

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
AUGUST 29, 2019  
9:00 A.M.**

**Meeting Locations:**

<b>Office</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Meeting Room</b>
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Rd.	Las, Vegas	Room 114
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**

Elaine Wynn  
Mark Newburn  
Robert Blakely  
Felicia Ortiz  
Katherine Dockweiler  
Cathy McAdoo

**In Carson City**

Dawn Miller  
Teri White

**DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:**

**In Carson City**

Jonathan Moore, Deputy Superintendent, Student Achievement  
Heidi Haartz, Deputy Superintendent, Business and Support Services  
Sarah Nick, Management Analyst  
Mary Holsclaw, Education Programs Professional  
Andre DeLeon, Education Programs Professional  
Kevin Laxalt, Education Programs Professional  
Blakely Hume, Education Programs Professional  
Megan Peterson, Management Analyst

**In Las Vegas**

Felicia Gonzales, Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement  
Jessica Todtman, Chief Strategy Officer  
Greg Bortolin, Public Information Officer  
Karl Wilson, Education Programs Supervisor  
Kim Bennett, Administrative Assistant  
Diana Hollander, Education Programs Professional  
Mia Pace, Education Programs Professional  
Kaitlin Lewallen, Education Programs Professional  
Melissa Scott, Education Programs Professional  
Tina Winqvist, Education Programs Professional

**LEGAL STAFF PRESENT**

**In Las Vegas**

David Gardner, Deputy Attorney General

**In Carson City**

Greg Ott

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:**

**In Carson City**

Nancy Richards, Public  
Sara Cummings, NWRPRP  
Jimmy Lau, Ferrari Public Affairs  
Janeen Kelly, Washoe County School District  
Bryn Lapenta, Washoe County School District  
Susan Keema, Nevada Association of School Superintendents  
Jordan Hosmer, Governor's Office  
Kate Schumm, Washoe County School District  
Kimm Rombardo, NWEA  
Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District  
Nikki Bailey Lundahl, Crowley & Ferrato

**In Las Vegas**

Tracy Spies, UNLV  
Shirin Adibifar, UNLV  
Zane Grey, Sierra Nevada College  
Monte Bay, National University  
Kim Metcalf, UNLV  
Alexander Marks, NSEA  
Sharilyn Durudole, English Mastery Council  
Kelisha Everage, Public  
Dana Everage, Public  
Cheryl Everage, Public  
Chris Day, NSEA  
Bill Garis, CCASAPE  
Leonardo Benarites, CCSD  
Patricia Huddal  
Meredith Smith, Nevada Succeeds  
Dale Norton, Nye County School District  
Rebecca Feiden, State Public Charter School Authority

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m..

**Public Comment**

Cheryl Everage, parent, commented on the character of her daughter, Kelisha Everage. Mrs. Everage stated her daughter attended UNLV in Las Vegas. She is an excellent person, daughter and speaks the truth. When she is given the opportunity to share her character she will also be able to tell you what a great individual she is.

Dana Everage, parent, said his daughter is an awesome young lady. She has been teaching in CCSD and has always wanted to be a teacher. He and his wife are taking time off from their state jobs to support their daughter. He values the importance of family and a sound education, and believes his daughter is highly qualified to teach and received her bachelor's and master's degree from UNLV. He asked the Board to take this into consideration when the item to suspend her license is heard.

Kelisha Everage stated that she began teaching in 2012 after she graduated from UNLV. She has taught at mostly Title I schools for the past six years where there are high social and emotional needs. She takes pride in being accountable and doing what is best for her students. If she were not a teacher, she does not know what she would do. Character is important to her and she works with students to develop their own understanding of what is right and wrong.

Chris Day, Nevada State Education Association, referred to the Class Size Reduction (CSR) item stating there has been a lot of focus on public education in Clark County School District (CCSD) over the last few weeks. Unfortunately, none of that attention focused on the issue of overcrowded classrooms. Large class size is one of the most frustrating issues for Nevada educators, students, parents and school communities. For the second year in a row Nevada ranks last with the largest student/teacher ratio in the country. While rapid growth may have fueled the problem in previous decades, the lack of political will and sufficient funding is the main reason Nevada has not done better recently

Research confirms that the number of students in a class makes a difference with students and teachers alike. For students, smaller class size can help close the racial achievement gap, lead to early identification of learning disabilities, improve high school graduation rates, improve student behavior and allow for more engagement in lessons. For educators smaller class size improves educator morale, and individualized instruction. He noted the Board has little choice today other than to accept the report and approve the variance. However, he suggested raising this issue at every turn to generate the political will to do what needs to be done to raise revenue so every Nevada student has access to a high quality public education.

### **Approval of Flexible Agenda**

**Member Blakely moved to approve a flexible agenda. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

### **President's Report**

President Wynn recognized Mrs. Gail Hudson of Hummel Elementary School in CCSD as the Nevada 2020 Teacher of the Year. Mrs. Hudson is a fifth grade teacher who serves as Hummel Elementary's Equity and Diversity Site Liaison and Title I Coordinator. Mrs. Hudson will represent Nevada in the National Teacher of the Year competition.

President Wynn recognized NDE staff member Diana Hollander. She leads the Department's Pupil Transportation and Emergency Management work and received the Peter J. Grandolfo Memorial Award of Excellence at the School Transportation News Expo earlier this month. The award was a fitting tribute to Diana's lifetime of service and contributions to the NDE over the past 23 years.

### **Superintendent's Report**

Superintendent Ebert announced that beginning next month she will visit all of the 17 school districts and the charter school authority as part of a Statewide Listening Tour. She is looking forward to hearing directly from constituents about how the NDE can help them reach their goals for the future.

An update on AB 309 was provided. The bill appropriated approximately \$19 million for block grants to districts and the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) and identifies seven allowable expenditure categories. Each district and the SPCSA were asked to provide the NDE with their anticipated allocation across these seven areas.

Superintendent Ebert shared an update related to the organization of the NDE. The Office of Inclusive Education was created under director Will Jensen and deputy Jonathan Moore. It is an expansion of the Office of Special Education to include Indian Education and Gifted and Talented Education.

