

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
DECEMBER 13, 2018
9:00 A.M.**

Meeting Locations:

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	9890 S. Maryland Pkwy	Las, Vegas	Board Room (2 nd 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

Mark Newburn
Ashley Macias
Robert Blakely
Tonia Holmes-Sutton
Felicia Ortiz
Cathy McAdoo

In Carson City

David Carter
Dave Jensen
Dawn Miller

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

In Carson City

Jonathan Moore, Deputy Director, Student Achievement
Greg Bortolin, Public Information Officer
Dave Brancamp, Director, Standards and Instructional Support
Andrew Snyder, Education Programs Professional
Mary Holsclaw, Education Programs Professional
Mike Pacheco, Education Programs Supervisor
Kris Nelson, Director, Office of Career Readiness, Adult Learning and Education Options
Randi Hunewill, Education Programs Supervisor
Karen Johansen, Assistant to the State Board of Education
Shawn Osborne, IT Technician

In Las Vegas

Steve Canavero, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Seng-Dao Keo, Director, Student and School Supports
Alberto Quintero, Education Programs Professional

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

In Carson City

Greg Ott, Senior Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

In Carson City:

Nicolette Smith, NWRPDP

Kimberly Rombardo, NWEA
Wayne Workman, Lyon County School District
Mike Paul, Washoe County School District
Colleen Harsin, Davidson Academy
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents

In Las Vegas:

Ernie Rambo, Virtual Learning Community Coordinator
Monte Bay, National University
Kenneth Retzl, Guinn Center
Doris Watson, University of Las Vegas
Chris Day, Nevada State Education Association
Bill Garis, CCASA
Kim, Mangino, Clark County School District
Alex Marks, Nevada State Education Association
Patricia Haddad, Opportunity 180
Sharolyn Pollard, University of Las Vegas
Leonardo Benavides, Clark County School District
Jenn Blackhurst, HOPE for Nevada
Amelia Pak-Harvey, Las Vegas Review Journal
Brenda Pearson, Clark County Education Association
Vikki Courtney, Clark County Education Association
Katie Dockweiler, NB Institute
Barbra Konrad, HOPE for Nevada
Spencer Stewart, Western Governors University
Lisa Jackson, Clark County School District
Ramona Esparza, Valley High School

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:04 a.m. with attendance as reflected above.

Public Comment #1

Nicolette Smith, RPDP Professional Learning, said she is a National Board Certified Teacher. She facilitates and supports the work of National Board Candidacy for the Regional Professional Development Program. This week, across the country, educators are celebrating a week of educators evaluating accomplished teaching and learning for all students. Recent studies have shown that students in classrooms of Nationally Board Certified teachers average an additional 1-3 months of learning. The numbers almost double to 4-6 months for students of color in low socio-economic schools. As of December 1, Nevada has 752 National Board Certified teachers with another 932 candidates currently pursuing certification.

Dr. Ernie Rambo, National Board Certified Teacher and Virtual Learning Community Coordinator read remarks prepared on behalf of the CEO and President of the National Board for Professional Standards, National Board Certified Teacher, Peggy Brookins:

This is a week of great celebration because nearly 4,000 teachers have become National Board Certified Teachers. They have proven they teach to the highest standards in the profession. This milestone is meaningful to those who are certified, but also represents a force to advance student learning, improve schools, and enhance communities around the country. In Nevada there are 154 new National Board Certified Teachers, a 33 percent growth year over year, the most in the country. Thousands of students are impacted by teachers who make a measurably positive impact on student performance. This work must continue to expand by encouraging more teachers to pursue this voluntary certification because it makes them strong teachers and more able to address student needs.

Chris Daly, Deputy Director, Nevada State Education Association, said that unfortunately the Achievement School district is a failure. A majority of legislators that voted for A.B. 448 in 2015 are no

longer in the Legislature. Ever since the community outcry in 2016 and the January 2017 FBI raid on Solarity Educational Group, the NDE has been jumping through hoops to make the broken ASD work. The model is flawed and the whole thing should be scrapped to focus on the important work of improving the existing schools in Nevada.

Dallas Johnston, NDE Teacher in Residence, provided an update on the Superintendent's Teacher Advisory Cabinet (STAC). The application has been re-opened until January 2, 2019 to solicit new membership. Previous applicants will be reviewed along with new teachers who would like to apply to be new members of the cabinet. One to two members will be selected in early January, 2019.

Approval of Flexible Agenda

Member Blakely moved to approve a flexible agenda. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

President's Report

Member Newburn said that he was invited to a Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) meeting to learn about ways to improve the accuracy of overall ratings. He attended and had a good discussion conveying the Board's concern about overall accuracy.

