

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
JUNE 6, 2019  
9:00 A.M.**

**Meeting Locations:**

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

**SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
(Video Conferenced)**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

**In Las Vegas**

Elaine Wynn  
Mark Newburn  
Robert Blakely  
Felicia Ortiz  
Katherine Dockweiler  
Tamara Hudson

**In Carson City**

David Carter  
Dawn Miller

**DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:**

**In Carson City**

Dave Brancamp, Director, Standards and Instructional Support  
Randi Hunewill, Education Programs Supervisor  
Chris Thomas, Education Programs Professional  
Megan Hanke, Management Analyst  
Andre DeLeon, Education Programs Professional

**In Las Vegas**

Jason Dietrich, Director, Educator Licensure  
Kim Bennett, Administrative Assistant  
Shawn Osborn, It  
Alberto Quintero, Education Programs Provider  
Emily Champlin, Early Learning  
Mia Pace, Education Programs Professional  
Felicia Gonzales, Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement

**LEGAL STAFF PRESENT**

**In Las Vegas**

David Gardner, Deputy Attorney General

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:**

**In Carson City:**

Kirsten Gleissner, NWRPRP  
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents  
Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District  
Katrina Midgley, Sierra Nevada College

**In Las Vegas:**

Maria Roberts, University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Monte Bay, National University  
Doris Watson, University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Tracy Spies, University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Allison Warren, LEE  
Nathan Trenholm, Data Insight  
Kenneth Retzl, Guinn Center  
Robert Askey, Touro University  
Kristin DellaSala, University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Bill Garis, CCASAPE  
Don Sofier, Nevada Action for School Options  
Justin White, Data Insight  
Meredith Smith, Nevada Succeeds  
Zane Grey, Sierra Nevada College  
Maryann Abdelhamid, Opportunity 180  
Brenda Pearson, Clark County Education Association  
Cynthia Romero

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 9:01 a.m. with attendance as reflected above.

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment

**Approval of Flexible Agenda**

**Member Blakely moved to approve a flexible agenda. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**President's Report**

President Wynn welcomed the new student representative, Rui Ya Wang, who was recently appointed by Governor Sisolak. She is a high school student attending West Career and Technology Academy under the Biomedical Sciences program, and is part of the National Honor Society. She plans to major in political science.

President Wynn welcomed recent new board member Katie Dockweiler as well as all in attendance to the NDE's new building location in Las Vegas.

**Superintendent's Report**

Superintendent Ebert acknowledged the staff in Las Vegas who worked late into the night to ensure the new NDE building and boardroom were ready for the meeting today.

Introductions were made for the two new Deputy Superintendents recently appointed by superintendent Ebert. Felicia Gonzales serves as the Deputy Superintendent of Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement in Las Vegas. Previously, Ms. Gonzales served as a school associate superintendent for CCSD and prior to that opened the Southwest Career and Technical Academy as the principal in 2009.

Heidi Haartz serves as the Deputy Superintendent for Business Support Services. Previously she worked for the Nevada State Health Division and the Fiscal Analysis Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau. Recently she served in various roles at the Nevada System of Higher Education including Budget Analysis and Interim Budget Director.

Jonathan Moore, Deputy Superintendent for Support Services was recognized for his leadership as the Interim Superintendent prior Ms. Ebert's appointment, and also for his work during the legislative session.

Superintendent Ebert provided an overview of the following education bills passed during the 2019 Legislative Session:

Early Learning and Pre-K –There is no longer federal funding as in the past and funding previously provided by the State has increased three fold. Pre-K grants are no longer competitive, they have been moved to an allocational component. There are approximately 3,000 seats available for early learners, and the qualifications for those seats is at 200 percent of the poverty level. Currently, Nevada is only serving 11 percent of students that are eligible.

