NEVADA STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

TELECONFERENCED OPEN MEETING

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2016

CARSON CITY, NEVADA

THE BOARD: ADAM JOHNSON, Chair

PATRICK GAVIN, Executive Director MELISSA MACKEDON, Vice-President

NORA LUNA, Member JACOB SNOW, Member STAVAN CORBETT, Member JASON GUINASSO, Member

BRIAN SCROGGINS, Deputy Director

FOR THE BOARD: GREG OTT, Deputy Attorney General

ROBERT WHITNEY,

Deputy Attorney General

DANNY PELTIER, Management

Analyst I

TANYA OSBORNE,

Administrative Assistant III

REPORTED BY: CAPITOL REPORTERS

BY: NICOLE HANSEN,

Nevada CCR #446

AGENDA/INDEX

AGE	NDA ITEM	PAGE
1.	Public Comment #1	5
2.	Approval of the January 27, 2017 SPCSA Board Action Minutes (Adam Johnson, Chair, SPCSA) (Information/Discussion/Action)	5
3.	Financial Framework (Information/Discussion)	6
4.	Presentation of the Draft ESSA plan (Brett Barley, Deputy Superintendent, NDE) (Information/Discussion)	22
5.	Beacon contractual amendment update of performance targets (Patrick Gavin, Executive Director, SPCSA) (Information/Discussion/Action	60
6.	2017 Legislative Session update (Patrick Gavin, Executive Director, SPCSA) (Information/Discussion/Action)	98
7.	Infinite Campus implementation update (Patrick Gavin, Executive Director, SPCSA) (Information/Discussion)	109
8.	Update and discussion of the SPCSA Strategic Plan and Goals (Adam Johnson, Chair, SPCSA) (Information/Discussion)	119
9.	Quest Academy and Silver State Charter School Update (Josh Kern, The Ten Square Group) (Information/Discussion)	114

——CAPITOL REPORTERS (775) 882-5322 ———

1		AGENDA/INDEX	
2	AGEN	DA ITEM	PAGE
3			
4	10.	Jessica Hoban Recognition of service (Gavin Patrick, Executive Director, SPCSA)	120
5		(Information/Discussion)	
6			
7	11.	Public Comment #2	122
8			
9	12.	Adjournment	124
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
		CAPITOL REPORTERS (775) 882-5322	

1	CARSON CITY, NEVADA; FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2017; 10:00 A.M.
2	-000-
3	
4	CHAIR JOHNSON: It is 10:00 a.m., so we're
5	going to go ahead and begin. We're going to call this
6	meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. We're going to start with
7	the roll call. Member Guinasso?
8	MEMBER GUINASSO: Present.
9	CHAIR JOHNSON: Vice-Chair Mackedon?
10	VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: Here.
11	CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Luna?
12	MEMBER LUNA: Here.
13	CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Snow?
14	MEMBER SNOW: Here.
15	CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. And we do have a
16	quorum.
17	Mr. Whitney, have you reviewed the agenda,
18	and does it comply with the open meeting law?
19	DEPUTY AG WHITNEY: Mr. Chairman, this is
20	Robert Whitney. I have reviewed the agenda and also been
21	in contact with Mr. Peltier about the posting. Both the
22	posting and the agenda are in compliance with the open
23	meeting law.
24	CHAIR JOHNSON: Thank you very much. And
25	before we say the pledge, does anyone have anything that

1	may be a potential conflict? All right. We will stand
2	for the Pledge of Allegiance.
3	(Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)
4	CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. Before we get
5	started, do we have a motion for a flexible agenda?
6	VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: Melissa Mackedon. So
7	moved.
8	CHAIR JOHNSON: Is there a second?
9	MEMBER LUNA: Nora Luna. I second.
10	CHAIR JOHNSON: All in favor?
11	THE BOARD: Aye.
12	CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. We will get
13	started with Agenda Item No. 1. We'll begin in the
14	north.
15	Danny, do you have any public comment?
16	MR. PELTIER: No, we do not.
17	CHAIR JOHNSON: And, Joan, do we have any
18	public comment here in the south?
19	MS. JURGENSEN: I did not receive any.
20	CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. Then we will move
21	forward to Agenda Item No. 2, which is approval of the
22	January 27th, 2017, SPCSA action minutes.
23	MEMBER LUNA: Nora Luna. I make a motion to
24	approve the minutes.
25	MEMBER SNOW: Jacob Snow. I'm seconding that

1 motion. 2 CHAIR JOHNSON: All in favor of approval of 3 the January 27th action minutes? 4 THE BOARD: Aye. 5 CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. We'll move on to 6 Agenda Item No. 3, which is the financial framework 7 discussion. Duffy, I think, will begin that presentation 8 up in the north. MR. PELTIER: Just give me one moment, 10 Mr. Chair, to bring up this presentation right now. 11 CHAIR JOHNSON: Perfect. Thank you, Danny. 12 MR. PELTIER: You guys should be able to see 13 that on your screen now, so I'll go ahead and turn it 14 over to Mr. Chagoya. 15 MR. CHAGOYA: Okay. I'm presenting a 16 financial performance overview for the 2015-2016 fiscal 17 year. Considerations of the financial performance 18 overview. This information is based on the 6-30-16 and 19 6-30-15 audited financial statements submitted to the 20 SPCSA by authorized personnel from each charter school. 21 The data represents our initial findings. Financial 22 measure of results and narratives will be sent to the respective schools' principal and board chair via e-mail 23 2.4 for additional review.

A comparison of the 2015-16 versus the

25

2014-15 school year, the detail for this has been provided in the Board meeting supporting docs. The financial performance measurement results are presented individually by schools. Some of the measures result in -- when you're looking at the detail, you'll see some of the measures result in an "NA" due to schools not having data to measure. For example, if they don't have long-term debt, then there's no way to measure that. Some of the measures result in NA due to results not falling into a specified range as stated in the financial performance framework workbook.

2.4

For example, if we have it in a workbook where the "meets standards" is less than five, "does not meet standards" between five and ten, and "falls far below standard" is greater than ten, if a school should end up with a measurement of 5, it will not fall into one of these categories. Therefore, it will have an "NA," and this is something we'll need to review and clear up going forward.

The ratings. There's three ratings we use to measure the indicators for the financial framework. The school's performance on "meet standards." The schools' performance on this component does not signal a financial risk to the school and meets the authorizer's standard.

Meeting the standard requires no follow-up action by the

authorizer. "Does not meet standard." The school's performance on this component signals a moderate financial risk to the school and does not meet the authorizer's expectation. This indicator may require follow up depending on the interplay with other indicators. Schools may be eligible for a Notice of Concern, breach or revocation.

2.4

"Falls far below standard." The school's performance on this component signals a significant financial risk to the school and does not meet the authorizer's expectation. Followup is necessary to determine Notice of Concern, breach or possible revocation. Measures resulting in "falls far below standards" will receive a Notice of Concern. Schools with more than two measures resulting in "falls far below standards" will receive either a Notice of Concern or a breach requiring regulatory action. Schools meeting standards in all financial measures require no follow-up action.

Kind of looking at this as like an exception reporting. As long as you're doing well, there will be no follow-up action. We are communicating with NACSA in developing a weighted rating system to help standardize the scoring of the eight financial measures. Right now, we have eight financial measures, and we're looking at

them and saying, "What does it really mean?" So we're trying to come up with a weighted rating system that will give an overall score for those eight measures.

2.4

Here is a summary of -- there's eight measures in total for the schools. Here's a summary for the current measures which consist of current ratio, days of cash on hand, enrollment forecast accuracy, and debt default. Now, this is a comparison of the '16 to '15 year across all schools. This slide is a summary of four sustainability measures across all schools which consists of: total margin, debt-to-asset ratio, cash flow, debt-to-service ratio.

Are there any questions regarding any of this information?

MEMBER GUINASSO: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Yeah, actually, I do have a question. So on the days of cash on hand is actually the largest drop in year-to-year percentage, so 21 percentage points between '15 and '16. Question one, is that a concern? Because that's across all of our schools, and question two, do you know what's led to that large of a drop?

MR. CHAGOYA: It is a concern. Being a near term measure, I think it's not as much of a concern as one of the sustainability measures, but it is a concern.

I do not know why -- I could not answer why there was a 1 2 drop. 3 MEMBER GUINASSO: Mr. Chairman? CHAIR JOHNSON: Yes, Member Guinasso. 4 5 MEMBER GUINASSO: I have a question. 6 CHAIR JOHNSON: Yes, please. 7 MEMBER GUINASSO: Okay. Thank you. Member 8 Guinasso, for the record. I'm looking at the enrollment forecast accuracy, and it appears that only a third of 9 10 our schools are meeting standards, and the vast majority 11 of them don't meet standards. Why is that? What's 12 happening there? 13 MR. CHAGOYA: Well, the enrollment forecast 14 accuracy is based on actual to projected enrollment, so that just means they're following -- they're projecting a 15 16 certain number of students to enroll, but the amount of 17 students that actually enroll is either higher or lower 18 than a certain percentage. 19 MEMBER GUINASSO: So is not meeting that 20 standard indicative of there being a flaw in the 21 standard, or is there some flaw in the way that the 22 schools are coming up with their forecast number? 23 MR. CHAGOYA: I'd say part of it is the

schools coming up with their forecast number, and the

other part may be the measure. Again, if a school's

2.4

25

forecasting, let's say, 1,000 students and they have more than forecasted above a percentage, I don't know if that's a good or bad thing, but either way, they're not meeting standards.

2.4

VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: Just right along with that -- Melissa Mackedon, for the record -- do you know, kind of just vaguely, where the majority of these -- I mean, if they have more students, that's one thing. If they have less students, it's a much bigger deal because they may not be able to pay their bills. So do you know kind of roughly were the majority of it that they overestimated or underestimated?

MR. CHAGOYA: At this point, we don't have it. I mean, we have it. We just haven't scrutinized it that way.

CHAIR JOHNSON: This is Chair Johnson. What support can we give to schools to help them more accurately forecast? Because I think, again, that figure is going to drive revenue and it again, as Vice-Chair Mackedon stated, it's one of the largest predictors of how we're be able to remain sustainable over the years. How can we better assist the schools in accurately forecasting their student enrollment? Especially -- and again, if we don't know it's over or under at this point, but still, I think it's good for us to have some more

accurate forecasts.

2.4

It looks like at this point, we're just not doing very well at forecasting the number of students that we're going to be able to have. I guess I don't know --if that's going to be a question directly for you or maybe it's just for someone at the Authority to help us understand how we can better assist schools in accurately forecasting enrollment.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCROGGINS: For the record, this is Brian Scroggins, Deputy Director. I would say that retention, obviously, is something schools need to do and to forecast what their retention is going to be year to year. Obviously, as you mentioned, financial forecasts are important, but we can certainly look to see how we can support in that area, but I think the retention efforts of the schools is going to be on each school individually and what they're doing to retain students.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Are there other questions?

Just a second, Member Guinasso. Member Corbett has a question as well.

MEMBER CORBETT: Thank you, Chair Johnson.

Kind of in line of what you're inquiring about in terms of what are some of the things that are alarming to the Authority, and what conversations have they inspired?

And what type of research or support can the Board provide in that vein?

2.4

DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCROGGINS: I'll answer that question. Right now, we've put together some tools.

We've put this together, the tools to gather this information. We really didn't have those tools in place before or we had them and they weren't pulling all of the measurements that were stated in the performance framework. So now we're getting all of this data together, and we're getting these results put out quicker. Now the next step is to analyze the results to see how we can help the schools along.

MEMBER CORBETT: So just for clarity, if I understand what you're saying, that this is relatively new information. You're just now beginning to look at what the are some of the potential solutions or strategies to be able to address some of these, just so I'm clear?

MR. CHAGOYA: Yes.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCROGGINS: Mr. Chairman, again, Brian Scroggins, for the record. The schools have not received this information yet and will be receiving it. Certainly if you have some that are not meeting standards or falling below standards, we should be having a conversation with them, so we'll be discussing with

Duffy and the rest of the staff on how we can reach out to them. Obviously, these are indicators of things we should be looking for, the potential challenges coming up.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Perfect. Keeping abreast of, you know, because again, this will be for more of a sustainability thing than it will be anything. So if we can help with trying to figure out some good strategies along the way, I think that's where we can be supportive.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCROGGINS: Absolutely.

CHAIR JOHNSON: We had another question?

MEMBER GUINASSO: I'll defer to Member

Mackedon.

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Mackedon?

VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: I just had one question, and I don't know. Maybe we'll have to wait for Patrick to get an answer, but I felt like when we approved the financial frameworks, it was similar to the academic framework in that there was a trigger point. You know what I'm saying? Like if you're below 60 percent graduation rate or you're a one- or two-star school, it triggers like a, you know, triggers something.

Does anyone know or can they remember, is there something like that with the financial framework where there's a certain percentage of these that fall

below or does not meet standard where it triggers like a next step, or am I wrong?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCROGGINS: Falls far below standards should trigger an event as well as does not meet standards. It depends how many measures do not meet the standards. That hasn't been quantified yet. You may have a school that does not meet standards for five out of the eight measures. They don't have "falls far below," but they're not doing well either. They should have some guidance.

CHAIR JOHNSON: And it looks like there's only one school thus far who has more than -- who either falls far below or does not meet the standards for more than 75 percent or more of the standards than the other school we've already been in contact with, so it sounds like we're already doing some of that work.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCROGGINS: Yes.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Guinasso, your

question?

