

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
JULY 26, 2023  
9:00 AM**

| <b>Office</b>           | <b>Address</b>     | <b>City</b> | <b>Meeting</b>                |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|
| Department of Education | 2080 E. Flamingo   | Las Vegas   | Room 114                      |
| Department of Education | 700 E. Fifth St.   | Carson      | Board Room                    |
| Department of Education | Virtual/Livestream | Virtual     | <a href="#">Lifesize Link</a> |

**DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Felicia Ortiz, President  
Dr. Katherine Dockweiler, Vice President  
Tamara Hudson, Board Clerk  
Joe Arrascada  
Maggie Carlton  
Tate Else  
Tim Hughes  
Michael Keyes

**BOARD MEMBER ABSENT EXCUSED**

Rene Cantu  
Mike Walker

**DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT**

Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Ann Marie Dickson, Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement Division  
Megan Peterson, Deputy Superintendent of Student Investment Division  
Christy McGill, Deputy Superintendent of Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement  
Joseph Baggs, Administrative Assistant III  
Barbara Bidell, Office of Student and School Supports  
Katherine Broughton, Education Programs Professional  
Elizabeth Callahan, Office of the Superintendent  
Kathleen Galland-Collins, Education Programs Supervisor  
Felicia Gonzalez, Office of the Superintendent  
Michelle Trujillo, Office of Safe and Respectful Learning Environment

**LEGAL STAFF PRESENT**

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE**

Liz Barnum, Milken Educator Award Winner  
Jason Murray, Milken Educator Award Winner  
Brenda Pearson, Clark County Education Association  
Adam Searcy, Chief Operating Officer for Washoe County School District  
Grega Seidman, Opportunity 180  
Pam Teel, Nevada Association of School Superintendents  
Steph Vincent, Lyon County School District

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

Meeting called to order at 9:05 A.M. by President Felicia Ortiz. Quorum was established. President Ortiz led the Pledge of Allegiance and provided a land acknowledgement.

## 2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

- a. Pam Teel, Nevada Association of School Superintendents provided comment regarding agenda item 7.
- b. Dr. Barbara Pearson, Clark County Education Association provided comment regarding agenda item 9.
- c. Adam Searcy, Chief Operating Officer for Washoe County School District provided comment regarding agenda item 7.

*(Complete copies of the statements are available in Appendix A.)*

The following are public comments submitted via email. A complete copy of their statement is available in Appendix A.

- a) Rick Harris provided a public comment regarding school start times.
- b) Cindy Plummer provided a public comment regarding school start times.
- c) J Evans provided a public comment regarding school start times.
- d) Lisa Park provided a public comment regarding school start times.
- e) Johnathan Reynolds provided a public comment regarding school start times.

## 3. APPROVAL OF FLEXIBLE AGENDA

**Member Tamara Hudson moved to approve a flexible agenda. Member Katherine Dockweiler seconded. Motion passed.**

## 4. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

### • Board Member Updates

President Ortiz mentioned that Member Katie Coombs has resigned from her position and the Governor's Office is aware.

### • NSHE Updates

Member Arrascada stated that at the recent quarterly meeting several academic programs were approved. He mentioned that at the University of Nevada, Reno, a Master of Public Health, and a PhD. in epidemiology as well as a B.A. in social research analytics. He went on to state that at Nevada State University, has added a Master of Science in nursing leadership and at western Nevada college has added, an associate of applied science in mech-electronics technology.

He went on to say that Nevada System of Higher Education system level-staff are currently working on policy revisions based on bills passed during the legislative session. Some of those bills passed during the Legislative Session were AB 226 which exempts non-resident tuition students who successfully complete a high school equivalency assessment administered in Nevada. This means they will now have the opportunity to meet the Nevada System of Higher Education residency determination as students graduated from Nevada high schools.

AB 150 broadens the criteria for Native American fee waivers including the initial dual enrollment students and students who live on qualified tribal land located in the state of Nevada.

AB 279 broadens the purple-heart fee waiver to include a child of purple heart recipients who graduate from Nevada high schools. He also stated that the Nevada System of Higher Education received a \$2 million budget enhancement to cover teacher education courses during the summer quite like what was done several sessions ago for nursing courses. This will help NSHE institutions broaden educational course offerings during the summer thereby assisting students in moving through the teacher pipeline in an

expeditious way.

NSHE looks forward to the implementation of AB 428 which is the teacher pipeline, in addition to SB 291 which is the Nevada institute on teaching and education preparation. He mentioned AB 515 which incentivizes pathways to teaching grants.

Nevada System of Higher Education system level staff are continuing to work with representatives from the Nevada Department of Education on the academic officers from our four community colleges to update agreements on CTE college level articulation. This group has also determined how NSHE can support the Nevada Department of Education's Perkins state plan.

The National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships which is the NACEP works to ensure that college courses offered by high school teachers are as rigorous as those sponsored on the college campuses. He mentioned that the NACEP will be holding their 2023 national conference this October 22nd through 2024 in St. Louis, Missouri.

