

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
NOVEMBER 14, 2019  
9:00 A.M.**

**Meeting Locations:**

<b>Office</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Meeting Room</b>
<b>Department of Education</b>	2080 E. Flamingo Rd.	Las Vegas	Room 114
<b>Department of Education</b>	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Board Room

**SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**

*(Video Conferenced and Livestreamed)*

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

**In Las Vegas**

Dawn Miller  
Felicia Ortiz  
Katherine Dockweiler  
Mark Newburn  
Robert Blakely  
Rui Ya Wang

**In Carson City**

Kevin Melcher  
Teri White

**In Elko**

Cathy McAdoo

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT**

Elaine Wynn, Excused  
Tamara Hudson, Absent

**DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT**

**In Las Vegas**

Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Felicia Gonzales, Deputy Superintendent of Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement  
Heidi Haartz, Deputy Superintendent of Business and Support Services  
Jessica Todtman, Chief Strategy Officer  
Patti Oya, Director of Early Learning and Development  
Dr. Stacey Joyner, Education Programs Supervisor  
Dr. Kristen Withey, Education Programs Professional  
Jeff Briske, Education Programs Professional  
Chris James, Education Programs Professional  
Melissa Scott, Education Programs Professional  
Kaitlin Lewallan, Education Programs Professional  
Matthew Hoffman, Education Programs Professional  
Mia Pace, Education Programs Professional

**In Carson City**

Dr. Jonathan Moore, Deputy Superintendent of Student Achievement  
Kristine Nelson, Director of Career Readiness, Adult Learning & Education Options

Dave Brancamp, Director of Standards and Instructional Support  
Nancy Olsen, Education Programs Professional  
Dr. Patrick Bell, Education Programs Professional

**LEGAL STAFF PRESENT**

David Gardner, Deputy Attorney General

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE**

**In Las Vegas**

Alexander Marks, Nevada State Education Association  
Anthony Nunez, Teachers and Leaders Council  
Bill Garis, Clark County Association of School Administrators  
Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association  
Dr. David Jensen, Humboldt County School District  
Ed Ronca, University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Ernie Rambo, Nevada National Board Professional Learning Institute  
Gail Hudson, Nevada National Board  
Guy Hobbs, Hobbs Ong & Associates  
Jenn Blackhurst, HOPE for Nevada  
Jim McIntosh, City of Henderson  
Kenneth Retzl, Guinn Center  
Kimm Rombardo, Northwest Evaluation Association  
Leonardo Benavides, Clark County School District  
Meredith Freeman, Nevada PTA/HOPE 4 Nevada  
Monte Bay, National University  
Patricia Haddad, Opportunity 180  
Robert Askey, Touro University Nevada  
Zane Gray, Sierra Nevada College

**In Carson City**

Anna Savala, Washoe County School District  
Charles Lednicky, Washoe County School District  
Jimmy Lau, Ferrari Public Affairs/Imagine  
Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District  
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents  
Nate MacKinnon, Nevada System of Higher Education  
Sara Cunningham, Nevada's Northwest Regional Professional Development Program

### **1: CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Meeting called to order at 9:00 AM. Quorum was established. Vice President Newburn led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **2: PUBLIC COMMENT #1**

Nate MacKinnon, the Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges from the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), spoke on behalf of NSHE to voice support for Agenda Item 9, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act (Perkins V) State Plan. Mr. MacKinnon thanked Director Nelson, from Career Readiness, Adult Learning & Educational Options for her partnership and work with stakeholders, as well as the partnership received from the Department of Education and Career and Technical Readiness Office. *(A complete copy of his statement is attached in Appendix A)*

[Public Comment read by Member Ortiz]

Jordana McCudden, Teaching Policy Fellow with Teach Plus Nevada and teacher from Clark County School District, had comment on Agenda Item 8, New, Transfer, and Current Teacher Incentives pursuant to Senate Bill 555 Section 30 and Assembly Bill 196, specifically Teacher Incentives in Title I schools. Ms. McCudden reflected that teaching at Title I schools is both rewarding and demanding, and that Teacher Incentives for teaching in Title I schools was a good program to help encourage qualified teachers to equip those schools. Ms. McCudden noted that it was demoralizing and appeared as though government did not care for student success when they fail to uphold the promises they made regarding distribution of monetary incentives. Ms. McCudden asked that the state value educators and not remove incentives while claiming that they care about educators. *(A complete copy of her statement is attached in Appendix A)*

