

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
OCTOBER 10, 2019  
9:00 A.M.**

**Meeting Locations:**

<b>Office</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Meeting Room</b>
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Rd.	Las, Vegas	Room 114
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  
Rui Ya Wang

**In Carson City**

Teri White  
Kevin Melcher

**DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:**

**In Carson City**

Jonathan Moore, Deputy Superintendent, Student Achievement  
Heidi Haartz, Deputy Superintendent, Business and Support Services  
Sarah Nick, Management Analyst  
Mary Holsclaw, Education Programs Professional  
Andre DeLeon, Education Programs Professional  
Kevin Laxalt, Education Programs Professional  
Nancy Olsen, Education Programs Professional  
Patrick Bell, Education Programs Professional  
Chris James, Education Programs Professional  
Anna Savala, Washoe County School District

**In Las Vegas**

Felicia Gonzales, Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement  
Jessica Todtman, Chief Strategy Officer  
Greg Bortolin, Public Information Officer  
Tina Winquist, Education Programs Professional  
Karl Wilson, Education Programs Professional Supervisor  
Gabby Lamarre, Education Programs Professional

### **In Las Vegas**

David Gardner, Deputy Attorney General  
Alberto Quintero, Education Programs Professional  
Kristen Whitney, Education Programs Professional  
Leroy Espinosa, Public  
Ernie Rambo, Nevada National Board Professional Learning Institute

### **AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:**

#### **In Carson City**

Jean Tierney, Teacher of the Year Candidate  
Nick Jacques, Carson City Middle School, Teacher of the Year Candidate  
Charles Lednicky, Washoe County School District  
Pilar Biller, Teacher of the Year Candidate  
Carol Gebhardt, Washoe County School District  
Kimm Rombardo, Northwest Evaluation Association  
Jordan Hosmer, Policy Analyst, Governor's Office  
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents  
Anna Savala, Washoe County School District

#### **In Las Vegas**

Erica Etienne, Clark County School District  
Amy Dockter-Rozar, Clark County School District  
Jeanine Roser, Washoe County School District  
Kim Metcalf, University of Las Vegas  
Jean Linnell, National University  
Jimmy Lau, Ferrari Public Affairs  
Alexander Marks, Nevada State Education Association  
Leroy Espinosa, Public  
Ernie Rambo, Nevada National Board Professional Learning Institute  
Tracy Spies, University of Las Vegas  
Patricia Haddad, Opportunity 180  
Meredith Freeman, HOPE 4 Nevada  
Chris Day, Nevada State Education Association  
Rebecca Feiden, State Public Charter School Authority  
Alexandra Dominquez, College Board  
Tonia Holmes-Sutton, Teach Plus  
Leonardo Benavides, Clark County School District  
Brian Rippet, Nevada State Education Association  
Zane Gray, Sierra Nevada College  
Brenda Pearson, Clark County Education Association  
Bill Garis, Clark County Association of School Administrators  
Monte Bay, National University

### **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m..

### **Public Comment**

Patricia Haddad, Opportunity 180, said core to their work is celebrating the success of schools that are beating the odds. This year they released the inaugural version of an annual top schools report to highlight schools doing great things for kids who need it most. She thanked superintendent Ebert and her team for providing the data workbook that allowed Opportunity 180 to ensure their data portal and information was timely and accurate. She listed the requirements to be considered a top school. There are three schools in Nevada that met the criteria and she congratulated Nevada Prep Middle School, Mater Academy Mt. Vista Middle school and Reuben Diaz Elementary School for their commitment to great outcomes for kids. Also

highlighted was Fay Herron Elementary, Lewis Rowe Elementary and Helen M. Smith Elementary as schools to watch. The report can be found at: <http://greatschoolsallkids.org/>

Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association (NSEA), said that NSEA was the primary mover of the original AB 462, the legislation that the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) will be discussing today. When AB 462 was originally introduced it put a moratorium on new charter schools until the process could be completed. The Legislature amended the bill and abandoned that part of the legislation. The idea of potentially limiting the expansion of charter schools is a good idea and one whose time has come in Nevada. Charter schools were initially promoted by educators including those in the union who sought to innovate within the local public school system to better meet the needs of students. Over the last 22 years charter schools have grown dramatically to include large numbers of charters that are privately managed, largely unaccountable, and not transparent to their operations or performance. The growth has been driven in part by well-funded efforts to ensure charters are exempt from many of the same basic safeguards and standards that apply to all public schools. When accounting for demographic differences, significantly lower percentages of at risk students, EL learners, and students with IEPs are easier to teach student populations while traditional public schools have students that require more resources to provide higher quality education. When accounting for these demographic differences, charter schools perform no better than traditional public schools. The Board's main charge is to look at traditional public schools in Nevada and to work to improve them.

