

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
COMMISSION ON PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS IN EDUCATION
SEPTEMBER 20, 2017**

Meeting Locations:

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	9890 S. Maryland Pkwy	Las Vegas	Board Room (2 nd Floor)
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St	Carson City	Board Room

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

(Video Conferenced)

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

In Las Vegas:

Ramona Esparza
Jill Pendleton
Ana Zeh

In Carson City:

Melissa Burnham
Frances McGregor
Michelle Gallivan-Wallace
Stacy Drum

COMMISSION MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Jennifer Carvalho
Kapua Maruyama

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

In Las Vegas:

Dena Durish, Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement Division
Jason Dietrich, Office of Educator Licensure
Michael Arakawa, Office of Educator Licensure
Matthew Borek, Office of Educator Development and Support
Paul Partida, Office of Educator Licensure

In Carson City:

None

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

In Carson City:

Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

In Las Vegas:

Angela Burkhardt, Clark County School District LINKS Team
Cynthia McCray, Clark County School District LINKS Team
Robert Askey, Touro University

Monte Bay, National University
Doris Watson, University of Nevada Las Vegas
Allison Smith, University of Nevada Las Vegas
Jessica Bouchte, Clark County School District Human Resources
Patricia Cooper, Sierra Nevada College
Zane Gray, Sierra Nevada College
Michael Robison, University of Phoenix
Kait Kolik, Nevada State Education Association
Lisa Ramirez, Nevada Teachers of Tomorrow
Cori More, University of Nevada Las Vegas
Ruben Murillo, Nevada State Education Association
Andrea Yate, Clark County School District Human Resources

Carson City:

Kate Schum, Washoe County School District
Teri White, Douglas County School District
Keith Lewis, Douglas County School District
Jose Delfin, Carson City School District
Beth Bouchard, Sierra Nevada College
Kirsten Gleissner, Northwest Regional Professional Development Program

Elko:

Teresa Stauffer, Great Basin College

Agenda Item #1 – Call to Order; Roll Call; Pledge of Allegiance

President Esparza called the meeting to order at 9:05 am
Roll call attendance was taken as reflected above. It was determined a quorum was met.
Commissioner Drum led the Commission in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Agenda Item #2 – Public Comment #1

No public comment in Carson City, Elko, or Las Vegas.

Agenda Item #3 – Approval of Flexible Agenda

Motion: Commissioner Zeh moved to approve the flexible agenda. Commissioner Pendleton seconded the motion. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Agenda Item #4 – Approval of Minutes for August 16, 2017 Meeting

Motion: Commissioner Pendleton moved to approve the August 16, 2017 minutes. Commissioner Drum seconded the motion. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Agenda Item #5 – Nevada Department of Education updates presented by Jason Dietrich and Dena Durish

Dena Durish presented NDE updates and stated that Nevada was one of the first two states to have their Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan approved by the US Department of Education, 33 other states were attempting to send in their ESSA plans by Monday's deadline. A large part of the plan is the accountability system and accountability framework. In Nevada, we have a Star Rating system. This is the first year we have growth data for student achievement statewide testing results. Last Friday, our State Superintendent released the results of the State's proficiency score data as well as growth data on our NDE website under Nevada Report Card to look up by district and/or by school. There is a dashboard that will go into the different components for the final star ratings for schools. Our advisory team and the districts are still working on the star rating calculations. The explanation as to what goes into the data points for the levels of Elementary, Middle, and High Schools includes: Proficiency, Growth, English Learner Proficiency, Opportunity Gaps from different groups of sub-populations, and

a category for high school that measures Career and College Readiness. Over the next few months, you will be hearing a lot more about this. The State Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent Barley, Public Information Officer, will be coming out to the districts to visit with parents and educators to explain how this all works and the intent is to release the star ratings in December 2017.

A couple more updates regarding bills that do not directly impact this body; we have had a lot of questions on them. To put them on the record, there were a lot of conversations about protecting our children and students. Senate Bill 287, sponsored by Senator Heidi Gansert and Assembly Bill 362, sponsored by Assemblywoman Jill Tolles. These deal with the backgrounds of people working with students. Jason Dietrich and Mike Arakawa of the NDE have helped draft advisory language for districts and charter schools regarding AB 362, and the Department is publishing two forms that all people who work for or with schools and their students would use to authorize prior employers to release information pertaining to any accusations of sexual misconduct. In addition, there is a form that districts will use to send to those employers to disclose that information. SB 287 creates a 5-year requirement in which districts must fingerprint all of their employees and run background checks on a regular basis; this includes all support staff. The bill language itself also talks about having backgrounds done on any volunteers that will have unsupervised or regular contact with students. The challenge right now is the language on how the districts will define “regular contact.” A few of the districts have had discussions and have asked if the Commission or the NDE would define the language, but neither have statutory authority to do so.