He went on to say that one of the reasons why this is so important throughout the system of higher education and through the Nevada Department of Education is because concurrent enrollment is imperative for the productivity and systemic way that the system of higher education and the Department of Education can maintain a strong relationship between each other. NSHE can maintain the college-level courses taught in high schools by faculty members of higher education and through the high school students and teachers.

President Ortiz stated that Nevada is the fastest growing state for dual enrollment. She mentioned that our students can take as many classes as possible in high school that allows them to have an associate degree before they even graduate from High School. She mentioned that dual enrollment is a huge benefit to the students and the community, since it increases the percentage of students enrolled in higher education, it also saves the community a lot of money.

## 5. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

- **Principal Advisory Cabinet (PAC) and Superintendent's Teacher Advisory Cabinet (STAC) Update**  
Jhone Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, reported that the Student Teacher Advisory Committee is the STAC, and the PAC is the Principals Advisory Committee, and she is excited to have their input. Superintendent Ebert went on to state that Kelly Lynn helps to bring everyone together and sets out goals. She stated that the PAC and the STAC asked a lot of questions, and could be involved in moving this legislation forward, because once it's passed. She also stated that she wanted to make sure that our educators, our support staff professionals, have input and support as we move forward in several different areas. She went on to say that school is starting in less than two weeks in our state.

## 6. CONSENT AGENDA

**Member Katherine Dockweiler moved to approve the consent agenda. Member Tim Hughes seconded. Motion passed.**

## 7. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING SCHOOL START TIME REGULATIONS *(For Information, Discussion, and Possible Action)*

Felicia Ortiz, President, Nevada State Board of Education, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the [Creating Regulations on School Start Times in Nevada](#).

President Ortiz stated that the Board had three different workshops, two in Las Vegas and one in Carson City, to receive any feedback, it has been about even support in favor and opposition. She went on to state that the biggest concern the public had after Covid is students' mental health. She gave a little bit of history

and review behind this item and why it's a point of discussion. She stated that during this meeting the Board will be taking a poll, and this will help to determine if and what language goes to LCB to evaluate and perfect.

President Ortiz asked the Board if they would be proceeding in changing regulations on high school start times. She reminded the Board that it is a yes or no question. The second question asked by President Ortiz was should the regulation include and be applicable to all school districts and charter schools? The Board members' poll resulted in a no. Member Hughes wanted to state that the Board has chatted about guard rails, that this poll is guidance and perimeters and knowing that local control is very important. President Ortiz stated that in a no. She went on to elaborate what the next section in the decision tree stated. President Ortiz opened this section for discussion.

Member Else stated that on a personal note, his parents from the rural areas are in favor of starting earlier. He also stated in the Eastern part of the State the elementary start times are dictated and when elementary students arrive at the bus stop, they arrive five minutes before it gets dark. He mentioned his local community is pushing for an early start time. President Ortiz had a follow-up question for Member Else, she asked if any analysis on how students are doing in that first period class have been done. Member Else mentioned that he hasn't done an analysis on it but that his students tend to do well even with his 7:35 a.m. start time.

President Ortiz summarized what has been discussed during the Boards workshops and public comments. Member Hughes stated that what the Board is grappling with is that there is a bit of discrepancy with what parents are saying and what districts are saying. The Board is trying to find how to move forward with both. The Board is looking to move incrementally if they move forward and not all in one year. He also stated that we should channel this and do bigger bolder things for students versus being concerned about a few minutes.

Member Keyes stated that he wanted to share what he's heard from other students from urban areas that their school starts at 7:00 a.m. and they go to a school that is about 40 minutes away. These students wake up at 5:00 a.m. and he stated that this can't be healthy for their physical and mental health. President Ortiz clarified that the Board is not looking to change start times all in one year. She mentioned that there is an opportunity to address a serious public health concern for the students, that can impact student outcomes, but that it would be up to the school districts to determine the how. She also stated that the Board will specify the guard rails. She gave a few examples.

Member Carlton wanted some clarification on the waivers and guard rails. She mentioned that she would be leaning towards yes with waivers. President Ortiz mentioned that the Board has been cognizant about not creating more work so each district will be receiving a waiver document with a description on what the district is doing. It would generate a report for the Board for each district on where they are in the waiver process.

Member Else asked if the Board had an idea on how many schools are starting at 7:00 a.m. and if it was only in Clark County. President Ortiz mentioned that most of the 7:00 a.m. start time schools are in Clark County with exception with a few schools around Clark County with a 7:38 a.m. start time. She stated that the Board is looking for districts to state why they're starting early and how they're scheduling classes to make sure that the most important classes are taken later in the day.

Member Else went on to say that this would be hard for some districts since some teachers teach six different preps a day. President Ortiz mentioned that this information would be important for the Board to know and take certain obstacles into consideration that need to be addressed.

