

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

Thursday, June 16, 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 (arrived 9:15 a.m.)
Victor Wakefield
Felicia Ortiz
Elaine Wynn
Samantha Molisee

In Carson City:

Teri Jamin
Pat Hickey
Dave Jensen (Departed 2:50 p.m.)

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

In Las Vegas

Dena Durish, Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness & Family Engagement
Tricia Cook, Administrative Assistant
Diana Hollander, ASSPR Program Officer

In Carson City

Brett Barley, Deputy Superintendent, Student Achievement
Roger Rahming, Deputy Superintendent, Business and Support Services
Greg Bortolin, Public Information Officer

June 16, 2016

Lauren Hulse, Management Analyst
Mike Raponi, Director, Career Readiness, Adult Learning and Education Options
Mark Gabrylczyk, Director, Student and School Supports
Peter Zutz, Administrator, Assessments, Data and Accountability
Dave Brancamp, Director, Career Readiness, Adult and Education Options
Edward Ableser, Director, Safe and Respectful Learning Environment
Will Jensen, Director, Special Education
Katherine Rohrer, Education Programs Professional
Tom McDermott, Education Programs Professional
Kevin Laxalt, Education Programs Professional
Dana Embro, Business and Support Services

In Carson City:

Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

In Las Vegas:

John Haynal, Clark County School District
Barbara Gnatovich, Sierra Nevada College
Heidi Arbuckle, Clark County School District
Jeanne Donadio, Clark County School District
Ben Gerhardt, Nevada Virtual Academy
Deb Hegna, Clark County School District
Monte Bay, National University
Ramona Esparza, Clark County School District
Teresa Gregory, Nevada Virtual Academy
Zane Gray, Sierra Nevada College
John Hawk, Nevada State High School
Bill Davis, CCASSPE
Zach Stork, Clark County School District
Branden Mueller, Clark County School District
Spencer Steward, Western Governor's University
Laura Browder, Clark county School District
Ignacio Ruiz, Clark County School District
Shanna Goldenberg, Clark County School District

Carson City:

Allison Combs, Nevada System of Higher Education
Eian Gilbert, Washoe County School District
Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District
Scott Coffee, Renaissance Learning Academy
Emily Ellison, Washoe County School District
Dawn Huckaby, Washoe County School District
Tim Logan, Director, Human Resources, Lyon county School District
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Karina Nevers,
Mila Paul, Washoe County School District
Katrina Midgley, Southern Nevada College

June 16, 2016

Todd Butterworth, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Kirsten Gleissner, Northwest Regional Professional Development Program

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

Public Comment #1

There was no public comment.

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 welcomed Samantha Molisee, the newly appointed student representative for the State Board of Education. Member Ortiz was congratulated for winning the primary election representing District 3 for the State Board.

Superintendent's Report

Steve Canavero, superintendent of public instruction, reported on the following items:

- Modernizing the Nevada Plan and transitioning to a weighted funding formula in four categories, ELL students, poverty or at risk students, special education and gifted students.
- The transition to weighted funding formula begins with special education. Board members received a report about transitioning from a unit basis (FY2015-16) to a per pupil multiplier in Fiscal Year 2016-17.
- The assessment was successful and the testing window is closed. There were 35,000 assessments in grades 5 and 8. All the summative assessments in math and ELA are on track with up to 37,000 assessments administered. Included were end of year summative tests as well as interim assessments that districts and teachers can provide during the year with access to the digital library. An assessment survey with a third party is helping to map the layers of assessments being used.
- The settlement agreement with the two vendors that were put into breach of contract from the failure to deliver the assessment last year has been settled with Measured Progress. Also, a final settlement has been reached with Smarter Balanced for a \$1 million credit towards expenses this year.
- Highlights were provided from an Ed Tech needs assessment conducted annually by a third party. The overall availability of education technology in classrooms has steadily increased since 2012.
- Areas for improvement include teacher professional development. Teachers from large districts feel better prepared to use educational tools for instructional purposes opposed to teachers in medium and small districts.

June 16, 2016

- Jana Wilcox-Lavin has been hired for the Achievement School District. The position is funded with private dollars.
- Roger Rahming has been hired to replace Mindy Martini as the Deputy Superintendent, Business and Support Services. He has background working with the NDE in the past. Dr. Canavero's executive team is now fully staffed.

President Wynn commented that it would be helpful to receive a report card on the status of technology in the state. What are the goals and what is being contemplated to reach the goals, with a comparison of best case state scenarios for an understanding of what we would like to have, where we are and where we are going with a prognosis.

Approval of Consent Agenda

- a. Possible Approval of Nevada School Bus Driver Training Manual
- b. Possible Approval of Nevada School Bus Out of Service Criteria
- c. Possible Approval of Nevada Minimum School Bus Standards
- d. Possible Approval of School Emergency Management Model Plan (NRS392.644)
- e. Possible Approval of the Nevada State High School courses to be counted as dual-credit with College of Southern Nevada, DeVry University, Great Basin College, Nevada State College. Truckee Meadow Community College, University of Las Vegas, University of Nevada Reno, Western Nevada Community College.
- f. Possible Approval of dual-credit request with Lincoln County School District and Great Basin College
- g. Possible Approval of:
 - RE-licensing 3 Clark County Private Schools for four year periods: LVVWD – School's Out! Program, Dr. Miriam and Sheldon G. Adelson Educational Campus & Montessori Visions Academy
 - Re-Licensing of 1 Clark County Private School for a two year period: All Saints' Day School
- h. Possible Approval of April 28, 2016 minutes
- i. Possible Approval of SEAC appointments
- j. Possible Approval of SEAC report
- k. Possible Approval of CTE standards for Health Information Management

Member Holmes-Sutton requested that spelling and grammatical concerns are reviewed in the School Bus Driver Training Manual.