A.B. 289 – Read by Grade 3, this bill repeals the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade retention program. Research across the nation showed that retention was not as successful as originally thought. Students will now receive additional supports if needed as they move forward in 4<sup>th</sup> grade and will also receive them in 5<sup>th</sup> grade if necessary.

S.B. 313 – Computer Literacy and Science, this bill specifies coursework and preparation required for educators to obtain an endorsement to teach in this field. The NDE will compile resources and professional development and make them available through the internet by July 2022.

S.B. 314 – Financial Literacy creates a statewide Financial Literacy Advisory Council and the Financial Literacy state seal so students can add that to their diploma. There will be a financial literacy month and coursework requirements for educators seeking to obtain an endorsement to teach financial literacy. It also creates a mechanism to obtain a scholarship to offset the costs of the program of study.

A.B. 235 – Revises provisions related to the Nevada Advisory Commission on Mentoring. An appropriation for the Commission to be part of a national affiliate and to award grants to entities to create mentorship programs was added to the bill.

S.B. 204 – Enhances the Suicide Prevention Programs for middle and high school.

S.B. 89 – Describes school improvement plans, accountably and school safety improvement plans. The bill requires the principal of each school, in consultation with the employees of the school, to prepare a plan to improve the achievement of pupils enrolled in the school. It put into law the Safe Voice Program which has been extremely successful, and revises provisions related to the plan used by schools in responding to a crisis, an emergency or a suicide.

A.B. 219 – Revises provisions governing the reporting information about achievement for English Learners. The bill contains reporting requirements that add to what was previously reported including a requirement to provide assessments in Spanish and alternate languages.

S.B. 467 – Extends Zoom and Victory school programs through the next biennium; districts were allocated the funds through S.B 555. There was \$900,000 allocated to the NDE for software to monitor school districts and communication with school improvement plans.

A.B. 78 – Related to the Achievement School District (ASD), it transfers the current four schools in operation to the Charter Authority. They will still operate as ASD with their current regulations and they have a full year to transition and make application to come under the Charter Authority. If they do not make that application or are not accepted then they will no longer exist. It also asks the State Board of Education to appoint two members to the Charter Authority Board.

Member Ortiz inquired about oversight the NDE retains to evaluate and hold traditional public schools accountable for chronic under performance. Superintendent Ebert responded that she would like to bring a presentation to the Board that outlines moving forward. Upon further questions from member Ortiz, superintendent Ebert said that after she has an opportunity to speak with staff she will bring the presentation to the Board.

S.B. 545 – The marijuana excise tax was previously designated for education, and now it is specifically an excise tax that goes directly to the Distributive State Account.

S. B. 555 - The bill increased statewide per pupil average spending by nearly \$1,000, or an almost 10 percent increase. It is the largest budget increase for public education in Nevada. It took into account inflation, which has not been taken into account for a very long time. For fiscal year 2019-2020 the estimated statewide average for all students, across the state in all funds, including items such as Zoom, Victory and other resources, is approximately \$10,227 per pupil. In fiscal 2020-2021 the estimated state average is \$10,319 per pupil. For the biennium the estimated statewide average is \$10,273 per pupil. That is not specifically for identifying each and every school district.

Member Ortiz asked superintendent Ebert to repeat the budget increase. Superintendent Ebert responded it increased by almost \$1,000 or almost 10 percent by the end of the biennium. Member Ortiz asked if it is possible to get a side-by-side comparison of 2018-19 and 2019-20 to understand which budget items were increased. Superintendent Ebert agreed adding these bills just passed less than a week ago, and there has not been an opportunity to generate these tables yet. There has not been transparency in the past about where the various funding sources are from and how they come into play, and it will be important to discuss these numbers moving forward.

Member Ortiz acknowledged that is where her confusion lies, if it cannot be clearly articulated, then how is it known there is \$1,000 more per pupil. If that were the case with an over funding increase of \$1,000 per pupil, that would add up to \$470 million. She said she does not believe the entire state budget increased by \$470 million.

