

**NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
NEVADA STATE BOARD FOR CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION  
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2016**

**Meeting Locations:**

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

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

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

**In Las Vegas:**

Mark Newburn  
Victor Wakefield  
Felicia Ortiz  
Elaine Wynn  
Samantha Molisee

**In Carson City:**

Pat Hickey  
Teri Jamin

**DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:**

**In Las Vegas**

Steve Canavero, Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Dena Durish, Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement  
Jana Wilcox-Lavin, Superintendent in Residence, Nevada Achievement District  
Rebecca Feiden, Deputy Director, Achievement School District  
Kim Bennett, Administrative Assistant

**In Carson City**

Brett Barley, Deputy Superintendent, Student Achievement  
Roger Rahming, Deputy Superintendent, Business and Support Services  
Greg Bortolin, Public Information Officer  
Mike Raponi, Director, Office of Career Readiness, Adult and Education Options  
Dave Brancamp, Director, Standards and Instructional Support  
Katherine Fuselier, Education Programs Professional  
Alex Kyser, Education Programs Professional  
Kim Vidoni, Education Programs Professional  
Shawn Osborne, IT Technician  
Karen Johansen, Assistant to the State Board

**Phone Call-In**

Peter Zutz, Administrator, Office of Assessments, Data and Accountability

**LEGAL STAFF PRESENT**

**In Carson City**

Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:**

**In Las Vegas:**

Krista Donnelly, Turn Around Zone, Clark County School District  
Ricardo Mercado, Data Recognition Corporation  
Megan Rauch, Guinn Center  
Patricia Cooper, Sierra Nevada College  
Tracy Clarke, ELL Director, Clark County School District  
Somer Rodgers, Parent  
Judy Mantee, National University  
Silvia Heredia, Opportunity 180  
Tyler Hanevold, Opportunity 180  
Stephen Augspurger, CCASA  
Patrick Leytham, Touro University Nevada  
K. Mead, Instructional Design & Professional Learning Division, Clark County School District  
Zane Gray, Sierra Nevada College  
Barbara Perez, Clark County School District  
Sheryl Colgan, Science, Clark County School District  
Doris Watson, UNLV  
Amanda Morgan, Educate Nevada Now  
Robert Jones, Clark County School District  
Karin Ekanger, Pearson  
David Gomez, Nevada Peace Alliance  
Barbara Gnatovich, Sierra Nevada College  
Jenn Blackhurst, HOPE  
Ruben Murillo, Nevada State Education Association  
Chris Brockman, Nye County School District  
Heidi Hoshibata, Clark County School District  
Jeff Geihs, Clark County School District  
Jennifer Varrato, Clark County School District  
Tish Nilsen, national University  
Tonya Wallis, Touro University,  
B. Larsen-Mitchell, Clark County School District  
Kristoffer Carroll, RPDP  
Julie Vigil, HOPE  
Terri Janison, United Way  
Sylvia Lazos, Educate Nevada Now  
Beth Rubins, Vegas PBS  
Debra Solt, Vegas PBS  
Kip Ortenberger, Vegas PBS  
Meredith Smith, Nevada Succeeds

**Carson City:**

Shawna Piscotti, Student, University of Nevada Reno  
Gabby McGregor, The Ferraro Group  
Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District  
Allison Combs, Nevada System of Higher Education  
Sandra Aird, Washoe County School District  
Adam Drost, Legislative Counsel Bureau  
Kaitlyn Griffiths, Carson City School district  
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents  
Dawn Huckaby, Washoe County School District  
Brian Mitchell, STEM, Governor's Office  
Kyle Dalpe, Dean, Tech Sciences, Truckee Meadows Community College

Julia Viani, Mineral County School District  
Kirsten Gleissner, NWRPDP

### **Call to Order; Roll Call; Pledge of Allegiance**

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 A.M.

### **Public Comment #1**

President Wynn noted written public comments were received from David Blodgett, Clark County School District (CCSD) and are posted on the Board's website.

Amanda Morgan, Educate Nevada Now (ENN), stated that Educate Nevada Now has been serving parents, principals and others about various aspects of the CCSD reorganization and wanted to share input that may help shape the regulations in the future. Please see [written comments](#).

Chris Brockman, principal, Nye County School District, provided comments about the end-of-course (EOC) assessment. They have not received the scores for the cohort of 2016 on pass/fail from the test they took last year on Math 1. There has not been any remediation because they did not know who to remediate. The class of 2016 is going to be expected to take the Math I test over again without any remediation if they get the scores prior to the test being taken. Mr. Brockman also has concerns about the test window. The window is shortened by three weeks for all the schools that started early. This year CCSD is not impacted but will be next year. His kids are expected to go from test to test to test where CCSD has three extra weeks and gives students breaks between their testing.

It is not fair to the rural schools or schools that started earlier. He asked if the sophomores will be expected to pass the EOC exams. The juniors and seniors are not expected to pass any of the EOC tests because they are the classes that determine the cut scores. Mr. Brockman inquired whether they will be able to remediate students. If so, they need to know the pass scores early so they are not removing students from classes they have already begun to put them into remediation classes. The test is given in April/May, registration is already going on, and they need the scores before the beginning of school so those kids that need remediation will be able to be remediated during that time.

Davis Gomez, president, Nevada Peace Alliance, and father of four children, stated their school system needs a reform. When the CCSD is not inviting the state people from the Achievement School District (ASD) to address concerns at the meetings, then there are communication problems. Fingers are being pointed at the state saying there is no transparent information. He stated there is a blockage in the CCSD and people from the ASD have been stopped from explaining how the schools will be chosen from the low performing schools. There have been issues for years with the superintendent and trustees in CCSD. They are not collaborating with the state and allowing the information to be transparent. At a recent meeting he attended there was a lot of finger pointing from CCSD to the state.