Tonia Holmes-Sutton, Interim Director for Teach Plus, celebrated Gail Hudson, National Board Certified Teacher and the 2020 Nevada Teacher of the Year. Ms. Holmes-Sutton acknowledged that in the 20 years she has been in Nevada and celebrated teachers of the year, she has not previously had the opportunity and privilege to acknowledge a teacher of color. She emphasized the importance of this for students, families and communities that Gail Hudson represents Nevada as the 2020 Teacher of the Year.

#### **Approval of Flexible Agenda**

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

#### **President's Report**

President Wynn welcomed Kevin Melcher back to the Board of Education. Governor Sisolak appointed member Melcher on September 27, 2019 to represent District 2. He is finishing out the term of board member David Carter, who resigned his seat this summer for personal reasons. Member Melcher brings a wealth of experience to the Board including having served on the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) Board of Regents and as the Regents representative to the State Board from 2013 – 2015. His decades as an Elko County School District teacher and administrator will continue to lend invaluable perspective to the Board's work.

President Wynn expressed gratitude to vice president Newburn and member Dockweiler for representing the Board when superintendent Ebert hosted members of congress last week. Bobby Scott, Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Workforce was visiting Nevada invited by Representative Susie Lee, Steven Horsford and Dina Titus to learn about Nevada's education system. Context on Nevada's teacher shortage issue was shared with related concerns for class size as well as the need for increased access to mental health professionals and resources in our schools.

On September 26, the NDE recognized Nevada's three blue ribbon schools, Advanced Technologies Academy or A – Tech, CCSD, the Charles and Phyllis Frias Elementary School, CCSD and Hunter Lake Elementary School, WCSD. These schools were recognized in the exemplary high performing category due to their outstanding academic achievement and graduation rates. Representatives from these schools have been invited to attend the 2019 National Blue Ribbon School award ceremony in Washington on November 14 – 15.

President Wynn said she was inspired by the news, photos and tweets from the superintendent's statewide listening tour. The tour launched on Sept 23 in Douglas County School District (DCSD). To date the

Superintendent and members of her team have visited Carson City, Storey and Clark County School Districts as well as two Las Vegas area schools authorized by the SPSCA.

### **Superintendent's Report**

- School visits with Assistant Secretary Scott Stump, U.S. Department of Education
- Commission on School Funding
- Perkins V State Plan public comment period open
- Regulation workshops and public hearings

Superintendent Ebert thanked the superintendents of the school districts for the Listening Tour. Teri White, Richard Stokes, Todd Hass, Jesus Jara as well as Rebecca Feiden, Director, State Public Charter School Authority helped coordinate the site visits.

Superintendent Ebert informed that she and the U.S. Department of Education, Assistant Secretary, Scott Stump visited the East Career and Technical Academy as well as Morrison East High School. Secretary Stump oversees Career, Technical and Adult Education. Secretary Stump oversees an area that just had an audit from the U.S. Department of Education. The Adult Education and Family Literacy Act team successfully completed their audit from the U.S. Department of Education. The monitoring occurred in September, and the auditors praised the NDEs work and said they were going to use Nevada as a model moving forward in their monitoring process. It is rare, but in the last four years of audits from the U.S. Department of Education, Nevada had no findings. She recognized staff in Carson City including director Kris Nelson, assistant director Nancy Olsen and the Adult Education, Family Literacy and Title II teams as well as fiscal, grants who support the work that led to this result.

The Office of Career Readiness Adult Learning and Educational Options (CRAELO) team announced on October 1 that the NDE is seeking input on the initial plan for strengthening Career and Technical Education (CTE) for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act, also known as Perkins V. Much of what was in Perking IV has been maintained with an increased emphasis on high quality CTE programming, increased employer engagement and CTE programs that are aligned to high skill, high wage and in demand jobs in Nevada. The state plan draft was created by the CRAELO team in partnership with a variety of stakeholders including public meetings conducted from March to August, 2019. The plan will be brought to the Board at the November meeting.