Jason Dietrich presented NDE updates; he stated he wanted to bring two updates back to the Commission. Licensure has passed our first data migration to our new licensure system at 100%. We will go into full system testing by Monday and be on target for full release to the public in January 2018. To add to what Dena stated about backgrounds, quite a few new federal requirements have come out on the licensing side. The NDE has periodic audits conducted by the Department of Public Safety in order to be able to run backgrounds on the educators. We completed an audit in September of this year with no adverse findings, which is very good news.

Dena read directly from the letter from the Department of Public Safety, which gave a glowing review of the NDE’s licensure office. She stated that Government agencies do not typically go out of their way to change their form letters and add positive content to them.

Jason stated that the process has been in statute for some time that once the Commission adopts a regulation through workshop and public hearing, it must go to the State Board of Education for approval. The State Board has the authority to approve or send back the language before it is allowed to go before the Legislative Commission to be adopted and codified. The State Board has elected to start reviewing our regulations. We have our first language from this year’s proposed regulations coming back from LCB so we may go to public hearing in October or November. This will work the kinks out of the process. Jason will present to the State Board on these and will invite President Esparza and Vice President Pendleton if they wish to attend.

Dena stated that the audience for the State Board is different from the Commission meetings and she is excited for the opportunity to see the process in action.

President Esparza gave kudos to Jason Dietrich and his team on their work on behalf of the Commission. She opened the floor to comments from the Commission on the updates, there were no comments.

Agenda Item #6 – Clark County School District Presentation on Autism licensure endorsement by Andre Yates, Clark County School District Human Resources

Andre Yates, Cynthia McCray, and Angela Burkhart presented a proposal on Autism. Andre Yates stated that Clark County School District feels that there are barriers in this area. Autism vacancies are

historically higher than vacancies in other special education areas over the last three years; in the 2015-2016 school year we had 439 total autism program units in the CCSD, of those 439 units 18 of them were kids programs which were vacant, an additional 32 autism units were also vacant for a total of 50 vacant units without a teacher. You can multiply that by the number of students in each of the classrooms, which is a substantial amount of students which did not have a licensed teacher. During the 2016-2017 school year, we had 522 autism program units, which was an increase; we had 11 kids programs vacancies and 52 autism unit vacancies. This year (2017-2018), we started with 576 autism programs, we were fortunate to have only 2 kids program vacancies and 61 autism program vacancies for a total of 63 vacancies. The number of students served in 2015-2016 was 4,589, which jumped up to 4,993 students in 2016-2017, which increased again in 2017-2018 up to 5,360 students. Additionally, in 2015 there were only 5 states out of the 50 which had an autism-specific endorsement; this is pertinent because when educators come to Nevada they are subjected to additional coursework. CCSD frequently finds qualified teachers who come from out of state and would like to teach in Nevada, but they do not have the money to take the expensive additional coursework required. CCSD has the LINKS team, our professional development group which trains our educators and our administrators on ADA best practices and autism classes. He spoke with Cynthia to think up another pathway or option for someone with a special education license. For example, we would like is someone who would qualify for a generalist license to be able to take the LINKS team training classes and be able to gain the autism endorsement and be able to teach it.

Cynthia McCray presented on behalf of CCSD LINKS team on autism training. She stated that their team supports these programs and it has been a struggle to keep teachers in these classrooms. They would like to increase the quality in these classrooms; some of the trainings that would be pertinent would be what we call the 2-day didactic training, an overview on autism, the history of autism and how to interact with the students. As a district, we have adopted the ADA training in those two days of training, about 6 hours, she believes in this training and it has been worthwhile. This is a prerequisite for 24 more hours of training over 4 days that deal with hands-on with the students and practice with them we give them feedback in the moment. For the initial 2-day training, we service upwards of 150-200 teachers and administrators at a time. Everybody that does the initial 2-day training is able to go through a prescribed program with students to work with them. We felt this was viable for the possible endorsement. We call it the Behavior Intervention Gambit (BIG), which teaches behavior intervention strategies for the given moment; this is a higher level skill. We have these listed here depending on the level of the development to address.

Cynthia continued and stated that they have a second part of the program called "BIGGER" to make sure we show it was progressive. The second part goes into more detail to explain how to do functional behavior programming, how to determine if a program they were using was working, and how to fine-tune to individual behaviors. Another program we have, called Beyond the Four-day focuses on curriculum development, individual targeting behavior, and lesson planning, all are prerequisites from the first 2-day, to the 4-day, to beyond the 4-day training. Another is an opportunity to critique is an ADA video provided by Autism Partnership. They are one of the community organizations that support our program to ensure that we have credibility throughout. We have a contract with them train our teachers and specialists to make sure we are being true to the process. These are the initial classes for the Commission's consideration for this request. It has been a big struggle to keep our classes filled and this would be handled through our ARL program and Angela Burkhart coordinates that portion.

Angela Burkhart stated that another piece would be the follow-up that they have with their mentoring with their ARC teachers for 3 years. It is intensive during the first year, their autism itinerant specialists come out and they make recommendations based as to how the teacher should proceed and then have weekly mentoring sessions to support those recommendations. During years 2 and 3, it is by referral process if a teacher needs more help from the LINKS team.