Somer Rodgers, parent, stated she is a mother of two children in CCSD schools. She first found out about the ASD from a letter sent home from her son's schools. She chose her neighborhood public school, Hummel elementary, for her children. Her first grade son has an Individualized Education Program (IEP) and because of how he learns Hummel Elementary was the best learning environment for him. Ms. Rodgers researched the ASD and has many concerns. From the possibility that her son's teachers could lose their jobs, to the schools not being comprised of the current demographics, and the ability of the charter school to say they are unable to provide services to many of the children with special needs. Earlier this week she met with Jana Wilcox-Lavin to discuss her concerns and they were lessened. She is not 100 percent on board but is interested to see how it plays out for the betterment of CCSD and will remain concerned about the exception charter schools receive for children with special needs. Current law allows a charter school to turn a child away if the school cannot serve the child's needs. She encouraged

the Board and the ASD to have transparency as the community moves through this process and to share all the information with parents so they become well informed.

Jeff Geihs, assistant chief turnaround, CCSD, said he has collaborated with Jana Wilcox-Lavin five times and will continue to do so after the official list comes out from the ASD office. He was happy to learn ASD is in support of and will consider the local district efforts. He is anxious to work together in a collaborative effort to learn about other exit and entrance criteria and is pleased the ASD position is that schools demonstrating gains on the recent NSPF rating are on track for changing eligibility status will not be recommended for transformation in 2017. He understands the intent of the ASD is to focus on transforming chronically underperforming schools but has concerns that some schools are beginning their first year of Turnaround, Victory or ZOOM. Law specifies that for the ASD it is the lowest five percent within schools at elementary or middle school level and high schools that have a graduation rate of less than 60 percent. The NDE has the ability to develop regulatory language and CCSD has testified against some of the proposed language. It is clear that there are 132 schools that have been identified based on the proposed regulatory language and CCSD is proactively meeting with those school communities.

Reuben Murillo, president, Nevada State Education Association (NSEA), stated he is in support of the collaboration of Clark County Education Association (CCEA). He said it bothers him when people are testifying, specifically ENN, about the negative impact of the teachers association when it comes to being part of a decision making process. The heart and soul of A.B. 394 will be the school organizing teams. When testimony is given that ENN has spoken to principals in Title I schools and are very concerned about the participation of CCEA, then he questions what is the commitment from the principals to be open minded about collaboration when it comes to working on shared decision making and working with different groups. He applauds focus on parent involvement.

Steve Augspurger, Clark County Association of School Administrators, stated he is also concerned with the ENN letter received today. He has talked with their staff and applauds their efforts for working with parents. But they have two collective bargaining organizations that were on the point for passing and pushing for the passage of A.B. 394. He has worked extensively with their members and they understand this is a new way of doing business in schools. It is unique and different than what has happened before, and it had to happen. There was a growing dissatisfaction with the CCSD, how it was structured and how resources were provided. Both will be impacted by A.B. 394. They have met with principal groups and they understand that this is a new way of working with teachers, support staff and parents and understand their role is different.

A single vote by a principal is immaterial. It is a hard change to swallow, but it is the right way to do this business for a principal to come in. Under the regulation they still develop the plan and budget. Their role is to sell the plan and budget to the team of people selected by those constituent groups and it causes them to work differently. New skills and complexities have been added to that job. Their role is to help shape opinion, expand thinking, and change the vision of people for the betterment of kids. We should not get distracted about whether there is a vote or not. It is too premature, school does not start until August 2017, and there are already recommendations for changes when it is not known how it will play out in practice. Changes will no doubt need to be made, the bill is not perfect. He suggested waiting until this is rolled out and there has been months of practice, and then come back to the table to discuss changes that need to be made.

### **Approval of Flexible Agenda**

**Member Newburn moved for a flexible agenda. Member Wakefield seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

### **President's Report**

President Wynn acknowledged she does not usually respond to public comment. However, because of the CCSD reorganization effort, the Board will consistently be challenged by people who are concerned about

the plan unfolding right now. She reminded everyone that the State Board approved the regulatory of plan. The Board did not create the plan, but they have a responsibility to oversee it as it evolves and unfolds. It is good that people are coming forward and expressing concerns, but she cautioned that this is just beginning to rollout. It has been barely one month since it has been formally approved. She has heard expressions of support and cooperation. The Board is happy and willing to oversee the results as they unfold. She added that the CCSD board of trustees will still be holding their public meetings and that is a good place for many of these concerns to be expressed going forward.

### **Superintendent's Report**

Superintendent Canavero informed the Board that the High School Graduation Committee will reconvene in November. They will discuss statutory language that may need to be changed given the direction of the NDE including nuances to graduation requirements. Bills have been submitted for the upcoming legislative session; however they may be amended with proposed language before they are introduced.

The joint meeting with the Board of Regents and the State Board is scheduled on Friday, October 21, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. October is a busy month and Dr. Canavero listed important dates:

- October 6, 2016 - Board action to possibly approve 2016 EOC ELA and Math cut scores.
- October 7, 2016 - Statewide results for the Smarter Balanced Assessment will be released.
- October 13, 2016 - The Nevada Report Card will be published. It includes information about school and district performance, and will also include preliminary graduation rates.
- October 14, 2016 – Release the rising stars (historically underperforming schools) and shining stars (schools that serve poverty students) list.

Workgroup and advisory group meetings continue with spirited discussions about the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Concerns with communication related to the ESSA advisory group have been discussed. A national expert was brought in to discuss the role of federal funds, what has changed, what is new, and how can federal funds be leveraged in service towards students.

Dr. Canavero reported on his testimony in a subcommittee of the U.S. House of Education and the Workforce Committee to urge the U.S. Department of Education to reconsider its proposed regulations on the supplement provisions of ESSA.

President Wynn noted that Principal Brookman commented earlier about his confusion with the EOC cut scores. It concerns her that he was not able to go to his own superintendent for clarification. Communication between the district superintendents on these issues is critical, so that the local educators can make that their first stop of inquiry rather than having to come to a Board meeting to express confusion.

