

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
JULY 19, 2018
9:00 A.M.

Meeting Locations:

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	9890 S. Maryland Pkwy	Las, Vegas	Board Room (2 nd Floor)
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St	Carson City	Board Room

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
(*Video Conferenced*)

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

In Las Vegas

Robert Blakely
Tonia Holmes-Sutton
Mark Newburn
Felicia Ortiz

In Carson City

David Carter
Dave Jensen
Dawn Miller

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

In Carson City

Brett Barley, Deputy Superintendent, Student Achievement
Dave Brancamp, Director, Standards and Instructional Support
Kris Nelson, Director, Career Readiness, Adult Learning and Educational Options
Andre De Leon, Education Programs Professional
Randi Hunewill, Education Programs Supervisor
Karen Johansen, Assistant to the State Board of Education
Shawn Osborne, IT Technician

In Las Vegas

Steve Canavero, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Dena Durish, Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement
Peter Zutz, Administrator, Data and Accountability

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

In Las Vegas

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

In Carson City:

Lisa Blauth, Sierra Nevada Journeys
Jeff Church, Reno Public Safety
Sean Hill, Sierra Nevada Journeys
Eaton Dunhelberger, Sierra Nevada Journeys

Stephanie Barragan, Nevada Leads
Connie Fraser, Nevada Leads
Kristen Conway, Nevada Leads
Dawn Huckaby, Lyon County School District
Paige Barnes, NASB
Natha Anderson, WEA/SEA
Kirsten Gleissner, NWRPDP
Jen Sturm, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents

In Las Vegas:

Monte Bay, National University
Kenneth Retzl, Clark County School District
Rebecca Meyer, Clark County School District
Jesse Welsh, Clark County School District
Ricardo Mercado, Data Recognition Corporation
Renisha O'Donnell, Clark County Education Association
Linda Jones, Clark County Education Association
Ann Wozniak, JAG
Marcus Sherfield, JAG
Keenan Korth, Clark County Education Association
Amelia Gulling, DRI
Tambre Tondryk, Beacon Academy
Mike Vahsen, VNZ Strategies
Bill Garis, CCASA
Denise Lovern, Teacher, Clark County School District
Sylvia Lazos, UNLV
Theo Small, Clark County Education Association
Jenn Blackhurst, HOPE
Brittney Miller, Nevada Assemblywoman
Rebecca Garcia
Rene Cantu, JAG
Meredith Smith, Nevada Succeeds
Angela Quick, First NV
Julie Vigil, HOPE
Brittany Holmes-Sutton
Angie Sullivan, Clark County Education Association Social Justice
Don Soifer, Nevada Action for School Options
Vikki Courtney, Clark County Education Association

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. with attendance as reflected above.

Public Comment #1

Jeff Church, Candidate for Washoe County School Board Trustee District F, informed that he is retired from the Reno Police Department, retired U.S. Airforce Intelligence Officer and has taught recruiting nationwide for police and teachers. He commented on the Governor's School Safety Task Force as an experienced recruiter, stated that it is impossible to hire and staff a police officer for every school, every day in every district. Even if there were enough applicants, it would bankrupt the police. Most police officers make over \$100,000 a year plus the 40 percent PERS contribution. Nationwide, existing police departments cannot fill their positions. The plan concentrates on technology as opposed to an armed officer in the school. Also, the armed officer in the school in the past has often been neutralized and

proven ineffective in many school shootings. The use of technology involves the use of community service officers in a secure bullet resistant booth control center.

Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District (WCSD), on behalf of WCSD, offered support to the staff recommendation and motion from the standards committee for the proposed cut scores for the ACT assessment.

Brittany Miller, Assemblywoman, said she is also a teacher in Clark County School District (CCSD) and the sponsor of A.B. 312 from the 2017 Legislative Session. Class size is an issue that impacts Nevada schools and it was recently reported that Nevada has the largest class sizes in the country. The reason for the bill was to have the NDE make recommendations to the Board of Education to make a prescription of what the best student to teacher ratio in a classroom should be. By reducing class size a conducive environment will be created so students can achieve academically and socially. The bill was also supported by police and fire departments because they were concerned about the physical safety of students.

Sylvia Lazos, Professor of Law, UNLV School of Law, commends and supports the equity study that will be discussed on average versus actual in the CCSD reorganization. It is important crucial research and is essential to the ESSA plan. How can Nevada be the fastest improving state in the nation when giving the neediest kids the least. That is what this report shows. It understates the amount of inter-district inequity in CCSD. It does not have the data to look at the vacancy issue and affects the Title I schools the most. She recommended a discussion regarding the policy recommendations with the legislature as a result of the report. Also suggested was that a board member communicate the findings and policy judgement of the Board to the trustees at CCSD to work together, and ensure the community and stakeholders understand this report and its importance. Ms. Lazos recommended a possible Bill Draft Request (BDR) regarding a piece that is not part of the report concerning the S.B. 497 Task Force work about leadership. She suggested the principals under the re-org need some kind of certification training that is supervised and approved by the Board

Adam Berger, Teacher at Desert Oasis in CCSD, informed that is the vice chair of the School Organizational Team (SOT) at his high school. He said in the middle of the school year he learned they would not be receiving the funds from S.B. 178, which was a loss of \$400,000. They had plans to hire an EL strategist, have intervention software for the most at risk students, professional development for culture response teaching instruction, and after school tutoring. Losing that amount is a big chunk. Some of the language in S.B. 178 is flawed because their graduation rate increased but the data remained the same. The school may revert back to the way it was without this funding.

Rebecca Garcia, parent, said she has four children in CCSD schools and gave her support for Classroom Size Reduction (CSR). It is important to her as a parent. Her fourth grader will go from a class of 24 students to 35. This teacher will have more kids, but their needs have not changed. Ms. Garcia noted the changes must come with funding. Everyone agrees that CSR is needed, but the reality is there is not enough funding for CSR. Base funding must be available for every student in Nevada to have a quality education, which includes appropriate class sizes.

Rebecca Meyer, Director of Assessments, CCSD, recognized the importance of potentially approving cut scores for the ACT and the Board's commitment to ensure the decision made today is one that will allow schools throughout the state to be credited for their efforts in successfully teaching students the adopted Nevada Academic Content Standards. She noted that national experts are cautioning states against using a college entrance exam as a proficiency measure. With an understanding that the NDEs challenge in having limited academic achievement data at the high school level, it is critical to highlight the potential implications of using a college ready assessment to measure students mastery of the Nevada Academic Content Standards. Most achievement tests are based on academic standards and designed to measure mastery of those standards, the ACT is an assessment designed to predict a student's likely success in college in measure of college readiness, not mastery of the Academic Content Standards adopted in 2010 by the Board. Alignment studies recently conducted by Achieve, a non-profit education policy

organization with extensive experience in conducting standards and assessment reviews for states, show that less than half of the questions in both ELA and math are aligned to the expectations on the ACT that are recorded in the Common Core State Standards.