An update was provided on SB 543 regarding the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. Governor Sisolak has formally announced the members of the Commission on School Funding. The first meeting will take place in late September.

### **Approval of consent Agenda**

- a. Possible Approval of the five private school license renewals for a term of two years each:
  - 9<sup>th</sup> Bridge School, Clark County School District
  - Candil Hall, Clark County School District
  - Sunset Montessori Community, Clark County School District
  - Spring Valley Montessori Community, Clark County School District

- West Charleston Enrichment Academy, Clark County School District
- Possible Approval for three private school license renewals for a term of four years each:
- Cornerstone Christian Academy, Clark County School District
  - Foothills Montessori, Clark County School District
  - Kids Campus – MLK, Clark County School District
- b. Possible Approval of 40 Annual Agenda Permits for non-exempt private schools for a term of one year beginning July 1, 2019 – July 31, 2020 per NRS 394.261
- c. Possible Approval of Petition for Revocation of the Nevada Educators License for Ryan M. Davis
- d. Possible Approval of Petition for 60-day suspension of the Nevada Educators License for Kelisha Everage
- e. Possible Approval of Instructional Materials from Carson City School District:
- Social Studies – America Through the Lens: U.S. History 1877 to the present – Grade 11
  - Social Studies – Myer’s Psychology for the AP course (third edition) – Grades 11-12
  - Social Studies – World History and Geography: Modern Times – Grade 10
  - Social Studies – World History Great Civilizations: Ancient Through Early Modern Times – Grade 6
- f. Possible Approval of Dual Credits for:
- White Pine School District request dual-credit courses offered by Great Basin College
  - Carson City School District request dual-credit courses at any local college campuses; Western Nevada College, University of Nevada, Reno, Truckee Meadows Community College and Sierra Nevada College
  - Leadership Academy of Nevada request dual-credit courses offered at College of Southern Nevada
  - Washoe County School District requests dual-credit courses offered by Truckee meadows Community College, Sierra Nevada College, Western Nevada College Great Basin college and the University of Reno
- g. Possible Approval of Nevada Academic Content Standards for Computer Science and Integrated Technology
- h. Possible Approval of appointment to the WestEd Board of Directors:  
Dale Norton – Term Expiration 5/31/2022 – SWRL Director representing the County School Districts of Nevada
- i. Possible Approval of the Nevada Minimum School Bus Specifications and Procedures
- j. Possible Approval of the Nevada Out of Service Criteria
- k. Possible Approval of July 17, 2019 Board minutes
- l. Possible Approval of Beacon Academy’s Work-Based Learning Application
- m. Possible Approval of the new Career and Technical Education Business Fundamentals Standards

Member Blakely requested that Consent Agenda items 6c and 6d are pulled for further discussion and consideration. President Wynn suggested the Board approve the consent agenda with the exception of items 6c and 6d and hold those items for discussion at the end of the regular business of the meeting.

**Member Newburn moved to approve the Consent Agenda minus items 6c and 6d. Member Blakely seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Information and Discussion regarding the progress of the English Mastery Council (EMC).** The passage of AB 92 granted a three year extension of the EMC along with an increased fiscal support. This brief informational presentation will provide updates regarding the council’s work and legislative mandates.

Superintendent Ebert noted that in 2013 the Legislature established the English Mastery Council (EMC). They are charged with making recommendations to the Superintendent, the Board and the Commission on

Professional Standards as well as the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) Board of Regents, and school districts to ensure that English learners have access to quality educational opportunities. The EMC provides recommendations that are related to district policies for serving English learners, educator preparation, English language development and curriculum standards. The EMC has been extended until June 2022 by AB 92 from the 2019 Legislative Session.

Dr. Sharolyn Durodola, Chair, EMC conducted a [PowerPoint presentation](#) and provided updates on the EMC from 2014-2019. There are three sub-committees within the EMC:

- District Policy and Criteria Planning
- Teaching English as a Second Language
- Standards and Curriculum

Dr. Durodola detailed information about the three subcommittees. The EMC has worked tirelessly to raise awareness about misconceptions of children from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, and to build capacity within the state to focus on teacher educators and school administrators. They have also looked at assessment practices within Nevada. The EMC has addressed and identified practices that do not work, such as over identification of ELs in special education settings. They hope the Board is open to receiving an annual presentation from the EMC to keep up with their progress.

President Wynn recognized the importance of the EMC and thanked Dr. Durodola for the presentation. The Board is focused and supportive of their work and she inquired about how the implementation is going. Dr. Durodola said they are looking at how to evaluate the effectiveness of the recommendations and policies and to measure their impact. President Wynn said the Board has complete support going forward with the work of the EMC.

Member Ortiz commended Dr. Durodola and the EMC for all the hard work they have done. It has given her hope and she appreciates the focus put on the children, especially those who are multi-lingual.

Member Dockweiler applauded the work and inclusion of students who are not EL, but who are language deprived and may be scoring below a certain cut off level on assessments. Without language models they will not develop the skills needed to become proficient in those areas.

**Information, Discussion and Possible Action to appoint individuals interested to the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) board members.** The Board is required to appoint two members to the SPCSA by October 2019, per AB 78 from the 2019 Legislative Session. The Department received applications from its website and is recommending candidates for appointment.

President Wynn recalled that the Board approved the SPCSA application at its July meeting and it was posted on the NDE website. Today there is a slate of candidates to discuss.

Superintendent Ebert explained that per the Board's request, the NDE screened applications for the SPCSA board for their consideration. Specific criteria was considered such as whether the candidate had local charter school board experience, if they have national charter board experience, and instructional or administrative experience. The candidates ranged from having no experience in some areas to having lead an organization or were recognized by colleagues as experts in this area. Six candidate applications are listed for consideration today:

- Don Soifer
- Doris Guvar
- Jeffrey Geihs
- Steve Canavero
- Michael Robison
- Tonia Holmes-Sutton

Member Ortiz said this was the first time she has seen the application document, has not had time to review the material and is not comfortable with this item until she has had time to review the applicants. Member Blakely said at the previous meeting the Board decided there would be six applicants brought forward for consideration. He agreed there has not been time to review the applicants but suggested moving forward with the presentation of the applicants rather than postponing the item.