Superintendent Ebert responded she would provide the different funding sources that make up that number at a future meeting.

President Wynn suggested that become an item at the next board meeting with a presentation of the funding formula and an explanation of the braided funding. She noted this is a difficult and technically complex new step in the funding process. The NDE needs some time to review all the issues for a full understanding of them. This is the most complex change that has occurred since 1967 and although it is easy to describe things by percentages and numbers, it is clear we do not understand what that means.

Member Ortiz clarified the bill she is referencing is S.B. 555, the current funding formula for the next biennium.

President Wynn responded there are numbers floating out there for various purposes and we are trying to understand all of it. We need to back up and start from square one about how to move forward and how it will impact funding distribution in a way that makes sense to all of us.

S.B. 551 - This bill includes a component that allows school districts to add a quarter tax if they choose. It also created a large portion of flexible funds when it was first originated. Categoricals in the bill such as Pre-K, Zoom and Victory were discussed earlier. At the end all of that money was put into a block grant that will be allocated directly to the school districts. The dollar figures are available in the bill.

A.B. 309 - The bill created various areas and flexibilities for school districts. It also created a block grant that includes programs such as Nevada Ready 21 and the Great Teaching and Leading Fund (GTLF).

Member Newburn asked if Item 7 regarding the GTLF will be heard today as it appears A.B. 309 affects the GTLF in a way that is not completely clear. Superintendent Ebert said that will be updated during Item 7.

S.B. 543 - This is the funding formula bill. The intent was to advance the equity for school districts in a way that has equity and educational opportunities for all students in Nevada. It replaces the methodology just discussed, formally known as the Nevada Plan. It now becomes a pupil centered funding plan. It has also created a 2-year time period to run the models side-by-side. The weights have not been decided on at this point in time, but they will come to the State Board of Education to be considered in a regulation. The

bill creates the Commission on School Funding establishing its duties and provisions relating to reports of expenditures by public schools and directs certain revenues to be deposited in the State Education Fund. Superintendent Ebert stated this is just the beginning, and that the NDE will be working diligently during the next Legislative Session to ensure it is implemented correctly.

Member Newburn said that he tried to closely follow this bill but it was almost impossible to follow where the dollars were going and where they were coming from, which is a characteristic of The Nevada Plan. He suggested the funding plan is of enough interest that the Board may want a brief update at every meeting. He noted that the loss of the Achievement School District (ASD), which was similar to a foster care system for schools, whether people agreed with it or not, was addressing the perennially failing schools. It was day and night between the beginning of the ASD and after the ASD started. Real efforts to try and turn these schools around was apparent. The concern is that CCSD could go back to where it was before there was no consequence for having schools fail, basically for generations.

Member Ortiz asked to clarify whether the funding formula weights will be decided by the Commission or the NDE. Superintendent Ebert confirmed the NDE will decide the weights. Member Ortiz informed that S.B. 500 from 2013 Legislative Session created a K-12 Task Force on education that had determined what those weights should be. She inquired whether that work was going to be re-done.

Superintendent Ebert responded the weights are not starting over from scratch, and that currently there are weights for differently-abled students and weights for gifted and talented students. She recognized there has been a huge shift and students are different today than they were 52 years ago and what is needed to support those students may also be different.

Member Ortiz said if she remembers correctly, S.B. 500 from 2013, stated that the weights must be implemented by 2021. She inquired whether S.B. 543 would supersede that or would it work in parallel?

Deputy Attorney David Gardner referenced S.B. 500 from the 2013 Session and said he did not see that implementation is required by 2021. Member Ortiz responded that a report from the K-12 Task Force submitted in 2014 specified that beginning in fiscal 2018 a phasing of the total calculated funding for EL, At Risk, SPED and GATE and inclusive of all new funding will increase over a 4-year period; 10 percent in 2018, 30 percent in 2019, 60 percent in 2020 and 100 percent in 2021. Categorical funds were being excluded from collective bargaining and it accepts the weights 2.0 per SPED. She said she does not want to re-do the weights if it is not required.

