

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

**Thursday, April 28, 2016**

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

And

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

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

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

**In Las Vegas:**

Tonia Holmes-Sutton  
Mark Newburn  
Allison Stephens (departed at 1:00 p.m.)  
Victor Wakefield  
Felicia Ortiz

**In Carson City:**

Teri Jamin  
Pat Hickey (departed at 12:00 p.m.)

**DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:**

**In Las Vegas**

Dena Durish, Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness & Family Engagement  
Sophia Masewicz, Department of Education

**In Carson City**

Mindy Martini, Deputy Superintendent, Business and Support Services  
Greg Bortolin, Public Information Officer  
Lauren Hulse, Management Analyst  
Peter Zutz, Administrator, Office of Assessments, Data and Accountability Management  
Dave Brancamp, Director, Standards and Instructional Support  
Mark Gabrylczyk, Director, Student and School Supports  
Tracy Gruber, Education Programs Professional  
Diane Mugford, Education Programs Professional  
Julian Montoya, Education Programs Professional,  
Tom MacDiarmid, Education Programs Professional

**In Carson City:**

Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:****In Las Vegas:**

Ignacia Ruiz, Clark County School District  
 Track Clark, Clark County School District  
 Bruce Clemmer, Clark County School District  
 Andre Yates, Clark County School District  
 Martin Kehe, GED  
 Dawn Huckaby, Washoe County School District  
 Mila Paul, Washoe County School District  
 Christine Williams  
 Gail Larson  
 Sylvia Lazos, Latino Leadership  
 Nicole Rourke, Clark County School District  
 Ed Bonessi, HNH  
 Jeff Wolfenden, HMM  
 Zane Gray, Sierra Nevada College  
 Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District  
 Jenn Blackhurst, HOPE  
 Monte Bay, National University  
 Sheryl Colgan, Clark County School District  
 Zach Stork, Clark County School District  
 Barry Herr  
 Lorna James-Cervantes, Clark County School District  
 Demetria Murphy, Leadership for Education Equity  
 Manny Lamarre, Governor's Office  
 Barbara Konrad, HOPE  
 Caryne Shea, HOPE  
 Donya Sanford, Parent  
 Mary Jane Dorofachuk, Nevada Arks Council  
 Karin Ekanger, Pearson Education  
 Heidi Arbuckle, Clark County School District

**Carson City:**

Melissa Burnham, UNR College of Education  
 Allison Combs, Nevada System of Higher Education  
 Dana Galvin, Washoe Education Association  
 Julie Waller, Fiscal, Legislative Council Bureau  
 Adam Drost, Fiscal, Legislative Council Bureau  
 Jaimarie Dagdagan, Fiscal, Legislative Council Bureau  
 Adam Drost, Legislative Council Bureau  
 Mary Pierczynski, Nevada School Association of Superintendents  
 Scott Bailey, Washoe County School District  
 Katrina Midgley, Sierra Nevada College  
 Barbara Gnatovich, Sierra Nevada College  
 Tierra Tranquillo, Sierra Nevada College  
 Kirsten Gleissner, NWRPDP  
 Kathleen Conaboy, McDonald Carano and Wilson

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

**Public Comment #1**

Dana Galvin, Washoe Education Association (WEA), explained that the Washoe County School District (WCSD) Danielson Evaluation has been a five year process that the WEA has been part of the from the beginning. She requested approval to keep their Danielson Framework for teaching evaluation. They have

made all of the changes asked of them from the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC). At the last council meeting the TLC approved WCSD using the Danielson model.

### **Approval of Flexible Agenda**

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

### **President's Report**

President Wynn announced that it will be Member Martinez's last meeting representing students in Nevada. Member Martinez thanked the Board for his all experiences serving Nevada students.

### **Superintendent's Report**

- Superintendent Canavero announced that next week is teacher appreciation week.
- A link has been provided on the Board's agenda for the Governor's Strategic Planning Framework. The document aligns the state with goals established by the Governor.
- This year the online assessment, Smarter Balanced (SBAC), has been successful. Credit goes to the school sites, teachers, principals and district superintendents for standing behind the assessment. There have been up to 60,000 students interacting on the assessment daily.
- Work continues with the districts regarding initiatives for teacher recruitment and retention.
- A slate of contracts was recently approved by the Board of Examiners related to accountability and reform including the external evaluators. Seven NDE programs including, ZOOM, Victory, Read by Grade Three, Underperforming Schools, Turnaround, social worker grants, Nevada Ready 21 and the Great Teaching and Leading program are evaluated by third parties.
- Nevada invested in a Harbormaster, an entity who helps create conditions for higher quality schools for students in poverty. The contract was awarded to Opportunity 189, the sole vendor. There are four main areas of work, supporting quality schools, strengthens educator pipelines, community engagement and a research component.
- Updates on NDE personnel were provided, two new hires and one departure.

### **Approval of Consent Agenda**

- a. Possible approval of Abbey C. Gardner-Nash Stipulation and Order for Suspension
- b. Possible appointment of nominees to fill the current vacancies on the SEAC as recommended by staff.
  - Jodee Prudente – Special Education Teacher – North
  - Lauren Bruni – Private Schools
  - Meskerem Kassa – Parents of Children with Disabilities and/or Individual with Disabilities
  - Daniel O'Gara – Parents of Children with Disabilities and/or Individual with Disabilities
  - Lisa Rosas – Parents of Children with Disabilities and/or Individual with Disabilities
  - Rosalie Woods – Parents of Children with Disabilities and/or Individual with Disabilities
- c. Possible Approval of March 17 minutes
- d. Possible Approval of:
  - Re-licensing of 2 Clark County Private Schools for two-year periods: Christian Montessori Academy and Sunset Montessori School
  - Re-licensing of 1 Clark County Private School for a four-year period: CornerStone Christian Academy.

- e. Possible Approval of Clark, Nye and Carson County School District textbooks

**Member Newburn Moved to approve the consent agenda. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the State's Class-size Reduction (CSR) Program and the report of second quarter CSR variances for submission to the Interim Finance Committee (NRS 388.700)**

Dana Embro, Business and Support Services, conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation about the FY2016 second quarter variance request and the quarterly interim finance report, and explained the different class size reduction options.