President's Report

Superintendent Canavero announced that February is Career and Technical Education (CTE) month, and the Board will receive a presentation at the January 2019 Board meeting.

Superintendent Canavero clarified the terms of Board members who are appointed by the Governor. He noted that NRS 385.021 7 (b) specifies that each (voting) member continues to serve until a voting successor is appointed. Members may be re-appointed in the same manner as the original appointment.

The Parental Involvement and Family Engagement team and Alberto Quintero are developing a coherent framework with school improvement plans, family engagement standards and the NEPF connection. He is proud of the work that was recently shared with district superintendents.

Superintendent Canavero announced that Deputy Superintendent Durish has moved on from the NDE and he will serve in her capacity until Governor Elect Sisolak is inaugurated and decisions regarding department leadership are made. Jonathan Moore, the new Deputy Superintendent of Student Achievement, was introduced; he comes from the Arizona Department of Education where he oversaw the K-12 Academic Standards. He said he is excited to be part of the Department and the great state of Nevada.

Approval of Consent Agenda

a. Possible Approval of Career and Technical Education Standards for:

- Computer Science
- Health Science I & II
- Business and Marketing Middle School
- Media Technologies Middle School
- Technical Education Skilled and Technical Sciences Middle School

b. Possible Approval of Minutes: November 15, 2018 State Board Meeting

Member Ortiz commented it is fantastic that the kids of Nevada have an opportunity to learn these standards at such a young age. They are learning things she did not learn until college, and the content they are learning is very impressive.

Member Blakely moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Member Ortiz seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding Clark County School District's (CCSD) Evaluation Rating Tool for School Building Administrators and a request by the Nevada Association of School Superintendents (NASS) to utilize the same Teacher and School Building Administrator Summative Rating Tools. Based on recommendations by the Teachers and Leaders Council, and following the State Board's approval at the November 2018 meeting of CCSD's application to use an Alternate NEPF Teacher Summative Evaluation Rating Tool for the 2018-2019 school year, CCSD has submitted a follow-up request to also use an Alternate NEPF School Building Administrator Summative Evaluation Rating Tool. Additionally, NASS has requested that any/all other Nevada school districts also be granted approval to utilize Application to Use an Alternate Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) Summative the same Board-approved Alternate Teacher and School Building Administrator Summative Rating Tools. Possible action may include approval of one or both of these requests.

Vice President Newburn noted this item is a carry-over from the November, 2019 meeting. The first item is a request to approve an alternate tool for use in evaluating school administrators. The tool was approved for evaluating teachers at the last meeting. The second item extends the approval for both alternate tools, teachers and administrator, for use by other school districts as requested by the Nevada Association of School Superintendents (NASS).

Kathleen Galland-Collins, Education Programs Supervisor, and Pam Salazar, Chair, TLC explained the proposed changes with the alternate tool for the administrator evaluations are ready to make the same changes made with the teacher summative rating tool. This change reduces the copy and paste burden placed on supervisors and other districts who would like access to the same tools once it is approved for administrators. At the last meeting the alternate tool was approved for teachers, and now the request is approval for the administrators and other districts to use this alternate tool.

Member Ortiz moved to approve the alternate evaluation tool for school administrators. Member Blakely seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Member Ortiz moved to allow other school districts to use the alternate evaluation tool for teachers and administrators. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding approval of at least 50 percent of the schools recommended by the Nevada Achievement School District, pursuant to NRS 388B.200(2). Annually, the Nevada Department of Education releases a list of schools that meet the criteria to be eligible for the Nevada Achievement School District (Nevada ASD). By December 1, the Executive Director of the Nevada ASD must submit a list of not less than 20 percent of the eligible schools to the State Board of Education for approval. The State Board is required to approve at least 50 percent of the recommended schools within 30 days.

Rebecca Feiden, Director, Nevada Achievement School District (ASD), explained that the Board will review recommendations provided by the ASD on November 30, 2018 and consider approval of 50 percent of those recommended schools pursuant to NRS 388b. 200. Ms. Feiden conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation and a re-cap about the process and timelines:

- On September 15 the NDE published the Rising Stars list denoting 79 of the Rising Star Schools as eligible for the ASD.
- A parent petition window was available but no petitions were submitted by the deadline, November 15, 2018. All of the 79 school defaulted to being eligible for the ASD.
- On November 30 there was a memo recommending 16, equal to 20 percent, of the eligible schools to the Board for review.
- Today, December 13, the Board will review and approve 50 percent of those schools.