Denise Lovern, Teacher, Judith Steele Elementary School, CCSD, said classroom sizes are often spoken about in the abstract. She asked to picture this: a room the size of an average family room. Classrooms are about the same size. Put in a file cabinet, sink, water fountain, two or three book shelves, and a teachers desk. Add a table for science and social studies, a classroom library area, a math center, an area for small group instruction, a small storage cabinet and then add 36 desks, chairs along with 36 nine and ten year olds all with a variety of learning needs. She said she just described her 4th grade classroom from 2016. Nevada's children deserve smaller class sizes where every child has the attention they need. Stop setting up Nevada kids for failure by underfunding their education and placing too many students in a classroom.

Kenneth Retzl, Director, Research, Accountability & Data Services, CCSD, stated that the high schools NSPF gives five indicators; student engagement, English language proficiency, graduation rates, college and career readiness and academic achievement. Each of these indicators are critical in preparing students for the future. CCSD has concerns how academic achievement is being measured. The ACT is not designed to measure the proficiency of ELA or math standards. Considering that 20 percent of a school's star rating is based upon ELA and math proficiency, it is critical the assessments selected and approved by the SBE accurately measures what we intend to measure. (audio difficulties) National experts caution against using college admission exams to measure a student's mastery of academic standards because they are not designed to gauge the extent to which students have mastered those standards.

Approval of Flexible Agenda

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

Vice President's Report

Vice President Newburn welcomed the new superintendent of CCSD, Dr. Jesus Jara, and invited him to make a few comments.

Superintendent Jara said he is excited to be representing CCSD and that his entry plan is available at CCSD.net. (audio difficulties) In his first month he has met with principals, teachers, parents, community leaders and some students. He shared some of his initial goals and said if all the adults are working together for 322,000 children, they can accomplish great things and be the number one model district in the country.

Member Ortiz welcomed Dr. Jara to Las Vegas and said she is hopeful there will be great things happening with CCSD. She is very optimistic and is looking forward to working as one team.

Member Jensen, Superintendent, Humboldt County School District, welcomed Dr. Jara from the Nevada Association of School Superintendents (NASS). He noted the passion and drive Dr. Jara has for CCSD matches the passion of the other 17 superintendent's in the state, and expressed hope in working together as a unified group.

Vice President Newburn continued with his report and noted that last month Nevada held its first ever Computer Science Summit. There were 160 administrators, principals and teachers across the state brought together discuss the requirements of S.B. 200. Several national organizations participated who want to use the Nevada summit as the model going forward with other states.

Superintendent's Report

Steve Canavero, Superintendent of Public Instruction, provided updates on the following:

- Friday, June 13, 2018 was the School Safety Task Force's second complete meeting. The Task Force has two sub-committees, one is about infra-structure that deals with matters related to the

School Building and Safety Issues. The second is about Student Well-Being. The subcommittees bring recommendations to the Task Force for consideration.

- Regulatory public hearings are on the agenda today and more will be coming forward as the NDE winds down on regulations from the 2017 Legislative Session.
- The Nevada Star Ratings will come out in the middle of September.
- The External Evaluator that has been in place since 2015 will report on the efficacy of the categorical programming in December.
- The funding study from S.B. 178 is ongoing. Augenblick has been charged to update all of the NDE studies. In late 2018 there will be draft recommendations with adequacy and equity numbers for the base and student weights.
- The meeting is being live streamed as a test pilot for the first time today. A budget enhancement has been requested so the State Board meetings are available to the public with live streaming.
- The NDE is working on BDRs from the School Safety Task Force and others through the Governor's office.

Member Ortiz inquired whether the Safety Task Force or the sub-committees have discussed social and emotional learning. She said it begins in kindergarten so students are armed with tools to deal with traumatic situations. Superintendent Canavero said a statewide framework for social, emotional and academic development was a policy and budgetary recommendation from the well-being subcommittee. It fits nicely with the 2017 change for integrated student services as a framework.

Member Ortiz asked whether discussion occurred about supporting teachers, staff and dollars set aside to ensure teachers receive support. Superintendent Canavero said there was recognition that the adults in the system need training and support. Member Ortiz inquired about the funding formula for school districts.

Member Holmes-Sutton echoed member Ortiz in her support for social and emotional learning. She expressed concern for teachers, not just assisting them in supporting students, but acknowledging their social and emotional well-being needs.

Member Blakely shared that when he was on the Board of Regents the chancellor took on the task of re-vamping the funding formula. He noted if the funding formula is ever going to change that the superintendent is the starting point.

Approval of Consent Agenda

- a. Possible Approval of Instructional Materials for Lyon School District
 - Statistics and Probability with Applications - Grades 9-12
- b. Possible Approval of Instructional Materials for Carson City School District
 - Physics, College Physics; AP Edition, Grades 9-12
 - Chemistry, Grades 9-12
 - Economics , Grade 12
- c. Possible Approval of Dual Credit request for students taking a community college or university course from Carson City School District.
- d. Possible Approval of Dual Credit Courses for Nevada State High Schools Sunrise Campus in North Las Vegas, Nevada and the Meadowwood Campus in Reno, Nevada
- e. Possible Approval of Career and Technical Education standards for:
 - Information Technology Networking
 - Automation Technology
- f. Possible Approval of the re-licensing of three Nevada private schools for a four-year period:
 - Far West Academy, Clark County
 - Green Valley Lutheran Kindergarten, Clark County
 - Triad School, Washoe County
- g. Possible Approval of 22 annual Agent's Permits for non-exempt Private Schools for a term of one year

- h. Possible Approval of minutes:
 - March 30, 2018 Regulation meeting
 - June 7, 2018 State Board of Education meeting
- i. Possible Approval of the Special Education Advisory committee (SEAC) Annual Report
- j. Possible Approval of SEAC appointments:
 - Ellen Richardson Adams - Parents of Children with Disabilities and/or Individuals with Disabilities
 - Diana Cannon - Parents of Children with Disabilities and/or Individuals with Disabilities
 - Joseph Holguin – Special Education Teacher - South
 - Jan Albertson – Special Education Administrator – North
 - Josh Baker – Universities - South
 - Brian Brill – Parents of Children with Disabilities and/or Individuals with Disabilities
 - Jesse Rojas Espinoza – Parents of Children with Disabilities and/or Individuals with Disabilities
- k. Possible Approval of Petition for revocation of the Nevada Educators License for:
 - Roger W. Brown
 - Jeffrey L. Entner
 - Deborah L. Urrizaga
 - Willie D. Bell
 - Jonathan A. Scheaffer
 - William A. Crawford
 - Kathryn A. Navrides
 - Rachel A. Marsh
 - Robert L. Faiman III

David Gardner, Deputy Attorney General, refreshed the Board about the new policy of including teacher revocations on the consent agenda.

