price score. He stated if they imagine it as a fraction, the numerator of that fraction becomes the lowest price vendor and the denominator of that fraction becomes each other vendor’s price. Anything over itself is one, so they get the perfect score, and for each other vendor, they get some number between zero and one, which is divided by the weight, which gives them a weighted cost score for the cost criteria.

President Ortiz thanked Mr. Davis and stated it sounded super complicated and asked if they can make it more streamlined.

Mr. Davis stated there are other formulas that other states use or that they can consider instead, but that’s the standard formula that Nevada uses. He stated that if a vendor is twice as much as the lowest price vendor, they would receive half of the available cost points, and as they get more expensive, they end up with less points. The results are easy to see in the outcome because they’re getting a proportional percentage of the total available points based on how expensive they are.

Member Carlton stated that the explanation that she just heard sounds like the person with the lowest bid gets an advantage over the person with the higher bid not taking into consideration the actual deliverables that the state will receive.

Mr. Davis replied she was correct and stated the deliverables are taken into consideration in the technical scoring, and Member Carlton stated she’s not sure if that’s the answer she was looking for.

Member Carlton asked Mr. Davis, in his experience, how many times does the lowest bidder actually end up succeeding in the process when he has seen this formula work out, and Mr. Davis replied he would guess around 50% of the time. Member Carlton stated that in her experience, the number of time the state has had to go back out and rebid things, she believe that their challenge has been folks with that lowest bid and the way the formula actually works. She stated that she’s new to this and would love to understand the technical side of the deliverables work into this to make sure they actually get what they’re paying for.

Member Stephens stated that if 80% of the contract is based on deliverables of what they're looking for and some of those are so specific to what they want to see as an outcome of assessment practices, she thinks it is going to help. She stated when they look at the rubric, even if they adjust further to make the functional and technical sections work more, it has huge improvements from what they had in the first round, which was also 20% for the cost, but the technical and functional components was only worth 20% and everything else was worth 65% of the rubric last time. Their proposal now is at a much more reasonable rate, which is that the equity component is 10% and the other section is 20%. She stated it is worth consideration that they've shifted the mark, which is something that was much less related to learning, assessment and achievement and more now about putting the onus on that side and less on cost and things that have nothing to do with learning or achievement.

Member Cantu stated that they looked at the weights and the technical and functional requirements are at 50% because they wanted what was in the RFP.

Member Hughes stated on the equity front, he would love to have the Board weigh in on the weights if there are disagreements or if they think they should prioritize a rank order because some of those are directly related to the stakeholder survey. He stated the conversation they had on the equity was that there are other aspects of the technical section that tend to accessibility and parental engagement, so they felt like that was already woven throughout, but they also wanted to name it as a priority separately, so that's why they landed on a smaller percentage because they felt that some of the other specific questions were already accounted for that idea within.

President Ortiz stated that she appreciated Member Hughes' clarification because she was going to ask why it was split out and as a Board, they have been very focused on equity and she liked that they also included the test developer and their staff in their equity and diversity as well because that will ensure that some of those biases are caught or at least noticed.

President Ortiz asked if there were any further comments or suggestions on the weighting from the Board on this item and there was none. She stated that her recommendation based on the feedback that they got from the Subcommittee and the comparison of the prior weights versus now is that they've taken a significant increase towards technical and functional and the project management of the tool and cost has somewhat stayed the same, but she thinks that should address some of the concerns, especially now understanding a little bit more the formula that the procurement team uses, so they're not just getting the highest score because they have the lowest price, which adds a little bit more equity to it as well and is helpful. She stated that hopefully, this will result in them getting scores back that are wholly focused on what the assessment delivers and how it's going to meet their needs and not so much based on cost. She does not want them picking tools, curriculum or anything because it's the lowest cost because she wants it to be the highest quality.

President Ortiz asked if there were any other questions or comments before they move on from this item and there was none. She thanked the subcommittee and the procurement department for all of their hard work and time as well as the Department of Education for their patience. This is a huge decision and impacts their children greatly, so they want to make sure that they do this thoughtfully and strategically as it will not be seen again for potentially another three to four years. They look forward to hearing that this RFP has been put out on the street again and then eventually getting a recommendation from the procurement office.

