

Nevada State Teacher Recruitment and Retention Advisory Task Force

MAY 16, 2020

9:00 A.M.

Meeting Locations:

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Teacher Recruitment and Retention Advisory Task Force (Task Force) met via videoconference. In accordance with Governor Sisolak's [State of Emergency Directive 006](#), Section 1, there was no physical location designated for this meeting. The meeting was livestreamed on the [Nevada Department of Education Website](#).

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT via videoconference:

Felicia Gonzales
Jason Dietrich
Kathleen Galland-Collins
KellyLynn Charles

MEMBERS PRESENT via videoconference:

Sarah Santos
Lance Lattin
David Navarette
Magdaline Wells
Eleanor Williams
Elizabeth Rechs
Tammie Smithburg
Meridon Fortune
Tamara McCord
William Cox
Kathleen Keene
LaResa Darrington
Vici Cooper
Thomas Brooks
Allison Brolsma
Maria Cristy-Fernandez
Laurie Henderson
Kristina Ernest

Senior Deputy Attorney General via video conference:

David Gardner

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE via videoconference:

Alex Jacobson
Mary Peterson
Andrew Morrill
Dr. Tracy Edwards
Christina Levrant
Victoria (Ivy) Higgins
Jordana McCudden
Shelley Brunskill
Renee Paterson
Jennifer Varrato
Eleni Oikonomidou
Sebera Coleman
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE via Livestream:

The Livestream feed allowed public viewing throughout the meeting.

1. Call to Order; Roll Call: Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting of the Task Force was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Cristy Fernandez, Task Force Chair. Quorum was established. Chair Fernandez led the Pledge of Allegiance. Members were informed of the new hand raise feature in Lifesize and meeting norms. Chair Fernandez asked for questions.

Chair Fernandez moved to Agenda Item #2.

2. Public Comment #1

In accordance with Governor Sisolak's [State of Emergency Directive 006](#), Section 2, public comment was to be submitted via email and read into the record by Kathleen Galland-Collins, NDE Assistant Director, EDLiFE.

Additional time was provided for the public to submit comments via email.
No public comment was submitted.

Ms. Galland-Collins informed the Chair there were no public comments at this time and that comments would be continued to be accepted in order to read them at Public Comment #2.

Chair Fernandez moved to Agenda Item #3.

3. Review of Previous Meeting Minutes (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Chair Fernandez asked members to review the minutes. Ms. Galland-Collins reminded the members these are summary minutes and they are not verbatim and to check for accuracy and typos. Member Henderson noted the misspelling of her last name on page 6 and page 9. Member Brooks noted page 11 needed clarification on his remarks regarding summer professional development. Ms. Charles indicated the minutes would be updated to reflect the corrections.

Member Santos, Member Rechs, and Member McCord joined the meeting.

Chair Fernandez asked for a motion to approve the summary minutes of the April 25th meeting of the Task Force with the noted corrections. Member Keene made the motion to approve the minutes as revised. Member Henderson seconded. Motion passed.

Chair Fernandez moved to Agenda Item #4

4. TEACH Plus Southern Nevada Teacher Retention Work Group Project (Information/Discussion)

Chair Fernandez introduced the Teach Plus group. She asked all the members to hold questions until the end of the presentation.

Shelley Brunskill began the presentation. She thanked the Task Force for the opportunity to share their work. In August, they gathered and began an intense discussion of educational training challenges in Nevada specifically in Clark County School District. Teach Plus Fellows recognized having the opportunity to collaborate on an educational issue of significant importance. Their interest was recruitment and retention as of a crucial issue not just in their districts and state, but in our nation. They decided to address this issue by researching how other districts and states addressed recruitment and retention. They published a memo on their results and have shared the exit survey they developed.

Jordana McCudden asked the Teach Plus Fellows to introduce themselves. Shelley Brodsky, Dr. Tracy Edwards, Ivy Higgins, Christina Levrant, René Patterson, and Ms. McCudden introduced themselves individually and mentioned their years of teaching.

Ms. McCudden shared the group realized recruitment and retention was a root cause for the inadequacies they see across the state. Recruitment and Retention puts stress on the ability to provide equitable access to education across the state. She added the group knew recruitment and retention was a state priority in the ESSA plan as well as a priority in Clark County's Focus 2024. Ms. McCudden shared information on

attrition rates, monetary incentives, and that educator preparation programs can't make up attrition numbers.