2.4

MEMBER GUINASSO: Yes, thank you, Chair

Johnson. I guess my question is along the same lines as
the prior question, and that is, with this information,
where are we compelled to act? That is, you know, when I
see several indications that many of our schools are
falling far below standards, that's alarming to me, and

it makes me feel like as a board that we need to do something, but I'm not sure what that something is. Or alternatively, that the Authority has some obligation to act, and I'm not sure what I should be expecting to see from staff in terms of what they're doing to act on this information.

2.4

DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCROGGINS: I think what we need to do to act would be to either follow up with a Notice of Concern for those schools or consider if it's a breach or a possible revocation.

MEMBER GUINASSO: Chair Johnson, Member
Guinasso, for the record. Do you think for our next
Board meeting that we could look at each of those schools
that falls far below standards and look to see if we've
sent out those Notices of Concern and what we're doing to
get schools -- these school to meet the standard that
we've set forth with regard to financial performance?

CHAIR JOHNSON: Yeah, absolutely. And so I guess the request was then to ensure that we have an update on whether or not these notices are going to -- I know you were going to contact schools, Mr. Scroggins, within -- we're told if you're far below -- falls far below or does not meet standards, there should be two separate actions that can be taken at each one of those points; correct?

1 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCROGGINS: Absolutely. 2 Mr. Chair, Brian Scrogins, for the record. Again, I 3 think now that we have the information and we've had 4 those triggers again, with the ratings, then we can talk 5 with Duffy and we can determine a plan of action with 6 Patrick when he comes back. So again, I think that's 7 right in line with what we're doing. Now that we have 8 the information, we can do something with it. CHAIR JOHNSON: So we'll be able to see that 9 10 at our next meeting? 11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCROGGINS: Sure. Right. 12 CHAIR JOHNSON: I'm sorry. Maybe the April 13 meeting, not the March meeting. 14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCROGGINS: Okav. 15 CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Guinasso? 16 MEMBER GUINASSO: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, two 17 other requests along those same lines. With regard to 18 the enrollment forecast accuracy that we were talking 19 about earlier, for the next agenda, could we look at --20 could we drill down into what's occurring to only allow a 21 third of our schools to comply with that standard? 22 mean, either they're overestimating or underestimating, and I'd like to flesh that out a little bit. 23 2.4 satisfied that we fully understand what those numbers

25

mean right now.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCROGGINS: Yeah, absolutely.

I would say again, if they're overestimating or again, if they're getting more enrollment than they anticipated, that's not a bad thing, necessarily. But if they're getting less, that's going to make a cash flow problem.

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: I think the thought process is that we need to still try to be as accurate as possible given the financial implications of either overestimating or underestimating either way. So if there is a way for us to be able to look more closely into whether we are overestimating or underestimating and then trying to understand the reasons behind that.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCROGGINS: Absolutely. We are an over/under town, so I guess we can do that no problem.

MEMBER GUINASSO: So my specific request then, sorry, Chair Johnson, my specific request is just that we have that on the agenda next time so we can really drill down and find out what's going on. And likewise, with the days of cash on hand that you were questioning, that number concerns me a bit. Does that mean that the State's not providing funding in a timely way so that the school is having to float certain bills until they get money? I mean, there's a significant drop year over year, like you said, and so maybe for the next

agenda, we could drill down in that a little bit, too.

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: We certainly can move both requests, but it won't happen at the March meeting. As noted, it will be at the April meeting.

Any additional questions? All right. Thank you so much for this. That's very helpful. And glad we're actually able to dig into some of these to have such a broad view of what's happening at the schools in general.

MR. CHAGOYA: Excuse me, Chair Johnson. I'd like to go to my next slide, please.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Oh, I'm sorry. I did not know that you weren't complete. I apologize.

MR. CHAGOYA: Oh, that's my fault. I just wanted to make the Board aware that we are working on the quarterly monitoring of financials. I'm working on the new template for the 2017-18 school year. The template will utilize the annual budget submitted to SPCSA that's submitted to us in June prior to the start of the year. That way, we have the school's financial plan.

We're going to focus on budget to actuals by quarter, utilizing their annual budget, and we're going to identify the year-to-date spending to the annual budget on a quarterly basis. So we should -- I will be working on this, and we'll be having it in place for the

17-18 school year.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: This is Melissa. would just say, I mean, I think that's great. We should be doing it quarterly. I would just say it is worrisome using that June budget just because this June, we're going to submit it. We aren't even going to know what our DSA numbers are. So on those years when the legislature is in session, those June budgets are -they're a joke. I mean, you literally do not even know what grants are going to be, you know, is the CSP grant even going to be funded, what your DCSA rate is going to be, you know, if they completely change the funding formula like they're talking about. So there is some concern for me that schools are going to end up looking really bad based on what -- I can tell you our budget in June is never the realistic budget. It's just too early to have any accuracy.

So I'm not saying we shouldn't do that, but I think we should do it with open eyes knowing that there's a lot of information that schools don't have when that budget is due. I mean, we're doing ours right now, but we literally don't even know what our per pupil is going on to be and if our special ed is going to start at 1.5 or go up to 2 and et cetera, et cetera, so I think we have to be cautious as we use that June budget and judge

schools on their ability to forecast.

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: Is there a way for us to, on our odd-numbered years where -- even better stated, legislative years, for us to wait a bit so as to not use a budget that will be such a draft and so maybe use a mid-July budget, or is there a compromise there so we can understand how to best measure the efficiency of our schools so that we have the most accurate information and we're measuring them on accurate information as opposed to something different?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCROGGINS: I don't know.

We'll look into that. But I certainly, you know -- this report information is beneficial to us because it gives us indicators of challenges that are coming up. It's not an audit, but when I've been in businesses and things when I've been audited in the past and you do a report as to if it does not meet standards, what actions are you going to take to have it come to standards. So I think this information is beneficial for us to be able to look at the indicators and talk to the schools.

I talked to someone earlier from a school, and they had mentioned that they're not having a cash flow problem, but it indicates on this report that they are. So again, it would be interesting to talk to them and have that conversation as to if it indicates you are

and you're not, what's the challenge here? 1 2 CHAIR JOHNSON: Are there any other 3 questions? All right. Just want to check with the last 4 slide. I don't want to be premature again. 5 MR. CHAGOYA: Yes. That's it. 6 Thank you so much for the CHAIR JOHNSON: 7 presentation. It was very helpful. All right. 8 We can move on to Agenda Item No.4, presentation of the Draft ESSA plan. Mr. Brett Barley, 9 10 deputy superintendant of NDE, will do the presentation. 11 MR. PELTIER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just give 12 me one minute, and I'll get Brett set up. 13 CHAIR JOHNSON: Thank you, Danny. 14 MR. BARLEY: Good morning. Deputy Superintendant Brett Barley with the Nevada Department of 15 16 Education. I'm going to do my best to filibuster a 17 little bit while the presentation comes up. Thank you so 18 much for having us here today. I'm really exited to 19 share the Every Student Succeeds Act Plan with all of 20 you. There's been a lot that's gone into this work. see some familiar faces here and down south who have been 21 22 along for the ride with us, so I'm really looking forward 23 to diving into that with you. I will also point out to

this body a couple of separate issues from the Every

Student Succeeds Act Plan.

2.4

25

About a month ago, we asked for an update				
from different authorizers across the State on their				
plans to provide support, address the schools in their				
portfolio that were on the rising stars schools list, and				
we received all of that feedback now. Our team is going				
through them. But what I've heard from the review team				
is that they've been very impressed with the Authority's				
thoughtful approach to addressing and supporting rising				
star schools in your portfolio. So I wanted to pass that				
along to you today and just let you know we do expect to				
send a response to the Authority and to other state				
authorizers who provided the memos that we received, and				
so thank you for that, and we're looking forward to				
following up with you on all of that. I think we're				
getting relatively close here. Some cute kids on the				
screen.				

2.4

MEMBER GUINASSO: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR JOHNSON: Yes, Member Guinasso?

MEMBER GUINASSO: Again, may we move for a three-minute break? I had a little bit too much coffee this morning, and it sounds like they're trying to get set up, and that would take the pressure off of them.

CHAIR JOHNSON: We'll take a three-minute convenience break and resume at 10:33.

(Recess was taken.)

CHAIR JOHNSON: Right on time. It is now 10:33, so we will resume our meeting.

Mr. Barley, are you ready?

MR. BARLEY: I am ready. Deputy
Superintendant Brett Barley with the Nevada Department of

6 | Education, for the record.

2.4

We're going to spend some time with you all talking about the State's Every Student Succeeds Act Plan, so let's just dive right in. I'll try to move through this very quickly as I can, knowing that you're a very sophisticated audience, and we've been giving this presentation to parents and teachers and folks like that that might not have the high-level understanding about what the State has been up to the last several years that all of you do.

So just to start, the Every Student Succeeds
Act is a replacement to the No Child Left Behind law.
That was passed in January 2002, so it's been 14 years
that we had No Child Left Behind, and now it's pivoted
toward the Every Student Succeeds Act. If you're a
political and policy nerd like I am, you'll notice that
almost all of the folks in the photo there with President
Bush are no longer even in Congress, and they had long
tenures there. George Miller has retired, Ted Kennedy
passed on, John Baker has handed the gavel to Paul Ryan.

Most of the folks in this when No Child Left Behind was passed are no longer in the Congress, and I think that's reflected in the law that you saw passed last December or December of 2015, the Every Student Succeeds Act Plan.

Major change in direction.

2.4

And so a lot has changed at the federal level. Certainly, Nevada has been changing, too. There is a phrase that's been used, and I think's gained pretty significant traction here, and that's, the "new Nevada" and the "new Nevada economy." There are new industries coming into the state, and they're requiring a new set of skills for our young people to be successful in that new Nevada economy.

Here's an example of some national attention
Nevada has received because of its transition to a new
high-skilled workforce. The Atlantic was out here in Las
Vegas before the election and had a roundtable with folks
talking about the new Nevada economy and the demands of
the new Nevada economy workforce. So when we say the
"new Nevada economy," there obviously is an implication
that there was an old Nevada economy, and that was
primarily two kind of key anchor industries that did a
remarkable job supporting and growing the middle class in
Nevada, mining and gaming. But when the Great Recession
hit in 2008-2009, it became clear that having those two

anchor industries wasn't necessarily going to be sufficient to support the Nevada middle class moving forward. We needed to diversify and evolve our economy to keep up with the 21st Century.

2.4

So then if that's the old Nevada economy, what in fact is the new Nevada economy? I'd like to use this image here. This looks like a spaceship, but it's just Tesla. There's Faraday down south as well, there's Switch. There are data farms that are popping up.

Nevada is becoming kind of the back office to Silicon Valley. Drones are a huge and emerging industry here, and they all require a very unique and specialized set of technical skills.

So while our economy has been changing, our student demographic and our student population has been changing. If you look to the far left of this slide, you'll see school year 2003-2004. We choose that because that was the year the No Child Left Behind law was passed, and then you can come right up to where we are today. Every year, small upticks in the number of students that we're serving in our states. And the colors on these bar graphs have to do with the type of student that we serve. And so this slide is a little bit harder to discern how that has changed, but the next slide, this one here, should make that student population

change very apparent for you.

2.4

If you look in the middle of this chart, you can see a student population group that is inching up every single year. That's our Hispanic Latino student population. And you can see a student population set that is inching down every single year. That's our white Caucasian student population. So significant changes happening in Nevada, both in regards to number of students and type of students that we're serving in our schools.

There's also kind of a recognition -- and this is my least favorite part of this presentation when we talk about current performance benchmarks. We're going to talk about some really impressive highlights and gains later, but it's important to set the stage about kind of where we are currently relative to other states.

This graph shows you NAEP performance statewide for fourth grade and eighth graders. The light blue and the red below the bisecting line that runs through the middle of the graph shows you the students that are below basic, or excuse me, are below basic or not proficient and not performing at grade level. And then the darker blue and the navy blue above that middle line, those are our students that are proficient.

Obviously, we want all of these students to be above that

middle line, to be at grade level and above proficient, and so we're working hard with folks like you to push more people above that middle line.

2.4

When we really unpack the data and look at our student performance across subgroups, we see that there is -- our historically underserved student populations are the ones being left furthest behind. So on this slide, I would draw your attention to our English language learners. If you look at eighth grade reading, three percent of our English language learners are proficient or advanced. If we look at our students with disabilities in eighth grade, five percent proficient or advanced in math and reading, so significant room for growth there for our kids.

When we tally it all up and we think about how Nevada stacks up nationally, in fourth grade, we're 47th and 46th in math and reading, and in eighth grade, we inch up to 43rd. And I think everybody in this room would agree that Nevada kids are no less competent than students in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Indiana, a lot of these states that we see at the top of the list. They can do it. We know that they can do it. We just need to provide them with the supports they need to get there.

This slide is the one that kind of brings it

home most for me about the current state of student performance, especially if we're going to tie it back to the workforce and the demands of the new Nevada economy. So this big bar going across the top, that's a hundred kids, average of 100 kids in Nevada, 42 Hispanic kids, 34 Caucasian students, 10 African American kids and then the smaller groups of our multiracial, Asian, American Indian and Pacific Islanders. When we move those kids through the system, we lose them every step of the way.

2.4

These benchmarks here were chosen because they aligned with the Department of Education's six strategic goals. That's proficient in reading at the end of third grade, that's ready for high school, and that's graduate college and career ready. So if we benchmark that and look at where our kids are at each of the three stages, 46 of those 100 kids are reading at grade level by third grade. By the time we get to 8th grade, 33 are at grade level, and then by the time they graduate, 18 will take the ACT, which is now offered to every kid in the state, and score with a score that would put them in non-remedial classes at the University of Nevada-Reno or Las Vegas.