President Esparza asked Director Yates about the number of vacancies for the current school year. Andre replied that it was 61 vacancies in regular autism and 2 in the kids programs for a total of 63 inclusive vacancies this year.

Commissioner Pendleton stated that at Clark High School they added a second autism unit and they were lucky to find a qualified teacher. She commended CCSD for thinking outside the box to find an alternative to fill these needs, it takes an exceptional individual to work with and grow with these special students. She asked about the current implementation for the LINKS trainings available. Cynthia McCray stated it was the current model and all new teachers come through the program. This is a snapshot of the overall training. They have 32 different trainings available, some are mandatory and some are voluntary. Commissioner Pendleton asked about if someone where a licensed generalist in Nevada. Andre Yates replied that an example would be Autism teacher from New York who did not have the Autism specific endorsement, moving to Nevada, they would be on the option program ARC which means they must do expensive coursework and the LINKS training. Commissioner Pendleton followed up with a point of clarification about currently licensed teachers in Nevada needing the same training. Andre replied that she was correct.

Commissioner Burnham stated that the Commission did not have the authority to approve endorsement areas in ARL programs and asked Jason to correct her if she was wrong. Jason Dietrich stated that Commissioner Burnham was correct.

President Esparza stated that she was thankful for the presentation and asked Jason to clarify and bring guidance.

Jason Dietrich stated that the NDE does not currently offer an ARL for an endorsement area. What Mr. Yates was referring to was the Alternative Route to Certification (ARC) program, which is a different model to the ARL. On ARC, they are a district employee placed into that assignment and obtain the college credits to add onto their license. When equating a special education generalist to autism, they must take 12 credits which are required to add that endorsement. We have spoken to CCSD previously on this. They asked to be placed on the agenda and we will continue to work with them on how to help bring back to the Commission at a later date as to what options could be presented. The Department will continue to work with CCSD to see if it would be possible to develop an alternative certification.

President Esparza stated that it was not within the Commission's purview to make changes to these regulations.

Andre Yates stated that they added the 3 specific areas due to how common they are and where they end up. They appreciate the Commission's consideration and if there were any questions to contact CCSD.

Agenda Item #7 – ARL Program Withdrawals, Presented by Jason Dietrich

Jason Dietrich presented ARL program withdrawals. Recently, a lot of the smaller rural districts have been withdrawing their ARL programs as they join with Great Basin College as their ARL provider. This is due to reporting requirements and staffing issues. These are the two remaining: Elko County School District and Eureka County School District. The NDE recommends the Commission allow for withdrawal of these two ARL programs.

Motion: Commissioner Burnham moved to approve the withdrawals of Elko County School District and Eureka County School District ARL programs. Commissioner McGregor seconded the motion. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Agenda Item #8 – ARL Application Process and Review Team, Presented by Jason Dietrich

Jason Dietrich gave the Commission a brief history on the ARL Application Process followed up by a recommendation on the make-up of the ARL review team going forward. Historically, the Commission

has seated 2 members and the NDE has seated 2 members for a total of 4 members on the review team. The NDE would propose having 2 Commissioners, 2 NDE staff appointed by the Secretary of the Commission, and the Secretary to the Commission to make up a 5 member body rather than a traditional 4 member body. This would require a regulation change should the body agree to this. The Secretary of the Commission would be the new position which often has to oversee the meetings and provide clarification on many of the areas. The NDE would also recommend an on-going process, rather than a semi-annual process for reviews of the ARL program approvals. Soon, the Commission will also have to do the traditional programs approvals and this would put the ARL program approvals in-line with the traditional programs. If the Commission were willing to entertain the request, they could make a motion and move forward to amend a very small portion of the regulation to clarify it.

President Esparza asked who current sits on the ARL review team. Jason replied it was Commissioners Drum and Burnham and NDE staff members Christine Furst and Matthew Borek.

Commissioner Burnham stated that having someone who has served on the review team previously would be important as well as having someone on the team who is intimate with licensing details. She would like to see consistency on the review team. Jason stated that the individual in the education preparation program seat within the NDE would stay on the review team due to overseeing the traditional programs pathway. The rotation would be more on the NDE staff level with the Licensure Analysts. He believes all the analysts need to have the experience. Commissioner Burnham likes the idea of rotating Commission members. President Esparza stated that she also agrees that having rotating staff members is very helpful to have cross-training available for the NDE.

Motion: Commissioner Pendleton moved to approve the drafting of language in regulation for the additional member of the Secretary of the Commission on the ARL review team, rotation of the NDE staff on the review team, and rotation of Commission members on the review team. Commissioner Zeh seconded the motion. **Motion carried unanimously.**

President Esparza called a recess at 10:01 am.

President Esparza called the meeting back to order at 10:09 am.

