

**NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
NEVADA STATE BOARD FOR CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION**

Thursday, July 23, 2015

Department of Education
700 East Fifth Street
Board Conference Room
Carson City, Nevada

And

Department of Education
9890 South Maryland
Board Conference Room
Las Vegas, Nevada

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
(Video Conferenced)

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

In Las Vegas:

Elaine Wynn
Tonia Holmes-Sutton
Mark Newburn
Allison Serafin
Victor Wakefield

In Carson City:

Kevin Melcher
Freeman Holbrook
Teri Jamin
Lisa Noonan

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

In Las Vegas

Dena Durish, Director, Educator Effectiveness & Family Engagement

In Carson City

Steve Canavero, Deputy Superintendent, Student Achievement
Mindy Martini, Deputy Superintendent, Business and Support Services
Jane Splean, Assistant Director, Student and School Support
Kevin Laxalt, Literacy Coordinator
Matt Smith, Education Programs Professional
Katherine Rohrer, Education Programs Professional
Tracy Gruber, Education Programs Professional
Diane Mugford, Education Programs Supervisor
Michael Shafer, Chief Auditor, Business and Support Services
Mayita Sanchez, Administrative Assistant

Cindy Little, IT Department
Shawn Osborne, IT Department
Karen Johansen, Assistant to the State Board of Education

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT:

In Carson City:

Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

In Las Vegas:

Nicole Rourke, Clark County School District
Mary Pike, Clark County School District
R.D. Nordgren, National University, San Diego, CA
Dina Pacis, National University, San Diego, CA
Katie Dunlap, DRC-CTB, Oklahoma City, OK
Andre Yates, Clark County School District
Lauren Casillas, Grayling, Denver, CO
Craig Stevens, Clark County School District
Victoria Carreon, Guinn Center for Policy Priorities
Adam Johnson, Teach For America
Judy Mantee, National University
Jason Lamberth
Evangelyn Visser, Nye County School District
Andrea Klafter-Rakita, Clark County School District
Nya Berry, State Sponsored Charter School Authority
Lori Herz, Huntington Learning Center
Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District
Grant Hanevold, Clark County School District
Karl Man, Fox 5 KVVU
Ignacio Ruiz, Assistant Superintendent, Clark County School District
Tiffany Seibel, Assessment, Clark County School District
Ann Jacklin, Clark County School District
Jenn Blackhurst, HOPE
Tom Avery, Clark County School District
Seth Rau, Nevada Succeeds
Justin Jones
Ben Gerhardt, Nevada Virtual Academy
Justin Harrison, Las Vegas Metro Chamber
Punam Mathur, University of Reno
Sharie Johnson, 8NewsNow
Henry Takai, 8NewsNow
Sylvia Lazos, Latino Leadership Council
Amber Lopez Laster, Clark County Education Association

Carson City:

Sue Wheeler, ACT

Kirsten Gleissner, Northwest Regional Professional Development Program

Scott Bailey, Washoe County School District

Kristen McNeil, Washoe County School District

Jim Bell, Washoe County School District

Carol Gebhardt, Washoe County School District

Emily Ellison, Washoe County School District

Todd Butterworth, Legislative Counsel Bureau

Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents

Allison Combs, Nevada System of Higher Education

Public Comment #1

Approval of Flexible Agenda

Member Serafin moved to approve a flexible agenda. Member Cook seconded the motion. The motion carried.

President's Report

Superintendent's Report

The meeting was called to order at 9:01 a.m.

Victoria Carreon, Guinn Center, informed the Board that the Guinn Center has written a policy brief titled *Integrated Implementation of Nevada Literacy and Intervention Programs*. The policy brief contains recommendations on Read by 3, Zoom Schools and Victory Schools. She requested that the report be included in the minutes. (Attachment A)

Ms. Carreon stated The Guinn Center thinks it is important to move to a single K-2 assessment across the state and support the NDE's recommendation to implement a statewide assessment system by 2016-2017. They recommend that each district use the same assessment to enable comparisons for evaluation purposes for the 2015-2016 school year. They also agree with the staff recommendation that duties and professional development for the learning strategist should be aligned to the Nevada State Literacy Plan. Ms. Carreon cautioned there is not enough funding in the Read by 3 grant for a learning strategist at each school. The total cost would be \$31 million and the grant only includes \$4.9 million for the first year. They recommend other options are explored to mitigate funding the financial impact.

Ms. Carreon noted Item 10 provides a proposed list of recruitment and retention incentives for Zoom and Victory Schools. Research shows financial incentives alone are not effective. They agree with staff recommendations that there should be both monetary and non-monetary financial incentives. The Nevada Educator Plan presented to the Board last month showed that Nevada has a disproportionate number of first year teachers in high poverty schools. She recommended countering this, financial incentives provided through Zoom and Victory schools should be limited to experienced teachers who have been rated as highly effective teachers.

Nicole Rourke, executive director, government affairs, Clark County School District (CCSD) informed the Board that CCSD representatives have already testified at the English Mastery Council's (EMC) on Recommendation 3.2 at the Commission on Professional Standard meeting. She said they understand why the Commission did not accept the recommendation, however they believe the recommendation will adversely impact their ability to recruit teachers coming from other states. Not all teacher preparation programs include a requirement for a TESL/ELAD endorsement, or the equivalent, and with the current nationwide teacher shortage they need to be able to recruit qualified teachers from all over the country. For those reasons, she encouraged the board to not accept the EMC recommendation 3.2 under item 7.

Jennifer Manning, asked the Board to consider moving the start time of the meetings to the afternoon so more teachers could attend.

Danielle Miller, assistant superintendent, CCSD, commented on Read by 3 recognizing learning strategists cannot be in every school. She asked how that can be maximized and suggested there are instructional coaches that could fill some of those rolls. Ms. Miller encouraged a broader discussion about how to maximize dollars to ensure students are making achievement gains and taking it to the next level. She suggested professional development to include administrators to ensure everyone is a literacy leader, not just one person. Ms. Miller also recommended a formal discussion regarding assessment tools for Read by 3.

Adam Berger, special education teacher, CCSD, posed historical questions in relation to student test scores and the country's obsession with raising test scores. He observed that since no child left behind was passed in 2001, child poverty has skyrocketed, the concentration of wealth at the top of the society has grown, the present industrial complex has expanded and the gap in college admission and retention between poor and wealthy students has expanded. The wealthy are sending their children to private schools with few tests and huge emphasis on the arts. The poor and the rapidly shrinking middle class send their kids to schools which are stripped down test factories with beaten demoralized teachers. This is the ugly reality that the flowery rhetoric of inclusion hides. If narrowing the achievement gap is an anti-poverty strategy it is the single most ineffective strategy in American history. With regards to children in poverty, he thinks that what transpired this last legislative session and \$800 million put forth that there will be drastic gains with students in poverty in the state and CCSD.

Approval of Flexible Agenda

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

President's Report

President Wynn announced that Anthony Martinez was appointed as the new student representative. He is an incoming senior at Desert Oasis High School in CCSD. He is nominated by the Student Council Association and approved by Governor Sandoval for one year of service on the Board. Today he is at a leadership camp but will join the Board in September.

President Wynn informed the Board that she appointed Member Newburn and Member Wakefield to an interim task force that will examine educator professional development and recommend improvements to the superintendent, the Governor and the legislature.

She recognized Member Serafin who wanted to make a comment. Member Serafin informed the Board that this past week she had the opportunity to visit the Dawson College Bound group. Dawson is a private school in CCSD that has a summer program where they partner with CCSD students. They have 134 7th and 8th graders from CCSD schools. The program gives high achieving students in the CCSD greater access to opportunities that will better equip them to be successful in high school and then college. Students must have at least a 3.5 average. Mentors and volunteers work with students on legal questions building critical thinking, and also on financial analysis.

Member Serafin served as the key note speaker. A Teach for America teacher from 2008 manages the program. His focus was on partnering with CCSD and bridging the gap between a private school and kids who are not in a position to that access. There were two students she wanted to highlight; Alika Williams who is a student at Tarkanian middle school and Defne Egbo who is an 8th grader at KN Knudson. Both of these students, thanks to the College Bound program at Dawson, received full ride scholarship to Thatcher. Thatcher is a boarding school and the scholarships equals about \$100,000 a year total for each child. She said this is a perfect example of having partners working together to give families and kids opportunities.