### **3: APPROVAL OF FLEXIBLE AGENDA**

**Member Blakely moved to approve a flexible agenda. Member Dockweiler seconded. Motion carried.**

### **4: PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

[Vice President Newburn presented the President's Report]

In October, two Nevada teachers were honored with the Milken Educator Award, which selects top educators from around the country in the early to middle stages of their career in recognition of what they have done and will do in the future. Ben Nguyen, a STEM teacher at Sunrise Mountain High School, and Nicolas Jacques, a music teacher at Carson Middle School, were presented the award by Governor Sisolak, Superintendent Ebert, and Lowell Milken. The Board of Education will formally recognize these awardees in a board meeting next year.

### **5: SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT**

Superintendent Ebert acknowledged the efforts of Deputy Superintendent Felicia Gonzales, Kathleen Galland-Collins, and Dr. Kristin Withey; they recently visited Nye County School District to aid in implementation of the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF). The response from Nye County School District has been positive, citing greater focus, particularly around student goals.

The Superintendent stated for the record that the purpose of the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) is to serve, and that NDE will continue to do so.

The Statewide Listening Tour is progressing well, and over half the school districts have been visited. Superintendent Ebert is continually impressed with the classrooms she visits, as well as the Superintendents and administrators she meets. Maxwell Elementary School is notably integrating robotics and computer skills into first grade classes, building the capacity for children to develop the technologies

of the future. The Listening Tour serves to gather data on where we can improve as a state, and will drive the 2020 State Improvement Plan.

In October, the WestEd Conference was hosted in Las Vegas. Superintendent Ebert, Deputy Superintendent Moore, Member Ortiz, and several others attended. Nevada, California, Arizona, and Utah are represented by WestEd. Overall, it was a successful and productive conference.

National Board Certification is recognized within Nevada classrooms, as well as monetarily supported by the State Legislature. National Board Certification aligns with continuous improvement, and the National Board often leads the way in how we can innovate improvement.

[Presentation by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: Dr. Ernie Rambo and Gail Hudson]

The National Board seeks to maintain rigorous standards for what teachers should know and be able to do; these standards are national and were developed by teachers. Certification involves a test, as well as creating a portfolio which examines three aspects of teaching; certification is also voluntary.

The National Board is based on five core propositions: commitment to students and their learning; knowing the subjects they teach and how to teach them; managing and monitoring student learning; thinking systematically about their practice; and being a member of a learning community. These propositions are the foundation for the National Board body of knowledge, which include standards written for each certificate area, as well as the architecture of accomplished teaching.

Nationally, there are 122,000 teachers Board Certified, and approximately 20,000 pursuing certification. 81% of Americans believe that teachers should receive Board certification. Nevada has 906 National Board Certified Teachers, with 1652 pursuing certification; overall, this impacts over 125,000 students.

The National Board works with teachers across the continuum of their career. Board certification facilitates teachers to look at the students they serve, and in their own practice, look at what they can do to meet those student's needs. Board certified teachers are more likely to remain within the field of teaching, and create positive climates where they teach.

Schools can utilize their professional learning funds, including Title I and Title II funding to support Board Certification costs.

The National Board is also working to launch their Teachers 2020 Campaign, for which a petition is forthcoming.

[Discussion]

November 16<sup>th</sup> was previously the date for Nevada recognition of Board Certified teachers. However, that date requires petition each year, and the National Board was unable to petition this year; at this time, there is no officially scheduled date for 2019 recognition of Board Certified teachers in Nevada. Member Ortiz acknowledged the achievement of Board Certified teachers, and the National Board expressed interest in assuring a 2020 date for recognition.