Regulation workshops from the Office of Safe and Respectful Learning Environment were conducted on October 3. Included were revisions for the framework for integrated student supports, a model policy for prevention of suicide, and the ratio of pupils to specialize instructional support personnel and restorative justice. Superintendent Ebert stated it is important that the regulations are conducted in a way to uplift schools and districts and not just focus on compliance.

The Commission on School Funding had their first meeting on Friday, September 27. The commission chair is Karlene McCormick-Lee, and Guy Hobbs was elected as vice chair at the meeting. They divided into two workgroups to tackle key tasks and responsibilities. The two groups are the Formula and Distribution workgroup led by superintendent Dave Jensen of Humboldt County School District and the Reporting and Monitoring workgroup led by the City of Henderson CFO, Jim McIntosh. The workgroups will meet for the first time on October 11 at 8:30 am at the NDE, followed by a full Commission meeting starting at noon. The members of the Commission are planning to present an update at the November 14 board meeting.

**Information and Discussion regarding the 2020 Nevada Teacher of the Year.** The Board will hear a presentation regarding the State Teacher of the Year program, including the application and selection process, recognition and honors received through the Council of Chief State School Officers National Teacher of the Year Program, and information about the 2020 Nevada Teacher of the Year. The 2020 Teacher of the Year and the four finalists will be recognized and presented with certificates.

KellyLynn Charles, Education Programs Professional shared the Teacher of the Year (TOY) selection process and introduced the 2020 finalists as well as the Teacher of the Year. The mission of the Teacher of the Year program is to celebrate excellence and strengthen the teaching force by honoring teachers on the school district, state and national level.

There were 38 nominations for TOY from nine school districts across Nevada. Five finalists were sent to superintendent Ebert to make the final selection. The Nevada TOY engages in many state level events focused on recognizing and elevating outstanding educators. All five finalists are eligible for membership in the Nevada chapter of TOY and are invited to engage in various professional learning opportunities and focus groups across the state. Being named state TOY brings national opportunities including professional learning at Google, International Space Camp, travel to Washington D.C. for a White House visit and a celebration at a national college football playoff game. The five finalists are Jeanine Roser – CCSD, Kathy Durham – Elko County School District, Patricia Martin – Nye County School District, Nicholas Jacques – Carson City School District and the 2020 TOY is Gail Hudson – CCSD. Gail Hudson will automatically represent Nevada at a Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) 2020 National Teacher of the Year candidate.

### **Approval of Consent Agenda**

Possible Approval of the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) report of the activities of the previous school year

- a. Possible Approval of Dual Credit requests for:
  - Clark County School District for any courses offered for dual credit by a Nevada System of Higher Education Institution
  - Elko County School District for school year 2019-2020 in partnership with Great Basin College
- b. Possible Approval of Instructional Materials from Carson City School District
  - Computer Science – Grades 9-12
  - Social Studies – Grade 11
- c. Possible Approval of the re-licensing for four Nevada private schools for a four-year period
  - Christian Montessori Academy, Clark County
  - Henderson International School, Clark County
  - New Horizons Academy, Clark County
  - St. John's Children's Center, Washoe County
- d. Possible Approval of the Nevada School Bus Driver Training Manual
- e. Possible Approval of the recommended appointment to fill a current vacancy on the Special Education Advisory Committee:
  - Candace Emerson – Parent of Children with Disabilities and/or Individuals with Disabilities
- f. Possible Approval of 2020 State Board of Education meeting dates

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

**Information and Discussion regarding MAP Assessment Data for grades K-2.** The Read by Grade 3 team will also highlight programmatic changes resulting from Assembly Bill 289, including new partnerships.

Dave Brancamp, Director, Office of Standards and Instructional Services introduced Kim Rombardo and Nate Jensen from the Northwest Evaluation Association. Ms. Rombardo conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation about RBG3 and MAP growth. She explained that Nevada is the only state that uses a single assessment in K-3 reading and the resulting data was discussed. MAP growth is a computerized adaptive assessment that provides longitudinal growth data on how students are performing in K-3 reading. Students receive a score called a RIT score that illuminates what the student knows and what they are ready to learn. It also provides information on projected achievement in relation to state assessment. The student performance is measured independent of student grade level.

