

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ENGLISH MASTERY COUNCIL
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, March 3, 2022
8:00 AM**

NOTICE: THIS MEETING WILL BE VIRTUAL WITH NO PHYSICAL LOCATION

Access	Links
Watch the Meeting	Lifesize Livestream
Provide Public Comment to	tina.lombard@doe.nv.gov
Provide Public Comment by Phone	1 (312) 584-2401

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE ENGLISH MASTERY COUNCIL MEETING

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Lorna James Cervantes, Chair
Alain Bengochea
Laurel Crossman
Gladis Diaz
Karl Wilson
Leah Terry
Paula Zona

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Kul Axtell
Jeff Briske
Linda Fields
Kathleen Galland-Collins

PRESENTERS IN ATTENDANCE

Justin Gerald

AGENDA

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

- *Lorna James-Cervantes, Chair, English Mastery Council*
Chair Cervantes called the meeting to order.

Tina Lombard performed roll call and quorum was established.

Chair Cervantes led the Council in the Pledge of Allegiance and called for a moment of silence considering the events taking place in the Ukraine and the people there affected.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

Yvette Williams, Caucus Chair, provided comment in support of the recommendations, as written, and approved by the EMC unanimously on May 13, 2021. (A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)

Karl Wilson read the comment from Yvette Wilson in support of the recommendations written and approved by the EMC on May 13, 2021.

3. APPROVAL OF FLEXIBLE AGENDA (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)

- *Lorna James-Cervantes, Chair, English Mastery Council*

Motion: Approve Flexible Agenda
By: Leah Terry
Second: Paula Zona
Vote: Passed unanimously

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: 11/4/21 ENGLISH MASTERY COUNCIL MEETING (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)

- *Lorna James-Cervantes, English Mastery Council Chair*

Laurel Crossman indicated that on page 12 of the minutes, the word used for her comments is "ensuring." Ms. Crossman indicated that she was not trying to say that critical race theory should be ensured but rather was attempting to emphasize that it is not part of the curriculum at this time and requested that this word be changed to "emphasizing" rather than "ensuring."

Karl Wilson indicated that page 10 should refer to AB-129 rather than AB-219 but noted that it had already been resolved.

Motion: Approve November 24, 2021, EMC Meeting Minutes as corrected
By: Karl Wilson
Second: Laurel Crossman
Vote: Passed unanimously

5. EDLiFE PRESENTATION (Information/Discussion)

- *EPP from Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement, Nevada Department of Education*

Chair Cervantes thanked the presenters from EDLiFE for their patience in that their presentation had to be rescheduled from the last meeting to this meeting. Chair Cervantes further indicated that the presentation would focus on the topics of licensure and the bilingual endorsement based on the request from the last EMC meeting. This would be to better understand the endorsement and how both the bilingual endorsement and the ELAD endorsement may overlap or be like one another.

Kathleen Galland-Collins, Assistant Director for the Office of EDLiFE, explained that the director was traveling. She indicated that she is not quite as familiar with the regulations as he is but will share with the Council what the director had prepared. Ms. Garland-Collins thanked the Council for the invitation. She indicated EDLiFE's welcoming of the opportunity to work with the Council to review the current regulations in NAC 391.242 and NAC 391.059. The opportunity also allows suggesting updates as necessary or appropriate to the Commission on Professional Standards (COPS), which is the regulatory body responsible for developing regulations for standards for licensure.

Kathleen Galland-Collins informed the Council that NAC 391.242 includes and delineates the endorsements and requirements to teach about the program of bilingual education, which requires a bachelor's or more advanced degree with a major in bilingual education. Ms. Galland-Collins further indicated that these educators must hold an elementary, secondary, special education, or middle school license as well. Additionally, to receive the endorsement, they must have at least 12 semester hours of credit. These would include theories for the acquisition of a second language and remaining coursework in at least three of the following areas: methods for teaching language arts or reading in native language; methods of teaching math, science, or social studies in the native language; testing and

evaluating students of a second language in English and the native language; development of curriculum materials and teaching methods for bilingual education; native language and culture; bilingual education, history, philosophy, and theory. Ms. Galland-Collins indicated that there is also a testing component in 1-B, a test for oral and written proficiency in the native language, if one exists, which is the other regulation to be completed within two years of the issuance of the endorsement.

Kathleen Galland-Collins next discussed NAC 391.059, which is the regulation around testing or assessment of a teacher assigned to a program of bilingual education. Ms. Galland-Collins explained that the regulation requires the school district to select, develop, and administer an appropriate test or other means of assessment to ascertain that the teacher's language proficiency suffices to provide instruction to students in their native language. Ms. Galland-Collins further indicated that the passage of the assessment by a district does not exempt the educator from any other licensure requirements. In addition, Ms. Galland-Collins added, the school district must maintain records of assessments conducted in an annual report to NDE. Ms. Galland-Collins informed the Council that there are currently 210 teachers out of the more than 25,000 in the state who hold a bilingual endorsement issued by the state of Nevada. Twelve new endorsements have been issued since January of 2018, ten of which were reciprocal from another state. In the previous year, four teachers were assigned to a bilingual program in Nevada.

Chair Cervantes noted the differences between the bilingual endorsement and the ELAD endorsement: there is not any type of field work being required for the bilingual endorsement at this time; the testing of the native language for the bilingual endorsement.

Alain Bengochea noted that the bilingual endorsement and the ELAD endorsement come into conflict in the sense that the courses in ELAD in relation to the bilingual endorsement courses listed in NAC tend to heavily overlap. Mr. Bengochea indicated that in the case of such an overlap in other states, the bilingual endorsement courses would suffice and subsume the requirements for ELAD. Mr. Bengochea further indicated that because of the way the requirements in Nevada are currently set, this could be very taxing for students due to repetition in the coursework. As such, Mr. Bengochea suggested that the Council consider the bilingual endorsement to subsume the ELAD endorsement.

Chair Cervantes concurred, citing her own experience as a holder of both the bilingual and the TESL endorsement. Chair Cervantes suggested that the TESL workgroup discuss Mr. Bengochea's suggestion and come up with recommendations to bring back to the state to look at the overlap and perhaps give credit at the state level for course content within that overlap. In addition, Chair Cervantes questioned whether the bilingual endorsement should include a field-study piece, or a certain amount of practicum work as is required for the ELAD endorsement.