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

Public Hearing and Possible Adoption of Proposed Amendments to R032-16; NAC 395.010 to amend by adding a subsection addressing: "A pupil with significant disabilities" defined; "Special Education" defined; "Related Services" defined; "Supplementary aids and services" defined; "Transition services" defined; "Department" defined; "Superintendent" defined; Additionally adding the following sections and subsections regarding access to the special education contingency account: Application requirements and process; reimbursement requirements and allowable expenditures; development of a process for a timely review and approval or disapproval of applications; timeline for reimbursement of funds

The public hearing was opened at 9:38 a.m. There were 24 individuals in attendance in Carson City and 21 individuals in attendance in Las Vegas.

June 16, 2016

Brett Barley, deputy superintendent, Student Achievement, introduced Will Jensen, the new director of special education. Mr. Barley informed the Board that these proposed regulations deal with the contingency account with special education that was completed as a part of the complete re-design of the special education funding for school districts and state sponsored charter schools in S.B. 508, (section 24) in 2015.

The bill requires the board adopt regulations for the contingency account for special education application approval and disbursement of money commencing with the 2016-17 school year to reimburse school districts and charter schools for extraordinary program expenses and related services which:

- a) Are not ordinarily present in the typical special education services and delivery system at a public school;
- b) Are associated with the implementation of an Individual Education Plan (IEP of a pupil with significant disabilities, as defined by the State Board;
- c) The costs of which exceed the total funding available to the school district or charter school for the pupil.

The proposed changes to the regulation will ensure consistent definitions and clarify it is a special education student for whom the cost to serve is greater than the funding available. The changes will set the application process including a mechanism to review and approve or deny the application.

Member Stephens asked where do students with 504s and without an IEP fall into the process, and is there a trigger for that. Mr. Jensen said the distinction is that students under 504 are students who present with a disability that limits one or more life activities. These students are generally found eligible on a short term basis, are not usually long term, but something happened that limited their ability to participate in school. If the same students were on an IEP they would receive specially designed instruction, which is about the cost. Students on 504s are generally less expensive to serve than students on IEPs and the 504 students are not included in this contingency fund.

There was no public comment.

Member Newburn move to approve the proposed changes to R032-16. Member Wakefield seconded the motion. The motion carried.

The hearing closed at 9:48 a.m.

Public Hearing and Possible Adoption of Proposed amendments to R112-15, NAC Chapter 388 to establish a process for grants from the Bullying Prevention Account (NRS 388.125 and 388.1327). The public hearing was opened at 9:48 a.m. There were 24 individuals present in Carson City and 21 individuals present in Las Vegas.

Dr. Ableser, director, Safe and Respectful Learning Environment informed the Board this regulation is the Bully Prevention grant within the office of Safe and Respectful Learning Environment with a process to establish district access to the grant, per statute. It affords the opportunity for school districts to apply for a grant that will aid in their efforts in bully prevention, reduction and cyber bully prevention and assist the office with the training and development of programs embedded in districts to eradicate bullying from schools. The regulation provides a process in which districts will access the funds and opens the opportunity to collect funds from the public to aid in the effort. Specific to the regulation, it does five things:

- Instructs the office to provide notice to school districts when there is more than \$1000 in account available for grants.

June 16, 2016

- Demonstrates effectiveness of the program.
- Evaluates the application and makes a determination if the request is less than \$10,000.
- If the request is \$10,000 or more, evaluate the applications and submit recommendation to the Board for action.
- Requires the Board to take action and make a determination.

In response to a question from Member Jamin, Dr. Ableser advised the legislature appropriated \$70,000 for the bully prevention account. He clarified that currently the funding is first come first serve. Upon approval, districts will be advised of the dollars available and will be evaluated according to the regulation. Charter schools are not included in the regulation.

Board members discussed the application review process. The process will be a collaborative effort with districts and the charter school authority.

There was no public comment.

Member Newburn moved to approve proposed amendments to regulation R112-15. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Public Hearing and Possible Adoption of Proposed regulation R037-16; NAC 388, for compliance of S.B. 391 – Nevada Read by Grade 3 Initiative as cited in Section 5.1 (b) Procedures for assessing a pupil’s proficiency in the subject area of reading using valid and reliable assessments that have been approved by the State Board by regulation and Section 6. 4 (a) any training for professional development that a learning strategist is required to successfully complete; (b) any professional development a teacher employed by a school district or charter school to teach kindergarten or grade 1, 2, 3 or 4 is required to receive from a learning strategist in the subject area of reading; and (c) the duties and responsibilities.