Superintendent Ebert stated the Department will be bringing back the draft RFP for the April 6 meeting. They are on a very tight timeline to get the RFP out and then go through the process and award, so they're happy to come back at the next meeting.

President Ortiz stated that she has an agenda setting meeting tomorrow and will make sure the item is on there. Member Hughes stated he had one quick reminder/request. For some of the categories they said was a yes/no, they will want to make sure they crosswalk that with the questions that are in the rubric that shouldn't be the full spectrum that are either yes or no because he thinks that was omitted and asked to have it flagged.

President Ortiz thanked Member Hughes and stated that they will keep an eye out for the materials and asked if he sees the meeting materials ahead of the meeting to please notify the Department so that they can update it before they actually meet.

11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

President Ortiz stated that she mentioned at the beginning of the meeting that they will have workshops coming up on the 30th in Carson City, and then they will be back here on April 15 for the variance approvals for class size reduction. They also had a request in the last meeting to discuss the naming conventions for private schools because there was a recent private school licensure application that had “Charter” in the name, so they want to talk about that.

President Ortiz asked Superintendent Ebert for clarification on Executive Order 2003-003, and Superintendent Ebert replied that Executive Order 2003-003 is the review of the regulations that they’ve been collecting input, and the State Board of Education must take action before they can submit it to the Governor’s office.

President Ortiz asked to circle back to the English Mastery Council recommendations and have it on their calendars to ensure they get feedback from the Department on the items they’ve punted to them and get feedback from the Department and team that reviews the English learner plans to make sure that they’ve incorporated the recommendations from the English Mastery Council.

Superintendent Ebert asked to add for the April 6th meeting an item related to the legislative updates. She stated that Dr. Katie Broughton has been providing them with a synopsis of the week and then also looking forward, she would like to have her give a review and any items the board members would like to talk about and then specifically have it as an action item as well to designate board members to speak towards any bills as a body. She stated they need to discuss as a Board prior to representing the Board on any topic, so she would like to have a deeper dive on the April 6th meeting, if that’s amendable.

President Ortiz stated that sounds good and thanked to Dr. Broughton for all of the hard work she’s doing in giving them those updates. She stated it’s been super helpful, and she loves the hyperlinks.

12. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

There was no public comment in Carson City. The following were public comments from Las Vegas:

Jessica Jones, Hickey Elementary School, provided a public comment. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A.)*

Hezekiah Israel, Bnai Or Congregation, provided a public comment. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A.)*

Ed Gonzalez, SOT member, Hickey Elementary School, provided a public comment. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A.)*

The following public comment was submitted electronically:

Dr. Trancita “Tina” Winquist, Rosemary Elementary, provided a public comment. *(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 Thursday, April 6 at 2:00 p.m. She stated they will commence the new board schedule in the June meeting, and they will see the updated board calendar in their April meeting materials.

13. ADJOURNMENT

President Ortiz adjourned the meeting at 5:01 p.m.

APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS GIVEN DURING PUBLIC COMMENT

APPENDIX A, ITEM 1: SILVINA JOVER – PUBLIC COMMENT #1

Good morning to all members of the Senate Committee on Finance and Assembly Committee on Ways and Means, and the corresponding sub-committees on Education.

My name is Silvina Jover and I am a Dual Language Bilingual Education Social Studies teacher at Desert Pines HS in Clark County. I currently teach Relaciones Internacionales to freshmen and Gobierno de EE. UU. to seniors. I teach these classes in Spanish. I am also a PhD candidate at UNLV and my research is in bilingualism and language policy. Finally, and more notably, I am the product of bilingual education back in Montevideo, Uruguay.

I am calling to speak about Budget Account 2699 which makes reference to the allocation of funding to piloting dual language programs.

I have been working in dual language for 9 years, since my beginnings as an educator; first in the state of Mississippi and in Nevada for the last 7. Generally speaking, one of the biggest challenges of moving into a language acquisition program that is asset-based, such as dual language, and moving away from subtractive programs such as English As A Second Language ones, is precisely establishing the difference in frameworks and purposes of the various models of language acquisition.