Leah Terry concurred with the suggestions of Mr. Bengochea and the Chair, citing her own experience as a holder of both the TESL and bilingual endorsement. Ms. Terry discussed the testing requirement put upon the districts in the NAC. Ms. Terry indicates her agreement in ensuring a bilingual classroom teacher is proficient in the language, but questions if the State Department of Education might have a recommendation for a test of that bilingual proficiency.

Laurel Crossman indicated that because of the teacher shortage and the desire of the state to hire highly qualified teachers, any work that the Council could do to consolidate some of the credentials at the college level would help to improve the availability of teachers.

Gladis Diaz concurred with and reiterated Ms. Crossman's commentary.

Laurel Crossman indicated her belief that some states incentivize teachers who hold these additional endorsements and wondered if there had ever been a consideration of this for teachers in Nevada.

Chair Cervantes indicated that she did not know the answer to that question and asked for someone within the state department and/or for someone in EDLiFE to potentially research this and return an answer to the Council. Chair Cervantes suggested that if this incentivizing is not currently taking place, it is a potential recommendation that the EMC could make in the next legislative session. Chair Cervantes explained that the Council is already looking at a weighted funding formula for the state based on students who speak English as a second language, bilingual students, and students in need of special education services. Chair Cervantes opined that perhaps the Council should investigate

if student funding should be weighted more since these students need more as well as placing additional funding into districts. The additional funding could help them pay for things like stipends to attract teachers who are bilingual, TESL, or ELAD endorsed to the state, particularly because so much of the population in the state are English Language Learners.

Kathleen Galland-Collins indicated that she could work with Blakely Hume and Karl Wilson to determine who would be best to do that research for the Council.

Laurel Crossman offered the example of the bonus provided for the National Board-Certified Teachers but indicated that she did not know if this bonus was offered through just her district or through the entire state.

Kathleen Galland-Collins explained that the bonus to which Ms. Crossman referred used to come through the department in the form of a reimbursement request. Galland-Collins then further explained those funds are now allocated by districts as they see fit to spend them and no longer at the department level.

Blakely Hume asked if the National Board Certification stipend had been a one-time stipend on a yearly stipend.

Kathleen Galland-Collins indicated that it had been a one-time reimbursement for things like fees and coursework costs for the initial National Board Certification.

Leah Terry pointed out that National Board Certification is under NRS 391.161, which indicates that National Board-Certified teachers receive a 5 percent increase to base salary across the state, regardless of district. Ms. Terry further indicated that some districts do offer more to teachers who have achieved National Board Certification. Ms. Terry informed the Council that approximately 4 percent of teachers in Nevada hold National Board Certification.

Kathleen Galland-Collins clarified that there are two different funds--the pass-through for the pay raise and the reimbursement program.

Laurel Crossman explained that when the ELAD and TESL endorsements were reviewed in the districts across the state, the rural counties seemed to be having a harder time finding qualified and certified teachers. Crossman suggest a potentially salary increase could help to better equip these counties with qualified and certified educators.

Chair Cervantes reiterated to the TESL workgroup the Council's wish for the group to discuss and return recommendations to the Council that could then be brought forward to the state regarding changes to licensure requirements for licensure programs that currently overlap in coursework. Chair Cervantes further explained that one of the goals of the EMC is to consistently make recommendations to the state Department of Education for what priorities may be for English Language learners moving forward into the next year and into the next legislative session.

6. NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION UPDATE (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)

- *Karl Wilson, Education Programs Supervisor, Nevada Department of Education*
- *Blakely Hume, Education Programs Professional, Nevada Department of Education*

Blakely Hume informed the Council that he sent everyone an email regarding two major reports. Mr. Hume explained that the English Mastery Report is submitted to NDE leadership annually every February 1. Mr. Hume further indicated that depending upon the year, the report then moves forward to the Governor or the Committee on Education, or to the Governor and LCB. Mr. Hume explained that this year's report was submitted to NDE leadership and is moving through the process and once approved, will be brought forward to the Council. Mr. Hume informed the Council that the report is legislatively mandated to be updated and provided. Mr. Hume next discussed the contents of the report, indicating that these include current and/or new membership; an overview of EMC; and the requirements for the Council. Mr. Hume explained that a step-by-step process is involved in terms of meetings that have been conducted, as well as summarized details and items that were discussed or voted on in these meetings.

Blakely Hume next discussed the English Proficiency and Academic Achievement Progress and Procedures Report. Mr. Hume explained that this report is not legislatively mandated, but that oftentimes the Council will request data, information and/or research on a particular topic. Mr. Hume explained that with the last legislative session and the new requirement, Requirement 7, to support students in the bottom quartile of academics, this report emerged as a request last spring. As such, Mr. Hume explained, as the EMC moved towards recommendations for the English Proficiency and Academic Achievement group, the idea was to provide research, summary, and data to support those recommendations. As a result, Mr. Hume informed the Council that many reports have been done, citing the ELAD endorsement as an example. Mr. Hume explained that because these reports are requests, they do not fall under Open Meeting Law (OML) obligation to share data or drafts. Once completed, Mr. Hume indicated the reports are presented to the Council for the Council to have a chance to review first. Mr. Hume informed the Council that the email he sent lists an outline form and that the report is still in draft form and still being researched. Mr. Hume indicated that when the report nears completion, it will then be presented to the EMC and submitted for review.

Blakely Hume explained that the report currently stands at approximately 50 to 60 pages. Mr. Hume next went over the different sections in the report. First is an overview that discusses the general timeline, the research process, and the recommendations that have led up to the drafting. Then, there is a discussion of AB92 and the 2019 legislative session. Next are examples of the impact of COVID-19 on the EMC, including the move toward a virtual environment and platform for current meetings. Following is an initial inquiry guiding the research for the EP&AA, which includes the questions regarding how best to support students in the lowest quartile, language achievement and acquisition, development, and speech and language. Next is a summary of research, including peer-reviewed articles, best practices on literacy and language development, as well a set of summarized research articles and links. Mr. Hume then discussed the summary of research regarding language proficiency and acquisition and linguistic variations nationwide practices, which is not academically based but rather nationwide based on cultural implications, social trends, ideas and articles, and history of the issue. Next in the report is the federal and state designation regarding language proficiency acquisition and identification that emerged from a discussion regarding federal designations and identification. Then, a summary section on research regarding the scholars and areas of language proficiency and acquisition, linguistic variation, and multilingual scholarship nationwide, which summarizes the academic conversation and the national dialogue concerning these matters at the institutions of higher learning throughout the United States. Next is EP&AA draft recommendations. Finally, a timeline of meetings, decisions, stakeholder involvement, and research conducted.