**Member Newburn moved to approve the Class Size Reduction Program (CSR) and the second quarter variances report for submission to the Interim Finance Committee. Member Ortiz seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

President Wynn noted the CSR program is a source of frustration and confusion for Nevada. Although Nevada legislators have made it a point to try and get smaller class sizes it continues to feel like an unfunded mandate. She suggested the Board give more thought to the program and suggested the legislature address it further. Approving variances is an indication that something is not working right.

**Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding FY16 and FY17 Teach Nevada Scholarships pursuant to SB511. The Board will consider criteria for the FY17 Scholarship application Washoe County School District reallocating unused funds to be awarded for the Teach Nevada Scholarship.**

- a. The Board will hear an update on the status of \$360,000 previously awarded to Washoe County School District for fifteen FY16 scholarships, and members will consider possible re-allocation of unused FY16 funds to maximize the impact of the scholarships.
- b. The Board will review a projected timeline for FY17 scholarship applications and may establish FY17 scholarship priorities.

Dena Durish, deputy superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement, recalled that the Board reallocated additional funding for scholarships at the last meeting. Washoe County School District projected they would have 15 students and the projected cost would be \$24,000 for each participant. They partnered with more than one institution of higher education to complete the course work. Fifteen recipients have been awarded scholarship money. The recipients chose to attend different higher education institutions which resulted in \$127,000 unused of the original amount of \$360,000. Deputy Durish discussed three options to re-allocate the unused funds:

1. Recommend WCSD use the \$127,000 remaining funds for seven additional scholarships. Any funds remaining from the seven scholarships would be returned for 2016-17.
2. Reallocate a portion of \$127,000 to WCSD and a portion to other providers.
3. Rollover the \$127,000 to the 2016-17 application. This would not yield graduates until December opposed to August.

**Member Wakefield moved to accept recommendation #1, WCSD will use the \$127,000 remaining funds for seven additional scholarships. Any funds remaining from the seven scholarships would be returned for 2016-17. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

The Board considered the timeline for the FY 17 scholarship applications and priorities. Deputy Durish explained item b and stated the law does not prohibit or require offering the scholarship to alternative route to licensure (ARL) providers or traditional providers. Last year there were 14 applications from several institutions, some were traditional, some were ARL and some were both. The Board decided that teachers are needed in classrooms as soon as possible and awarded 134 scholarships. Two considerations were presented:

1. Open the scholarship to all participants and programs or limit it to ARL providers.
2. Consider prioritization of scholarships based on teachers who have identified a program area in content areas including elementary, secondary language arts, math science and special education, and demonstrated students meet one or more of criteria including a veteran or spouses of veterans, economically disadvantaged or a racial minority.

Member Wakefield asked for the big picture of this fund. Deputy Durish responded that the fund is to increase the teacher pipeline and use the scholarships to recruit teachers. It was not intended to go to a student who has already begun a teacher education program. The intent is to recruit the best and brightest candidates to go into the career of teaching. Member Wakefield asked if it is possible to have an application process that is simple and shows a University is able to expand their teacher pipeline and prioritize the subgroup populations. Member Ortiz asked if the schools are using a consistent standard application, do they meet the criteria so it can be prioritized.

Member Jensen responded that Humboldt School District is one of the providers. Originally, they awarded five scholarships and have a waiting list. Those five represent about five percent of their teaching staff. These individuals will provide an immediate impact on Humboldt County School District and he expressed appreciation. He has seen an immediate impact, appreciates the opportunity and will apply again.

Board members discussed options to include in a motion.

**Member Wakefield moved that the 2016-17 applications is open to alternative route providers which will result in scholarship recipients being eligible for initial licensure and hire by December 2016. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Member Ortiz moved that awards of grants will be prioritized by scholarship recipients identified in programs areas in Elementary, Secondary Language Arts, Math, Science and Special Education and recipients who demonstrate they are Veterans or Spouses of Veterans, Economically Disadvantaged and are a Racial/Ethnic Minority. In addition, the program will have a plan to grow its enrollment year over year which is in the spirit of the law and the school who receives the scholarships has the intent to grow their program and increase the pipeline of students' year over year. Member Wakefield seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Public Hearing and possible adoption of proposed amendments in R050-16; NAC Chapter 385 and NAC Chapter 389. The proposed amendment to NAC 385.408 Minimum passing scores - changes the standard score for the GED® Test from 150 to 145. The proposed amendment to NAC 389.694 Waiver of credits for adult standard diploma - changes the scores which a person must achieve on the GED Testing Service (2014 Series) assessment to waive credits for an adult standard diploma.** The GED testing service announced a national change to minimum cut scores from 150 to a 145. As the cut scores for all three state-approved High School Equivalence (HSE) tests are in Nevada Administrative Code for the purposes of credit waiver for the adult standard diploma program.

The hearing was opened at 10:04 a.m. with 24 individuals present in Carson City and 29 individuals present in Las Vegas.

Mike Raponi, director, Office of Career, Readiness, Adult and Education Options informed the Board that this amendment adjusts the minimum passing score of the GED test from 150 to 145. Historically the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) has always been aligned to the minimum passing score on these national tests. In January 2014 GED released its current version of the test which was aligned to the Common Core or the Nevada Academic Standards. Since that time, through the testing processes, GED testing service made the decision on the national level to readjust the minimum passing score from 150 to 145. This creates a regulation that establishes a cut score and allows the NDE to go back retroactively and

award those students who scored between 145 and 149, since January 1, 2014, a certificate of high school equivalency. It was determined that approximately 200 adult students are impacted by the new cut score. They are potentially without a certificate and if this regulation is approved, they can go back and ensure those students are awarded a certificate of high school equivalency in Nevada. Mr. Raponi clarified Nevada is not lowering standards. Historically the regulation has always been aligned with the national test score. There are over 30 states using the GED and the nationally recognized cut score of 145.

### **Public Comment**

Mr. Martin Kehe, vice president, GED Testing Service, informed the Board that the set of scoring enhancements, the adjustment of the cut score from 150 to 145, and two additional performance levels, one GED college ready, and GED college ready plus credit, were established. If students receive a score in a certain range, they can be deemed college ready and skip placement testing when they go to college. If they score in the highest level they can earn up to 10 college credits.