The RBG3 data was highlighted and Ms. Rombardo recalled that the Board adopted the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile of rank on the MAP growth reading assessment as its RBG3 indicator. How Nevada students performed the last couple of years in relation to the performance indicator was discussed. Students who perform below the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile are noted as in need of additional support and given support through their RBG3 program.

Information and data was provided about growth by race and ethnicity in K-2 for the 2017-18 school year, and then the 2018-19 school year. In response to member Ortiz inquiring if the MAPS test is bias tested, Mr. Jensen responded that the test goes through sensitivity and bias checks any time new items are introduced with statistical checks.

Mr. Jensen noted that Nevada students on average are average, they are right around the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile for their meeting achievement percentile. As a whole, being average is not all that bad and achievement in Nevada is consistent with achievement across other states. Ms. Rombardo added for the state summative assessment, students need to be operating at the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile to be at a level of proficiency. Support for the RBG3 program was highlighted. Mr. Brancamp said collaboration is the key with all partners focused on improving reading achievement including the districts, the NDE, NSHE partners, and the new ELA person that will join on October 21.

Member Dockweiler commented about the increase of students participating in the examinations since the RBG3 was originally passed. She asked if it is fully implemented at all schools now. Deputy Moore responded the RBG3 is fully implemented, however, at the 2019 Legislative Session there were significant changes to the legislation that have impacted implementation. The assessment portion and expectations for instruction and growth of students is fully implemented. The NDE is currently working to ensure that all schools are supported. Competitive grants were called for in the 2015 legislation to support the RBG3 program. Not every elementary school was eligible to participate or receive supports from the state with the onset of RBG3. With the 2019 legislative changes in AB 289, the legislative appropriation allocated funds so that every school would have a Literacy Strategist. That altered the various levels of support where some schools did not receive any from the state, they are now receiving direct support. The support is being leveraged and implemented according to the expectations from the law.

President Wynn observed that there is a tremendous effort directed in this area, but it is hard to take comfort in being average when we are under proficient. She commented that being average is not satisfactory.

**Information and Discussion regarding statewide assessment results for the 2018-19 school year.** This presentation will include information regarding data from each of the statewide summative assessments that were administered during the 2018-19 school year.

Peter Zutz, Administrator, Assessment, Data and Accountability Management conducted a [Powerpoint](#) presentation. He provided results from the State Accountability Assessments including the Smarter Balanced assessments, Science assessments, the ACT assessment and the World-Class Instructional Design assessments (WIDA). He acknowledge four years of successful assessment testing and results in Nevada and thanked the districts, schools, and the teachers and students who made this happen.

The education test can provide teachers with needed clarity regarding specific skills and knowledge and can help teachers devise more accurately targeted instructional activities. There are four levels of achievement that students earn with their results on each assessment. Proficiency is the minimum achievement level students must obtain in the content area as determined by Nevada educators, content experts, stakeholders and parents. The minimum level for proficiency in Nevada is Level 3.

The Smarter Balanced assessment is taken each spring by all elementary and middle school students in grades 3-8 and assesses their acquisition of skills and knowledge in ELA and math. Data was provided about proficiency rates by content area, ELA and math, student performance, ethnicity and race, and populations. Data was included by grade for the last four years of ELA and Math. There is an overall upward trend in all grades for ELA. Students in grades 3-8 improved over last year in ELA compared to the previous year. Fifth grade students had the highest level of ELA proficiency, followed by 7<sup>th</sup> grade, then 4<sup>th</sup> grade students. The

lower grades show consistent increases in math, and the upper grades are trending upward as well. There was improvement this year in middle school math, although it is well below middle school ELA proficiency rates. Science proficiency results included data by ethnicity/race and by populations. Science is taken each spring by grades 5 and 8, and either grade 9 or 10 in high school. Science assessments are based on the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS).

The ACT is taken each spring by all grade 11 students per NRS. The ACT assesses college and career readiness through critical thinking, problem solving and reasoning skills needed to succeed in today's world. It assesses the domains of English, math, reading science and writing. Data was provided about ACT results by ethnicity, race and student groups for ELA and math. Almost all populations saw an increase in their composite score.

The WIDA is administered to English Language Learners (EL) and assesses their skills in English as mandated by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) that requires students identified as EL are annually assessed for English proficiency in the domains of speaking, listening, reading and writing. The assessment is used to ensure EL students are on track to graduate from high school with the skills needed to succeed in today's world. Proficiency data was provided by ethnicity, race and student groups. Proficiency stayed the same, or remained flat.