Blakely Hume reminded the Council that this was shared via email with the members.

Chair Cervantes explained that part of the reason for this report and some of the additional work done is due to the recommendations from the workgroup that indicated the need to look at national trends for addressing African American students who are failing in school.

Karl Wilson was informed that the NDE English learner department has been requested to participate in the summer conference of the Nevada Association of School Administrators. The EMC has been requested to share information regarding English learners and how school administrators can help to ensure that students who are English learners receive the supports and services they need. Mr. Wilson next indicated that UNLV is in the process of receiving a contract to conduct a study of the experience of African American students in terms of their education in the state of Nevada. Mr. Wilson informed the Council that NDE has dedicated some of the ARP ESSER state activity funds to assist with conducting this study. Mr. Wilson next informed the Council that approximately a year earlier, the US Department of Education conducted a monitoring of the state in terms of the Every Student Succeeds Act, and delivered some specific findings related to services for English learners. Mr. Wilson explained that NDE is working to address a finding related to statewide entrance and exit criteria for students in that the state needs to update or submit an amended state ESSA plan that would incorporate changes to the ELX criteria. Mr. Wilson indicated that local Title III directors are to be included in all decisions regarding statewide entrance and exit criteria and that a meeting was held with the directors in December to share the criteria. Mr. Wilson explained that the purpose of bringing this to the EMC is that the NDE has historically turned to the LEA Title III directors as well as the EMC for

feedback regarding proposals that impact English learners. Mr. Wilson indicated that at the conclusion of the presentation, the Council will be asked for specific feedback regarding the proposal. In addition, as NDE prepares to submit an updated state ESSA plan, an open public comment will be held regarding the proposals being discussed today.

Karl Wilson explained that there are four pathways to reclassifying in terms of English language proficiency that the state of Nevada is proposing. Mr. Wilson indicated that the first one has been in place since 2017 and prior to 2017, the exit criteria on the WIDA access assessment was a composite score of 5.0 and a 5.0 on the literacy subtest scoring. Mr. Wilson explained that in 2015-16, WIDA did some re-norming of their assessments, and the state conducted a study to look at the level of English language proficiency on the WIDA access that would be a level where English learners were performing at a comparable level as their non-English cohorts so they would have a similar rate of proficiency on state academic assessments. Mr. Wilson indicated that NDE found that with the newly updated norms that WIDA had conducted, if students were to receive a composite score at or above a proficiency level of 4.5, in terms of English learners, academic performance on the SBAC would be comparable to that of English-speaking peers. As a result, in 2017, the state Board approved the 4.5 composite proficiency level as the exit criteria for English learners. Mr. Wilson further explained that after that, the districts and charter schools have the requirement to monitor the former EL performance over the next four years to ensure that they are achieving academic success.

Karl Wilson informed the Council that when NDE worked with local Title III directors, one of the things highlighted was that sometimes students, particularly secondary students, do not feel motivated to their best on the WIDA assessment. Wilson explained that as a result, students demonstrate on the test a level of 4.0 or higher, but not the 4.5 or higher level even though they have demonstrated that they have the academic language to be successful. Mr. Wilson explained based on that understanding, a proposal was made that if a student did not achieve 4.5 or higher but did achieve between 4.0 and 4.4 in addition to achieving proficiency on the content assessments for English, language arts, and math; this would qualify as an alternate method to demonstrate English language proficiency. Mr. Wilson indicated that the recommendation at the time moved forward to the state Board and included the fact that there needed to be other lines of evidence demonstrating that the students had developed English language proficiency. Mr. Wilson informed the Council that both recommendations were approved in October of 2017.

Karl Wilson indicated that proposal number 3 is a new one that NDE has discussed with the EMC and with LEA directors. Mr. Wilson explained that in the ESSA law, states must have a way for English learners who are dually identified as a student with a disability to be able to exit in terms of participation on annual assessments. As such, Mr. Wilson explained, proposed option number 3 is to look at the English learners with disabilities who are unable to participate in all four domains of the WIDA assessment. The scores can then be taken from the domains in which they did participate and to calculate an overall composite score to determine whether the students qualify to exit EL status and be reclassified as English proficient.

Karl Wilson explained that the fourth proposal centers on English learners who have the most significant cognitive disabilities, students who would typically participate in Nevada's alternate assessment, which is reserved for approximately 1 percent of the population. Mr. Wilson explained that it is proposed that if the students achieve a proficiency of P-2 along with a body of evidence, they would then also be able to meet the exit criteria. Mr. Wilson further explained that without some proficiency level tied to the WIDA alternate access assessment, those students would never achieve a proficiency level of 4.0 to 4.5 or higher because the assessment does not score that high.

Karl Wilson next shared some of the nuances of the four proposals based on feedback from the US Department of Education. Mr. Wilson indicated the question of other body of evidence criteria under option 2: if the students achieve a 4.0 to 4.4 and demonstrate proficiency on either the SBAC or the ACT ELA in math, what will constitute the other body of evidence that would be consistently used across the state to meet federal expectations? Mr. Wilson next discussed options 3 and 4, indicating that feedback from the US Department of Education was problematic in

terms of ensuring consistency with the other body of evidence criteria. In addition, Mr. Wilson indicated that the US Department of Education stated in their report that it also does not demonstrate the extra requirements are applied consistently statewide. Mr. Wilson explained that input from LEA directors, especially for students with disabilities, is that when looking at the documentation, so much of which has been personalized in terms of individual student abilities and disabilities, that to have the same portfolio items across the entire state does not seem reasonable. As such, Mr. Wilson indicated the discussion with LEA Title II directors focused on whether it would be sufficient to look at just two factors for students under option 2: an EL proficiency of 4.0 to 4.4 and proficiency on the content assessments as the other factor and then eliminate the body of evidence. Mr. Wilson explained that the determination was that the factor about demonstrating proficiency in English, language arts, and math really demonstrates students' levels of academic language competency and thus negates the need for an additional body of evidence beyond that. Therefore, Mr. Wilson explained, that the recommendation for students under option 2 ultimately came down to the following: a WIDA composite score in the range of 4.0 to 4.40, and proficiency levels with their content assessments. Mr. Wilson explained that this then led to conversation related options 3 and 4: under option 3, students who do not participate in all four domains and under option 4, students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Mr. Wilson indicated that this conversation centered on students who participate in less than four domains. Wilson further explained that the direction Nevada is proposing is consistent with that of other states who are part of the WIDA consortium in terms of calculating a proficiency level based on the domains in which the students do participate. This would include the understanding that they must participate in at least two domains for the state to calculate a proficiency score based on the less than four domains situation.