Agenda Item #9 – Workshop on NAC 391.0573 Conditional licensure: Areas of instruction to teach certain pupils; categories of instruction to teach special education to certain pupils, presented by Mike Arakawa

Mike Arakawa presented the workshop on NAC 391.0573; essentially what the NDE is doing in this language is cleaning up outdated language in the regulation which is no longer applicable. More specifically, in all the places where it references pre-kindergarten through grade 12, the NDE is changing the language to reflect early childhood through grade 12, which is how the programs and endorsements read. In 2(B) language is being removed that references specific areas which are no longer issued as distinct endorsements and are now captured under the Special Education Generalist endorsement. In 2(D), where it makes references to pupils under 8 years of age, it will change to pupils enrolled in a program of Early Childhood Education. There are no substantive changes to the regulation or intent; this is simply language cleanup so that everything reads the same across all relevant regulations.

Commissioner Burnham asked for clarification from Mike in regards to 2(B). Mike replied that the language was outdated and contained endorsements that were no longer being issued by the NDE. They are now all included within the Special Education Generalist endorsement. Commissioner Burnham asked for clarification from Mike in regards to 2(D) and if that also needed to state Early Childhood Special Education or if it was implied. Mike replied that it was implied as it deals with special education. Commissioner Burnham asked if this would have any impact on a pupil who has a disability in a regular course of study in early childhood. Mike replied that he would defer to Director Dietrich. Jason Dietrich stated that the old language stated pupils who have disabilities and who are under 8 years of age, which the new definition is under Early Childhood Special Education. There should be no impact to the field at

all; those individuals would be under an Early Childhood Developmentally Delayed (ECDD) license, but adding the specific area of licensure would convolute the regulation. It is implied under special education in the regulation in its entirety. We could add clarifying language under 2(D) if the Commission wishes so. Commissioner Burnham would like the clarification language. Jason stated the NDE would add the language which would come back at Public Hearing.

Motion: Commissioner Burnham moved to approve the Regulation language for NAC 391.0573 with the amendment under 2(D) to add Early Childhood Special Education clarification language and move it to public hearing. Commissioner Gallivan-Wallace seconded the motion. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Agenda Item #10 – Workshop on NAC 391.060 Expiration of licenses and endorsements, presented by Mike Arakawa

Mike Arakawa presented language for the workshop on NAC 391.060 stating that it reflects a change in practice for the National Board of Teaching Standards. Previously, a National Board Certificate was valid for a 10 year period. National Board is changing the validity of the certificate to a 5 year period at some point going forward. In order to reflect that change, the NDE proposes changing the language in NAC 391.060 from specifying a 10-year license to simply stating that the license would be valid for the period of validity of their National Board Certificate. There is one more piece of cleanup for NAC 391.056 referencing expiration on the licensee's date of birth, and exempting a license under this regulation.

Motion: Commissioner Drum moved to approve the Regulation language as written for NAC 391.060 and move it to public hearing. Commissioner Zeh seconded the motion. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Agenda Item #11 – Workshop on NAC 391.160 Types of endorsements issued by Department, presented by Mike Arakawa

Mike Arakawa presented language for the workshop on NAC 391.160. He stated this was language cleanup and that it would remove defunct language in administrative endorsements, including the endorsement for supervisor of curriculum and instruction, and adding the position of Dean. After speaking with the districts, they do not use the supervisor of curriculum and instruction position and it is defunct language. The NDE proposes striking subsection 4 which makes reference to a life diploma, which the districts stated that they had no idea what it was, which means this is removal of more unused language.

Motion: Commissioner Pendleton moved to approve the Regulation language as written for NAC 391.160 and move it to public hearing. Commissioner McGregor seconded the motion. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Agenda Item #12 – Workshop on NAC 391.335 Endorsement to teach grades 5 through 9, presented by Jason Dietrich

Jason Dietrich presented Workshop language on NAC 391.335 and the repeal of this regulation. It is encompassed by NAC 391.111, which was also recently clarified with additional language and passed workshop by the Commission two meetings ago. The information is no longer relevant and the NDE is requesting the repeal of the regulation.

Commissioner Zeh asked how many people hold this endorsement. Jason stated that less than 30 individuals hold this outdated license and the NDE will grandfather these individuals into the new regulation. The NDE is trying to clean up old and outdated language. There is no negative impact to the field to those currently holding this license with its repeal. This is simply regulatory cleanup being done during the light period.

Commissioner Burnham asked if this endorsement had any impact on the NAC 391.111 license rather than the endorsement. Jason replied that this goes back to a prior meeting where the terms “endorsement” and “license” are convoluted in regulation. Technically, middle school is a license; however, it is referred

to as an endorsement in regulation. LCB has returned language calling it an endorsement. This is a flexible term. Middle School is a license and educators hold a content area endorsement under that license. Everything has been rolled into NAC 391.111 and this is cleanup of defunct language that has not been used since 2005.

President Esparza stated that NAC 391.335 seems very confusing and asked Jason if the NDE had anyone seeking this endorsement. Jason replied that no one was looking to add this endorsement and that the NDE does not currently issue licenses or endorsements under this regulation.