Christi Levrant continued the presentation with information on the States' priorities to recruit and retain teachers. Ms. Levrant included incentive pay. The exit survey they created helps analyze the effectiveness of retention funding, identify opportunities for future retention legislation and policy, and provide a broad view of working conditions. She shared the group looked at survey use in other states in order to develop a useful survey. Ms. Levrant explained the Utah legislature passed a bill to develop a survey, Virginia enacted an optional survey, and the North Carolina's State Board of Education is required to compile a report on why teachers leave. She stated exit surveys provide data and transparency.

Ms. Brunskill shared that the group relied on Virginia's survey and study. She shared information on the feasibility study Virginia conducted and how the Virginia model was implemented. She explained the survey developed by the group was done electronically to make it easier to analyze the data. Clark County is currently piloting their survey. The group doesn't have access to the exit survey data; however, they get feedback from those exiting the district on the exit survey they take.

Dr. Edwards restated key points of Ms. Levrant's section of the presentation due to her sound issues. Dr. Edwards discussed best practices for exit survey implementation. She stated one best practice is conducting the survey online as respondents are more honest with online surveys and they are easier to access. She stated using a third-party host keeps respondents' information confidential and is more trusted. Dr. Edwards shared incentives offered to survey participants will increase participation rates.

Ms. Higgins shared that surveys should have teacher input. They worked with Clark County to develop a side-by-side feedback survey to gather data on the survey questions. She shared an overview of the feedback the group has received. Ms. Higgins acknowledged a need to modify the survey if it were to be used statewide to meet the needs of each district.

Ms. Paterson shared that rural and urban districts need to be taken into consideration if an exit survey is used. She stated Nevada is a unique and diverse state that needs to be looked at holistically.

Member Smithburg asked if those at the district level can see who answered and what they answered. She feared teachers may not be as honest if the district could see names and content. Ms. McCudden shared that the group had that concern as well, which is why they recommend a third party to administer the survey. Ms. Paterson shared that many of the states they looked at partnered with Universities as this lowered the costs and the Universities then had data that they could use to inform their teacher preparation programs.

Member Wells asked if the survey is being piloted and if so, is there a completion rate. Ms. McCudden replied about 20 teachers to this point. The survey is specific to Clark County School District which they modified, and 21 teachers completed the exit survey and all teachers took the feedback survey. Member Wells asked if Teach Plus has the goal that an exit survey should be a state goal in Nevada? Ms. Brunskill replied that yes, those states with a survey are seeing better retention rates. Ms. Paterson shared that when things come through the legislative process it creates a natural barrier between the districts and the participants and there seems to be a greater buy-in from people taking the survey.

Member McCord asked if there is a survey or data about why teachers are staying. Ms. Higgins answered that this survey specifically addressed why teachers left, but they added questions about what could have made them stay. This doesn't address your question directly, but it leads to better retention incentives. Ms. Brunskill stated that it could be addressed via a climate and culture survey.

Member Ernest asked if this is districtwide or is it broken down by school. Ms. Paterson replied that she believes it is districtwide and was a consideration as school level data lacks anonymity.

Member Keene asked what incentives were being given. Ms. Brunskill replied - no incentives were given by the group because the survey is being piloted by Clark County. Their research found Arizona showed higher survey participation when the survey was conducted by a University with random, lottery style participation incentive.

Chair Fernandez asked if districts have climate surveys and if so, have you been able to reach out and collaborate with those districts? Ms. McCudden replied that this group is Clark County specific and was designed with Clark County in mind, but they know a statewide survey is needed. She added the group

believes that once an exit survey is in place and teachers trust the anonymity, the opportunity would be there to give all teachers a survey.

Ms. Paterson thanked the Task Force for their time and shared that the group was in the process of talking with Washoe, but COVID-19 slowed the discussions. They had expected to be further along in the process.

Member Brooks shared that in a free country everyone is able to exercise their rights and not be forced to do things. He was not sure of a law for exit surveys. He addressed the anonymity of taking a survey in a small district. If only one person is leaving, it's not anonymous. Clark County doesn't necessarily reflect his little district. Ms. Paterson replied that people have the right to say no as the laws they studied provides for districts to offer the survey, not that teachers must participate. She shared that's why if the survey was administered at the State level the anonymity would be maintained. Member Brooks thanked Ms. Paterson for the information and shared his concern that Statewide data might not reflect what is needed in small districts. Chair Fernandez addressed the growth of Nevada and how exit survey data could help small districts attract teachers in the future.