Member Wakefield asked for clarification about graduation rates and the federal mandate for how the high school graduate rate is calculated. Dr. Canavero responded that the federal government identifies the cohort graduation rate and the way in which a student who graduates or transfers out or, is a drop out. There are federal and now state laws to execute the cohort graduation rate. It is technically called a four year adjusted cohort graduation rate because the cohort can adjust through time as students move in or out of the education system.

### **Approval of Consent Agenda**

- a. Possible Approval of re-licensing 2 Clark County Private Schools: Southern Highlands Preparatory School and Trinity International School.
- b. Possible Approval of Dual Credit request offered by Great Basin College to White Pine High School District
- c. Possible Approval of Instructional Material for Clark County School District
- d. Possible Approval of Career and Technical Education Quality Program Standards. The proposed Nevada CTE Quality Program Standards (QPS) include eight components designed to validate

career and technical education (CTE) programs in public and charter schools. The program standards identified in this document are listed as a model for the local district or charter school to design, implement, assess, and improve CTE programs. The standards represent rigorous and relevant expectations for program organization and delivery

- e. Possible Approval of September 1, 2016 Minutes

President Wynn noted that Trinity International School will not be included in the approval of the consent agenda today.

**Member Newburn moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Member Wakefield seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Appointment of member to Technical Advisory Committee created by A.B. 394, Section 26.**

The Board originally appointed Allison Serafin to represent the State Board of Education on the Technical Advisory Committee. Possible action includes the appointment of a present Board member to replace Ms. Serafin on the Technical Advisory Committee.

**Member Newburn moved to appoint Member Ortiz to the Technical Advisory Committee. Member Wakefield seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding standard setting of the 2016 End of Course Examinations in English language arts and mathematics, and possible approval of 2016 End Of Course English language arts and mathematics cut scores.** The Board will be provided information on the standard setting of the 2016 End of Course assessments and will receive a recommendation to adopt scores that define a standard of achievement needed to pass each exam.

Brett Barley, deputy superintendent, Student Achievement, reminded the Board that last year when the 2014-15 EOC exam cut scores came before the Board they had a recommended passing score of 3. There are four levels of proficiency with 4 being the highest and 1 being the lowest. This year the recommended passing score is level 2. The standard setting and policy committee deliberated long and hard about this recommendation with broad statewide participation on the committees.

Peter Zutz, administrator, Office of Assessments, Data and Accountability Management, clarified earlier public comment about the EOC results arriving in a timeframe that benefits both students and educators. It was a successful year of assessment with the vendor, Data Recognition Corporation (DRC), however, when the testing windows were closed there were challenges getting the data out in a meaningful way. Currently, the NDE is working with the vendor to identify the processes needed to have reports in the hands of students and educators in a timeframe in which those results will be beneficial and can be used for the benefit of the students. That process has been ongoing for over a month, and DRC will be in Carson City in a week for discussions about the processes and will produce by November 1 an agreement for the date by which all Nevadan's can expect student result reports in 2017.

Mr. Zutz explained the cut scores were the output of a standard setting process that took place August 2-4, 2016 and then a policy committee meeting took place on August 5, 2016. For the content meeting on August 2-4, there were 17 participants working through the ELA content and 15 participants working through the Math content. There were six participants in the policy committee meeting on August 5.

Rick Mercado, DRC, conducted a PowerPoint [presentation](#) about the proposed EOC cut scores for the Spring, 2016 test administration. Mr. Mercado said he learned a lot about the cut scores over the last year when achievement standards for the EOC were discussed. They spoke about the expectations of students in Nevada on these important tests and then went back after the spring 2016 administration and asked questions. What do students need to know in Nevada in order to be in level 1, 2, 3, and 4 on the EOC tests for the six tests? He explained that part of the process of standard setting is first making a clear statement about what the expectations are for each level. A robust process was used working with Nevada

educators, stakeholders, a process called the bookmark standard setting procedure and a secondary process as well asking what do students need to know and be able to do on the test in order to be in the achievement levels:

- Level 1: The student has not met the achievement standard and requires substantial and significant improvement to demonstrate the knowledge and skills needed as preparation for success in college and/or after high school.
- Level 2: The student has minimally met the achievement standard and may require specific and targeted improvement to demonstrate the knowledge and skills needed as preparations for success in college and/or after high school.
- Level 3: The student has met the achievement standard and has demonstrated progress toward mastery of the knowledge and skills needed as preparation for success in college.
- Level 4: The student has exceeded the achievement standard and has clearly demonstrated the knowledge and skills needed as preparation for success in college.

Students at Level 2 are still working toward becoming college and career ready. It was the recommendation of the policy review committee that Level 2 be considered a minimum graduation requirement; that if a student met a Level 2 threshold they would fulfill the requirements for graduation in terms of the EOC requirement. Mr. Mercado discussed the ELA and Math results in context. The policy review group recommends using Level 2 for the graduation requirement and that Level 3 is considered the college and career readiness goal for all students.

Member Molisee said as a senior in the class of 2017 and who participated in the EOC exams, she has a few concerns. The lower grades seem to perform better than the higher grades. Next year, will there be emphasis that focus on the higher grades? She said next year she is going to college and needs to be prepared for the college setting. When recommending Level 2, are we are saying we are meeting the minimum standard? Going into either college or career concerns her, as a senior she wants to be assured she is ready to go into college.

Mr. Mercado said she interpreted the data correctly. Students in lower grades performed better than students in higher grades. The antidotes that were heard from the standard setting participants and policy review had to do with the motivation of students. Students in grade 10, 11, and 12 either knew or could have known they did not need to do particularly well on these tests. They needed to sit for it, answer a question, but did not need to meet a particular threshold to meet their graduation requirement. He said that is one of the major levers why the results for those grades look different than those for the lower grades. Member Jamin expressed concern about the language in the descriptors because there has been a lot of input from employers that they are looking for the same knowledge and skills for students going into careers as being asked to achieve going into college. With these descriptors, it seems there is a division for Level 1 and 2 with more emphasis on career versus Level 3 and Level 4. Mr. Mercado said the achievement level descriptors are living documents and serve to give context to test results.