Motion: Commissioner Zeh moved to approve the repeal of regulation language for NAC 391.335 and move it to public hearing. Commissioner Pendleton seconded the motion. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Agenda Item #13 – Workshop on NAC 391.339 Endorsement to teach mathematics in grades 5 to 8, inclusive, presented by Jason Dietrich

Jason Dietrich presented the workshop on NAC 391.339. The NDE is requesting to repeal this regulation. The information within this regulation is also within NAC 391.111 and is thus redundant in the number of credits for majors and minors. The new language within NAC 391.111 allows for a major in this field with 24 credits or a minor with 14 credits. This makes it less restrictive. The NDE has received comment from the field about the repeal of this regulation with concerns about removing mathematics in middle school, this was a misunderstanding. This is not the case, the language is still contained in regulation under NAC 391.111 and the language for NAC 391.339 is not needed nor has it been amended since 2005. We do not currently issue licenses under this regulation, there are less than 30 individuals who hold this endorsement and they would be grandfathered in under NAC 391.111. This repeal has no impact on the field or those license holders. To add more context, as discussed in the previous meeting, individuals would be able to test into the content area for middle school. For example, someone holding elementary, special education, or secondary licenses may pass the content area Praxis examination to test into the endorsement or license area. This is simply cleanup of defunct old language and redundancy.

Motion: Commissioner McGregor moved to approve the repeal of NAC 391.339 and move it to public hearing. Commissioner Burnham seconded the motion. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Agenda Item #14 – Workshop on NAC 391.0575 Conditional licensure: Requirements to apply for initial license to teach secondary education or to teach pupils in prekindergarten through grade 12 in specific area, presented by Jason Dietrich

Jason Dietrich presented language on Workshop for NAC 391.0575. He stated that in 2014 at the establishment of this regulation, the NDE was allowing Alternative Route Providers only through higher education institutions and school districts. Since then, the business model has changed to allow non-degree providers to become ARL providers. The content that was required in NAC 391.0575 was 18 semester hours of work in pedagogy, which the NDE would like to change. Under the traditional secondary pedagogy route it is much less rigorous and requires 14 semester hours and 8 hours of student teaching. The ARL student teaching is exempt due to it being encompassed into the program and it is not credit-based. As the licensing body, the NDE was having difficulty with the differences in the two regulations. Universities questioning why a traditional route secondary individual had to do 14 credits, but there were 18 credits in specific areas for the alternative route. Those specific areas are encompassed in regulation, but they are more broad-based and it allowed those institutes of higher learning to develop better programs. The NDE is offering suggested language, not suggesting the Commission not be able to keep it as is, but the NDE believes that putting it in line with the traditional route be in the best interest of the educators seeking licensure. This will make a great impact for relieving frustration among applicants with the educator licensure process.

President Esparza asked why there were 18 credits originally. Jason replied that it was specifically designed that way in 2014. In the secondary ARL realm, they are testing out of content and not taking pedagogy. Moving forward, this is going to be standard business practice if someone holds another

license in Nevada, there would be no need for alternative route to go from one area to the next, such as elementary to secondary. Educators would be able to test into the other areas. Conversations are changing and the state is evolving, and this will remove barriers. President Esparza asked for context on the courses listed at the bottom of the regulation. Jason stated that the courses are still relevant, but being called out specifically there would be no leeway or flexibility to change with the times or needs for the program. If the Commission mirrors them to the secondary requirements for pedagogy, it opens those up. These are all courses that can be taken in that secondary pedagogy, but there are others as well. As an additional point of clarification, the multi-cultural education course is now statutorily mandated. That course itself will have to be taken after licensure; there is no consideration for anything in the pre-service realm. They will be required to take the multi-cultural education. The English Language Learners (ELL) community, under English Language Acquisition and Development (ELAD), who have been licensed or are renewing after a certain period would be required to have a 3 credit course or professional development to renew those licenses in ELAD. If we allow for broader interpretation to mirror standard secondary, it will allow programs to more flexibility in their courses.

Commissioner Burnham stated that she was present in 2014 and remembers specific and prolonged conversations about what this conditional license needed to be. There was a recommendation for the 18 semester credits for secondary pedagogy and in the specific courses that were required, rather than allow for any 14 credits secondary-related. This was not something that was drafted overnight or without a lot of discussion and conversation. Not to say it couldn't be changed, but that is the history.

Commissioner Gallivan-Wallace stated there are no 14 credits required for traditional coursework. She asked for clarification with the ARL content coursework and if it was implied in the program. Jason stated that 14 credits are implied within the program. If the provider were a school district offering ARL, placing those individuals within higher education institutions or a higher education institution that is degree-granting. Those 14 or 18 credits would be granted however this Commission decides. It is the equivalent of professional development for the non-degree granting ARL providers. It can be convoluted.