Context for the operator and school performance was discussed and Ms. Feiden reviewed the recommendations and explained the recommendation process. The recommended 16 schools were listed, and they fall into at least one of the following categories:

- Middle or High schools in CCSD where students and families could benefit from a Neighborhood Option.
- Other Schools that have shown persistent underperformance, including being eligible for the Nevada ASD for at least two of the last three years.

Eight of the listed schools will not be selected because there is currently no operator to serve the community. These schools were recommended because of their persistent underperformance. Neighborhoods and communities that are proposed for potential neighborhood options were clarified. Board member discussion ensued.

Member Jensen asked what efforts are being made to expand the number or classification of operators that are willing to go into rural locations given that all the efforts are currently Clark and Washoe County centric. Ms. Feiden responded that there is a smaller pool of operators that are interested and have experience in rural communities. She noted that going forward she would like the opportunity to work with member Jensen to identify those needs and to look for operators that have the skills and capacity the rural communities need.

Member Holmes-Sutton inquired about the Partnership Network. Ms. Feiden responded that the Partnership Network is continuing and does not intend to pause or stop the work that is going on in the schools under the Partnership Network. Those schools are persistently underperforming and have challenges with student outcomes. As a result, adding a neighborhood option is only a benefit to the community, it does interfere with the work the school is doing to improve. Member Ortiz asked for a report from the Partnership Network at a future board meeting so they can understand the challenges better.

Vice President Newburn expressed concern that there are 16 schools, the Board must choose eight, and eight of the 16 have notations that they will not be selected because they do not have an operator available. Member Ortiz said she would rather have recommendations of schools that are in the most need, have not had any success, and have had programs in place for 2-3 years but have seen no improvement.

Member Holmes-Sutton said she struggled with the schools that are chosen because it is where the operators want to be, and there are so many schools that have great challenges, needs and continue to have persistent challenges. This decision is difficult. Board member discussion continued.

Vice President Newburn moved to approve the schools that have an operator available: Brinley, Jerome Mac, Johnston, Monaco, Orr, Sedway, Von Toble and Wes Prep Sec, all middle schools, to join the Achievement School District. Member Blakely seconded the second. The motion carried.

Temporary Public Hearing and Possible Adoption of Proposed Amendments to NAC 389.254; Financial Literacy prescribed courses of study for 3rd grade, NAC 389.2933 Prescribed courses of study for 4th grade, NAC 389.2942 Prescribed courses of study for 5th grade, NAC 389.372 Prescribed courses of study for 6th – 8th grade and NC 389.511 Prescribed courses of study for 9th – 12th grade.

The public hearing opened at 9:57 a.m. There were six individuals present in Carson City and 20 individuals present in Las Vegas.

Dave Brancamp, Director, Standards and Instructional Support informed that these standards are being added to the current Nevada Academic Content Standards for Social Studies, per S.B. 249 from the 2017 Legislative Session. The bill requires that the standards are added for grades 3-12. Approximately a year ago the Board approved the teacher friendly language on the Consent Agenda at a board meeting, and today is the public hearing for the regulation process. The districts have already done some professional development work for these standards and the Nevada treasurer's office conducted a summit last summer to help aid teachers learn how to teach the standards.

Member Newburn asked that because these are part of the social studies standards, were they already adopted as part of those standards, or are amendments being made to the social studies standards that have already been adopted. Mr. Brancamp clarified these standards are being added and have not been seen outside of the teacher friendly language that was adopted by the Board as part of the Consent Agenda about a year ago. As a temporary regulation the workshop and public hearing is conducted and the LCB legal language will be available when these standards come back after July 2019 for the Board to consider for adoption as a permanent regulation.

There public hearing was closed at 10:04 a.m. There was no public comment.

Member Ortiz moved to approve the proposed amendments to the Financial Literacy Standards. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Public Hearing and Possible Adoption of Proposed Amendments to R120-18; NAC 391.xxx pertaining to New and Transfer Teacher Incentives pursuant to Assembly Bill 434 passed during the 2017 Legislative Session.

The public hearing was opened at 10:05 a.m. There were six individuals present in Carson City and 20 individuals present in Las Vegas.

Superintendent Canavero explained this regulation is responsive to A.B. 434 from the 2017 Legislative Session with two different incentives, one for new teachers to Title I low performing schools and the other for existing teachers to transfer into those schools. The qualifications and rules are specified for teachers and eligible schools. Transferring teachers would be eligible to receive up to a \$5000 incentive. Section 1 deals with newly hired teachers and Section 2 deals with the transfer of existing teachers that are transferring into Title I or underperforming schools.