Member Holmes-Sutton noted that on page 7 of the June 7, 2018 board minutes the name of James *Brecht* from Nevada Rise was misspelled as *Break*.

Member Ortiz moved to approve the Consent Agenda with the added spelling correction of *Break* to *Brecht* in the June 7, 2018 Board minutes. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Public Hearing and Possible Adoption of proposed amendments to R087-18; NAC Chapter 389 amendments to NAC Chapter 389, relating to the standards of instruction in the content area of health. The proposed amendments revise the language in NAC 389.2423 Grades Pre-Kindergarten through 2nd grade, NAC 389.2938 Grades 3 through 5, NAC 389.381 Grades 6 through 8, NAC 389.455 Grades 9 through 12, to reflect the inclusion of instruction in cardiopulmonary resuscitation and the use of an automated external defibrillator Students, as required in Assembly Bill 85.

The public hearing opened at 10:03 A.M. There were 33 individuals present in Las Vegas and 14 individuals present in Carson City.

Dave Brancamp, Director, Standards and Instructional Support, stated that A.B. 85 requests that the State Board add CPR and the use of the automated external defibrillators to NAC chapter 389.

Andre DeLeon, Education Programs Professional, informed that he worked with LCB to add the language to NAC and there is teacher friendly language to guide instruction for the standards. The addition fits nicely in the health standards.

The hearing closed at 10:06 a.m.

There was no public comment.

Member Holmes-Sutton moved to approve R087-18. Member Blakely seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Public Hearing and Possible Adoption of proposed amendments to R079-18; NAC 388.1327, 288.1351 and 388.1455 concerning the establishment of the program required pursuant to NRS 288.1455. Clarification is provided regarding instances and requirements in which an individual who submits a report to the tipline required by NRS 388.1455 has elected to not remain anonymous

The public hearing was opened at 1:06 a.m. There were 33 individuals present in Las Vegas and 14 individuals present in Carson City.

Amber Reid, Education Programs Professional, Safe and Respectful Office, provided history on the regulation. During the 2015 Legislative Session, S.B. 504 was passed, additionally S.B. 388 passed and established an anonymous reporting outlet for dangerous activities that may occur at school or on a school bus. Senate Bill 212 passed in the 2017 Legislative Session clarifying the requirements and provisions of the Safe to Tell and now the Safe Voice program. The NDEs office for Safe and Respectful Learning Environment has worked diligently with the Department of Public Safety with the Safe Voice program which allows for a single phone number, mobile application or online platform for students to report concerns of their own safety well-being or of a peer.

Research demonstrates that in the majority of school shooting incidents at least one person knew of the plans prior to the attack. NRS 388.1323 requires the NDE to maintain a hotline for reporting concerns of bullying, and NRS 388.1351 further requires the principal to respond to bullying reports in a timely fashion with the requirements that go into the investigation and parental notification, and the development of a plan to support the physical and emotional well-being of the students involved. The Safe Voice program ensures the anonymity of a person who reports such an activity or the threat of such an activity and wishes to remain anonymous. Current law allows for the use of a single center to receive information pursuant to both avenues of reporting, bullying as well as concerns for safety and well-being. The anonymity of the two programs are different, and the application of the strong anonymity provisions of NRS 388.1455 to individual reporting of bullying of themselves would prevent the principal of the school from knowing the self-reporters identity.

Section 1 of the language establishes the requirements for when a student waives their right to anonymity by either reporting something that is a concern for their own safety and well-being, or providing their name and contact information after being notified that information is not required. Section 2 further allows for a person who waives their anonymity by reporting something that could affect the safety and well-being of another person or that they also submit their own name and contact information after being notified that it is not required. Section 3 specifies that an individual who deliberately reports false information through the Safe Voice program with the intent to cause harm would be deemed to have elected not to remain anonymous. While the anonymity in these causes is waived, confidentiality is always ensured.

The public hearing was closed at 10:13 p.m.

There was no public comment.

Member Ortiz moved to approve proposed regulation R079-18. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Public Hearing and Possible Adoption of proposed amendments to R035-18; NAC chapter 385.410 concerning high school equivalency assessment retesting

The public hearing was opened at 10:13 a.m. There were 33 individuals present in Las Vegas and 14 individuals present in Carson City.

Nancy Olsen, Education Programs Professional, informed the Board that the intent of this regulation is to remove an unnecessary restriction on re-testing. Section 1, sub-section 1, strikes the statement *an applicant who takes a high school equivalency assessment for the first time must complete the entire battery before re-taking any of the sub-tests. This revision removes the restriction on re-testing each sub-test prior to competing the entire battery.* The original language aligned with the vendor pricing at the time it was adopted. Now vendors have changed their pricing structure to focus on each sub-test and this revision aligns with the way the vendor pricing currently works removing an unnecessary restriction.

The public hearing closed at 10:17 p.m.

There was no public comment.

Member Blakely moved to approve proposed amendments to R035-18. Member Ortiz seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and possible Action regarding Tesla's Nevada K-23 Education Investment.

The presentation will outline Tesla's investment strategy and allocation of the first installment to the Education Gift Fund (EGF) Chris Reilly, workforce Development and Education at Tesla

Vice President Newburn stated that today is the beginning of an exciting partnership for Nevada students and teachers by accepting Tesla's investment in Nevada consistent with the September 11, 2014 original letter that memorialized this partnership. In the letter Tesla agreed to donate a total of \$37.5 million to K-12 education in five annual installments beginning this month. The purpose of this partnership is to augment STEM education on a statewide basis as well as to fund desired education programs within school districts located in the geographic regions surrounding the Tesla facility. The growth of STEM jobs in Nevada's projection is 40 percent higher than non-STEM jobs between 2014 and 2024.