Mr. Zutz added these are a work in progress. They are trying to express what the policy committee expressed, that there are students who at a certain level should not be penalized for the performance on the EOC. When looking at the performance levels of the EOC exam, what does that look like when preparing Nevada students for success in career and college?

Member Ortiz commented that she was part of the team in March when it was first presented. It was a grueling process as they went over the standards to decide where students need to be. They took the test and bookmarked the difficulty of the questions. It became clear that students receive different messaging, they have different priorities and the test scores were re-evaluated. This will be ongoing, it is a positive step and it is a smart decision for the kids setting the bar high enough to ensure they are striving. If

students hit Level 2 they are graduation eligible but it also indicates there is still work that needs to be done before graduation to ensure they are college ready. Next year when there is a cohort of students taking the test that are vested, that will provide another good picture if further adjustment is needed.

Member Newburn said he was part of the process last year and again this year with the level setting and the policy committee. He described Level 2 as marginally college ready and Level 3 as solidly college ready and the way the system works it needs a measure as marginally college ready. Level 2 is what the legislature intended it to be. Nevada went from having an exit exam to an EOC, and in that process, it became incredibly hard. In its raw form, most teachers would not pass the test.

**Member Newburn moved to adopt the EOC cut scores. Member Ortiz seconded the motion. The motion carried**

**Information, Discussion and Possible Action concerning evaluations of Teacher-Librarians in accordance with A.B. 447. Assembly Bill 447 provides for the Board to determine evaluations of counselors, librarians, and other licensed educational personnel.**

Pursuant to NRS 391.675, the Board may provide for evaluations of counselors, librarians and other licensed educational personnel. The Board will hear updated recommendations from the Teachers and Leaders Council regarding the manner in which Teacher-Librarians should be evaluated, including but not limited to, standards, indicators, and student performance.

Dena Durish, deputy superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement recalled the Board has had this discussion many times and previously took action to provide for a statewide evaluation system for librarians. Kathleen Galland-Collins, education programs professional, NDE, conducted a PowerPoint [presentation](#) about the Teacher-Librarian statewide performance evaluation framework.

Ms. Galland-Collins explained the NDE created and facilitated the work groups to provide recommendations to the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) regarding the statewide performance evaluation framework for school librarians. The work group members consisted of elementary, middle and high school building administrators and teacher-librarians from Clark, Elko and Washoe County School Districts. Directives from TLC were given to the work group. School librarian brings up different images across the state and the work group defined teacher-librarian as teachers that hold a valid teaching license with a school library media specialist endorsement (NAC 391.255) and are working in a school library. The TLC approved and recommended instructional practice standards and teacher-librarian professional responsibilities standards. Detailed information was provided about the five standards and indicators.

The TLC recommended a motion to the Board, that the statewide teacher-librarian evaluation framework includes:

- Proposed Teacher-NEPF standards and indicators for use in the statewide teacher-librarian performance evaluation (as shown)
- Proposed Teacher-Librarian professional responsibilities standards and indicators (as shown)
- Same NEPF educational practice and student performance category weights as teachers and building administrators
- Equal weighting of the instructional practice and professional responsibilities domains
- Choice of using student learning goal or library goal

AND

- Full implementation in the 2017-18 school year (with the 2016-2017 school year to serve as a pilot study year)

**Member Newburn moved to adopt the proposed motion. Member Ortiz seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the Nevada Educator Performance Framework: Student Performance Domain and district-determined assessments.** Pursuant to NRS 391.465, beginning with the 2016-2017 school year, teacher and school administrator performance evaluations must include pupil achievement data derived from assessments approved by the board of trustees of a school district. The Board will hear recommendations from the Teachers and Leaders Council regarding the Student Learning Goal rubric to be used to determine the score for the district-determined data (10%) portion of the Student Performance Domain.

Deputy Durish conducted a PowerPoint [presentation](#) related to student performance. This is the first year, 2016-2017, that student data will be included in the teacher and principal evaluations. The first year of implementation was 2015-16 when all teachers and administrators received a final rating score based only on educational practice that was strictly based on observations. The first year will be looped in so at the end of 2016-17 there will be 20 percent student data included. Of that 20 percent, student performance will be utilized and will include statewide performance measures. There is no growth data because there is not two years of scores, rather there is one year of test results from 2015-16. At the end of this school year the NDE will be releasing the aggregate score to each school as a culmination of their statewide assessment data. The remaining 10 percent is why this item is here today. It is related to the loss as it also must include district determined measures. This is the local measure the school district is permitted to determine. Each principal and supervisor will be identifying for each teacher a specific Student Learning Goal (SLG) at the beginning of the school year. The discussion today is how they will get the number that will get to that score. A teacher's evaluation will be made up of three pieces; a) the educational practice based on the observation at 80 percent, b) the 10 percent from statewide data included in the formula, and c) the number must be determined. It is not easy because every educator will have a different SLG.

Ms. Galland-Collins continued the presentation. The SLG goals are already embedded within the NEPF protocols, it was part of the process that teachers and administrators set based on their student needs. This is the first year it will be used as part of the student performance domain. Ms. Collins listed the District Determined Measures and SLGs:

- Embedded in NEPF protocols
- Encourage collaboration among educators
- Reinforce good teaching practices
- Adaptable
- Current year data
- Educator specific and based on student needs
- Specific to standards and essential skills
- Show student growth over time
- Differentiate targets based on where students start

Dr. Pam Salazar said the TLC brought in a technical assistant from the Great Teachers and Leaders center as well as assistance from the American Institutes for Research. This is a prevalent process across the country and is not something new. Further information was provided about the SLG process including developing and approving the SLG, monitoring progress and criteria and priority levels for assessments used to measure progress toward the SLG. The SLG scoring rubric top score is 4, moderate is 3, low is 2 and unsatisfactory is 1. Dr. Salazar said this is the first year and suggested launching into this in a way that drives improvement and practice and therefore improvement in learning.