Karl Wilson explained that in 2019, a workgroup was convened that included English learner representatives and special education representatives. Mr. Wilson indicated that at that time, the group felt that if WIDA could provide support in assigning an observed z-score value to the proficiency calculation, that would likely be the preference. Mr. Wilson explained that WIDA is not able to do that for states at this time, and so with input from the local Title III directors, the recommendation has been to move to model 2 of the four models that WIDA has defined as valid, which is to assign an average as observed domain score based on the domains in which students did participate.

Karl Wilson explained that the process is still being defined in terms of protocol, but the information NDE has from WIDA allows for calculation to identify which domains were assessed for whether students participated in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and then the domain scores. Mr. Wilson indicated that in the WIDA proficiency defining process, listening, and speaking are not weighted as high as reading and writing. When looking at the total composite calculation, reading and writing are factored as 0.35 of the total whereas listening and speaking are weighted as 0.15 of the totals. Mr. Wilson informed the Council that this reinforces the concept of using option 3, in that with the calculated composite score, students would be eligible to exit EL status if with that calculated proficiency score, they are at 4.5 or higher or in the range of 4.0 to 4.4 with proficient scores in the content assessments for English, language arts, and math. Karl Wilson further indicated that for English learners with the most significant cognitive disabilities, NDE did some research on option 4 along with WIDA, and the recommendation that came forward is that if a student achieves the proficiency level of P-2, they will qualify for exit criteria.

Karl Wilson informed the Council that WIDA provides to participating states and schools a supplemental resource that helps to define the different proficiency levels and language expectations. Mr. Wilson informed the Council that NDE has taken that chart and simplified it into just one area. Mr. Wilson explained that level P-2 in the WIDA proficiency levels is considered emerging, and next discussed the difficulty in assessing students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, indicating that the Nevada Alternate Assessment (NAA) and the WIDA Alt Access provide a reasonable approach to assessing these students. Mr. Wilson further indicated that WIDA is working with membership states on the development of a new Alt Access that should be out in approximately three years' time. Mr. Wilson explained that the new Alt Access will be initially piloted approximately a year from now and then will continue through the norming process. Mr. Wilson indicated the recommendation is that for English learners with

the most significant cognitive disabilities there be one criterion: to achieve a proficiency level of P-2 on the Alt Access Assessment.

Karl Wilson summarized the proposals for the Council: for option 2, to go with the English language proficiency from 4.0 to 4.4 along with the proficiency in content assessments, but the elimination of the body of evidence criteria in terms of a portfolio; option 3, to move ahead with allowing a calculation of English language proficiency based on at least two domains, that students who are English learners with disabilities participate on the WIDA access, and that NDE use the average score for arriving at that, and that the body of evidence criteria be eliminated; option 4, the proficiency level of P-2 and elimination of the body of evidence criteria for the purposes of achieving consistent measures across the state. Mr. Wilson indicated that this proposal, when reviewed against other states, seems to align with most states that have adopted exit criteria for English learners who have disabilities in the less than four domains assessment, and then the Alt Access assessment process.

Karl Wilson concluded his presentation by informing the Council that following December's discussion with Title III directors, a survey was sent to all districts to have an equal voice. Mr. Wilson indicated that NDE requested that one survey be completed per district, and one on behalf of the state public charter school authority. Mr. Wilson informed the Council that the surveys were returned in mid-December and indicated unanimous support from the local Title III directors to support the proposals.

Chair Cervantes reminded the Council that when some of the new alternate criteria were formed, part of the reason the other body of evidence was originally added was because many of the members had opined that if students are passing their coursework, in addition to passing an ACT or CRT, that body of evidence should count.

Karl Wilson explained that one of the things NDE considered in moving away from other bodies of evidence was that in ESSA law, there were some states that were inconsistent from district to district in terms of the ELXA criteria. Mr. Wilson further explained that part of ESSA in 2016 indicated that NDE needed to move to one set of criteria that would be consistently implemented across the state. Mr. Wilson indicated that when the 4.0 to 4.4 plus the passing of academic content was built into option 2, the federal government then indicated that the other body of evidence, unless the same rubric is used for every student, would not be implemented consistently across the state. As such, Mr. Wilson explained that other states dropped the other body of evidence as a required component, and NDE proposed this as well. Mr. Wilson further shared that NDE is working collaboratively with the Office of Inclusive education and colleagues in special education in terms of this protocol, in how to implement this, particularly with options 3 and 4, noting the need for awareness that there must be coordination and collaboration between English learner services and the IEP teams. Mr. Wilson indicated that NDE is working on those details to ensure that the processes are consistent across the state.

Paula Zona thanked Mr. Wilson and Mr. Blakely for the update, reiterating to the Council that it represented a lot of time and effort and hard work on their parts to do so.

Karl Wilson asked if the EMC feels that it is in a position where it understands enough about the proposals to take a formal action to provide support for these recommendations, indicating that this would help move forward communication with NDE leadership and the US Department of Education.

Chair Cervantes asked the members of the Council to provide their thoughts on whether they felt comfortable in moving forward with the recommendation to NDE about implementing the recommendations in the state of Nevada. Chair Cervantes indicated her belief that this is going to be very consistent across the state and would therefore eliminate any of the possibilities where the students who do still need services would be exited, thus protecting students and school districts from those types of decisions. Upon receiving no commentary from the EMC, Chair Cervantes asked for a motion to accept the recommendations as presented.

Leah Terry commended the work, citing her position from the standpoint of a teacher who has administered plenty of WIDA assessment.