The public hearing was opened at 10:04 a.m. There were 24 individuals present in Carson City and 21 individuals present in Las Vegas.

Deputy Barley informed the Board that S.B. 391 directs the Board to approve professional development for learning strategists, teachers, and adopt the reading assessments as part of the Read by Grade Three (RBG3) program. Nevada must implement a statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment (KEA) by fall 2016 as part of the Federal Preschool Development Grant and it is possible for the KEA to serve as the first assessment in kindergarten for the RBG3 program.

The NDE convened stakeholder groups to discuss the K-3 assessment and the KEA options. Based on their feedback the NDE released an RFI to solicit proposals for assessments that met the requirements of S.B. 391. The process resulted in the identification of three K-3 Reading Assessments and one KEA:

K-3

- Northwest Evaluation Association: Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP)
- Curriculum Associates: i-Ready
- Renaissance Learning: STAR

KEA

- Curriculum Associates, Brigance Screen III.

The districts were surveyed about their preference for a menu of approved assessments or just one. The overwhelming response was for the Board to choose one RBG3 assessment. (Districts/charters representing 347 schools asked for one assessment versus districts/charters representing 27 schools asking

June 16, 2016

for a menu. Churchill, Elko, and Eureka were the only districts that asked for a menu. All three use MAP. Elko uses a combination of STAR and MAP)

The district recommendations align with national best practices. It makes it easier to add the assessments to the state's accountability plan and allows for common professional development, technical assistance and statewide support.

The recommendation is for the State Board to adopt the Curriculum Associates' KEA, the Brigance, as the RBG3 qualifying reading screener to be given during the first 30 days of kindergarten. The Brigance is valid and reliable, research-based, easy to administer, score and interpret and it is already used or well-aligned with many current district KEA practices. It is also recommended that the NWEA MAP assessments are used as the K-3 Reading Assessments starting mid-year in kindergarten. MAP was the highest scoring K-3 reading assessment suite submitted through the RFI process and it offers a valid and reliable system that provides meaningful and useful outputs for instructors that informs instruction. Currently 16 districts use NWEA products.

The Board has the ability to prescribe the Brigance KEA as the RBG3 beginning in kindergarten as the assessment and the NWEA MAPS as the RBG3 mid-kindergarten through the 3rd grade assessment. Also, a technical amendment is recommended to change the language about where the State Literacy Plan is found, moving it away from the term Striving Readers.

Member Jamin stated that board members received an email from a teacher expressing concerns about identification of kindergartners that are at risk. Board members and Deputy Barley discussed the email and the RFI review committee process, when and how students are determined to be at risk, and how it is communicated to parents from school districts.

Dr. Canavero stated the NDE is recommending the selection of a specific assessment, MAPS, and the inclusion of KEA Brigance for kindergarten use of a literacy assessment. The feedback was not to add assessments, instead determine how to make it work together. That is the reason there is a literacy assessment that is appropriate for kindergartners different from MAPS; mid K under MAPS and Brigance as KEA upon entry. The assessment is to be used to identify students in need of support of literacy instruction and inform the learning strategists in the school. The assessments can be predictive of performance.

Member Wakefield inquired about requirements to notify families if a student is not meeting expectations. Mark Gabrylczyk, director, Student and School Supports responded that the NDE has a guidance document and a letter template that districts can use and amend at their discretion when notifying parents about a student's progress. Assessments are critical in this process. Law specifies that if a student is not making progress with the assessment then the district can convene a team with the parents included to make a decision about whether retention needs to occur with the student.

Member Ortiz commented that parental engagement is one of the more important factors. She asked if there is communication going out to parents prior to their kids starting kindergarten, and is there a communication timeline with progress between Pre-K through 3rd grade. Deputy Barley responded he will provide the template letter to the Board, and can work up a suggested timeline of communications.

Member Stephens said as a parent she would like to further understand a principal and teacher reaching out to a parent to provide information on the status of a child. She asked why that requires a designation of at risk and why the parents are singled out. It is valid to not want to label children and she asked if there has been deliberate competency into the development of the communication tools. Children can fall into that category and become at risk when they are not at risk. She expressed concern about segregating

students, labeling some at risk, only communicating to parents when the children are perceived to be at risk and the level of cultural competency going into the development of communications.

Mr. Gabrylczyk agreed that students are varied in their abilities for many circumstances and situations. There needs to be communication given to parents that their student may not be proficient and there is a consequence this could happen at a later time with retention. It is important to consider the terms used.

Public Comment

Melissa Mackedon, Oasis Academy Charter School, said she understands the value of one statewide assessment in K-3; however, she expressed concern that the decision impacts the autonomy of charter schools. The overreliance of MAPS in her district was a key reason why the charter school was opened. They are a five star reward school and perform well. The overreliance and use of MAPS was the reason many master teachers left the traditional district and came to teach at the charter school. They saw it as a problem. She has been a State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) board member for five years and observed that in the last five years every low performing charter school who has come before the Board has wanted the SPSCA to ignore their state testing and rely on their star and MAPS testing to show how their students are doing. There is no correlation to their state tests.