Chris Reilly, Workforce Development and Education programs, Tesla, conducted a PowerPoint presentation and discussed the Greater Workforce Development. Every program Tesla launches relates back to their goal of "accelerating the world's transition to sustainable energy" which is their mission statement. A brief update was shared about gigafactory 1 including they plan to have 6,500 full-time team members at the gigafactory and currently about 90 percent are Nevada employment. Their building has 5.4 million square feet of operational space across three levels. From a long term standpoint, Tesla is just getting started in Nevada.

The manufacturing development program is a high school graduate apprenticeship program in its first year. They have worked to ensure students have access to apprenticeship scholarship programs to continue with their education with a 20 credit scholarship at Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC). There is reserved housing nearby and a 7-day a week shuttle transportation. Tesla is working with the Governor's Office of Economic Development, called the Gigafactory Gateway. An allocation of funds from the Governor's Office of Economic Development, Workforce Innovations for a New Nevada, and with partnerships is training Nevadan's in advance manufacturing. They are excited to see their partnerships with UNLV and UNR grow. Approximately 20 percent of last year's intern class came from UNR.

Tesla committed to investing \$37.5 million over five years, approximately \$7.5 million per year available to entities across the state including schools, school districts, and non-profits through the Department of Education's gift fund. Mr. Reilly highlighted robotics stating 75 percent of alumni from high quality robotics programs are entering STEM fields either as a profession or as a student. Students coming out of these programs are twice as likely to have an interest in STEM.

Mr. Reilly said Tesla is excited to share the first \$1.5 million and he explained that the investments have a detailed multi-year plan and budget. Highlights and examples were provided about Tesla's programs.

Establishing a robotics program in every school in Nevada is a goal. A statewide teacher training infrastructure and partnership with DRI will be developed with opportunities in both north and south Nevada. Further details were provided about the programs.

Board members and Superintendent Canavero expressed excitement and gratitude for Tesla's investment that focuses on encouraging K-12 students from all backgrounds to consider and pursue careers that support Robotics, STEM and engineering.

Member Blakely moved to accept the \$1.5 million in to the education gift fund to be used as directed by the donor under the July 19, 2018 letter. Member Ortiz seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding A.B. 312. In accordance with AB 312, the Nevada Department of Education will present information to the State Board of Education for discussion related to the ratio of pupils per teacher. Information will include national standards, research findings, and a summary of Nevada educator input. Based on the information provided and discussions, the Board may take possible action in developing nonbinding recommendations for the ratio of pupils per licensed teacher in public schools for kindergarten and grades 1 to 12, inclusive

Brett Barley, Deputy Superintendent, Student Achievement, informed the Board that A.B. 312, relating to ratios of pupils per licensed teacher, was passed in the 2017 Legislative Session. The recommendations to the Board were prescribed in law and are to include three pieces; prescribe a suggested ratio of pupils to teachers, must be based on evidence based national standards, and take in to account the unique needs of certain pupils including English learners.

Karl Wilson, Education Programs Professional conducted a [Powerpoint](#) presentation to inform about the pupil-teacher ratios. Existing NRS 388.700-725 relates to teacher ratios for K-2 and grade 3, and also allows for variances of those requirements under certain circumstances. The Legislature provides funding along with recommendations related to the ratios. Senate Bill 544 from the 2017 Legislative Session provided funding that supports the ratio at 17 pupils per teacher in grades 1-2, and 20 pupils per teacher in grade 3. Senate Bill 515 from the 2015 Legislative Session provided funding to support class-size reduction at the same ratios that were continued in 2017.

Based on research, the NDE recommends that the Board considers the following pupil-teacher ratio recommendations for each classroom and course of instruction except choir, orchestra and band. For grades K-3 the recommendation is a pupil-teacher ratio of 15 pupils per teacher in the classroom and for grades 4-12, 25 pupils per teacher.

Dr. Sophia Masewicz summarized the results of the research and commission report that was reviewed to make the recommendations. Research shows mixed results. Some studies indicate that large class-size reductions have a positive impact on student outcomes, especially for disadvantaged students. Other studies show that small or moderate class-size reduction had little or no impact on student outcomes. Classroom size reduction has support of a broad political coalition and it is enormous in popularity with parents, teachers and in general with the public.

The significant cost of reducing class-size coupled with the modest benefits to student outcomes implies that increasing class-size in some situations may represent a budget cutting strategy on the part of the states that minimizes harm to students. Ms. Masewicz reviewed national trends of pupil-teacher ratios and a funding study in preparation for the 2019 Legislative Session.

Mr. Wilson reviewed results from the Nevada Teacher survey that was conducted in the summer. Initially there were concerns about the timing, however approximately 9,000 teachers, or about 40 percent of Nevada teachers, responded. He informed the Board they are to develop non-binding recommendations for pupil-teacher ratios that incorporates K-12, for all classrooms and courses except for choir, orchestra and band, based on evidence-based national standards and taking into account the unique needs of certain pupils, including English learners.

Member Newburn said he agrees with the recommendations. However, later today he will approve CRS waivers for schools that will be much higher ratios than these recommendations. Approving this does not magically staff schools at this level. How will this recommendation be used going forward, and not ending up in a dusty drawer? How will it improve policy and outcomes for kids? Superintendent Canavero noted it is important to consider the teachers voices and the evidence in research. The idea that the CSR program will be magically fixed by these recommendations will not happen. The opportunity is to post the Augenblick study and design a model that points to adequacy which includes staffing based upon ratios from professional judgement panels as well as case studies.

Board member discussion ensued about the Classroom Size Reduction program.

Member Jensen said most of his issues have been addressed which are regarding funding streams, and the infrastructures of schools. He does not have room to add five more positions to his schools, and consideration must be given to the infrastructure. He asked questions from his staff and expected the responses received but what was not asked was relative to the workload that has been shifted to teachers over the past several years, the impact of that workload, and their perception of what they need in terms of class-sizes to effectively function within those parameters. The studies referenced were lukewarm at best, and research did not cover the quality of instruction. Also, studies about the quality of instruction often counter the discussion about class-size. It comes down to the effectiveness of the instructor in the class-room which comes back to teacher shortages. He challenged that simply reducing numbers is an answer to improving academic performance unless staff members are prepared to be successful in the classroom.

Member Ortiz asked if consideration was given to special education students and that their classrooms have more needs. Mr. Wilson said there are specific ratios for students with disabilities, and they are very prescriptive.