Member Newburn suggested including this discussion about the new funding formula under Future Agenda Items. President Wynn stated that in all fairness there are a lot of moving pieces to this. The NDE has a relatively new superintendent who has relatively new department staff and the 2019 Legislative Session just barely ended with many new directives and laws to put in regulations. The Commission on School funding was created for technical and financial advice, not policy. Understanding the layers of approval and submission to get to the final place and appreciate that it is a gargantuan assignment. She suggested that if all of the information cannot be provided at the next meeting to divide it into steps because there are many elements that go into this transition.

Member Blakely said he advocated for a new plan because The Nevada Plan has been in effect since he was in high school, a long time ago. He expressed enthusiasm over the new funding plan adding it has created a new challenge for the Board. One of the big problems with the current funding program is that there was never clarity on how the money was actually funded or spent. Now transparency is being added. This is part of making the education system in Nevada better and more transparent in the way money is spent. It appears there is more money to spend, whether it be 10 percent or more. A lot of good things have happened out of the legislative session and now the Board has some new responsibilities.

Member Hudson concurred and said she was pleased with the legislative session.

Member Carter said California went through a re-organization statewide, and one major feature of that change was implementing a statewide chart-of-accounts. It made it easier to evaluate what each district was spending, where and how they were spending their money, and whether they were doing it

appropriately. It becomes an important part of transparency in having a statewide program like that, and he is looking forward to the change.

President Wynn noted that superintendent Ebert has heard the feedback from the Board, and the Board will work cooperatively with her and the NDE on a timeframe that is comfortable to supply updates and information moving forward. In terms of prioritization, she reminded that RBG3 adjustments are something they want to monitor and watch over. To member Newburn's point, the focus becomes a bit more distended, which is of concern.

Superintendent Ebert said she appreciates the questions, input and direction this morning. The work will be researched, components of other bills will be taken into account, and then more information will be provided at the next meeting.

Superintendent Ebert said that prior to her arriving at the NDE the Board had discussed having a training about how to move forward not only for the State Board but other boards across the state. She has committed to that work and would like to bring that information in the near future. Recently she spoke with Nancy Brune from the Guinn Center who offered some help with that work.

### **Approval of Consent Agenda**

- a. Possible Approval of Instructional Material from Washoe County School District
  - English Language Arts, Instructional Materials Benchmark Education Co., Grades K-1
- b. Possible Approval Dual Credit Request from Nevada Connections Academy
- c. Possible Approval of re-licensing for one Nevada private school for a four-year period.
  - Omar Haikal Islamic Academy, Clark CountyPossible Approval of renewal licensing for one Nevada private school for a two-year period.
  - Lake Tahoe School, Washoe County
- d. Possible Approval of Career and Technical Education (CTE) standards for Fire Science-revised.
- e. Possible Approval of Minutes
  - May 2, 2019 Regular Meeting

**Member Newburn moved to approve the consent agenda. Member Blakely seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the FY20 and FY21 Allocation Recommendations for the Great Teaching and Leading Fund. Board members will hear recommendations for awards based on FY20/FY21 priorities previously identified by the Board. Possible action may include awarding of funds.**

President Wynn explained that after this agenda was created and posted, new activity and information came forward which has impacted this item and it will be deferred because it cannot be acted on today.

Superintendent Ebert clarified that after Item 7 was added to the agenda, A.B. 309 which created block grant funds for school districts, was heard at the Legislative Session. Included in that block grant was specifically the GTLF fund.

This means that school districts may still take advantage and use the funding within the block grant to continue projects they had in the past and move forward in other areas. However, the decision is up to the school districts. Moving forward over the next few months will show how the districts are making the determination about using the funds, and they will advise the Board if they are going to use the funds toward this program. Kathleen Galland-Collins will continue her work with the districts as they move forward. This program is at a point where the funds are allocational and it will be determined by the school districts as to whether they would like to proceed with this activity.