Ms. Mackedon said she hopes there will be a correlation and a reliable predictive value of the tests, adding the NDE has done a fantastic job of providing templates for parents that tick off all the boxes per the law. Another concern with MAPS is that it will not tick all the boxes for the dyslexia bill. There are areas that must be assessed per the bill and MAPS will not get the job done. There will need to be an additional test for kids who are performing below grade level to meet the requirements of the dyslexia law.

Scott Coffee, representative, Renaissance Learning Star Assessment, stated he thinks choice is better than a single solution and sometimes a single solution backfires. Without competition the growth needed or an intervention is sometimes not seen. He suggested reconsidering having a single solution because pricing and or problems can arise and then the process must start over again. That recently occurred with the state assessment. He recommended looking at solutions that have been successful in different states and have the ability to provide solutions for students in Read by Three and give teachers choices. If it is limited to one there is no opportunity to make change and it is unknown if the solutions will grow as the state and students grow. Also, it limits pricing the districts may have. If is limited to one it limits change or growth.

Karina Nevers, professional development specialist, Curriculum Associates, advocated for the 100's of teachers she works with on a daily basis in CCSD, Zoom, Victory and Striving Readers schools who have consistently asked to use i-Ready next year because so much professional development and time has been invested. They like the data, it is easy to use, and it is correlated to the standards and has an instructional path that students can use. She agreed with Mr. Coffee that choice is something for consideration. It leads to innovation and encourages companies to respond to the request that teachers have to make innovative products as well as negotiate pricing. Also, all three are highly correlated to Smarter Balanced (SBAC). Colorado has been implementing the Read by Three act with choice for a while and have been very successful and seen significant gains.

Dr. Canavero summarized the technical changes for consideration today. The first change is on page 2, section 2, item (1). The i-Ready assessment published by Curriculum Associated is eliminated as well as (3) in the same section; the STAR Reading assessment published by Renaissance Learning. That leaves (2) the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment published by the Northwest Evaluation Association. A *kindergarten entry assessment* would be added to section 2. To clarify section 2 would read; (1) The measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment published by the Northwest Evaluation

June 16, 2016

Association and (2) kindergarten entry assessment Brigance, Curriculum Associates' KEA. Other technical changes appear on page 2, section 3, (2) change the link to something more generic than striving readers. Striving Readers is a term of a federal grant and would likely change the language to Literacy. In addition page 4, section 4 (2) that link would also change.

Member Newburn moved to approve R037-16 with the changes listed by Dr. Canavero. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

The hearing closed at 11:11 a.m.

Public Hearing and Possible Adoption of Proposed regulation to R126-15; NAC 385, Alternative Performance Framework. Senate Bill 460, section 2 requires the Board to adopt regulations that prescribe an alternative performance framework to evaluate public schools that are approved pursuant to section 3. The regulation describes the manner in which the progress of students enrolled in a public school for which an alternative performance framework has been approved will be accounted for and the manner in which the school will be accounted for within the statewide system of accountability.

The workshop opened at 11:11 a.m. There were 24 individuals present in Carson City and 21 individuals present in Las Vegas.

Deputy Barley stated the charge of S.B. 460 is to develop an alternative performance framework to evaluate schools whose mission is to serve a specific type of student population. Eligibility for evaluation under the alternative performance framework is predicated on a school's mission statement and proof that 75 percent of the student population falls into one or more of six categories listed in the bill.

The six categories include schools serving 75 percent of students:

- 1) Expelled or suspended from school;
- 2) Deemed habitual disciplinary problems;
- 3) Considered academically disadvantaged;
- 4) Are adjudicated delinquents;
- 5) Adjudicated to be in need of supervision;
- 6) Have Individual Education Plans (IEPs).

The regulation describes the manner in which academically disadvantaged students will be calculated for purposes of the alternative performance framework. Academically disadvantaged is defined as including students who have a 'deficiency in the credits required to graduate on time'. The regulation also describes the manner in which the progress of students enrolled in an alternative performance framework will be accounted for and the manner in which the school will be accounted for within the statewide system of accountability.

Member Wakefield asked for a description of what this regulation replaces. Dr. Katherine Rohrer, education programs professional, responded there is currently an accountability system for all schools. This comes from schools that serve high needs populations and the need for them to have a framework. Under the current accountability system most of these schools cannot be rated under that system. The bill came forward with the need for these schools that could not be rated with these high need populations to be rated.

Member Wakefield asked if there is concern about perverse incentives if the framework is adopted. Is there risk of a district being more inclined to not try and retain students at one type of school because there is another school rated differently? Dr. Canavero responded that is a legitimate concern. He said this may resolve a perverse incentive that risks when they do not have a system that adequately or appropriately measures alternative schools against rigorous schools

June 16, 2016

Member Newburn asked, for a school to be rated under this new system, does the district need to apply to the Board for a change in rating? Dr. Rohrer concurred. Member Newburn said he is also concerned about the perverse incentive that dumping grounds are being created where a district could improve school ratings by concentrating all their low performing students in a single school. He asked about the development of the metrics and recognized that the schools have a different role and their rating systems should not be easier, just different. He asked how the measures will be validated.