Member Ortiz asked will there be an SLG for each teacher in each school? When is the teacher required to create their SLG? Who is reviewing to assure it makes sense and reviewing throughout the year against the SLG. Ms. Collins said TLC does not set a specific timeline; it is up to individual districts. The

timeline is flexible. It is not something in addition to what teachers do, they already look at baseline data and pre-accessing students. This solidifies and provides a concrete process for teachers to follow. Supervisors or administrators will review. The goal setting and planning tool has criteria within it to guide questions. Member Ortiz expressed concern if teachers will be forced to give even more tests to the kids to achieve these goals. Ms. Collins said assessment is part of teaching and is a piece of what teachers already do and they are using existing assessments with more focus. Member Ortiz said it would be helpful if teachers would identify assessments that are not aligned so the district is made aware those assessments are not just another test kids are taking and nobody is using to measure. Ms. Collins clarified this is not in addition to, it is already something they do.

Dr. Salazar informed that this supports the teaching process versus taking away from it. It is grounded in the idea there are a set of standards that students master, should know and be able to do by the end of the year.

Member Wakefield asked to clarify that the Board is being asked to decide about the District Determined Performance measures or the student's progress toward SLGs identified at the beginning of the school year. Deputy Durish noted the Board approved statewide performance measures in regulation at the last board meeting, and the decision today is concerning the district determined performance measures.

Board member discussion ensued.

**Member Wakefield moved to approve the TLC recommendation: The Board accepts TLC's proposed recommendations for the District Determined Measures, including the prioritization of assessments to be used, and the Student Learning Goal Rubric to score each educator's impact on student progress toward the identified Student Learning goal.**

Member Molisee commented that as a student who sits in the classroom every day and experiences teachers on a first hand basis, that there are teachers who have been of immense benefit in preparing her for the years after high school, and then there are those teachers who have not been beneficial to her high school career. There are flaws in the system, however when looking past the flaws, the idea of targeting each individual teacher and how they will affect student performance is a good idea, from her perspective, and it will be effective when the kinks are worked out

**Member Ortiz seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the allocation of FY16 grants from the Great Teaching and Leading Fund (GTLF).** Pursuant to NRS 391A.500, any unexpended GTLF appropriations remaining at the end of a fiscal year must be carried forward to the next fiscal year. Members will hear recommendations from the GTLF Review Team regarding remaining FY16 funds and possible action may include allocation of these funds to FY17 applicants not previously awarded.

Deputy Durish informed the Board that at the last meeting the Board reviewed the remaining funds from FY16. There is about \$700,000 remaining from the grant process and those that did not receive funds or received a reduced amount were contacted and asked if interested to re-submit their application. Applications were submitted with revised budgets and the review team met three times to consider the applications. There were six applicants that the [review team recommended](#) utilize the remaining \$700,000:

- Doral Academy
- Elko Institute
- Southern NV Public TV
- Teach for America
- TNTP

- University of Las Vegas - collaborative

Member Wakefield recused himself from voting.

**Member Ortiz moved to release the funds to the six recommended entities. Member Newburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Information and Discussion regarding 2016-2017 licensed personnel staffing and data used to determine the 2016-2017 Teach Nevada Scholarship eligible schools list.** The Board will hear a presentation regarding the current status of teacher recruitment, hiring, and vacancies in school districts and charter schools. Based on this vacancy data, the Department will also share a new list of schools where 2016-2017 Teach Nevada Scholarship recipients will be eligible to receive the remaining 25% of the Scholarship funds following five years of continuous employment.

This item was not heard and will be moved to the November 10, 2016 agenda.

**Information and Discussion regarding the Nevada Achievement School District (ASD) overview of the data categories and approach that will be used to inform school selection recommendations.**

Dr. Canavero remarked that there has been a lot of recent discussion about the ASD. The NDE welcomes debate and discussion and ideally all parents will have an opportunity to have their questions answered in real time. However, the NDE was not invited nor involved in CCSD meetings and the material they produced in communicating with families. Dr. Canavero framed the discussion:

*The governor initiated the ASD in his state-of-the-state address and signed the bill creating the ASD, not just as an accountability measure to balance the 2015 investments with responsible accountability, but also as a promise to families and children across the state. The promise that all children deserve the opportunities in life that stem from a quality education will be honored on his watch. If and when the system fails to deliver on that promise, it will not be tolerated and there will be an avenue to deliver on that promise. It is a simple standard that has been and will continue to be confused with the noise that corresponds with any break from the status quo. For far too many students, primarily those in communities of poverty, the school system of yesterday is not working.*

*This is not an indictment of anyone or an assignment of blame, this is an empirical truth, equal to the truth that all students can reach and achieve high standards. Therefore it is incumbent upon us as professionals to embrace and address these truths for the benefit of children in Nevada. There is nothing to gain from finger pointing or turf wars, in fact there is too much to lose. Our students, parents, teachers and school leaders deserve better. When we lay this reality of performance on top of the economic opportunities of today and tomorrow, the urgency only rises. In our state many students are, by the nature of their circumstance, in schooling distanced from claiming the economic opportunities that come from a quality education. This is a reframing of what we used to call the achievement gap, or the distance or proficiency gap between students in poverty and their non-poverty peers, and reframing this gap as the opportunity gap. This point is important considering the New Nevada Economy will demand more not less of our education system to deliver on the promise to all Nevada students.*

*Dr. Canavero's approach to this work is with deep humility, he does not have the solution and it would be naïve to think anyone has the solution. Collectively there are a number of strategies, including the ASD that address the expectations of K-12 against the expectations of college and career readiness and seek to close the opportunity gap for kids. Additionally, we approach this work with transparency and availability. Today we*

*seek your feedback and to all those in the audience and elsewhere, please do not hesitate to reach out to seek answers to your questions. In response to a recent tweet he read what appeared to be responses to parents seeking to not have their school taken over by the ASD. The tweet suggested lobbying the State Board of Education as the avenue. In his opinion that is incorrect. He offered to everyone that the avenue out of being considered by the ASD is to deliver on the promise to the students with high outcomes.*

Deputy Barley recalled that at the previous meeting the Board received a presentation about Nevada's developing ecosystem of support for struggling schools. It included an overview of the new Harbor Master which is similar to an economic development agency designed to recruit and grow schools and educators committed to serving low income students. The Board also received information about some of the 17 new programs and funding sources available to support schools and the Board heard from the ASD which can select no more than six underperforming schools each year for transformation into a high quality Nevada Achievement School.

