

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SPECIAL MEETING
APRIL 29, 2024
2:30 PM**

Office	Address	City	Meeting
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo	Las Vegas	Room 114
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson	Board Room
Department of Education	Virtual/Livestream	Virtual	Virtual

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Dr. Katherine Dockweiler, Vice President
 Tamara Hudson, Board Clerk
 Tim Hughes
 Maggie Carlton
 Angela Orr

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT EXCUSED

Felicia Ortiz, President
 Joe Arrascada
 Rene Cantu
 Tate Else
 Michael Keyes
 Mike Walker

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction
 Ann Marie Dickson, Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement Division
 Lisa Ford, Chief Strategy Office
 Christy McGill, Deputy Superintendent for Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement
 Angie Castellanos, Administrative Assistant
 Cindi Chang, Education Programs Director
 Mandy Leytham, Education Programs Professional
 Mike Mosqueda, Education Programs Professional
 Tannaz Rezai, Education Programs Professional

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

None

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

Meeting called to order at 2:01 P.M. by President Felicia Ortiz. Quorum was established. President Ortiz led the Pledge of Allegiance and provided a land acknowledgement.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1 *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

- a. Melody Thompson provided public comment regarding agenda item 5.

3. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS *(Information and Discussion)*

Vice President Dockweiler outlined the purpose of today's meeting and inquired if any Board members had questions about the rationale behind today's special session.

4. DISCUSSION OF 2024 SPECIAL MEETING CALENDAR *(Information, Discussion, and Possible Action)*

Vice President Dockweiler indicated that the Board would determine the necessity of future special meetings following the June 12th meeting, if required.

No action was taken.

5. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION OF READ BY GRADE 3 TOPICS *(Information, Discussion, and Possible Action)*

Joan Jackson, Education Programs Professional, Dr. Kevin Laxalt, Education Programs Professional, and Mark Rincon, Education Programs Professional provided a review of the [PowerPoint presentation](#) that was presented to the Board on January 10th meeting.

The Board requested further exploration from the RBG3 team on the following, request number one, Research overview: Do other states use mandatory retention like our RBG3? If so, what percent of 3rd grade students in each state are identified for retention? What mechanism are they using for a cut-off/retention point? Of those identified for retention, what percent are retained? How were the rest promoted? Request number two: The retention component as outlined in AB400: What role/autonomy does the principal have? Can the district supersede the principal's determination or pass a district policy that weakens the principal's autonomy? Identify the uniform assessment and mandatory score a student must obtain to be promoted to 4th grade. What is the current designated cut score and assessment? What are some options for different cut scores? What are some options for different assessments (or a matrix?)? Request number three, Alternative and uniform assessments – it appears that it may be permissible for the State Board to pursue: Multiple measures for each the alternative and the uniform assessments. Measures in another language for students whose primary or dominant language is not English. Possibility of designating that the assessment be in matrix form. What parts of AB289 continue, what components are replaced? Deep dive on each of the good cause exemptions. Relative to the portfolio: What components might be included so that a uniform approach is undertaken statewide (apples to apples)? Relative to students who receive special education supports: To what extent does disability category matter, if at all? What is legally permissible? What happens when IEP teams are rejected when requesting the Nevada Alternative Assessment be used for a student? How are those students then considered? Relative to English language learners. No student with less than two years of exposure or instruction in English is expected to be fluent/literate. What flexibility does the Board have to expand the good cause exemption relative to multiple language learners? English language learners will be a major student group negatively impacted by this law in general. How can we ensure they are protected and given appropriate consideration independent from the consideration given to their monolingual peers? Request number six, Clarify what "directly" means for literacy specialists. Confirm that there are multiple titles/designations/professions who can provide these "direct" services. What does this look like on a campus and how does it impact the role of the literacy specialist? Request number seven, how can we consider the instruction and intervention components that a child may have (or may not have) experienced? Caution against penalizing a student with retention when they did not receive appropriate instruction or intervention prior to the retention (potentially for several years).

RBG3 Team will provide the Board with a follow-up presentation at the June 12th meeting.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

None

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:18 P.M.

APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS GIVEN DURING PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Melody Thompson, Nationally Certified School Psychologist provided written public comment regarding agenda item 5.

STATEMENTS GIVEN DURING PUBLIC COMMENT

APPENDIX A, ITEM 1: Melody Thompson

Good afternoon members of Nevada State Board of Education,

Thank you for conducting a special meeting to address Read by Grade Three requirements.

Also, thank you in advance for listening to the following three, research-based, key points to keep in mind:

#1 - Extensive research provides evidence that retention is correlated with multiple negative impacts on students:

- Academically, decreasing long-term performance and increasing high school dropout rates;
- Behaviorally, increasing sexual activity and violent behaviors in adolescents; and
- Emotionally, lowering self-esteem and increasing suicidal ideation.

#2 - Read by Grade Three's good cause exemptions are not adequate for addressing the disproportionality impacts of this bill. Students with IEPs, English language learning impacts, and lower SES status will be unfairly penalized.

#3 - As you consider AB400 requirements, using assessments in which we can compare our students to students across the Nation would ensure some level of accurate identification of students at-risk. Such assessments have national norms and yield average range scores between the 16th and 84th percentiles.

Please see [attached documents](#) for additional information and references.

Thank you for taking on the task of addressing the retention demands of the current Read by Grade 3 bill.