Dr. Rohrer responded it is an ongoing concern. This was started in 2013 with workgroups and extensive input. There were distinct take a-ways. A preliminary framework has been developed and taken back to districts. The proposal is that when the set of schools that apply are approved by the Board to be rated, there is a preliminary framework that was created and will be moved forward for a soft year and will continue to collect information throughout the year getting feedback from the schools. Then ask if these are the metrics, what will be the baselines and what will be leveraged to indicate this should be the cut off and a good rating for the school. As they continue with the stakeholders, and continue to get feedback they will come out with a good foundation.

Member Newburn suggested the Board should maintain a close view on this because there is a lot of potential for abuse.

There was no public comment.

Member Newburn moved to adopt the proposed changes to regulation R126-15. Member Wakefield seconded the motion. The motion carried.

The hearing was closed at 11: 24 a.m.

Information and Discussion regarding NRS 391.168 enhanced compensation and performance pay programs and teacher retention.

- a) Pursuant to NRS 391.168, the State Board will review district programs of performance pay and enhanced compensation, including the amount of general funds reserved for the 2016-2017 school year, the percentage of teachers and administrators to be impacted, and the amount of salary increases.
- b) Board members will hear presentations from Clark and Washoe County School Districts on district and teacher retention, including retention/attrition rates, specific strategies implemented to increase retention, and how state and federal funds are leveraged to address retention.

Dr. Canavero informed the Board that having a qualified and highly effective teacher in front of every student has been an ongoing focus for the Board. The NDE needs to work with districts to bring people together for an understanding of the solutions to solve the problem of teacher retention and move forward in a cohesive way, and how programs can be put in service of students and teachers.

Dena Durish, deputy superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement, informed the Board that NRS 391.168 is a law that has been in place for several years, but not implemented. It was addressed in the 2015 Legislative session with A.B. 483 with timeline changes and additional requirements. She provided an overview. The law requires that each district will establish performance pay and enhanced compensation for recruitment and retention of teachers allowing districts to develop their own program. Districts have taken different approaches.

With the addition of A.B. 483 school districts were also to utilize the plan to have the primary focus of academic achievement of pupils, at risk schools and schools receiving lowest performance ratings.

June 16, 2016

Districts were to take this into consideration as they developed their plans. Districts were sent details of the plan with the request they identify their total number of licensed teachers and administrators and how many teachers will be impacted by implementation of the plan. Neither the Board nor the NDE approve the plans. Further details were provided about the plans.

Deputy Durish explained categories in the district plans including data and highlighted the reported dollar amount set aside for each district. Statewide there was \$2.5 million set aside for the first year of implementation of the plan. Of the 27,000 total licensed teachers and school administrators reported, the impact is anticipated just under \$1400.

Tim Logan, HR director, Lyon County School District, presented information about using the funds to address assessment needs in Lyon County. He is constantly looking for special education teachers to come to his district and recruiting as well as retaining them has been a concern. Their graduation for special education is about half of the regular population and he knew he had an issue with special education. Special education needs and wanting to retain good staff helped develop their plan. His goal was to retain special education teachers and \$3,000 was set aside for pay for performance. A co-teach model with general education teachers was created. Both general education and special education teachers will receive \$3,000. Approximately \$150,000 was set aside to benefit about 50 teachers and three administrators.

President Wynn asked where his funding came from. Mr. Logan responded it is coming from the general fund. Mr. Logan and board members discussed his special education needs and funding for the plan. President Wynn asked if this effort is an extension of what he has been doing already, or is it a new effort. Mr. Logan responded the retention is a new effort. The recruitment money to get special education teachers has been ongoing.

Deputy Durish explained this is one small piece of retention efforts. It costs districts thousands of dollars to recruit teachers. Once they are here it is not always clear how to retain them. The compensation plan for funding is one piece of the puzzle. Retaining teachers is more than a monetary effort. Clark and Washoe County Districts were asked to share what they are doing for retention of teachers, including budgetary items as well as other initiatives.

President Wynn asked if there has been relevant research that would determine the monetary amount that makes a difference in being an incentive. Was there research done to inform decisions? Deputy Durish said it has been an informal discussion. Research indicates it is not always the amount of money but rather school leadership that has an effect. Some teachers stated they do not need a pay incentive if they can go to a school with a strong leader. Others state that \$10,000 extra is not enough to go to a school without leadership to support the work.

President Wynn observed that is human nature. But the legislature just dumped a huge pile of money into the school districts and she is concerned about the impact of the money as an incentive for all of the objectives discussed. A good leader is critical in any organization; people will take a cut in pay to stay in a place where they feel valued. The Board is to oversee, manage and be accountable for an extraordinary amount of money and should not lose focus. Her concern is being the steward of the funds.

Deputy Durish clarified law does not specify a minimum amount of dollars each teacher must be compensated. But there is a ceiling that specifies it must not exceed 10 percent. Districts have flexibility. There is no ceiling on the amount of people it must impact, but it must impact at least 5 percent.

Mike Barton, CCSD introduced Mike Gentry, interim chief recruitment officer, CCSD who conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation in three parts. The first part was an update on attrition data with the CCSD, then

June 16, 2016

systemic steps taken to attract and retain talent in their schools, and retention strategies to retain talent practiced by two principals serving in Clark County schools. Mr. Barton reported on attrition in the US across all industries including school districts, as well as in Nevada and CCSD.