Data was gathered ten days ago and there are about 1400 students in Nevada that can get a credential now since January of 2014. In addition, 550 Nevada students have achieved GED College ready and are individuals that if they go to college can avoid placement testing. There were 202 students who achieved GED College ready, which means they have earned the score to receive college credit in at least one or more of the content areas on the test.

The reaction has been positive across the country. Most of the GED administrating states had changed the cut score as of March 1. There are two states remaining that have not formally accepted the cut score, Nevada and New Jersey.

**Member Newburn moved to approve the amendments. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

### **Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding prescribing statewide performance levels and outcome indicators to measure the effectiveness of the Zoom programs and service.**

The Board will receive a progress report regarding district Zoom programs and services to understand the proposed performance levels and outcome indicators that align with statewide accountability measures for schools that service English learners. Based on NDE recommendations, the Board may take preliminary steps to establish performance levels and outcome indicators and outlines in S.B. 402 (1) (13).

Karl Wilson, Education Programs Professional, informed the Board he will provide an update from the NDE about the impact on EL acquisition. Information from both CCSD and WCSD will be provided about measurements in place for the last two years about the academic impact of the Zoom program.

Mr. Wilson conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation about Zoom school outcomes and recommendations for performance levels and outcome indicators. In 2013 when the legislature approved S.B. 504 it targeted significant funding to CCSD and WCSD to establish Zoom schools. The schools selected served the highest percentage of EL, were the lowest performing, and were elementary schools. Three types of Zoom schools were referenced in the report:

- Zoom schools that were served in 2013-15
- Next Zoom schools, they were not Zoom during 2013-14 and 2014-15 but are part of the expansion in the 2015-16 school year. These schools are most like the initial Zoom schools but were higher performing than initial Zoom schools.
- Non-Zoom schools that were not funded as Zoom in 2013-14 and 2014-15.

Mr. Wilson stated the recommendations is for outcome indicators and performance levels to move the state to one accountability system that would satisfy state and federal requirements and will take growth

towards proficiency into account. Adequate growth percentile calculations are typically based on a five year projection for English learners. The expectation is that within five years they would achieve English language proficiency. Reviewed data indicates that the Zoom program and services are having a positive impact on English language acquisition.

Dr. Danielle Miller, assistant superintendent of instructional design and professional learning, Clark County School District (CCSD) conducted a PowerPoint presentation. Currently they have 29 schools, 26 elementary, 2 middle schools and one high school. They service over 22,000 students with Zoom funding, which is 18 percent of the CCSD EL students. They are adding nine schools in the 2016-17 school year. Ms. Miller further discussed:

- The language and literacy skills of the 49 Pre-Ks currently operating within the 26 elementary schools.
- The 148 kindergartens up and running with Zoom and the focus on writing for kindergarten students.
- Open reading centers for student's not making progress and transferring skills learned there to a classroom.
- Adding 17 additional days of instruction to apply skills learned all year.
- Family involvement.
- Recruitment and incentive pay for teachers in Zoom schools.
- The students and their academic results served under the Zoom funding.

Eric Finney, coordinator, Zoom and Victory Schools, WCSD, explained they currently serve over 15 schools and over 7,000 students with the goal to expand to 24 schools adding 3 middle schools next school year. There are 15 kindergarten classrooms and they offer 18 additional instructional days similar to CCSD. He reported on:

- The challenges faced serving just 32 percent of EL learners and 21 percent of Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students. About one in five of the students in WCSD are second language learners.
- The Reading Skills Center.
- Structural changes in Zoom schools regarding the fidelity of implementation beyond just the training.
- Challenge of scaling up, refining and calibrating the work with literacy for second language learners.
- The importance of Pre-K kids transitioning into school earlier with access to develop early literacy skills.

Member Wakefield said at the last meeting they were given data that there is a four percent vacancy rate of teachers in classrooms, but in Zoom schools there is a six percent vacancy rate. He asked WCSD and CCSD to respond.

Mr. Finney said speaking anecdotally about trends across the country for staffing in Title I schools, that having a high quality teacher in front of the kids is the most important thing that can be done.

When starting the school year short of teachers and using substitutes, whether in a high or low achieving schools, students are negatively impacted. High quality teachers are needed in the classroom and high quality teachers are needed.

Ms. Miller said the CCSD new teacher contract is a step in the right direction with opportunities for teachers to be compensated for the work they do in at risk schools. They are working on more job embedded support for teachers and seeing how it is beneficial for teachers to work in at risk schools; not just because they love the kids but they feel compensated

Member Wakefield recalled that 30 percent of EL students are being served by Zoom schools and asked if that number is going up next year. Mr. Finney responded they are going to add nine new schools next year and will have 24 schools, or about 32 percent. Ms. Miller said only 18 percent of CCSD ELs are in Zoom schools, and they have 217 elementary schools. It will more than 18 percent next year when nine more schools are added.

Discussion ensued about accessing performance in individual schools and accountability measures if students are not achieving. In response to an inquiry about where students are taught, Mr. Finney responded that although they are over-crowded, they use their Reading Skills Center. From an instructional standpoint, the model they use meets the needs of the kids in the classroom with high quality tier one instruction. When kids are not growing or moving they respond by additional instruction. Schools make it work. Sometimes it is working with kids in another classroom, but much is happening in current classrooms by providing kids access to tier one instruction. They also use teaching assistants with small groups.

Traci Davis, superintendent, WCSD, acknowledged they have severe overcrowding in schools. The short story is there are two choices, double sessions and year round, or schools will need to be built. Part of their mission is maintaining schools in addition to building schools.

Member Jamin asked if the nine new schools being added are coming from the group of Next Zoom schools that are not receiving Zoom services. Mr. Finney clarified that he has a group of seven schools that are brand new this year, part of that data set, and in addition nine new schools will be added next year for another expansion. In response to Member Jamin's inquiring about data, Mr. Finney suggested that data should be viewed from a variety of ways. A comparison group is needed and it is powerful when the data from year one schools that are headed into the third year is pulled. It is an indication of how long change takes to occur.