Vice President Newburn asked how the State Board could best support the National Board; Dr. Rambo highlighted that many schools do not have a deep understanding of the National Board Certification, and are unsure how to prepare for it, or how to support or utilize teachers who are certified or seeking certification. It takes between one and five years to receive certification, but teachers get a 5% salary increase; if more teachers knew about this, they may be more likely to do so, especially if schools know how to utilize their funding to alleviate the cost of certification.

## **6: APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA**

- a. Dual Credit Request from Leadership Academy of Nevada for courses at the College of Southern Nevada
- b. Instructional Materials from Carson City School District
  - i. Middle School Math
- c. Fourth quarter class-size reduction report with the average daily enrollment and ratio of pupils per licensed teacher for the associated grades
- d. Board Minutes: August 29, 2019 & October 10, 2019

**Member Blakely moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Member Ortiz seconded. Motion Carried.**

## **7: INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL**

Anthony Nunez, Vice Chair of the Teachers and Leaders Council, and Dr. Kristin Whitey, Education Programs Professional in the Office of Educator Development and Support, Nevada Department of Education, conducted a PowerPoint presentation on the [Nevada Educator Performance Framework](#) results for the 2018-2019 school year, as well as recommendations from the Teachers and Leaders Council regarding score ranges to determine final summative evaluation ratings of educators for the 2019-2020 school year.

The following groups are reviewed: school administrators; school counselors; school nurses; school psychologists; school social workers; speech-language pathologists; teachers; and teacher-librarians. Educational audiologists will also be evaluated, but they were in their pilot year, so they do not have ineffective, developing, effective, or highly effective ratings, as a score range has not yet been determined for them.

When observing the number of social workers in Clark County School District, it was noted that many of those employed are contracted, and those contracted are not required to use the Performance Framework, and this trend extends to many of the categories with low numbers.

[Discussion]

Vice President Newburn noted that these presentations began in 2011, and in 2018, the State Board requested that the Teachers and Leaders Council rethink their approach to the data, as it seemed that the distribution shifts to the right, with very few rated as ineffective and developing. The State Board had a distinct concern with the developing category, as new teachers are developing by definition. It is a disadvantage to have them in the effective category, because the evolution from developing to effective cannot be tracked. It was found that the developing category could begin the process of termination, and the Board received testimony that principals could not put teachers into the developing category. The Board requested that this be changed, so that teachers could be placed into the developing category without consequence. Ideally, reporting should present a bell curve. The Board's primary complaint has been that the distribution does not reflect a plausible distribution, and in turn, the Board must express their disbelief each year.

Member Blakely extended further concern, and questioned whether the current system of rating is accomplishing the intended goal, as those rated developing are dismissed and those rated effective are considered to be at the bottom of the evaluation, making them question their long-term future. Vice President Newburn added that it was a fire/don't fire distribution when the bill was developed and changes need to be made in order for it to be a credible distribution in the future. Member Ortiz noted that SB 475 is permitting the transition from punitive ratings to ratings in line with educational development.

Member Melcher highlighted that there may be difficulty with the terminology being used, particularly with the term “developing”.

Mr. Nunez, responding to an inquiry from Member Ortiz, mentioned that there is a Guidance Memo providing the districts information for implementation, as well as resources and supports, including specific cycles for those in the “developing” category.

Vice President Newburn expressed concerns, after reviewing that all administrators in Clark County were rated effective or highly effective, that administrators evaluate administrators, and that this may not be a neutral practice. Member Dockweiler inquired if feedback was considered as a variable for administrator ratings. In 2014-2015 the Teachers and Leaders Council did utilize feedback as a component, but at that time, decided not to keep that element as part of the scoring for administrators. Member Ortiz noted that Clark County got rid of 3 principles for subpar performance, yet their scores reflect only effective and above. Member Ortiz supported Member Dockweiler’s suggestion that feedback be considered as a component of administrator evaluation, or suggested the addition of 360 degree reviews.

Member Dockweiler expressed concern that the presentation does not include or rate those who are exempt. Teachers and administrators who receive two years of highly effective rating do not require evaluation the following year. Member Blakely also noted that if you calculate the exempt teachers and administrators into the distribution, the trend of those rated effective and above is much higher.