Superintendent's Report

Superintendent Erquiaga informed the board about recent action with Congress and the Senate regarding two pieces of legislation on the reauthorization of the elementary and secondary education act. The bills are dramatically different from each other; however both represent progress for their respective houses in moving forward. Hopefully the houses can agree and there will be an authorization within this congress. The fear is reauthorization might not occur until a new president takes office.

Superintendent Erquiaga reported the NDE applied for a State Personnel Development Grant in special education, (SPDG) and the grant was received for \$3.78 million dollars over the next five years. The grant has two goals. One goal is to increase the academic performance of students with IEPs who are in the general education classroom at least 80 percent of the day through using a particular program called instructional consultation assessment in teaming. It requires professional development strategies, and it is used in rural districts in Nevada for great success. Goal two is the NDE has been working with the CCSD on the performance of 3rd grade students with disabilities on statewide assessments in reading and English language arts (ELA) through building their capacity. They will be able to scale up that program. It is gratifying to see the special education unit work closely with CCSD in an outcome based program. The NDE is historically a compliance entity and to move to an outcome based entity is very different, and this grant is a great opportunity for that.

Superintendent Erquiaga provided staff updates announcing that Dena Durish will serve as the deputy superintendent for Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement. A new position has been posted for the director of the office of the Safe and Respectful Learning Environment. This office was created by S.B.504 and it is the second office in the NDE that is specifically required by state law. The office of Parental Involvement and Family Engagement is also required in statute. The director is required to report directly to the superintendent, and the job has been posted. This will be the office that handles anti-bullying efforts. A national search will be

launched for the executive director of the Achievement School District created by A.B. 448. The district will be located within the NDE. Five or six positions have been hired associated with the pre-school development plan. It is a four-year grant from the federal government to scale up early learning. In October there will be 16 additional program positions.

Superintendent Erquiaga provided information about legislative implementation and informed that updates can be tracked on the NDE web site. The requests for proposal applications have been released for the Great Teaching and Leading Fund from A.B. 474. Those applications are due on July 31, 2015. They will be screened by a review committee then brought to the Board for approval. Those are funds for professional development and the recruitment and redemption of educators. The Board will then set next year's priorities for the fund and to do so will review the funding priorities established by the regional training programs and their needs assessments.

He advised much of the legislation is effective in this school year, and quick action was required. Today the Board will be asked to adopt as policy measures the bills that require the Board to ultimately place in regulation. The regulation process is long. To move quickly policy can be adopted and then form working groups over the school year to advise the NDE as regulations are brought to the Board. We are doing it as quickly as we can and then we are tightening it up over the next year to provide guidance to the districts.

Superintendent Erquiaga provided additional information about the Choice Scholarship Program that is a tax incentive program. Temporary regulations have been adopted by the NDE. A similar bill creates an Education Savings Account and it is more complex. The State Treasurer administers this program and is working through their regulatory process. The NDE will provide the Treasurer with data about student enrollment and attendance, and the NDE is responsible for aggregating academic testing information from students. This bill goes into effect January 1, 2016 but preparatory work and working with families is being done now.

Superintendent Erquiaga informed the Board that on August 11, 2015 the Board of Examiners will consider the contract for a new testing vendor. Data Recognition Corporation (DRC) and CTB McGraw Hill were awarded the testing vendor contract for certain services primarily in ELA and math in grades 3-8, science in grades 5 and 8, science in grade 10 which is required for federal accountability purposes, the EOC examinations which have been prescribed, alternative assessments and the legacy high school proficiency exam. Since the award by purchasing, DRC and CTB McGraw Hill have merged, and the ultimate relationship will be with DRC. That contract must be approved by the Board of Examiners on August 11. The Board may wish to attend the meeting. DRC will be present, and it is almost a guarantee, that the Governor, the Attorney General and the Secretary of State who comprise that Board will take a presentation on that contract given the challenges that occurred with testing vendors this year.

Superintendent Erquiaga reported for the first time, the Governor has included K-12 education on a trade mission. Governor Sandoval is already overseas with a delegation from Nevada Economic Development and he has been in Ireland and England. This week the Governor will be in Berlin, and Superintendent Erquiaga said he is honored to be joining him to participate in the trade mission with a delegation from the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE). They will visit Germany, Poland and Italy. The trade mission is about export, import and business development opportunities between Nevada and foreign countries. This trade mission is also

about work force development. The NSHE and K-12 will participate in an exchange with high school and early college institutions in Europe. Their system is different; they run a very aggressive apprenticeship program in Germany. It is heavily focused on career readiness which will be a major topic for the NDE. Superintendent Erquiaga has agreed to participate in a national effort by the state chiefs on career readiness and how that aligns with college readiness. President Wynn commended the superintendent and the NDE for the extraordinary amount of work that has been done. She said the Board is there to work with all of the school districts, and the reason they exist is to try and make their work easier, better, more appropriate and to have students fulfill their potential.

Approval of Consent Agenda

(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) President

a. Possible Approval of:

- Re-licensing of a Clark County Private School for a four-year period: Kids' Co-op
- Re-Licensing of a Clark County Private School for a two year period: Omar Haikal Islamic Academy, Candil Hall Early Childhood Education
- Re-Licensing of a Washoe County Private School for a Four Year Period: The Goddard School – Somerset

b. Possible Approval of Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) Nominations

- Ellen Richardson Adams I Parents of Children with Disabilities and/or Individual with Disabilities.
- Diana Cannon – Parents of Children with Disabilities and/or Individual with Disabilities
- Caroline Longre – Parents of Children with Disabilities and/or Individual with Disabilities.
- Jan Albertson – Special Education Administrator – North
- Joseph Holguin – Special Education Teacher – South
- Joseph Morgan – Universities – South

c. Possible Approval of the SEAC Annual report

d. Possible Approval of June 11, SBE minutes

e. Possible Approval of Career and Technical Education Standards

- Architectural Design
- Food Science Technology
- Manufacturing Technologies

f. Possible Approval of appointment of Member Serafin to the Technical Advisory Committee created by A.B. 394.

g. Possible approval of Western Nevada College Jump Start Dual Credit Courses for Lyon County School District.

Member Holmes-Sutton moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Member Serafin seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding recommendations of the English Mastery Council. The Board will receive information on three recommendations for action, following deliberation by the English Mastery Council and Commission on Professional Standards over the last 12 months:

- a. A recommendation that all educator preparation programs approved in this state include a TESL/ELAD endorsement as part of their core curriculum.
- b. A recommendation that future licensees in this state have received the TESL/ELAD endorsement prior to a certain date.
- c. A recommendation that current licensees in this state participate in continuing education related to English Language Learners as a condition of license renewal.

Karl Wilson, education programs professional informed, the Board that the chair of the English Mastery Council (EMC) had a family emergency and is unable to attend today. Mr. Wilson said today's report is a brief update about next steps. Specifically, the first recommendation from the EMC to the Board is that all Nevada teacher preparation programs that prepare pre-service and initial licensure students must include preparation for the Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) or English Language Acquisition and Development (ELAD) endorsement no later than two years after that is approved by the appropriate board.

Mr. Wilson advised the board that his office has had informal discussions with NSHE members regarding recommendations. At the May EMC meeting a letter was received from Dean Metcalf. He referred to a letter that was sent to EMC in January which provided support for all educators to be better prepared to meet the needs of English Learners (EL), but raised the concern about the number of credits that are required and the additional credits required to receive a degree and an ELAD endorsement. In the follow up letter in April, Dean Metcalf stated *"I am completely committed to ensuring our College of Education does everything possible to ensure that every graduate from our programs, whether that be traditional 4 year undergraduate programs, our alternative licensure programs or our professional graduate programs, is prepared to provide optimally effective education to all children. In southern Nevada where 98.3 percent of UNLV's education graduates are employed, this absolutely must include effectiveness in working with children and families whose primary language is not English."* UNLV has made a commitment over this past year to bring in additional staff to support their preparation program. Mr. Metcalf continued *"I also note that I am completely supportive of the EMC intention to stipulate some enforceable requirement for previously licensed teachers to develop proficiency in working with EL populations whether this is done through recertification requirements or other means, he believes he must ensure that every teacher possess the professional tools to effectively serve EL students."*

Mr. Wilson said he thinks NSHE is supportive but there are concerns about how to actually deliver on preparing all teachers meet the needs of EL. Discussions are continuing with NSHE related to that recommendation.