Now the thing that really gets me every time is that we know that our kids want to be college material because they get asked when they take the ACT. 68

percent say that they want to seek postsecondary education. They want to go to college. So that's their aspiration. I've been calling this the American dream slide. Almost 70 percent of our kids want to go to post-secondary education, college, community college, you name it. Of those 68 percent that want to go, 46 end up enrolling, and only 5 from that original 100 graduate in four years.

2.4

Let me go back here real quick. I've given this presentation a number of times, and it was only when I was with a community down in Las Vegas a couple of weeks ago that it dawned on me -- and you can really track here also where your subgroup populations fall off. So it's not just raw numbers. It's subgroup populations as well. So of those 100 kids, there's 42 Hispanic kids when we started. Only one of them is going to graduate from college in four years. And if we look at our African American kids, they don't show up in that five at all.

So the question that we asked when we started on this endeavor was what's going to take Nevada from here to here? The Department's been thinking about this for a handful of years now, and we've developed a vision and a mission that's aligned with preparing Nevada kids for success in that global 21st Century economy. We

talked about our goals a little bit earlier and how those transition points that we looked at on the American dream slide are aligned with the Department's first three goals.

2.4

And since 2013, the State has -- the State legislature and Governor have passed an incredible number of new school supports and programs, starting with Zoom in 2013, and then all of the programs that came out of 2015: Victory, pre-K, Full Day K, Read by Grade Three, Nevada Ready 21, Social Workers, Great Teaching and Leading, and on and on and on. There is now a robust ecosystem of supports that exist to improve some of the outcomes that we talked about earlier, and there's also been increases in resources provided to schools and to students to change some of those outcomes. So you can see, starting in 2014, the full level of support that a student would get, and then if the Governor's budget this year were passed, what that would look like in 2019.

The point I would make on this slide is that these are smoothed numbers, so this is an average for students across the state. But if you're a student in a Zoom school, you're going to have a higher average than this because of the resources that you would receive by being in a Zoom school or by being in a Victory school. So just an important point of clarification. So yeah,

this kind of brings us back to a lot has changed over the last 14 years, both in our federal government and here in Nevada.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Real quick refresher. I'm sure you all know this, but for the communities that we give this presentation to, they'd like to know what's the difference between No Child Left Behind and the Every Student Succeeds Act. And in short, it really kind of flips the responsibilities. So No Child Left Behind was a very prescriptive law and one size fits all. tight on inputs, tight on outputs, told states kind of what they had to do. So under that regime, Nevada created a plan to comply with No Child Left Behind, and we had limited ability to kind of tailor our plan to our unique needs and our systems. And then we told school districts that they, too, had to follow that regime and abide by all of the requirements within it. And on the right side of this slide, you can see a long list of some of those non-negotiables. This is not an exhaustive list, but just an example of some of the things that No Child Left Behind had us do.

So when we first began this conversation, we asked the group that helped with the writing of the plan to flip this idea. What if we put Nevada first, designed a plan that was going to work for Nevada, for Nevada

kids, for Nevada teachers. What if we worked in partnership with schools to figure out how that plan could meet their unique needs and the needs of their community, and then how could we bring the federal law up last and just make sure that we're holding ourselves accountable to the requirements of the federal law and comply with the federal law but not let the federal law drive us. Let's let Nevada drive us and comply with the federal law on the back end. And you can see the Every Student Succeeds Act has eliminated a number of those non-negotiables that were part of the No Child Left Behind law.

2.4

So here's kind of what it's looked like for us since May. The superintendent convened what he called an advisory group to hold the Nevada strategic plan, our mission, our vision, our goals, theory of action, our ideas about workforce development and being ready for the new Nevada economy to help us hold that sacred, let that be the guiding light. And then underneath that advisory group, there were six issue-specific work groups that met at least four times over an eight-month period and sent recommendations to the advisory group. There was one for accountability and one for assessment, one for English language learners, one for teachers and leadership quality, one for school improvement supports, and one for

federal funding streams. They sent their recommendations up to the advisory group who helped us decide whether to include them in the plan or not. And then eventually, we got the plan that we're going to share with you today.

2.4

A quick reminder on the timeline. The federal law was signed in December of '15. We got our first set of regulations around how to go about complying with the law in May. We convened our advisory group and work group that same month. This year, this school year is a transition year. We've just finished with the writing of the draft plan. It's available for public comment. It will be open for public comment until March 1st, when we'll pull it down, include public comment in the final version, and submit to you, as said, on April 3rd. School year 2017-18 will be the first year of full implementation.

This is what it looks like. This is the draft plan for public comment. You can find it on our website. We're also soliciting feedback through a survey which you can find on the website. That link will take you there. It's also on our splash page, so it should be relatively easy to locate. And here's the cheat sheet. It's a 71-page plan, but within the plan, it articulates a vision for becoming the fastest-improving state in the nation. And I've got some really exciting early evidence

of success to share with you. It's just my favorite part of this presentation.

2.4

And then we also heard from our stakeholders that within the Every Student Succeeds Act, while most of the funding flows directly to school sites and districts, there's a 7 percent state set-aside for Title 1, a set-aside for Title 2, a small one for Title 3 and for Title 4. We should get really specific about the key levers that we think are going to improve student performance so that we're making big bets on those levers and not spreading the money so broadly and so thinly that it doesn't make the difference that we intend it to have. And so with the support and the advice of the advisory group, we've narrowed in on three key strategies.

So one is focus on the lowest-performing schools. Historically, if a five-star school called us up looking for help, we'd roll up our sleeves and help them the same way that we would with a one-star school. We didn't make much of a differentiation between the two. So now we're saying we're going to answer every phone call that comes in, we're going to provide the technical support that everyone asks for, but when we really roll up our sleeves and focus our time, it's going to be on those schools that need it the most.

The second is grade school leaders:

assistant principals, principals, area superintendents, charter leaders. We've got to invest in them, right? That's probably the right spot for the Department to play. We're an office of 160 folks. We could not, in a realistic way, go out and provide direct one-on-one professional development to every teacher in the state, but we could put principals into a great professional development program or provide meaningful kind of one-on-one consultation with principals with a much higher degree of effectiveness than we could if we were trying to do that for teachers. And we also know that teachers will want to stay with and will thrive under the leadership of a great principal or a great school leader.

2.4

And then finally, data. The Department has a monopoly on statewide data. We're the only entity in the state that knows what's going on in every county across the state and is able to identify best practices and areas where we need to see some improvement and help to match people up in mentorship roles, figure out where we're having those successes and where we need to spend more attention. And so we've committed through this plan to play a bigger role in helping people understand data and in helping people use data to make informed decisions.

This is my favorite part of the presentation.

Why we think it's realistic to be the fastest-improving state in the nation. So first, most people that I give this presentation to did not know that Nevada was tied with California for the fastest improvement on NAEP reading in eighth grade. That's a remarkable accomplishment and one that we should talk about more. Most people also didn't know that Nevada's tied for third in eighth grade NAEP science growth, so another major accomplishment that probably hasn't gotten the attention it deserves.

2.4

When we talk about college and career readiness and getting kids ready for the new Nevada economy, I don't think enough people know that Nevada's widely seen as a leader in career readiness. We just received a \$2 million grant from the Council for Chief State School Officers and J.P. Morgan Chase to expand some of the practices that we've developed here in the state. I think there was 40 states that applied. Ten won the grant, so that's a pretty good achievement and a not insignificant dollar number in free money coming into the state.

Nevada will be the first state in the country that has computer science, AP computer science classes in every district across the state. That was a commitment that the Governor at the college board made during

computer science week in late fall, early winter. And then a couple of years ago, Clark County was the AP district of the year. And I made this presentation a couple of weeks ago, but since we built it, we released a press release -- I think it was yesterday or on the 22nd, I can't keep track of my days. Nevada has the fastest growth of scores of three or higher on AP exams last year and in total over the past three years, so we're seeing remarkable improvement in our advanced placement score improvement primarily, I think, due to access across the state.

2.4

Our graduation rate is one of the four fastest improving graduation rates in the country.

That's another reason to celebrate. And then as we think about making data-informed decisions, we have cooked in an external evaluation for seven of the key programs that were passed in 2013, and their feedback to us was clear.

One: stay the course. These programs look to be working as intended, based on early evidence. And if you change now, you're going to give schools, districts, teachers, principals a little bit of whiplash. You need to give them some consistency and let them figure out how to exist in this new landscape.

Second was focus on results. They've told us to be very focused on accountability. Make sure that our

dollars are being used to achieve the outcomes that we want to see. And then second, they said if you're going to change anything, one, put in common measurement systems so that we can compare the progress that schools are making against each other. We want to have an ability to see, okay, here's a school that's implementing — here's a Victory school. They're having remarkable results. Here's another Victory school which by nature serves similar student populations. They're not seeing those results. How can we pair them up so one school can figure out what the other school is doing? And then finally, consolidating planning and reporting. You'll see this in some of the recommendations within the plan.

2.4

There are all of those new programs that we talked about, but many of them also have their own application process, and we want to make sure that schools, teachers, principals, district leaders are spending time building thoughtful strategic plans that match need to funding stream and more time in the classroom and less time filling out paperwork.

So here's the new Nevada plan and the advisory group recommendations. I grouped -- I'll move through these relatively quickly. The first set is responsive to the new Nevada economy, and then the next sets are aligned with the three key strategies around

school leader development, data-driven decision making, and supporting our lowest-performing schools. And here's a cheat sheet for you. If you want the full list -- did I skip those? Yeah, I guess I don't have all of those to walk you through. So if you want a cheat sheet, you can see the full list of recommendations in Appendix B, which is on page 52 of the plan. All of the recommendations related to challenging academic standards and assessments are on page 27. You can find the accountability, school improvement ones starting on page 32, and educational equity and supporting all students starting on page 46.

2.4

So I'm really optimistic about everything that has transpired over the past several years, but in particular, over the last eight months. The stakeholder feedback that took place in the development of this plan was unlike any that I'd ever seen. I've got Melissa sitting here in front of me, and she was along for the ride. But when we started, we thought we were going to have this group meet three times?

VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: Three.

MR. BARLEY: For two hours a piece. And by the time it was all over, we've met ten times now with two more meetings on the book, and usually, these meetings last, at a minimum, two hours and sometimes stretching to three. So folks have devoted an incredible

amount of their personal time, and we don't even give people bottles of water. People have really come up beside the Department and been incredibly helpful as we develop these plans. As we've been sharing this with the field, people have kind of rallied behind and been galvanized by this "fastest-improving" state in the nation idea. And I think whenever I give this presentation, I see a lot of head nods on the focus on low-performing schools, focus on school leaders, focus on data.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

So we do need your input. The plan is live for another several days. There's a technical plan as well. The one here with the cute kid on it is kind of a public facing plan with lots of pictures and charts and graphs, a lot of the same ones that you saw here today. And then the second one is a technical plan from the U.S. Department of Education that's a fill-in-the-box type of plan with lots of code sections and things like that. Both are on our website. Both are open to public comment. And the reason why we've got two more meetings with Melissa and others on the advisory group is because we're actually going to give that public comment to the advisory group, and they're going to help us think through what changes to make in the plan. So there's still time to have your voice herd and have it considered as we develop the final that is submitted to the U.S.

Department of Education.

2.4

So that's the end of the formal presentation.

I'm happy to entertain questions if I haven't put folks
to sleep yet.

CHAIR JOHNSON: That is -- this is Chair

Johnson -- was incredibly helpful, I think especially

with the framing of why we're doing what we're doing. I

did have a question a little bit as it pertains to the

three buckets of the three categories of work, focus on

low-performing schools and then data and school

leadership.

Was the thought around focusing on low-performance schools and not necessarily on subgroups, was that because -- I guess why was that as opposed to subgroups? Because when we look at some of the struggling subgroups, it seemed like you might be able to have more immediate impact, you know, focusing on groups of those students, but was there a different line of thought there?

MR. BARLEY: That's a very insightful question, Adam, and I think the answer is that you're going to see both. It's a yes and. The federal designations of comprehensive and targeted support schools, which are going to be the low-performing schools

by definition through the federal law, the Every Student Succeeds Act law, the comprehensive schools are going to be schools that perform in the bottom five percent of schools in the state and have a graduation rate of less than 67 percent. Targeted schools are also going to have the department and districts, first starting with the district, kind of roll up their sleeves and support those target support schools. And they are, by definition, schools that have the most significant gaps in performance for their subgroups. And so the subgroups are a huge part of this focus on low-performing schools, and they're actually cooked into the definition of what we would call low-performing schools by nature of their subgroup performance gaps.

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: Perfect. That's very
helpful. Thank you, Mr. Barley. Member Luna?

MEMBER LUNA: Thank you. This is Member
Luna. Mr. Barley, thank you for the presentation. I
have a couple of questions. On one of the earlier
slides -- I'm not sure if you can go back to it, but when
you set up the information in terms of the 100 students,
so do you have a projection or a goal of how that is
going to change based on this plan? You know, out of 100
students, five will graduate, five Latino students would
graduate college, I think you said zero Black would

graduate college. With this plan, what will the results be?

2.4

MR. BARLEY: Thank you for that question.

Brett Barley, for the record. As you open up the 71-page plan, there's a section within the plan that describes what it would take to be the fastest-improving state in the nation. And you'll see charts and graphs about where Nevada is now, and if we were the fastest-improving state in the nation, where we'd be in five years.

Now, I think that this is an ambitious goal, the right goal for Nevada to have, but I also know that when I first received back those charts and graphs from our data and accountability team, I was still very disheartened to see if we are the fastest-improving, even if we are the fastest improving state in the nation in five years, we still have an incredibly long way to go.

Right? So we can improve our scores on the ACT for all of these subgroups, be the fastest-improving state in the nation and still be not anywhere close to where we would all think we should be and all kids deserve to be.