Member Else asked if there is a set time to start school, was it 9:00 a.m., 8:30 a.m. President Ortiz mentioned that the Board has not discussed a certain set time. But that guard rails were discussed like schools not starting before 8:00 a.m. She clarified that the Board is looking to create a form for all school districts to fill out and that it wouldn't be a one size fit all. She also asked what the costs would be for changing the school start times.

Member Keyes mentioned that a survey should be sent to stakeholders. Member Else stated that usually when the Board hears from stakeholders is typically after the fact and mentioned that it would be good for stakeholders to be surveyed. Member Keyes also stated that if the survey was sent that equal representation was received. He stated that all public comments received today were from administrators and that students don't realize that they have a voice. Vice President Dockweiler wanted to see if the Board can add some metrics like school safety and climate aspects.

Member Carlton wanted clarification if this waiver document would be developed within the regulation or if language would be created for the regulation. President Ortiz mentioned that the Board would be creating a waiver but that the Board wanted to have a draft before sending it to the LCB. Member Hughes stated that he was concerned in adding another document to the districts. He mentioned that he feels if school districts check off boxes to receive a waiver will this change and help students. He stated that he would like to see school districts provide multiple options for families. Member Else also asked who would approve the waiver, the Board, and what happens if the waiver is not approved.

Superintendent Ebert provided the Board with a very rough idea as to what current start times are for each district. The list is organized from earliest start time to the latest, from 6:35 a.m. to 8:45 a.m. She also mentioned that this would be additional data for the members to review.

Member Dockweiler mentioned that the option to a later start time shouldn't be a zone variance or school variance to go somewhere else. She mentioned that magnet and technical school students are in a particular school for a reason. Member Hughes offered examples of options like starting school during second period and first period asynchronous, dual enrollment. He mentioned that giving parents options is important. Member Else stated that he can't speak for all districts, but he thinks that a lot of school districts currently offer families the choice to start later using options for students to start later.

President Ortiz mentioned the regulation will proceed with all school districts providing options for students that start later than 8:00 a.m. If they don't have options for students and families, then they would have to prove why. Member Hughes mentioned that he was thinking more like if your average time was at x time then you should be ready to provide additional options to start later.

Superintendent Ebert mentioned that the Board needs to get a framework. All this work would come back to an official public meeting and go through the regulation process. And she also clarified that the board does not have to decide all the solutions but just needs to construct the regulation.

President Ortiz mentioned that the regulation would be applicable to all school districts and charter schools. If x percentage of schools start at x time, then the Board needs to understand what options they're providing families or why they're not providing options, the Board would need to ensure that the districts are gaining stakeholder input. Member Hudson would like the survey to be reflective of the student population.

President Ortiz mentioned that considering the research that the start time wouldn't be earlier than 9:00 a.m. but rolling them out using a certain percentage of schools. She gave a few examples like using 20% the first school year then another 20% the next school year. Member Else mentioned that there are multiple schools

in different time zones. So, the Board would need to take this into account. President Ortiz asked the Board on how they felt on the gradual incrementation. Member Dockweiler stated that she sees pros and cons to both. President Ortiz mentioned that the waivers would apply to all school districts, there would be guard rails around making sure school districts are taking stakeholders input for consideration, and are working towards providing options that are later than 8:00 a.m. She also asked Superintendent Ebert if this is enough for legal to start drafting some language. Superintendent Ebert mentioned that there is enough information to start drafting a regulation. Member Carlton wanted clarification if there will be a waiver process. She would like to add guard rails in place for schools that protect individuals from participating and their districts won't allow them to participate. Member Hughes mentioned that if we could also receive input from SOT.

**President Ortiz stated that the Board will move to the next agenda item. She thanked all the Board members for their active participation.**

**8. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CLASS SIZE REDUCTION** *(For Information, Discussion, and Possible Action)*  
Jhone Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Nevada Department of Education, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding [Maximizing Class Size Reduction ROI](#).

Superintendent Ebert stated that per NRS 388.700(6) the Board submits a report to the Legislature by February 1 on each odd-numbered year. Schools that exceed their target pupil-teacher ratio must request a variance for the next quarter. She explained some of the variance reasons. She also stated that reports for the Class Size Reduction is due quarterly on November 1, February 1, May 1, and August 1. She mentioned what research says about our class sizes and where the Board is heading. She mentioned that the optimal class size for the youngest learner is between 13 – 18 students. Starting in Pre-K through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade the largest benefits via all the research are for minority students and students living in poverty. She provided some data for the school identification criteria. She provided the Board with a chart of the top 19 schools who are in over class size limits and would benefit from CSR Support and Intervention.

President Ortiz asked that she also like to see another piece of data, how many of these schools have long-term substitutes as staff and, how the increased funding from the past legislative season will impact this. She inquired if the school districts are looking into the same data and using the funds to hire more teachers.