Member Ortiz moved to approve the Nevada Department of Education's proposed recommendation of Grades K-3 = 15 to 1 and Grades 4-12 = 25 to 1. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information and Discussion based upon the assessment made pursuant to A.B. 448 subsection 1. The Department shall make a recommendation to the State Board of Education and the Nevada Legislature regarding whether to continue to use the average unit cost for budgeting for salaries and benefits of staff of the local school precincts or whether to budget for such expenditures in another manner.

Vice President Newburn informed the Board that the bill cited on the agenda has a typo and it should be A.B. 469. However, the description of the content to be discussed is accurate.

Superintendent Canavero stated that a report and letter dated July 2, 2018 was sent to the Board to fulfill an obligation from A.B. 469 that the NDE is required to access the equity of using the average unit cost in building the strategic budgets for schools within CCSD. Assembly Bill 469 is the CCSD re-organization bill that codified the regulations developed by the Board post 2015.

Superintendent Canavero thanked Michael Vannozzi from TC2, Justin Gardner with Innovative Research and Analysis and CCSD. He said we would not have been able to get this far without the hard work of these individuals. The premise of the CCSD is a fundamental transition and a redesign of a centralized operational model to one that is de-centralized. Other districts across the country that have done this have a focus on schools to create conditions and empower principals with training to promote their role to make key decisions and allocate resources. Then principals can then make decision at a local school site to best serve the needs of students under the outcome goal of improved academic achievement. He has made process related recommendations but there is not a specific recommendation.

The work is difficult when considering an organization the size of CCSD and the accumulated processes that reinforce the centralized structure to move it to a de-centralized structure. The NDE and CCSD have partnered in a joint implementation plan to help build the infrastructure and systems necessary for this work. It will take some time and patience as the challenges are identified to work with systems and resolve them. These are long standing systems and traditions about the way things have been done and now new ways of operation are being introduced.

The subject of this study sought to understand how the financial resources allocated to CCSD are distributed to schools. It is complex with no simple solutions. This is about the manner by which the funds are distributed to schools that are allocated to CCSD, whether that is more or less money. It is how the funds are moved from central to the schools. A similar discussion will occur in CCSD about how the money they receive is distributed on a per pupil basis. Noted was that the findings of this report could apply to the majority of school districts across the country. Report cards that come out for the 2018-19 school year, and per pupil expenditures must be reported to federal, state, and local for every school and district across the state. This is a long standing issue and the hope is to collectively engage in a productive dialog about looking forward and fixing the issue.

Superintendent Canavero discussed the following main findings of the study:

- How has CCSD constructed local school precinct budgets for schools?
- How equitable is CCSD's current local school precinct budget allocation model?
- How equitable are actual local school precinct expenditures on instruction?
- How do instructional staff vacancies affect the equity of actual expenditures on instruction at local precincts, and how have local school precincts addressed those vacancies?
- How does instructional staff member length of service affect the equity of actual local school precinct expenditures on instruction?
- How would the equity of instructional staffing allocation change if CCSD:
 - Budgeted available resources to local school precincts on a 1-to-1 per-pupil basis?
 - Budgeted available resources to local school precincts on a weighted per-pupil basis where local school precincts would be allocated a maximum of a 1.5 weight for students with Limited English Proficiency (LEPs) and students who qualify for free or reduced-price lunch (FRLs).

Superintendent Canavero suggested the joint implementation plan is amended to include a per pupil model that over time achieves horizontal and vertical equity. The process on how designing, developing and implementing this model is important. He has called it a Funding Equity Workgroup and said it should be composed of principals, teachers and SOT members to advise on policies. There must be a timeline in the joint implementation plan timeline with benchmarks to measure progress.

Vice President Newburn provided the perspective of a board member. He said that the average unit cost and average teacher salary allocates dollars from what the district receives down to the schools. This is a standard method but the problem has to do with the characteristics of CCSD.

It is so large and serves such a diverse community that there are transparency and equity issues. In theory, one school could have all top senior staff, and another school could have all new junior staff, and to the public it appears the same amount of money is spent at both schools. In fact, twice as much money could be spent at one school. This is further exacerbated by the fact that substitute teachers make so much less. If there is a school that is staffed with all long term substitutes, and a school that is staffed with all senior individuals, three times as much money could be spent at one school over another and it would be completely invisible. The question becomes, where did the one school get all those extra dollars to pay all that super senior staff? They got it from the other school. If all the schools are averaged, the one school would not be able to afford those teachers.

Vice President Newburn explained that dollars have been moved invisibly from one school to another school. From an accountability point of view at the state level, it makes it hard if not impossible, to

measure the effect of additional dollars to the system. If the state, through categorical funding, were to send dollars to an at risk school, and at the same time the staffing at that at risk school changed so that they now have more junior staff or more long term substitutes, it appears that dollars are added to that school when in fact dollars are being extracted from that school.

It is impossible to tell the effect of those new dollars. There have been cases where the local paper and university used the published average salaries to try to make a determination whether new dollars were affecting those schools. The answer is almost certainly incorrect because what they were measuring had nothing to do with the real dollar allocations to schools. This is an enormous transparency problem. What we see in this report is probably the first time this community has ever seen how real dollars go to schools. It is a huge problem. We should always know what schools are getting in terms of real dollars, and that has always been an unknown.

It was learned through monitoring the teacher shortage that there is a migration pattern for teachers. It is a huge district, and CCSD advised that new teachers go to the at risk schools. Over time, as teachers gain seniority, they tend to move to other schools. There is a pattern that as a teacher's salary increases, they move away from at risk schools to the more affluent schools. This is a real life situation where the difference in salaries has been created. Reports show that one star schools have eight times the vacancy rate as a five star school with a linear progression between the two. Not only is there a certain class of school that has more junior staff, they have more long term substitute staff. This happens, different amounts of money is spent, and it is all invisible. This creates an enormous equity problem because schools are funded that are serving at risk students at possibly a much lower level than schools are being funded in the affluent areas. It is all invisible, the dollars are moving from one class of school to another class of school and it cannot be seen when it is happening.

Board members got to the position where they were fairly certain that there was a class of schools serving at risk students that was financially subsidizing a class of schools in the suburbs. That is a problem. The fear is that this becomes institutionalized to such a degree that the only way schools in the suburbs can afford their teachers, is that schools serving the most at risk students must be staffed with the least experienced staff and long term substitutes. A student who is at a school where every year they get either a rookie teacher or a long term substitute, or a rooky long term substitute is the on ramp for the school-to-prison pipeline. That should be stopped immediately and should not become a desirable feature of the budgeting process.