Mr. Wilson said the comparisons he wants to share today is how the original Zoom schools have done compared to schools most like them that were not served with the Zoom funding. Those have come on board this year and are most like them although they started out at a higher level of performance. There will be an independent evaluation that will look at the data in a more comprehensive way. We are now approaching the end of the third year of Zoom. There is an annual report the districts prepare for the Board and legislature.

Mr. Wilson informed the Board that the next part of the presentation includes recommendations for the Board's consideration regarding outcome indicators and performance levels. Beginning with the outcome indications and how they are measured. The recommendation is that it is in Nevada's interest to develop one aligned accountability system, which would also satisfy federal requirements. Recommendations Mr. Wilson discussed include:

Zoom Outcome Indicators

- **1A** The percent of students meeting Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP) on the composite score of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Access for ELLs

#### Zoom Performance Levels

- **2A** The Board establishes an interim performance level target for SY 2015-16 and SY 2016-17 on the ELPA. The AGP target for Zoom schools would be set at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile AGP performance for all schools in the state with sufficient N-count of EL students.

#### Zoom Outcome Indicators

- **1B** Use the EL subgroup accountability for content assessments that will be designed in the Nevada School Rating System.

#### Zoom Performance Levels

- **2B** NDE recommends that the Board establish interim performance level targets for SY 2016-17 on the Nevada statewide content assessments for Mathematics and English Language Arts. The AGP target for Zoom schools would be set at a percentile of AGP performance based on data from the SY 2015-16 results for all schools in the state with sufficient N-count of EL students.

#### Zoom Corrective Actions

- **2C** NDE recommends that the Board designate the following as possible corrective actions for any Zoom schools not meeting state performance or not making adequate progress toward achievement of state performance levels:
  - Submission of a corrective plan
  - Increased NDE monitoring of the corrective action plan
  - Possibility of reduction in Zoom funding

Mr. Wilson explained the recommendation is that the Board defines the outcome indicator to be those measures that are adopted for the academic performance for Nevada. The next component is that statute directs the Board to identify corrective actions. If Zoom schools are not implementing the programs and services as outlined by law, or are not meeting the performance levels defined by the Board, then there needs to be corrective actions specifically outlined. If a school is identified as in need of a corrective action plan, there would be increased monitoring by the NDE to ensure that the plan is implemented. If all good faith efforts have been made but they are still not achieving that, there is the possibility of reduction of Zoom funding

President Wynn stated the expectation for the Board is to approve outcome indicators and performance levels and in terms of corrective actions, we can make recommendations going forward with regard to that. But the other two areas are specifically identified for action today. She expressed dependence on the NDE to make recommendations and the Board abides with them, until they are not happy with them.

Member Jensen clarified throughout the presentation the term Zoom schools was used, but it is recognized in smaller districts that they do not have schools; they have programs, primarily early childhood. How do these apply to the smaller districts? Mr. Wilson said the difference is the amount of resources that goes into the Zoom schools including a requirement that there is a full set of services provided in the Zoom schools in CCSD and WCSD. In districts and charter schools, other than CCSD and WCSD, they are Zoom programs and services, not the full complement and not the same kind of funding.

Member Newburn asked what the NDE will be using as the accountability system, or is there none until the new system rolls out. Mr. Wilson said because of the inability to connect AGP to the SBAC, this year, will look at the data to get a feel for how well EL learners are doing in the state. They will begin to input that information a year from now for the two sets of data that are necessary to calculate AGP.

Dr. Canavero commented that this is Nevada establishing some accountability statewide. It does not obviate districts from collecting and being accountable for outcomes for these students and Nevada will be interested in leveraging those local data sets to appreciate the impact and efficacy for those

interventions at the school level. The third party evaluation will have accountability to implementation and alignment of funding and appropriate use of funding. There will not be many outcomes for some programs. Zoom we will be leveraging much of the local data sets to bring to legislature to demonstrate program efficacy.

Member Wakefield asked, in the big picture, who is the audience of the accountability that the Board sets. Is it for the legislature to look at whether these investments are a success? Is it for districts to support their own analysis of the current state? It is hard to offer a motion if the big picture of the intent of this legislation and the choice today is not understood. Dr. Canavero said there are accountability assessment provisions at all levels to inform from instructional decisions to the state. Today, it is primarily informing the legislature of a continued investment or increased investment in a Zoom categorical towards a particular weight and understanding as dollars are expended, where do we get the impact on students outcomes and bring a package to the Governor and legislature to expand the funding or not.

Member Jamin asked under the corrective actions, what is the possibility of reduction in Zoom funding for a particular school, the impact on the students on that school, would they be transferred to another school? We need to make sure the students are adequately funded.

President Wynn just mentioned that in terms of action today, that we could defer the conversation about corrective action because this kind of activity is going to be involved in lots of the programs that we have launched. It might require a task force that can get into this more deeply. There could be consequences we do not want to deal with lightly. What we are doing today is confined to the outcome indicators and performances levels. The Board needs to take action on recommendation, the outcome indicators and recommendation 2, the performance levels, a and b and defer on c ([PowerPoint](#))

Member Wakefield said he was stuck on the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile. If this is going to be the report card by which the legislature is looks at Zoom investments, and we say that 50<sup>th</sup> percentile in growth is the benchmark that we expect schools to make, then our choice today has consequences about the way the legislature discusses this item. If schools miss it completely, then there could be a conclusion the program is a failure and should not be renewed. Dr. Canavero said you could establish a 50<sup>th</sup> percentile as a goal, but also measure progress through the percentile ranking for the schools. If a school is in the 23<sup>rd</sup> percentile and over the course of three years, it moves from the 23<sup>rd</sup> to the 47<sup>th</sup>, you could imbed in the motion that is to be included as a growth model.