Dr. Edwards added that in light of COVID-19 a statewide survey could help track how COVID impacted Nevada's retention.

Member Fortune asked for clarification on Teach Plus. Ms. McCudden informed the members that Teach Plus is a national organization. They are Teach Plus Nevada and are statewide during legislative sessions. This session is an off year, so the focus was on Southern Nevada. Member Fortune followed up with a question on if the group expected it to grow and be more statewide. Ms. McCudden replied that yes, Fellows from rural districts are represented when it is statewide again, especially in legislative years. Teach Plus Fellowships will be offered statewide again.

Chair Fernandez shared she researched Teach Plus before the meeting and asked how they share the opportunity across the state. Ms. McCudden replied they use their webpage, networks, presentations, etc. They try to use as many routes as possible to get the application out. Dr. Edwards added they intentionally target rural teachers during legislative session years. Ms. Paterson stated that the Teach Plus opportunity is not exclusive to traditional public-school teachers. It is also open to charter school and non-traditional learning environments.

Member Keene suggested that if on a statewide exit survey, the rural districts were combined, teachers there could keep their anonymity. The data would be more beneficial, and the smaller districts will look at it more positively. Ms. McCudden responded that this was an excellent point. She added that as the Task Force works on their recommendations, the group looks forward to continued collaboration.

Convenience break 10:05-10:15

Chair Fernandez called the meeting back at 10:16 and moved to Agenda Item #5.

5. Task Force Work Session (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Ms. Galland-Collins shared that Teach Plus members watched the last meeting online and reached out to NDE with an offer to share their work.

Ms. Galland-Collins provided an overview of the work session plan. Data and answers to the questions they had at the last meeting will be included. The data to be shared is on teacher mobility, recruitment to the profession, recruitment to employment, and retention. She shared that not all of this data is going to be presented, and it is going to be in the posted document. The data is in response to some of the questions the members asked during the first meeting. Ms. Galland-Collins shared an update to the timeline. She informed the members that the new deadline to get recommendations to LCE had been adjusted to July 15th, so the Task Force has time to have a third meeting during the early part of June. This will allow time to develop the recommendations based on the root cause analysis and take that to the Legislative Committee on July 15th.

Assemblywomen Miller shared that she was enjoying the conversation today.

Chair Fernandez moved to Alex Jacobson's presentation on teacher mobility.

Mr. Jacobson shared this is mostly summary data and will take additional requests. He shared the steps in analyzing the data. The data is based on individual-level teacher assignment data provided by Nevada

Department of Education. The data does not capture the reason for leaving, just the record of where teachers were each year. It includes their location, assignment code, and some personal characteristics. Data were provided for school years 2015-16 through 2019 - 20. Mr. Jacobson explained the limitations of the data as the data are reported to NDE and are not exit survey data. The data cannot provide a reason for the observed change in assignment location. The last limitation is a little bit of a special case. In 2018-19, the numbers of teachers in Clark and Elko counties dropped dramatically and then returned to the priority level in the following year. The reason for this district shock is not known. Information that includes 2018-19 data should be interpreted cautiously. For that reason, Mr. Jacobson said he's really focusing on pre-2018-19 data. He is not really using that year because of the unusual change in the data which could be representative of an anomaly. Mr. Jacobson shared that in preparing the data, it includes only teachers, counselors and administrators are not included and it identifies a single location assignment, excluding the small percentage of teachers (1.24%) who have multiple locations assignments. He also explained the data compared teacher assignments to where they were the following year. Mr. Jacobson reminded the members of the mobility categories.

Mr. Jacobson shared statewide mobility trend data for the years 2015-16, 2016-17, and 2017-18. Mobility rates refers to the percentage of teachers who did not stay in their same assignment. The specific mobility categories generally include those who stay, moved schools, moved districts, and left the state.

Mr. Jacobson presented Teacher Mobility data using graphs and maps. See meeting material posted on the Nevada State Teacher Recruitment and Retention Advisory Task Force [meeting materials webpage](#).