President Wynn commented that this item covers one of the recommendations from the Governor's Blue Ribbon Commission from years ago, prior to Governor Sandoval's term, and it was deemed important enough to be a standalone item. She suggested revisiting the rationale about why it was created to ensure it does not get overlooked in future activity and the importance of creating it is lost.

Member Ortiz echoed her thoughts stating that the GTLF came out of the 2015 Legislative Session in response to the teacher shortage, which was a recommendation from the Sage Commission. There is a shortage of teachers across the nation, and Nevada has been hit hard because of its growth. The GTLF was intended to recruit, retain and develop high quality educators. Reading the language with feedback from Deputy Attorney Gardner suggests there is language in this bill that allows school districts to use this block grant for whatever they please. Her concern is that organizations such as the RPDPs, UNLV, and the Public Education Fund that are receiving some of these dollars may lose programs.

Member Newburn said this feels like the death of the GTLF. Except for one or two, none of these dollars are going to flow through the districts and end up back in these places. It sounds like the death of the program as it currently exists.

Superintendent Ebert agreed with the comments. She stated the NDE will be working with the districts moving forward. This is just one of the areas; Nevada 21 is also part of the block grant. As the districts make determinations moving forward, the NDE will support them and report back to the Board as decisions are made.

**Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding Teach Nevada Scholarships (TNVS). The Board will hear a brief presentation on the successes of the Teach Nevada Scholarship program, reconciliation for the FY16-19, current available funds, obligated funds, and requests for FY20 scholarships. Possible action may include awarding scholarships to various state-approved traditional and/or alternative route to licensure teacher preparation programs.**

Jeff Briske, Education Program Professional, conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation regarding the Teach Nevada Scholarships (TSNV). The successes, available and obligated funds were reviewed along with the requests for scholarships.

Member Newburn commented that there was a discussion last year during this item about the need to address Career and Technical teachers as a goal under ESSA. Now, it is under the State Improvement Plan (STIP) to increase the number of CTE graduates. Also both diplomas, the new College and Career Advanced Diploma and the Standard Diploma were changed. He does not want this to get lost and requested the discussion continues. Next year he is looking forward to discussing an overall strategy to support hiring more CTE teachers, and is this the item for that discussion.

Deputy Attorney Gardner said he does not see how the discussion would fit into this item with the two new requirements. It is a requirement to follow students who will be applying, but they must be receiving an endorsement to teach English as a second language, or an endorsement to teach special education. These endorsement are a requirement going forward.

Member Ortiz noted there is no language in the bill that states the Board can guide the NDE as to where the priorities lie for these scholarships, or the schools. Deputy Attorney Gardner explained that A.B. 219, and also NRS 391a.580 subsection 3, specifies that the Board may prioritize the award of grants from the account. The Board has some authority to prioritize it for veterans or spouses of veterans, people that intend to teach in public schools with the highest shortage of teachers, economically disadvantaged, or belonging to a racial or ethnic minority group eligible to teach in the subject area for which there is a shortage of teachers, including science, technology, engineering, mathematics, special education or English as a second language. The Board has the ability to prioritize this however it is still a requirement they must get one of those endorsements.

President Wynn said the endorsements are a way of enforcement. The other is more difficult to monitor. The suggestion that we can prioritize is an indication of where we like it to go. There is no way to enforce

or ensure other than through the goodwill of the NDE. The Board is getting reports on some of the other indicators that have been stressed as priorities, but we are not mandating. How does that get addressed.

Member Ortiz asked if it is possible to request the providers have a higher weight for that category in the application process. Jason Dietrich, Director, Educator Licensure, responded that the priority set by the Board can be brought to the institutions that are granting these scholarships as a set priority. He cautioned that it is not the only priority to ensure as many scholarships as possible are awarded.