Superintendent Ebert mentioned that prior to 2019 there was a specific amount set for reducing class size. Superintendents and school districts wanted more flexibility out of the categorical funds. She also mentioned that the funding for these categories didn't go away, they are incorporated into the plan, but the school districts need to allocate them accordingly. She mentioned that school districts are diligently working to finish contracts with unions, which will drive operational funds. She also said that the first report in November will determine if the funds are aligned with expenditure.

President Ortiz mentioned that with most collective bargaining agreements still in the negotiation stage, she believes it may be too soon to tell how the funds that were recently authorized in the Legislative Session will affect the board. She said that if the negotiation of a contract ended today, it will only affect the salaries of the educators they now employ. She also stated that it does not imply that the Board is aware of the amount of money that remains after paying new teachers to fill those posts in our most underprivileged or under resourced schools. And she stated that, considering the number of openings we have, we might not notice the effects of this until November. She also stated getting waivers from school districts would be sufficient, and if not, what would happen next?

Superintendent Ebert stated upon reviewing the statistics and discussing with the superintendents, she

believes that some of the discussions that have taken place could come up during the upcoming Legislative Session. She stated that the first one fits nicely with the procedure we now use with our EL student. Students may choose to transfer to another school in their district if an EL student is enrolled in those institutions. Therefore, this board may want to consider going forward to ensure that parents are informed and given the chance to attend a school that is grade-level capacity. She also mentioned that she will be giving David Gardner for the legal counsel for more guidance. Deputy Attorney General David Gardner mentioned that the section of NRS 388.700 allows the State Board to approve variances can be found there. He said that the school district would not be able to have the variance if they did not grant them, and they would have to follow the law. The school system would then have to decide whether to be out of compliance with the law or find a method to comply with it. He also said that there are a ton of additional ways to request variances; they essentially hand it off to the State Board. He asked if there are further question, or does it address President Ortiz's question. President Ortiz went on to say that back in 2019 when the Board was providing funding for class size reductions if the Board said no the lever was to pull back the money. But now if the Board says no to the variance, then schools will pull teachers from other schools. She asked for any other questions and comments from the Board.

Member Dockweiler has a request for the Board to see the 19 schools' data again in November so that the Board can compare the new numbers, either in November or December. Member Else mentioned that the school districts are running out of time, options, and are in a tough spot. President Ortiz asked if there has been any discussion in changing the teaching model, so that there is not just one teacher per classroom. Member Else mentioned that he's pretty sure that the districts are already doing it. He mentioned that he's done team teaching but that it's not ideal since there's typically about 42 students with two adults in the classroom. President Ortiz went on to say that she was thinking more in including other supportive adults that are not licensed teachers, like student teachers. She directed a question for Superintendent Ebert about long term subs and how this typically makes the data look worse. Superintendent Ebert mentioned that the list of schools is not in rank order of the larger class sizes. The list has larger class size and is not achieving to the level the Board would like to see. She went on to touch base on the long-term sub data, and the data will be provided this fall. Member Hughes went on to state that the Board should consider that there is nothing magical about a smaller classroom. But he mentioned that the research says that having a smaller classroom enables more individualized instruction, more time and attention for mental health and behavior challenges, and teacher workload. He also stated that are we focused on all or nothing. But he mentioned that there should be other ways and not just focused on reducing classroom sizing. He mentioned that he would like to focus on how the Board fixes the challenges that the students have. President Ortiz inquired if this a NAC or NRS and if there is an opportunity for the Board to change it or if it must be on the legislative level. She mentioned that she would prefer to receive reports on how the school districts are closing the outcome gaps. Deputy Attorney General David Gardner stated that NRS 388.700 mentions the pupil and teacher ratio. The Board might be able to change the language on the definitions of what the pupil to teacher ratio means. President Ortiz mentioned that she is more interested in potentially replacing the regulation, with something that addresses the student outcome. David Gardner mentioned that what President Ortiz is looking for is a statutory change.

**President Ortiz called for a break before returning to item number 9. She also mentioned that agenda item number 9 would be taken out of order, and they would start with agenda item 10 right after the break.**

- 9. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE 82ND LEGISLATIVE SESSION AND SPONSORSHIP OF CITY AND COUNTY CHARTER SCHOOLS** *(For Information and Discussion)*  
Katherine Broughton, Education Programs Professional and Greta Seidman, Director of Public Affairs, Opportunity 180, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the [82nd Legislative Session Overview and Update](#).

Dr. Broughton stated that she will provide an overview of the final outcomes in the 82<sup>nd</sup> Legislative session. She mentioned the objectives for the Board. She also provided the Board with information about the session.

Megan Peterson provided the Board with a funding overview. She started with the Pupil Centered Funding Plan and gave the board an update for FY24 and FY25. President Ortiz asked if she had a comparison from 2023. Megan Peterson mentioned that she has the total funding comparison. She went to tell the Board the amount and breakdown. She also gave the Board a breakdown of the State Special Education for FY24 and FY25. She also stated that there were employee raises and that travel enhancements were approved. She also stated that a retention incentive and longevity pay was reinstated. There was also an early childhood literacy readiness account of \$70 million per FY and \$2 million for a Teacher Advancement Scholarship. President Ortiz had a question regarding the Teacher Advancement Scholarship, if it's a separate award from the Teach Nevada Scholarship. She also wanted to know if the Board would have a part of criteria setting and distribution.

