

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
JANUARY 20, 2023
3:00 PM**

Office	Address	City	Meeting
Department of Education	Virtual	Virtual	Lifesize Link
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Board Room

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Felicia Ortiz, President
Tamara Hudson
Maggie Carlton
Tim Hughes
Dr. Katie Dockweiler
Michael Walker
Malia Poblete
Dr. Summer Stephens
Joe Arrascada
Dr. Renè Cantú

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Dr. Jonathan Moore, Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement
Kristofer Huffman, Chief Strategy Officer
Dr. Katie Broughton, Education Programs Professional, Office of Superintendent
Elizabeth Callahan, Public Information Officer
Craig Statucki, Interim Deputy Superintendent

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

The audience could attend via live stream.
No audience members attended in-person.

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

Meeting called to order at 3:00 P.M. by President Felicia Ortiz. Quorum was established. President Ortiz led the Pledge of Allegiance and provided a land acknowledgement.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

Royce Severson provided a comment regarding the State changing high school start times. Mr. Severson also thanked the Board for opening the College and Career Readiness (CCR) test survey to all Nevadans and remarked that he would like to see some of the people in the trenches placed on the evaluation committee. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

3. APPROVAL OF FLEXIBLE AGENDA

Member Katherine Dockweiler moved to approve the flexible agenda. Member Tim Hughes seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

4. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE STATE PLAN FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF PUPILS

Dr. Katie Broughton, Education Programs Professional (EPP), Office of Superintendent and Kristofer Huffman, Chief Strategy Officer (CSO), provided a PowerPoint presentation to the Board regarding the NV Statewide Plan for the Improvement of Pupils (STIP).

The Board discussed this presentation, and Member Carlton posed a question relating to schools, data, and the sources of that data included on slide 18 of the presentation. CSO Huffman confirmed he would follow-up with the appropriate Nevada Department of Education (NDE) office. Member Stephens made several observations about the wording of the survey data category and stressed the Board would need to see the survey questions in relation to the data. Member Stephens also discussed diplomas and expectations for students achieving the newer College and Career Ready Diploma. Member Hughes asked for further explanation regarding measuring how the gap is closed and the math behind how check marks were determined on the opportunity gaps slides. CSO Huffman explained that the closure of opportunity gaps is determined by the differences between the highest performing subgroups and each of the remaining subgroups in each category and if there is a reduction in that gap. Member Hughes asked whether the difference between the two scores decreased from year-to-year and whether the gap diminished. Member Hughes asked to see progress percentages in terms of closing the gap data applied to all categories and asked whether the measurements are relative or absolute. CSO Huffman confirmed that they are relative. Member Hughes went on to query what is misaligned around NDE's role and changes purposed to the STIP. CSO Huffman reported that NDE is still in the early phases of looking at revisions, individual strategies, and the specific measures of success within each strategy. It was noted that, occasionally, the measures of success are not within the NDE's purview. NDE is looking at how it can measure the work of the Department itself and its impact. The strategies are not incorrect, but how NDE measures these strategies may need to be adjusted. President Ortiz and Member Hughes had some concerns around measuring differences between NDE's work and current STIP outcomes. The teacher vacancies slide was also a concern. President Ortiz went on to list the items over which NDE has no control and stated that focus should be directed to the things that are controllable. Member Hughes noted that the point of having a State-level education agency is to create the conditions and support mechanisms that should be part of the success and measures calculation.

Member Dockweiler posed questions regarding benchmark dates and goals with regards to the State Board of Education (SBE) Goal Alignment. Superintendent Ebert stated that the Board will be informed as those benchmarks and goals are put in place. There was agreement around the "Closing Opportunity Gaps" new data measurements, including adding actual numbers. Member Cantú asked why there hasn't been more progress in the African American and Individualized Education Plan (IEP) columns and queried how large the gaps are. CSO Huffman responded that all the requested data is available, and he would work with NDE staff to collate it for the Board. Member Cantú asked the presenters to explain the considerable increase