Section 1 aligns timelines and in addition to Section 2 ensures that the incentive program is run through the existing enhanced for performance pay program required in all districts. The clarification of underperforming exists in both Sections 1 and 2 and deals with new teachers and transfers related to the lowest two ratings pursuant to the star system, or 1 and 2 star schools. Section 2 stipulates that the school must be a Title 1 school or a school designated as an underperforming school. The teacher that would transfer and become eligible for the incentive may not presently be serving in a Title 1 school that is designated as underperforming. In addition the teacher must be rated as effective or highly effective.

Member Ortiz asked if it is possible to utilize these funds for existing teachers that have stayed in Title 1 schools rather than transferred out when they are eligible to transfer? Superintendent Canavero said that is not in the language of the law. Member Ortiz asked if priority is given to existing teachers versus new hires. Superintendent Canavero stated there are funds dedicated for existing teachers who transfer to Title 1 underperforming schools, and there are funds for new hire teachers.

Member Ortiz inquired whether language can be added to the regulation so a new teacher hired to work in a Title 1 school and is receiving this incentive must be experienced and is a highly effective teacher. Superintendent Canavero responded that there are some priorities in the existing incentive pool which includes the new hire. Later there will be an opportunity to award \$5 million in incentives under a different agenda item. He added there could be some changes to the law in the upcoming 2019 Legislative Session. Member Ortiz replied she is hopeful that the Legislators will get it right in the upcoming session.

Superintendent Canavero asked member Jensen, Superintendent of Humboldt School District whether he had any suggestions. Member Jensen said he did not have additional suggestions, adding he does not agree with providing an incentive for people to stay. The intent is to entice the best and brightest to go to the lowest performing schools to teach.

Member Blakely admitted to some confusion and said if the Board does not approve this public hearing, then they are not allowing the \$5 million to be distributed, and he asked what the consequences are. Superintendent Canavero responded that the regulations are catching up to how the incentives for both new and transferred teachers have already been preliminary allocated. Language will be incorporated in the award notices for the transfer teachers already awarded so districts have clarity about when they will reimburse teachers, who have transferred consistent with the incentives already awarded.

Member Blakely commented that based on what he has heard, there appears to be some inequities in this process. If no action is taken, does that mean that the money would not be distributed?

Superintendent Canavero recognized the board's tension regarding some of the language. The dollars have already been awarded, and the districts are waiting for a formal notice to request the reimbursements for the incentives that have already been awarded on the transfer side. He does not think the regulations are necessary for the request for funds to occur, nor are the regulations necessary for the incentive decision the board will have later. They are helpful for clarifying the administration and how the dollars are to be used.

Vice President Newburn said the tension has always been that based on law it can only go to teachers who are being recruited to attend the At Risk Schools, it cannot be used to retain teachers. There is nothing this Board can do about that, it is in the law.

There was no public comment. Vice President Newburn discussed and summarized the options. The hearing closed at 10:20 a.m.

Member Carter moved to adopt R120-18. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Public Hearing and Possible Adoption of Proposed Amendments to R097-17; NAC 389.0482 to 389.0482; NAC 389.0484 Eligibility of pupil to take college and career readiness assessment; NAC 389.051 Times for administration; special administration; NAC 389.0515 General requirements for examinations; NAC 389.054 Confidentiality and security of testing materials; NAC 389.056 Procedures for administration; NAC 389.0565 Use of calculators on examinations; NAC 389.057 Eligibility for reexamination; NAC 389.0574 School district to provide remedial study to pupil who fails end-of-course examination; plan to provide remedial study to be provided to Department; review and approval of plan; times remedial study to be offered; NAC 389.0576 Charter school to provide remedial study to pupil who fails end-of-course examination; plan to provide remedial study to be provided to sponsor; review and approval of plan; times remedial study to be offered; NAC 389.058 Reporting of results to Department; NAC 389.059 Restriction on reporting scores of individual pupils; reporting of aggregated scores; NAC 389.061 Specific criterion-referenced examinations required; NAC 389.071 Proficiency examinations in writing: High school; fifth and eighth grades; NAC 389.083 Maintenance of results of examinations and list of names and scores.

The public hearing was opened at 10:21 a.m. There were six individuals present in Carson City and 20 individuals present in Las Vegas.

Mike Pacheco, Education Programs Supervisor, explained this regulation cleans up language to account for changes in the end-of-course examinations stemming from the 2017 Legislative Session. Senate Bill 303 from the 2017 Legislative Session changed how the high school assessments are structured and the regulatory language aligns with that bill.

There was no public comment. The hearing closed at 10: 25 a.m.