Motion: To accept the recommendations as presented
By: Leah Terry
Second: Alain Bengochea
Vote: Passed unanimously

Karl Wilson indicated that based on the recommendations that came from the education policy and plan workgroup, NDE has been working for more than a year with colleagues in special education to develop guidance to assist educators in plans and services for English learners either suspected of or having a disability, in terms of ensuring that the right assessments and the right services are provided. Mr. Wilson explained that as NDE continues to move forward with this, it hopes to have a guidance document and training available in the fall. Mr. Wilson further assured the Council that one of the driving factors for NDE to request a partnership with colleagues in special education was the concern expressed by the policy and plan workgroup regarding over or underrepresentation of English learners in special education or in gifted and talented programs.

Chair Cervantes indicated her hope that at the next meeting the Council might receive an update on where the state stands in terms of implementation of the English language development framework and the professional development that went alongside that. Chair Cervantes explained that this was work instigated through some of the workgroups within the English Mastery Council. Chair Cervantes further stated this is primarily done by NDE to ensure that teachers have a resource to help them understand how to differentiate instruction for students in their classrooms that are at different levels of English language development while still engaging them in the content areas.

Blakely Hume indicated that two members of the ELD framework that have done the most work on this would be meeting with one of the small groups in today's Zoom breakout session. Mr. Hume assured the Council that he would request an update be provided for the next meeting.

7. ZOOM WORK GROUP BREAKOUT DISCUSSION (Information/Discussion)

- *Lorna James-Cervantes, English Mastery Council Chair*

Chair Cervantes indicated that the workgroup breakout sessions would last for approximately an hour, preceded by a 15-minute break, prior to resuming the meeting of the full EMC at 11:00 a.m.

8. SHARE-OUT ON EMC WORK GROUP UPDATES (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)

Work Groups:

- TESL

Alain Bengochea indicated that he was the only one present among the TESL workgroup members, and as such, proposed that he report back to the workgroup his proposed changes relating to the bilingual endorsement. Bengochea explained this would include modifying the Nevada Academic Standards so that the bilingual endorsement coursework more closely resembles the ELAD coursework, obtaining the bilingual endorsement would waive the ELAD endorsement requirement for those individuals, and discussing ways to incentivize teachers to take ELAD and bilingual endorsement coursework.

Chair Cervantes asked about the feasibility of saying there are times when a course could meet the requirements for either a bilingual or ELAD endorsement rather than one endorsement always replacing the other.

Laurel Crossman suggested that if some of the courses are similar, rather than waive the endorsement, perhaps there was a way to doubly endorse educators who take some of the bilingual endorsements to also be ELAD endorsed.

Alain Bengochea provided the example of taking a bilingual course on assessment requiring and understanding of the holistic picture of a child's abilities whereas when taking a second language or an ELAD endorsement course,

one only looks at the second language.

Chair Cervantes indicated that perhaps instead of waiving the ELAD endorsement, if all the coursework had been completed for bilingual endorsement, the educator should then be dually endorsed for bilingual and ELAD on their teaching license.

Blakely Hume asked Dr. Bengochea if the coursework from the ELAD perspective be different than that from the bilingual perspective.

Alain Bengochea indicated the coursework would be very similar, so similar in fact, that Mr. Bengochea indicated his belief that there is not a point to taking additional coursework in ELAD if an educator is already bilingually endorsed, the only difference being that a bilingual educator would use a bilingual lens to look at content learning rather than an English learning lens.

Laurel Crossman indicated that this would potentially increase the number of bilingual certifications in the state.

Alain Bengochea reminded the Council that the bilingual endorsement has the additional requirement of being proficient in another language.

Karl Wilson summarized that if the expectations were to be more clearly defined and an educator candidate were to do the bilingual endorsement, and if that included practicum, they would achieve the bilingual endorsement. Mr. Wilson further explained it might be possible that they would get the ELAD endorsement as subset for having completed the bilingual endorsement because the bilingual endorsement is above and beyond, requiring language proficiency in additional to primarily the same coursework. Mr. Wilson clarified, however, that the endorsement would not work in the other direction, rather, someone with the ELAD endorsement would not automatically qualify for the ELAD endorsement because the workload for the bilingual endorsement outweighs that of the workload for the ELAD endorsement.

Leah Terry reminded the group of the importance of statewide consistency of whatever assessment NDE ends up recommending. Ms. Terry further discussed different possible incentives for the different endorsements, indicating that perhaps the incentive for bilingual endorsement should be higher because it is a more valuable endorsement.

Chair Cervantes cautioned the necessity of carefully weighting one endorsement over the other, indicating the importance of narrow parameters on the coursework within the state and including these as part of the discussion, particularly when discussing endorsing people from other states. Chair Cervantes further indicated her eagerness to hear back from the TESL committee at the next meeting regarding where Nevada sits in terms of advancement toward all universities being on track with the ELAD endorsement coursework at both the elementary and secondary levels.

- **District Policy and Criteria Planning**

Laurel Crossman explained that the group met with Linda Fields and Kulwadee Axtell from NDE, who provided the group with an update. Ms. Crossman explained that the workgroup made five recommendations on English learner plans back in 2019, which never made it to the State Board of Education because of the onslaught of the pandemic. Ms. Crossman explained that both the guests indicated their support of the recommendations, with one suggestion to change under the ELD curriculum development recommendation. Ms. Crossman further explained this recommendation was to eliminate the second sentence for NDE to provide a list of approved ELD curriculum and supplemental materials since different districts have different approved curriculum models and to add the sentence, "Educators will weave ELD standards into content instruction to promote academic English development."

Karl Wilson asked that Ms. Crossman share the five recommendations with the full EMC.

Laurel Crossman shared the five recommendations with the group and requested that if the full Council is amenable to the proposed change that someone put forth a motion to approve these recommendations to move forward to the State Board of Education.

Motion: To adopt the proposed recommendations as amended and instruct NDE to present the recommendations to the State Board of Education
By: Laurel Crossman
Second: Lorna James-Cervantes
Vote: Passed unanimously

Chair Cervantes noted the idea of funding for incentives for professional development and/or TESL bilingual endorsement licensure for the State of Nevada as a recommendation that could be moved forward by NDE or by the state Board in the next session.

Laurel Crossman informed the Council that during 2019 and into 2020, the workgroup reviewed all the district's English learner plans, from which the recommendations were based. Ms. Crossman indicated that because of the COVID pandemic, feedback was not provided to schools or to individual districts last year and as such, the workgroup intends to consolidate the comments made on those plans and then submit them in the spring to the districts to have them make some corrections to it.