Member Wang noted that approximately 57 percent of students increased their score by taking the ACT a second time. A new law allows students to re-take some sections of the test, and she asked how this affects test scores in Nevada. Mr. Zutz said ACT will provide related data upon request. However, two years ago with AB 7, Nevada changed from EOCs being the high school federally reported assessment to the ACT. When the ACT became the high school federally reported assessment, Nevada could no longer offer that assessment on multiple occasions to students. Per USDOE, Nevada is required to offer the assessment scores for the federally reporting requirements for a single administration.

Member Ortiz asked whether legislation would be required to change the initial ACT test score or the final test score used to report student scores. Deputy Moore said statute designates the administration of the ACT taken once a year as the test for 11<sup>th</sup> grade students. The federal requirement is that Nevada administer an assessment at the high school level for college and career readiness, and a single administration of scores taken across the state to affect the accountability system. Taking multiple scores may not fulfill the federal requirement of how Nevada reports that data.

President Wynn said if the students demonstrate improved performance by re-taking the test, it would be important to know what percentage of improvement there is. If it is significant enough to warrant being allowed to re-take the test, the Board should advocate either legislation or regulation to allow for that. President Wynn stated it is a research question and suggested debating the issue as a future agenda item.

Member Dockweiler said the presentation highlighted disparities across the performance of Nevada students. Recently, SB 320 was passed requiring a plan for students in grades 3-12 for advanced placement and more rigorous courses in math, ELA, science and social studies. Hopefully by tracking students into more rigorous courses based on their aptitude, other factors can be addressed and this data will be improved in years to come.

Member Newburn noted at one time there was an issue that if students in 8<sup>th</sup> grade math took algebra I or II, and then took the EOC exam and not the SBAC exam, it affected the 8<sup>th</sup> grade math scores. He asked if that is still the same. Mr. Zutz responded that the EOCs are not reported, they are district administered, district scored and that data stays in the district and does not roll back up to the state. There were high achievers when EOC exams were used as the federally reported high school exam. Approximately 6,000 to 7,000 high achieving 8<sup>th</sup> grade math students would jump to the EOC and not take the SBAC. Those students are now taking the 8<sup>th</sup> grade SBAC assessment.

Member Newburn inquired about Science being an EOC, but now it is a standalone test and asked whether it is now Science multi subjects. Mr. Zutz clarified the EOC exams at this time are district administered, district

scored and district used, the data does not roll up. Those assessments are EOC, ELA, and EOC math. The historical EOC Science assessment has become the high school Science assessment administered in grade 9 or 10. It is federally reported on a cohort in grade 10. Member Newburn asked about the content of the high school science as a big drop in proficiency is seen and whether that is now a multi-area for science? He is trying to understand the big drop in high school, is it because the science test is a multi-science subject, and not all kids take those subjects? Mr. Zutz responded that the high school assessment focuses more on life science and biology.

Member Melcher asked if the data that is in trends by populations and in trends by ethnicity and race are cross studied, or is that at the district level. Are there trends that would show when trying to find solutions. Mr. Zutz said yes, the web address provided at the end of the presentation, [Nevada Report Card](#), has data that can be downloaded to segregate. What is seen is what ESSA requires to desegregate and display. Member Melcher said there is a lot more detail that can be pulled out of the data than what is reported.

Member Blakely commented that the math proficiency in high schools for all students is not very good. An additional year of math in high school was approved by a subcommittee of the Board and he asked whether that would be implemented.

Member Newburn commented about changing the requirements for the standard diploma to include two flex credits. The categories of classes was limited, one was additional math or science with the hope more kids would take additional math and science. There was a 5-year rollout of that diploma, so it has not been seen yet. Math trends down from 3<sup>rd</sup> grade down to ACT, it is a downward line and he is unsure why that occurs.

**Information and Discussion regarding the 2019 star ratings, as well as an overview of school improvement and supports provided by the Department to districts and schools.** This is the third presentation to the Board based on the request to understand the state of school improvement in Nevada. This presentation will also include information on the connection between star ratings and school improvement designations.