So I'd encourage you to take a look at that, provide some feedback, and know that while we've tried to set an ambitious goal, we understand that there's a huge hill to climb, and this only takes us up part of the hill.

MEMBER LUNA: Thank you. And I have one more question. This is still Nora Luna. Will the AP computer science classes be available at every high school?

MR. BARLEY: So the commitment was made to offer it at every district. I can follow up with the college board and the regional professional development group within your neck of the woods to see where the conversations are at at specific high schools, if you'd like to have that specific conversation.

MEMBER LUNA: Thank you. Yes.

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: Are there other questions for Mr. Barley?

MEMBER GUINASSO: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Member Guinasso here.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Please go ahead.

MEMBER GUINASSO: Okay. Thank you for the presentation, Mr. Barley. A couple of things I was wondering about. With regard to graduation rate, we spent a lot of time focusing on that. It's a key indicator of success. And what I'm wondering is what does that mean in terms of students being able to succeed in college and being career ready in the Nevada economy? So if we're seeing an increase in graduation rate, does that necessarily correspond to our kids actually succeeding in the colleges that they're attending and/or

in the parts of the economy they're participating in?

MR. BARLEY: Deputy Superintendant Brett

Barley, for the record. Fantastic question. It's one that we're wrestling with, continuing to wrestle with.

2.4

Right now, unfortunately, in many instances, a standard Nevada diploma is a ticket to remedial coursework at a four-year institution. We know that can't be and shouldn't be the case. So within the Every Student Succeeds Act Plan, one of the changes that's made to the school performance framework at the high school level is the creation of what the work group, the accountability work group, call a college and career readiness indicator or index, excuse me. And the intent of that index is to provide extra points to high schools that are putting students onto college and career ready pathways as defined by the state board.

So the draft language that we looked at with the graduation subcommittee a few weeks ago was here is the college pathway that the high school could get some extra points on. If a student accumulates college credit while in high school through AP/IB dual enrollment, for example, and scores on the ACT a 22, the non-remedial guarantee, then that student could be counted as college ready, and the school site could achieve some extra bonus points for putting them on that pathway as kind of a soft

incentive for schools searching out kids that they could provide this type of college-level curriculum and instruction to. And the same thing for career readiness, only instead of it being AP or IB, we're talking about certificates of value that are accumulated through participation in a career and technical education pathway that results in something tangible that they could then give to the industry and say, "Look. I have the skills to be successful in this industry."

2.4

MEMBER GUINASSO: So what inputs -- Member

Guinasso for the record -- what inputs is the Department

getting from institutions of higher education and from

employers to determine sort of the success of our

students relative to what you just described?

MR. BARLEY: Thank you. Deputy

Superintendent Barley, for the record. The Governor's

Office of Workforce Innovation, OWINN, is kind of the

point guard, as he would describe it, between all of

these different agencies, so the Department of Education,

Nevada institutions of higher education, the industry

councils, the workforce development boards, department of

rehabilitation employment and training, and they're going

out to industry, kind of in partnership with the

Governor's Office on Economic Development, and telling us

what they value rather than us trying to tell them, "You

should value this."

2.4

So one of the outcomes from those conversations has been industry telling us, "Look. If a kid scores on the ACT work keys, for example, at a silver level, that means something to us, right? And so we can take that information back and say, "All right. We're going to put this as one of the things that could earn you extra points in the NSPF if you put a kid, have a kid take the work keys and they score a silver, that can count towards the career ready pathway, and it's information that has been sent to us from industry rather than other way around.

MEMBER GUINASSO: And then that works similar with institutions of higher ed? They're giving you feedback along the way?

MR. BARLEY: Yes. So we had a joint meeting with the Institution of Higher Education and our state board late fall/early winter. We talked about some of these pathways, the 22 on the ACT, the type of class work that they want to see, you know, more than the base level for graduation. They want to see extra math, extra science because their research is telling us that kids with extra math and extra science are succeeding more frequently in college than kids that aren't. So yes, there is a conversation happening in both directions.

MEMBER GUINASSO: Now, with that graphic that Member Luna had mentioned earlier, the one that I think is most disturbing to many that go through this, this appears to be like almost a funnel, and kids are being eliminated along the way, and disproportionately so as it pertains to the minority populations that we're serving.

2.4

I'm just wondering, with regard to what you described about credits for career readiness, is there extra emphasis being put on the minority groups so they're not being eliminated by whatever is happening structurally? Because I can't imagine that the kids aren't as capable, so there has to be something structurally happening that's eliminating them by the time we get to college and career readiness.

MR. BARLEY: Deputy Superintendant Barley, for the record. Yes, it's an opportunity gap. And so as we think about this work, one of the reasons that the field said you should have this college and career readiness index within the high school rating system is so that all high schools are going to try to provide these types of opportunities for kids. There wasn't necessarily an incentive to do that in the past, and now there is.

And then through some of our state grant making, for example, we have money to support kids with

advanced placement. Through the legislative process, we've asked that we be able to target those funds to Native American students and to African American students who are the populations and the subgroups that we saw were least likely to value access to those classes.

2.4

MEMBER GUINASSO: So does the Department expect that we'll see dramatic improvement amongst those populations in the five-year gap? Even though we'll have a lot of work to do, it would seem like the efforts that you're making, we should see some dramatic improvements amongst those populations.

MR. BARLEY: Yeah. Deputy Superintendant Barley for the record. Yes, that's the intent.

MEMBER GUINASSO: Perfect. My last question.

Member Guinasso, for the record. We have a new

administration in place at the federal level. Is there

any forecast on policy direction from this new

administration that may deviate from this change in

direction that was passed through the Every Child

Succeeds Act?

MR. BARLEY: Brett Barley, for the record.

We received one letter from the new secretary. It said
to proceed forward with your submission of the Every

Student Succeeds Act Plan. They said that the
application itself might change slightly and they'll let

us know if it does or not, but the application window is April 3rd, and then September are still the dates moving forward.

2.4

We asked the advisory group about this at our last meeting, and I think to a single one of them when they went around the horn they said, "Well, look. We didn't do this for them. We spent the last eight months working on it for us." And it was never our intent to develop a plan to only comply with what US Ed wanted. We wanted one that would work for Nevada. And so as far as the advisory group was concerned, they were like full steam ahead. This is the right way to go and submit it.

MEMBER GUINASSO: Member Guinasso, for the record. So we don't expect anything at the federal level to undermine all of the hard and good work that you've done over the last year or so? We don't expect that to be unraveled in any way?

MR. BARLEY: Brett Barley, for the record.

Not anticipating it. As far as we've seen, systems are a go. I know that there's some conversations happening in Washington about some of the regulations that were put forward; can't predict exactly what's going to happen with that. But as far as we're concerned, we've created a plan with stakeholder engagement that meets the requirements of the existing law, and we think it makes

sense for our state.

2.4

MEMBER GUINASSO: Thank you.

CHAIR JOHNSON: This is Chair Johnson. I just had a quick question. One of the things that I was thinking about, you mentioned the opportunity gap and how that presents itself in the high school level. But in looking at those 100 students who start off with and then how, for example, Black students lose -- 70 percent of those Black students are not proficient by the time they are in third grade, and so that opportunity gap clearly exists long before our secondary school age.

How will our plan be able to address how that gap starts presenting itself for Black and Latino students at such a young grade level, specifically around early childhood education and providing the structures through this plan that will allow for that gap not to exist by third grade in terms of not being able to grow any larger if it does exist?

MR. BARLEY: Thank you. Brett Barley, for the record. That's a question that we've been asking our stakeholders all across the state. I think if you look back at those six groups of folks that we pulled together to help us write the plan: accountability, school improvement, English learners, funding streams, teachers and leaders, everybody fit nearly into that box. And so

a couple of weeks ago, I went and presented this same presentation to our early learning community and asked them for their help.

Some of them participated on the advisory group or in one of the different work groups, but there wasn't a single group of folks looking specifically at early childhood, for example, just like there wasn't one looking at special education. And so we know that that's an area that we want to make more robust in the final plan and would welcome feedback on that.

I can say that the state and the federal dollars that we have to help solve some of the early childhood issues that you identified are focused on underserved communities, students at or below the poverty level and providing high-quality, full-day access to those students. We have money from the federal government to open up and support additional classrooms. We are having trouble finding qualifying classrooms with qualifying teachers and qualifying programs. So if anybody here knows of or has capacity to serve kids, we have money to deploy in service to those kids. It's more of a supply problem than a demand problem right now.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you very much.

Member Mackedon?

2.4

VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: Melissa Mackedon, for

the record. I would just think it's important to note, too, that on the advisory committee, there were representatives who were deeply passionate about representing their constituents, particularly Hispanic students and African American students. And they -- I mean, it was amazing just to see how they were like -- those kids were represented on that advisory committee, and it was awesome to see. So I just wanted to put that out there, that there was a big voice at that table, and they were not going to let those kids get sidestepped in any way, shape or form. So that was just really good to see.

2.4

And then I would also just say if you guys haven't had a chance to read the plan, I know March 1st is right around the corner, but I think we really need smart people who understand the landscape of education to give us feedback on that plan so we can make it the very best plan possible. So I would just really encourage the members of this Board who do have an understanding of the landscape to please read the plan and provide that feedback.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Luna?

MEMBER LUNA: Thank you. This is Member

Luna. Along those lines, I do have a question. Deputy

Superintendant Barley, so how does the plan address some

of the prejudices, the biases? And I hear about them all the time. I grew up here, I've worked in the schools, the expectations that some of the teachers, the leaders, the administrators, the trustees have of our students? How does the plan address that? And I will read the plan.

2.4

MR. BARLEY: Thank you. Brett Barley, for the record. So I think the straightest line answer to your question is that I think the plan is very clear on expectations and equity; that we have to have high expectations and a high bar for every single one of our kids, and we've got to be honest with ourselves about where we're at now and be very focused on outcomes moving forward.

So the plan itself doesn't pull any punches. It puts the current state of student achievement, lays it out. And it also lays out areas where we're seeing improvement, right? So there's good. There's good, but there's a whole lot of stuff that we'd like to improve, and it's separated by subgroup population, so it definitely does not pull any punches.

And then when we talk about becoming the fastest-improving state in the nation, we know that that improvement has to happen more rapidly with our most historically underserved subgroup population. There's a

technical group right now that's working on our long-term goals, measures of interim progress, what does it mean to be a one-star school versus a three-star school versus a five-star school. And they're talking about big kind of technical questions. Do we want to set a point in time where everybody's at the same spot, or do we want to set a point in time where we've moved the bottom faster so that they can catch up more quickly but they're still at the end of this time horizon, this five-year plan, a gap that exists. These are important questions to have. But in every instance, we're talking about bringing -- focusing our attention and bringing up the students that haven't necessarily seen the success that we want them to see as quickly as we can.

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: I would add in the section that is around great leaders, we can actually work through some of the mindset shifts that might be necessary to ensure that the high expectations are continuously held and put in some best practices around teacher development, teacher coaching to ensure that, you know, as we have this high bar for our schools, every single teacher is being developed to a place where they understand how to ensure that every student is being held to a high standard and not just some students. That's my hope.

MR. BARLEY: And, Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I didn't say Nevada is the only state in the country that I've seen -- I doubt we're the last -- but the only state that I've seen across the country so far that in its school rating system has included an opportunity gap measure where schools are awarded points for closing the opportunity gap from its least proficient students to its most proficient students. So we're not just calculating proficiency and growth like most states. We're pulling out a sub -- our lowest-performing students, that subgroup, and we're awarding points to schools for closing that gap. I think it's a really thoughtful way, and kudos to the accountability work group that came up with it to make sure that gap closure is front and center in everything that we do.

2.4

VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: If I could just add one more thing. This is Melissa Mackedon, for the record.

Nora, there was a lot of conversation that leads right into what Adam said, too, about the differences in leadership at schools that are high performing versus low performing, and I think, like Adam said, that leadership strand that's going to be such a big focus, a lot of conversation centered around making sure you have the strongest leaders with the students who need them the most and not the other way around.

1 MEMBER LUNA: Thank you. 2 CHAIR JOHNSON: Are there any other 3 questions? Member Corbett? 4 MEMBER CORBETT: Yeah. Thank you. Member 5 Corbett, for the record. I just want to really say 6 really how elated I am about the level of transparency 7 and the level of candor that you're sharing. A lot of 8 what you're saying are usually comments and things that happen not in the public environment. So to hear that 9 10 usually the conversations I'm privy to are actually 11 migrated into the public space, and I think that's just a 12 tremendous inclination of a success as it relates to the 13 potential in this plan because now knowing that these 14 conversations are in the public environment at the forefront, I'm just elated to hear. 15 16 My only question would be, is there support 17 to have the presentation that's in front of us today 18 either included in the support docs and/or forwarded to 19 the Board members? 20 MR. PELTIER: Member Corbett, this is Danny 21 Peltier. Yeah, that will all be included. I believe 22 there's a link that will be uploaded and live later 23 today. But if not, you guys will all have it really 2.4 soon.

-CAPITOL REPORTERS (775) 882-5322—

Great.

Thank you.

MEMBER CORBETT:

25

VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: Sorry. Can I just add one more thing? I'm sorry. Payback for all of these meetings.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIR JOHNSON: Do not apologize.

VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: The other thing, going right along with what Member Corbett just said, is if all goes according to the discussions, although certain data points will not be part of the performance framework, there's a plan in place for a data dashboard, if you will, that will put a tremendous amount of this data that you're talking about available to the public for -- I mean, it's insane the amount of data. The amount that people want. And we'll see what actually ends up in that final dashboard, but I think even though it won't count, you know, towards your points in your school in your rating system, I think there are really great plans in place to make a lot of this data very public, including things like -- I mean, I don't want to speak out of turn in case this doesn't end up getting there, but the conversation was around things like, you know, years of experience of the principal at these school, how many teachers are considered, you know, novice teachers, brand-new teachers verses veteran teachers, those things that, like you said, they haven't necessarily been in the public eye and the spotlight hasn't been on them will

1 hopefully be more readily available to everyone in the 2 public. So I also thought that was really encouraging. 3 CHAIR JOHNSON: Well, there are no additional comments or questions, we will move on. 4 5 Mr. Barley, thank you so much for that 6 presentation. That's very helpful and looking forward to 7 looking at some of this data and then also helping to 8 provide input on the plan. 9 MR. BARLEY: Thank you so much. Looking 10 forward to your feedback. If you want us to go anywhere 11 or do anything, have any conversations with anybody, 12 we're happy to do it. 13 CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. We'll move on to 14 Item No. 5: Beacon contractual amendment update of performance targets. So I know Mr. Gavin is not here, 15 16 but Mr. Scroggins will fill in in his stead. 17 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCROGGINS: Yes, 18 Mr. Chairman. Beacon will give an update presentation 19 here, so we invite them to come up. 20 CHAIR JOHNSON: And some had to go to the 21 restroom, so we will wait for two minutes until they 22 return. (Brief recess.) 23 2.4 MS. TONDRYK: Good morning. This is Tambre

Tondryk, for the record. Thank you for the opportunity

25

to present to you this morning.

2.4

As you may recall, on December 16th, 2016, the SPCSA Board unanimously approved a jointly drafted charter amendment requesting to limit the enrollment at Beacon Academy to students who are eligible under SB 460, the bill that created the alternative performance framework. Based on the approved amendment of the Board, the parties anticipated Beacon would not become eligible to be evaluated on the State's alternative framework until cohort 2019. The parties also agreed that the framework would be created to evaluate Beacon during this transitionary period that would be presented to this board no later than March 2017, which is why we are here today.

The draft framework represents a cooperative effort between Beacon Academy, Momentum Strategy and Research, and Director Gavin. These organizations utilized guidance from Nevada statutes NRS 385A.74 -- 730 section 5. 740 section 5 as well as discussions between Beacon and the SPCSA.

I'd like to introduce to you Dr. Jody Ernst, the cofounder and vice-president of Momentum Strategy and Research, a Colorado-based nonprofit focused on collecting and providing the best available data to K-12 education stakeholders to form education policy and

practice. Dr. Ernst and her partner, Jim Griffin, have been involved in policy and research surrounding alternative education and accountability for over a decade and founded Momentum to focus more exclusively on these issues. Prior to forming Momentum, both Jody and Jim worked for the Colorado League of Charter Schools, where they provided research and advocacy to Colorado's charter schools and their work on alternative school accountability framework. Momentum's collective expertise with charter school law, charter school accountability, and alternative schools and accountability made them an ideal partner to work with Beacon and the Authority to develop the framework being proposed today.

2.4

So, Danny, if you don't mind, take it to the first slide, please.

MS. ERNST: Thank you, Tambre. Dr. Jody
Ernst. So we'll just dive right in. As Tambre
mentioned, the three organizations have been working for
the past several months on developing a framework for
holding Beacon Academy accountable in the interim until
the State has developed their own alternative framework
and as Beacon goes through the transition of, you know,
bringing in the alternative students.

There were several objectives that we had

while developing the framework. First and foremost, we wanted to parallel, as closely as possible, the frameworks being used by the Authority currently for traditional high schools but allowing enough room for the mission, the new mission of Beacon Academy.

2.4

In addition, we wanted to parallel as closely as possible what we're seeing coming from the State with respect to where they are on drafting their alternate accountability framework. We were provided a draft in January, I believe it was, shortly after our first iteration of the framework, and we're delighted to see a number of overlapping measures, and I'll point those out as we go along.

In addition, we wanted to follow common and best practices or alternative frameworks that are being or have been in place for states and authorizers across the country. One of the value adds for Momentum is that we have a 50-state database on what every state is doing as far as alternative accountability and defining alternative schools, so we have a good reference log to draw from, and we've worked with a number of those states or authorizers within those states to develop those, so we are a pretty familiar.

The targets being set or the targets that have been set and that are present in the documents, we

wanted to make sure that they were rigorous, but to understand what rigor was for the specific group of schools, we needed data. So Momentum has a database of 4,000 alternative education schools and programs across the country, and we have been slowly collecting publicly available data on graduation rates, whether that's four-year cohort, five-year cohort, six-year cohort, attendance rates, anything that we can find that's publicly available at this time. In addition, we have a couple of vendors for national assessments that we have started working with where they have provided us data on alternative schools to analyze in order to find out how the students typically perform on assessments like NWEA and Star 360.

2.4

Finally, we really wanted to ensure that whatever was selected was usable not only for the Authority's purpose of holding the school accountable, which is very important, but also for the school's own use in its day-to-day practice. So we at Momentum feel very strongly that accountability measures shouldn't just be, you know, checking boxes and busy work, that the data that's, you know, within them should be able to be used by the staff to work with its students in real time and for school improvement practices and strategies.

Next slide, please.

MS. TONDRYK: So the mission at Beacon
Academy of Nevada is to offer at-risk high school
students the choice of an innovative and relevant
education which provides the flexibility and support to
graduate from high school with concrete plans for the
future. This has been the mission of the school since it
began. And so as you know, when we transitioned in
December and we've been enrolling students, we continue
to work towards that mission. And our goal is by the
2018-2019 school year, we will serve at least 75 percent
alternative education students. Next slide, please.

2.4

MS. ERNST: So as I mentioned, it was really important to us that we stay as close as possible to the Authorities' traditional high school framework, and we did so mostly under what we call "indicators." So these are the large buckets of measures that are being used to hold traditional high schools accountable and, therefore, Beacon as well.

So on the left side are the three indicator areas that are in the Authority's current framework, so status measures. Those are, you know, your proficient and advanced measures like that, growth measures, and college and career readiness measures. So Beacon has measures under each of those indicators, but additionally, we have added an indicator called student

engagement.

2.4

Now, because of the addition of the fourth indicator and to adjust to the mission of the school, the weighting, which is the percentages in the parentheticals, have been shifted around. And it was very important to Beacon that college and career readiness receive actually the most weight because that's really where the focus of their mission lies. So you can see that the weights are a little bit different across the three that overlap, but it is holding with the overall sentiment that growth in college and career readiness should be heavily weighted for high schools.

Next slide, please. It is our understanding, in conversations with Mr. Gavin, that the State is in flux with respect to its end-of-course exams and whether or not those are going to be used for accountability up into the future. So in the interim, because NWEA is an assessment that Beacon has been using, and because Momentum has a lot of data and has recently published a report on how alternative students typically perform and grow on NWEA, that seemed a really good place to start with finding how Beacon is doing with respect to students' performance, excuse me, at the end of the year in math and reading.

So I'm not going to go in detail into the

actual targets unless asked, but there was a document that was provided that is very thick with technical details, and this is to ensure that the Authority understands what's being proposed and also to help the school implement it because once we're finished with our project, you know, it's theirs to implement. So that's what this document is meant to do. So we can refer to it if there are specific questions about that. Just know that the targets that were set for performance on NWEA were set using that research that Momentum has conducted, how the typical alternative school does in that case.

2.4

Next slide, please. Similarly with growth, we're proposing that they use NWEA growth measures, and just as with the status measure, it will be on reading and mathematics, and the targets that are established are based on research from other alternative campuses across the country.

Next slide, please. For college and career readiness, there are four measures in the proposal: quarterly credit accrual, transition success, graduation rates, and college and career readiness assessments. It was neat to see the ESSA presentation because what they had to say around college and career readiness definitely is reflected in here, and some of the measures around work keys and ACT are reflected in the college and career

readiness assessments.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Because the mission of Beacon is to take in students who are behind in credits, of course credit accrual has to be a measure, right? So we're going to be looking at quarterly credit accrual. This measure takes into account the length of time that students are enrolled in Beacon, so if they are there for two semesters, sorry, two quarters, Beacon will be able to say okay, for the two quarters they were here, did they meet the 1.5 credit accrual during those two semesters if they were there for three? So really, we can get measurement on nearly 100 percent of the students in this manner in that -- I should have put that on the first slide as well -- is that each of the measures we really want to reflect all of the students, not just the students who stay for a year or not just students that are there on a particular test day, et cetera. tried really hard to make sure that any of the computations that go into this are able to adjust based on students that enter late or leave early throughout a year.

Transition success is probably the most complicated measure that we have, but essentially what it does is looks at each of the students that exit the school and looks at why and considers successful any

transition that is educationally positive for the student. So transitioning to, you know, they deal with a lot of adult students, students who are over 18, and for one reason or another, whether it's work schedules or, you know, just needing to take care of a child, full-time school might not be the best option for them, and so if they transfer to an adult education facility that eventually offers them a GED or an adult diploma, that will be considered a success in this case because these students are at such high risk for dropping out.

2.4

There are some that also are considered neutral, and I want to be very clear that they are not considered neutral in as far as their impact on the student, but in as far as the level of, sorry, the school's ability to impact what's happening. So incarceration, for example, would be considered neutral, whereas by the State, currently, that's considered a dropout. So this kind of takes all of the reasons for leaving and applies positive value to educational transitions, graduations, of course, and then puts in a neutral category those that the school really has no control over. Graduation --

CHAIR JOHNSON: Quick question. I'm sorry.

So there's a positive value for positive transitions, a neutral value for things outside of their control.

1 Uh-huh. MS. ERNST: 2 CHAIR JOHNSON: Is there a deduction value 3 for things that are in the control --MS. ERNST: 4 Absolutely. I'm sorry. Yes. Ι 5 thought that would be implied. Yeah, absolutely. 6 there are some of the codes that are being looked into 7 because interpretation of them is unclear such as being 8 withdrawn for juvenile court reasons. That one is being looked at currently, but that's currently in the 9 10 negative. Ten-day absence withdrawals are negative, 11 30-day unknown whereabouts and withdrawals are a 12 negative. So basically, anything that the State 13 currently kind of considers a dropout code is in the 14 negative category. Does that make sense? 15 CHAIR JOHNSON: Yes -- this is Chair Johnson. It makes sense to me. I'm just trying to understand. 16 17 Sometimes, even within those codes, though, you still --18 it might still -- it should be coded as a neutral. 19 within ten days, you might drop out, but it may not be 20 within your control why the student dropped out, so I 21 wouldn't want to be adversely affected, even though you 22 have a -- it's in like another category that's 23 traditionally a category that's negative. 2.4 MS. ERNST: Right. 25 CHAIR JOHNSON: So how do we kind of mitigate that type of risk?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MS. ERNST: Right. Again, I think the three categories that we're looking at are those that are currently considered negative. Some of them -- I believe that most of them, and this is just my belief -- we don't have evidence to this, are transitional codes. So, for example, withdrawn for juvenile court, that might be a transition code where the student has been incarcerated or will move to a juvenile detention center but is not yet enrolled in a school there. That's what's being looked into at this time to ensure that those kinds of issues are corrected so that only students that leave and are unknown -- granted that isn't always in the control of the school, but that's sort of on everybody, right? But if a kid is absent for ten days, the school is required to drop them. And if they don't get picked up at another school, that would be considered a dropout.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Thank you. Member Corbett?

MEMBER CORBETT: Thank you. Member Corbett

here. Kind of in line with what Chair Johnson just

asked, are there any conversations around prevention or

intervention strategies based on these negative impacts?

MS. ERNST: That would be yours.

MS. TONDRYK: Tambre Tondryk, for the record.

Yes, we have three social workers who our main focus,

even now, is called re-engagement. So ten days is clearly a problem with all schools and all students. But really, typically, these kids are two years behind as it is, so they're looking at graduating, you know, 19, 20, sometime. So it's really hard to keep them in school.

2.4

Anyway, yes, we are actively going after the students. We're contacting them, you know, trying to get them back, bringing them in, trying to remove some of those barriers. We're not always successful but, you know, we do the best we can with that. And so that is really something that we're focusing on and then trying to -- we're looking for surveys to identify that before the kids get there, so giving those surveys so that we can identify kids who are considering dropping out and so that we can act proactively to prevent it.

These are challenges that we spend a lot of time even at our Board meeting on Wednesday night, talking about these withdrawal codes. Because the State hasn't come out with their alternative performance framework, our thoughts are when that comes out, we will align this with the State because those schools may be facing -- some of the schools will be facing these challenges. The alternative performance schools, the alt ed schools right now in the state are mainly adjudicated and then so the students are incarcerated really and

attending school or they're going -- there are schools that serve a special education population. So they don't necessarily have the same problem of this withdrawal code. But if the State is starting to think about schools like ours that are serving the credit deficient students that have fallen through the cracks all along, this is going to be something that hopefully will be included in the State's framework that we can change to.

2.4

MS. ERNST: Jody Ernst, for the record. The draft does have a very similar measure to this. They score it a little bit differently, but we chose the codes that aligned to the extent that they were available. Like sometimes they have words in there, and sometimes, like for graduation for specific diploma types, the codes were actually in there, but then they used words like "transition to adult education" or "transition to GED," so they just used words in that case, and so we selected out the codes that had that description. So but to Tambre's point, they will be following the State 's guidance on that when it's available.