Member Blakely asked to look at the slide that shows distribution of funds again. He is excited about all the people, institutions and distribution that exists. He suggested for a future year to consider Nevada State College because they specifically develop teachers. Mr. Briske confirmed that Nevada State College is a partner in this program, they just did not apply for Cohort 20. They have applied for 18 scholarships that were granted, and they have one completer already.

**Member Blakely moved to approve not more than 200 Teach Nevada Scholarships per the Cohort 20 table. It is pending IFC Work Program approval moving funds between categories and final budget closing and funding for the biennium. Member Ortiz seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Presentation from Data Insight Partners on the State of Education in Nevada – Beyond Sensationalism. The presentation will include a review of Nevada’s national Educational rankings and the underlying measurements including a review of long-term educational attainment.**

Superintendent Ebert explained this presentation was requested by member Ortiz at the May 2, 2019 Board meeting.

Nathan Trenholm, Founding Partner, Data Insight Partners conducted a PowerPoint presentation titled Nevada Education, Beyond the Sensationalism. Mr. Trenholm was the former director of Research and Accountability for the CCSD. He explained the title of the presentation adding that often education information is presented in Nevada in the moment with sensational headlines. The intent today is to take a step back and ask what is really going on with education in Nevada and provide some context.

He listed a few of the sensational headlines:

- More stagnant test scores for Clark County students on national exams. The latest batch of education rankings is out.
- Nevada remains mired near the bottom, leaving state and local officials to search for any semblance of headway.
- Nevada ranks last in the US for education, but officials upbeat.
- Nevada schools continue to rate poorly, but officials are not standing still.

Mr. Trenholm explained that to understand Nevada’s rank as a state, we need to better understand how that ranking happens. It is a ranking that nationally happens from the Annie E. Casey Foundation; they rank states in areas such as health, economic well-being, and education. The 2018 Kids Count Data Book was their most recent education ranking of states in education. They ranked Nevada 49<sup>th</sup> in education. He provided an explanation of the four components, equally weighted, used that go into the ranking.

- NAEP 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading Proficiency
- NAEP 8<sup>th</sup> grade math Proficiency
- On time Graduation rates
- 3- and 4-year-old prekindergarten enrollment

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is the gold standard of student assessments, and the US Department of Education has been using this assessment since 1969. They can look back over 20 years to see consistently reported data by states.

He reviewed and discussed the data that has been reported for Nevada and how it compares to other states throughout the country for those approximately 20 years.



Details were provided about:

- Free and Reduced Lunch eligible students and economic demographics
- NAEP 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading Proficiency
- NAEP 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Math Proficiency

Mr. Trenholm informed that Nevada's ranking for reading proficiency from 2007-2017 using adjusted NAEP scores has consistently been going up and is the highest it has ever been. The same story emerges when looking at 8<sup>th</sup> grade math. There is another piece of context to take into consideration when looking at Nevada's results. In Nevada, CCSD makes up 67 percent of K-12 enrollment. When comparing Nevada's results, it is like comparing the large urban school district to other states instead of a large urban school district to another large urban school district. Now, for the first time ever CCSD reported results from the NAEP so it can be compared to another urban school district.

**When** looking at the larger urban school districts who report results on the NAEP the CCSD is significantly out performing 12 of the 26 districts that participated in 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading. The same story is true for 8<sup>th</sup> grade math. Nevada is significantly out-performing Los Angeles, Milwaukee, Cleveland, Washington D.C., Atlanta, Dallas and the results are in line with Chicago, Miami, and New York. A different picture emerges when the results are put into a different context. Nevada has made huge progress. When looking at the overall ranking it looks like Nevada has not made any progress compared to the national average.