I kindly ask the Committee to bear in mind that dual language is not the same as ESL, TESOL, ELL programs, and similar. The money must be allocated to programs that honor the four pillars of bilingual education, namely: 1. Critical consciousness; 2. Bilingualism and biliteracy; 3. Grade level achievement; and 4. Sociocultural competence.

CCSD's Dual Language Education model intent stated in its Handbook reads as follows: "In partnership with families and the community, the Clark County School District (CCSD) offers students within the Dual Language Program opportunities to use their full linguistic and cultural repertoires to engage in content-rich, multilingual, and multicultural learning across the curriculum. Students receive high-quality, grade-level content instruction in a supportive environment guided by research-informed practices resulting in linguistic, intercultural, and academic proficiency." Let this serve as a guideline at the time of disbursing the money to the asking programs.

Thank you for your attention.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 2: ED GONZALEZ - PUBLIC COMMENT #1

For the record, my name is Ed Gonzalez and I'm speaking as an individual today. I'm commenting on item 8, start time. I think what we have seen from the State Board previously we've seen very early meetings and meetings at 2:00 PM. There have been times where there have been some special items on the agenda that I know that I have made a request for a later time so we can get feedback from principals and educators and obviously students. So, when you look at, consider, and weigh the start times. Previously I think, the meetings started at 9:00 AM, where you didn't have the ability at that time to watch the meeting, you had to be there in person but as you look at it. I think one of the things you want to say is that if an educator wanted to come here, I know that we don't get a lot of them, but I know that some who have come literally race here from school just to get here in time to not be able to public comment until after you have made a decision. So regardless of what your decision take into consideration that if you want to move the meeting earlier that is the business of the body and the desire but to say that there are certain topics that should be held until a later meeting. I want to have voices heard and I know that this body does too. So, I would hate for staff to have to take time off to come to these meetings or students if they wanted to submit something in person and speak on in would basically have to miss school. So, if you look at it, it's the same thing that Clark County School District has done with the School Board work session. They have moved that to 4:00 PM because they use to meet at 8 or 9:00. So regardless of what decision this body makes, keep that in mind. Thank you.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 3: ERIN SMITH - PUBLIC COMMENT #1

Board Members,

A group of us secondary ed folks have been watching the meetings regarding Nevada's statewide test for 11th graders. We wanted to make a few suggestions.

First, please correct the wording in the CCR test Scope and the Scoring Rubric to match what was on the original survey question for priority 4. Question 4 of the Functional & Technical Requirements of the RFP section has been reworded so heavily that it has completely changed the meaning from Priority 4 that was listed on the survey. The original survey question that Nevadans selected as a top 5 priority mentioned consistently comparing the progress of 11th graders across the state from year to year, but that Question 4 in the Scoring Rubric and Scope has been altered so much that it now looks more like one of the bottom two priorities Nevadan's selected about consistently measuring student progress from K-12. Please correct Question 4 of that section to reflect the wording of the original survey question re: 11th graders since the current Scope and Rubric wording doesn't match the original survey wording or intent at all. It also changed the wording from progress to "process".

Secondly, in the prior subcommittee meeting they had lowered Cost to 10% of the weight. Board member Hughes had mentioned that when it was as high as 20% Nevada almost awarded the bid to the test vendor with the worst evaluations last time just because cost was such a large (20%) factor and they underbid all their more reliable competitors and came in at less than half of the industry standard pricing. The subcommittee's original weight of 10% seemed more likely to avoid that problem again rather than when they inadvertently switched it back to 20% as listed a few days ago. Please switch cost back to 10% instead of changing it to 20% and possibly risking awarding the contract to what the evaluators stated was the worst test product, just because they undercut everyone on price.

Lastly, in addition to the overall 50-60% (or higher) weight given to the "Functional and Technical Requirements" category which shows the stakeholder survey priorities, (we agree with Dr. Stevens that it should probably be even more) we would all encourage the board to do what President Ortiz and others originally suggested in weighting Nevadan's top 5 selected priorities most heavily at the top. i.e., Survey response Priority #1 should get more weight within that category than survey response priority #5, and especially more weight than items 6,7 and * that weren't even part of Nevadans' survey responses.

Thank you for the thorough and transparent process. Keep up the great work.