Superintendent Ebert said the third of a three part series on School Improvement would be presented today. The first presentation was in July when the Methodology for Designating Schools for Comprehensive and Targeted Support under ESSA was discussed. In August, the Responsibilities of the State Education Agency to Intervene in Chronically Underperforming Schools with options for more rigorous interventions was discussed. Today the presentation will culminate with an update on the 2019 Star Ratings under the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) and how star ratings relate to the ESSA designation. Work under ESSA and the NSPF is to ensure that students have access and opportunities that will prepare them to graduate with tools needed to build a life and future.

Patrick Bell, Education Program Supervisor, Office of Assessments, Data and Accountability conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation with information about the star ratings and designations for 2019. Information was provided about how the Star Ratings are calculated for Elementary, Middle and the High School performance framework. Each school is given an index score from 1 to 100 based on total points earned for performance measures for each school type. Measures include academic achievement, EL proficiency, student engagement and growth. The star ratings are correlated with the total index score a school receives with rating tables set for Elementary, Middle and High School.

Further details were provided about how star ratings are used in designations. A school star rating only results in a ESSA designation if the school receives a 1-star, which results in a Comprehensive School Improvement (CSI) designation. All other ESSA designations are based on schools demonstrating low overall performance, or low performance within student groups on the NSPF performance measures. The majority of schools in Nevada are rated 3-5stars, or approximately 62 percent.

Gabby Lamarre, Director, Title I, reviewed school designations. Schools with consistently underperforming student groups across indicators are Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) schools. They are schools that have very low student performance, that are on their own and would lead to a CSI designation. School



supports for CSI, TSI and Additional Target Supports and Improvement (ATSI) schools were discussed. Further data and information was provided regarding:

- Approval Process and Progress Updates for CSI plans
- Targeted/Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI/STDI) School Plans
- Support for Evidence-Based Interventions
- Federal and State Funding for School Improvement
- Additional Resources

Karl Wilson, Assistant Director, Student and School Supports highlighted some of the fiscal supports available to assist schools in the improvement process. Programs under ESSA were listed. ESSA was designed to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair equitable and highly quality education and to close achievement gaps.

Next steps include more in depth analysis of the 2019 NSPF data to identify trends that specifically relate to low performing schools CSI, TSI and ATSI. Based on that data analysis NDE will partner with a third party evaluator to determine what the practices are that are proving successful in turning around the low performing schools.

Member Newburn commented that although we are not where we want to be, he gets the feeling that we are trending in the right direction. This is good news. It is not time to celebrate yet, but Nevada is moving in the right direction.

President Wynn acknowledge that Nevada is not getting worse, but that is not significant enough. A tremendous amount of work the NDE is contemplating has been outlined and addresses many concerns the Board has had. There is a lot of data, planning to plan, coordinating and there is cross agency collection of materials. More information will be brought back to the Board, but she cautioned to not just bring more data because the Board is relying on the NDE to get to the bottom line. She supports the tremendous amount of work that provides a real snapshot of where we are.

Member Dockweiler said under CSI all 1-star schools would be designated as CSI. She asked if all 2-star schools also receive a designation, and supports. Deputy Moore responded that currently within the state ESSA plan, only the 1-star schools receive an immediate designation for CSI. Currently the NDE is in an amendment process with the ESSA plan that started in November 2018 with stakeholder engagement. There is a proposal to amend part of the ESSA plan so schools that are designated as 1-star are not necessarily automatically designated with CSI.

In response to an inquiry from member Ortiz regarding schools that are designated as CSI after 3 years, Ms. Lamarre said in the second presentation more rigorous options and interventions were discussed. Those are for schools that do not exit in the prescribed number of years. Then more intense support would be considered along with collaboration with the Board. Member Ortiz asked if there is an indication of how many schools are trending that way. Deputy Moore said it is a point of data that can be provided to the Board. Member Ortiz asked how curriculum can be evaluated when teachers all use different books. Deputy Moore said currently the materials are evaluated by the Office of Standards and School Supports. If districts seek to implement curriculum for various subjects, there is a process by which curriculum is vetted to ensure alignment to the Academic Standards. The process applies to new materials that districts are seeking to implement.

Superintendent Ebert added that if outdated materials are identified, they are noted. Then a discussion occurs with the school and school district regarding those items. School districts have the opportunity to use various resources in the classroom to meet the needs of students.

Member Ortiz commented about student transiency and students who move around the districts and state. Given that schools are local control, and choosing their curriculums, if students moves from school to school chances are they are not using the same curriculum and may not be on the same schedule of learning. Is there

any thought to a strategy to ensure schools are covering the same standards regardless of the curriculum. If kids move then they would not encounter gaps and lose instructional time.