- **English Proficiency & Academic Achievement**

Chair Cervantes indicated that the EP&AA group primarily discussed the work that has been done over the past two years, and brought new member, Leah Terry, up to date on this work. Chair Cervantes indicated that the group feels that three recommendations should be brought forward to the State Board of Education: targeted resources for students in the lowest 25th percentile, with this possibly being a recommendation to move forward to the next legislative session; ensuring that each district has a plan to meet the needs of students in the lowest 25th percentile, which could include things such as the need for professional development, assessments, a specific curriculum, an emphasis on social/emotional learning; a recommendation for corrective action if districts fail to meet the needs of students in the lowest 25th percentile that could be similar to the action that would have been taken in AB219.

Laurel Crossman asked if this recommendation changed the recommendations approved by the sub-workgroup or if those recommendations are still in place with the focus now being on these new recommendations.

Chair Cervantes indicated that the recommendations are still in place and that these recommendations are more in-depth regarding meeting the needs of students in the lowest 25th percentile. Chair Cervantes further indicated that a more in-depth conversation might be more appropriate under item 10 following the presentation of the speaker for item 9. Chair Cervantes explained that the workgroup felt that the recommendations brought forward last time could potentially be condensed to possibly look at more targeted funding as well as the planning piece to meet the needs of the students and the corrective action plans.

9. PRESENTATION: SCHOLARSHIP ON LANGUAGE AND MULTILINGUALISM (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)

- *Justin Gerald, CUNY & other scholars*

Chair Cervantes welcomed speaker Justin Gerald and asked him to introduce himself and his areas of research to the Council as well as touch a bit on some of the questions Blakely Hume prepared with Mr. Gerald regarding his presentation today.

Blakely Hume read a brief biography of Justin Gerald to the Council as an introduction.

Justin Gerald explained that his presentation really comes down to racial linguistic ideologies. Mr. Gerald indicated that in most countries, including the United States, language and race aren't separate in terms of the way people think of the people in these categories. Mr. Gerald indicated that because that is the way society has been organized, partially by chance and partially deliberately, this necessitates a way to provide extra funding and support in shifting one group into another. Mr. Gerald explained that these mechanisms are tricky to figure out; equally tricky is figuring out how to support people within the paradigm of public service because these ideologies create hierarchies that harm people by making certain people sort of pathological and in need of fixing, whether because of race or language or both. Mr. Gerald further explained that ideologies cannot be taken apart because that constitutes a decades-long project. Mr. Gerald poses the question remains of how best to support minoritized students, with minoritized defining students who have less power rather than those in the numerical minority. Mr. Gerald indicated that there is no definitive answer, but a start is to move away from policy that might treat either or both groups as lacking or inherently deficient, what Lisa Delpit (phonetic) refers to as deficit mindsets. As such, Mr. Gerald suggested the importance of thinking about the language assets that both groups have, determining how they are already experts academically, and figuring out how to highlight that through funding.

Blakely Hume informed the Council that he had shared with Mr. Gerald some of the initial guiding questions that the workgroup surrounding these recommendations developed.

Justin Gerald discussed a book called Looking Like a Language, Sounding Like a Race, by Professor Jonathan Rosa, which unpacks how people who speak different languages, especially in the United States, can often be seen as lacking language or viewed with the belief that their communication in English is deficient. As a result, people end up in an in-between state.

Chair Cervantes discussed the fact that students who speak African American vernacular in their homes are seen as non-standard English speakers and asked for Mr. Gerald's input on this subject.

Justin Gerald indicated that this is a good example of the groups he is discussing, indicating that these students may be classified as English learners and discussed what society thinks of English learners. Mr. Gerald next discussed the movement in the 1990s that Chair Cervantes mentioned to establish African Americans as having a language and the idea that they would then be seen the same way as someone who speaks a different language. Mr. Gerald explained that this was the prevailing attitude 20 to 25 years ago, and that it is still seen by certain people in the linguistics community as a separate language. Mr. Gerald indicated that the difficulty in this is developing metrics for this, citing the example of incorrectly characterizing all black students as speakers of African American.

Blakely Hume requested that Mr. Gerald spend some time discussing the Oakland School Board decision, which was important in recognizing AAVE and its subsequent characterizations as a language. Mr. Hume inquired as to what has emerged since that time and what conversations have taken place since the academic community focused in on this area.

Justin Gerald discussed the importance of looking at who is making the determinations of what languages are. Mr. Gerald explained that for however many years, it was different groups of researchers studying students of color and determining what they say and how they say it; whereas Professors Flores and Rosa (phonetic) determined that researchers need to look at the white perceiving subject and determine who is listening to/perceiving the language. As such, Mr. Gerald indicated that conversation in the last five, six years has sort of flipped around to ask how the listeners can do things differently. Mr. Gerald continues that research is showing the amount of time it takes to improve English, whether grammar or vocabulary, can take years or decades. Mr. Gerald explained that there has been significant debate as to what to call black or African American language, and the discussion now centers mostly on how to get the people listening to improve their perception with the idea that no matter how much people improve in their language, if people don't improve in their perception of these speakers, it doesn't much matter.

Chair Cervantes opined that based on Mr. Gerald's statements, perhaps it would be more important to focus on services provided for students struggling with academic language and looking at how teachers approach students, the expectations placed upon them, and the professional development they're given in meeting the needs of each individual student.

Justin Gerald indicated that this is a great idea but explained that the obstacle is that service providers like teachers and officials tend to think they are already doing the right thing, thus indicating the need to convince people to try to do things differently by exposing them to different perspectives.

Blakely Hume asked if the movement toward internal or individual perception has moved to the forefront or if it has been around for a while. Mr. Hume followed up by asking if, based on that, the direction in academics and scholarship is now shifting toward perception or how to change perception.

Justin Gerald explained that it is all rather incipient and as such, all academics may not be listening. Mr. Gerald used the example that everybody has an accent, but only recently have people been able to point out the assumptions people have of accents based on looks and location. Mr. Gerald thus indicated the importance of addressing both policy and individual assumptions in training.

Karl Wilson indicated that the workgroup that has been studying these issues has placed significant focus on how to find the most promising practices in terms of student achievement. Mr. Wilson then asked Mr. Gerald if he could point to anything in his research that could help educators to help African American students achieve higher levels of academic success.