Katherine stated to the Board that she would be going over the major education topics throughout the session. She went on to say that a few hot topics were funding, student and school safety, teacher recruitment and retention, early childhood education, accountability, CTE and work-based learning, curriculum, standards, and instruction. She stated that the Governor sponsored six bills on behalf of the Department of Education, she told the board the assembly bills, the topic, and the final bill status.

President Ortiz wanted clarification on Senate Bill 9 and the education involvement accord/parent report card. Katherine stated that the education involvement accord was used by both NDE and the title one, so the same document was given twice. The parent report card was a document that the teacher would evaluate parents. It wasn't used but it was in NRS and decided to take this out. Superintendent Ebert clarified on the parent report card, it was used by educators and asked parents on how much time the parent was spending reading with your student or also how much time the parent would spend to reach back out to them.

Katherine continued and mentioned that several other Assembly Bills that were passed. She mentioned assembly Bill 73, which allows students to wear adornments of cultural or religious significance during their graduation. She continued to state additional Assembly Bills that were notable.

President Ortiz wanted to receive clarity on AB517 and what they're auditing. Katherine mentioned that they are auditing a return-on-investment analysis and getting outcomes. She continued with another notable bill AB428.

President Ortiz wanted clarification on AB428 and implementation. Katherine mentioned that the bill requires one staff member, but the bill doesn't clarify the implementation. Superintendent Ebert mentioned that this CTE pathway is different because everyone in the building is already licensed to teach. She also mentioned that CCSD has had great results and other districts are seeing great results. President Ortiz wanted to know if there is anything about praxis. Katherine clarified that there is information on praxis and having applicants receive an exemption from praxis one if they take a course that is authorized by NDE and receive an A or B. She continued to go over the other notable bills, SB80, SB425, and SB442.

Member Hughes had a question regarding AB241, are there monitoring provisions, will there be a report on how this is going or was that not included in the bill. Katherine clarified that having a report was not part of the bill but that the student does need approval from a counselor and their family if they wanted to opt out. Member Hughes had a follow-up question for Superintendent Ebert if NDE would be able to tack on how many families opted out of this track. Superintendent Ebert mentioned that the Board would be working with the districts and noted that the student needs the administrator to sign off.

Member Hughes had another question regarding the teaching licensure bill and wanted to know what was



next, more about incremental steps and competency-based work. Superintendent Ebert mentioned that she would like to add this topic to a future agenda item. She also mentioned that these conversations have been happening and they created a pathway where a licensed educator was able to take an assessment to license for math and that the Board is moving in that direction.

Member Dockweiler had a question regarding SB425, she mentioned that the Board will have one member appointed by the President. She wanted to know when this commission would first meet. Katherine clarified that they're working with many different authorities to schedule the meeting. President Ortiz mentioned that if any board members are interested in sitting in this commission to please let her know.

Dr. Broughton went on to clarify that AB330 and AB285 are for school safety. President Ortiz wanted clarification on the bill, if the bill defines on when it includes or excludes on when a student is removed from a classroom but not receiving instruction from a classroom. Dr. Broughton clarified that NRS already defines suspension and expulsion, this bill helps with guidelines for when a student is removed from the classroom but is not suspended/expulsed. President Ortiz mentioned that she would like to make sure that a grey area isn't being created where this can occur. Deputy Christy McGill mentioned that they're currently working on guidance to really look at those plans.

Currently there are re-enter and restorative plans and there are in-person options, all this information needs to be in the restorative plan and reviewed. President Ortiz mentioned that she feels it creates an opportunity for the district to code the student as being disciplined in school and not expelled or suspended. She would like to make sure there are some safety measurements so that this does not happen. Deputy Christy McGill mentioned that she noted her concern and will make sure the appeal process will capture her concern.

Member Else asked if this bill had changed and he wanted to know when the Board will be receiving guidance. Deputy McGill mentioned that yes, the bill did change, and they would be given guidance during the NASS meeting. Member Dockweiler asked if there is a process to know when a student is not receiving instruction. President Ortiz also wanted to know if there is a process for students and adults to report that there are students that are not receiving instruction so that there is accountability. Deputy McGill mentioned that this is something that they can investigate. Also, Dr. Broughton mentioned that the Boards concern is the temporary removal from the classroom and within the district plan they are required to submit their process, we can update the Board.

President Ortiz asked if the legislation had any language in ensure that staff receive training in trauma informed practices. Dr. Broughton mentioned that this bill doesn't include any language in this training specifically but AB285 does require all educators within the State to be trained in restorative practices. President Ortiz would like to know if the Board can receive data on how many educators had completed this training. Member Else mentioned that what training counts as suffice. Deputy McGill mentioned that the Board may want to consider the review panel of the discipline plans and if you would like to part of the team, this team puts together guidance on where the concerns are, and anyone is welcomed in this committee. She also mentioned that on the trauma plan they're planning on adding this.