Member Melcher questioned if there were reports for how each district was processing the evaluations. Deputy Superintendent Gonzales remarked that school districts are required to report to School Board Trustees on the Performance Framework, and the Nevada Department of Education collects that information. The Department also conducts surveys on Framework implementation, as well as face-to-face interviews. She further noted that the weights system for the Framework has changed from year to year, and that this would be the seventh year the Department would be starting with new percentages and a new baseline.

Vice President Newburn emphasized that the State Board’s focus is accountability and transparency, and they were interested in seeing further work on the Nevada Educator Performance Framework metrics.

[Recommendation]

The Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) met on October 30, 2019 and reviewed the Nevada Educator Performance Framework data. Mr. Nunez noted that recommendations were based on how the Framework would be implemented in 2019-2020 based upon the 2019 Legislative Session. The Student Learning Goal (SLG) weight was changed in 2019, and the “developing” rating is being shifted. Notably, the weights have also changed every year for 7 years. The Framework has always been developed as a growth document by the TLC to support teachers and administrators to become master practitioners. There is a great deal of context for what doing right by our student means, and what it means to be a good administrator.

The current recommendation by the TLC is to maintain stability in the ranges for the period of time, until we can get stability in the weights for each area and range. Several other licensed educational personnel (OLEP) work groups are reconvening to determine what a 4.0 rating should be, and updating their standards and indicators to align with the specificity in which they operate to improve the Framework. There are several changes going on, so we would like to maintain stability in these ranges for our educators at this time. The TLC is requesting that the State Board also pass a motion to establish score ranges for educational audiologists; all other groups have had score ranges previously.

**The State Board of Education approves the recommendation by the Teachers and Leaders Council for 2019-2020 Nevada Educator Performance Framework score ranges to remain the same as in previous years to allow for comparability across multiple years, and to use the extant score ranges for the Educational Audiologists during the 2019-2020 school year.**

**Member Ortiz moved to approve the recommendations of the Teachers and Leaders Council. Member Dockweiler seconded. Motion carried.**

*Convenience Break*

**8: INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING NEW, TRANSFER, AND CURRENT TEACHER INCENTIVES PURSUANT TO SENATE BILL 555 SECTION 30 AND ASSEMBLY BILL 196**

Jeff Briske, Education Programs Professional in the Office of Educator Licensure, Nevada Department of Education, conducted a PowerPoint presentation on the current available funds and requests for funds from districts and SPCSA schools regarding [Teacher Incentives](#), with recommendations for Teacher Incentives Awards to districts and SPCSA schools per the State Board's request at the October 10, 2019 meeting. The Department of Education distributed surveys across the districts to gather this information, and recommends that the Board make separate motions on each Teacher Incentive category.

[Discussion]

Member Ortiz asked for clarification regarding whether the School Districts had made any promises regarding distributions. Mr. Briske noted that Churchill, Clark, Washoe, and White Pine had not made promises; Humboldt, Lander, and Lyon had made promises to teachers but would either be able to make up for disparities with other funding resources or understood that they could not be guaranteed those funds.

Member Ortiz also asked for clarification around distribution, and assuring that the full dollar amounts get distributed to teachers in Title I schools. Mr. Briske noted that distribution is handled by the local School District.

Mr. Briske clarified that the Legislature decided to take a portion of the incentive dollars and put them into AB 309, which is a block grant. If districts need to utilize other funding sources for incentive dollars, AB 309 may be one of the funding sources they could select.

Member Dockweiler noted that a new hire in the 2019-2020 school year could become a current hire in the 2020-2021 school year; Member Ortiz elaborated on hiring schedules and how that may affect incentive distributions.

*Member Blakely made a motion to approve spending half of the biennium funding in FY20, reserving half for FY21 for New Hires; Vice President Newburn asked that Member Blakely hold his motion so that the Board could vote on all motions at the same time.*

Member Ortiz expressed concern with the teacher incentives provided for current teachers; she noted that while Nevada is in a dire situation to find teachers, there is also a need to keep the ones we have, and \$661 does not seem like an incentive to keep someone. Mr. Briske remarked that current discussion with districts is primarily around attracting new teachers. Member Ortiz welcomed public comment from Human Resources professionals in the audience.