Mr. Jacobson shared 3-year statewide mobility trends. He stated the general trend of how the data breaks down stays pretty consistent. The shock previously mentioned is reflected in the data. He will try to stay with 2016-17 data for the rest of the presentation to avoid confusion due to the shock. District data was presented next. Mr. Jacobson shared Clark and Washoe Counties first. He stated as the largest districts, they are driving the state numbers. The next data set was mid-sized districts (100-600 teachers). Elko County data for 2017-18 is not included due to the shock mentioned previously. Mr. Jacobson pointed out that as the districts get smaller, the percentage of individuals who are moving becomes larger or changes drastically. He stated, generally the districts are pretty stable. The smaller districts (less than 100 teachers) were presented next. He reminded the members the increase in volatility is due to the smaller number of teachers and a few teachers moving or leaving have a larger impact on the overall percent change.

Member Ernest asked if Alternative Route to Licensure (ARL) teachers are included in the data. Mr. Jacobson replied they would be if they had an official assignment in the data file reported. The assignment data provided didn't differentiate by license. Mr. Dietrich clarified that yes, ARL license holders are placed into a standard license assignment in this report. They are not delineated in the data as independent.

Member Rechts asked for clarification on when teachers left the state and if it included retirements. Mr. Jacobson answered yes, if they reported their assignment in one year and if they weren't in the data they were counted as having left the following year.

Mr. Jacobson then presented information by Locale Code. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) has a set of codes they use to put districts into categories based on their proximity to a Metro Center. There are 4 overarching categories: (1) City, (2) suburb, (3) Town, and (4) Rural. Nevada doesn't have suburb data. Statewide average mobility by locale data by city, town, and rural was shared. Mr. Jacobson shared mobility, attrition rate, churn rate, and new teacher rate (teachers new to the education system) data by district using a map of Nevada.

Chair Fernandez asked if there were any questions.

Member Smithburg asked if we knew why the Elko data shock occurred. Mr. Jacobson answered that no, it is district reported and it was a very large change in the number of total teachers based on their license reported in the assignment data.

Chair Fernandez asked if there were data on allocations and if that is why in specific districts lost allocations and teachers move from one place to another. Mr. Jacobson asked for clarification. He stated vacancy data might provide how many positions they had to hire for, but he doesn't have a specific data set that would provide that. In the research he stated one way to look at that would be the changes in enrollments. Mr. Dietrich stated Mr. Jacobson is correct. NDE doesn't capture available allocations by school but may do so in the future. He mentioned that Clark County has a high rate of teachers moving from school to school; some voluntary, some due to "surplus," so when you have those rates of change of enrollment that occurred

during the school year after October, teachers can be reallocated to other schools to meet the needs of those schools and that could account for some of those numbers in addition to voluntary moves. Ms. Galland-Collins shared that when Clark County was opening up 10 to 15 new schools per year, that could be reflected in the churn rate.

Member Santos asked for clarification that this was just the raw data of those vacancies and moving teachers, there is no info on why teachers are leaving. Mr. Jacobson answered that yes, this data only says "Teacher A" was at one school one year and at another school the next. Mr. Dietrich added that Clark County does its allocation projections for the next year in December and there is a lot of calendar time for needs to change. Now with COVID, projections could be off due to projected number of people not moving to Nevada. To be fair to districts, we need to take that into account.

Chair Fernandez stated in Washoe County allocations don't come out for teachers until February and that can change all the way to September the following year. She stated it would be interesting to see that as she knows a lot of the new teachers are the ones that have to move to different schools for their first four or five years because of their lack of seniority. They get tired of moving and expressed the need to look into that issue.

Member Henderson added that it isn't just allocation but also being "overaged." In Washoe County if you have less seniority you are the one that tends to be "overaged" and not having a lot of say in where you go.

Chair Fernandez stated that at the last meeting they discussed teachers not feeling a part of a culture and that she feels that mobility/"overage"/allocation is a big factor in teachers not feeling a part of the community if they move every year.

No further comments or questions. Chair Fernandez moved to the next section of the work session.

Ms. Galland-Collins shared the data on grade point average (GPA) requirements for programs from the Title II Reports. She explained that an informal questionnaire for Educator Preparation Programs (EPP) was developed from feedback during the April 25th meeting. EPPs responded quickly to the informal questionnaire. Ms. Galland-Collins shared some of the answers on the document with the members.