Dr. Broughton went on to start AB400, which includes \$70 million dollars for early childhood literacy and readiness account, the opportunity for City/County to sponsor Charter Schools, \$7 million dollars for charter school transportation, expansion on the duties of the Commission on School Funding, \$2 million for the Nevada Teacher Advancement Scholarships, and expansion of Read by Grade 3 Provisions. President Ortiz asked to elaborate on the expansion of Read by Grade 3 Provisions. Dr. Broughton mentioned that it will review the specific things that need to be revised and the retention of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade students. President Ortiz mentioned that wasn't this provision just taken out. Dr. Broughton mentioned that it was removed in 2019. President Ortiz mentioned that the Board and NDE needs to look into this. Superintendent Ebert mentioned

that Early Childhood Literacy and Readiness is aligned with the Read by Grade 3, these students will be reviewed in 2028. Member Dockweiler mentioned that they might want to reconsider adding the establishment of the cut score for the retention.

Dr. Broughton mentioned that she will now go over specific things the Board needs to do. She started with the review of AB469, which included SB251, SB 282, and SB148. She also mentioned that the Board needs to do: AB65-which is work-based learning plan approval moves to the State Superintendent, AB399-which is The Subcommittee on Education Accountability of the Interim Finance Committee which can compel any member of the State Board of Education to attend any meeting, AB515- which provides authority to the Department of Education and SBE to award tuition assistance and stipends for the Incentivizing Pathways of Teaching Grant Program, and AB241 and AB274 these bill work with NDE to revise and clarify graduation requirements for diploma types in NAC, AB400- SBE must compile a report regarding the Teach Nevada Scholarship and Teacher Advancement Scholarship, AB428-must adopt regulations that prescribe the curriculum for the Teacher Academy College Pathway Program, and SB425-The President of the SBE will appoint a member of the SBE to the commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education. Greta Seidman mentioned that she will be giving the Board information on AB400. She provided the Board with some background information that included NRS 388A. She went on to go through the process and implementation. She also provided the Board with a timeline which included information on the proposed timeline and accelerated timeline.

President Ortiz thank Opportunity 180 for the help and the Board looks forward to seeing the results. She also asked if it is up to the Board or NDE to decide which timeline. Superintendent Ebert mentioned that she asked Opportunity 180 to be presented to the Board and she clarified that the Board doesn't have in the statute any responsibility for this work, but she wanted the Board to be aware, since the Board is responsible for all public schools in the State. She also stated that President Ortiz and herself can work offline and just at certain points to inform the Board. President Ortiz mentioned that her personal preference that she is curious to see the application and the process that's developed and every so often she would like to see how many cities and counties would apply. She also mentioned that when the Charter Schools are authorized who has authority over them the Charter School Authority or the Board. Superintendent Ebert clarified that once the cities and counties apply, they would be applying to be like SPCSA. She also mentioned that they would be authorizers for Charter Schools. President Ortiz wanted to receive more clarity on if they would need to have a board. Superintendent Ebert mentioned that once the city or county applies to be an authorizer then they would need to have a board, oversee federal grants, special education, ELL. Member Hughes mentioned that they're a lot of models since they're multiple pathways to get authorization. Member Else wanted to know who they receive funding from if they would receive funding from the Pupil Center Funding plan. Member Hudson asked if a certain city could take all the schools and not want be part of CCSD and take those schools. President Ortiz also asked if a municipality to authorize so many charters that the traditional public school go away. Superintendent Ebert mentioned that she believes that there is a cap of 7% and she also mentioned that questions would be asked during the application process. Member Else wanted clarity on what was the driving force behind this. Superintendent Ebert mentioned that there has been an increased interest.

## **10. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ON THE 2022-23 MILKEN EDUCATOR AWARD WINNERS AND PRESENTATION OF THE AWARDS** *(For Information and Discussion)*

Kathleen Galland-Collins, Education Programs Supervisor, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding [Nevada Milken Education Awards](#)

Kathleen mentioned that the Board will receive an overview of the MEA program. She also mentioned that the State of Nevada had three winners selected. She provided an overview of what recipients receive and who it targets. She also mentioned that the process is confidential, and the recipients receive the award at a

surprise school-wide event. She then went on to mention the goals of the program and criteria for the selection process. She also acknowledged all the three winners and read their bios provided by the Milken Foundation. She also showed the Board the announcement video of the recipients receiving their awards.

President Ortiz would like to hear from the recipients on what this award means to them. Recipient Jason Murray went on to say that he was shocked but that he puts kids first and the needs of students first. He mentioned that for him every day going to school is a joy. Recipient Liz Barnum mentioned that it was a complete honor, and she hopes that the three recipients can work together and collaborate.