Jason further stated that he understood the historical context and two of the courses in the current regulation, Multi-cultural education and ELAD, are now required by statute. This means that educators would have to repeat those specific classes under this regulation as it is written. The NDE was trying to be proactive before it reached those individuals and would have to tell them to take those classes again. Commissioner Burnham stated they get this within the first 3 years of conditional licensure rather than after the 5 years of teaching with young students and not having a course or instruction and not having anything to do with multi-cultural education or ELAD. Jason clarified that it is still part of the secondary pedagogy courses which can be taken. The institutions do what is right for the field and they make sure that the courses which are needed would be embedded in their ARL programs. It creates a bit of angst with specific credit differences. At the higher education level, there are some institutions that have traditional route secondary pedagogy and alternative route programs, periodically they get crossed. There will be individuals who complete the 14 credits of pedagogy because they went through the ARL program, but somehow fell into that other bucket. At the higher education level this can be very confusing because they come out with the same thing. The NDE has not denied those who have the 14 credits as opposed to the 18 credits, it has been a very small amount, but those individuals met every other requirement. If the Commission were able to clean up the differences in credit hours and wanted to maintain the specific coursework, which would be very helpful. If not, then business will continue as usual.

President Esparza stated that she understood the removal of credits and classes; she opened up discussion to the Commission on the number of credits requirements. Commissioner Burnham stated she does have an issue with it. She believes that the traditional route should possibly be revisited to become 18 credits instead.

President Esparza asked the Commission if they had any more comments or concerns. Commissioner Pendleton asked for clarification in regards to the total number of credits for the traditional route. Jason replied that the number of total credits is 8 credits of student teaching and 14 credits of pedagogy for a total of 22 credits. Commissioner Pendleton asked for clarification from Jason about language and being in the classroom for 8 years versus 5 years. Jason replied that is how the regulation is currently written; an ARL provider must provide that specific content for secondary pedagogy. If the Commission went with the revised language, it would allow the ARL provider to still provide that content, but would also allow them to provide additional content that the Commission also allows on the traditional side. The NDE is trying to be more proactive so that individuals do not have to repeat the two courses at their expense that are now specifically required by statute. Any license issued July 1, 2015 to current, must take a course in Multi-cultural Education to satisfy 3 credits of the current 6 credits upon renewal on their license. This must be done at application for their first renewable license, this means the first initial license is a 3-year non-renewable license and they renew for their standard 5-year license, they are required to have this course. At the renewal of their standard renewable 5-year license, they are required to have the ELAD course to fulfil that provision. This is where the 8 years comes into play. With ELAD, there is a staged implementation into the prep programs, it is either 2020 or 2022, they are starting with the elementary realm or it will stage into the various levels of the prep programs. ELAD will eventually become part of the pre-service training; this will be part of the renewal change in a decade or so. In the Licensing office, people complain about having to re-take courses that they have already taken. It is the Commission's role to determine what the field must take.

Commissioner Burnham stated one more point of clarification if an ARL program includes ELAD endorsement as a requirement, then they would not need to retake anything. Even in the renewal requirement it states if they already have the endorsement, they do not take additional ELAD coursework. Jason replied that would be dependent upon the ARL provider; if it is university-based that would count as credit, but a non-degree granting ARL program would not be able to offer this as credit.

President Esparza stated that she is hearing a lot of uncertainty within the Commission and stated that perhaps the NDE could clean up the language some more and then come back before the Commission. Commissioner Pendleton stated she would like more historical context, she likes the idea of streamlining the coursework, but is not ready to act upon this regulation.

Commissioner Burnham asked that the NDE provide the minutes from the 2014 meeting in which NAC 391.0575 was discussed to have historical context. Jason stated that the NDE would provide those minutes to the Commission to bring NAC 391.0575 back before the Commission for discussion at an upcoming meeting.

The Commission chose not to act upon this regulation Workshop.

Agenda Item #15 – Workshop on NAC 391.065 Renewal of license: Educational and professional requirements; exception, presented by Jason Dietrich and Matt Borek

Jason Dietrich presented the language on the Workshop for NAC 391.065. He stated that upon renewal, most licensees must have obtained 6 renewal credits through continuing education or professional development. While attending national conferences, information was provided from other states and their requirements for renewal credits or professional development. The NDE came upon a renewal model in another jurisdiction which seemed to really fit what Nevada is doing right now. The NDE has started the third year under Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF), with wonderful classes that do not give renewal credits. This is an evaluation system which is based upon employment-based professional growth and goals. The language for this would bring NEPF and licensure together for license renewal purposes.

Matt Borek stated that this removed the credits at the starting point. Every year educators receive an evaluation and part of that evaluation is a growth plan for the next year, which is agreed upon with the

educator's supervisor. Renewal would be based upon an individual providing the NDE with 1 completed annual growth plan per year of employment during the term of their license, rather than the current practice of gathering enough certificates or credit hours. There is a lengthy second part of this. Overseas they do not use NEPF, other people who this might apply to may be those teaching at private schools or not currently employed for at least half of their licensing term. In these cases, it would revert back to their previous requirements. This is how states such as Georgia, New Hampshire, and Wisconsin are currently doing it. This is a logical next step after the investments around the country in educator development.

Jason stated that to add a few things, if there was an individual who traveled abroad and wanted to receive credit for this travel toward license renewal, the travel and credit currently have to be approved by the NDE. Under the proposed new language, the licensing office is not working with these educators; it is the administrators in these schools working with them. These are the people who are better able to determine what the educator should be doing for their growth program to improve as educators. The NDE views this as a less bureaucratic process. This is not just a regulation change; it is also a philosophical change within the profession. This is putting the emphasis of the professional goals out of the bureaucratic process and putting it where it belongs.