The second recommendation is that all new licensees be required to hold the TESL/ELAD endorsement. The Commission on Professional Standards did not accept that recommendation. When the EMC shared that recommendation with the Board at the March meeting, the Board did not take formal action. There is no additional information to provide at this time.

The third recommendation relates to teachers already in the field. The proposal from the EMC is that as part of the re-licensure process, teachers be required to participate in training that would provide them with the skills necessary to meet the needs of EL in their classroom. When that presentation was made to the Commission on Professional Standards, they encouraged the EMC

to go back and clarify their recommendation. At the May 7 EMC meeting, a recommendation was proposed by the TESL sub-committee of the EMC council. The full EMC approved the recommendation and brought it back to the Commission on Professional Standards.

In addition, the EMC requested sharing a recommendation from NAC 391.065, subsection a. It specifies six semester credit hours required for re-licensure, clarified through a revision, that three of those six be tied to services for EL learners or directly the course work under the ELAD endorsement, and that requirement remain in place until, as teachers go through the re-licensure process, they either achieve the ELAD or its comparable so they might have that requirement through several phases of re-licensure. And then that is tied specifically to teachers that are renewing a standard licensure.

Member Wakefield noted that statute offers an opportunity to review the rigor and efficacy of the ELAD or TESL currently offered in the state. He inquired whether the EMC reviewed the impact of those programs, or how the NSHE institutions are doing and whether those programs actually lead to student achievement in the classroom. Mr. Wilson responded he understood there was a lengthy review and discussion with NSHE which lead to recommendations to modify some of the course work and those recommendations have been approved by the Commission on Professionals Standards. Member Wakefield requested an update for the Board in the near future.

Member Serafin asked if data has been reviewed from teachers who have exited students from EL within one year or demonstrated significant proficiency increases with EL to determine if TESL is a key area the teachers all have in common. Is there enough evidence from the best teachers serving EL to draw that conclusion? Mr. Wilson reported they have not been able to do that kind of conclusive review of data recognizing in part because the rate at which students gain both English proficiency and success in the academic world is very individual. It may take some students, even with the best training and support, four or six years to attain full English proficiency.

Member Serafin said she asked that question because when she taught in Houston she had a high percentage of EL students. The district would identify teachers that had demonstrated good success with EL. Then those teachers worked in partnership with the district to identify strategies, areas of knowledge or course work that enabled them to be equipped with the skills necessary to lead to those outcomes. Teachers that demonstrated success with EL were recognized for their leadership in the classroom. The district has policies about bilingual education to ensure kids are exited on an urgent timeline. If kids stayed in EL too long, there were bigger challenges with content.

Member Holmes-Sutton concurred with Member Serafin and added she completed a TESL 18 credit program. It has helped her to better serve her students and pieces involved in the curriculums helped her to serve all her students.

Member Melcher commented he has always been a strong supporter of EL. He chaired an ESL committee when he worked for Elko County School District (ECSD) and attended TESL national conferences. He brought in a program from Pearson Education and had trainings at numerous schools to help teachers develop skills. The idea was not to pull kids out of regular

classrooms for EL instruction, but to help build those skills so they are able to teach EL in regular classrooms. That is critical because if they are pulled out too long they become good at the English language but miss class content. It is a delicate balance of getting language proficiency while ensuring students do not miss out on content. He is a strong supporter of teacher preparation in EL. If teacher requirements are very stringent there can be difficulty recruiting teachers into areas that are already struggling to find quality teachers.

Member Melcher said that he has a letter dated January 8 from the deans of the colleges of education at UNR, UNLV, Nevada State and Great Basin but he did not see the letter mentioned by Karl Wilson. He stressed the need to ensure that teachers are able to effectively instruct students in EL but also have skills they can use with all students. Member Melcher stated he has a problem with the first recommendation that it is required for all and cannot support the second recommendation either. He supports the direction of the recommendation that is effective October 1, 2018 to require three of the six continuing education credits gets more to the core and using teachers already in the classroom. Colleges and universities are already working to ensure their teachers are prepared to teach ELL, and then teachers in the classroom need to receive help as well. He said we need to get it right, there are still many questions to be answered and suggested forming a committee to answer the questions.

Member Melcher asked about NRS 388.411 that specifies this statute only takes effect through June 30, 2019 and if that is a drop dead date? Mr. Wilson replied that date authorizes the work of EMC through that period, then the legislature would review that work and decide the future. The original S.B. 504 was for the last biennium, they foresaw the need to have an advisory group that would go beyond those first two years.

President Wynn asked what percentage of the teaching working force is comprised of teachers recruited to come to Nevada for whom the TESL requirement would be mandated. In addition, where else in our region are there examples of effective TESL efforts? Mr. Wilson said much of the work of the EMC has been simultaneous with the implementation of ZOOM in the first two years. The ZOOM schools in WCSD and CCSD have seen growth in both English proficiency and academic achievement. The ZOOM initiative is multi-faceted with different opportunities for students, including a greater focus on pre-school, full day kindergarten, a reading center to build literacy for students with summer and inner session opportunities. Mr. Wilson added there is also a need for effective professional development to build the capacity of staff working with EL. The EMC has also looked at what other states are doing.

Member Melcher asked if it has been compiled what each county is doing in this area. He suggested that because of the diversity in the counties it might helpful to see what is being implemented in the school districts. He added part of getting teachers to step forward is providing incentives to teachers and asked if something could be done through the professional development programs.

Member Newburn said he understood from discussions at the last board meeting that the Commission on Professional Standards did not accept some of these recommendations, particularly number 2, and that considerable debate, testimony and public comment occurred. He expressed concern because the Board has not heard the public comment, debate or testimony on the subject. He felt at a disadvantage not having heard the pros and cons for the recommendation

and was expecting some of that would be heard today. He said he does not understand why the Commission did not accept these recommendations. What was their reasoning, what was the testimony?

Superintendent Erquiaga disclosed that by statute he sits on the EMC and served on the council for the first 18 months of its operations. Recommendation 3.1 is about prep programs. Law presumed the endorsement would be good and directed the council to review it with NSHE. After that review the EMC changed the name and content. The Board's decision is, should the endorsement be required to be incorporated in the prep programs. That triggers issues about the 120 credit requirement, and will a fifth year be a problem. That is a topic the Board will deal with. Is it important to have the endorsement available, or is it important to have the endorsement embedded so everyone who goes through the program obtains it. The Board will consider that and provide direction to bring additional items, or appoint a committee to deal with that issue. Recommendation 3.2 is a broader application of the idea that would apply to all licensees coming in.

Much of the public comment from Clark County at the Commission on Public Standards and at the EMC is that would be an onerous requirement. What if a teacher came from Iowa and they did not have an ELAD or TESL endorsement and to get in the queue they would need to get that added. Would that delay their hiring or would there be a certain amount of time to add those endorsements? Law specifies if it is not accepted by the Commission it must come to the Board for consideration. It is unusual for the Board to set a requirement in licensure that was built into S.B. 504 of the 2013 session. It requires more examination and information. The Board may request more information is brought to a board meeting, or appoint a committee. The Board has two roles. One which is the Board's by law including prep programs, and the other that is required by the transitory language of S.B. 504 to consider this.

President Wynn asked what "endorsement available" refers to. Superintendent Erquiaga said there are endorsements in the regulation which is an additional certificate that one can add to one's license. An endorsement might be in TESL, or an endorsement in a content area. They are not required but they add value to the teacher's credentials. President Wynn asked regarding recommendation four, what push back would there be from existing teachers who would be forced to dedicate some time to that. Superintendent Erquiaga responded, as example, an art teacher may question why they would be required to have this training in continuing education and how can the state tell them what their continuing education should be. The other side of that is, virtually everyone has EL students in their class or program, and this helps those students acquire specific skills in academic language, The content is everybody's job.

Member Wakefield asked what the current process is for teachers to obtain their continuing education credits. Is it self-selection by the teachers, or is it required based upon their areas of professional growth from their evaluations, or something in between? Deputy Durish replied that currently it is six credits for the majority of licensees upon renewal, and the Commission sets that number. It is not in statute. Typically, it is every five or six years depending on the type of license. It is broad, stating it must be in an area related to their area of teaching. Assembly Bill 234 directs the Commission to set regulations for licensure for all new licensees after July upon renewal requiring they take a course in multi-cultural education. The discussion has already begun. Member Wakefield clarified he asked the question because there seems to be independent

work streams in relation to the same item. It is not clear if there is evidence to know if there is efficacy of the continuing education credits for how programs are evaluated or if the credits help teachers become better practitioners. He asked if the Board could have a complete look at the idea of continuing of educations credits. He said he would like to understand more and it is difficult to make such an important decision on continuing education credits. President Wynn added the average tenure of teachers is not even five years, and it is conceivable teachers could come in and out and not be required to do that training.