Member Arrascada asked how many Milken award recipients there are in the entire country. Recipient Jason Murray mentioned that there are 34. He also mentioned that people who are earning this award all have one thing in common, they're putting kids first. Superintendent Ebert mentioned that in Nevada there was a pause where the State of Nevada didn't participate. But when the State participated again the State of Nevada had two winners. She also thanked everyone who participated and helped to arrange this process. President Ortiz thanked all the award recipients. She also stated that a lunch break would happen before started agenda item 9.

#### **11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS** (*Information/Discussion*)

- Update on Statewide Plan for the Improvement of Pupils
- Licensure and competency-based work
- Transportation Needs, workshop
- Creating a Student Advisory Board
- Presentation from NSHE leadership from the institutional research office, data dashboard

#### **12. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND RECURRING ITEMS FOR THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION** (*For Information, Discussion, and Possible Action*)

**President Ortiz tabled this for a future meeting.**

#### **13. PUBLIC COMMENT #2**

None

#### **14. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting was adjourned at 3:05 P.M.

**APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS GIVEN DURING PUBLIC COMMENT**

1. Pam Teel, Nevada Association of School Superintendents provided comment regarding agenda item 7.
2. Dr. Barbara Pearson, Clark County Education Association provided comment regarding agenda item 9.
3. Adam Searcy, Chief Operating Officer for Washoe County School District provided comment regarding agenda item 7.
4. Rick Harris provided a public comment via email regarding school start times.
5. Cindy Plummer provided a public comment via email regarding school start times.
6. J Evans provided a public comment via email regarding school start times.
7. Lisa Park provided a public comment via email regarding school start times.
8. Johnathan Reynolds provided a public via email comment regarding school start times.

## **APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS GIVEN DURING PUBLIC COMMENT**

### **APPENDIX A, ITEM 1: PAM TEEL**

Pam Teel, Superintendent Lyon County School District. I am representing the Nevada association of superintendents. The Nevada association of school superintendents wishes to express our deep concern with the development of statewide regulations concerning school start times. While we acknowledge the importance of student sleep and wellness research, we firmly believe that decisions regarding school start times should lie within the purview of local districts considering their unique needs and the communities they serve. Numerous operational constraints affect the time at which schools start in the morning including the length of the instructional day, the availability of transportation, collective bargaining agreements, zone sizes extra-curricular and athletics scheduling.

Without the additional funds to support the operational challenges mandated changes to school start times will lead to inefficiencies. Moreover, altering school start times has a significant ripple effect on the entire community disrupting morning routines for students and parents, equitable access to before and after school programming, school safety concerns during travel times and students' ability to participate in after school employment. Stakeholders especially families and community members must be actively involved in these discussions which must occur prior to any action taken by the board to ensure comprehensive input and a better understanding of the implications associated with this drastic decision.

To achieve this, we urgently intentionalism efforts to engage diverse voices throughout the state on this issue. Furthermore, there is a legitimate question as to whether the state board has the authority to regulate school start times. The broad interpretation of NRS 385.075 and 385.080 appears to overlook the legislative intent of granting local school districts control over public education as explicitly stated in NRS 385.005. The legislature re-affirms its intent that public education in the state of Nevada is essentially a matter for local control. The provisions in this title are intended to reserve to the boots of local school districts within the state such rights and powers as are necessary to maintain control of the education of the children within their respective districts. These rights and powers may only be limited by other specific provisions of the law. Given Nevada's diverse cultural and geographical landscape, decisions regarding school start times should be grounded in the law, local realities and available resources. We are grateful for the opportunity to engage with the state board in this matter and sincerely hope that school start times remain under the discretion of local school districts guided by the information and judgments.

### **APPENDIX A, ITEM 2: DR. BRENDA PEARSON**

Good morning president Ortiz and members of this committee. My name's Dr. Barbara Pearson and I'm representing the Clark County education association. Agenda item number nine today we're going to be hearing about and I just wanted you to know that the role that the role that the CCSA plays on these bills. The first one first and foremost is AB 428 which is the teacher college pathway academy. You all know that the situation right now has approximately 1200 vacancies as we enter the 2023-2024 school year. That means about 35,000 students won't be having a teacher when they enter school on the first day.

The teacher pipeline bill really creates a pipeline that has not been created otherwise in Nevada. It links the high school to NSHE institutions as well as to employment in CCSD or other school districts within the state. Specifically, students are given notice in high school about this program. They're offered it's offered in every high school in Clark County and offered outside of Clark County as well and so students are able to enroll in CTE programs, they're able to get dual enrollment credit, go through an internship process and then are offered an opportunity to enroll automatically in NSHE institutions with reimbursement towards education institutions and then with employment within CCSD.