Today the Board will learn more about how the ASD will, in partnership with the Board and community stakeholders, over the next several months select the final list of schools to join the ASD portfolios in 2017. The process will be open and transparent with multiple interactions with districts and the community. No list of eligible schools exists now. The initial list will be available on October 14 and will rely on data from the 2016 Nevada School Report Card which will be released the same day. The eligible school list, with Board member input, will be narrowed between October 14 and the December 15, 2016 board meeting.

Jana Wilcox-Lavin, superintendent in residence, Achievement School District underscored that there is not a list of schools today; the analysis has not been completed yet. As a reminder from their last presentation, the ASD is one part of a much larger strategic coordinated strategy to serve all students across Nevada. This is a community informed process that relies on transparency and engagement of families and stakeholders.

Ms. Lavin conducted a PowerPoint [presentation](#) and stated the outcome today is for Board members to understand the information to help inform the school selection process. The timeline was described:

- October 15 – the NDE publishes the list of Rising Star Schools and Shining Stars schools and the ASD Eligible Schools.
- November 15 – the ASD recommends at least 20 percent of eligible schools for 2017 conversion to the Board
- Within 30 days of recommendation – the Board approves at least 50 percent of recommended conversion eligible schools
- By February 1 – the ASD selects up to six schools for transformation and pairs them with operators.
- Fall 2017 – Schools Open

Ms. Lavin addressed myths and facts surrounding the ASD. Myths include; when a school goes through transformation all the teachers are required to leave, zoned students get kicked out, and they no longer serve students with special needs. None of this is accurate information and Ms. Lavin countered the myths with facts. Information was provided about moving from a rising stars school list to a recommended list of 2017 conversion eligible schools. It was clarified this is not just an ASD list but also a list of underperforming schools that as a state the NDE is federally required to create. The list also serves as a launching point for multiple interventions.

The Rising Stars list was formerly known as the Underperforming Schools List. This is the list of schools that meets the federal requirement to publish a list of the state's lowest performing schools. In the absence of the ESEA waiver and defined ESSA plan; the same criteria is used for the Rising Stars as the ASD eligibility list.

The Shining Stars list has never been published. This list is designed to recognize achievement at the school level for those schools that have significantly outperformed the state in serving all students with an emphasis on closing the achievement gap. High poverty and high performing schools will set the bar for what is possible for each Rising Star School.

Ms. Lavin provided details about ASD eligibility criteria and how the different pieces line up with the ASD list and the general Rising Stars overlap. Information was also provided about the Shining Stars composition. The presentation detailed how the list of Rising Star schools and additional criteria and transition from the eligible schools to the list of recommendations will be brought in draft form for Board consideration. Data will be collected from all the schools on the list to identify the chronically underperforming schools

Ms. Lavin shared details about the spreadsheet the Board will receive and encouraged board member input to help inform the process as it involves. A one page summary of each school with the most recent data, historical data and rationale used to identify and recommend a school will be provided.

Member Ortiz asked if the culture and climate rating information could be included in the data as well as the demographics of the students.

Member Wakefield asked that the number of years of an intervention, how much was invested and intervention data from the districts that have already done a turnaround intervention is included in the list of interventions that have taken place. Then efforts that have taken place are clear. Ms. Lavin said they can access information that has been invested and that a special request would need to be made to each district about interventions that have taken place.

Member Newburn reiterated that the schools would be combined and ranked, and said he would like to understand how the formula works. He added he would like the list to be in ranked order, so that the schools that are most deserving of going into the ASD are at the top of the list, and the least deserving schools at the bottom so there is logic to the list. He noted there is an underlying assumption in the ASD model that a failing public school will be turned into a successful charter school. At some point he would like to hear the process that guarantees that it is going to be better. There are some great charter schools in the state but they are not in his district 4, the charter schools in his district have more of a history of failure. There is no value in his district to turn failing one star school's into one star charter schools.

Board discussion continued with clarifying questions.

President Wynn expressed confusion and said she was not clear about Mr. Geih's earlier public comments. She noted there has been confusion that the CCSD has gone off on a path that has led to some of this confusion, and asked if anyone could come forward to clarify. To the extent that everyone is transparent in what is happening would serve everyone better.

Craig Stevens, CCSD, commented that community meetings were held at several different schools, and more will occur in the future, because when the regulation was approved many schools were going to be added to a list. Since not many people understand what is going on when it comes to the ASD, the CCSD wanted to get out in front of the issue.

If a school heard it was on a list, then it was thought the school was supported by the CCSD, and it was important to get as much data as possible for any school that is on the list. That is what those meetings

were about. It was to inform schools that they may be on a list that has not been published yet. There will be due diligence to ensure the schools are supported and the data is collected.

President Wynn asked if this effort was coordinated through the ASD. Mr. Stevens replied that it was not. It was not about the ASD so much as it was about making sure CCSD schools were comfortable. There were going to rumors they would be turning into charter schools, and CCSD wanted to make sure all the information was out there so the schools felt supported. President Wynn said she understands the confusion. Holding those meetings is of concern in the sense that schools may be warned they could be put on a list, and if they are on a list, this is what it means. Why would schools be alerted that they could be put on this list, that it is imminent and here is what the CCSD is going to do?