Superintendent Ebert explained that the NDE depends on school district superintendents. Transiency is a complex issue ensuring the standards are solid and the bar is set high. Member White, Superintendent, DCSD, commented that the issue of transiency is a challenging one, even across schools within a district. Douglas County School District is trying hard on the local level to get some consistency and a pacing guide from school to school within their district. To try and do that on a state level is quite an undertaking however important.

Concerns looked at in DCSD include the alignment of standards to the work in the classrooms, prior to testing ensuring the standards are taught and using the MAPS assessment to provide the formative information in the fall and winter to adjust instruction from winter to spring. Then that information is used to help understand where the deficits are for students who may not be meeting the SBAC benchmarks. Aligning curriculum school to school, district to district, state to state, while it is valuable work could be very difficult.

**Information and Discussion regarding the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA).** The Board will receive an update on the SPCSA's work on the Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment and Growth Management Plan required under Assembly Bill 462.

Rebecca Feiden, Executive Director, State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA), conducted a [Powerpoint](#) presentation with an update to meet the requirements of AB 462 from the 2019 Legislative Session. Background was provided on the SPCSA. The charter school authority is a charter school sponsor which means they are responsible for authorizing public charter schools across Nevada. They are responsible for oversight and monitoring to ensure positive academic outcomes and strong stewardship of public dollars. The SPCSA is a political subdivision of Nevada created in 2011 with a 9-member board. Two members were recently appointed by the State Board of Education.

There are 60 schools or campuses located in five counties, 85 of the schools are located in CCSD. A breakdown of the star ratings for this year was provided. The SPCSA had about 10 percent of four and five star schools this year. They serve approximately 45,000 students. The schools are open to all students and do not have an admissions criteria. Demographics for the student body, on aggregate, were discussed.

Ms. Feiden discussed the demographics for their student body, on aggregate. Some schools are very different from this, but on aggregate this is the student body. Noted is that the numbers in all three of the categories are traditionally student categories in which students have historically underperformed. They are below the state in all three of these categories, some more than others. This is an area that has focus on it to change and improve. The work today is focused on ensuring that high academic performance is maintained while making sure we are accessible to all students across the state including those who have been traditionally been underserved.

There were a number of pieces in the 2019 Legislative Session that impacted charter schools and the charter authority. AB 462 is focused on moving the SPCSA in the direction of strategic authorizing. Moving in the direction of ensuring the schools sponsored are working to meet the needs of students in Nevada, these main parts of the bill were discussed by Ms. Feiden:

- Written notices to ensure communication is more effective
- Conducting a needs assessment to understand the needs of students across Nevada.
- Creating a Growth Management Plan to map the future for Charter Schools over the next five years.
- Conducting site evaluations of schools every two years.

The initial needs assessment was completed over the summer. It is being updated to include the new star rating data that recently came out as well as incorporate the new demographic data in November. Work is ongoing with the growth management plan in an effort to ensure the January 1st statutory deadline is met.

**Information, Discussion, and Possible Action regarding New, Transfer, and Current Teacher Incentives pursuant to Senate Bill 555 and Assembly Bill 196.** The Board will receive a brief presentation on the currently available funds, historical context, current law, challenges, and successes regarding Teacher Incentives. The Board will also hear a proposal for a Department business process regarding the application and distribution of Teacher Incentives for Fiscal Year 2020 and into the future. Possible action may include approval of a business process for Teacher Incentives

Jason Dietrich, Director, Educator Licensure introduced Jeff Briske, Education Programs Professional who conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation. Mr. Briske explained that one of his duties is the administration of the teacher incentive program. The Department is proposing a business process to the Board to ensure equal distribution of funds to each teacher and to establish a timely process to distribute funds.

It has been confirmed that \$5 million from SB 555 section 29 was transferred to the block grant in AB 309. The block grant has a defined dollar amount for each district with several allowable use categories. This provides greater flexibility in how a district chooses to use the block grant funds. One of the allowable uses is providing incentives to new teachers. Districts have reported a projected allocation of their funds, some districts have chosen to allocate a portion of the block grant funding to teacher incentives and other districts have chosen not to allocate any of the block grant funding to teacher incentives. Currently there is just over five percent of the block grant funds that have been projected by districts to be used for teacher incentives. Mr. Briske discussed biennium funding for teachers.