Member Carter moved to adopt R097-17. Member Blakely seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information and Discussion regarding an update of the National Board certification and National Board Certified Teachers in Nevada. December 1, 2018 teachers throughout the country will receive notification of their National Board scores; thousands will learn of their certification status. The Board will recognize the teachers in Nevada that achieve National Board certification as well as acknowledge those already certified - committed to student learning and achievement and excellence in service to the profession.

Dr. Katie Dockweiler, National Board Certified Teacher (NBCT), explained she leads and serve teachers in pursuit of the National Board Certification, in leadership and collaboration with Dr. Tonia Holmes-Sutton, and Nicolette Smith. They are presenting today during team NBCT week as they join national boards for teaching standards and affiliates across the country in recognizing and celebrating new current and aspiring NCBT teachers. Last year Governor Sandoval proclaimed Nov 16 as NCBT day in Nevada.

They remain empowered and passionate about their work and impacting student growth and achievement for 1000s in the state through National Board Certification. A presentation was provided by Dr. Ernie Rambo to inform and provide context for National Board Certification.

To achieve National Board Certification teachers must successfully demonstrate clear consistent and convincing evidence of accomplished teaching through each of the four components of National Board Certification. Grounding evidence of accomplished teaching and the accomplished teaching body of knowledge consists of five core propositions of what teachers should know and be able to do:

- Teachers are committed to students and their learning;
- Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students;
- Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning;
- Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience;
- Teachers are members of learning communities

Based on the five core propositions, National Board standards define what accomplished teachers should know and be able to do in 25 certificate areas. They represent 16 different subject areas and four developmental levels and are applicable to most teachers in public schools across the country.

This week NCBT teachers in Nevada are recognized and celebrated for successfully demonstrating they meet the highest professional teaching standards and impacting teaching and learning in such a way that contributes to Nevada serving its students with integrity, equity and commitment to excellence and achievement. The schools in Nevada that have four or more NCBTs were recognized.

Board members asked clarifying questions about the NCBT.

Member Macias was asked if she has had any NCBT in her classes. She has not, but stated she knows of teachers who are working towards their certification. They are already excellent teachers as they work towards their certification, and the difference between NCBT teachers is noticeable.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding Teach Nevada Scholarships (TNVS) pursuant to NRS 391A.550 – NRS 391A.590. The Board will hear a brief presentation on changes made to TNVS implementation due to the passage of SB544 (2017). Some of these changes resulted in residual FY16, FY17, and FY18 funds for which the State Board has statutory authority to carry over into future fiscal years and biennia. Possible action may include awarding these carryover FY16 – FY18 funds, as well as funds not previously granted during the first Phase of FY19 allocations, to various state-approved traditional and/or alternative route to licensure teacher preparation programs.

Superintendent Canavero conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation. All the providers were recognized and the FY19 Phase II grant opportunities were announced approximately five days ago. Applications were submitted to the NDE with the program type, the number of scholarships requested and the amount per scholarship. The recommendation is for the Board to approve not more than 55 scholarships per the Phase II table to the following five institutions that submitted applications:

- University of Nevada, las Vegas
- Clark County School district
- Western Governors University
- Sierra Nevada College
- Nevada State College

Member Ortiz moved to approve the 55 Teach Nevada Scholarships, pending approval by the Legislature to move funds from Reserve to the Operational Budget Category. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information and Discussion pursuant to NRS 385.040 (2), focusing on the goals and benchmarks of the State for improving student achievement; the effects of those goals, status in achieving them, and the status of any corrective action the Department has imposed. Per NRS 385.040(2), the Board has invited individuals and will engage in discussions with the superintendents of the school districts, presidents of the boards of trustees of the school districts, representatives of the governing bodies of charter schools, representatives of the governing bodies of university schools for profoundly gifted pupils, and the chairs of all board, commissions and councils in the public education system in this State.

Superintendent Canavero explained this item is an opportunity for individuals to engage in a discussion about the education goals of the state. Over the course of the past three years the NDE has aligned their work against a single plan with clear metrics and benchmarks for success. Today is a chance to hear from the public about improvements to the plan. It is an ongoing process and in March 2019 the Board will adopt the next iteration of the State Improvement Plan (STIP). This is also an update for the Board about corrective action. If a school district or a charter school are operating outside the law, they are noticed and then a plan is developed to get them in compliance with the law and move forward. The joint implementation plan with CCSD and discussions under A.B. 469 are in the areas of compliance, and are reflected in the joint implementation plan. Progress is being made.