Superintendent Erquiaga observed the Board has rightly focused on the right cause and data question. Nevada does not collect, in any organized manner, the kinds of root cause data nor has an analysis been performed that the Board has discussed. Knowledge cannot be stated that the TESL/ELAD endorsement is the item that directly changes student outcome. In this phase there is only the statutory requirement to begin tracking and identifying long term ELL. It is not known in this phase if is the endorsement, or the continuing requirement because it is entirely up to the licensee today. It is work that requires significant research beyond the ability of the NDE and would also require additional future funding.

Member Wakefield said the difference between the ZOOM work that has been done and the EMC should be clarified and he understood there was no required inter connection in the law. There was no ZOOM effort from statute to ensure there was more TESL/ELAD endorsed teachers at the Nevada schools. Superintendent Erquiaga agreed adding the ZOOM school initiative in the prior biennium as carried forward and scaled up is about certain prescribed interventions at a school identified with a high EL population. The EMC's role assigned in 2013 was the policy regarding district curriculum, licensure, endorsement and continuing education. The EMC is the body that deals with policy, the district implement, the ZOOM funding and the actual instruction of EL.

President Wynn expressed concern about making policy without data. She suggested the discussion continue and for the Board to consider what they could do moving forward parallel to the policy making. Member Melcher said incentives are important and he asked which teachers need this endorsement more than others. Is it elementary teachers, certain content area teachers, where is the priority? He recommended considering a committee from the NDE, EMC, school districts and NSHE to collect more data and information that would help school districts.

President Wynn asked the Board for their thoughts about creating a commission or committee for further study. Member Serafin asked if the Board could request that the EMC do extra research as opposed to creating an additional committee that would need to coordinate with the EMC and other committees. The request would be to ask the EMC to come back to the Board with additional data and she suggested looking at other states that have similar high percentages of ELL learners with districts and schools that demonstrate significant student achievement. Then the EMC could bring back trends leading the Board to make decision aligned to what is occurring in other areas.

Superintendent Erquiaga agreed that staff can work with the EMC to present more robust data gathered from elsewhere regarding the first two recommendations. President Wynn requested that Member Wakefield work with staff as a liaison. No action will be taken today on this agenda item.

Member Jamin suggested a sense of urgency on this item. Achievement with the EL sub-population is suffering and she asked if the EMC could provide a schedule about when they would address these matters. Mr. Wilson said he would bring that request to the EMC. President Wynn said she hoped to have updated recommendations and information in October.

Information and discussion regarding the report required pursuant to NRS 387.304 and NRS 387.3045,

Michael Shafer, chief auditor, Business and Support Services presented a report required by NRS 387. The CPA reports were reviewed to determine whether the school districts have any long term obligations in excess of the general obligation debt limit of the 17 school districts. When information was compiled, the determination was there are not. Mr. Shafer provided further details in the report.

Member Newburn asked what the role of the Board is regarding these reports. Superintendent Erquiaga explained the law requires that the NDE provides the information, but the Board has no financial oversight over a district unless they reach a point of financial emergency and are requesting aid. The role of the Board today is to receive information. If any items are of concern, the audit office can be asked to bring information back.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the requirements of Senate Bill 391 of the 78th Regular Legislative Session, S.B. 391 requires that the State Board:

- a. Prescribe the assessments for determining a pupil's proficiency in the subject area of reading; and
- b. The training, duties, responsibilities, and professional development required to be a learning strategist; and
- c. The professional development a teacher is required is required to receive from a learning strategist.

Deputy Superintendent Canavero informed the Board there are two recommendations for the Board to consider today. One is related to the adoption of the assessment (9a) and the other is regarding the learning strategist roll (9b-c). These are preliminary steps to be taken today.

Deputy Canavero explained that 9a are the assessments for determining a pupil's proficiency in the subject area of reading. Senate Bill 391 requires school districts use procedures for assessing a pupils proficiency in the subject area of reading, using valid and reliable assessments that have been approved by the State Board by regulation. The Board is required to adopt regulations that would allow a school district to select an assessment from a list for the purposes of the regulation. He provided information titled Comprehensive Pre-K Early Literacy Assessment and Support System and critical questions for the Board. There have been many suggestions about how the assessment should function, and the purpose of administering it to children in the early elementary years for reading. More discussions need to occur and many components need to be considered and discussed with policy makers.

Considerations include the purpose and how long it will take to deliver. This information needs to be vetted across the state and the result would be a request for qualifications (RFQ). An RFQ

would go out to the vendor community and then come back. A committee will review the results and then the assessment recommendations would be brought to the Board for regulations.

The immediate work is adopting assessments for the 2015-16 school year ensuring the field what is accepted in the first school year while working on long range plan. This summer a survey was conducted with district superintendents and the charter school authority about what assessments are being used. A list was generated details were provided about the results of the survey. Deputy Canavero said the NDE recommended the Board approve the list with the addition of acuity of reading assessments presently being used in the field for the 2015-16 school year, as the K-3 reading assessments would enable districts to comply with S.B. 391.

President Wynn asked for clarification and why is it necessary to have 13 items. Deputy Canavero said the Board is considering these because they appear on other state's approved assessment lists, they appeared on the American Institute for Research Response to Intervention approved assessment list, and they met reasonable measures of validity and reliability. The necessity comes from the process to engage districts, stakeholders, and answer key questions about the values underlying the particular assessment. Then issue an RFQ to the vending community and return to the Board with a Pre k-3 list that clearly identifies why it is one, or more than one.

Superintendent Erquiaga added the practicality is there are 17 school districts and many charters that are inside the charter school authority. There is no aligned assessment system in Nevada. They have all done their own thing and have contracts with vendors. If we pick one of these now, someone has to cancel contracts, or may result in over testing. Nevada needs a year of transition for a practical reason while moving to an aligned assessment system in K-3.

Member Melcher observed when he reviewed the provided list he was familiar with most from the school district he worked in. Many teachers and students have spent a lot of time learning how to use these assessments and they are comfortable with them. From a student and teacher standpoint it is good to have the assessments they are already using.

President Wynn agreed, but said now we are entering into an area of high stakes and before much of this was voluntary. Now there are dire consequences to these assessments. Member Serafin asked if it is possible to get a matrix to understand all the components of developmental literacy, what each of those assessments assess. Understanding the assessments would allow a teacher to understand the literacy development of their students.

President Wynn agreed her observations are correct, however it has been clarified there are contractual obligations making this necessary now. Going forward the substance of the assessment will be important when decisions are considered. Member Serafin said wants to ensure Nevada is going in the right direction with robust assessments that will provide parents, students and teachers the right indicators about a child's preparedness going into third grade. Superintendent Erquiaga agreeing said next year's kindergarten class is the first class to which the retention requirement applies. Member Serafin is correct, by the time that class is assessed the instruments approved should be aligned to the third grade test that will be imposed on that class that will result in their retention. This is a transition year where it is recommended that the

Board accepts what the field is doing. But by next year's kindergarten's class the Board must go through the long play because there are consequences for that class.

Member Serafin added she wants to be certain that it is not about the third grade test, rather, it is about ensuring third graders have the knowledge and skills that put them on a college and career ready path. The test is the validation of strong instruction to ensure kids are headed in the right direction to achieve their dreams.

Member Jamin encouraged the NDE to work closely with the Nevada Association of State Superintendent's (NASS) in this process. It will accomplish what Member Serafin requested which is that districts do not enter into contracts for assessments beyond the appropriate period and also that the assessment chosen is one all districts use and will be the best to accomplish the objectives.

Member Wakefield asked if the appropriate learning score for the grade level equivalent in each of the tests can be shared with the field so that in the transition years the state, parents, students, and principals become familiar with what it means to be able to read at the appropriate grade level. Deputy Canavero replied that requirement is based on law, how reading deficiency is identified based on assessment. Measuring literacy assessments is complex. The Board's discussion necessitates additional discussions with the NDE to focus on key questions, and then bring the answers and assessments with a clear vision for implementation back to the Board. The NDE has the matrix with the skills assessed and the time required. This information will be provided for the Board.