Historical context was provided about AB 434 from the 2017 Legislative Session that specified the Board shall adopt regulations for distribution of Teacher Incentive Funds. The regulation process took over eight months which delayed the distribution of the 2017 funds until July, 2019. Challenges include that requests outnumber available funds in some of the allowable use categories leaving unused funds in one area and not enough funds in another area. When this occurs, a work program can be requested from the IFC to move funds among the allowable use categories.

Mr. Briske noted that because of the time challenges of adopting regulations, the Department is proposing a business process based on current law. If adopted, the business process will allow a faster turnaround time for the distribution of Teacher Incentive Funds for the 2019 Session. The business process would be used for the current fiscal year and all future years for the teacher incentives where the Board has oversight. The process timeline will apply to future years, and the timeline will begin in October this year if the Board decides to adopt the process.

Mr. Briske outlined the five steps in the business process:

- Teacher Incentive applications will be made available to districts on or before August 31;
- Upon receiving applications from the districts the NDE will calculate the requested number of teachers to be incentivized in each allowable use category to determine equal/proportional distribution of funds from each matching allowable use category;
- Proposed awards will be brought before the Board for approval in September;
- On or before October 31 of each year, the NDE will issue award letters and sub grants to districts allowing them to request funds for teacher incentives;
- The NDE reserves the right to make technical adjustments.

Member Ortiz said she understood the regulation intent was to be used as a tool for recruitment and retention of high quality, highly effective teachers in Title I schools. Based on the timeline and the proposed process, she questioned how a district will use this as a tool for recruitment and retention when teachers do not apply until August 31 and they are already in the classroom. The incentive cannot be used for teachers because it is unknown how much the incentive is, and whether the school will even receive it. Mr. Briske said they need to know how much money there is before the districts can be given applications. Districts still have the option of using block grants to promise incentives if they choose to do so. She asked how this can be made an effective tool for recruitment and retention of highly effective teachers in Title I schools given the timing.

Mr. Dietrich responded that funding teacher incentives has been minimized. The majority of that funding went into the Block Grant funding. That funding is real time funding to the districts, they know ahead of time what they are receiving in the block grant. If they want to front load initiatives around hiring incentives or similar, the districts could do that. The disadvantage on the state side is that budgets are funded July 1 each year. Funding needs to be readily available before applications for sub grants are out. There is also a requirement to bring it to the Board to approve those incentives. Until that funding is realized, they cannot put applications out and bring those potential awards to the Board.

President Wynn clarified that the option is to approve the business process or move forward with the regulation process. Mr. Dietrich explained that currently within the law it allows for the Board to move forward with a regulatory process to establish a business process within regulation to move it forward allowing guidance to the NDE on how the process should function on the distribution of funds. Because the regulation process can take eight months or more, it was decided to move forward with a business process model for the Board to consider as it is more expeditious.

Superintendent Ebert suggested taking one step back to member Ortiz's question. There is a set dollar amount until it is known how many teachers the districts say they have. Given there are funds, the bill provides the Board with the option of implementing regulations. It is not required, so instead of going through the regulation process, another option is to consider the recommendation of approving the process presented today to move forward with the distribution of the funds available to school districts. Member Ortiz said children need to be put first, and she is leaning towards approving the business process to get the money in the hands of the school districts. Then they can decide how to distribute the funds.

**Member Ortiz moved to approve the Department Business Process for application and distribution of Teacher Incentive funds for fiscal year 20 and all future teacher Incentive funds where State Board has oversight. Member Blakely seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

#### **Future Agenda Items**

President Wynn listed the future agenda items to be considered by the NDE:

- Chronic Absenteeism
- Perkins V State Plan
- Presentation by members of the commission on School Funding
- Update on the Early Learning Development Grant

Member Newburn requested an agenda item about board training. Member Ortiz requested an item on Census 2020 so all kids in Nevada are counted.

#### **Public Comment #2**

Leroy Espinoza, retired teacher and principal, commented that he was the principal at Dondero Elementary School and hired Gail Hudson, the teacher of the year. He noticed she was a person who would be a good administrator, and he encouraged her to go through the leadership program, which she did. She took the program three different times to keep herself on the list for administrator. Today he feels like a proud parent after she received the Teacher of the Year award and recognition.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:34 pm.