President Wynn agreed it is a quick amount of time to digest the material. She suggested taking this item out of order and if the meeting goes into the lunch hour, then there would be an opportunity to review the candidates at lunch, or take a 10 minute break to review the materials. She moved the agenda item to the end of the meeting.

**Information and Discussion regarding the newly revised Read by Grade 3 (RBG3) Act (AB 289).** The Board will receive a review of the program and an update on the changes that will be implemented during the 2019-2021biennium under the newly revised statute from the 2019 Legislative Session.

Dave Brancamp, Director, Standards and Instructional Support, conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation and informed the Board that it is important to remember that the children are the first priority with the RBG3 program initiated in 2015. The program recently transitioned from the NDE Office of Student and School Supports to the NDE Office of Standards and Instructional Support. Now there is a strong emphasis on instruction and the support offered to schools, students, and teachers. The emphasis is still on students being able to read proficiently by the end of third grade.

Dr. Kevin Laxalt, Education Programs Professional, provided a brief history over the past four years of the RBG3 act. The primary intent of this law was to dramatically improve student achievement by ensuring all Nevada students are able to read proficiently by the end of third grade. Another intent was to improve K-3 literacy instruction and to establish an early reading assessment framework. Currently there is a statewide consistent interim assessment that has been used for the past two years. Another intent was to establish a comprehensive statewide system of reading instruction, intervention and to implement a promotion retention decision making process. This last intent was replaced during the 2019 Legislative Session to provide intensive instruction and intervention services beyond third grade into fourth and fifth grade.

Key changes to RBG3 from AB 289 from the 2019 Legislative Session:

- Removes the grade 3 retention requirement and replaces it with mandatory intervention and intensive instruction for grades 4 and 5
- Clarifies that a student's reading plan will regularly assess reading growth to ensure that programs and services are effective.
- Extends reading intervention services and intensive instruction to include all grades in an elementary school.

Dr. Laxalt discussed the levels of implementation. These include local literacy plans, a Literacy Specialist expert in the building who provides training, coaching, and modeling for educators and a parent notification process. Parents will receive a notification when students are identified as struggling in reading. After students are identified as struggling they are put on a progress monitoring plan with specific interventions and will be monitored for growth.

President Wynn inquired whether the Literacy Specialist is mandated for each school or is it an option to be selected. Dr. Laxalt responded that per law it is not required however it is the recommendation and it is implied. President Wynn inquired whether there has been a correlation made between schools that have a Literacy Specialist as opposed to those that do not. Dr. Laxalt noted some programs with Literacy Specialists that were awarded funds have been compared with programs that were not. Performance was compared and schools with RBG3 performed at a higher level. President Wynn questioned that when a specific strategy that has results has been identified, why would that not be focused on going forward as a strong recommendation if not a mandate. Dr. Laxalt replied that it was rolled out with the NDEs request that every elementary school in the state provide those services. President Wynn said it would be helpful to identify what does and does not

work at the end of the research. Then recommendations could emphasis and focus on how the Board could support the findings of this work.

Member Ortiz said she is trying to understand why the RBG3 program moved departments, is it because there are no longer grants? If so, how are LEAs getting money now and is there assurance the money is used to put this program in place if it is not grant based.

Jonathan Moore, Deputy Superintendent responded that the RBG3 move from Student and School Supports into the Office of Standards and Instructional Supports shifts the focus of the NDE support of RBG3 from a technical assistant supporting the implementation of grants to that of programmatic implementation for teaching and learning. The shift will allow the team to work closely with activities aligned to daily teaching and learning. Regarding an executive summary of all the RBG3 activities, it is anticipated a workgroup representing stakeholders throughout the state will form and include teachers and educators who work with RBG3. The primary of this workgroup would be to study current implementation across the various systems in the state and to engage in data collection methods to help determine best practices.

Member Ortiz asked how is money being distributed to LEAs now? She noted feedback received three years ago when she was knocking on doors was that letters going out to parents about struggling students was that the letters were harsh. For a parent that is not educated in advocating for their student, it was long and complicated. She brought it up three years ago and asked if the parent notifications have become more family and culturally sensitive. She asked if the training noted in the 2019 bill was funded so teachers are being paid for the time to take the training, or are they required to take the training on their own time.

Deputy Moore explained that a formula was built in consultation with legislation and stakeholders representing the districts. It was allocated at approximately \$70,000 per elementary school, and LEAs will complete a report detailing how they plan to expend the funds. There is some flexibility under current legislation on how LEAs will expend the funds. Regarding the letters sent to parents, technical assistance and templates can be provided so letters are informative and more sensitive.

Member Ortiz stated the \$70,000 per elementary school would pay for a Literacy Strategist. Deputy Moore noted that amount may or may not cover the cost of a Literacy Strategist. That is why the NDE has worked with each of the districts to allow flexibility about how to deploy the Literacy Strategist and why there could be two schools in a system who may share a strategist. Deputy Moore confirmed board members will receive a report about how the districts are spending the funds.

President Wynn said in the work of the CCSD reorganization where money was given to LEAs, does that money become part of the pool that is then decided upon by that principal and team to determine whether they want to use it for the strategist or does it become part of the pool of their budget than can be reallocated. Deputy Moore responded that it is clear these funds are for the Learning Strategist only and they are not able to deviate from that purpose.

Member Dockweiler inquired why there is not a requirement that every school has a Literacy Specialist. Looking back at the session, it was intentional that given the current teacher shortage it would not be the best decision to require every elementary school have a Literacy Specialist when in reality they may not have the human capital to meet that demand. Providing the funds was an intentional way to address that while accommodating everyone's needs.

Darin Hardman, Education Programs Professional said part of understanding RBG3 involves looking in the past, and looking at where Nevada is now. Part of that story includes data and student achievement to improve reading outcomes for students in grades K-3. He detailed kindergarten data based on the MAP reading growth data for the 2017-18 and 2018-19 school years. A significant percentage of students making below average growth has been reduced and increasing is the percentage of students who are making above average growth. He added this is preliminary data, and said that between the school that had a Literacy Strategist and a school that did not would be made available to the Board.