Member Holbrook asked how the third grade SBAC test relates to this test. Deputy Canavero said there are a few ways a child demonstrates proficiency in third grade reading, one is the SBAC score. If a student does not demonstrate proficiency on the SBAC, there is an alternative assessment that could be used. The third grade CRT is the ultimate benchmark.

Member Holmes-Sutton moved to accept the recommendations in 9a to move forward with the list of assessments. Member Wakefield seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Deputy Canavero commented that item 9 b-c includes three areas in statute that the State Board must prescribe by regulation. The principal of every elementary school must designate a licensed employee to be the learning strategist. It does not necessarily mean that the learning strategist is a new hire. This could be an additional responsibility for a teacher already on staff. There are three areas in law related to the professional development the learning strategist must complete as well as the professional development required along with skills and attributes the learning strategist must have.

Deputy Canavero explained the approval for 9b,3 is to approve the first step pending significant feedback and then work with school districts, noting the criteria may change as the NDE comes back to the Board to adopt regulations. That addresses the various context so the best situation can be created to ensure support is received.

Kevin Laxalt, education programs professional, informed the Board that she is the lead literacy coordinator for the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy initiative at the NDE. She provided

context about the document titled *NDE Preliminary Version of Learning Strategist Position for 2015-2016 School Year* that was provided to the Board. Information included:

- Professional development that a learning strategist must complete,
- Professional development that teachers much receive from the learning strategist
- Duties and responsibilities of a learning strategist.

Member Serafin asked about districts that do not have the capacity or money to assign a full time learning strategist. What should a district consider if they have a split strategist role and or a teacher that may take on this work? Ms. Laxalt said she created a second document to address this issue. Qualifications were suggested for the districts to consider and part of the law defines a learning strategist as one who has leadership skills. The goal should be to establish a culture of literacy.

Deputy Canavero agreed with Ms. Laxalt's comments and stressed a critical component is the ability of the learning strategist to interact with adults. He added another practical item is the corresponding grant funds to implement the program. The first year there is about \$4.8 million in competitive grant awards and the second year it goes up to \$22 million. The first year is a way to incubate this program within specific districts, learn from that then to continue to develop tools to use models for the following school year.

In response to a question from Member Serafin, Superintendent Erquiaga clarified the intent is to have the exemplary and the good enough while working with the districts and charter schools. Further division and edification of the list is envisioned while learning from the grant process, and as discussions occur. It is necessary to get started and so the list was brought today as districts are identifying their learning strategists. Every elementary school must have a learning strategist. As they begin to do that, the Board is asked by policy to provide this year's guidance in a transitional year. Member Serafin asked if guidance can be provided to districts about the prioritization of schools that need a full time learning strategist

Superintendent Erquiaga responded he would be glad to discuss that with the districts. Member Serafin asked if the leaders who take on those shared roles as a learning strategist could be recognized for taking on additional responsibility. Superintendent Erquiaga said he would ask staff to consider, either as requirements of the grant, or as a scan of information at the end of the school year to collect data identifying schools where there was a full time learning strategist distinct from schools where there a teacher assigned additional duties because they were exemplary. Over time they will begin to build data.

Member Jamin expressed appreciation to staff for their work on this item.

Member Holbrook move to accept the recommendations in 9b-c. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the requirements of Senate Bills 405 and 432 of the 78th Regular Legislative Session, S.B. 405 and 243 requires that the State Board prescribe a list of recruitment and retention incentives for teachers and other licensed educational personnel at Zoom Schools and Victory Schools.

Deputy Canavero explained that through this process the SBE creates a list of acceptable uses, and the districts will choose from the list to implement in the schools. These two bills are categorically different, but similar in supporting students whether they are EL or students in poverty who are often EL. There are also similarities in statute for the bills to include a list of recruitment and retention incentives that bridge both programs. The list can be used by Zoom or Victory schools, and hopefully by districts as they work through their pay for performance plans.

Jane Splean, assistant director, School and Student Support stated there was a team that worked closely with administration and leadership on the development of the recruitment and retention list that was provided. She explained how the list was developed.

Matt Smith, education programs professional, explained the differences between Zoom and Victory schools. One key difference is a cap in the Zoom legislation. Up to two percent of a Zoom allocation may be spent on professional development, recruitment or retention incentives and family engagement. Victory legislation has no limitation. A school district could choose to use 100 percent of their Victory school allocation on recruitment and retention incentives. Research indicates that financial incentives matter, particularly in scale. There is a big difference in a classroom between a \$1000 and a \$10,000 incentive. However, financial incentives alone are unlikely to hold a teacher or recruit a teacher to a specific school.

Ms. Splean said they knew the incentives had support and built effective leaders and teachers, reflected the input and recommendations received, had alignment with the NDE mission, goals and theories of action as well as coordinated with some of the other recruitment and retention incentives in legislation. Research indicated the challenges are complex and there are no simple answers. However, four recurring themes that include factors that influence recruitment and retention of effective educators include:

- Financial Incentives
- Opportunities for Professional Growth
- Administrative Support and Leadership
- School Culture/Working Conditions

Staff recommends that the Board approve the attached list that prescribes the recruitment and retention incentives for school districts and the sponsors of charter schools for teachers and other licensed educational personnel at Zoom Schools and Victory Schools for the 2015-16 school year.

Superintendent Erquiaga reminded the Board the way both bills operate, the school or district receives these funds and these are eligible uses of Zoom or Victory dollars. There is a host of recruitment and retention incentives. The districts are also required to have a pay for performance and enhanced compensation plan or program as of July 1, for their district. That program morphs over this biennium as well. This is a specific use of Zoom and Victory dollars. The Board's duty under the bills is to prescribe a list of incentives. That list is provided for school year 2015-16.

Member Serafin said she reviewed the list and asked if schools that have incentives over the biennium are budgeting available dollars beyond the biennium. Superintendent Erquiaga stated

all legislative appropriations are only for two years, the funds in total expire. The local board or the governing board of a charter school has a pool of money available for this year and next year. Contemplation of how to continue dollars is a local determination on collective bargaining decisions, and a host of other decisions. It is not contemplated in the state framework, all of the money expires. Member Serafin asked if it can be ensured that is a guiding question for schools that are engaging in the distribution of dollars. Superintendent Erquiaga said the Board has a representative from the superintendents association and the board of trustees for a reason. Those are the entities that will make those decisions. The two entities are here for a reason, to advise as non-voting members, but to carry messages back. He requested they do that.

Member Wakefield observed law has a board accountability mechanism, and he asked the superintendent to comment on that. Superintendent Erquiaga responded the two bills have distinct mechanisms. Victory Schools are explicit that this Board can seize distributions if funding is not resultant in achievement. That statute assumes the program will continue. He said he did not think the Zoom bill contains such an explicit demarcation of ending money. The money is distributed to CCSD and WCSD. Member Wakefield clarified his question was in regards to Victory Schools. Superintendent Erquiaga said because of operating in the biennium, the first application would occur at the end of this school year for next year Victory's dollars. Member Wakefield asked if they will be able to review the impact of dollars looking at the 2016 year. Dale said that was the legislature's intent. Some of this will depend on what the Victory plans look like. Different schools will emphasis different areas. Victor clarified, whenever there is a review mechanism, it can cause fear that if something is not done to show impact this school year, it is not an effective use of funds. He said he hopes as a Board that is not how they will look at funds. They will look at a comprehensive plan for victory schools that is responsive to the needs assessment of the community per the law. It is not a gotcha provision that demands results tomorrow, but rather it is looking at how to partner effectively and ensure dollars are being used in the most effective way using the school based needs assessments as the guide post.

Member Serafin asked if the Board could get information about the additional categorical cash flow allocation to each campus for Zoom and Victory schools at the October meeting. There are many categorical programs and would like to know what the districts officer. Also she requested a list of schools and asked how much additional cash they are receiving for the 2015-16 school year. Superintendent Erquiaga explained the two bills operate in slightly differently ways. In the Zoom school, the two large districts which receive a direct allocation will submit to the department by August 1, their plans and schools.

The NDE is engaged in the Zoom grants process. All of that information must go to the IFC by a date certain in August. He said he will provide the Zoom school report. Zoom schools do not require a by school budget, but he has the authority to ask for that. Victory schools operate in a different way. They require the submission of a plan and there are both district and charter schools on that list. The plans will come in different forms. Those plans must be approved and there is a mechanism in the law to allow a statement of intent if the plan is not done by a hard date set in law. Those require a budget because the intention for the Victory dollars all along has been that they are the last dollar in, as reported, all those schools have assistance from a number of revenue streams. He advised he will provide reports, that are slightly different, and that should be feasible for both at the October meeting.