Chair Fernandez shared that it was interesting that the task force asked about requirements and the EPPs stated a challenge is that the students don't understand the specific course requirements of the programs.

Ms. Galland-Collins continued to share items from the document. She called the members attention to bullet one on the last question. She reminded the members that at the first meeting Mr. Dietrich mentioned that allowing national accreditations as a means of meeting program approval is something Nevada is looking into and possibly moving towards. Mr. Dietrich stated Ms. Galland-Collins was correct regarding national accreditation as a pathway to accreditation approval in Nevada.

Ms. Galland-Collins asked for questions on responses received from the EPPs. Ms. Galland-Collins thanked any EPP representatives on the line for their quick turnaround and for being positive and responsive.

Member Smithburg stated she appreciated the EPPs and the responses helped answer what the Task Force was asking.

Chair Fernandez asked for questions. None were asked.

Ms. Galland-Collins continued by sharing that NDE also reached out to district personnel with questions regarding recruitment to employment and retention. One such person was Jennifer Varrato the Director of the employee onboarding development in Clark County School District. Ms. Galland-Collins asked Ms. Varrato to speak on the data shared. Ms. Varrato shared that her department is tasked with working with all new teachers, but specifically tracking beginning teachers with no prior contracted teaching experience. The data presented is from 2013-14 to 2018-19. She explained the beginning teacher separation data. In the 6th year, the Clark County School District is still below national large urban district average separation rate of 55%

Member Santos asked if the induction program includes all teachers or if Special Educational induction is separate. Ms. Varrato shared that all new teachers are required to go through the induction program, and they can choose Professional Development (PD) to align with what they are teaching.

Mary Peterson (WestEd) asked if 27% of the new hires in 2013-2014 had left the district by the end of the second year, 38.16% left by the end of the third year, and then by the end of the 6th year, half had left. Ms. Varrato answered yes, that is correct. This is an ongoing rolling tracking of when they separate. She explained the retention rate data from 2013-14 to 2018-19. There was an increase in retention rate of beginning teachers. In Clark County, beginning teachers are staying at a higher percentage than experienced teachers to the district.

Member Navarette asked how Clark County is using the data to adjust the requirements for onboarding and new teachers. Ms. Varrato explained that over time the induction program has evolved, and other items have been layered in, such as hiring incentives in addition to induction requirements and professional development hours. Her department is looking at tracking the effectiveness of the New Induction Model and how their percentages are growing. They are using this as one factor in determining the effectiveness. They use multiple data points to see where they can improve and collaborate with other departments in Clark County. They differentiate for new teachers and understand that how a teacher connects to the community goes a long way to keeping a teacher.

Member McCord stated Humboldt Professional Development requirements can be overwhelming and receives mixed feedback from inductees. She asked whether feedback was collected regarding the requirement of professional development. Ms. Varrato answered yes, they ask about the best time to conduct Professional Development. They adjust their model to align with contract units for pay scale movement, optional events, and offer professional development at night to account for sub shortages.

Member Smithburg stated based on what Ms. Varrato said classroom management is an issue and asked if there are teachers or staff who go physically into the classroom to support these teachers with classroom management. Ms. Varrato responded that in the past, there were more project facilitators available to do that. Right now, they don't have a team but do have project facilitators that can go out by request. They do have some staff that can go support them. She added they use site-based strategists or mentors and work on building relationships at events during the year.

Member Santos asked how long the teacher induction program is. Ms. Varrato responded the teacher induction program is based on the negotiated agreement and teachers have 2 years to complete the required 21 hours of their onboarding.

Chair Fernandez asked if within the 21 hours are the topics or hours based on teacher need. Ms. Varrato answered that all teachers need to complete 21 hours and the topics are self-selected by the teacher within parameters.

Member Santos asked if there was any data from Clark County to show the previous induction model for retention. Ms. Varrato responded they have accurate data back to 2013-14, prior to that no.

Member Keene stated she appreciated the data and the help in Clark County. She referred to the EPP data shown earlier and asked if the EPP representatives knew if during their coursework students say "I'm not going to do this" or if they are struggling with it. Ms. Galland-Collins noted the EPP representatives had left the meeting already. Chair Fernandez clarified that courses during semesters can change so more information on what classes cause students to drop out would be nice. Mr. Dietrich stated NDE is working with the institutions and institutions say candidates need more and earlier interactions with students during their program. They are working to get that going.