Member Newburn said human behavior is bell curved and questioned that the average growth center is so much smaller than the left and right of the displayed graph, and that it is consistent all through MAP. It looks bi-modal as though there are two distinct groups of students being served, and for some reason one group performs very well and another group performs very well. It is unexpected to see this break up in human performance; why does this look like two completely different groups of students being tested, and why does this not appear on Smarter Balanced. Is it possible two different groups of students are being served in a way they can be measured consistently on MAP or are the MAP cut scores wrong?

Mr. Hardman said he would research this and get back to member Newburn. He added two populations are being looked at. Those students who enter into the system reading at grade level, and those students who do not read at grade level. To be determined is whether or not students are making adequate progress, and is a year's worth of growth for a year's work of instruction impacting students who are already reading at grade level. Is there more than one year of reading growth for students who are reading below grade level. There are four different categories with the Smarter Balanced data. There are four levels of performance students are being compared with. That information will be brought to the next board meeting.

Member Dockweiler said she had a similar question with the descriptive categories and the percentile ranges. Using a one standard deviation from the mean, we should be able to calculate the 16<sup>th</sup> percentile to the 84<sup>th</sup> percentile, but here we are looking at 40<sup>th</sup> and 60<sup>th</sup>. We would get a more normal distribution if we followed the norms that were part of the MAP assessment, and these descriptive categories do not align with the actual test.

Member Blakely said he also has some questions, and thinks there is probably two distinct groups and they are actually measuring the real problem.

Mr. Hardman said to address member Dockweiler's concern, remember back when the Board approved the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile as that cut score for determining which students are believed to be performing under grade level expectations. That is the metric being used.

Dr. Laxalt explained that to specifically understand the kindergarten data, it is a unique set of data for RBG3 in that it is only capturing two data points, from the winter to the spring. That could actually be part of the explanation for this unique roll out of the statistics. It was determined in the fall that kindergarten students would receive a screening that was identified as a Brigance test, the kindergarten entry assessment. Then it was decided to implement MAP at only two data points, which could skew the data.

Mr. Hardman noted that the current data in front of board members is for 1<sup>st</sup> through 3rd grade students. That population of students was separated, and there are three data points to compare and determine whether students are making at below average, average, or above average growth. For each of the grade levels provided, they have not yet been able to tease out the differences between a school that has a RBG3 Literacy Specialist, full time and implemented, versus those that do not. The Board's request was heard to provide aggregated data to get a more detailed story of what is going on with the RBG3 performance.

Dr. Laxalt reviewed several years of Smarter Balanced data for grades 3 and 4. Mr. Hardman said this is the current summarization of AB 289 regarding funding. In the past the RBG3 were competitive grants and the LEAs were required to write grants to be approved by the NDE in order to receive those funds. Now, 435 public elementary schools in Nevada are receiving funding based on weighted funding to ensure that RBG3 occurs in every one of those schools.

The primary intent is to ensure that literacy is improving and support is provided for teachers and students throughout the elementary grades. In the past a focus was on grade 3. The intent of the legislature now is to ensure all of the grade levels at an elementary school are served. Some elementary schools are K-5 and some are K-6. The legislature included around \$31.7 million for each of the biennium, which is a 54.5 percent increase in the funding received from the last legislative session. The Legislature wanted to ensure every school has at least one person designated as the Literacy Specialist. That Literacy Specialist is designed to help with school work, and the administrator is to serve as the resource person who comes to staff and the



administration with the professional development needed to produce master reading teachers so there are reading teachers for every student in Nevada elementary schools.

Many of Nevada schools have circumstances that may prevent them from having one full time person. Esmeralda School District serves approximately 78 students and it would be challenging in that environment to hire a full time person to work with 78 students. Each district has submitted a literacy plan to the NDE to understand what is being done with the Literacy Specialist dollars. Are they being used to promote and hire one person full time or are the funds being used for after school development with a teacher who is highly effective, assigned to a 3rd grade classroom, but they cannot get a replacement for a teacher in that third grade classroom.

Member Dockweiler cautioned about the language “produce master reading teachers”. She questioned whether the bill specifies that the Literacy Specialist will do this. It is an expectation that they assist teachers who teach reading to improve their instructional skills, but there is not a certificate to produce a master teacher.

President Wynn noted in the absence of evidence that might come forward linking improvement to having specialists at schools, it seems to be a vital piece of information schools need to determine how they spend their money. Dr. Hardman agreed.

Member Newburn commented that this is an overarching concern. There are other states that had success with RBG3, and he does not believe it is because they failed kids in 3rd grade. However it creates a sense of urgency in K-3 to ensure the student is ready to read.

Of concern is that because the tension has been removed from the program that the foot is going to come off the gas in K-3 and there will be a RGB3 that will turn into a RGB5. The Board would like to drill the data to determine if it appears the foot has come off the gas in kindergarten. The emphasis on urgency is gone. The analysis he would like to see, is the urgency there? Or are we going to end of trying to fix the problem in 4<sup>th</sup> and 5th grade.

Mr. Hardman stated the language in law removes the mandatory retention element. However it still allows principals, parents, and the Literacy Specialist who are involved with the students education development to develop a consensus whether the student can move on to 4th grade based on what is best for that students literacy development. The law replaces the mandatory retention requirement with mandatory intervention and intensive instruction services. The moment it is known a student is reading below grade level that student becomes eligible for those intervention services and/or intensive instruction services that will be provided at the school level.

Member Ortiz inquired whether the intensive instruction only occurs in 4<sup>th</sup> and 5th grade? Or if a student is identified as needing interventions in kindergarten, could they begin receiving interventions then? Will the one Literacy Strategist be doing all the interventions? Teachers are expected to instruct students and put together a plan to ensure students are up to speed, and have parent teacher conferences with parents whose student may need interventions and also work with the Literacy Strategist for improvement. It is a lot of work for one person and one school. Will there be additional money to support after school tutoring programs or perhaps the student just needs new glasses? There are many other factors that could contribute to a student being behind in literacy.