Justin Gerald discussed the importance of removing barriers to learning, the most important step of which is providing psychological safety. Mr. Gerald informed the Council that he would be happy to send some links with information regarding how to provide psychological safety to students.

Chair Cervantes informed Mr. Gerald that much of his discussion of psychological safety resonated with her and cited the example of adult EL classes that she taught in the past and the discussions overheard of students feeling uncomfortable in some of these classes.

Justin Gerald discussed teacher incentives and indicated that the difficulty with new teachers is that even if they are very committed, they are often not yet experienced enough to solve these types of issues.

Alain Bengochea discussed the value of assigning a designation in the way it is done for ELs for students who speak Black English because then educators know how to allocate supports and funding. In addition, Mr. Bengochea discussed the importance of academic language for things like writing technical reports across different content areas. Alain Bengochea then asked Mr. Gerald about highlighting the differences and contrasting the analyses of language that could be helpful to teachers in supporting students who speak non-standard English and identifying the nuances or differences between their languages to help meet expectations.

Justin Gerald agreed that there is value in a label but cautioned about labels potentially becoming anchors. Mr. Gerald explained the importance of being very careful to build from the label and not just stop there, indicating that the label should be just the beginning and not the end. Mr. Gerald further concurred with Mr. Bengochea's point regarding systemic functional linguistics but indicated the need to try to move away from anything that's idealized that certain people know how to do because of who they are. Instead, Mr. Gerald indicated the importance of teaching this as a specific skill because the problem with the way that academic language is often positioned is in the way that some people speak. Therefore, Mr. Gerald highlighted the importance of separating the goal of the skill at hand from the academic language used for communication.

Blakely Hume asked for clarification regarding the academic turning away from categorization and towards perception.

Justin Gerald clarified that it is not categorization but rather the movement away from named language boundaries and moving toward the sub-category of translanguaging.

Alain Bengochea indicated that his field is specifically focused on translanguaging and concurred that this focus is the path he sees many states moving towards, explaining that this is what ESSA allows for: states to focus heavily on content rather than language.

Justin Gerald concurred that letting people do things in the way that they naturally communicate while teaching content and skills is a path.

Alain Bengochea opined that language is a product of the content learned.

Chair Cervantes indicated that within coursework, whether it be in-service, professional development, or pre-service professional development, there exists the question of should there be a shift at the university levels so that the idea of language development among native English speakers, as well as those not speaking traditional or standard English in their homes, be addressed. Chair Cervantes continued that this idea, along with more cultural competency, be embedded within state licensure. Chair Cervantes indicated that this may be a future discussion for the TESL subcommittee to discuss whether this belongs in policy.

Justin Gerald explained that in his work as a TESL member, one of the things studied was licensure standards for schools and indicated that in New York, for the programs that do the certification, they all have their own standards about what the teachers are given in the schools. As a result, Mr. Gerald indicated, it is almost inevitable that some harmful ideas will be perpetuated without the intent to do so. Mr. Gerald further explained that the changes are being made for the people who are already out there and eager to make the changes, but it would have ultimately been easier had they gotten this when they were entering the field.

10. DISCUSSION OF EP&AA RECOMMENDATIONS (Information/Discussion)

- *Lorna James-Cervantes, English Mastery Council Chair*

Chair Cervantes indicated that one of the things the EP&AA group had considered was the goal when looking back at the recommendations, and to have additional resources and support for African American students, particularly those falling within the lowest 25th percentile. Chair Cervantes explained that the group questioned whether Nevada is better served as a state to stay with those initial recommendations of identifying African-American learners as standards English learners versus recognizing the fact that student achievement for the state has shown that, given historical input and data, there are certain groups of students who typically fall in the lowest 25th percentile and generally speaking include African-American, Native American, Pacific Islander, EL students, and those who are economically disadvantaged. As such, Chair Cervantes indicated that the EP&AA group raised the question regarding trying to address the need for more targeted support and funding for these students. As such, Chair Cervantes suggested presenting to the State Department the idea of providing targeting funding for students in the lowest 25th percentile as a recommendation in the next legislative session in addition to the weighted funding to ensure that districts are properly allocating their existing funding to meet the needs of those students. Chair Cervantes indicated that this would include state and federal funds such as Titles I and III and IDEA funds. Chair Cervantes continued to say that in alignment with the previous recommendations, numbers 2 and 3, that the Council recommend that each district is required to have a plan in place to meet the needs of students in the lowest 25th percentile, which could include PD, curriculum, social-emotional learning, and instructional needs of students and teachers, and in alignment with recommendation number 3, that schools that don't meet the needs would then need to have a corrective action plan in place similar to that that's already in place under AB 219.

Laurel Crossman concurred and cited the district in Carson City, which has less than 1 percent African American students but 25 percent of students not meeting proficiency because the students in this district tend to be transient and high poverty. Ms. Crossman indicated that each district is going to have different needs based on their student

populations and indicated the idea of potentially reevaluating assessments that determine student proficiency. Ms. Crossman concluded by indicating the importance of focusing on the state as a whole and the needs of all students who are not at the desired level of proficiency.

Chair Cervantes concurred and indicated that this idea of the recommendations meeting the needs of all students who fall into this category in all districts across the state is one on which her thoughts have been focused during the past year, as well, particularly because the charge of the EMC is to focus on all students who fall within the lowest 25th percentile. Chair Cervantes further concurred with Ms. Crossman's idea of reassessing the assessments.

Leah Terry discussed the three major statement recommendations and suggested potentially adding an assessment piece to those recommendations in the future. Ms. Terry indicated the importance of emphasis on formative assessment done over time for teachers to keep track of where students are on a day-to-day or week-to-week basis. Leah Terry further explained that this is much more valuable data than just a one-time test in terms of helping students to improve their learning.

Chair Cervantes indicated that one of the reasons the EMC tries to synthesize recommendations into three major statements is the short amount of time allotted for presentation to the State Board of Education and explained that all the things outlined would fall under the recommendations in those three major statements that the EMC could then delineate if asked by the Board. Chair Cervantes then asked, given the new information, if the Council needed to again vote to accept the revised recommendations for presentation.