Mr. Trenholm provided context about on time graduation rates. Graduation rates were used from 2016 when Nevada's graduation rate was 10 points lower than it is now. From 2011 to 2018 the graduation rate went from 62 percent to 83 percent, up 21 points in just 7 years. The question becomes, is Nevada inflating graduation rates. A report put out in 2017 from the College Board stated that Nevada showed the largest 5-year and 3-year increases in the percentage of public high school graduates earning a 3 or higher on an Advanced Placement (AP) exam. Nevada has the fastest growing AP pass rates in the country. From 2011 to 2017 the percent of graduates passing the AP exam went from 16 percent to over 24 percent, or about 1 in 4 graduates are now passing an AP exam in Nevada exceeding the national average. The national average is 22.8 percent and in Nevada it is 24.7 percent.

Advanced diplomas from 2011 to 2018 have gone up 50 percent, over 3,000 more students left high school with an advanced diploma compared to 2011. The rate of students in the cohort getting an AP diploma was 18 percent, by 2018 it was over 25 percent. One in four students left high school in 2018 with an advanced high school diploma.

Data was provided about Pre-K enrollment, Nevada is tied second for last at 36 percent of 3 and 4 year olds enrolled in Pre-K. The highest in the country is 80 percent. Further data was provided, and the bottom line is that Pre-K enrollment is not the cause of the ranking, it is a symptom of the ranking. The symptom is caused by chronic under funding in education, and a community that does not value and appreciate our education system. Historical investments in education have not been wasted. By all objective measures education in Nevada is now significantly better than it was 20 years ago.

The students that come to school today are coming with obstacles to their education that exceed obstacles seen 20 years ago. It is important to remember that those obstacles such as poverty and speaking English as a second language are not cognitive disabilities, they are obstacles for these students fully receiving their academic instruction. These obstacles often require additional supports to overcome the challenges those things present. Kids are not bringing down our scores. These kids have challenges that they need support overcoming. Historically, even students with these challenges who are not getting the full supports they currently need have still been making improvement over the last two decades. The question becomes, now that you have seen the state of Nevada education in context, what are you going to do about it.

President Wynn stated that for full transparency, she chairs the National Board of Communities in schools. The positive impact of community involvement and wrap around services ties in with the social and emotional piece that communities and schools identified early on as the rationale and mission for

work they do. She suggested that a CSI representative could attend a meeting to share information about the program, the value and the results with kids in CSI programs

Another point is the issue of communications and her experience is that non-profit organizations or public institutions that have limited funds always cut in the areas of communications, messaging and public relations. It is unfortunate because it winds up creating exactly this situation, a complete void in terms of counteracting and supplying information that needs to be known in the community.

Perhaps moving forward, the Board might consider how to effectuate a better way even if that would require a public or private partnership with an entity that would be willing to participate with the Board. Not just those two times a year when explaining what the test results mean, but in an ongoing campaign. She agreed with member Newburn, this is the best report the Board has heard and it counteracts reports heard in the past when Board members left the meeting so demoralized. She has always know what they are talking about, because she has questioned, how could this be. We know what is happening with these kids, we know who they are, despite the demographics. The improvement is staggering.

This is a message that is our fault, shame on us. We have not done a good enough job, the CCSD has not done a good enough job either as the single largest participant in the data. This is not to dismiss all the other districts. Perhaps another charge for the Board moving forward is to correct the message and and celebrate the good work. This has been a good and inspiring presentation.

Member Blakely agreed, and said he enjoyed the presentation. He suggested that the Board and the superintendent needs to get this message out to the public to make more of a public statement. There is a member of the staff that is under-utilized and he is the person that can get this message out. There are a lot of federal organizations that evaluate Nevada and we need to do a better job interacting with them to send this message out.

Member Newburn echoed that we should thank the teachers who are fighting through the increasing challenges they face every day, and fighting the onslaught of negative publicity and media. It is important that the Board thanks them, this is their achievement.