Based on testimony the Board heard during the reorganization they became concerned that if the budget is dependent on a teacher shortage, how is a teacher shortage fixed? There was testimony that dollars saved from using substitute teachers are being moved to subsidize other schools. From the Boards perspective there is a huge transparency and equity problem. It is a nasty problem because it is how the dollars go from the districts to the schools. If the base is increased and the district receives more money, it does not fix the problem.

There is a \$50,000 difference between the lowest and highest salary. If every teacher was given a five percent raise, the difference is larger at \$52,500. Raising the base funding does not fix the problem, and looking at how the Legislature was going to go to weighted funding it was even worse because of the disparity shown in the report between who is serving at risk schools and who is serving affluent schools. Some percent of the dollars weighted to serve the most at risk students are guaranteed to move and serve the most affluent students in the system. The characteristics of the district have made what is a standard process, a huge visibility and equity problem.

Board members met with the reorganization committee to relay there is an issue with the process and it is resulting in a huge transparency and equity problem. Based on testimony, CCSD knows it has transparency and equity problems, and that it will undermine the larger effort to go to a weighted funded formula. There is an issue with this showing up in a regulation for Board approval, so they asked for a study to shine the light on what they view to be a very dark corner of the budget. Member Newburn said he agrees with almost all of the recommendations, however, there are a couple he disagrees with. There

should be a push to get average unit cost out of the reorganization law as soon as possible. Also he has an issue with the make-up of the task force.

Vice President Newburn expressed concern that everyone on the task force will have a vested interest in maintaining that system and he would like a group that will come up with an innovative solution. Another concern of his is that sending this report to the task force will be sending it to die and be buried in a shallow grave in the desert. He suggested that because CCSD knew this was occurring, they have lost the right to control the solution to this problem. The group who is involved should be expanded to include a Board of Education member because they raised the flag early. The group consisting of individuals who must be part of the process are not going to come up with an answer.

Member Carter recalled that when he worked in California they had similar problems, and he discussed their solutions at the district level. The district was responsible for ensuring there was equity among the different schools. A rural school would have the same effort and possibility of getting good teachers as an urban school.

Member Blakely stated that as a board member he represents Las Vegas and the area indicated by the study, and that it was not getting equity. He is not happy with the study but is not stunned because he has lived it for most of the time his daughter was in school. It is not easy because the reality is that some of the money is being spent where it comes in. The argument comes from the affluent parts of the state. We brought the money to the state, so we should have the access to it. Sometimes those people are the loudest. He is saddened by the study and does not know if there is a good answer.

Member Ortiz echoed Vice President Newburn's comments and agreed that the Board has been discussing this for a couple of years. Board members it was happening, but seeing it in black and white makes it more impactful. Something needs to be done. She agreed that board members should be included in the working group, specifically someone from the community or in the education advocacy group that is focused on equity. Much of this would not have come to light if it had not been for the bill passed in the 2015 to reorganize the school district. She asked to hear from the school district and what their reaction to the report is.

Kirsten Searer, Chief Communications Marketing and Strategy Officer, CCSD, thanked the Board for the discussion on this topic. She said CCSD is aware that this is a concern nationally, not just at CCSD. Their top priority is to strive for equity in all ways, including the way schools are funded. As this report acknowledges, addressing this issue could require more resources to go to some schools at the expense of others. She said they look forward to working with the state to address this issue and ensure that all students have access to quality teachers.

Member Ortiz said her biggest concern is whether these discussions are occurring in negotiations with the union on teacher contracts, and are there discussions about how teachers can be incentivized? There was a recent situation where money was allocated by legislators to incentivize teaching in at risk schools. However, the way that was implemented was a slap in the face to teachers who already teach in these schools. It was a large bonus for teachers to move to those schools, but nothing for teachers that were already there. Thought must be given to implementation and the unintended consequences when legislators are making decisions. She asked if there are discussions about ways they can strategically work with unions in the employment agreement with teachers, and find other ways to potentially incentivize teachers to stay in these schools instead of moving away.

Ms. Searer said they are working on their legislative platform for 2019 and their board has instructed staff that a top priority should be exploring incentives for all Title I teachers. There was a bill passed in 2017 that provided incentives to new teachers in Title I schools, either teachers transferring or new teachers coming in. There was concern and a shared discussion about how to create incentives for all Title I teachers. Member Ortiz said the Title I teachers should be incentivized based on them being great teachers with a good track record. In response to further questions from member Ortiz, Ms. Searer

responded they look at multiple ways to incentivize teachers to stay and work at Title I schools. Strong leadership is key at needy schools to keep good teachers and be successful

Member Newburn commented that this is going to take a novel solution adding that solving this problem could be the most important thing to come out of the reorganization legislation.

Theo Small, Vice President, Clark County Education Association reminded the Board that they worked with the district and created the 2015-17 contract which looked at the issue of reducing the vacancies in their highest need schools, and how teachers can be incentivized to attract them and keep them in those schools. He agreed that teachers in those schools should be just as incentivized as new educators. They are willing to work with the district and these issues, and share the same concerns about how to equitably fund and keep educators.

Member Newburn agreed that the solution is not only good teachers but strong principal leadership.

Superintendent Canavero summarized the direction he heard from the Board. The joint implementation plan is directly connected to his authority in the bill that provides him with the authority to take actions he deems necessary to effectuate the law.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the proposed cut scores for the ACT assessment. NDE and DRC staff will present the results of educational stakeholder committee that conducted standard setting to determine cut scores that relate to achievement levels.

Deputy Barley recalled that over the past year the end-of-course exams have been transitioned to district administered and scored end-of-course finals that will contribute a percentage of the grade in the class in the future. That leaves the ACT as the single high school assessment that is provided to all students in Nevada and requires that the ACT be Nevada's federally reported high school assessment for the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) at the high school level for the academic achievement indicator. There will be an alignment study this year with the ACT and additional work will be going into ensuring it is mapped to the Nevada Academic Content Standards. There have been discussions regarding the scores today. They were vetted and recommended by a standards setting committee and then went to the Academic Standards Council. The standards council consists of content experts from WCSD and CCSD, board members, community members and a NSHE representative. The standards council approved the recommendations brought to the board for consideration today.