Clark County School District attrition rates for 2014-15 and 2015-16 were discussed. Member Wakefield commented that he was assured this item would provide data on sub groups. He said he is not concerned about CCSDs attrition rate outside of the district, because it is the only district in Las Vegas, but is concerned about the shift from Title schools to suburban schools or why the lower the star rating the more vacancies. Zoom and Victory schools have the most vacancies. He asked if there is information about district movement from Title schools to non-Title schools. Mr. Gentry responded the information he has today is at the macro level, but that information is available.

Andre Long, chief human resources, CCSD noted they are currently in the transfer process that does not end until June 30. After that date they will be able to share data about teachers who have moved from non-Title schools to Title schools.

Member Newburn explained that what is occurring in one star school's is a big focus for the Board. The process as it was described to him is that these new teachers are used as cannon fodder. They all start at Title I schools in the most difficult classes there are. Then there is a burn and churn where the goal is to get out of the school and move within the district within a couple of years, or they leave the profession. Nationally, half of new teachers leave the profession within five years. The concern is that in one star school's the turnover rate is not 50 percent in five years, but 100 percent. Students are getting new teachers or long term substitutes every year they are in a Title I school. The result is horrible academic performance. He asked for information about:

- The flow of the new teachers coming into Title I schools.
- Turnover and retention rates at the lowest performing schools.
- The difference between the highest performing and the lowest performing schools.

The sense is there is a large difference. A student in a one star school has an eight times greater chance of having a long term substitute than in a five star school. This appears to be the failure of the system. The poorest schools get the least experienced teachers or long term substitutes, they burn and churn and teachers that survive move on to other schools. It creates a perfect storm at the lowest performing schools.

President Wynn said she senses the data the Board wants is not the data being shared today in great detail. She inquired about postponing this to the next meeting to enhance or adjust the data with specificity of that information the Board wants. She noted there are a couple of school principals at the meeting today that are doing new and unique work attempting to address some of the concerns and asked to hear from them. Rather than getting overviews with broad thematic discussions they want to dig deep and address issues that Member Newburn listed. She asked for the materials in advance so they can study them in advance, prepare questions and receive information with more context about Title I schools. She asked to defer the balance of this report to the next meeting.

Mr. Barton said they have two principals that would like to discuss what they do to retain teachers for their at risk schools.

John Haynal, principal, CCSD, was recently awarded the National Distinguished Principal Award from Washington D.C. Mr. Haynal stated he loves working with at risk kids. New teachers cannot be placed in a school like his without support. He brings in teachers that have a past history of working with students at-risk, or love at-risk kids and his schools are in some of the toughest neighborhoods in the city.

June 16, 2016

Mr. Haynal informed the board that he is a franchise principal with three schools and he will probably add more schools. Bringing in good people for the leadership team is most important. They love kids. If you get people with heart, and want to work with kids that need the most effort, they will stay no matter what the money is. He has had to work with a long term substitute nine years in a row, but he is fully staffed every year. They have a vision and believe family and students come first. The climate and culture at the schools has changed. There were teachers and leaders who believed the kids could not learn and now kids believe they can climb the stairs right now. His teachers rarely leave because they love the kids.

President Wynn commented that not all principals in CCSD have the ability to be as flexible as Mr. Haynal. This is an example of a model that appears to be working, and every year it gets better but it is still innovative. She inquired if the new money is helpful because the extra dollars are allowing him to be more creative. Mr. Barton responded they have studied why it works with Mr. Haynal to understand how great leaders can be developed underneath him that would be ready to be principals and have a flagship school one day. Flexibility cannot be given across the board because in the wrong hands it will not work. The district is focusing on the readiness with the instructional training series.

Member Hickey asked what is a “franchise principal” ? Mr. Barton explained franchise in the CCSD is taking some of their talented principals with proven results at a school, called a flagship school, and give them oversight on multiple campuses. Mr. Haynal had two campuses last year, Roundy and Vegas Verdes and then a third school was added. It is taking the strong talent at the principal level and extending their reach for a broader impact.

Ramona Esparza, principal Valley High School, CCSD, explained that Valley High School is rated as a two-star, priority and a SIG school. When she went to work at the school she knew what she was taking on and that change had to happen. In order to get a different result things have to be done differently and think out of the box. Last year when she began there were 60 out of 150 teachers that exited. The school was not addressing and meeting the needs of all of the students, especially the special needs students. Last year was a difficult year but it was a year for change that needed to happen. Having the Victory funding for the second year, which is this year, has made a significant difference at Valley. Not only for the infra structure and upgrading technology, but being able to bring in new teachers and value them as professionals.

The teachers receive professional development, have time to plan their day and collaborate. Thought was given about how to retain the teachers and mentoring was provided with a veteran teacher. Valley High school serves 3100 students, 78 percent Free and Reduced lunch, 13 percent special needs population and more than one-third are second language students. They are a minority/majority as well. Teachers that come may be new teachers so the value of mentoring is important. Ms. Esparza said she had nine teacher vacancies on the first day of school this year that were in special education. She used teachers that were long term substitutes and ARL teachers. Today, because of the incentives and discussions of community building and mentoring, she has filled all of their special education vacancies. Now, teachers are coming to her from other schools because of word of mouth and community building.