Deputy Moore said there are multiple intervention tiers identified as tier 1, 2, 3. Depending on the level of a students needs, the educators would work to meet the needs of the student through each of the tiers. The Literacy Strategist is not expected to be the sole provider and care of providing interventions, it would be a communal effort. There are outside community partners available to examine the students ability to progress in proficiency in reading that extend beyond the classroom setting.

President Wynn calculated that it appears between January 2015 and June 2019 about \$65 million has been expended on this program.

It is important as policy makers to clarify to our superintendent and the NDE that this is a pivotal piece of their business as a Board. The RBG3 has always been a sensitive issue because it is understood what it portends when kids do not read by 3rd grade. The fact that the laws have changed, and lessened the consequences has taken the onus off of the adults to do what needs to be done, which is to continue the focus on this. What is being heard from the Board is the directive to make this a priority going forward because this is the critical piece of what the Board does. We know what works, strategists, experts and people at a school site that can coordinate and deliver interventions not when kids get to the 3rd grade and the problem is discovered, but all along that path. This has got to be in the top three priorities of our focus. How it gets executed is left to the professionals, but it really matters to the Board. We are stewards for the public money and are accountable. We are all in this together.

Superintendent Ebert said she appreciates the Board's comments, clear direction, and will bring the additional analysis questions with data back to the Board. She commended staff as additional dollars were added, and time is spent with district leaders to ensure the intended dollars are reaching all children. In some instances some schools have multiple Literacy Specialists because they have more students that need the intensive support with classroom teachers.

Mr. Hardman clarified that the law specifies that anytime a student is identified as reading below grade level, regardless of which grade it is, the school is to enact interventions and intensive reading instruction to support the student until the student reads at grade level. It is for any student, at any grade level, K-5. President Wynn replied that there is no consequence. The RBG3 consequence was a consideration of holding students back that no longer exists. Mr. Hardman agreed that the legislature removed that provision.

**Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Class Size Reduction report and requests from school districts to operate specific schools under a variance from the prescribed class size ratios.** 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. Senate Bill 544 (2017 Session) requires pupil-to-teacher ratios of 17:1 for grades 1 and 2 and 20:1 for grade 3 during the 2017-2019 biennium.

Megan Peterson, Management Analyst, Business and Support Services explained that the [PowerPoint presentation](#) today covers the evolution of the Class- Size Reduction program for Nevada. Information was provided about:

- Research on Pupil-Teacher Ratios
- History of Class-Size Reeducation Ratios
- District Responsibilities
- Current Financial Authority
- Future Statutory, funding, reporting and evaluation considerations

Member Newburn stated it is clear that class-size matters. A new teacher will do better with 20 students than 45 students. The problem, similar to California's, is when they implemented their CSR they hired a lot of brand new teachers. The average experience level of the district went down and the more affluent districts, since they had new slots, began to hire experienced teachers from the inner city. A kid in the inner city had an experienced teacher with more kids in the classroom, but now you have a brand new teacher with fewer kids. It ended up not being a net win. The issue is that class size is one of many factors that contribute to teacher effectiveness.

Another issues is that large class sizes are viewed by teachers as a low quality environment. Big class sizes put a lot of pressure on teachers. It is almost not a student achievement issue as it has become a recruitment and retention issue for teachers.

He relayed a personal story:

His daughter was an advanced science teacher at a high school in Okinawa. When her husband was re-deployed to New Mexico she did not go back to teaching because she did not want the large class sizes, and instead became a medical lab scientist.

He was surprised to discover a rural district in Texas had enticed his daughter back into teaching, not with more money but with small classes. When discussing class size the concepts need to expand because it is more than just about achievement, it is also about recruitment and retention. In general, parents and the community view class-size as a quality metric on education. Whether the research backs that up or not, that has happened. Some charter schools can cap their class size and the private schools use small class sizes as marketing for students and teachers. Class sizes are a clear factor in teacher retention and recruitment.

President Wynn noted that to have smaller class sizes, it means the kids must be moved into more rooms. The buildings do not have more rooms. The district is faced with either renting more portables to add space or hold bond drives to try and raise money to build bigger or newer schools. This discussion about CSR is very complex, but unfortunately the public is not necessarily conversant about it. Part of the Board's job is to highlight the issues.

Ms. Peterson continued the PowerPoint presentation and provided information about the history of the CSR program beginning in 1989. The actual deployment of the program began in 1991. Class size ratios were further discussed. Districts, excluding Esmeralda, are required to annually submit a plan and districts with populations less than 100,000 may submit an alternative plan for approval by the Board to use target ratios of 22:1 and 25:1.

Districts are required to quarterly report their class size ratios as well as request variances in classes that exceed the target ratio. Included must be the reason and justification including facility limitations, difficulty hiring and lack of available funding. Member Ortiz commented about daily average enrollment, and that it tells her how many students are enrolled on average per day. But given chronic absenteeism and transiency in districts, the numbers could be skewed. She asked if it is possible to know how many kids are actually sitting in a classroom per grade instead of average daily enrollment.

Superintendent Ebert responded that as part of SB 543 and work moving forward, linking and exposing that information is something they would like to have. If no personal identified information is shared that information could be provided. Member White added that average daily enrollment is the number of pupils. The issue with CSR is that allocation is based on a districts number not a school number. That is why there are some disparities with schools when looking at the quarterly report. But the average daily enrollment is the number of kids in each school at each grade level.

Ms. Peterson discussed funding bills passed each legislative session that provides CSR funds may not be expended until the superintendent has approved the annual plan and verified districts have demonstrated that a sufficient number of teachers have been employed to maintain baseline ratios established in the 3-years prior to the start of the program from resources other than CSR funding. The SBE may deny a variance request, and the districts would need to hire additional teachers to reduce class sizes or would be found out of compliance with the law. Future considerations were discussed including statutory revisions, funding and reporting updates, and potential evaluations.