Ms. Stevens said *could* is not the proper word. They will be put on a list because the criteria in the regulation states who is going to be put on that list that will be given to the Board. It will not be the final list, but there is no “you may or may not” be on the list. This is what Dr. Geihl was trying to say. If the school is in the bottom five percent or a two star school trending downward, it will be put on a list. This is being taken in context with A.B. 394 with the reorganization of CCSD. There are many questions that teachers, principals, schools and the community has. This is in addition to, and there is confusion. We did not want to have a list put out which is codified in regulation regarding who is going to be on the list. We were trying to be responsible to our schools, teachers and parents. The CCSD has their turn around process, they are very proud of it and asked the NDE to let them have the first crack at the turn around process. The CCSD has interventions with ZOOM, Victory and the turnaround process. They are not sitting on their hands and letting these schools fail. They would like to have a shot to see the interventions through.

President Wynn said but there is plenty of work for all of us to do. Unfortunately it has been pointed out that there will be more schools that need help than what help we will be able to provide. Clearly the turnaround program is vitally important. But to the extent that Mr. Stevens is indicating this is a Board matter in providing this new information, it would have been helpful to have linked this activity through the Board and the NDE so everyone is on the same page, and if there was information disseminated that at least it was sanctioned or perhaps coordinated. What we are hearing is a result of that effort, which was well intended, but it created some confusion. She suggested in view of the reorganization, now CCSD will have teams of site based management occurring and they are supposed to take ownership of their schools. How will those groups feel about being told that after only a year on the job that maybe they qualify for ASD intervention? There is enough going on to confuse people and make the job harder. Our message to all of the districts is to please try and coordinate through the state department, we are not directing or telling you what to do, but it would be helpful to stay informed and not have to be reactive.

President Wynn said she would like to invite Superintendent Skorkowsky to attend the next meeting with whomever he selects from the district that is working in this area, and present legitimate concerns, frustrations, plans so we can air these publically and resolve them.

Allison Serafin, Opportunity 180, responded to Member Jamin’s concerns about the lack of high quality charter schools in Douglas and Carson City School District. She said it has been exciting to talk to charter operators across the country that are considered best in class. They are non-profit charter operators that serve a predominate percentage of children in poverty with evidence of success. Ms. Serafin said it is a business decision to recruit high quality charter operators.

It is evident through the applications that some of the high quality charter operators have already applied to launch schools in CCSD. There are a number of high quality charter operators that want to expand to Nevada.

Member Ortiz expressed concern about the motivation behind the list of schools from CCSD. It feels like it is undermining the efforts of the ASD to get out there and talk to community from a positive perspective, and they are now being reactive. There are more positive things that could be done with our

time than having meetings with what ifs, and oh just maybe you might be on the list. She proposed taking a more positive approach in the future to work cooperatively with the Board so we are not blindsided by emails from parents that are worried they are going to lose their school, when the list has not even been released yet.

In response to Member Wakefield commenting that he is trying to understand the disconnect with CCSD, Mr. Stevens said his interpretation about why they are here today is to narrow down the list of criteria that will be used in order to take the original list that is laid out in the regulation and use the data points to continue to do the work. When that information is brought to the Board to narrow down the list, then they will have more information. However, the regulation is very clear.

Member Wakefield recommended that when the CCSD superintendent comes to the Board that they have the materials that were shared in the meetings. If there is any misinformation, he would appreciate if it is cleared up before the next meeting.

Ms. Lavin said their team is open and available to answer any questions that come up.

**Information and Discussion regarding: school technology that includes Nevada Ready 21, the Nevada Broadband Task Force, Computer Science, and STEM.**

Brian Mitchell, director, Governor's Office of Science Innovation and Technology provided a brief overview of what he does in the Office of Science Innovation and Technology. The office directs STEM education and workforce development in partnership with the NDE, the governor's office of Economic Development, and the STEM Advisory Council. They also work with broadband. He conducted a PowerPoint [presentation](#) with an overview of what his office is doing. The legislature appropriated \$3 million dollars for STEM workforce challenge grants which are mainly post-secondary focused. There has been over \$2 million total invested in STEM workforce training so far and the training capacity is being increased to 428 for student graduation. Information was provided about the STEM Advisory Council and three of its duties; developing a survey of schools; developing a strategic plan and recognizing schools and students.

Mr. Mitchell's office has been working with the STEM Advisory Council on a STEM Marketing Initiative. The Governor has proclaimed this school year as the year of STEM in Nevada and it is hoped this initiative will raise awareness and increase opportunities for students to study STEM. Information was provided about a [STEM resource](#) that is a comprehensive STEM Career guide with resources for teachers and a calendar of events and career options. The Governor's office announced the Nevada K-12 STEM challenge which invites students and teachers to work on a project throughout the school year and then present their solutions to policy makers and STEM experts at recognition events in May. Another initiative is a creation of a governor's STEM school seal. Any school in Nevada is welcome to apply to receive this special designation from the governor. Up to 15 schools will receive this designation to market their STEM programs in May.

Mr. Mitchel conducted a PowerPoint [presentation](#) about Broadband. The Nevada Broadband Task Force is another task force that is under his office. A recommendation made to the Governor is surrounding how to deliver broadband to Nevada schools, particularly the rural schools

The universal service schools and libraries program, commonly known as E-rate, provides discounts of up to 90 percent to help eligible schools and libraries in the United States obtain affordable telecommunications and internet access. E-rate is not being leveraged as well as it should be in Nevada. When comparing with Utah with a similar geography, Nevada pulled down \$8 million in E-Rate funding, and Utah pulled down \$32 million. In addition, Nevada schools spend 40 percent of their E-rate funds on phone service rather than broadband. His office is working on a plan to improve the way Nevada applies for and utilizes E-rate funds.