Ms. Esparza explained the hiring process at Valley is very different. Traditionally teachers interview, talk to the administrator and check references at the previous location. At Valley they have teachers on their panel with out-of- the box thinking. Their administrators can go off campus with a master teacher to view and observe the other teacher where they teach. At Valley High School students graduate because of the teachers, and that is their message about student success. The school culture has shifted and people want to buy in, stay and work at Valley.

Discussion followed with board members and Ms. Esparza.

June 16, 2016

Dawn Huckaby, chief human resources officer, WCSD and Emily Ellison, director of talent acquisition, WCSD provided a [PowerPoint](#) presentation about teacher retention and strategies being implemented in WCSD. Information presented included:

- Attrition numbers over the last three years in WCSD including the district, high needs, Focus, Priority, Zoom, Victory and one and two Star schools and the turnover rates for teachers and administrators.
 - The Teacher Incentive fund (TIF) grants to meet Student Learning Objectives (SLO) growth targets, maintaining individual attendance targets, achieving Highly Effective performance evaluations and eligibility for performance incentives through TIF grants.
 - Teacher Incentives from S.B. 511 and the Teach Nevada Scholarship; up to \$5,000 per new hire at Title I schools
 - Enhanced compensation for an incentive of up to \$1,500 per recipient for continuing to work at an eligible school, maintaining highly effective evaluations and meeting attendance targets per A.B. 483
 - Providing bonuses for principals at designated accelerated zone school for signing and end of year.
 - Providing stipends to effective or highly effective teachers working in the Learning Strategist role per S.B. 391, Read by Grade 3.
 - S.B. 133, Teacher Supply Incentive for classroom teachers eligible for reimbursement up to \$250 per recipient for supplies purchased to support classroom instruction.
 - Providing support as well as programs for mentoring novice teachers.
 - Other Initiatives including climate surveys, teacher leadership, Washoe academy of school leaders, peer assistance review and MyPGS/evaluation system with aligned professional learning.
- Salary schedule adjustments to assist in recruitment and retention of veteran teachers.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding initial allocations of FY17 Teach Nevada Scholarship funds pursuant to SB511.

The Board will receive an update on ARL education preparation program providers that have submitted 2016-2017 applications. Possible action will include initial scholarship allocations to providers, pending final review and disbursement of FY17 funds in September 2016.

Michelle Esposito, education programs professional, stated the Teach Nevada Scholarship was created per S.B. 511 and provides scholarships to new students who are pursuing initial teacher licensure programs. The Board is charged with establishing the number of scholarships available. In April, 2016, the Board decided to limit the providers of scholarships to those that are ARL preparation programs. The application was made available in May and there were eight applications. The NDE reviewed the applications and summarized the requests. Ms. Esposito shared information from the applications.

The total amount of money requested was \$3,546,800 which is equal to 209 scholarships; however there is just \$2.5 million to allocate towards scholarships. There are two options for the Board to consider fitting the request into the money available.

June 16, 2016

- Option #1 funds all the applicants equally, at a rate of 74 percent of the original requests funding 107 scholarships
- Option #2 funds all the applicants. Humboldt and Lincoln County School Districts would be funded at 100 percent, and the rest of the applicants at 72 percent funding 109 scholarships.

Ms. Sposito stated the NDE recommends Option #2, awarding 109 scholarships fully funding the rural school districts and funding the remainder of the applicants at 72 percent which is under the \$2.5 million dollars. In addition \$1000 must be awarded for each completer to the provider resulting in holding back \$109,000.

Board members asked clarifying questions.

In response to comments from Member Wakefield, Dr. Canavero clarified the Board has already reallocated for one particular provider that was not able to meet their numbers, and the Board redistributed the scholarships during the process. The Board has maintained accountability. President Wynn suggested mandating that all of the distribution of the scholarships follow the Board's priorities, and if they wish to make an exception, then to file for exceptions. Deputy Durish answered that they would probably not be able to award 109 scholarships. President Wynn noted they do not have enough data to evaluate and after a couple of years of the program unfolding, corrections could be made if appropriate. Deputy Durish said last year's applicants were required to be licensed by August. They will be in classrooms if the programs are successful. The providers that won last year's awards know that data will be collected about who got licensed, who was hired, and what criteria are needed. Two lists can be provided, one will show the outcome of last year's money and if the recruitment criteria were met.

Member Wakefield move to approve Option #2, funding Humboldt and Lincoln County School Districts at 100 percent, and the rest of the applicants at 72 percent funding with a total of 109 scholarships. Member Ortiz seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information 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 reminded the Board that at the last meeting there was discussion about how to place the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the transition in federal policy, in service to Nevada's priorities. He asked how do we place (ESSA), a transition in federal policy, in service to Nevada's priorities? He suggested beginning with state priorities, which is a renewal of the 5-year strategic plan. Six goals were presented at the last meeting regarding third grade literacy, middle school preparation, high school graduate rate, effective educators, stewardship of public funds, and ensuring students are in an environment that is safe.