President Wynn asked how to get specific on that and Member Wakefield asked why do that and the 50<sup>th</sup> and not just do a growth model. Mr. Wilson stated, there have been different perspectives. Part of it was the state should establish a goal that all schools should be working to equal or exceed, but there was a discussion that if a school is not yet there, when we look at corrective action, what we would prescribe would be dependent on if they are not yet at the 50<sup>th</sup> percent percentile, are they showing improvement toward it. If a school starts below the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile but within three years see progress towards the state standard. Then the expectation for corrective action would be different than a school that is below the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile but not seeing improvement towards that expectation.

Member Wakefield said he has a significant reservation against the absolute bar. We are saying that we only expect children in our Zoom schools to become 50<sup>th</sup> percentile children compared to other EL learners growth. I would not want them to become 50<sup>th</sup> percentile students against all children in Nevada because we are investing in the difference. The idea is we are giving them an opportunity to succeed on an absolute scale. The premise I am coming in with is, we have completely unacceptable outcomes for EL learners in Nevada. If we take the middle point of that, that is still unacceptable. And then it we take the Zoom schools and just want to get to the mid-point of our EL learner outcomes, that does not pass an equity test. That also does not feel that is something we should rally around. It feels like we are benchmarking against performance we and uncomfortable with versus actually trying to benchmark against our goal with is to ensure children have the supports they need to be successful in like and can compete with any child.

Member Newburn said he thought the AGP was both status and growth. Mr. Wilson said the AGP is a calculation that is individually student measured. It takes them from where they started and calculates have they achieved proficiency and if not, have they made enough progress towards proficiency within a given year to be on track to achieve that. The performance level we are discussing is not we are asking for individual students to get 50 percent there, we are saying as schools, what percent of your students are achieving. Member Wakefield asked, comparison to what, any child? Mr. Wilson clarified EL at the same grade level who started in a similar position as them from the previous years assessment.

Member Ortiz, said to Member Wakefield's point, if those students we are comparing against are at a much lower level than we want them to be, and comparing against them is not a good comparison to show the programs are being effective. Mr. Wilson said you are comparing students who started at a similar spot, not students who are far above them or far below. When they take the assessment in the spring of 2014 it helps to determine what would be that appropriate trajectory for that student compared to other students who started at the same grade level, same proficiency and moving forward.

Dr. Canavero said the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile is a measurement of a rate of change, it is not a proficiency standard. We would be expecting Zoom schools to have higher than average, or higher than the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile in terms of a rate of change having students met there adequate growth percentile. A student take the WIDA, gets a score, then it is projected that within X number of years that student would need to continue to increase their EL proficiency on that battery of assessments at that level in order to meet AGP. As a school turns them, then the rate of that would be compared to the rate of that change in non Zoom settings that have ten or more EL students.

Member Wakefield reiterated that in theory a school with a very high percentage of EL learners must be in the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile of growth against any school that has EL learners at least ten. So that is a comparison against most schools.

Jonathan Gibson, part of Karls team said he can help with some of these questions. Currently we are looking at 328 schools that made the N-count. To Member Wakefield's concern, in setting the target that will become part of the states accountability system for AGP being met for the EL proficiency assessment, currently in the interim the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile has some compelling possibilities. But the intent to set the target as part of the accountability will not use just Nevada data, but will access the full WIDA consortium data so that we will not be setting the benchmark against Nevada's specific performance. We will go nationwide to include 34 states and approximately 1.5 million students and from that peer group we will be setting the target for performance. That will not happen until probably the 2016-17 as we develop the accountability system with the WIDA access scores. The 50<sup>th</sup> percentile is an interim step, but the intent is that the full accountability that will be set is a target will go beyond the Nevada performance to national performance in the WIDA consortium.

President Wynn clarified we are talking about an interim measure that until we can get all of the pieces in place, that will give us a more accurate way to grade. Member Wakefield said he thought the goal was the Zoom schools would enable students to achieve. President Wynn said this is not suggesting that is not still our goal, this is just a piece of mechanics that we need to have in place so that there is some guidance and range or measurement that can be discussed as we adjust the accountability piece when we have more data in place.

**Member Wakefield moved that for Zoom English language proficiency and literacy to use the percent of students meeting Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP) on the Composite score of the WIDA ACCESS for ELLs (Nevada's ELPA). Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Member Wakefield moved that for the Zoom academic achievement and growth indications in the subject areas of English/Language Arts and Mathematics to use the EL subgroup accountability for**

**content assessments that will be designed in the Nevada School Rating System. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Member Wakefield moved that for the Zoom English language proficiency level that the State Board establishes an interim performance level target for SY 2015-16 and SY 2016-17 on the ELPA. The AGP target for Zoom schools would be set at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile AGP performance for all schools in the state with sufficient N-count of EL students and this as an interim benchmark that represents progress towards our long term aspiration using nationally data to ensure outcomes for EL students. Member Ortiz seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Member Wakefield moved that academic achievement and growth indicators in the subject areas of English/Language Arts and Mathematics, the State Board establish interim performance level targets for SY 2016-17 on the Nevada statewide content assessments for Mathematics and English Language Arts. The AGO target for Zoom schools would be set at a percentile of AGP performance based on data from the SY 2015-16 results for all schools in the state with sufficient N-count of EL student. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried**

President Wynn suggested because corrective actions will be consistent with future requirements of future programs that as an agenda item, they can be given a list at that time, of corrective action activity that needs to be anticipated for the programs in place. Dr. Canavero agreed.

**Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the Washoe County School District Application to use an Alternate Teacher Evaluation System.**

Deputy Durish conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation and explained that S.B 447 allows for a school district to apply to the State Board to use a different performance evaluation system and tools. In the past the existing law gave districts flexibility to use different tools but the standards and indicators equivalent to those in the statewide performance evaluation system. Through a federal grant WCSD has been working with a different evaluation than the state system. The law allows WCSD to apply to the Board the requirement is to show if it is determined that the proposed system and tools apply the standards and indicators that are equivalent to those prescribed by the Board. Washoe County School District is only applying to use their teacher evaluation; they are using the NEPF for administrators.