Member Ortiz expressed concern that all of Nevada's tests are given online and asked how quickly the broadband issues in rural schools can be turned around. Mr. Mitchell said he hopes as soon as possible. It is very expensive to connect to broadband because the infrastructure does not exist. It is a process.

Kim Vidoni, education programs professional, acknowledged she was at the helm of planning the Nevada Ready 21 program which began in 2012. She introduced Daphne DeLeon who is the program director for the Nevada Ready 21 program. Ms. DeLeon informed the Board that the Nevada Ready 21 program is a statewide one-to-one learning initiative that was funded for middle schools in this biennium. Professional development has been provided for teachers including digital learning vouchers available for each school site and a learning management system to facilitate the development of a community of practice where teachers can share lessons learned and network with each other virtually. In August and September over 19,000 chrome books were successfully deployed to the complete student population for the Nevada Ready 21 program.

Ms. Vidoni shared that on October 26, from 12:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m., an online meeting through Go To Meeting will be held for stakeholders and others across Nevada will be convened to discuss what has been learned from phase one of the Nevada Ready 21 program and how to accelerate the program going forward. If anyone is interested in attending please email Kim Vidoni at the NDE.

Member Newburn commented that the battle is getting the word out so people understand the importance to the economy and preparing for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The programs are synergetic and it is an exciting time for Nevada and STEM.

Dave Brancamp, director, Standards and Instructional Support, acknowledged the task force is fortunate to have Member Newburn as the Computer Science Task Force chair and he listed the other members. They were fortunate in the early part of June the National Computer Science Foundation has a framework they are building and they were invited to do part of the final review of the framework. As this rolls out on October 17 the official document of this framework will be released. He listed the other states, advisory, industry and organizations involved in the framework steering committee. Through that work Nevada has been invited to join the Expanding Computing Education Pathways Alliance (ECEP). The taskforce has four recommendations they want to bring forth:

- Development of state standards and computer science
- Update regulations for "Use of computer Technology (NRS389.018, NAC389.664 and 389.450)
- Allow advanced/rigorous computer science courses (AP CS A and CSIII) to count as science requirement for graduation, NSHE admission, and Millennium Scholarship
- Teacher professional development needed to meet new requirements

The next step would be to formalize the task force and moving forth, with the legislative session in 2017, consider adding the task force to Mr. Mitchell's list. It makes sense with synergy and pulling everything together to work with the Office of Science, Education and Technology.

Member Newburn commented how this small grass roots group that people wanted to join, found themselves positioned uniquely when the process of doing the standards framework came out. They were in the right place at the right time. Nevada is one of the lead 14 states and this has expanded from the White House to the Girl Scouts. Computers are so pervasive now everybody owns one. Nevada is just recovering from a decade long downward trend of producing computer science graduates. Now there is a national movement to try and change and recognize that computer science, the computational thinking and understanding how to solve problems with computers, is not a core academic subject. All the states are reacting at the same time to try and change the negative trends and create an environment where we can create teachers. It is an exciting time for Nevada

**Information and Discussion regarding Governor Brian Sandoval's Proclamation of October 3-7, 2016 as Week of Respect in Nevada and school District Celebrations for the Week of Respect with highlights, goals, and an invitation to participate.**

Victoria Blakeney, education programs professional, shared that the Governor has proclaimed that the week of October 3-7, 2016 as the Week of Respect in Nevada. The legislature set requirements that the Week of Respect much focus on:

- Methods to prevent, identify and report incidents of bullying and cyber-bullying;
- Methods to improve the school environment in a manner that will facilitate positive human relations among pupils; and
- Methods to facilitate positive relations among pupils by eliminating the use of bullying and cyber-bullying.

Ms. Blakeney highlighted what districts are doing, including CCSD wearing blue as the symbol of peace and kindness. Last night the Las Vegas Freemont experience turned their lights blue to honor the Week of Respect, and the event included fire and police departments, as well as district officials. The NDE is actively involved in providing training and technical assistance to schools and districts through training in the Integrated Multi-Tiered System of Support – which includes training on positive discipline and behavior systems, social and emotional learning, and promoting mental health.

Member Molisee said she is a representative of the Nevada Association of Student Councils and this is a strong topic with their association. In honor of the Week of Respect the Governor has declared, most of the student councils in CCSD will be Do Be Nice shirts to promote the idea that kindness is a great thing and we should all be kind to each other.

**Pursuant to Nevada Revised Statute 385.083, the State Board may accept and record a gift of money from Tesla Motors, Inc. to be deposited in the Education Gift Fund and expended in a manner consistent with the instructions by the donor.**

Dr. Canavero commented that statute specifies that the Board can accept gifts. Today, a gift from Tesla who has committed to investing \$37.5 million in Nevada's K-12 education System will be accepted. Tesla is present a check for \$10,000 made out to Education Gift Fund (EGF) and directs this funding to be allocated as follow: \$10,000 to the Truckee Meadows Community college (TMCC) foundation, to support the delivery of training in career and technical education programs to high school students in the TMCC High School Technical Pathway and ACE Charter Middle College located at TMCC's William N. Pennington Applied Technology Center.

**Member Newburn moved to accept this gift. Member Wakefield seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

Kyle Dalpe, interim dean, Technical Sciences, TMCC thanked TESLA motors for their gift to support high school programs at TMCC. These programs are designed to prepare students for the jobs emerging in the local economy. Reports project 52,000 new jobs in five northern counties by 2019, of those 80 percent will require skills that are obtained through community college certificate and associate degree programs. TMCC high school has been at the Dandini Campus for 20 years, the Academy for Career Education has been a long time partner as well, and they provide their students opportunities in partnership to get the certificates and degrees. This year, 100 A students will be on track to earn more than 1400 TMCC credits once they complete their programs. Many will have associate degrees and certificates.

**Public Comment #2**

There was no public comment

**Future Agenda Items**

There were no future items discussed.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.