Chair Fernandez moved to the next section of the work session and thanked Ms. Varrato. Ms. Galland-Collins reported they had reached out to Washoe County to share information with the members and they may be able to get more information from Washoe County for the June meeting.

The Task Force engaged in a discussion on the key findings from the research, findings from Nevada Data, remaining questions they had, and assumptions that can be made for the challenges associated with recruitment to the profession, recruitment to employment, and teacher retention. Ms. Galland-Collins typed member responses in the appropriate sections on the PDF posted to the Task Force [meeting materials webpage](#). Mr. Dietrich and Ms. Galland-Collins provided answers to members questions and clarified efforts in Nevada when needed. Member Brooks left the meeting at 12:31p.m.

Convenience break 12:32-12:45

Chair Fernandez reconvened the meeting at 12:45 and moved the meeting to the next section of the work session.

Ms. Galland-Collins recapped the conversation that occurred during the break on teacher incentives. She added the members comments to the Assumptions Section on the notetaking form.

Chair Fernandez moved to the next section of the work session and turned it over to Andrew Morrill of WestEd to begin the root cause analysis explanation.

Mr. Morrill explained that in this section the members will locate all the data and all the previous discussion in a process that is going to lead to a set of recommendations that the task force is charged with making. He began the training on Root Cause Analysis using information that is posted to the Task Force [meeting materials webpage](#).

Mr. Morrill asked the members to reflect on what they'd heard throughout the meeting. He explained that looking at root causes allows people to package what they know and what the collective says needs to be addressed, always digging deeper to make a logical and coherent case as to why the recommendations are important.

Mr. Morrill explained two useful tools in root cause analysis process: fishbone diagram- graphic organizer and the "5 Whys." He walked the members through the questions they should ask themselves as they engage in identifying the root causes and contributing factors. He explained how to continue to dig deeper in order to determine the root causes. He explained the fish bone diagram and how to fill it out. He explained the "5 Whys" tool is used with the fish bone as a brainstorming tool. One can help inform the other.

Chair Fernandez asked what do you do when you have a cause that you know will take many years to change, would you write that, or would you move to one you can actually see changes in the next few years? Mr. Morrill answered that many in that position have recommended doing a plan to state which parts of that cause need to be addressed in year 1, what could be addressed in year 2, and which would be long-term solutions.

Chair Fernandez thanked Mr. Morrill and asked members if there were any questions. She clarified that members should use the fish bone individually to identify root causes and contributing causes.

Ms. Galland-Collins stated the reason we shared this is to help members organize their thoughts. At the first meeting members received data and information, at the second meeting members heard additional data and research, now members are being asked to process that data and research. She added that between now and the next meeting, members should work with people in their school/district (if possible), share your thoughts with other teachers in your school, and really work on identifying the root causes for the challenges to recruitment and retention. At the June meeting, the Task Force will need to develop recommendations that they will share at the July meeting.

Member Navaratte wondered if members thought it would be beneficial to have subcommittees for rural or small communities because of the differences in issues with Clark and Washoe. He felt discussions move slowly with the large group and things might move faster with smaller groups.

Ms. Galland-Collins stated that is exactly what NDE would like them to do. They can take the fish bone diagram, talk to people in their districts and then bring the information back to the group at the June meeting. Member Navaratte responded he understood what they had been asked to do, but he wondered if other members felt it would be beneficial to discuss with other members in similar districts, not going back to our constituents, but members meeting. Chair Fernandez disagreed. She felt they need to create awareness between the members of what is happening in every district. She stated that working together and discussing will be more effective than working in separate groups. She added she would like to know what is working and not working in the other districts. Member Smithburg reminded members there is a walking meeting rules they talked about last time and members need to be mindful of Open Meeting Law. Member Santos stated it sounded member Navaratte was talking about subcommittees and she believed if they do subcommittees like member Smithburg pointed out, those have to be open meetings. Ms. Galland-Collins agreed with member Santos's comment and added the meeting in June was tentatively scheduled for June 2nd and it would be highly unfeasible to do subcommittees within that 2 weeks.