President Wynn asked for clarification regarding 3-c which specifies “*to provide opportunities to provide leverage to the district for securing the placement of highly effective staff in Zoom Victory Schools*”. Jane Splean responded this is about opportunities of leadership within the district and getting the staff they need and want. Another example is that they can outsource a recruitment organization that has a proven record of hiring highly effective staff.

Superintendent Erquiaga confirmed that all board members have seen and reviewed a copy of the Recruitment and Retention incentives. Member Wakefield recused himself from the vote because his employer may be one of the vendors that could help with district improvement.

Member Serafin moved to approve the staff recommendation. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried. Member Wakefield abstained from voting.

Information and Discussion regarding the personnel recruitment activities of the Clark County School District (CCSD). The Board will receive an informational update from CCSD regarding the current teacher shortage and the success of recruitment campaigns.

Ryan Yanagi, deputy chief human resources officer, CCSD and Jennifer Varrato, director of employee onboarding and development, CCSD, provided an update on their expanded recruitment efforts in the hiring season. A [PowerPoint](#) presentation was conducted that provided information in four main areas:

- Accomplishments
- New Recruitment Innovations
- Challenges
- Next Steps

Member Serafin remarked that as a former teacher recruiter she understands it is a tremendous amount of work given the number of hires CCSD needs. She recognized CCSD continues to have a tremendous amount of vacancies, some in schools prioritized from the past legislative session as not meeting expectations for school achievement. It is a concern because this is year two, and she questioned the prioritization and strategy. She asked if CCSD is able to calculate their cost per hire, and from there measure conversion rates. Given the tremendous amount of effort, energy and dollars, 131 new teachers are not serving its purpose.

Mr. Yanagi said what they realized in the beginning of the year is that their traditional candidates were not there. They put focus back onto what was giving them candidates, which was the Alternate Routes to Licensure (ARL) program. As they advertised nationwide, CCSD was looking for both types of candidates, traditional and ASL. Using the Teach for America (TFA) strategies about how to recruit other candidates, they looked at how to get candidates to Las Vegas into an ARL program. A large focus was put on ARL and numbers have been increasing from that point on. Member Serafin asked what the cost is per ARL candidate, including time, talent and resources. Mr. Yanagi said he does not have the exact breakdown, but it comes out to about \$1500 per candidate. That is cost for administration, teachers and support staff that are being hired. There were about 3,600 applicants hired this year for all three groups.

Member Serafin questioned what is working and what is not working. Mr. Yanagi said last year CCSD had a large internet presence on monster.com, Career Builders and others, and received a lot of applications. The majority of the candidates are out of state, and the competition was

challenging this year. In the past when he went to recruitment fairs, he would sit at a table that said Las Vegas, and people would just walk by. All the amazing aspects of Las Vegas need to be shared with the candidate to stop them from walking by. That is why they hired four recruiters to establish relationships with Universities and with candidates.

Member Serafin requested he walk her through the success of those recruiters. It is one thing to look at the total numbers, but she said she still does not understand, being as year two, what is not being done. Where is support needed? If year three has 1,000 vacancies going into the 2017 legislative session, families will be let down. Mr. Yanagi said the majority of their candidates are from out of state, and now that every state is hiring again, the candidate needs to be convinced to move to Las Vegas. Human Resources have focused efforts on candidate cultivation. That is not only getting the candidate to Las Vegas, but providing. It is not only getting them there, but providing support afterwards and convincing them throughout the entire process of their being hired, and even into the start of the school year to come to Las Vegas.

What was seen in the past, even though people were hired in July, the teacher may be picked up in their home state and take that contract instead. It is finessing them all the way through the summer until they are on campus with their kids. That support mechanism was put back in. There are many opportunities in Las Vegas for candidates. Member Serafin asked to be walked through year three. If CCSD continues to grow at 1 or 1.5 percent, a significant number of teachers will be needed for next year. She asked what is going to happen differently over the course of the next 90 days to fill existing vacancies and what will be different in year three so the same conversation does not occur next summer.

Mr. Yanagi explained if they do not get enough candidates by the start of the school year, they still recruit for substitutes. He is putting out a big campaign for the substitutes. He realized from last year that substitutes need support to get into the classroom. For new teacher induction day the substitutes are being separated from new teachers and focused training is put on just substitutes with ongoing support. It is a constant discussion of looking at the numbers and they are trying to get accurate data on how candidates hear about coming to Las Vegas. The ARL will continue to grow. Member Serafin asked what the retention is of ARL candidates from last year. Ms. Varrato said the retention for ARL is higher than for new experienced teachers coming in. She added that their big recruitment push was the end of January. That is when the recruiters began, and there was a sharp spike in the number of visits to their web site. Much of that interest is in ARL, many people are changing careers. While they are the largest ARL providers, there are other approved providers in the state they want to partner with to work collaboratively together to get more teachers in CCSD.

Member Serafin said it would be helpful to have a breakdown by supply line of teachers from last year and this year. She requested information on the traditional routes, from three or four Universities as well as raw numbers and percentages of hires from last year and this year, including ARL program through the district, Teach for America and Troops to Teachers. She would like to work as a Board with the district and it would be good to have a clear baseline to understand where to increase investment, and what partners are not in a position to deliver the volume and quality of talent needed. Member Serafin expressed interest in what the outcomes are now and what the focus on the 2015-16 school year should be to ensure hiring targets are hit. That means 100 percent of the classrooms have a licensed teacher in 2016.

President Wynn asked if a performance self-evaluation is required each year. Mr. Yanagi said their Board of Trustees was provided a report on the status of the recruitment campaign in the beginning of the year and another update was provided in June. President Wynn suggested in addition to a status report an evaluation on the methods used that produced the most success would be valuable. A lifestyle in Las Vegas is being marketed and sold similar to selling a product like many businesses. She suggested taking advantage of local companies HR for good ideas in view of their expertise.

Mr. Yanagi responded every company you can think of is in Las Vegas. He has invited MGM Grand, Caesars Entertainment and more to round table discussions. Before their campaign was launched those companies provided feedback on all aspects, it was a great partnership and experience with community members. As recruiters went out they were asked the same common question. Whenever someone was asked what they think of Las Vegas, the first thing asked is do you live in a hotel on the strip. Candidates must be educated about everything outside of the strip and they are looking at ways to measure the investment in various advertisement products.

Member Serafin asked Mr. Yanagi his prediction for the number of new hires they will have in the next 30 days, there are 813 vacancies effective July 13. Mr. Yanagi responded the goal was to hire 2600 teachers and currently 1300 have been hired. His personal goal is to hire 1600 although he would like to hire at least 2000. Member Serafin asked if there was a plan to reach 1600. Mr. Yanagi said his plan is cultivating the candidates in their pool and the ARL program. Member Serafin said it would be helpful if he came back in October with an update. She expressed interest in seeing his operating budget for recruitment from last year and this year and partner with the Board to ensure this does not happen again.

Member Jamin asked whether the poor ranking of Nevada comes up with the applicants, and if so is information provided to show the efforts Nevada is making to improve. Mr. Yanagi said you might think that is a frequent question, but it is not. The question is as simple as what is Las Vegas, define Las Vegas. He shares what Las Vegas is about and the variety CCSD has to offer its candidates.

President Wynn asked if there has been thought to reaching out to communities or cities that have experienced contraction in business, such as Detroit, that might have populations of people that want to relocate because of circumstances. Mr. Yanagi responded they are hunters for unemployment so they look for states that are laying off teachers. The hard part about recruiting teachers from the east and Midwest is the moving cost. The interest can be captured, but getting them here is hard.

Member Newburn said he would like to get a sense of openings. Are these created through growth, or are teachers being lost to retirement, are teachers leaving the state, or are teachers exiting the profession. It appears to be a high churn profession. Mr. Yanagi said it is a combination of everything. Retirement and resignations is slightly up. The retention of out of state candidates that were hired and keeping them in the CCSD is difficult. Discussions need to occur with those out of state candidates to stay in the state. Focus needs to be on the retention. Member Newburn said he was interested in ratios of growth and what factors are creating the openings. There may be other ways than recruiting to address the shortage.