Member Newburn stated that the Board does this every quarter, and the Legislature gives the Board the authority to approve or disapprove. They clearly expect the Board to do something, and not just be a rubber stamp. He said he is ready to do something; draw a line and start saying no. The way districts distribute experienced teachers across the system is questionable. Districts attempt to serve the most at risk students in the lowest performing schools with the least experienced teachers. The Board cannot stop them from doing that, but the Board can prevent them from putting 30 kids in a teachers class.

Member Newburn proposed the Board disapprove any request where a teacher with less than two years' experience is exceeding the recommended class size reduction in a 1 or 2-star school.

Because there is a new teacher, the students in that class will have the benefit of a smaller class size. There will not be the issue of changing multiple factors such as trading an experienced teacher for an inexperienced teacher. Students who are the most at risk in the lowest performing schools would actually get an achievement benefit from having a smaller class with a new teacher.

Member Newburn said he would like to create a recruiting and retention incentive for the newest teachers. This would guarantee that if a new teacher was put in one of the most at risk schools they would have a reasonable class size for the first two years of their career. It is nationally known that half of all teachers are out of education within the first five years. The teacher shortage will never be solved if new teachers are treated as expendable. If the newest teachers can be given two years of reasonable class sizes that may help with the retention level. Then there is a chance to finally have enough teachers and begin addressing larger class size issues.

A method is needed that over time will retain more of the newest teachers. Member Newburn suggested a system where they Board would not approve waivers if there is a teacher with less than two years' experience in a 1 or 2 star school that is over the CSR limit. Trying to serve the most at-risk students at the lowest performing schools with the least experienced teachers and overloading them in their class-size, makes no sense.

Member Newburn asked for input and for the NDE to consider his suggestion. There are additional issues, such as should long term substitutes be considered? Should it be for specific grades, should kindergarten be considered, when should it take affect? Is this something that could happen in the spring, or will it take another year. He wants to do something other than rubber stamp these variances.

President Wynn said there are a couple of ways to go about this, and she said member Newburn is on target. She suggested creating a group of people who are invested, who would have experience and other points of view to participate in this discussion that would help the Board arrive at some kind of program or ideas that could be advanced. She suggested with member Newburn's subcommittee experience that this could be one of his projects. His experience would allow him to identify individuals who should be on the subcommittee to help inform the dialog, and then propose a schedule and timeline that would be relevant, with input from the NDE. Programs that have more community support are those that are most successful to implement.

Member Ortiz referenced AB 304 passed during the 2019 legislative session that creates another group to review this topic, and said she did not want to do double duty. She suggested looking at the bill as guidance as to what is already occurring. She supports member Newburn's suggestion and agrees that the only way to make an impact on this issue is to stop rubber stamping the variances. The Board is challenged because they do not have the authority or ability to put money behind it, which it what it will take. She agrees with member Newburn to not allow variances with 1 and 2 star schools if they have new a teacher. Nevada needs to do better to ensure the right thing is being done for all students by funding education properly. Teachers are mad and will not continue to teach if they are continually put in overly filled classrooms. They will leave the profession.

Member Newburn agreed to take the lead. He stated he will push back on the money, all they have to do is swap the new teacher out with an experienced teacher at the 1 or 2 star school and there would not be a cost difference. If the facilities and money is not there for a teacher to be in a recommended class size, then swap them out to a 3 or 4 star school and put in an experienced teacher. He is happy to lead a subcommittee and work with the NDE to do whatever it takes to draw the line.

Member Dockweiler said she supports vice president Newburn's proposal. She suggested looking at a variety of thresholds to make more informed decisions moving forward. For a novice, three years could also be considered .

Member Blakely noted that another part of this item is when teachers are evaluated, and if they do not end up in a category three or four, then they are not retained. Often teachers could be coming up to expectations, but

developing, and that is a category two. Teachers are thrown away when they are in category two. He suggested the districts could be more flexible in their evaluation of their teachers. Funds could be withheld from districts or the Board could deny the variance request. Also, more options could be available.

President Wynn reiterated the CSR issue is complex, much in the way that the funding formula is complex. She recommended a comprehensive approach and that member Newburn take on the preliminary assignment and consider an approach on how to attack the issue, in what form, and then bring it back to the Board for further discussion. As a policy recommending board, they are allowed to submit recommendations to the Legislature for change. The recommendation does not need to include funding, that is separate and apart from what the Board does.

Member Miller said as an educator in the classroom who teaches at these schools, there is a need to discuss moving teachers mid-week into school and the effect on children and families. She noted that at the school where she teaches, all are senior teachers working with Title I students. There are many issues besides just saying new teachers should not be in those classrooms.

**Member Newburn moved to approve the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Class Size Reduction report and requests from school districts to operate specific schools under a variance from the prescribed class size ratios. Member Dockweiler seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Information and Discussion regarding educator licensure processes and legislative updates.** The Board will receive a presentation on the current state of educator licensure processes and requirements. The presentation will address improvements in efficiency, the required Parent Involvement and Family Engagement course, and updates on Assembly Bill 219 and Senate Bills 41, 100, and 296 from the 80<sup>th</sup> Legislative Session

Mr. Arakawa, Program Officer and Jeff Briske, Education Programs Professional, conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation with an update from the Office of Educator Licensure. The NDEs online portal, OPAL, went online in early 2018 just before the beginning of the busy season for educator licensure that year. During the summer of 2018 paper applications were still received through Opal as well as online applications. It was difficult to assess what impact OPAL was having on processing timelines.

Paper applications were no longer accepted for licensure this summer making this the first true summer with OPAL running. The impact of the application processing time is apparent. Since May 1, 2019 the Office of Educator Licensure has processed approximately 6,000 applications of all types. It is currently processing applications from four weeks from the date of receipt. Last summer applications were being processed in approximately eight weeks. In prior years it took anywhere from 16-24 weeks, or longer, to get a license issued during the busiest months of the year.