And the only point that I wanted to make about graduation rates is they will be using a four-year cohort graduation. But as Tambre mentioned, they are taking students that are two years behind already, and so at this time for the interim couple of years, they will

be reporting that to you all, but that will not be included as a measure that will be scored or will count towards the framework because there is no data at this time to indicate what would be an appropriate and rigorous benchmark for that measure. This will be revisited in two years when we believe that the State will have some data with more schools coming online that are serving this population and a benchmark will be set at that time. Any questions about that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Next slide, please. Finally, under student engagement, the two measures that, in talking with Mr. Gavin, we decided to include now -- and there are a few that will also fit under student engagement that will be revisited at a later time -- are student retention and student attendance. These are ones that we were able to not put some goals around because of existing evidence. We have some attendance rates from other alternative schools across the country, so we were able to set a student annual attendance rate around that. And student retention, we looked at students that are current or that have been attending Beacon for the past couple of years that would have fit under the alternative school definition and looked at what percentage of those students have returned on average and set the bar for meets a little bit higher than what that was.

next slide, please. Next slide, please. So
as I mentioned a couple of times now, in 2019-20 when
Beacon projects that it will be a fully functioning
alternative ed school at that time and when the State
will likely have data to help set some goals around some
other items, there will be a re-evaluation of the
framework and the measures within it, particularly with
the graduation rate. We anticipate that they will
actually set a goal around that rate that is rigorous and
applicable to alternative schools. But then also,
chronic absence and truancy is something that they would
like to track and will begin tracking now but will not be
held accountable for it at this time as well as beginning
to do some student surveys around, you know, how is the
student's adjustment as they come in and then how does it
change over time with the support structure that Beacon
is able to offer. Does the student feel supported? Do
the parents, you know, think their students are being
supported? And then for the students that come in with
behavioral challenges, maybe they were expelled before or
have been suspended, looking at those students in
particular for changes in incidents over time. So those
are some that will be considered for addition in 19-20.
Next. Oh, thank you. Finally, or not
finally yet close to finally the targets that we

have set follow the same structure as the Authority's current targets within their traditional framework, so those are the six categories ranging from "exceptional" at the top to "critical" at the bottom.

2.4

Next slide. And then the roll-up will be based on the same point values, so they'll accrue points for each measure, it has its weighting, and then when it's rolled up, there's a total score that will range from zero to a hundred, and the designation that they get, whether it's exceptional, exceeds adequate, approaches rolls up to the same point values as in the traditional framework now. So that will be parallel as well, so it will look and feel much the same.

The other document that you received is a one-page document with some data pieces that shouldn't be viewed as how the school is doing exactly right now. The NWEA, for example, is just based on fall to winter this year, and some of the other pieces were ones that we were looking at for the past few years and trying to help set the goals, so they're like an amalgam of a couple of years put together, so we just thought it would be interesting for you to see what it would look like, that it's very similar to what the Authority currently does, and let you have a frame of reference.

At this time, I'm done presenting on the

framework, and I'm open to questions about technical issues or anything that you might have.

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Snow?

Member Snow. First of all, I think that you're to be commended for taking on this Brave New World assignment and forging ahead where no educational institution has gone before, so to speak, with no real strong amount of a framework and guidance for "this is how you're supposed to do it." So to me, it's obvious you put a lot of work into this, and I think you're to be commended for coming to this point.

But I have a question for you, Principal

Tondryk. I know that just by the nature of Beacon

Academy and the student population that you work with

that you're accustomed to challenges from students, and

you're working very hard to get them through and to teach

them and to get to the point where they can thrive, but

my question to you is this. As you've been through this

transition, what have you learned that you think is

valuable that's different from what you were doing

previously as part of this process? Is there something

-- does it just have to do with a renewed focus on

student engagement, or what have you learned through this

process or what you think would be of value to others

that might be in your situation? Do you think it just could be beneficial in general?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MS. TONDRYK: That's a tough question. think that the most challenging and what we've learned is that it's, I guess is that we, every day, we learn what we don't know. And so it's been challenging identifying students that qualify, looking at the statute and trying to stay within the statute so that we hit the 75 percent threshold. And so there are many things not included in the legislation, so we're struggling as a school, my counselors, my social worker, myself. Does the student qualify? Does the student not qualify? And it's because there is a lot of unknown. As you mentioned, we're going first. And so, you know, just an example, the amount -the credits, the way that the statute defines it is at the end of the year or after two semesters or four semesters or six semesters. Well, there's a midyear, and so we're having to hold students back from enrolling because at the end of two semester, they may not have been at zero credits, but in the midyear, they only have earned one that they had earned at the end of two semesters, but at the end. So there are many things like that.

I would say the best thing we've learned, though, is there's a lot of students that fall in the

alternative education classification or meet the criteria, and it's really nice to be that place where they go and they feel welcomed and they're excited.

They're getting a whole new fresh start. They're treated as a person. We trust them, you know, we have them on campus. We're not treating them -- hiding them away in the back corner of the school but welcoming them, asking them how we can help, being that school where they can go and, you know, re-engage and have that hope again. So I guess, you know, there's the good and the bad. But really seeing these kids really haven't given up.

They've just lost a place to start over, you know.

2.4

MEMBER SNOW: Is there something that you need from the Charter School Authority that you're not getting in terms of support in going through this process?

MS. TONDRYK: Yes. Okay. So the questions that we have, because the statute is new, so there's a lot of -- I don't know how you say it, a lot of holes in it. And so just reclassifying, identifying such as what is the end of the year? Is it June? Is it August? Is it the last day of school? Is it June 30th? We don't know. And so when we look at those -- when we're trying to be compliant and reach the 75 percent threshold, because I'm very nervous that if we do it wrong, we're

not going to hit the 75 percent threshold, and then we're going to continue to be in this midregion, and then all of us, you know, are back to square one. The school is in trouble again because we haven't remained compliant.

We're trying, but we don't know when the end of the year actually is. We don't understand if it's after two semesters why can't there be a three semester and a fourth semester?

2.4

Another question would be, you know, after -okay. So in sixth grade, students earn a half a credit
for computer science. Does that half credit mean that
the ninth grader who ends the year, he hasn't earned a
credit in those two semesters, but is someone going to
look at that transcript and say, "No, he didn't have zero
after two. He had a half a credit that he earned back in
sixth grade." So I have several questions such as this.
That's really preventing us from enrolling students. And
I have parents that are saying, you know, "What do I have
to do? Rob a bank to get in your school? I want to be
in your school." And every question that I have is a
person or several people, and so I'd like answers sooner
rather than later.

And then also, you know, the end of the year is coming, and if we enroll students, we want to start them right away earning credits. We don't -- we offer

free summer school. We're a year-around program. So when can I -- if I start them in June and they earn two credits over the summer, they're no longer going to qualify for alternative ed. Am I going to hear next fall, "Oh, those kids don't count?" And they would have qualified if the end of the school year was June the last day of school. I just need to make sure that I am following the rules very, very closely, and I can't mess up because that impacts everything.

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: Thank you. Thank you very much.

MS. TONDRYK: Thank you. Those are good questions.

MEMBER SNOW: I'm sure Mr. Scroggins will be happy to share with you the list of banks that are going to be easiest to rob so those students can find a niche. But, Dr. Ernst, excellent presentation. Do you have anything else that you want to add? You mentioned accountability. Do you have anything else you want to add on metrics for accountability? That seems to be a very important issue to you.

MS. ERNST: It is. I think I would encourage the Authority, if not the State, to really move beyond a four-year cohort graduation rate for this group of students. It just is not one that makes a lot of sense,

and we see it across the country. And so a number of states and/or authorizers or school districts who are being proactive have really started looking at extended year cohorts and been successful with that. Colorado actually goes out through eight years to account for the length of time that students are funded publicly. So looking at sort of a best of five, six, seven-year graduation rates is something that we're seeing people start to use and feel like that's a very promising and realistic measure for schools whose mission is to take students that have fallen behind already.

2.4

MEMBER SNOW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's the end of my questions.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Thank you, Member Snow.

Actually, I wanted to follow back up though because it sounds like this is -- the support you said you needed, Principal Tondryk, is one that is a systematic kind of solution that we need to be able to provide, and it's not like -- because individual questions will continue to come, right? There will always be individual questions.

And so looking at you, Mr. Scroggins, I know Director Gavin will be here eventually, but how do we think through providing support when, you know, A, we know that you are -- there's capacity issues. And what structures can we put in place so that we can provide

answers quickly? Because when we have our schools who are, again, I want to reiterate Member Snow's comments about just how impressed I am around your diligence and putting in support, putting in accountability measures. I really do appreciate that. But how do we make sure that we can allow for them to follow the rules so that they know what's expected of them and then they can have a system to follow and not just have to reach out to Director Gavin for an answer which then puts an additional strain on the Authority and all of you, because again, the systems are more important than the individual question every two weeks or how often they arise.

2.4

DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCROGGINS: Patrick is up north. Oh, there he is.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: I was really trying to stay in the background and just watch all of this, but I didn't want Brian twisting in the wind on this particular one.

So actually, to be really clear, this entire medical emergency has just been part of the secret ploy to ensure that our poor court reporter does not have to listen to me speak 360 words a minute. But yes, apparently that's what they clocked me at as of last week or last month. So I'm endeavoring -- it helps that it's

hard to read all of the letters on this page that I'm looking at so I can go slower.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think the core challenge here, Mr. Chairman and Member Snow, is that we don't make the rules. rules are made, in this case, by the State Board of Ed. And to the degree that there is ambiguity in them, I have counselled the school to take the most conservative interpretation possible. I recognize that that creates exactly the kinds of roadblocks that Tambre has articulated, and I really think the appropriate means for doing this is initially public comment and then through face-to-face meetings with individual members of the state board to discuss how this is working in practice. Because I think candidly, the folks who are doing this work at the Department are incredibly hard working people, including some former members of our team, but they've never run an alt ed school. They've never done this work that Tambre is doing right now or that many of our schools, or really in some cases, many of our schools are doing because they come from a more research-based background.

So much like we do not have the authority to calculate a 6-year or 7-year graduation rate as an agency, I don't feel like we're in a position to nor do I think it would be good for the school to take our word

and our interpretation on something when ultimately, we aren't the final arbiter on this. And I really do think that the voice of a school and the voice of CSED is a more effective way to get at this. Certainly, once we get down to item number 7, I would say yes, the voices of schools on issues are a far more effective way to get the attention of the decision makers than it is by just constant nagging of the nice folks who work in this building.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIR JOHNSON: I want to interject. I think there's a lot of value in the trailblazer being able to help identify for the rest of the group where the biggest points of pain are. And so if there's some way for us to, with this experience that they're going through, to help us ensure that others don't have to kind of see some of the same pain points, I really think that that would be a very good use of time because we don't have any others at this point who are doing that. So I don't know what that looks like and I don't know what the steps are, so I'm not being very helpful in terms of providing a solution there, but as we start thinking about again, as they are uncovering new problems every week, how do we allow for them to again have a more direct and quick resolution to those; and B, be able to have some sort of voice in making sure that those are able to be resolved

because I think Principal Tondryk's point is a very important one. Every question is a person, and if our duty is to students and children and families, then we can't allow for, you know, the laws of -- the time to be grinding by as some student is waiting trying to figure out how to get back engaged in their own educational experience, especially if they want to. So I'll get off the soapbox now, but I think that's really important.

MEMBER SNOW: Member Snow, for the record.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well said. And it probably shouldn't be put just on Mr. Gavin's shoulders to go do all of this, and maybe the Board needs to help get involved to see if we can get some answers to at least have a basic framework where students can actually be brought into the program because we've seen from the financial presentation previously that that's going to be part of the measures that we're going to be following to establish success. So if we can't get people in the program, we just can't be successful and maybe need to go to the State Board of Education, assist Patrick with that.

CHAIR JOHNSON: And so, Director Gavin -this is Chair Johnson. Again, all of us are eager to
assist all of our schools. And so again, I'm going to
allow for you to do the heavy lifting and thinking of

what needs to be done, but as Member Snow just mentioned and I'll reiterate, we are here to be helpful, so please use us as you see necessary because these are students and families who are impacted by this, not the adults.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCROGGINS: Mr. Chairman, just wanted to add -- this is Brian Scrogins, deputy director. We actually attended the Board meeting, Joan Jurgensen and myself went Wednesday night to the Board meeting. We got a list of questions from staff and legal counsel and just committed to working with them to get those answers as best we can.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Scroggins.

Other questions? Are there additional questions?

MEMBER GUINASSO: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Member Guinasso here. Not so much any questions. I just wanted to echo Member Snow's comment that it's extraordinarily commendable the courage and the leadership that's being shown by Beacon to be a trailblazer. I think it was said before. And I think with that praise is the concern that we don't turn our trailblazer into this sacrificial lamb. And so insomuch as within our authority we can be committed to helping these courageous people who are trying to innovate and produce results accomplish those goals, I think, you know, we should go out of our way to do that.

I think it's really within the spirit of the charter movement, as I've come to know it, to be innovative, to serve populations of students who may in fact be falling through the cracks and to do that in a way that's successful and accountable. And again, I just am very, I guess, pleased and excited to see the good work that's happening at Beacon, you know, not assuming the results, but just the effort is clear that the work that they're doing is quality work, they desire to be accountable, and I think accountability is the bedrock to being able to show that what we're doing in the charter movement is successful and important work in the overall portfolio of the education we're trying to deliver in our state. Thank you.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Thank you again for that report. We're excited to be able to partner with you. And again, as Member Snow mentioned, as I mentioned and Director Gavin, including you as well, however we can be useful in assisting this to move forward quickly, please don't hesitate to reach out to us and let us know. We want to make sure that this is a success. We are partners in this work.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR JOHNSON: Yes.

DIRECTOR GAVIN: Patrick Gavin, for the

record. I'm again endeavoring to speak at a moderate pace. I would just note that it had been, I think, both Principal Tondryk's intent and my intent that we would actually have some draft contract language for you to review to sort of fully incorporate in this month.