from low risk to medium and high risk in relation to the Access to Education opportunities slide of the presentation. CSO Huffman explained the differences between the prior risk assessment focus (2020-2022) and the new assessment focus, necessitated by new federal and state regulations. CSO Huffman explained that NDE staff review several factors to ensure the new process is in alignment with new codes and regulations. A high-risk recipient may still receive funding. Member Cantú asked whether the adjustment that was made to ensure federal regulation requirement compliance also provides a more accurate reflection of the level of risk with regards to access to education opportunities. Superintendent Ebert responded that it is in alignment with the federal requirements. In terms of student outcomes, this risk is not evaluating the outcomes in terms of the spending of the dollars but rather the expenditures of the dollars. Member Cantú noted if the Board is going to consider the Pupil -Centered Funding Plan (PCFP) as a factor in closing these gaps, it is imperative that the investments being made in education have an impact on these disparities. Superintendent Ebert responded that it's not just about increasing funding but how those dollars are used strategically within their districts and within the context in which they work every day. It is also important to track and monitor outcomes on a regular basis. President Ortiz noted that the funding inadequacy is going to make drastic change in outcomes very difficult. Superintendent Ebert replied that the transition from the Nevada Plan to the PCFP is ongoing and these strategies for capturing and elevating the funds are one piece, while the outcomes are a separate piece. Superintendent Ebert remarked that ideally, she would like to see a dashboard built to demonstrate how funding and outcomes come to fruition; it's a matter of time to make sure the through line can be demonstrated. President Ortiz noted that if a school district receives this pot of money based on the PCFP, it's still budgeted based on people and resources needed in the building and is not necessarily following the child. Member Cantú noted the importance of making the amount of money attached to certain categories more meaningful. Member Cantú continued with the suggestion that the Board and NDE need to ensure the dollars follow the student and that those dollars are sufficient to make a difference in that child's life. Superintendent Ebert noted that the dollar amount is tracked at every single school. She remarked that two separate systems currently exist to track dollars and reporting. Having the connectivity of the two systems flowing concurrently is what is currently lacking. Member Stephens shared that schools need to take the funds and prioritize needs. President Ortiz noted that the PCFP will provide transparency in terms of where the funds will be distributed under the plan.

5. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE 82ND LEGISLATIVE SESSION BILL DRAFT REQUESTS

Dr. Katie Broughton, Education Programs Professional, Office of the Superintendent, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the [82nd Legislative Session Bill Draft Requests](#).

Member Hughes asked Dr. Broughton for her perspective on which bills would have the greatest potential to improve student outcomes. Dr. Broughton noted that strategies within each bill would provide a safer environment for students to achieve. President Ortiz asked Deputy Attorney General Gardner to provide guidance on the parameters for Board member interactions with legislators. Deputy Attorney General Gardner explained that because the Board members are elected and appointed by the Governor, they cannot speak on behalf of the Board unless there has been a vote on the topic. Board members who make public comments need to be clear that they are making a public comment on their own behalf and not on behalf of the Board. Board members can talk to legislators and lobby but only on their own behalf as individuals.

6. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING BOARD SUPPORT OF THE NEVADA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS (NASS) iNVEST IN EDUCATION LEGISLATION PROPOSAL [iNVEST In Education Flyer](#)

Member René Cantú moved for Board support of the Nevada Association of School Superintendents (NASS) iNVEST in Education legislation proposal. Member Michael Walker seconded. Member Maggie Carlton abstained. Motion passed unanimously with Member Carlton abstaining.

7. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION'S SELF-EVALUATION [Silver State Governance](#)

President Ortiz recapped the Board accomplishments including the Silver State Governance training, multiple workshops, state goals setting, and the setting of a vision and mission for the Board and State. The Board also will need to complete a self-evaluation of meeting Board goals to become a fully focused Board. President Ortiz reviewed the various goals with the Board.

The Vision & Goals evaluation: It was determined that although the Board did self-evaluate using the Approaching Student Outcomes Focus, they did not sufficiently engage the community. It was also noted that the Board did not have clear interim goals. The Board will solidify its interim goals at the next Silver State Governance workshop.

The Values & Guardrails evaluation: Member Hughes noted that the Board set draft guardrails but has not yet solidified these. President Ortiz confirmed the Board will revisit the draft guardrails. Member Walker noted that the column 'Approaching Student Outcomes Focus' references obtaining feedback from stakeholders, which the Board has yet to do. President Ortiz agreed with Member Walker that the Board will need to find a reliable avenue for soliciting feedback from stakeholders and ensuring that the Board is bringing stakeholder needs and values to the table.

The Accountability & Monitoring evaluation: President Ortiz stated that the Board has done some monitoring but not in an intentional way. Member Cantú asked whether Board meetings could be structured in such a way that would systematize discussion topics. President Ortiz expressed her support for Member Cantú's previous suggestion to move action items to the beginning of meeting agendas and remarked that a calendar of all regular and statutorily required agenda items had been created. A discussion ensued regarding solidifying the Board's calendar and the requirement to establish an interim calendar against which the progress of the Board's goals could be measured. Member Hughes suggested that the Board add check boxes against each goal and dedicate a period of five-minutes at the end of each meeting to reflect on the amount of time dedicated to the meeting's most meaningful items.