The other bill I'd like to speak about is SB 282 which strengthens our SOT's and the SOT work in front of you guys over the last year. Really this strengthens the opportunity for us to give their voting authority specifically around the selection of new principals but most importantly it puts guardrails in place around carry-over dollars requiring all principals to spend 95% of all carry-over dollars in 24 months of that being accrued. The last of

the behavior bills is AB 285 and 330 these work in concert and we believe that safety should be important for all students at all schools. So, these bills in concert offer zero tolerance for violent behavior including possession of deadly weapons and empowering educators to remove violent and disruptive students in the classroom. If you have any additional questions, I'm here for you, but thank you very much for all of your work and we look forward to working with you moving forward.

**APPENDIX A, ITEM 3: ADAM SEARCY**

Thank you. Good morning. My name's Adam Searcy. I'm the chief operating officer for Washoe County School District. I'm submitting this comment on behalf of the district specifically regarding item seven today's consideration of mandating start times for high schools. The Washoe County School District would like to acknowledge the public comment presented on behalf of the association of superintendents and there's multiple support for that position, that start times should remain the sole discretion of each district. We also wanted to specifically highlight Washoe County School District's work, really from late 2019 to 2021 regarding this very topic. We actually appreciate and commend the state board's advocacy and efforts to recognize the importance and efficiencies, the issues that this causes our adolescents and to that end elevating it as an important public health issue, the school board during that time that I mentioned with the public in Washoe County, with the board of trustees and very nearly came to a conclusion that would result in bell time changes.

Ultimately, however factoring in budget impacts favoring or budget-neutral options, the degree of change was too much for the district to accommodate at that time. The change in bell schedules is costly and it's a time-consuming endeavor to implement. This includes considerable staffing increases for transportation, bus drivers. The Washoe County School District scenario was estimated to be an impact of \$2 million annually. The district of course has struggled with underfunding for years and particularly with the transportation department with regards to bus driver staffing levels. The Washoe County School District has made some choices financial choices to help with that staffing shortage.

We've been able to restore our service levels but still working very hard to maintain the status quo. So, with that said I want to reiterate how much we appreciate the rigorous discussion on this important topic. However we would also like to state that we feel that the costs and complexity in these communities really do believe the need for these issues to remain the sole discretion of each individual district. So, with that, I'd like to state that we urge the State Board of Education to allow each district to continue to determine start times that are best suited for their communities. Thank you very much for your time.

**APPENDIX A, ITEM 4: RICK HARRIS**

Dear President Ortiz and Members of the State Board of Education:

The Nevada Association of School Boards strongly believes school start times should be a local school district decision and does not support the development of state-wide regulations concerning school start times.

Sincerely,

Rick Harris

Executive Director

**APPENDIX A, ITEM 5: CINDY PLUMMER**

From: Cindy Plummer, Pershing County

Reference: School Start Times

I would like to go on record in opposition to you dictating School Start Times for districts across Nevada.

Each county is unique in their needs for their own students. A blanket policy for all is not appropriate and, in my opinion, an overreach of your responsibility for ALL students in Nevada.

Cindy Plummet, PCSD School Trustee

**APPENDIX A, ITEM 6: J EVANS**

Good afternoon, I noticed on your agenda, you have for discussion and possible action school start times.

It is my opinion this agenda item is yet another absurd and significant overreach by the Nevada State Board of Education.

This agenda item amounts to nothing more than an attempt to strip local school boards of their already limited local control. I highly doubt your board has conducted any meaningful studies into your attempted overreaching actions. Have you bothered to talk to local superintendents or school boards and get their thoughts on this item, I highly doubt it. The board of education has become nothing more than a political arm of the far right with your overreach and lack of support for local school boards and local control. Your actions are not about children and their education but about the last person who was in your ear at the time.

It's about time the board of education got back to what's it supposed to be doing, like supporting us instead of piling on more worthless restrictions and regulations. You all should really follow the existing law and existing legislative intent instead of trying to circumvent it.

As a current local board member, this agenda item is ridiculous and does nothing to support the local need and unique situations each district faces moreover it harms local school districts and restricts our ability to make the best decisions for our students and staff, please let us make our own damn decisions!!

Thank you.

**APPENDIX A, ITEM 7: LISA PARK**

Honorable Board of Education I would like to offer the following public comment in regard to State Board of Education on July 26th regarding agenda item seven, school start time regulations.

Constituents from each county in the state of Nevada elect their own school board trustees whose policies specifically based on their own needs. The residents of Pershing County trust their elected officials to make the best decisions for our students. Please allow local school district officials to continue to use their best judgment when it comes to the calendar and scheduling issues. This is not a matter the State Board of Education needs to manage. Thank you for your time and consideration.

**APPENDIX A, ITEM 8: JONATHAN REYNOLDS**

Hello,

My name is Jonathan Reynolds, and I am Principal of Pershing County High School.

I am writing this to urge our SBOE members to exercise caution when creating any regulatory language regarding school start times. It is my utmost belief that each district must meet the unique needs of their schools and communities. Local control and decisions of each district must be maintained in order to best serve our diverse and unique communities. A one-size-fits-all approach regarding start times will disenfranchise our students in all of our schools.

Thank you.

Jonathan Reynolds, Lovelock Nevada.