Kathleen Galland-Collins, Education Programs Professional, informed the Board that the preliminary review was presented to the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) January, 2016. The WCSD Teacher Evaluation System was found to be not equivalent to the NEPF. The TLC offered WCSD the opportunity to reapply with a revised application or provide additional evidence to show equivalency to the standards and indicators. In February and March NDE staff met with WCSD personnel and explained in detail some of the NEPF standards and indicators and discussed the review. In April WCSD came back with a different application, Version II. The application was reviewed again for equivalency, but there were still a few things missing. The feedback provided by the NDE was concept versus action. The final review in of the WCSD revised application found it mostly equivalent. There were a few that were partially equivalent and only one standard and three indicators that were deemed as not equivalent on the professional responsibility side. Version 3 had no indicators that were not matched equivalent with the instructional side, zero were marked as not equivalent for the instructional piece. They are 79 percent equivalent because four were marked as partially equivalent. On the professional responsibility side they are 67 percent equivalent with 13 percent partially, and 20 percent not equivalent. That 20 percent is made up of three indicators which all of standard five, the student perception piece. The instructional standards are weighted more heavily than the professional responsibility standards. When TLC reviewed the document they voted it as mostly equivalent.

The TLC voted to recommend the approval of the WCSD application for use as an alternate teacher system. After much deliberation they concluded it was equivalent enough to meet the needs of students. The proposal from TLC is that the Board accepts the recommendation of the TLC to approve WCSDs application to use an Alternate Teacher Evaluation System.

Member Jamin asked what the WCSDs rationale for using an alternative system for teachers and not for administrators.

Dawn Huckabee, chief human resources officer, WCSD responded that they have been working on their evaluation system in collaboration with their teachers and administrators since 2010 through the work of their teacher incentive fund grant. Through three legislative sessions there was always the ability of a district to have flexibility or apply for flexibility to the use of the alternative evaluation system tools. They have worked in collaboration and worked beyond just the evaluation tool where they aligned their professional learning to the indicators in their evaluation rubric. It is now online in a human capital management system where those professional opportunities are tied to those standards. Also, they developed a peer systems and review process based on the rubric. There is a whole professional growth system they developed over the course of the past five years. It was something that they thought was important to be able to continue the work. They feel strongly that they met the definition of an equivalent and can align to the NEPF and want to be a part of a state wide system. This provides them an opportunity to continue their work and align with the NEPF.

Mike Paul, director, professional growth system, WCSD clarified the work with their teacher evaluation systems started with one of their teacher incentive fund grants received in 2010. It was a federal grant of approximately \$9 million dollars and about \$3 million of that went to helping to develop their evaluation system they currently have. There has been a tremendous amount of training, time, resources and effort in the beginning of putting this together. Throughout the last several years of developing their evaluation system, the level of trust that has developed with teachers and administrators and the partnership with the teachers association has been tremendous. They have so much invested within their rubric and evaluation that they want to continue to work based on their evaluation system. They want to tie the evaluation system they are currently using through the standards of language in their rubric and indicators, all of their professional growth opportunities, specifically tied to their rubric, so when their teachers are evaluated they can align professional development to their rubric and evaluation. They can also align their peer assistance and review program specifically to their evaluation. Their evaluation has grown to a professional growth system and they want to be able to continue that work. They think they have demonstrated a high degree of equivalency.

In response to the question why teacher and not administrator, Mr. Paul stated they did not have the same investment in the administrator evaluation. They have not had a comprehensive development of a an administrator tool. It made sense for them to go with an administrator tool to be online with everyone else because they did not have a strong robust system.

President Wynn declared WCSD is an important and strong and partner in the education of Nevada students. As a member of the business community, she said she seems something here that if she were a parent she would not be able to effectively explain what was just said. It is the WCSD teacher evaluation system to be mostly a privilege. It does not say exactly, it says mostly. When looking at percentages it says 74 percent. She is hearing they were entrepreneurial, they went out, researched, got a grant to do this on their one, took a difficult path and did something they are proud of, not they are being told they are superimposing on top of their work something different or new and forcing it. Despite a couple of attempts to do it, some resulting in better numbers, we still do not have a perfect equivalency. If I were a parent in WCSD I would want to know what is missing. Why are teachers in every other part of the state expected to be doing something that WCSD is not doing. It if is financial bondage, a condition of the grant, that would be important. But in terms of the substance, the concept, she is having trouble with this.

Ms. Huckabee responded she understands the concerns that they are not exactly the same. When they talk about equivalency they are saying, conceptually, it is very close. It is not equal, but in their rubric and in the NEPF rubric it is close to being the same. Dr. Paul said one of the most critical things taken into consideration was they appreciated the feedback and the way it was outlined. When looking at they they thought the most important piece was the equivalency and mindset, with is the conceptual framework of

the evaluation. What does this mean, what are we looking at when evaluating a teacher, the concepts of the evaluation. There are 30 of the 34 indicators that are deemed to be fully aligned in concept. That is a high level of equivalency when looking at the conceptual pieces and matching up the framework. Specifically addressing the standard number 5, there was a grade discussion during the TLC meeting, and the reason that standard, when looking at the cross walk developed to show how the standards and indicators is going to cross over to the NEPF standards and indicators, they looked at the evidence and the way they are going to collect the information to rate the components within their evaluation system compared to the NRPF. All of those processes and procedures and the way they are going to collect evidence is identical to the NEPF. They are not trying to get away from anything different in the NEPF with just the tool itself. Explaining this to TLC, they talked about they would be doing student surveys, interviews during observation, principals or the observers talking to the students to get their perception based on what is in the NEPF. When looking at how their rubrics cross over with each other, there are pieces that cross over but are not work for word matched that were deemed to be on that equivalent in those work for work actions. But they have evidence indicators that will collect the same type of evidence to get those student perceptions to put into the evaluation.