Peter Zutz, Administrator, Assessments, Data and Accountability explained he is bringing the recommendation of a standard setting committee for the Board's consideration and possible action on setting proficiency cuts for the ACT assessment. Mr. Zutz conducted a [Powerpoint](#) presentation regarding the proposed cut scores for the ACT English language arts and math. Information was provided about the ACT in Nevada including:

- 34,000 Nevada 11th graders that the ACT
- It is offered free of charge to Nevada students
- The ACT is not a graduation requirement
- ACT is a national college entrance test
- Students use their scores to apply to college
- The Nevada System of Higher Education members use ACT scores for placement decisions

The cut scores brought today for possible action are for ELA and math. For this year ACT will be the federally reported exam for ELA and mathematics. These cuts do not affect the scores that an individual receives on the ACT. These cuts are a requirement by federal law. Federal law requires each state of those high school exams, the ELA, math and science, to annually report proficiency levels. The ACT results do not have built in proficiency levels. Earlier this year the proficiency cuts were set as required by the federal government. Any students results may be used by the student as they wish.

Board member discussion ensued regarding whether it is a student who is chronologically an 11th grader, or a student who has the credits of an 11th grader, takes the test. Mr. Zutz clarified that all assessment decisions regarding who takes an assessment, and at what time, are district decisions. A broad guidance based on NRS is provided to the districts. Member Ortiz emphasized the districts need to be certain the students are categorized in a way that aligns them with their coursework to ensure they have completed the coursework, have studied and are proficient in the standards that would make them successful with the ACT test.

Rick Mercado, Director of Research, Data Recognition Corporation continued the presentation and discussed how standard setting was used to create cut score recommendations for ACT. ACT does not have hard and fast cut scores, rather it has benchmarks for college readiness. The ACT benchmarks for college readiness are:

- English (18)
- Math (22)
- Reading (22)
- Science (23)
- English Language Arts (20) (combination of English, reading, and writing)

Students meeting these benchmarks have a 50 percent chance of earning a “B” or higher in specific credit-bearing college courses.

The committee recommended:

- Level 2: Students should have approximately a 50 percent chance of earning a “C” or higher in a credit bearing college course
- Level 3: Students should have approximately a 67 percent chance of earning “C” or higher in a credit bearing college course
- Level 4: Students should have approximately a 67 percent chance of earning a “B” or higher in a credit-bearing course.

The committee recommended that Level 3 be considered proficient.

There are three curves for ELA, the lower one is the probability of earning an A, the middle is the probability of earning a B, and the top is the probability of earning a C or higher. The recommended cut scores for ELA are 12,17 and 24. The recommended cut scores for math are 15, 20 and 26.

Mr. Zutz presented the cut scores for ACT ELA and ACT math for the Board’s consideration. For ELA the proficient cut is 17 and above and the proficient cut for math is 20 and above.

Member Blakely agreed academically with the proposed cut scores. Realistically, many students in CCSD schools are going to fall into Level 2. In terms of them going on to college, they are in the non-proficient category. What are the consequences of that?

Mr. Zutz responded that whatever cut is set does not undo the ACT underlying data. Benchmarks for ACT: ELA is 18 and math is 22. His proposed cuts are 17 for ELA and 20 for math. Should a student achieve 18 on ELA, they can use that score again for whatever they may choose. The 18 is considered proficient. Benchmark scores that are provided to each grade 11 student stand. Federal law requires that Nevada look at the data provided, and take the recommendations of committee to consider what is proficient. He noted it is important to remember that proficiency is not synonymous with college and career ready. The college and career ready considerations are made by ACT, and those considerations are about possible student performance in the first year of college predicted performance B or C level.

Vice president Newburn recalled the original purpose of the test was to give all students an early indication of where they were so they could have their senior year to prepare and be ready. Nevada is reusing the ACT test for accountability purposes. Member Blakely said his point is that a challenge of the

universities is that many students in Nevada require remediation when they enter college. If someone is less ready, they can still attend college but recognize they will need remediation. Mr. Zutz noted that NSHE accepts ACT benchmarks as non-remediation. Member Blakely said this is not to discourage students at level 2; they can still attend college but will require remediation.

Deputy Barley said this is why the state and the Board adopted the ACT. Previously, when students in Nevada was taking the ACT there were 9,000 students taking the test and they were overwhelmingly white and Asian. Now it is offered free to every kid in the state, there are 30,000 plus taking the assessment every year. Providing this test for free for all students across the state was a major equity win for Nevada.

Member Ortiz requested that data is tracked regarding how many students are now taking the ACT and how many students are actually going to college because they have taken the exam. It also puts kids on the radar of colleges and universities. She is in favor of the recommendations.

Member Blakely moved to approve the cut scores at level 3 and 4 as being proficient. Member Ortiz seconded the motion with the addition of approving levels 1, 2, 3 and 4 with levels 1 and 2 being non-proficient and levels 3 and 4 being proficient. Member Blakely accepted the friendly amendment. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the Alternative Performance Framework school approval recommendations. NRS 385A.730 and NRS 385A.740 requires a school district or a sponsor of a charter school to apply to the State Board on behalf of a school seeking approval to be rated using the alternative performance framework. The Department's recommendations for schools seeking approval from the State Board to be rated using the Alternative Performance Framework for the 2018-19 school year.

Deputy Barley recalled that in previous years the Board approved the inclusion of schools into the Alternative Performance Framework (AFP) that was created for schools that serve 75 percent or more with unique needs including adjudicated youth, students that are credit deficit, and special education students. Most discussions have been about how schools get into the framework. Today, there is one school that has applied for the framework. In addition there will be a presentation about how the schools are rated within the framework to understand how they are evaluated to monitor their progress against goals.

Katherine Fuselier, Education Programs Professional conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation with an overview of the Nevada AFP and an NDE recommendation to approve Beacon Academy to be included in the 2018-19 school year APF.

The Nevada Alternative Performance Framework represents a state accountability system designed to:

- Highlight qualifying schools who serve high-needs populations
- Collect and report data for schools currently under the Nevada State Accountability System that have an incomplete performance story; and
- Provide actionable information about the progress of qualifying schools in driving improvement in student achievement

There are four primary types of schools and students that are in the framework:

- Schools offering credit recovery programs and behavioral/continuation programs.
- Schools offering behavioral /continuation programs.
- Juvenile detention facilities serving adjudicated youth.
- Special education schools serving students with identified disability.

Additional information was provided about academic achievement, attendance, academic progress, graduation, and student engagement and planning for success, an indicator that measures student success

towards a career or college. The intent of the APF is to ensure schools are continuing to improve and provide a successful learning environment for students. Regulations adopted in 2016 specify that a school will be measured on itself. Each measure is compared year to year, and benchmarks are established to determine whether the school is improving, maintaining performance or declining. Details were provided about the items on the progress report.