Unfortunately, between just sort of all of the things on our plates and then my lack of presence for much of the last week, that did not occur. I believe we essentially have an agreement in principle on what we want to have this look like. It's just really making sure that both our counsels are comfortable with what that language looks like so that we can get that back to you as soon as possible.

And I believe if it weren't for the import of this particular language with relation to the -- and how unique and trailblazing it is, I would actually ask for delegated authority to just basically execute based on the terms that we've already articulated. But I think it's important enough that it should come back to you for your careful review.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Ms. Sanchez?

MS. SANCHEZ: Thank you, Chairman Johnson and Members of the Board. Africa Sanchez, for the record.

That's correct. I have been in discussions with Greg

Ott, and the terms of the agreement are really

encompassed in that December 14th, 2016, letter that was provided to you at the December meeting and which was voted upon and approved by your board. And so we, you know, Beacon's position is that the entire agreement is focused therein and large sections or large parts of the charter contract will need to be amended to put in obviously what we anticipate will be this new school performance framework, and there's going to be almost three, if you will.

There will be the one that, for existing students, the ones that were grandfathered in, if you will, that don't qualify within the 75 percent of the alt framework, and then there's the ones that do qualify that will be part of this new one. So it will be kind of encompassing a whole new lot of different sections, if you will, of that charter contract.

And I just wanted to speak on just from this morning and thank you for viewing Beacon as a trailblazer because you're right. There's a lot at stake. And when we came before you in December, you know, the threshold was 75 percent, and we just learned that, you know, there's Assembly Bill 49 that was actually kind of submitted on behalf of the State Public Charter School Authority, and like Sections 1 and 2 would specifically speak to Beacon Academy because now they would require a

hundred -- in order for them to qualify for the alt framework, it would require 100 percent of their students, and so we would not, you know, Beacon would not qualify by the end of cohort 2019. And even our amendment enrollment which was already passed in the December meeting, a big part of it would become moot.

And so I just wanted to voice my concern about that, and I hope that as this comes up to the legislature that we would have the Authority's support when we're dealing with that Section 1 and Section 2 because it's going to impact Beacon tremendously, to say the least. So that's Section 1 and Section 2 of AB 49. And I could not -- I have to speak up about that just because of the impact that it would have. It would have an impact as to the accountability because we're doing all of this with the intent that it was going to be the 75 percent threshold and obviously, now becoming a hundred totally changes the goal, the end goal.

MEMBER SNOW: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR JOHNSON: Just a second.

MEMBER SNOW: Mr. Chairman, Member Snow for the record. I apologize. I was not able to attend the last meeting. I don't know if that particular bill came up and was brought before the Charter School Authority Board, but I would just ask Mr. Gavin, if it's not going

to be covered on the agenda item today, to come to the Board with the providence of that legislation, where it came from, who's sponsoring it and why and what the staff's role has been with regard to that legislation. I would appreciate it.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Thank you for the question, Member Snow. Patrick Gavin here. So just for background information, we will get into this in greater detail at Item No. 6, but to be clear, the AB 49 is a bill from the Governor's Office that was submitted on behalf of the agency side of the State Public Charter School Authority.

With regard to Sections 1 and 2, just to be incredibly clear -- and I've spoken with Ms. Tondryk about this offline, but I completely appreciate

Ms. Sanchez's need to put this on the record. The language that we provided to the Governor's Office and to the Legislative Council Bureau included the 75 percent.

It is unclear to me why that was omitted by the drafter, and we contacted the drafter and informed them that this is language that will need to be amended at the table at the hearing for this bill.

It is certainly not our intent to pull a fast one with relation to a school that has been working with us or to undermine the policy that was put in place

during the last session related to alt ed. It's simply to provide essentially to articulate exactly the kind of pathway that we worked with Beacon on because this is an area where, frankly, some of our district brethren want more clarity and statutes about what they are permitted to do with potentially transitioning schools that they oversee. So that's one of the elements certainly when I've worked with Clark County School District on and discussed this. So let me be 100 percent crystal clear. It is certainly our intention to ensure that that 75 percent is put back in.

I will also say that my understanding is that if the bill is tentatively still scheduled to be heard this Wednesday, although it could be pushed out a week, and I would strongly encourage Ms. Sanchez and/or Ms. Tondryk to number one, come and voice this concern and perhaps even offer their own amendment if they wish, and I will certainly view that as a friendly amendment in this particular case.

And also, with relation to the issues that

Ms. Tondryk has brought up with regard to the ambiguity,

I do not think it would be at all inappropriate to

articulate the quandary in which she finds herself in

trying to ensure that they operate with integrity but

recognizing that there is a lack of clarity in some

cases. While that is certainly more the providence of the state board, I don't think it is ever inappropriate to make her voice heard in the legislative process on those kinds of matters.

I feel like Mr. Ott wants to say something as he sits next to me.

DEPUTY AG OTT: I was just going to mention this to Patrick, but even in the event because we have no control over what the legislature does if the legislature chooses to pass something with 100 percent, that would not prevent us from altering the contract to change to prevent the school from having the goalpost moved on them at a later date and giving them no time to comply with that. So there might still be things that the SPCSA could do on the contractual side to address the issue if legislature were passed as written.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: I think that is accurate. I would also note, to be very clear actually, that Sections 1 and 2 of the bill are specifically related to a school that is making that transition. I would argue Beacon has already made it, and so they've already completed the journey or they are well on their way.

So again, and I also believe there's certainly a lot of authority for the state board regs to

clarify in the event that this was somehow messed up legislatively, but I do not believe it will be. I think that there's certainly understanding. That 75 percent was a hard one, a hard negotiated number, and certainly, if it doesn't get cleaned up on the assembly side, assuming the bill survives, I am confident that we will be able to take care of that on the Senate side because the sponsor of SB 460 remains a very vocal member of Senate Ed.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Ms. Tondryk?

MS. TONDRYK: This is Tambre Tondryk, for the record. I just wanted to thank the Authority Board, the staff, Patrick Gavin, and Greg Ott for their continued support in helping us transition to the framework and just your ongoing assistance and everything. It really means a lot, and we really appreciate it.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Yes, Ms. Sanchez?

MS. SANCHEZ: Africa Sanchez on behalf of the Board. Thank you, Director Gavin and Greg, for your explanation of what we can expect as we continue forward.

And so just another one of the discussions that we had in December that came from the Board was the narrow definition of the students that qualify for the alt ed framework, and there was also actually some discussion about kind of expanding that definition, and

this would seem like the opportune time to do it. And so I'm hoping as we have this discussion, of course we would participate in that discussion ourselves, but if we can have the assistance of Director Gavin as well if it could be a friendly amendment as we interpret who will qualify for this alternative framework, I think that would be very helpful as well as we continue forward.

CHAIR JOHNSON: I imagine that was directed to Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott.

MS. SANCHEZ: What the position of the Authority is and of the Board, if this is something that they're going to be bringing forward, you know, in regards to this legislative bill, I think that the time is now. And because we are doing it because we're already in and we're already having these issues, let's do it, you know. If we're going to be working together, that would be my request.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Director Gavin or Mr. Ott?

Member Guinasso?

MEMBER GUINASSO: Yeah. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. I just want to ask legal counsel with
regard to where the discussion is going now, are we
outside the scope of the agenda item? I think we might
need to wait to talk about legislative positions and
these sorts of things for a later agenda item.

DEPUTY AG WHITNEY: Mr. Chairman, this is
Robert Whitney. I think Mr. Member Guinasso brings up a
good point. We are kind of getting out beyond the scope
of the agenda item, and although it's interesting, I do
think we need to stick closer to the agenda item, and I
think we're about ready to wrap up on it.

CHAIR JOHNSON: So then I guess in that same vein, I don't want to stray too far away then. How do we complete this conversation knowing that in March, we actually won't be or have very little room for agenda items aside from the ones that are already going to be listed on there? Member Snow? I guess I'm just looking for some guidance here.

MEMBER SNOW: Mr. Chairman, Member Snow, for the record. As I alluded to earlier, I appreciate Patrick's comments with regard to clarifying the situation, and I asked that he send something to the Board about the providence of this legislation and just give us an updated legislative report that we can deal with in between our meetings. If he can do that, maybe that will suffice.

DEPUTY AG WHITNEY: This is Robert Whitney, for the record. I think that sounds fine.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Then we'll go that route then. Thank you for the guidance, Member Snow.

1 If there are no further questions or 2 discussions, again thank you all so much, and we're 3 excited to continue to move forward. I quess I would be 4 willing to take a motion. 5 MEMBER SNOW: This is Member Snow. I'll move for approving the framework. 6 7 MEMBER LUNA: Nora Luna. I second that 8 motion. CHAIR JOHNSON: All in favor of approving of 9 10 the framework? 11 THE BOARD: Aye. CHAIR JOHNSON: I would also note that Member 12 13 Mackedon was absent and Member Corbett was absent from 14 the vote as well. 15 All right. We will move on to Agenda Item 16 2017 legislative session update, and I don't know No. 6: 17 if that's going to be handled by Director Gavin or 18 Mr. Scroggins. I see they're both here. I'm sure 19 they're both eager to provide us with an update, so 20 whoever would like to move forward with that. 21 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Thank you for the 22 question, Mr. Chairman. I'd actually suggest we move 23 just to the end, but since we did just kind of almost 24 jump into this agenda item, so -- and Member Snow, I'm of

course happy to send you an update on the information

25

that was shared with the Board last month including links to the legislation.

To be clear again, so there are a couple of bills that are worth discussing today. And on a couple of these, I'll be taking the lead, and I believe there's one in which Member Mackedon may wish to have a -- to voice the conversation because it's a matter that I know has come to her attention, and it may merit some
Authority interest as well. So let's talk -- I will first speak about AB 78, that is Assembly Bill 78, which is sponsored -- which is brought forth on the behalf of the Clark County School District. It is my understanding that that bill will be heard either on Monday or Wednesday of next week.

For those of you who will recall, this is the bill that requires that the Charter School Authority engage in consultative activity with the local school district location regarding both the initial approval and then any siting approval for new charter schools or new charter school campuses. I will note that the Charter School Association is currently opposing this bill. And based on the conversation during our last meeting, sentiment seemed to be that this would be an area where again, we would be opposing this, and this is certainly what I am articulating based on the current language to

our friends at the Clark County School District.

Although there are certainly other ways we can collaborate, the fiscal impact of that and the organizational impact of that, given the challenges we would have in complying, make it very difficult.

I will note that I have also begun to share some compelling research with them on other strategies that have been used by different states and districts around the country regarding district and charter school collaboration because I do think there is a real desire on their part to figure out how to do this better and how to be more playful. It's just quite challenging in our current context, especially giving the siting and facilities challenges that schools have around our state as we've seen at our own meetings with schools that have had to move significant distances from their initial approved location due to approval issues. So that's a key one.

Assembly Bill 49, which is the one that we just spoke of briefly during number five of this meeting. Assembly Bill No. 5, again, is a Governor's Office bill that is offered on behalf of the Authority, and it contains a number of sections. And we spent a lot of time talking about this during the last go-around during the last meeting, and I wanted to update you on some

developments.

2.4

One is yes, we certainly have provided the, you know, amended language to the Legislative Counsel Bureau and requested that they incorporate that certainly as an amendment to the bill so that we will be able to present that at the hearing specifically in relation to the concern that Beacon has raised, which again, was not -- which appears to be unintentional oversight. It's not clear why the bill drafter did that.

Other key areas that I know this Board had had some concerns about. The first of those -- so based on additional conversations with the Governor's Office, the guidance we have received is that their preference remains that the appointment of the executive director be under the authority -- and the removal of the executive director be under the authority of the Governor, much as the case with the State Board of Education and the state superintendent relationship.

With regard to the membership concerns, there continue to be concerns regarding the idea of vendors or officers or staff of an EMO being on the board or director or board members of a school. There was some thought that staff members of a charter school or a charter school management organization might be acceptable in limited numbers. So I have vetting contact

with the council bureau regarding that potential compromised language.

2.4

Again, to be clear, as the agency, it is my role to articulate the bill as put forward by the Governor's Office in an attempt to push that through as much as possible. Should the Board wish to take a different position, it is certainly -- and I would certainly understand that regarding your particular concerns about this language, because I have no way of knowing what the legislature may wish to do.

I will note that during the last session, there was a -- and just for clarification because Member Snow and others may not realize this. Under statute, I am a termed officer which actually is somewhat sui generis. There are, at this point to my knowledge, no other executive branch agency heads that actually serve a term, which means that the only way that -- there's really no mechanism for removing me. I essentially report to myself much like a constitutional -- much like an elected official does. And that is -- and while I certainly have to work very closely with this board, but I think there was this concern originally about sort of this separation between staff and the board for lots of reasons, including -- for a number of reasons when the legislation was originally passed in 2013.

But what is quite clear to me is that somebody needs to be able to fire me if I do something wrong. We actually, during the 2015 session, put in the bill that was sponsored by the State -- by the Senate Education Committee, the concept of this board being able to remove me by a majority vote. That was something that the legislature was uncomfortable with. They didn't, for whatever reason, they did not feel that was appropriate and it did not wind up in the final bill. So this is another attempt to sort of figure out how to get at that with this removal by the Governor. And again, there is ample precedent for this statute, so it makes a certain amount of sense.

2.4

I am also certainly cognizant of the concerns that that could raise. While a department of public health or a department of education are generally considered to be sort of pretty standard agencies and most people recognize the need to put someone with expertise and talent who know how to run those agencies in them, a charter school authority is a relatively unique animal, and different governors may have different viewpoints on whether they even want one or who they want in it or whether they want charter schools. So I would certainly understand if this board wished to articulate a different approach. And again, so I want to make sure

that in the event that this board wishes to offer an amendment, that that's something that certainly should be discussed in hearing and discussed in the building if this is an area where there is a lack of consensus between the position of the Governor's Office and the position of the members of this body, either individually or collectively, because I can certainly see you all having different opinions as well and wanting to talk to your legislators about them.