Duana Malone, Vice Chair, Advisory Council for Family Engagement stated that over fifty years of research confirms that family engagement in a child's education matters. Studies have found that family engagement in a child's education, regardless of income or background, leads to higher grades and test scores, enrollment in advancement programs, improvement in school attendance, better social and emotional skills, increased graduation rates and higher college persistence rates. She expressed appreciation for the STIP that dedicates an entire objective solely to family engagement. Family engagement is critical in regular student attendance, and chronic absenteeism is a national crisis. Ms. Malone discussed chronic absenteeism and its consequences in Nevada. It is important to continue having family engagement in future STIPs with the goal of embedding family engagement practices and strategies within other objectives in the plan to support desired goals.

Dallas Johnston, Teacher in Residence, Department of Education, said the newly selected 21 members of STAC reviewed the objectives in the STIP that align with student achievement. Collaboratively, members provided written comments on objectives focusing on student achievement. Deb Whitt, on behalf of the STAC members, provided an overview of the remarks. A consensus was determined to push for STEM programs and other elements of the STIP. They urged a holistic approach to the implementation of STEM programs, and that time is needed to measure the resources and training available to implement the programs. The Arts and Humanities are equally important as STEM ideology. Education goals should consider the development of the whole child to be college, career and community ready. Ms. Whitt addressed the educator equity gap and evidence based high quality materials aligned to meet objectives. Another important element to consider that is crucial in the determination to push towards any educational program is at what point are student populations, as major stakeholders, brought into the conversations that will affect their future

Member Ortiz noted the summary from STAC highlighted that the number one take away is teachers are needed to teach STEM effectively, and the same with expanding other programs. There must be educators who are willing, prepared and supported to teach those rigorous courses.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding 2018-2019 District Staffing, Existing Teacher Vacancies, and FY19 New Teacher Incentives. The Board will receive updated information since projected 18-19 staffing, anticipated vacancies, and new teacher incentive estimates were presented at the April 2018 meeting. Possible action may include final approval of FY19 new teacher incentive allocations for eligible new Special Education teachers hired at any school and new teachers hired at Title I or 1-Star /2-Star schools pursuant to Senate Bill 544 and Assembly Bill 434 (2017).

Superintendent Canavero conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation providing background on teacher incentives. In April 2018 the Board approved the preliminary allocations of \$7.2 million. The NDE reconciled the funds and discovered the available funds were off by over \$1.5 million for a total \$5,450,970. It is a difficult position to be in. What was thought to be available and what is actually

available is an NDE error. The \$5.4 million is both legislative appropriated with some carry forward funds.

Since April, the course of business is to receive an update from the districts regarding how many of the preliminary allocations have been used and how many new hires they would be seeking. Superintendent Canavero provided details about the data for the districts including the total number of all teachers to receive incentives, the amount of the recommended funding and the recommended percent of requested funds to allocate the districts. The following actions to approve the funding were discussed.

- Action 1 - Districts were rank ordered by vacancies, and then the percent of the request based upon the percentage of vacancies was adjusted. The highest is 80 percent of the request, the lowest is 60 percent of the request and 5 percent was used as a cut off. Above 5 percent, 80 percent of funding was received, and less than 5 percent, 60 percent of requested funding was received with the exception of Lincoln County who had one teacher, and it was \$4500. It made sense to completely allocate that amount.
- Action 2 – The logic is there should be no additional incentives for districts that have vacancies. Dollars should be provided for teachers who are hired to eliminate those vacancies. The lower vacancy number indicates the greater need for the incentive to honor the commitment to incentivize teachers to come. The percent of the request versus allocated changes, because of which districts, the larger districts, move this. There is 55 percent of the original request for those districts that have about 5 percent vacancy, and 65 percent of the award to the districts below 5 percent with a greater need to backfill the positions they hired.
- Action 3 – This a flat allocation, take the total available and divide the request by the available dollars and apply it uniformly across all the districts. That is at about 62.58 percent.

Member Jensen, Superintendent, Humboldt County School District explained that not all of the district superintendents have had the opportunity to weigh in on the options. He said his thoughts are not representative of the superintendents as a group as the data for Humboldt was highlighted and discussed. A point of conversation is leaving 3.3 percent of his vacancies unfilled. The eligible number of SpEd teachers is seven, eligible non-SpEd is 15 for a total of 22. Under this application Humboldt County School District submitted 22 positions, and they have filled all 22 positions, and requested the incentive funds to support. They still have seven unfilled positions, but he did not submit those positions under this funding formula. As a result, everything Humboldt District asked for, they filled. There will be similarities with other districts.