One school applied for the APF for the coming school year and it was determined they meet the 75 percent student threshold, and their mission is specific to the APF. This is the first school from the Charter School Authority, and it will be a new district that will join the APF. There are currently 22 schools in the APF system, and Beacon Academy will be the 23rd school.

In response to questioning from member Ortiz, Deputy Barley stated that the APF was created in Nevada because there were some schools serving unique student populations, and there were so many students it made sense to create a separate framework to supplement the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) rating. Through discussions with the federal government in the writing of the ESSA plan, they will not approve any states plan that does not have a common rating system for all schools in the state. That is the NSPF. The reason there is just one application this year is because last year when the framework became available there was a rush of schools and districts that applied for the APF. There are 22 school in the APF now and they all came in the first year. Beacon Academy investigated the APF a year ago and found they did not meet the eligibility, but made some changes and came back this year.

Member Blakely moved to approve Beacon Academy, State Public Charter School Authority, to be rated using the Alternative Performance Framework for the 2018-19 school year on the basis that the school mission and student population meets the requirements set forth in NRS 385A.730 and NRX 385.740. Member Ortiz seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the report that identifies each elementary school for which districts are requesting approval from the State Board of Education, as well as the justification for any such variance for Q3 of FY18. Senate Bill 544, Section 11 (2017 Legislature), requires pupil-to-teacher ratios of 17:1 for grades 1 and 2 and 20:1 in grade 3 through the 2017-19 biennium. In accordance with NRS 388.700(4), the State Board of Education may grant a variance from the required pupil-to-teacher ratios to a school district for good cause, including the lack of available financial support specifically set aside for the reduction of pupil-to-teacher ratios

Megan Hanke, Management Analyst I, shared the standard quarterly reporting of FY18 Q3 CSR reports with the board.

Member Ortiz asked about the aggregate class size ratios and if the calculations are based on licensed teachers without regard to whether they are in a classroom or are itinerate teachers. Ms. Hanke responded these are the teachers that are reported based on teaching in the classroom and special education teachers that teach in self-contained classrooms. It does not include special ed teachers that are roving or who teach more than one subject.

Member Ortiz said there are significant upticks in the number of students in classrooms that are asking for variances. When reviewing the data, in the past, the recommendation should be 17-18 students per teacher, and they have variances around 21-23. A couple of schools noted in the report had variances of 39, 28 and in Nye county one class had 32 students. A couple of 3rd grade classes are in the 30's. She has concerns about approving these variance. She questioned whether a class could be split, and if not, is that a budget issue or a lack of teachers? The data does not give enough information to help make actionable decisions to make changes. She asked for better data that would explain why there is a variance request, is it not enough staff, lack of facilities, or funding issues so the problem can be pinned down. Nevada is allocating this money down to the districts, and they are allocating it to schools based on star-ratings. When the star-rating changes the school loses money and then the class sizes go back up. Something else needs to be done, rubber stamping this does not make a difference.

Member Jensen gave his perspective from a superintendents point of view. He said it is easy to sit on the State Board and look at districts and make statements that due diligence is not being followed or there are intentional efforts to increase class sizes to save money. Humboldt County School District has a lot of variances, last count was six. Under the previous kindergarten class size reduction it was authorized that school districts still have kindergarten at 21 up to 25. When kindergarten class size reduction was eliminated there was not an adjustment to the statute which shifted it back down to 16. Now all of the districts, including Humboldt, have to report if their kindergarten is higher than 16, and if it is then they are out of compliance. That is one issue. At Grass Valley Elementary School the first grade is 22.13 and the limit is 22. Coming in at 21.99 is compliant, but 22.13 is out of compliance. In that case in order to be compliant he would need to add one staff member to that first grade level and have class sizes sitting at 16 to 1. That is ideal but not fiscally responsible. From a school district perspective they are doing their best to be fiscally responsible but to add a staff member when less than one student off at one grade level is not fiscally responsible. Over time they have shifted from what used to be district averages, and now are reporting them again, but a variance request must be submitted on individual classrooms. That was part of the push back when school districts said you are playing games when you use a district average versus an individual classroom. There is a variety of perspectives and issues that need to be taken into consideration when the Board looks at this, and the challenges that are actually occurring in the field.

Member Ortiz thanked member Jensen for his information and feedback. She questioned whether they are approaching CSR wrong. She suggested a change is brought to the next legislative session so the Board no longer needs to approve CSR variances. She said it is a waste of their time if the data does not help them make better informed decisions and causes unintended consequences.

Member Newburn said there is value in watching this or there could easily be a case where the district decides to staff all their wealthiest schools at the correct level, then asks for variances for all the poorer schools. If not being watched, they could get away with it.

Member Blakely moved to approve the CSR variance request for Q3 of FY18. Member Carter seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Future Agenda Items

Member Carter said he received an email letter from Richard Stokes, Superintendent, Carson City School District with a concern about not receiving the grant for the Read by Three program. Superintendent Canavero responded he is aware of the communication and will consult with Deputy Attorney General Ott about bringing it to the Board as a discussion item.

Member Blakely inquired about future items he has requested in the past that have not come to a Board meeting. Superintendent Canavero responded he is aware of his requests and it is a matter of fitting them in on the agenda.

Member Holmes-Sutton asked about Item 12 and the schools that applied for the APF. She previously served on the committee concerning these schools performance frameworks and asked who those additional schools are and if those that have been brought up during the committee service are included on the list. In addition, once she goes back through some materials, she would like to know about the soft skill standards noted on the consent agenda earlier.

Member Ortiz requested a report about the progress with the S.B. 108 subcommittee regarding requested additions to the health standards for teaching about laws and crimes that can be committed against students. She would like to hear if there has been progress, and if there has been feedback from the Commission on Professional Standards or health standards team.

Public Comment #2

Angie Sullivan, teacher, CCSD noted that at school board meetings there are limited funds and money is taken from one area and moved it to another. Taking money from public schools to have alternative charter schools, one school has lower CSR until they achieve then the money is taken from them to help a

school over there. There are not enough funds to go around. A \$1.3 billion tax credit was given to TESLA and they in turn gave education \$1.5 million today. She said she assumes the schools in the TESLA area will get the funds and she is worried about southern Nevada. She noted the SOTs are important and need to be guarded.

Vicky Courtney, President, Clark County Education Association, represents 18,000 licensed professionals in Clark County. She expressed appreciation for superintendent Canavero's and superintendent Jara's work and recommendations regarding the equity of using average unit cost for budgeting at local school precincts in CCSD. It is a good opportunity to start fresh.

The meeting adjourned at 2:34 p.m.