Ms. Anna Savala, Human Resources Manager at Washoe County School District, commented that there had been a morale issue at their schools, as teachers who had been at Title I schools their entire career did

not receive incentives, while transfers received \$5000. At the same time, only half of those transfers remained at the school they had received that incentive for. *(A complete copy of her statement is attached in Appendix A)*

Mr. Benavides, Clark County School District, commented that there was a need for consistency between categories moving forward, and that Clark County had been suffering from recruitment issues. *(A complete copy of his statement is attached in Appendix A)*

Member Ortiz remarked that she had concerns over the large transfer incentive, and the \$300 incentive for current teachers did not seem a viable option, as it was not enough to keep a teacher. She inquired if it was possible to grant the full incentive for new teachers to rural districts, and divide the balance in urban districts, with urban districts then supplementing that amount with other funds.

Mr. Briske noted that the Board could create their own motion.

There was surplus this year and last year within the transfer category, and a work group was done to move portions of this fund to another allowable use category. School districts do not have high demand for transfer to eligible schools. Movement of funds from the transfer category to another category, such as current, would require a proposal being sent and approved by the Interim Finance Committee. If transfer incentives were awarded for FY20, that would leave only the surplus amount for FY21.

Member Melcher discussed distributing funds differently between rural and urban districts, stating that if it had been the legislative intent, they would have done so. He had concerns about keeping things equitable, and the slippery slope of the Board designating different districts different amounts.

**The State Board of Education approves spending half of the biennium funding in FY20, reserving half for FY21 across all three categories—new, transfer, and current—with anticipation that the IFC would allow the Board to move funds from the transfer category to the current category, adding an additional \$52 per teacher.**

**Member Blakely moved to approve the Board’s decision on Teacher Incentives. Member Melcher seconded. Member Ortiz dissents. Motion carried.**

## **9: INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE STRENGTHENING CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION FOR THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY ACT (PERKINS V) STATE PLAN**

Kris Nelson, Director of Career Readiness, Adult Learning & Education Options, Nevada Department of Education and Mark Newburn, Vice President, Nevada State Board of Education, conducted a PowerPoint presentation on the draft [Perkins V State Plan](#), which will be presented to the Board in December for approval before it is submitted to the U.S. Department of Education.

[Discussion]

Member Ortiz requested clarification on how career clusters are determined, if there are roadmaps available to chart career preparation, and what data drives the programming.

Director Nelson noted that Nevada has six of the nationally-defined career clusters, and out of those there are 76 programs of study. Education is one of the four priority programs identified by the Governor as high wage, in demand programs, and receives priority status in the grant making process. Curriculum frameworks and roadmaps are available for each program of study, which are part of the LifeWorks program campaign. The data which drives the programs include comprehensive needs assessments at the local level, allowing the local education agency to conduct an analysis of the workforce and economic needs in their local areas which will then determine whether or not they have the current technical



education offerings that correlate with those needs. Another assessment is the Nevada Education to Employment Initiative which is in collaboration between the Department and WestEd. As a whole, Perkins V seeks to identify gaps and opportunities.

*Vice President Newburn elected to take the next agenda item out of order, moving to Agenda Item 11, Information and Discussion regarding the Commission on School Funding*

## **11: INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FUNDING**

Heidi Haartz, Deputy Superintendent of Business and Support Services, Nevada Department of Education; Guy Hobbs, Vice Chair of the Commission on School Funding; Dr. David Jensen, Lead of the Commission's Formula and Distribution Work Group; and Jim McIntosh, Lead of the Commission's Reporting and Monitoring Work Group, presented an Update on the work of the Commission on School Funding to implement the requirements of [Senate Bill 543](#).

Future collaboration between the State Board and the Commission on School Funding will include the establishment of regulations, relating to the methodology for setting the weights and cost adjustment factors, as well as the administrative caps for school districts.