A letter sent June 6 as an invitation to the work groups has had 160 responses including teachers and principals to help inform state level policy. The work group meetings will be open to the public for transparency and comments. Goals were discussed during an advisory meeting. There was discussion to add a goal about parental involvement and family engagement which is presently located on the strategy level, clarifying it is not a goal, rather a strategy to utilize in order to achieve goals.

Member Stephens said she participated in the advisory group. When the group discussed parental involvement there was an opinion that they did not need to focus on parents, but talk about family or a support system. There are children who are raised by grandparents or parents who are shift workers so another person, maybe a neighbor is engaged.

June 16, 2016

Member Jamin said she was a member of the Parental Involvement Advisory group before becoming a State Board member. She received information and evidence about the benefit of family involvement. It is a strategy, but raising awareness and standing as a goal could be beneficial. Evidence has shown how much student achievement improves as a result of this. It is worthy of consideration as more than just a strategy.

Dr. Canavero acknowledged there is a middle ground in values. He suggested that having parental involvement and family engagement more prominent as a goal opposed to a core value for the state will help guide the advisory group and the work groups.

Information and Discussion regarding the comprehensive process to develop the Clark County School District (CCSD) Master Plan for English Language Learner success. The Board will receive a presentation that will highlight key findings, priorities and strategies for implementation.

Dr. Ignacio Ruiz, assistant chief superintendent officer, CCSD conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation about a master plan for CCSDs ELL success. He provided information about gathering evidence to create the ELL Master Plan and what was learned in the process. A strong vision to drive the plan was established and the plan was aligned to their pledge of achievement. Five strategic objectives and principles of effective instruction were developed. Nine areas of core competencies that are essential skills all CCSD educators need to provide for quality instruction and four instructional models were identified for success.

Dr. Ruiz stated the goal is not to pull teachers and principals out for professional development but to receive the content, and have an instructional leadership team on board to facilitate at their site. The goal is to improve the competencies of educators at the site level. President Wynn asked Dr. Ruiz about the main barriers to this work. Mr. Ruiz said the number one barrier is the budget and finances, especially in non-Zoom schools. Ensuring there is the right amount of personnel to support the schools is also a challenge.

President Wynn asked what is different about what he is doing now from what has been done before. Dr. Ruiz responded that what is different is they have a vision, a scope and a system that will be consistent and coherent across the district. They will be able to build the competencies of their teachers and have a consistent approach to their work for all the students in the district. There have been initiatives in the past, but now they have a vision and system that is research based and they have several stakeholders invested in a district initiative.

Board members asked clarifying questions about the ELL master plan.

Member Wakefield said in a year from now when they come back to share their progress, what will be different. Mr. Ruiz replied looking at the professional learning piece and how many teachers have been trained, the content, classroom observations, and ELL shadowing and he expects to see a difference in language proficiency results, and the professional learning piece. Teachers will be teaching differently.

Information and Discussion and Possible Action regarding School District Class-Size Reduction Plans and Variance Requests for the 2016-17 School Year and FY16 third quarter. The Board will receive requests from the school districts for School Year 2015-16 and consider them for approval.

Roger Rahming, deputy superintendent, Business and Support Services, informed the Board that pursuant to NRS 388.700 the State Board is required to submit a quarterly Class Size Reduction (CSR) report to the Interim Finance Committee on each variance requested by a school district for the preceding quarter. The variance requests for quarter three are imbedded in the report. Deputy Rahming requested the Board

June 16, 2016

approve the report and the variances. In addition FY17 projected CSR variances are included for approval.

Member Wakefield moved to approve the CSR plans and variance requests for the 2016-17 school year and FY 16 third quarter. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Public Comment #2

There was no public comment

Future Agenda Items

President Wynn acknowledged the request to circle back to the CCSD for more information about teacher retention. Dr. Canavero said he would like to have a draft of a strategic plan for Board review. The Board would like more information on Read by Three and take direction related to the development of resources. Also, a technology report card was requested.

Member Wakefield recognized items will be prioritized, but requested long term, a discussion about the funding formula. He also requested information about how the teacher evaluation will work across the field and of critical importance, the recruitment and retention of talented people. Providing feedback to teachers and having accurate evaluations is something that matters.

Member Stephens recalled at the last Board of Regents meeting there was focus on disability resource centers and the discussion today on special education is relevant to some of the discussions in higher education to make sure there is a smooth transition and that they are accessible. It would be interesting to hear more about students on 504 plans. Children with chronic illnesses who cannot demonstrate that they are falling below grade level will be on a 504 plan. Often times the districts do not have funding to provide accommodations because they do not qualify for the Individual Education Plan (IEP). This could be considered because students are transitioning from K-12 into higher education and they are looking at how they are dealing with their disability resources across the entire spectrum

Member Newbern recognized the Board has often had meetings with themes. There is not an area he feels weaker about than special education. He suggested it would be of benefit to have information about special education to ensure members are up to speed on the vocabulary and programs.

President Wynn said the amount of information the board members deal with is very voluminous. Many members are capable of doing research and homework but it is good to have the support documents more than just a few days in advance. Information posted on computer with updates until the night before the meeting, but she would prefer to do her reading and homework in advance so she can come prepared with questions and then allow the presenters not to have to go so deep into the material that it is such a time consuming item. She would like to get to the chase of the issue when they have the meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:43 p.m.