Erin Smith

APPENDIX A, ITEM 4: JESSICA JONES – PUBLIC COMMENT #2

Good afternoon, President Ortiz members of the board for the record. My name is Jessica Jones. I'm a kindergarten teacher at Hickey Elementary School, which is a title one school on the east side of Las Vegas and our beautiful Clark County school district. I'm here today because I wanted to come and thank many members of the board. I wanted to thank Member Carlton. Member Hughes, Member Dockweiler you President Ortiz and also Deputy Attorney General David Gardner because you all made time for the students at my school during our very successful and fun Nevada reading week. The Children absolutely loved it Member Carlton? The kids kept asking about hummingbirds all week. I have many pictures. I'm going to put them all in a little booklet and I'll try to bring it at the next meeting if possible. But again, I wanted you know, just express my thanks because what you guys did was very memorable for all the students and they all had a really great time. So thank you.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 5: HEZEKIAH ISRAEL – PUBLIC COMMENT #2

Good afternoon, President Ortiz and members of the board. My objective is first I say peace be with you all and my objective is to get people to recognize that the reason for the growing violence in our society, particularly in our schools such as the mass shootings occurring is because people have failed to acknowledge God, our creator. I hold that there's one God who is the creator of the world and that he's both good and just good in the sense of giving his air, water and sun to everyone here both good and evil. Yet he's also just and that he judges everyone at some point in time according to their deeds. Now we are experiencing evil and mass shootings occurring in our schools quite regularly Over 3100 people have been shot in mass shootings in 2022 alone, which has been recorded as among the highest in history according to CNN. And since Columbine in 1999, more than 338,000 students in the US have experienced violence at school. And in 2022 alone 34 students and adults died while more than 43,000 children were exposed to violence at school according to the Washington Post, what a child is taught does make a difference in their actions. When the child is taught that they come from the same ancestor as an ape 10 million years ago through the theory of evolution, why do we act surprised when our kids act like wild apes? There's no evidence that people ever came from the same ancestor as an ape so they should not be taught to our Children as truth. To the contrary I have evidence that God exists. If I'm made in the image of God, I have my own image, my own person as evidence that he exists because most of your philosophers have agreed something with form and fashion must have been created. So my evidence of God is me, is you who has made in his image and when, when Children are taught this, it can help rid the lusts of evil actions in our Children and in our society, the acknowledgement of our creator is embedded in the very core of, of the declaration of our independence. We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator. They are endowed with certain unalienable rights that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. If our creator is acknowledged in the declaration of independence, why shouldn't he also be acknowledged amidst our students and teachers in the classroom? Who is the one who made the sea? Who is the one giving the air to breathe? Who is the one who made the sea? Who is the one giving me air to breathe? Who is the one who made the sun? Who is the one who lets me have fun? Who's the one who made my eyes? Who's the one who colored the skies? Who's the one creating things that grow Who is the one causing the winds to blow? Our creator it is him our creator. It is him, he who was and who will always be creator of the heaven earth and see our creator is him, our creator is him. Let us all acknowledge him and give him thanks for all he has done and for all his many benefits. Thank you.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 6: ED GONZALEZ - PUBLIC COMMENT #2

My name is Ed Gonzalez. I'm the community member at the Hickey Elementary School organizational team. As you heard from our chair, we really appreciate everybody coming. We had over 60 readers and which is highly unusual for that side of town and one of the reasons why we made such a strong push is that people usually say community members don't want to go to the East Side. And I know Maggie Carlton will look at me and realize how ridiculous of a statement that is and you guys proved it. But I do have an apology because I tried to reach out to every member and I assume that my contact was a good contact. So I will apologize to Member Cantu can't too, I realized after the event that my contact for you was not good. And so you're more than happy to come at any time to read. So I do apologize about that. The reason why we invited many of the members from the state board is that MS Hickey served on the state board. She was the first Latina and I can tell you I got a lot of people coming and going. Why didn't I get invited and what it was we had so many people it wasn't manageable. So my principal at one point said, Ed, you can't do this anymore. You guys saw that, you saw me running around trying to put people in classrooms. So I appreciate that and the second thing I want to highlight is that I talked a lot about Bailey Middle School's Health Clinic. It's been open since August after like four years. We got a message about a couple weeks ago that are actually right after reading week that it is now open to both Hickey and Sunrise Mountain. So since August, it was only open to Bailey Middle School and serving an absurdly low amount of student but the mission is not done, it should serve more students and we will get there as we can but I'd just like to acknowledge this because I know some members of the board have heard me say this since January 2019. And so we're happy we need more services for that, especially what's going on in schools as you know, today, the legislature, the Assembly Education Committee heard about school safety. Anytime we can get support two kids, it's much needed. So Madam president, thank you for the time. Thank you.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 7: DR. TRANCITA “TINA” WINQUIST - PUBLIC COMMENT #2

Emailed public comment to Board.