[Discussion]

Vice President Newburn emphasized that the failure of the last funding formula was transparency; for the new funding formula, the State Board is looking for transparency so they can engage with accountability and equity.

Member Ortiz asked that the Commission also focus on addressing adequacy. Adequacy should not be the goal; and that we should be funding what we need. She remarked on the importance that money from the state is getting all the way to the school, and when there are transfers, that money follows them, and that the focus is not just on the formula, but that there is enough money in the first place.

Members Blakely and Melcher echoed their support and gratitude for Commissions commitment to their work and the work they are doing.

*Convenience Break*

## **10: INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE OUTCOMES OF THE PRESCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT, THE CURRENT STATUS OF THE NEVADA READY! PRE-K PROGRAM, AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF SENATE BILL 84, WHICH ESTABLISHES A PROGRAM TO AWARD GRANTS TO SUPPORT PRE-K PROGRAMS**

Patti Oya, Director of Early Learning and Development, Nevada Department of Education, and Dr. Stacey Joyner, Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Early Learning and Development, Nevada Department of Education, conducted a PowerPoint presentation on various [Early Learning](#) initiatives, including the Preschool Development Grant, the Nevada Ready! Pre-K Program, and SB 84.

The Department's long-term goal is universal Pre-K, but the State currently serves approximately 11-15% of 4-year-olds at 200% under the poverty level. The majority of programs are within school districts, in elementary schools, but some are in childcare centers. The Quality Rating and Improvement System ratings are not aligned with the comprehensive campus scores, as they use different measures. At this time, these ratings do not affect the Nevada School Performance Framework ratings, as not every district or school has funding to provide Pre-K. The Preschool Development Grant is unable to continue due to lack of funding.

Member Dockweiler and Member Ortiz expressed their appreciation for the work being done to support Pre-K programs.

**12: FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Member Ortiz has been asked to Chair the Education Subcommittee for the Census Complete Count Committee, and would like to report on the first meeting of the Subcommittee at the December 2019 Board Meeting.

**13: PUBLIC COMMENT #2**

No public comment.

**14: ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 12:56 PM.

*Appendix A: Statements Given During Public Comment*

1. Nate MacKinnon, Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges, spoke on Agenda Item 9, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act (Perkins V) State Plan.
2. Jordana McCudden, Title I Learning Strategist at Keller Middle School and Teacher Plus Senior Policy Fellow, spoke on Agenda Item 8, New, Transfer, and Current Teacher Incentives pursuant to Senate Bill 555 Section 30 and Assembly Bill 196, specifically Teacher Incentives in Title I schools.
3. Anna Savala, Human Resources Manager at Washoe County School District, Agenda Item 8, New, Transfer, and Current Teacher Incentives pursuant to Senate Bill 555 Section 30 and Assembly Bill 196, specifically Teacher Incentives in Title I schools.
4. Leonardo Benavides, Clark County School District, Agenda Item 8, New, Transfer, and Current Teacher Incentives pursuant to Senate Bill 555 Section 30 and Assembly Bill 196, specifically Teacher Incentives in Title I schools.

**Item A1, Nate MacKinnon**

Good morning. For the record, my name is Nate MacKinnon. I'm the Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges at the Nevada System of Higher Education. It's a pleasure to be here with you, Mr. Vice President, Superintendent Ebert, and through you to the members. I'm here today on behalf of the Nevada System of Higher Education to voice support for Item Number 9, the Perkins V Plan discussion. I know that today you're not voting on approving it, but looking at doing that next month, and happy to be back here with you at that point to reiterate our support from the Nevada System of Higher Education. I want to thank Director Kris Nelson for her partnership in working on this with all stakeholders, ourselves included from the Nevada System of Higher Education and the Community Colleges, it's always been a terrific partnership with NDE and the CTE office here with our community colleges, and we were very pleased to be a part of this. Most notably, I think as you'll hear later today, the opportunities for CTE dual enrollment in particular, as we look to create and enhance our CTE pathways across the entire state for all students to ensure that students have an opportunity to get both college credits, as well as earn their high school credentials in their CTE area of expertise. On behalf of the community colleges, I wanted to come here today to voice our support for the proposal that's written, and we're very excited for what lays ahead under Perkins V. Thank you very much.