President Esparza stated that Nevada has been pushing professional development for all levels. She asked about the process between the NDE and educators for the approval process. Jason replied that current process is that Professional Development, conferences, travel, et cetera would be put in the hands of the Administrators and their educators and what would be acceptable under their professional growth programs. Charter schools would also have a growth program. If the administrator and their educator work out the program and those goals are satisfied, this is merely an agreement between them and once it is signed off on, the NDE could renew their license. The NDE is embedded in the field where it shouldn't be and should be giving that control to the administrators.

Matt stated that it puts professional development into the forefront rather than as an afterthought for renewal of licensure. Right now it is part of an annual expected process. This reaffirms NEPF as a continuous growth instrument, which was the original intent.

President Esparza stated that CCSD is going through reorganization and more autonomy is happening at the site level and this is very progressive. Administrators are already doing the evaluation for professional development of their licensed educators. As a building administrator, this is very much in line with the reorganization.

Commissioner Gallivan-Wallace stated this was very progressive and having come from Massachusetts, certain development points had to be fulfilled, not necessarily college credits, it could be a lesson plan shared with colleagues, it promoted collaboration and development. At the same time she is concerned about the workload for the administrators and would not like to see the NDE taken out of the equation for approving what is considered professional development.

Commissioner McGregor stated, as a classroom teacher who must have those renewal credits, she is concerned with how the evaluation would work. She is concerned with her growth plan not being up to snuff and not meeting the requirements. The current process in Washoe County School District, working with their Student Learning Objectives (SLO) had previously not been part of her evaluation, but this year it counts for 20% of her evaluation. All of a sudden, the SLO that her department used is not good enough any longer and they would have to completely redo it. She wonders with this move, what would be expected. She is also worried about getting away from Professional Development Courses. As an educator, she is going to take those courses she finds necessary for herself and her class. She is hesitant to move forward with this.

Jason stated that he does not want to misuse that authority of the word "approval" in the context of the conversation. If an educator is taking professional development or college credits currently to meet the 6

credit requirement, as long as the professional development provider has been approved by the NDE, courses may be taken from them or take college courses vaguely related to the educator's field. What happens currently is that the NDE does it as a business process approving conferences, workshops, travel, teaching, et cetera based on contact hours and subject matter being somehow related to the educator's field. The NDE does not look into the specific content of these; it is not as stringent as individuals may believe. It could be far more meaningful if done at the school base level. To Commissioner McGregor's point about the workload on administrators, the NDE would defer to the administrators on the Commission; President Esparza and Vice President Pendleton. As far as a professional growth plan, whatever an educator works out with their administrator for a given evaluation period is entirely up to the two of them. It would allow complete autonomy. Approval doesn't come into play into this new realm, approval is very liberal, and it is currently a paperwork function. The NDE does not know that specific professional is meaningful to a specific individual. That person and their administration could far better determine that. The NDE would encourage the Commission to look at this with an open mind, to broaden and become more progressive. Other states, such as Georgia, find that is far more meaningful for their educators. It puts the emphasis on professional growth where it belongs.

Commissioner Pendleton stated that the sticking point for her would be the word "employer" as she thinks of the employer as the school district rather than the building administrator. Jason stated that the NDE could narrow down the language to "site-based administrator," but the NDE wanted to leave it as broad as possible to capture all licensed personnel. Mike Arakawa suggested that rather than "employer" they could change the language to "evaluating authority."

Commissioner Pendleton stated that keeping it broader may be better for a regulation; she likes to streamline processes and is excited to have it done progressively and moving in the right direction, it makes sense. She is concerned about possible unintended consequences. Matt Borek stated that he understands the unintended consequences and sees it within the approval process of the Professional Development courses with all classes happening in exactly half-credit classes. One of the current unintended consequences deals with how many professional development courses are exactly 7.5 hours or 15 hours for half a credit or a full credit.

Commissioner Zeh stated that she would like clarification on other professionals, as a school counselor where the administrator may not know what the best source of professional development would be for a school counselor. The other side of that is when she was working for TISS, her professional growth plan they struggled with. She would like everyone to keep this in mind.

Commissioner Gallivan-Wallace stated that she perhaps meant oversight and is thinking of possible holes in this where one principal or employer would approve this, but then there is an administrator that would not think it was worthy to be professional development. She wonders who would make sure this is fair and equal across the board. Jason stated that not every educator and administrator is equal, there has to be a relationship between the two. The NDE doesn't approve everything, there are specific things submitted to the NDE, but it can be re-submitted after obtaining something that may be missing and be approved. There is not a perfect process for this, at the end of the day it is an evaluation with a developmental plan. The meaning and philosophy behind it is basically the same, it will not catch every scenario. Working with the administrator is crucial. The same thing occurs today, the growth may not be there. Within NEPF there are still growth goals. The NDE wants to make it more meaningful at the school-base level.