The Communication & Collaboration evaluation: President Ortiz noted that under this evaluation there are items that are not applicable because the Board does not complete a Superintendent evaluation. The Board has not hosted as many opportunities to listen to the vision and values of the community as it would have liked. President Ortiz asked Superintendent Ebert to confirm the maximum number of meetings the Board may schedule. Superintendent Ebert confirmed there are normally nine meetings and three additional meetings for the Board unless a meeting is called by more than three members of the Board. Member Cantú suggested that an opportunity for community feedback be incorporated into Board meetings on a quarterly basis. President Ortiz noted she had pushed back the meeting start times when she became Board President due to feedback from constituents and other stakeholders, especially teachers. The meetings held earlier in the day did not allow teachers to attend because they occurred during school hours. The Board's goal was to encourage greater community feedback and stakeholder attendance at the later meetings; however, this did not happen. President Ortiz continued that if the Board were to have quarterly meetings in addition to the regularly scheduled SBE meetings to solicit feedback from the community, evening meetings should be considered. These meetings could potentially conflict with District School Board meetings. Member Cantú remarked that the implementation of such changes to accommodate quarterly community meetings could still result in the same level of engagement. Member Cantú remarked that the Board will need to think of ways to proactively solicit community feedback by actively pursuing it. Member Hudson queried whether Board members may solicit community feedback at other events or meetings and whether there are any parameters around such actions. President Ortiz responded that her expectation is that Board members are already seeking to obtain community feedback at events they attend. President Ortiz cautioned Board members that they may engage in soliciting feedback from the community provided there are no more than three Board members present and

that they are not attempting to vote on topic. Member Hughes recommended the Board pre-identify the topics that should be prioritized for community input, to prioritize the items on the Board's calendar for planning ahead, and to determine focused ways to engage with the community.

The Unity & Trust evaluation: President Ortiz remarked that the Board is doing this well and Board meetings are well attended, but the Board does not have standard operating procedures and has not adopted an ethics and conflict of interest statement. Superintendent Ebert stated, and Member Dockweiler reiterated, that all Board members are required to sign an oath of office when joining the Board and that this is a component of the ethics and conflict of interest statement. Member Hughes suggested that the Board have a formal operating statement to provide guidance to new and future Board members.

The Continuous Improvement evaluation: President Ortiz asked Member Walker whether Carson City School District Board tracks staff time during their Board meetings, and he responded they do not. Member Walker elaborated and further discussion and clarification by the Board members ensued with regards to staff tracking time and what it entails. Members Hughes, Stephens, Walker, and President Ortiz discussed the evaluation recognition section and tying the Board goals more specifically to this section. The members went on to discuss calendaring the Board's goals on a monthly basis and scheduling a workshop after the March SBE meeting. This workshop would continue their Silver State Governance work with an eye towards the Board moving forward with its self-evaluation. There was also conversation around past governance and how the Silver State Governance was adopted.

Action items: President Ortiz to schedule another Silver State Governance workshop and in mid-summer the Board will complete another evaluation.

8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

State Board Meeting Times

Subcommittee Findings and Recommendations for Career and College Ready Assessment

State Board Officers Elections

English Mastery Council Recommendations

Workshop for High School Start Times

9. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

No public comment.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:11 P.M.

APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS GIVEN DURING PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Royce Severson provided public comment regarding High School start times and CCR test evaluation committee.

APPENDIX A, ITEM 1: ROYCE SEVERSON

We are a group of secondary teachers and counselors. We wanted to thank the Board for giving us all a voice in recent days. We are happy that the State is looking into changing high school start times and weighing the cost vs. benefits.

On the CCR test, thank you for opening the survey to all Nevadans. We would like to see some of the people in the trenches put on the evaluation committee. The current suggested list includes a variety of executive level positions who sit at desks in public offices. We have no doubt that they are highly qualified, but none of them are currently working in the high schools that administer the ACT. There is nobody from the classroom represented. Please include some high school teachers, counselors, assistant principals, and principals in the evaluation process. If there isn't enough room for us to have a seat at the table, just be sure to revise the RFP and evaluation criteria this time so that our voices from the survey are considered. In reviewing the priorities selected, it's clear that nearly every group in the state: parents, students, teachers, counselors, and administrators, have similar priorities on what type of test would be best.