When considering the districts that have greater than 5 percent vacancies, assuming there is a relationship to unfilled positions that they applied for, some districts would have been unable to expend the allocation and would need to revert funds back to the state. The point is to look at some type of mechanism under this, recognizing there are fewer dollars, that does not create a scenario where districts that are at 80 percent end up sending money back to the state because they could not fill all their vacancies.

Many of the districts under 5 percent and getting a 60 percent allocation are going to need to dig into their general fund to meet these obligations. These are positions that have already been filled. By filling those, discussions were had with new employees stating they would be receiving an incentive based upon however the district rolled it out.

Member Jensen said he is not in a position to step back from the commitment of \$5,000, rather he has an obligation to fill that gap through general fund dollars. That became his initial proposal, that perhaps it should be a reverse, 60 percent if over 5 percent vacancies, and 80 percent if under 5 percent vacancies. Additional suggestions were heard through further discussions. Clark County had an issue but did not have an opportunity to weigh in on any other recommendations. Based on that, concern rose around the 80/60 split and he recommended looking at other modification to consider the positions that have been filled in the fiscal impact that has already been committed to by each of the districts.

Vice President Newburn said the NDE is in the position where commitments and promises were made with strong suggestions that teachers would receive a certain incentive under this program. It seems the first order of business is to fulfill those commitments that were made the best we can. Which of the

options is going to do the best in fulfilling the commitments made, understanding that may take money away that could have been available to recruit new teachers.

Superintendent Canavero said member Jensen refined his thinking yesterday which resulted in the consideration of Action #2, and further refined it right now. If just considering the requested funds for all eligible new teachers in the hired column, it adds up to \$7,421 million. An option to consider would be to use the \$7, 421,650 not the \$8,710,400 which is inclusive of the new teachers. Instead of 68 percent, it would be 62.58 percent, the requested dollars against the \$7,421 million would be 73.45 percent. If considering funding the teachers already hired and using that as the formula, then look at 73 percent of the column of funding, with the available dollars rather than 62.58 percent of the total, which would include new teachers.

Vice President Newburn asked if only 73 percent of the commitment would be met? Superintendent Canavero responded that is accurate, instead of \$5000 it would be around \$3000.

Member Blakely said of the available funding, the most equitable option is to allocate it in even portions to all the districts. There was a plan, but now there is less money. If the lesser money was distributed at the same percentage to everyone, at least it is being fair with what there is rather than the plan where one district receives 80 percent, and another district receives 60 percent, resulting in questions. He suggested using Action 3 plus, which is being discussed now.

Vice President Newburn clarified the action being discussed and looking at funding based on actual teachers hired. Member Blakely expressed preference for using the same percent for all the districts, Action 3. Member Jensen suggested Action 2. Member Blakely said in Action 2, the final number is not the amount that is available. His problem with Action 2 is we do not have that money.

Superintendent Canavero noted that the motion to be considered is inclusive of language that would allow the NDE to make necessary adjustments. That is for two reasons, one is to allow for flexibility. The second is because there may be some districts that do not use the funds, so they can be tracked to move the money around. Member Blakely said that mid-year adjustments of the funds could be made if some of them are not being utilized.

Member Jensen said he liked the modification to Action 3, but he is only speaking for himself since this has not been brought to the broader group of superintendents. If the analysis considers the actual hiring from each district, considers the total numbers then made an allocation based on that, it will come closer to the equitable piece. From this point forward, even assuming if a district does hire, they are able to discuss and make that determination. Either general funds are committed or there is none available. He suggested a modified Action 3, but that is in isolation. He asked how urgent the decision is. Could this be an action item followed up by more accurate figures in January.

Superintendent Canavero said action on this item is necessary now. He asked member Jensen to convey what he believes to be the position of the superintendents in order for them to finalize the incentives, and then begin to process them. He deferred to member Jensen and his knowledge of the operations of the school districts. Member Jensen said that in Humboldt County the funds were dispersed in two payments. One was in December and one in June, as is common with grant funding. A component is paid out of the general fund and then they wait for the reimbursement. That is fairly similar across districts, it is not that they are waiting for these funds to hit their cash flow in order to provide the incentive.

Vice President Newburn asked if this payment has been made already. Can the knowledge that there is not going to be adequate funding be helpful in changing the direction in December? Superintendent Jensen replied they have already augmented their budget and the payments are scheduled to be made next week. Any deficit in the allocation will be made whole by their general fund. At least for Humboldt County, the \$5,000 commitment will be honored.

Vice President Newburn inquired whether the Board needs to act on this or give the NDE their preference, and then come back with more detail in January. Superintendent Canavero asked Deputy Attorney Greg Ott his consideration of a motion that would allow the board flexibility to approve an equitable allocation of the teacher incentives and for the NDE to have the flexibility to work with districts to determine the final allocation pending a financial true-up.