Superintendent Erquiaga said because a member has asked Mr. Yanagi to come back, he suggested the Board work with him on the retention questions. Responding to Member Newburn's question, he suggested the Board can work with him to understand what is being lost out of the pipeline and what causes from a policy perspective could be addressed. It is less expensive to retain a good employee than to recruit a new one. That would be helpful to the Board from a policy perspective.

Member Wakefield commented much of the discussion has been about the short term and doing the best we can for this year. It is hard to hear there will be at least 700 teacher vacancies the first day of school as a best case scenario. He said he would like to consider long range efforts, and asked about three conditions:

1. What is occurring within the school district making it harder to hire and retain teachers?
There were teachers picketing at the last school board meeting because of a salary freeze while CCSD is trying to hire new teachers, which makes recruitment efforts difficult. He asked how the salary negotiations affect the process.
2. He was surprised there was not more information in the presentation about NSHE institutions and growing the traditional pipelines. He said he would like to understand the roll of the colleges of education.
3. Are there legislative investments, reforms and programs that can help with this teacher shortage.

Member Melcher said the information has been helpful to get an understanding of where we are and where we are going. Clark County is not the only school district struggling with hiring issues. He said he would like to see a report from the CCSD board of trustees regarding their ideas and how they are dealing with the problem. Partnership is important, but in reality it is their job to do and our job to support them. He said he would like more involvement from the school district.

President Wynn remarked the Board would like deeper discussion at a future meeting about this topic, not only from the largest school district, but to get a profile of the entire state.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the requirements of Senate Bill 511 of the 78th Regular Legislative Session, S.B. 511 requires that the Board approve the distribution of money to the boards of trustees of local school districts to provide financial incentives to newly hired teachers in certain schools. The Board will receive information concerning school district programs prepared pursuant to NRS 391.168 and may allocate funds based on applications from some or all school districts in accordance with those plans.

Dena Durish, deputy superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement, explained S.B. 511 specifies a \$5 million increment in each fiscal year, and S.B. 515 which is a funding bill, added an additional \$5 million for a total of \$10 million to be used statewide for each of the two fiscal years.

Ms. Durish conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation about teacher incentives. The money may only be used to provide incentives to new teachers or those employed fulltime in a Title I school, or a school that has received one of the two lowest possible ratings indicating underperformance of a

public school. Ms. Durish provided further information about the new teacher incentives and provided recommendations for a Board motion:

- \$4,000 per teacher* to be awarded, based on 2,427 requested (unless less requested by district)
- \$9,671,000 to 10 applying districts on or before August 1, 2015
- \$112,000 for possible remaining 4 districts on or before October 1, 2015
- Remaining funds as of October 2, 2015 carried forward to 2016-2017

* Districts may still pay up to \$5,000 per teacher based on local plans, availability of funds, etc

Member Serafin asked where the dollars will go, how accurate the projections are and will charter schools have access to this money. Deputy Durish replied charter schools are not subject to the plan and none of them will receive these funds. Member Serafin asked whether schools that may be entering the Achievement School district will be able to apply for this money. Superintendent Erquiaga responded no, the schools become an Achievement Charter School, which is a defined term. Future legislation could bind charters and achievement school district charters to have a pay for performance and an enhanced compensation plan. They are not bound today. Charters are excluded from the requirement and are therefore excluded from the revenue.

Member Newburn asked in reference to the last item, it is possible districts will not hire all the teachers they projected to hire. In that instance, what happens to those teacher dollars? Ms. Durish responded the bill is clear the dollars will revert back and can be used the next year. The bill is also clear that each individual teacher cannot receive more than \$5,000.

Superintendent Erquiaga stated the job of the Board is to allocate money, and based on S.B. 511 to pro-rate that money if there are insufficient funds for the number of requests. This body does not set the level of compensation; rather a proration is used to get to the \$4,000 number. It appears that \$4,000 is how much there is. The money goes out in a block to each of the districts as shown in the PowerPoint. They can spend \$1,000 or \$5,000; it is dependent at the district level on how they write their enhanced compensation plan pursuant to NRS 391.168. The Board is not setting compensation at \$4,000 per teacher, that is a district decision and it will be scaled from district to district. To be clear, the Board's job is only to do proration. This is the simplest way conceived of to prorate \$10 million to \$10.9 million.

President Wynn clarified this is purely an incentive measure without any performance requirements attached to it. Ms. Durish agreed.

Member Wakefield asked if this could be prorated based upon the plan. Deputy Durish responded the role of the Board and the NDE is not to approve or deny the plan and that is why the plans were not provided today. Superintendent Erquiaga reinforced that the language in the bill states *on or before October 31, 2015 the State Board shall distribute the money to each board of trustees of a school district that submits an application in proportion to the number of teachers to whom the board of trustees plans to provide incentives.*

In response to questions from member Wakefield regarding agenda items, Superintendent Erquiaga explained a member of the board requested a report on the CCSD recruitment efforts, and the Board received a report on their recruitment efforts. Unrelated to that request, the law

operates as such in three different bills that the Board allocates money for purposes of retention and recruitment in two bills, and so the Board received a presentation about recruitment and retention on S.B. 405 and S.B. 432 and a presentation on S.B. 511 about retention. Going forward in the year, and bringing back more information and bringing back CCSD, there will be some improvement reporting, and some retention. The items brought forward were simply because of how the request was made by a board member in June.

President Wynn clarified the Board's role is to oblige with the spirit of this legislation which is to approve this funding to the various school districts based on the NDE evaluation of how to allocate that money.

Member Serafin moved to approve the recommendation. Member Wakefield seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the requirements of Assembly Bill 447 of the 78th Regular Legislative Session, A.B. 448 requires that the Board may provide for evaluations of counselors, librarians and other licensed educational personnel, except for teachers and administrators, and determine the manner in which to measure the performance of such personnel, including, without limitation, whether to use pupil achievement data as part of the evaluation. The Board may provide an evaluation for 2015-16 and may direct staff to gather further information

Ms. Durish conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation including two additional documents that provided extended facts about A.B. 447. She explained this legislation relates to the group three teachers, or the other licensed personnel. The Board will have a role in three components of the bill and Ms. Durish explained amendments in the bill that resulted from legislation.

- Student Achievement Data – requires that future use of student achievement data include both state and local data sources.
 - ✓ 2015-2016: Includes no student achievement data
 - ✓ 2016-2017: Includes 20% student achievement data
 - 10% statewide assessment data
 - 10% district determined data (TLC to recommend to SBE for regulation change)
 - ✓ 2017-2018: Includes 40% student achievement data
 - 20% statewide assessment data
 - 20% district determined data
- Principal Supervisors
 - ✓ The policy must also provide for the evaluation of those administrators at the district level who provide direct supervision of the principal of a school. The policy must comply with the statewide performance evaluation system established by the State Board pursuant to NRS 391.465.
- Other Licensed Personnel
 - ✓ Pursuant to NR S391.3123, The State Board may provide for evaluations of counselors, librarians and other licensed educational personnel, except for teachers and administrators, and determine the matter in which to measure the performance of such personnel, including, without limitation, whether to use pupil achievement data as part of the evaluation.

Deputy Durish recommended the Board motion include;

- 2015-2016: NEPF for teachers and building-level administrators only
- 2015-2016: Districts continue to use local evaluations, approved by board of trustees, for principal supervisors and other licensed educational personnel
- 2016-2017: Direct TLC/NDE staff to make future recommendations to Board for statewide evaluation system for:
 - ✓ Principal supervisors
 - ✓ Other licensed educational personnel
 - Which (if any) should be included in a statewide system
 - What the system(s) should look like
 - What (if any) student measures should be included

Member Newburn said his preference would be not to have the evaluation creep through other professions, such as the nurses.

Member Melcher commented that in many of the smaller districts superintendent's evaluate the principals. That could pose a question when public boards hire superintendents on multiple year contracts. Deputy Durish agreed the dynamics are different in each of the districts. She added this is just for 2015-16. It is law that everyone who supervises has a standard measure or a statewide evaluation system. The law specifies for the 2016-17 school year, that all principal supervisors would have a standard evaluation system. Member Melcher said it is an area that needs review to be certain there are not conflicting laws regarding supervision of school district superintendents and their hiring. Also, there will be a system where some superintendents will be evaluated through this process, and some will not.

Member Serafin move to approve the above recommendation. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information and Discussion regarding the results of the recent statewide administration of the ACT Complete, Nevada's approved college and career readiness assessment. The Board will receive a report from ACT on this year's test and prior year's data concerning the college-going behavior of Nevada graduates.