President Esparza stated that, as a school administrator, she is already doing this work where she has to do evaluations in line with NEPF. She is already signing off on the process. She asked the educators in the northern part of the state if they have an appeals process for their evaluations if they do not agree with their administrator's assessments. Commissioner Drum stated that at this point she doesn't believe that the northern part of the state has any appeal process that she is aware of. In all the evaluations she has had, she does not remember her administrator telling her that she should or should not take a course. A lot of the time the professional learning was not discussed and not part of her professional growth plan. She

stated that the administrators would need to be aware of what is available to all of their staff. She asked about National Board certification as part of their professional growth plan and how it could be used for the renewal of a license under section 2, but not listed under section 1. She asked if an individual holds National Board Certification would they be able to renew with it. Jason stated that it would be part of the professional growth plan. Under the new model, they are reducing the certificate from 10 years to 5 years. For Nevada, a National Board Certificate would be in line with the standard 5 year license, which means those holding a National Board Certification would lose time especially if they hold a master's degree or greater. The National Board Certification could become the professional growth for renewal. The NDE could look at it. The NDE is open to any suggestions.

Commissioner Drum stated that she does work with teachers working through the National Board Certification process. She gave a point of clarification on the National Board Certification timelines.

Commissioner Zeh stated that this regulation language opens it up more for her and the other professionals that want to add to their professional development.

Commissioner McGregor stated she sees pros and cons to this, depending on relationships between administrators and their employees, some may not get along. She would like to speak to other educators and administrators before making a decision on this. Commissioner Drum agrees with Commissioner McGregor and would also like to hear from other educators and administrators at various schools.

President Esparza stated that hearing there is a request for additional input, she would like to propose attaching this regulation to the next agenda and soliciting more public comment.

Motion: Commissioner Zeh moved to move regulation language for NAC 391.065 to the October 2017 meeting to solicit more public comment. Commissioner Pendleton seconded the motion. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Agenda Item #16 – Workshop on R083-16 NAC 391.075 Renewal of license: Credits and courses, presented by Jason Dietrich

Jason Dietrich proposed to remove the workshop on R083-16 NAC 391.075 as the regulation amendments were drafted in accordance with the previous agenda item and to move it to the next meeting in October 2017.

Motion: Commissioner Pendleton moved to move regulation language for R083-16 NAC 391.075 to the October 2017 meeting to solicit more public comment. Commissioner Zeh seconded the motion. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Agenda Item #17 – Workshop on NAC 391.030 Qualification to become licensed employee of school district: Courses or examination in certain subjects required; exemption, presented by Jason Dietrich

Jason Dietrich presented the repeal language for Workshop on NAC 391.030. He stated that it is defunct by statute and the NDE is requesting repeal at this time.

Commissioner Burnham stated she was concerned about getting rid of the regulation; her concerns are in section 1(B). Jason replied that deals with instruction to the NDE to issue provisional licenses based on the requirements for Nevada Law, Nevada Constitution, and US Constitution, which are no longer a requirement per statute. Commissioner Burnham asked about the status on the workgroup for the new requirements and how licensing is happening at this time. Jason replied that the statutory authority no longer resides with the NDE. The districts cannot legally act until the Commission determines the content and the Commission has 1 year determine the coursework. The NDE cannot issue a provision on licenses for what is in NAC 391.030; the NDE would be breaking the law in doing so. Mike Arakawa stated that

according to Senate Bill 20 of the 2017 Legislative Session, anyone issued a license after July 1, 2017 would have 2 years to complete the training.

Motion: Commissioner Pendleton moved to approve the repeal of regulation language for NAC 391.030 and move to public hearing. Commissioner Zeh seconded the motion. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Agenda Item #18 – Future Agenda Items

Jason Dietrich stated that the Commission would be hearing more regulation workshops, including NAC 391.065 and R083-16 NAC 391.075 for a second public workshop, and potentially public hearings. He gave a reminder to Commissioners that the next meeting is on Tuesday, October 17, 2017 rather than on Wednesday, October 18, 2017. We had to move the meeting due to the fact that Mike Arakawa and he are out of town.

Agenda Item #19 – Commissioners’ Comments

Commissioner Burnham expressed her support of President Esparza.

Agenda Item #20 – Deputy Attorney General Comments

Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General reminded the Commission on the process of workshops and regulations. Workshops are for information gathering.

Agenda Item #21 – Public Comment #2

No public comment in Carson City

No public comment in Elko.

Public comment in Las Vegas:

Ruben Murillo, President of the Nevada State Education Association stated that he wanted to thank the Commission for moving the topic of coursework for renewal to the next meeting. It will be difficult to get anyone out there to testify during the day. We will be working with teachers to bring back input relevant to topic and bring back their concerns. It sounds like a great concept, but there are a lot of nuances to take a look at. I’m not sure of the composition on how things work in the north and in terms of processes. A lack of northern presence from the administrators rank, this will impact all the counties and all school districts. We want to make sure that everything that is adopted is fair to everyone in the state.

President Esparza thanked Mr. Murillo for his comments.

Agenda Item #22 – Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:02 pm.