Dr. Pam Salazar, chair, TLC explained that in terms of the recommendation from TLC for the approval of this system as an equivalent system, and addressed the sticky points. There must be a way for WCSD to report back on the standards and indicators of the NEPF along with every other district so there is a way to assure that regardless of where the teacher is, the levels of performance across those standards and indicators are equivalent. When there is an aggregate report of all 17 school districts, that their data that is submitted from WCSD does not measure anything different from any other districts that are utilizing the NEPF as it sits with standards and indicators. The TLC thought that after listening to the explanation for the standard 5, in professional responsibilities, that they were going to be able to report back levels of performance for teachers in the same manner as any other district across the state. What is most important is that we are evaluating teachers, and regardless of what district a teacher is, the final rating of their performers, highly effective, effective, minimally effective or ineffective, needs to come from the same kind of measures. Although the 74 percent does not look like exactly the same equivalency, in terms of the capacity for their system to measure those 34 indicators in the same way they are measured in the other 16 districts, seemed to the TLC they are going to be able to do that. One of the recommendations that came from TLC, because they already built professional development system with a number of videos and modules to support their teachers that there were two big recommendations. One, teachers and administrators will need to be trained on the NEPF standards and materials so they can ensure calibration. The second recommendation is that the krust website which hosts all of the multitude of resources that are research based are fundamental to the concept of the NEPF, that those be integrated into their work in WCSD to they would have faith what they are getting in a report from the 17 districts, that their data that goes into the report is consistent and measuring the same thing it is measuring in the other 16 districts. The TLC felt that based on all of the presentation by WCSD, reviewing the alignment and the modifications and revisions made in their system in order to get to equivalency, it is important to note that conceptually understanding the difference of the NEPF versus most other systems, all are built on strong research. None of the evaluation systems have any kind of research that this causes greater student outcomes. They can report back across those 34 indicators with comparable data that would be in alignment with the other 16 districts.

Member Hickey said the law says the evaluation system can be different but equivalent. We do not want perfect equivalency to stand in the way of good work as in this case.

**Member Hickey moved to approve regarding the WCSD application and to use their alternative teacher evaluation system and support the application. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Information and Discussion regarding the rubric used to evaluate the application for the Great Teaching and Leading Fund Process.**

The Great Teaching and Leading Fund (GTLF) was created in the State General Fund during Nevada's 78th Legislative Session (2015) via Senate Bill 474 (SB474). The purpose of the GTLF is to provide professional development, programs of preparation, peer assistance/review, and leadership training and development for teachers, administrators, and other licensed educational personnel, as well as programs to recruit, select, and retain effective teachers and principals.

Funding and

Deputy Durish explained the Board approved the priorities for the Great Teaching and Leading F (GTLF) und for the 2016-17 at the last meeting. There was a member request to think about what does the actual application and process look like, what is the rubric scoring process. This is a discussion to get feedback before they standup the application which she hopes to do on May 16. There are two support documents today, one is a review and timeline of what was done last year. On September 3, 2015 recommendations were made to the Board by the superintendent, she would like to bring this to the July 21 board meeting. The funds are not accessible until July 1, and if they could get the first distribution of money out to the applicants in time to start spending three weeks after the fiscal year starts they would be happy.

The GTFL was distributed to multiple programs with different outcomes. There will not be a report from them until October 31, 2016 because the law specifies they have 120 days to compile a report to show results. In addition, this is one of seven programs that will be reviewed by an external evaluator. The bill specifies that the NDE will develop a review team. She went to their partners, and their list almost everyone applied for these funds. She presented a list of applicants to be considered for the application review team.

Deputy Durish provided the 2015 application for the Board's consideration and discussed various components of the application. When applications were received they were checked for completeness. A team met to review and score the 36 applications. It was a thoughtful process and discussion but it was a challenge. There are no funds for the review team. When an application had missing information or did not meet the intent of the law they were automatically disqualified.

President Wynn asked how to other states engage in grant making. Deputy Durish responded it varies, some states put teams together within the department, laws specify the practice in some states and other states have funded committees. President Wynn said this is a state department function and the NDE will need to come to terms on how this can best be done.

Member Ortiz commented that it could be beneficial to evaluate this from a larger perspective in giving out more grants. Maybe there is a single application with the potential to apply for multiple grants at the same time. That way less applications are being reviewed. Also, if this is done online the computers could be doing the evaluations depending on how applications is designed, so the review team is only reviewing the subjective material and take this into consideration to alleviate the need for more resources. President Wynn said this seems to be Member Ortiz's area of expertise and she was asked to be a liaison from the board with staff to help them with the process. Member Ortiz agreed.

Member Newburn commented that because the new science standards are involves, there will be decisions about whether the proposals are aligned with the new science standards and fit a larger strategy. It will be important to have someone on the evaluation team who has that knowledge. It is tricky, because everyone that has that knowledge will be bidding on this. He offered help in finding someone who can do that.

President Wynn offered that it would not be inappropriate to identify some operatives who are compensated that have a special skill that is going to be required and can make this a position where there is consistency. Member Wakefield suggested having an expert from all three of the prioritized areas. Also it would be good to make a definition of minimum, adequate, excellent prior to getting the application. Last year there was a rubric but not a definition of what it would take to get scored in each one. Additionally the factors could be weighted different, he suggested looking at results for efficacy to weight

the most. Research backing is important but an organization who has an excellent track record could be weighted highly. Does the law preclude us from having the NDE do the first round of review, then the committee to vet the reviews, if within the law to avoid the issue of asking from the public? Most review processes involve multiple grounds to check for fairness and bias. Deputy Durish asked for clarification about the last point. He said he does not know if it is possible within the law, but one model could be to have a staff member trained in the rubric, make a first review and do a normative review against the performance criteria, then the committee could vet those versus asking the committee to do the first score.

President Wynn suggested a Task Force to work on this, but Deputy Durish should do a first pass and see how far she gets. In areas that need clarity and assistance, a Task Force can be assembled to dig deeper. Deputy Durish noted that a position came with the GTLF and someone was just hired that will start on May 16 as a full time staff member dedicated to this work.

**Presentation and Discussion regarding the State Board's 5-year Strategic Plan (NRS 385.3593) and placing the Every Student Succeeds Act in service to Nevada's priorities.**

Dr. Canavero explained he will present what he believes are the next right steps for us especially as alignment, coherence, stability, ESSA, and the Governor's Strategic Framework are considered. He conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation.

Dr. Canavero discussed the 5-year Strategic Plan and the State Improvement Plan (STIP) that is unaligned to the 2012 strategic plan that was adopted. He advocated alignment and creating a strategic plan with visions and goals that are consistent with the NDE and state, which will provide a framework by which to understand how to leverage the opportunities in ESSA in order to achieve our goals. This is placing in ESSA in service of the state priorities, not responding to an accountability framework. Having a clear strategic plan in place with clean undeniable goals facilitates discussions in terms of how decisions are made and what is important.