Member Ortiz said it is not just the teachers in the classroom, it is the support staff including bus drivers, the folks that are feeding our kids, the police that are keeping them safe, and the community members who are going out of their way to advocate kids for every single day that has gotten us to this place. We are not done, we have a long way to go. She hopes that new systems will provide data that can be evaluated and presented, and the relationship continues with Data Insight because they are a valuable asset to our community.

Member Hudson thanked Data Insight, and said there are hard days being in the classroom. This lets us know we are doing the right thing and we can keep on in spite of negative comments.

Superintendent Ebert said she has been given a lot of challenges today, and she reminded everyone she did raise her hand. She has been honored to work with Nathan directly and also Justin for a very long time. They are extremely talented and have offered their skill set to continue to work with our team, and she is thankful for that. She also enjoyed the presentation, and Nathan and Justin are unique in that they know data and can articulate to the public what that data means and how it translates.

### **Future Agenda Items**

Member Ortiz said many will be at the WestEd meeting that begins on July 18. She requested that the Board consider rescheduling the Board meeting one day, to July 17. President Wynn said unless there is feedback that this creates a problem for a quorum, the meeting will be moved to July 17.

Future agenda items that were requested were reiterated. Member Ortiz said they would like a presentation on the year-to-year comparison of funding to previous years to what is S.B. 555 for this year, and requested ongoing updates of the funding formula implementation. She requested a brief presentation on the Census 2020 that is coming out next year. It has an impact on education in that if every student who lives in Nevada is not counted, that is money not received from the federal government. There is impetus upon the Board to put some effort behind making sure that Census 2020 is accurate for Nevada.

Member Ortiz explained that there was a bill put through the legislature about chronic absenteeism. Chronic absenteeism a portion or a piece of the Nevada State Performance Framework that has an impact on star ratings for schools. As a state there is no big stick to encourage families to ensure students get to school. There is also have a transportation issue in CCSD that has impact on kids getting to school. The chronic absenteeism numbers are staggering. A Task Force was convened last year to evaluate how schools measure absenteeism and it is not standardized. This bill would have put forth efforts about a marketing campaign and also ensuring the districts and schools standardize the way they are counting absenteeism and being tardy. The bill did not pass. The requested it is brought up to discuss what the Board could potentially do through regulation to either put more teeth behind it, or start thinking about it for 2021.

Member Ortiz mentioned accountability and ensuring schools are performing since there is no longer an ASD. An equity study was done last year about how resources are distributed, specifically to teachers and schools. She requested revisiting this because it has an impact on student achievement in those schools.

President Wynn expressed sensitivity to the job ahead of superintendent Ebert, and to feel free to space this in a way that is most helpful to the NDE and herself to provide the best information, not necessarily the speediest information.

### **Public Comment #2**

Don Soifer, Nevada Action for School Options, commented on some of the priorities from the 120-day Legislative Session. The Board gave licensure to two exemplary private schools that he has spent time with. Also, to the State Board, members and staff, the impact they had in the legislature was profound. He heard superintendent Ebert speak and was moved by her words.

He wanted to draw attention to a couple of bills that could be opportunities for the coming 2021 session. One bill relates to the funding formula. The current funding formula defines At Risk pupils as those who are eligible for free or reduced lunch. This Board's focus on equity is admirable, and if looking at At Risk factors as he testified, there are different At Risk factors in use in other states for funding purposes. He suggested the Board to direct some attention to that topic.

Regarding the Block Grant for certain programs, he said the Nevada 21 program earned and deserved national attention. It does not just provide resources for technology in the classroom, it supports teaching assistants with technical assistants and gives schools the opportunity to leverage the technology to differentiate instruction in meaningful ways. He does not want to see that get lost.

This Board now has the opportunity to appoint two members to the Charter School Board. In the course of the session the charter school authorizer which has strong new leadership focused on equity also gained new requirements to focus on equity and serving the students best who need them most.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:26 a.m.