Member Keene asked for clarification that it was the expectation members would be meeting with people of their own district, fill out the pages, so when we meet again, we can share them and start creating groups.

Chair Fernandez answered that was correct.

Member Rechs asked for clarification on how the Task Force wants her to get that information. Ms. Galland-Collins answered there was no set way. She suggested to make it as simple and easy as possible. She encouraged members to involve others in your district to help you work through your thinking. Mr. Morrill suggested members use the 3 challenge areas that the Task Force identified: challenge to recruitment to the profession, challenge to recruitment to employment, challenge to retention. Asking colleagues about those areas will provide the same basic approach.

Member Keene asked Ms. Galland-Collins if she will she send out the form with what the Task Force member discussed. Ms. Galland-Collins answered yes, she will share those templates.

Member McCord asked if they are supposed to send a copy of the form about fish bone before the next Task Force meeting. She wondered how the group is going to compile that and see everybody's work.

Chair Fernandez stated she'd like it brought back at the next meeting to see what everyone has done. Ms. Galland-Collins restated bring their copy to the next meeting and one of the first things at the next meeting's work session is to share what the members individually identified as root causes and then the Task Force can build out a group root cause analysis and make recommendations based on that. Member Henderson clarified members were filling out the fishbone individually and then we will do one as a whole Task Force. Chair Fernandez answered yes and asked if anybody else had any questions or comments.

Chair Fernandez moved to Agenda Item #6.

6. Future Meeting Dates Agenda Items (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Kellylynn Charles, Education Programs Professional, EDLiFE shared with the members that the only date that had a quorum of respondents was June 2, 2020 at 9 a.m.

Chair Fernandez asked for any objections. Member McCord and member Henderson objected. Ms. Galland-Collins asked for offered solutions. Member Henderson stated she could join after 12 o'clock.

Member McCord suggested a motion to hold the meeting on June 8th. Ms. Galland-Collins stated June 8th did not receive a quorum on the survey. Member Navaratte asked for the original dates that were asked in the survey. Ms. Charles reported the dates on survey were June 1st, June 2nd, June 6th, June 10th, June 13th. Chair Fernandez stated the majority of members voted for June 2nd; the only objection is the time of the meeting and asked if members if moving the time of the meeting to the afternoon instead of at 9 am would work.

Member Brolsma stated she'll be in a full meeting on June 2nd, she wondered why the weekend days were not provided as meeting date. Ms. Galland-Collins stated June 6th and June 13th on the list are Saturdays. Ms. Galland-Collins and Ms. Charles stated that those dates didn't meet quorum.

Chair Fernandez suggested keeping the June 2nd meeting and those who could not attend could share their info prior to the meeting. Member Ernest stated that things may have changed since they did survey, she also had been scheduled attending PD. Ms. Galland-Collins stated the members that can't attend can have an excuse absence with their districts, they won't charge them sick day or personal day. Deputy Attorney General David Gardner agreed with Ms. Galland-Collins that AB276 provided teachers excused absences at work. Mr. Dietrich suggested members take a vote on June 6th and see if they have quorum for that Saturday. Ms. Charles took a roll call for the vote on June 6th meeting at 9 a.m. She stated the meeting would have quorum.

Chair Fernandez announced that with no objection the meeting date was change to June 6th at 9 a.m.

Chair Fernandez moved to Agenda Item #7.

7. Public Comment #2

In accordance with Governor Sisolak's [State of Emergency Directive 006](#), Section 2, public comment was to be submitted via email and read into the record by Kathleen Galland-Collins, NDE Assistant Director, EDLiFE.

No public comment submitted.

Ms. Galland-Collins told members if they had any questions about the fish bone, they could reach out to her and Ms. Charles. Chair Fernandez and Ms. Galland-Collins suggested emailing the members that were not able to attend this meeting or left the meeting early to let them know the meeting date and time and the expectation prior to the meeting.

Member Wells asked Ms. Galland-Collins and Ms. Charles to send a list of the members of who they are or what districts they from just for information. Ms. Galland-Collins answered there is a list in the handbook and online on the Task Force web page. She reminded members to be careful of open meeting law violation.

8. Adjournment

Member Smithburg motioned to adjourn the meeting. Member Keene seconded.

With no objections the Chair adjourned the meeting at 1:41 p.m.