Karl Wilson indicated the importance of the EMC considering whether they've had a chance to fully think about and consider the issues that were shared during today's presentation prior to deciding to make an amended direction. Mr. Wilson informed the Council of his wish that Dr. Bettye Haysbert had been present in the EP&AA workgroup discussion earlier in the meeting given her deep experience and passion around the needs of African American students and the strategies proposed to the State Board that would make a difference for those students. Mr. Wilson next indicated that the question in his mind is if the intent of recommendation 1B truly commits resources to address the needs of African American students as well as other students in the bottom quartile for them to have access to services comparable to what English learners are receiving in terms of the fiscal commitment. Mr. Wilson further questioned that if that is at the heart of recommendation 1B, then how to ensure that the recommendations coming from the EMC address that core concern. Mr. Wilson addressed the Council in asking whether the members feel that they are ready to make the decision or do they feel the need to pull together concrete supports for the next meeting for whatever recommendations would be coming forward.

Chair Cervantes opened the floor to the members of the Council to respond to Mr. Wilson's question.

Laurel Crossman indicated that she would be more comfortable with more concrete recommendations, explaining her belief that there is a lot of important work to be done at the state level in terms of addressing the needs of African American learners.

Gladis Diaz concurred with Ms. Crossman.

Alain Bengochea asked if the EMC has looked at other states to see what kind of policies already exist, indicating that he was unable to find anything on this topic when searching himself.

Blakely Hume explained that federal identification and definitions is one of the sections in the EP&AA report and that many states have some similarities in terms of their different legal writing, but when discussing identification in terms of languages and AAVE, there are not currently any practices in place in other states.

Alain Bengochea concurred with Ms. Crossman and Ms. Diaz in terms of needing more time on this topic. Mr. Bengochea further informed the Council that he has sent a few names to Mr. Hume of additional scholars the EMC could consider.

Blakely Hume indicated that he would look at the information from Mr. Bengochea and be in touch.

Leah Terry concurred that the EMC likely needs some more time to review the subject prior to making additional recommendations.

Chair Cervantes concurred and requested that EP&AA ensure that the language in the recommendations has been cleaned up and worked through to present to the full EMC at the next meeting.

Chair Cervantes indicated that the EMC has two more meetings scheduled for this year, one on March 24 and one on May 19. Chair Cervantes further indicated that neither Karl Wilson nor Blakely Hume would be available for the May 19 meeting and so it would need to be rescheduled. Chair Cervantes informed the EMC that she would provide some additional possible dates for the last meeting of the year.

11. PUBLIC COMMENTS #2

There was no public comment.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Lorna James-Cervantes, English Mastery Council Chair

Chair Cervantes adjourned the March 3, 2022, meeting of the English Mastery Council

APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS GIVEN DURING PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Yvette Williams, Caucus Chair, submitted the following letter:

Greetings English Mastery Council members. On behalf of the Clark County Black Caucus Board and members, we are submitting this public comment to support -- in support of the recommendations as written and approved by the EMC unanimously on May 13th, 2021. See below. We have a particular concern about any changes to the language in section 1-A and 1-B, as outlined below. I personally attended that virtual meeting and witnessed a lot of discussion around students in the lowest 25th percentile, proficient and African American Standard English learners. See attached copy of the entire recommendations. We ask that this document be made as part of our public record and available for the public. We also ask, once again, that all research documents, et cetera, that the EMC Committee used to inform these recommendations be made available on the NDE website for the public to review. We made this request during public comment number two, at the May 13th meeting. This, in our opinion -- this is, in our opinion, excuse me, a violation of open meeting laws that require documents be provided and/or made available on NDE website to ensure transparency and accountability. Recommendation number one. Recommendation regarding language variation and proficiency; A, what is the national trend in states for identifying African American English variation speakers as English learners; B, since African American learners speak a language other than the academic language and benefit from ELL instruction, they should be designated as standard English learners, SEL, and afforded opportunities and resources of all ELs. We continue to oppose any effort by the EMC to dilute and disregard the needs of our African American students. Literacy needs to master academic Standard English and delays in presenting annual recommendations to the State Board of Education. Nevada revised statute was passed in 2019, with resistance from the EMC members to address the needs of these students and

wanted the scope of work to remain solely ELL students. It is now 2022, and although members invested tremendous amount of time -- amount of their time providing research recommendations in many conversations, this committee continues to, as they say in an African proverb, talk, talk, talk, too much talk. The proficiency gap based on racial disparities is too wide and demands urgent action. We have immediate and urgent concerns that the makeup of committee members brings into question a commitment to students other than ELL, and with recent events in the EP and AA subgroup, racial biases that have created an environment that lacks racial inclusion nor values BIPOC perspective, which unfortunately has left one important contributor to this subgroup feeling unwelcome and disrespected as reflected in her absence today. A black woman who is highly credentialed and an expert in this area herself. Additionally, we want to express our concerns about the lack of diversity and inclusion of African American linguistic professionals and experts in addressing the EMC, demonstrating a lack of cultural competency. Although BIPOC recommendations were provided to staff, none have presented as experts to help inform recommendations of policy. To that end, we encourage the EMC to consider the findings of the Linguistics Society of America, an organization founded in 1924, made up of scholars worldwide to advance scientific study of language and its applications. We have attached their resolution on this Oakland School Board's adoption that recognizes the language variety spoken by many African American students, and to take it into account in teaching Standard English and recognize the vernacular of African American students and teaching them Standard English as both linguistically and pedagogically sound. We ask that this document attached is also provided to the public as part of our public comment. Another point we want to make is that the current education system does not critique other speakers' language as to whether they speak a dialect, which is common or vernacular. They simply provide the same English language instruction. We expect African American Standard English learners, SEL speakers, to be given the same access to EL resources and learning opportunities as other students. Again, it is our opinion and interpretation of federal law that students are not discriminated against based on language, place of origin, or race. After all, this is 2022, and access to mastery of academic Standard English should not be a discussion, but a right, unlike the days of chattel slavery, when learning to read or write as an African American was prohibited by law. We compel this committee to do the right thing. Nevada is a leader in education reforms. The notion that we must follow the standards of another state is ludicrous. Lead by example. That's a great lesson that our students can learn from. Finally, we, again request all research documents, reports, information that informs the EMC in any decisions made today regarding these recommendations for discussion in agenda item nine, that informs a decision by the members -- the public is entitled to know the reasons and basis for a revision, modification of a previously approved item -- transparency matters. Thank you for your time and consideration. Yvette Williams, Caucus Chair.