Richard Vineyard, education programs supervisor, conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation. He explained that after the slides for this presentation were produced, there was an update with results and new numbers. All the 11th grade students in Nevada were eligible to take the ACT funded by the state. The tests were administered April 28, 2015 and the make-up test was May 12. Students should have received their individual student reports by mail the beginning of June. The reports are based on the 11th grade participation and graduating class results accumulated by all students who took the test in grade 10, 11, and 12 over their high school career. Every school district, the state public charter schools, the Davidson Academy and about 170 students that were not assigned to any school participated in the test.

Mr. Vineyard presented the preliminary results. The biggest difference is that in 2014 there were approximately 7,000 students participating and about 24 percent of graduates were tested. This year 95.1 percent of those students will participate in the class of 2016. Students who did not participate this year as 11th graders will get the opportunity to participate next year as grade 12

students because it is a graduation requirement for participation. The average composite scores dropped from 2014 – 2015 across every content area, which was expected for the first statewide adoption of ACT. There is a negative correlation between the participation rate and the average composite score because it was a much larger population of students taking the test. In 2014 and previous years, the students who took the ACT were students who were motivated to take it, paid for the test and had a clear expectation of going on to post-secondary education. It was required that all students participate and there was a larger population, including students who did not have an interest in going to college but had the opportunity to take the test to see where they were on the path towards being ready.

In 2014 there were 7,169 students who participated in the test, and 1,815 of those students, or 24 percent, met all four of the college and career benchmarks set by ACT. In 2015 there were 29,554 tested in Nevada, and 2,955, or about 10 percent, met all four of the college and career benchmarks. It is a smaller percentage, but it also means 1,040 more students this year met all four of the college and career ready benchmarks in Nevada than in 2014. Further statistics were provided.

Member Newburn said when this program rolled out, it was designed to give parents an early warning that if a student was college ready they could take college classes their senior year, or if not college ready they change senior classes to become college ready, or if they had never thought of college but discovered they were close, they could take college preps classes. It was designed to get more kids ready for college. Will there be any way of measuring whether the bill is having its intended effect, and will taking the test change senior behavior.

Deputy Canavero said there are opportunities for the state to work in consultation with school districts to establish a policy concerning the 12th grade year. Feedback from NASS was that the ACT was too late this year, which is why the ACT contract negotiated March 1 as the test date. Receiving test results earlier allows the student to contemplate what next.

Mr. Vineyard agreed with member Newburn, and said he understands the intent of the administration is not to provide data for the state to worry about the scores, but to provide an opportunity for students to get another measure of how they are progressing towards their post-secondary, whether it is college or career. For the purpose that it was selected the test is doing that by providing basic information to students. What comes next is important and he said he hopes by bringing the test earlier in the year and getting the results back, students will have an opportunity with a better knowledge base to work from as they plan for their 12th grade year.

Superintendent Erquiaga informed the Board that the new incoming president of NASS is Dave Jensen, who is the superintendent of Humboldt County. The ACT results were discussed and NASS has been asked to the Board meeting in September to discuss a planned response. The schools and the districts are required to respond based on the students identified college or career ready indicator. Statute specifies this board may collaborate with districts using that information to lead in establishing policies, remediation, to occur in high school rather than in college.

Member Serafin asked if they can get the scores by school. Mr. Vineyard said yes, the schools and districts will receive a data file with reports for the schools in their jurisdictions around the beginning of August. Member Serafin said she disagreed with Member Newburn regarding the

ACT test. When she took the test it enabled her to know what schools she would get into and what her options were. She said it is about providing accurate indicators so students so students know what is possible for them and they are not surprised.

Member Wakefield asked if these results can be included in the school performance framework. Superintendent Erquiaga said yes, and added the NEPF is due for revision as part of the waiver renewal. One suggestions that came from the preliminary advisory task force was to look at the high school measures and consider the ACT as a per school indicator point. That will be further discussed in the coming months. Member Wakefield asked if there could be a state by state comparison of the result. Superintendent Erquiaga said he would ask ACT to provide a full response but would need to wait until all state results are final, and then wait until ACT has a final publication of results.

Sue Wheeler, ACT, informed the Board they will provide a comparison on the high school graduating class profile report so Nevada will be able to see how they measure up with other states. That will not be apparent until the 2016 graduating class data. Then a comparison between Nevada's average ACT scores will be matched up against other states

Superintendent Erquiaga said it is a blow to see the test results. But as stated it is a baseline of where we are and a call to action. It is also a reminder of why Nevada, nor just in this legislative session, is investing and modernizing the education system that was out of sync with the 21st century. He asked to think back to the work that has been done on college and career ready standards. Remember how the common core standards were rolled out in Nevada, mathematics was not brought to high school for these kids we are not testing. That can be seen in their results. Our old math standards were not college ready standards. You can see it in our ACT score. As we bring mathematics standards to all students in high school and the next generation science standards to all students in high school, we should expect that number to go up. Be mindful the standards were changed for this reason. We were preparing students for basic proficiency, not college. There is a better jump in English, because Nevada English standards were more in line with the common core standards. These 11th graders had more years with higher standards in English. When we switched over that standard implementation four and five years ago, we switched over fully in English across all grades. There was better reinforcement. Yes, these test results are a blow and a reminder we must do better for all children not just those who self-identified as college ready. It is also an affirmation that we as Nevadans by increasing our focus on college and career ready standards, assessment, data and preparing kids for the New Nevada through this legislative session.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the granting of provisional approval to three educator preparation programs pursuant to NRS 391.038 and NAC 391.558. The Board will receive a report from the Review Teams recommending provisional approval for:

- a. National University - administrators
- b. National University - special education
- c. University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) – administrators

Deputy Durish informed the Board there are three items for Board consideration. She explained the National University submitted two programs for approval, and UNLV one program. The

Board can grant provisional approval at this time. There is an additional 12 month process with site visits with the provisional approval to ensure what is outlined in the plan is occurring. If the Board approves the three programs, which have made all the revisions requested of them, then at that point the team would pursue the 12 months outlined in NAC, then come back for a final approval rating to move forward with their programs. In the meantime the programs will be offered with provisional approval. The decision today is to grant provisional to one, two or all three of the institutions.

In response to a question from Member Melcher regarding the National University accreditation letters not being on public record, Member Serafin said a supplemental process was used for the report and it is not subject to public record. There letters of accreditation were submitted and are on file. Member Melcher noted the signatures as well as noting approval or provisional approval was inconsistent on the documents.

He suggested the forms need to be cleaned up. Deputy Durish said this is the first time for this process and there was a decision to not revise the forms from the last review team meeting. She was challenged with confusing NAC language and the intent is to clean it up. The review team does not recommend full approval, rather the choice is provisional approval or not provisional approval.

Member Wakefield commented he was excited to see the UNLV administrator program come to fruition.

Member Wakefield moved to approve the three programs. Member Holmes-Sutton moved to second the motion. The motion carried.

Future Agenda Items

Future agenda items include further information concerning teacher recruitment and retention in Nevada and further plans for the ACT test.

Public Comment

Sylvia Lazos provided a series of comments. She noticed the Latino students ACT scores were extremely low compared to any group. Currently the Latino population is 46 percent of CCSD and within ten years they will be the majority. If the Latino students are not helped to address the gap, the work force will be impacted. Ms. Lazos informed the Board that in 2012 a report indicated that in Las Vegas only one teacher out of 65, in 15 schools was teaching language development to the level of the common core. The rest of the teachers were not able to teach language development to the level of common core expectations. The quality of teaching in 2012 was not where it should have been in CCSD and she hope there has been progress since then. But she fears there is still a situation with teachers in the classroom and they cannot address the new Nevada population. The Commission on Professional Standards has resisted EMC recommendations because of a lack of understanding of what helps retain teachers in the classroom. You cannot have a teacher who comes to a classroom and has no knowledge based upon which to teach and expect that teacher not to panic and have the confidence to stay in the classroom. Our Victory schools are one third ELL and the ZOOM schools are 50 percent ELL. If

we do not address teacher preparation issue we will not have good results with this large investment.

Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District said that Washoe County School District would like to make a point on Item 13, about the possibility of a State Board prescribing a form by which districts could apply to use an equivalent evaluation system. On behalf of WCSD they would be happy to make that request in writing to staff.

The meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m.