Good afternoon, President Ortiz members of the board and Superintendent Ebert. My name is Dr. Tracy Winquist. In December of 2022. I decided to leave the Department of Education after having worked a combined four years as an education program, professionals, education program supervisor and the director of the Title one program in the Office of Student and School Improvement to get back to working with the students. Currently, I serve as an autism teacher at Rosemary Clark Middle School where I have had the privilege and honor of serving some extraordinary, amazing students alongside some incredible families, the administrative and school staff at our Clark Middle School exemplify a culture of learning improvement and one that I'm totally proud to be part of. Thank you for revisiting the importance of the values in our state plan for the improvement of pupils S T I P under NRS 385.111 and the 2023 addendum having completed my training last week to administer the Nevada alternative assessment to my students. I can attest to the fact that the values which are the heart of the STP matter. I feel that it is important to take the time today to share with the board and Superintendent Ebert, two issues that are directly connected to the values and the STIP and must be corrected in the Nevada alternative assessment before I begin, I would like to acknowledge the work of the department has done to reduce the burden and streamline the magnitude of the Nevada alternative assessment for students having to take it and teachers having to administer it. Although it's still an assessment that must be videotaped in its entirety for each student. I understand that over the years, the assessment has been streamlined from over 50 questions per section to now only 28 questions the Nevada alternative assessment is, is administered to approximately 1% of the students in Nevada and today I am advocating for that 1%. Having my master's degree from German University in Special Education and my doctorate from the University of Southern California in Educational Administration. I understand the importance of sound curriculum, instruction, and assessment. The teachers I teach have high quality engaging curriculum provided by the Nye County School District special education support services. Each student has their own set of materials and consumable workbooks for them to write in. So imagine my surprise when being trained to administer the Nevada alternative assessment that students must share student response booklets because schools will receive a ratio of one grade level test kit for every three students. Slide 17 of the NDE administrative training slide deck, page 35 of the test administrator's manual provides accommodation guidelines. Specifically the universal tool of being able to use highlighters to color text and items or passages. However, this obviously cannot be done if students who take the e Nevada alternative assessment must share their student response booklets provided in the test kits in my class. Students are taught with their own set of materials to write on and highlight when needed and having to share student response booklets for an assessment does not provide an equitable condition for Nevada alternative assessment test takers. The 1% of students affected the by this matters. The second issue that must be addressed is the fact that students taking the Nevada alternative assessment do not get to read the questions because the questions are not printed in the testing materials. I was so stunned by learning this, that this disparity struck me with for the rest of the training. Students I teach are present with multiple modularity, ease of learning the curriculum, including being able to see and read questions in their day-to-day learning experiences. Why wouldn't the Nevada alternative assessment provide students with the questions and writing for which they are being assessed as adults? Wouldn't we be at a disadvantage of not taking this assessment and not having the opportunity to see or read any of the assessment questions because they are printed and can only be heard in the assessment. Don't all the assessments have the questions included in the student response? What is there for students to see and read? Why not the Nevada alternative assessment? The 1% of students affected by this matter. None of us could predict exactly what technology, technological or medical advancement advancements might enable today's Nevada alternative assessment test takers to maybe someday be able to take the S B A C or A C T or other assessments? So how's this board going to correct these issues in the Nevada alternative assessment to have this assessment better align in administrative format and with other negative assessments, this will fulfill the commitment and provide the credence by ND and this board that when you say all students, you mean all students and when you include in the state's strategic plan, the value of equity, you mean that even students taking the Nevada alternative assessment will be provided the opportunity to see and read the questions for which they are being assessed. The 1% of students do matter and I trust the board and our superintendent to share this perspective. Thank you for your time, Tina Winquist