## **Item A2, Jordana McCudden**

For the record, my name is Jordana McCudden. I am a Teaching Policy Fellow with Teach Plus Nevada and have been an educator in the Clark County School District for 20 years. I have worked in both elementary and middle schools, one star and five star schools, in affluent and low-income areas.

I am an educator through and through. I cannot imagine working in any other field. Teaching is the most demanding yet rewarding job on the planet. Working at a Title 1 school is even more rewarding, but absolutely more demanding than working in wealthier areas. Students at these schools walk into the classroom a year or more deficient in any number of academic areas. Teachers must work to teach them at grade level while simultaneously catch them up. And class sizes at these schools are just as outrageously large as other schools - 35 to 40 per class in secondary schools.

The Nevada Legislature knew what they were doing when they allocated monetary incentives for teachers working in Title 1 schools. They understood that these are the schools most needing qualified teachers that stay year after year to develop a strong culture at their building, in which students have high expectations put upon them and are given the support to reach these goals. The Nevada Legislature knew that too often teachers at Title 1 schools are brand new to the profession, meaning they are ill-equipped to help students catch up and keep up with their more affluent peers. They recognized the need to entice highly effective teachers to Title 1 schools who can mentor and guide these new teachers as they work to improve their practice. The legislature understood that we cannot reach our state's goal of becoming the fastest improving state in the nation without doing something drastic to improve Title 1 schools. That is why they intended to give incentives to get teachers to move to and stay at Title 1 schools.

You must decide to distribute all monetary incentives to teachers this year. When money is dangled in front of teachers as a reward and then pulled away, it is demoralizing. It deflates our self-worth. It appears as if you do not value the hard work being done to help our students reach their potential. This is especially true in CCSD where teachers just fought tooth and nail to have our contract honored. Should we have to beg for this promise to be kept, too?

Year after year we ponder how we can retain teachers in Nevada. Let us stick with the basics: value educators. You cannot take away financial incentives and claim to value the work teachers do. This is a no-brainer. You will save money in trying to recruit teachers if you actively work to retain us.

Thank you.

### **Item A3, Anna Savala**

Good morning, this is Anna Savala with Washoe County School District up here in Carson. So I wanted to provide feedback as far as the dollar amounts. So, if we took option number two, splitting the funding between two years, that would give our current teachers about \$330. One of the issues we had last year was that we offered teachers who transferred into a Title I schools the \$5000, and it was a big morale issue for teachers who were at Title I schools their entire career and didn't get any incentive. So, with option 2, we're saying we'll give you \$330, but our new teachers, our teachers who are transferring into Title I schools, still get \$1500. That's going with option number 2. So we haven't talked about what the proper incentive amount would be. \$5000 was a lot last year to transfer into the schools. We had 28-29 people who were eligible for that incentive, and based off of that, only 50% of those teachers actually stayed at the school that they received the incentive for. So again, as far as correct dollar amount, we haven't looked into that, but I think we're still going to have issues with our current teachers only getting the \$300, and those that transfer in will still get a bigger incentive.

Anna Savala with Washoe County School District—so the surplus amount would only be, and Jeff, correct me if I'm wrong, would only be if we awarded that full 2.1 million for this one year. So that \$400,000 would be surplus for FY21, correct? I can't speak for how the other districts submitted their application, but based off of how other incentives have been awarded, that amount had always been split in half. So our application, our request is for the FY20 school year. So it wasn't to take, whatever, the 800 people we had over two years, it was for what our need would be for FY20.

**Item A4, Leonardo Benavides**

Good Morning State Board Members. My name is Leonardo Benavides from our Clark County School district. We will have our HR director get back to you, but in regards to your question, we do have to have some consistency going forward, especially between our different categories. So we also have some of the same recruitment issues as other districts, especially with our large amount of vacancies in some of these schools, so that's just something we wanted to bring to your attention today.