Mr. Briske discussed the Parent Involvement and Family Engagement (PIFE) course. He approves educator preparation programs including individual courses. The PIFE course is required of all new licensees per NRS 391.019 and NAC 391.030. In cooperation with the office of PIFE a standardized course approval was developed to ensure the coursework satisfies NRS. Currently there are 24 approved courses offered through 12 different institutions of higher education. A voluntary survey process was developed for teachers who completed the course. An ongoing pilot program was developed in the fall of 2018 between Southern Utah University (SUU) and Carson City School District with great success and feedback. It allows the same rigorous content to be delivered at a greatly reduced cost. Currently three other districts are in the early stages of talk with SUU to expand the program. To the benefit of their employees.

Mr. Arakawa provided the following legislative updates :

- SB 41 – Amends NRS 391.042 requiring that the NDE send notification to any educator whose license is within nine months of expiration. School districts previously held this responsibility. Automated notices will be sent through the OPAL system.

- The Board has had two options when an educator has been accused of misconduct and action has been brought against the individuals license; to suspend or revoke the license. This bill amended NRS 391.330 by adding the option to issue a letter of reprimand in event the other two options are more severe than the conduct merits. Regulations are required for the new reprimand process.
- SB100 – Requires the NDE expedite processing of applications of spouses of active duty military members and requires the NDE issue a license to a veteran active duty military member or military spouse if the applicant has completed an Alternative Route to Licensure program in another state.
- AB 219 – Relates to the recipients of the Teach Nevada Scholarship. As of July 1, 2019 scholarship recipients must agree to complete the requirements to obtain an endorsement to teach English as a second language, or an endorsement to teach special education.
- SB 296 – Requires the NDE to reciprocate for an educator license as long as qualifications for licensure in that persons home country are substantially similar to Nevada.

Member Ortiz asked if the PIFE coursework is reviewed with an equity lens towards cultural sensitivity. There is a large diverse population in CCSD, and parents in family engagement means different things to different cultures. In some cultures it is normal for parents to be involved and engaged and in others it is considered disrespectful to question a teacher. She asked if they are looking at the curriculum from that lens to ensure teachers are being taught to respect those cultural differences when working with parents and families. Mr. Briske responded they have a process to review all the courses; many were approved in 2015. The process is starting again to ensure all the elements in NRS are included. To his knowledge they have not thought of the cultural lens.. He works in cooperation with the PIFE and will include that in an upcoming review.

**Information and Discussion regarding an overview of more rigorous interventions for schools that are chronically underperforming.** This is the second presentation to the Nevada State Board of Education, based on the request to understand the state of school improvement in Nevada.

Superintendent Ebert explained that this presentation is the second of a three part series regarding School Improvement. The first part of the presentation was heard in July reviewing the methodology of designating schools for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan. Today the responsibilities of the NDE to intervene in chronically underperforming schools and options for more rigorous interventions will be discussed today.

Dr. Seng-Dao Keo, Director, Office of Student and School Supports introduced Gabrielle Lamarre, Title I Director and Federal Liaison who conducted a [PowerPoint presentation](#). Information was provided about the support that State Education Agencies (SEAs) are required to provide to Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools that do not meet the exit criteria. Options about how to support these schools for transformative change were discussed. The five options include:

- Option 1 – Additional State supports
- Option 2 – Innovation zones and managed partnerships
- Option 3 – Receivership and Extraordinary Authority Districts
- Option 4 – Charter Conversion
- Option 5 – Closure

In response to an inquiry regarding the Achievement School District (ASD) from member Newburn, Ms. Lamarre confirmed that because there is no longer an ASD option, the ASD charter school conversions are no longer available. Dr. Kao clarified that it is the NDEs federal and legal responsibility to intervene in CSI schools. The NDE is federally and legally obligated to provide intervention and support to those schools and districts.

Karl Wilson, Assistant Director, said it is mixed across the country. Interventions range from a light touch with supports to a heavy hand which includes mandatory conversion or closure of schools. For improvement in school outcomes, school and district collaborations are essential to build capacity of human, social, program and resources within an equity lens for low performing schools. A system needs to be developed that monitors the performance and implementation of the rigorous options and partner with universities to help evaluate and implement the measures. The more rigorous CCSSO framework was selected because it provides a current analysis of what other states are doing across the nation that help support low performing schools to ensure students have access to quality education experiences.

President Wynn noted that of the options provided in the presentation, some or all may be appropriate. Rather than going down a path with options the Board does not want to consider, she requested narrowing the focus on their next body of work.

Member Ortiz commented that three years ago the ASD was an option. The lowest performing chronically underperforming schools were identified as potential schools that could be removed from the school district and paired with a charter school to manage them in hopes they would improve performance for students. It was a controversial effort. During the 2019 Legislative Session that option went away. There are schools that have not delivered for students for decades. What is the Board's authority to make a difference for those schools. The Board would like to ensure there are options for helping schools improve or finding ways to ensure the districts does not forget about them.

Member Blakely stated that Option 2 – Innovation zones and managed partnerships, is the most appealing of the options presented

Member Newburn said one of the positives about the ASD was that it forced low performing schools to go into performance compacts. He suggested there is a sense of urgency so the schools do not remain low performing for a generation. Member Blakely acknowledged that member Newburn captured his philosophy. He prefers Option 2 but Option 4 is needed as a stick if things do no go well.

Member Dockweiler commented that process wise she likes the idea regardless of which option. Similar to what is done with students to monitor their process, an initial assessment of where they are needs to be done. Set a plan in place and then frequently monitor their progress towards their goals. She suggested considering something at least quarterly to be sensitive and responsive to the needs of the schools to ensure they are provided with supports they need so they can make those gains.

Member Ortiz asked if the Board will receive the NSPF results as in the past with rising stars, or will they be called CSI and TSI. Superintendent Ebert said schools will be identified as CSI and TSI. These designations are important. Deputy Moore responded that the shining star designations are synonymous with the identification and designation of CSI schools. Member Ortiz said she would like to ensure there is a tension with constant supports and interventions for these schools because kids cannot wait and the schools cannot be allowed to keep failing. She said this requires a lot of effort with a small budget and small staff, and asked how the Board can help.

Board member discussion continued.