Next is aligning strategies and getting rid of what is not working, and heavily invest in activities that are advancing the state toward the goals for benchmarked outcomes. The plan for implementation could be the state plan under ESSA. Dr. Canavero discussed:

- The Vision, Mission and Priorities
- State Goals
- ESSA in Service to Nevada Priorities and its Implementation
- Determine strategies, what is working/ not working
- ESSA Timeline
- Strategic Plan: Pre/Parallel Work

Dr. Canavero explained the High School Graduation Committee has had three meetings to discuss Nevada's College, Career and Community readiness. Students who meet the definition should be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions that are necessary to:

- Complete entry-level, credit-bearing college courses;
- Earn an industry recognized certificate or complete workplace training;
- Exhibit signs of personal growth, respect towards diversity, professionalism, and responsibility; and
- Enter high-skill, high-demand, and viable career pathways.

Knowledge, skills and dispositions were broken down further based upon data for college and career readiness.

President Wynn noted that Dr. Canavero created a pathway to move forward and created a new methodology to plug in a myriad of information and moving parts that have been occurring over the last couple of years.

Member Wakefield suggested as a way to engage a group that could be helpful is, he would like to engage as a Board around the current state, the needs and the inputs. He would like a cohesive synthesis of where is Nevada at today, how do we know that, what does it make us think. It could change actions we take and may be a starting point.

Member Newburn said what we tried to do is talk to consumers of our product, business and higher education. Higher education is starting to get the initial results of the longitudinal data system and they are beginning to drill in as to what college ready looks like. They presented charts on success in college verse a combination of math and science, and 2 years of a foreign language. We are asking them, this is where we are now, what is it we do not have to be college ready. We did the same thing with business, the economic sectors came in and they were asked, what would you like them to have. That is when we heard about the national career readiness certificate. We also received feedback on our current technical graduates. They take an additional career readiness assessment that the regular students do not take and they basically said we love your CTE students, please make more. We heard that from everyone, manufacturing to gaming. Part of the process is to look at what does it mean from business to be career ready and what does it mean from college to be college ready. We are seeing what was a well-rounded education in the 1950s is inadequate now. The bar has been raised.

Member Jensen said Dr. Canavero presented the concept to the Nevada Association of School Superintendents (NASS) earlier this month. He shared appreciation of the NASS group, it was well received. They have a focus on skills as are having discussion as NASS group, how do we use the ACT work keys in a greater capacity. We do a great job on college ready, not so much career ready, and how do we support that. They have some suggestions and will reach out to NDE staff.

Dr. Canavero said his goal is to bring a draft in June or July, collecting and aggregating existing work, talk about ESSA and other programs to execute strategies. Not just ESSA but all of the work we have.

#### **Future Agenda Items**

Member Ortiz said we were going to get a presentation about the EL Master Plan from CCSD and that did not happen. She asked for it to be on future agenda because there has been a great deal of work put into it and can look at as a model for what could happen statewide.

Member Newburn recognized Member Holmes-Sutton for being recognized at the White House as part of program to recognize excellent teaching. She is one of seven teachers invited.

Member Wakefield confirmed that they will engage in the updated school performance framework.

#### **Public Hearing and Possible Action regarding Hearing of Petition and recommendation for Revocation of the Nevada Educators License for:**

- a. Kelly Hoffman**
- b. Leticia Perez**
- c. Jeremiah C. Mazo**
- d. Mikhail Lerma**

President Wynn opened the hearing of petition and recommendation for revocation of the Nevada teacher's license for Kelly Hoffman. Deputy Attorney Greg Ott explained he is normally the attorney for the Board, but today he is representing the superintendent of public instruction and the NDE in their efforts to revoke these teaching licenses. For this hearing and the hearings of Leticia Perez, Jeremiah C. Mazo and Mikhail Lerma the Board will be represented by Robert Whitney in Las Vegas.

The State Board of Education may suspend or revoke the license of any teacher, administrator or other licensed employee after notice and an opportunity for a hearing based on the grounds set forth in NRS 391.330.

Mr. Ott listed the relevant grounds in the case of Kelly Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman was noticed and did not appear for the hearing. The evidence was presented and Mr. Ott proceeded with the hearing

**President Wynn moved to approve the findings of fact 1-5 and conclusions of law 1-5. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**President Wynn moved to revoke Mr. Hoffman's license. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

The hearing was closed for Mr. Hoffman.

President Wynn opened the hearing of petition and recommendation for the revocation of the Nevada teacher's license of Leticia Perez. Mr. Ott listed the relevant grounds in the case of Leticia Perez. Ms. Perez was notice and did not appear for the hearing. The evidence was presented and Mr. Ott proceeded with the hearing.

**President Wynn moved to approve the findings of fact 1-5 and conclusions of law 1-5. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**President Wynn moved to revoke Ms. Perez's license. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

The hearing was closed for Ms. Perez.

President Wynn opened the hearing of petition and recommendation for the revocation of the Nevada teacher's license of Jeremiah C. Mazo. Mr. Ott listed the relevant grounds in the case Jeremiah C. Mazo. Mr. Mazo was noticed and did not appear for the hearing. The evidence was presented and Mr. Ott proceeded with the hearing.

**President Wynn moved to approve the findings of fact 1-5 and conclusions of law 1-5. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**President Wynn moved to revoke Mr. Mazo's license. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

The hearing was closed for Mr. Mazo.

President Wynn opened the hearing of petition and recommendation for the revocation of the Nevada teacher's license of Mikhail Lerma. Mr. Ott listed the relevant grounds in the case Mikhail Lerma. Mr. Mikhail Lerma was noticed and did not appear for the hearing. The evidence was presented and Mr. Ott proceeded with the hearing.

**President Wynn moved to approve the findings of fact 1-5 and conclusions of law 1-5. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**President Wynn moved to revoke Mr. Lerma's license. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

The hearing was closed for Mr. Mazo.

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

There was no public comment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.