Mr. Ott asked for clarification. Would the Board approve a framework for the NDE to enter into negotiations with the superintendents, and once an agreement was made funds would be paid out, and then the final allocation would come back to the Board for final approval? Superintendent Canavero clarified the consideration is for one approval allowing the flexibility that it could be finalized under the purview of a motion that includes the NDEs ability to finalize it next week, and it would not need to come back to the Board.

Mr. Ott said that would be an improper delegation of the Board's statutory obligation to allocate these funds. It is the Board's obligation to determine where the funds are going, and they are not able to delegate that to the NDE. They could ask the NDE to work up a solution then hold an emergency telephonic meeting to agree on the final accommodation.

Member Blakely said in the proposal there is a recommendation for the Board to approve the FY18-19 teacher incentive recommended funding level for each district with the ability of the NDE to make necessary adjustments pending further reconciliation of the funds. He asked if they could make the recommended motion with a stipulation it is done under Action 3. Superintendent Canavero stated when he drafted the motion it was with the consideration that the Board would identify one of the Actions and that would be part of the motion. The idea of adjustments pending further reconciliation would be for any district that did not meet their number, then reconcile what is available and reallocate that to the other districts.

Member Carter clarified that Action 4 is the same as Action 3 except changing the percentage from 62 percent to 73 percent. Superintendent Canavero agreed and clarified Action 4 is 73.45 percent and would be applied against the column for teachers already hired, so the furthest right column which concludes with a total ask of \$7,421,650. The thought is that these are teachers who are already hired, to superintendent Jensen's point, are already committed. He divided how much was available by how much is being requested, and that came up with 73.45 percent. He took 73.45 percent of the district's request in the already hired column.

Member Carter moved to use Action 4 which takes the number of eligible teachers of 1750 and divides the \$7,410,650 into that at a rate that we will be able to spend the \$5.4 million which is the current limit.

Vice President Newburn asked if member Carter needed to amend the motion to allow the districts the flexibility to reallocate any unspent money? Mr. Ott said the districts have that flexibility. The Board would be allocating the money to the districts and the districts can choose how to spend it.

Member Blakely seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Future Agenda Items

Member Ortiz recommended an item about an equity lens in everything the Board approves. Also, if possible, to include in the Superintendent's report on a monthly basis, any feedback from STAC and the possible consideration of creating a Superintendent's Students Advisory Council.

Member Miller again requested an update on the OPAL system.

Public Comment #2

Ramona Esparza, Principal, Valley High School, explained that Valley High School is a Victory High school, and she knows the funding is on the table and is considering how things need to be revised and changed. She acknowledged Governor Sandoval and others who provided additional resources for Victory and Zoom schools. Her school serves over 2800 students, 78 percent are Free and Reduced Lunch, and a third of the students are second language learners. They are the highest high school that has a refugee Newcomer Academy with almost 250 students from 30 countries and 30 different languages. She is proud of the schools' diversity, which has its challenges.

Ms. Esparza shared the importance that it costs more to serve these students. The state deemed Valley High a transformational high school many years ago. Back then it had less than a 50 percent graduation rate. Since she came to the school, last year and the 17-18 year, 86 percent of students graduated. Their ACT scores have moved up and they provide innovative teaching, and an opportunity for students to take the ACT test more than once. The adequate growth percentile increased with their second language

learners from 12 percent in 2016-17 to 15 percent. She shared additional data they are celebrating. Because of Victory they are able to pay for students who do not have money to take the test. It is one thing to have academic success, but there is a hidden curriculum at every school. Valley High School is the first high school in southern Nevada that is implementing positive behavior instructional supports. When she began her job at Valley High School they had the highest expulsion rate for students with over 135 in one year. As a result of looking at the social and emotional learning of every child, they are now one of the lowest in the district for expulsion rates. They work with their kids and teach the whole child.

Because of Victory they were able to open a wellness center on site that provides mental health counseling services for the community. They save students from committing suicides. They are a two star school but the progress made in six years cannot be measured in stars. It is very important that Victory and Zoom funding continues. It costs more to serve the underserved.

Vicky Courtney, President, Clark County Education Association spoke about the National Board Program and offered if the Board would like to learn more about the work they have done with the professional development schools. They have 30 of them in the most at risk schools in the district and what happens is that the principals agree to do this alongside of the educators. It helps to move those schools. The best thing that happens is that the National Board Program can be started after teaching for three years. She said she would like to share the data.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.