President Wynn said she views the Board as the umbrella of the state. It is not the Board's function to run schools, it is their place to have strong oversight to ensure districts are running properly and doing what is expected of them. There are clear examples of neglect that have been going on for a long time. The first order of business is for everyone to understand there is a clear view that the Board will be doing deep dives into this area. The Board is committed to working in partnership with the districts to help the situation without an appetite for receiverships or closures of schools. The partnership theory is the right approach to take advising districts that the Board has authority to do more and get stronger. It is the districts to do, but the Board is here to help accomplish it.

**Information, Discussion and Possible Action to appoint individuals interested to the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) board members.** The Board is required to appoint two members to the SPCSA by October 2019, per AB 78 from the 2019 Legislative Session. The Department received applications from its website and is recommending candidates for appointment.

President Wynn suggested polling the Board allowing each member offer their two choices. If there is a consensus or majority on at least one, then that would be one voted choice. If several candidates emerge as being proposed, then the Board could hold a discussion.

Member McAdoo acknowledged that although she is a non-voting member, she has a voice. She stated that any of the six could serve well, and she would like to suggest that the remaining names of the four candidates are sent to the legislative committee that will be appointing three more candidates. Board members were polled with the following results:

Member McAdoo – Dr. Tonia Holmes-Sutton and Dr. Steve Canavero

Member Blakely – Dr. Steve Canavero and Dr. Holmes-Sutton

Member Dockweiler – Dr. Holmes-Sutton and Don Soifer

Vice President Newburn – Don Soifer and Dr. Holmes-Sutton

Member Ortiz – Dr. Holmes-Sutton and Dr. Steve Canavero

Member Wang – Dr. Holmes-Sutton and Don Soifer

Member Miller – Dr. Steve Canavero and Jeffrey Geihs

Member White – Dr. Canavero and Dr. Holmes-Sutton

Deputy Attorney Greg Ott clarified that for the final vote to appoint two members, only the voting member votes are considered. However, other opinions can be taken into account throughout the process of coming to the final vote.

President Wynn stated that there is consensus on Dr. Holmes-Sutton for one recommendation. The other two top candidates are Dr. Canavero and Don Soifer.. A poll was taken; there were two votes for Dr. Canavero and three votes for Mr. Soifer.

**Member Newburn moved to appoint Don Soifer and Dr. Holmes-Sutton to the State Public Charter School Authority Board. Member Blakely seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**6c. Possible Approval of Petition for Revocation of the Nevada Educators License for Ryan M. Davis**

**6d. Possible Approval of Petition for 60-day suspension of the Nevada Educators License for Kelisha Everage.**

President Wynn moved to Consent Agenda Items 6c and 6d which were pulled for further consideration. Deputy Attorney General David Gardner explained that he is in Las Vegas representing the NDE, and Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott is representing the Board in Carson City.

Mr. Gardner explained that the revocation for Mr. Davis is a typical revocation. He has been convicted and a plea deal was reached. President Wynn suggested that the Board consider action for Mr. Davis separate and apart for the discussion regarding Ms. Everage.

**Member Blakely moved to approve the Petition for Revocation of Nevada Educators License for Ryan M. Davis. Member Ortiz seconded the motion. The motion carried.**



Mr. Gardner informed that consent agenda 6d was a possible approval for a 60-day suspension of the Nevada Educators License for Kelisha Everage. The factual allegations are from April 25, 2018 when Ms. Everage helped students take a test. Clark County School District conducted an investigation and have statements from the principal, assistant principal, the learning strategist, a research teacher and 21 of 25 students stating that they had either seen or heard Ms. Everage. Clark County School District negated the test scores for 12 students based on that information.

Deputy Attorney General David Gardner explained the options, under NRS 391.322 sub 5, specifies as no appeal was heard during the 15 day notice (packet was sent February 1, 2019) the Board may suspend the license or take no action on the recommendation. This is a procedural matter at this time, it is not an appeal.

Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott said under NRS 391.322 sub 5, if no request for a hearing is received the matter still comes before the Board. The Board has the option to suspend or revoke the license or take no action on the recommendation. There is not a hearing officers recommendation.

Board members discussed the options available for Kelisha Everage. Member Ortiz recommended a letter of reprimand due to the teacher shortage, and that Nevada cannot afford to lose another teacher. President Wynn suggested because the family showed up and testified on her behalf, and it has nothing to do with the teacher shortage but rather character, that the Board adjust the time to a 30-day suspension to allow for a briefer amount of time. Ms. Everage has shown contrition and remorse, which is significant. Member Newburn noted that test integrity is a big issue in the state, anything that violates that would be cause for revocation. However, he agreed this is a teacher who made a mistake and he supports a 30-day suspension.

**Member Blakely moved to suspend the educator license of Elisha Everage for 30-days. Member Ortiz seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

#### **Future Agenda Items**

Member Dockweiler asked if the Board could receive a RBG3 report to address some of the distribution of student scores reported as a normal distribution. Also, regarding the MAP assessment, the level was set within the average range at about the 21<sup>st</sup> percentile. There are already numbers at the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile, if there were numbers for the 21<sup>st</sup> percentile as well, along with the scores of students within the normal distribution that would be helpful.

Member Ortiz asked for a continued update on SB 543 with hopefully a fully staffed Commission and a meeting under their belt before the next Board meeting. President Wynn inquired about inviting the Commission on School Funding to a State Board of Education meeting so the members could meet and ask questions. Superintendent Ebert said she would work with the newly appointed chair regarding her request.

#### **Public Comment #2**

Meredith Smith, Policy Director, Nevada Succeeds, commented on concerns brought up by the Board during the RBG3 discussion. She is encouraged by the discussion and shared insight on the data that was presented during the legislative session regarding the retention component of AB 289. Nevada Succeeds supported the initial legislation in 2015 and in 2019. The consequences of the initial law were placed unfairly on children based on some of the data presented, and given the current teacher license shortage in Nevada. It was estimated under the original bill that only one-third of students were receiving interventions and one-third of students were received no interventions. All students were held to the retention requirements. Studies showed that retention has a negative impact on student achievement and on student social and emotional learning. This is why the additional fourth and fifth grade interventions were added. Students who are retained show higher drop out and incarceration rates which negatively impact students on a human level and lead to a decrease in the state's overall economic productivity.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 pm.