2.4

The other bill, I think, that is worth talking about -- and I don't have the exact number off the top of my head -- is another assembly bill sponsored by Assemblywoman Neil, which is intended to repeal the legislation which created the achievement school district. The entire bill essentially just crosses out everything that was in Assembly Bill 448 of the last session.

It is my understanding that the Charter

School Association of Nevada, last week, voted to oppose
the repeal of the achievement school district. And so in
consult -- when I spoke with Member Mackedon, followed up
with me about agenda items, we did discuss this matter,
and I wanted to make sure that she at least had the
opportunity to voice CCN's position on this and determine
if members of the Board, either individually, or if the

body collectively wanted to take a stand on a particular issue.

2.4

MR. PELTIER: Real quick, that's Assembly Bill 103.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Thank you, Danny.

VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: Largely, initially, and we'll just say this. Initially, CCN had determined that they were going to remain neutral on this bill and on the achievement school district at large, being that really the mission of CCN is to support existing charter schools. But in light of many things that have occurred with the rollout of this bill or with the rollout of the process, I should say, it just kind of became apparent to us that we needed to stand behind this and that some of these students in these schools that were slotted to be in the achievement school district were -- information was being misrepresented to their parents, the leaders of those schools were -- just going to be blunt here -- getting promotions. It was kind of crazy, and it was not in the best interest of kids.

And so the long and short of it is that CCN decided to come out in opposition to this bill because at the end of the day -- trying to be politically correct, but I guess I'll just throw that to the wind and just go with it -- these kids can't be worse off than they

currently are, right? I mean, nothing is going to get worse for these kids. So let's give it a try, and let's see how it goes, and I'm not -- those are my thoughts. I don't want to represent those as CCN's thoughts for sure. So yeah, that's where we're at. And I certainly don't -- I'm not saying that this board should do that. Those schools aren't going to be authorized by us, et cetera, et cetera, but it is an interesting discussion to have whether we should, you know, be a community that's solidified around this event or just remain neutral or what have you.

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: Any questions for Director Gavin or Vice-Chair Mackedon?

MEMBER GUINASSO: Member Guinasso, for the record. There was legislation yesterday where we were criticized in one way or another. Did you want to address that, Director Gavin, what the context of the criticism was?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: There was a bill heard in Senate Education yesterday, Senate Bill 132 sponsored by Senator Harris, which is the result of an extensive collaboration including with some representatives from the charter school sector, certainly the department of education, really an extraordinarily broad coalition ranging from teachers unions all the way

to more sort of people who are considered more traditionally reform, although certainly there are reform-minded elements within certainly the unions as well, but a very broad coalition around this concept of individual graduation rates. I'm sorry, individual graduation plans, I apologize, and essentially creating a pathway by which students who are significantly academically behind, much like the students that we discussed under Agenda Item No. 5, to provide a plan which would create a mutual accountability between the student and the school related to achieving graduation within three semesters of the initial plan.

2.4

Based on an -- after extensive conversations with Senator Harris, both during the interim and then afterwards, she invited me to offer an amendment clarifying a couple of areas. I did so. She viewed that as a friendly amendment. There was extensive public comment following those amendments which were discussed at the table from one of the schools that we worked with regarding the accountability actions that this Board has taken, including, but not limited to the issuance of the Notice of Intent to revoke that school's written charter. There were approximately ten parties including staff, students, and the school's attorney, who spoke at length regarding their viewpoint on that action. So that is an

area where there was -- a number of things were said that I'm not sure everyone in this room would particularly agree with, but those parties certainly have the right to articulate their particular viewpoint on how they feel on what's going on with their particular school. But it is worth noting, especially for those of you who have relationships with folks who are members of that committee that this -- you may get a call from them saying, "Hey, what's going on here?" So I wouldn't want you to be surprised in the event that Senator Woodhouse or someone else or Senator Spearman or Senator Hammond, et cetera, reaches out and asks for clarification from you guys about what's going on.

2.4

You're free to refer that to me directly if you wish, or if you've got a relationship and you want to share your particular perspective on why certain decisions have been made to date, that's certainly within your purview.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Thank you, Director Gavin.

Are there any additional updates from you?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Those, I think, are the major ones. Certainly the stuff that Brett has talked about with relation to the ESSA plan, there's certainly enabling legislation to support that work I think we'll all be collectively supportive of to sort of

further that work.

2.4

There are a couple other bills that we have not yet seen numbers on, so I can't really speak to those or again, given my absence, may have a number but I haven't tracked it down yet, one in particular related to a school safety matter and ensuring that there is sort of some reciprocity in terms of alternate site locations when a school has some kind of a violent or disruptive incident and needs to have an evaluation. So that's something that Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axlerod is supporting, and then also Senator Hammond is continuing to work on a BDR that would provide some greater clarity on a number of issues for charters that he and I've had extensive conversations about, but I don't believe either initial language has been offered or a bill number has been assigned.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Thank you, Director Gavin.

We will move then to Item Number 7: Infinite Campus implementation update.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: I'd like to turn this over to Ms. Jurgensen because I know she prepared a great deal for this since she didn't think I was going to be here.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Yep. We already asked her to step on up.

MS. JURGENSEN: Hello. Joan Jurgensen. I'm
the education program professional for assessment
accountability. I'm happy to provide this update for you
regarding our implementation of Infinite Campus. You
know that this is something that has been that this is
a process that began about two years ago. In discussing
separating out our charter schools into individual
databases, we started with a pilot program with two of
our schools. There's been extensive collaboration
between NDE and our SPCSA staff and Infinite Campus, and
it's been determined that our pilot was successful.

2.4

So based on that success, we're now ready to move forward to separate out the rest of our charter school holders into individual and separate databases. So we certainly appreciate the support that Infinite Campus and NDE have provided throughout this process and will continue to provide. We've determined that our schools will be best served when they are administrating their own databases. So in order to do that, there are several moving parts that will all come together. SPCSA will maintain the cost of hosting and database subscription on behalf of our schools. However, any customization or any kind of training that schools will seek out on our own behalf, they will incur those costs, and those are contractual things that will be worked out

with Infinite Campus and the schools.

2.4

We do have an implementation schedule draft.

We have a -- I've been in contact with the Infinite

Campus liaison who is going to be our head person with

this effort. We're starting with some schools during

their spring breaks, so during this current 16-17 school

year where they're the live school year, they will take

over their own system administration. It's about a

five-day process during which they can't access Infinite

Campus, so we're looking at using their spring break time

when students aren't in the building, and so there's a

schedule of availability, and we're working on getting,

you know, getting those things ironed out.

What will end up happening is Infinite Campus will be providing training to those schools because they will be taking over full responsibility for administrating their system. We'll still have access to be able to audit, run reports, do the things that we need to do to ensure that our schools are compliant with state reporting and those types of things, but they will be --schools will be required to attend some training that Infinite Campus will put on their system administration thing. Some will be two-hour to three-hour webinar-type items. Some will be full-day implementation.

Schools will be contacted, and I've provided

information on who should be contacted at each school site so that they can start moving forward in setting those schedules, asking for preferred implementation dates. The promised window is the earliest a school will start in March, about the third week of March, with their transition, and the promised completion date is before school starts in August. So it will depend on when school is scheduled to have those transitions happen.

2.4

In the interim, it's important to recognize that as schools transition into their own database, they'll take over their own responsibilities for system administration. Until they're separated out, SPCSA maintains system administration for those that will still be under our purview. So it's going to be a process that will happen across the summer.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: I would just supplement one thing, and that is in addition to paying the costs of the training and any customization or sort of additional products like the lunch program or what have you, schools also -- there will be a standardized fee for support in customer service which will also mean that schools will be able to call Infinite Campus any time they need help. They will no longer need to sort of filter through us for that, but they will actually have a direct support line and the ability also to get advice

1 and quidance and even training on the fly from those 2 staff members when there is a particular need for or 3 especially when someone perhaps is new to a position. 4 CHAIR JOHNSON: What is the -- and, 5 gentlemen, you may know the answer to this. What's the 6 communication plan so that schools understand how this is 7 rolling out and then understand all of these different 8 moving parts? MS. JURGENSEN: This is Joan Jurgensen. 9 10 Currently, Director Gavin and I have had conversations, 11 I've had conversations with Infinite Campus. 12 drafting some communication that will go out to schools, 13 the first part, hopefully first part of next week. Ιt 14 will outline what the changes are that's going to happen, what the expectations will be and what will happen for 15 16 the schools, and then of course it will list a laundry 17 list of benefits for our schools, right? 18 In addition to that, then they will be 19 contacted by Infinite Campus, and they'll do some of the 20 more specific scheduling of what needs to happen, what 21 type of training they'll need to participate in, how 22 that's going to roll out, and then set their timelines. 23 CHAIR JOHNSON: Perfect. Thank you. 2.4 Are there any questions? 25 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: I would also note

that that communication will come out jointly from me and Deputy Superintendent Barley, given that this is something that has been a joint decision of the leadership teams of both agencies, and we've had to work very closely and consultatively with NDE, given the huge impact that any change to Infinite Campus could have on their systems.

I wanted to make it clear that this is something that we're very sort of moving full steam ahead with the full support and knowledge of the Department.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Wonderful. Thank you. All right. If there are no additional questions, we'll move on to Agenda Item No. 9, which is the Quest Academy and Silver State Charter School update from Mr. Kern, if he is up north?

MR. KERN: Yes.

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: I see Vice-Chair Mackedon nodding her head yes.

MR. KERN: I'm ready. Good afternoon. For the record, my name is Joshua Kern, and I am the receiver for Quest Preparatory Academy and Silver State Charter School.

I recognize that my last few reports to this body have been quite lengthy, so for the benefit of all involved, I plan to keep this testimony much, much

shorter. There are just a few items that I want to make certain you are aware of today. Let's start with Quest. Quest gave official notice to the Court and Tower, the landlord for the Torrey Pines campus, that Quest will vacate the premises by July 15th, 2017. The landlord and its attorney swore under penalties of perjury to the Court that it had a replacement tenant or tenants lined up for next school year. Quest has relied and acted upon these voluntary statements made by Tower and its legal counsel.

2.4

Among other things, Quest submitted its charter amendment application last week through Epicenter for relocation to the Founders Academy site. I hope you will consider this application at your earliest opportunity. Quest notified parents, students, faculty and staff of our intention to move to the Founder's campus for the start of the 17-18 school year.

And finally, Quest increased its efforts to finalize matters with our new landlords. As I mentioned last month, there are five distinct parcels with four separate property owners, so the mechanics of this deal have been far more complicated than is usually the case. On this last point concerning leases, I plan to update Quest's charter amendment application in the next week or two with executed leases for all five properties. The

lease terms will be consistent with the terms that I shared at the last SPCSA meeting. Mabel Gutierrez, who presented the Quest audit to you, has been working with another Ten Square person to support Quest in its preparations for next school year. Mabel's team will include one or two instructional coaches and will also support Quest's teacher recruitment efforts for next year.

2.4

Let me also share just a few updates concerning Silver State as well. First, the hearing for Dr. Cotler's appointment is currently scheduled for late March with Officer Lamboli. I am hopeful that this issue will be resolved next month so that the school can more effectively move forward in its planning for next year.

Silver State is submitting its accreditation application on March 20th. As the school continues to review past records as part of this process, one item that has struck me is that the schools spent \$188,000 on attorneys in the 12 months prior to my appointment.

That's a lot for a small school, approximately 10 percent of the school's overall budget. And unfortunately, Silver State continues to incur significant legal fees to address legacy issues left by the previous administration and Board.

Prior to the end of the school year, Silver

State will submit a charter amendment application which will include a request to rename the school along with new policies concerning attendance, enrollment, and other changes to the school's program consistent with the audit recommendations from last month.

2.4

Finally, you should know that enrollment for both Silver State and Quest is a top priority for next school year. Silver State has a goal of approximately 300 students, and Quest's goal is approximately 850 students. I'm working with both schools to make sure that plans are in place to support improvement efforts. That concludes my testimony this afternoon. I'm happy to answer any questions you might have.

MEMBER GUINASSO: Chair Johnson?

CHAIR JOHNSON: Yes, Member Guinasso?

MEMBER GUINASSO: Member Guinasso, for the record. Earlier in our meeting today, we had looked at the financial performance framework, and knowing that you were going to come up and speak, I thought we would take a look at Quest's performance in that regard.

MR. KERN: Great. Do you have it?

MEMBER GUINASSO: Well, just what was provided earlier just talks about the different areas of evaluation under the performance framework, and it states with regard to Quest that with regard to the current

```
1
     ratio element, the days of cash on hand, the enrollment
2
      forecast, the total margin, the debt-to-asset ratio and
3
      cash flow, all of those were a "falls far below
      standards" rating under this new framework. And I was
4
      just wondering if you had an opportunity to review that,
5
6
      and if --
7
                  MR. KERN: I haven't seen this report yet for
8
      either Quest or Silver State. Have they been sent out to
9
     schools?
                  EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: These are going
10
11
      out next week.
12
                  MEMBER GUINASSO: Oh, okay. Sorry.
13
                  EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: We wanted to give
14
      the Board information on what was happening and where we
15
     were on things.
16
                  MEMBER GUINASSO: So I'll ask those questions
17
     maybe next time.
18
                  MR. KERN: That would be great. I suspect, I
19
     mean, if they're as of -- perhaps I should ask. What are
20
      they as of?
21
                  EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: They're based on
22
      the most recent audit.
23
                  MR. KERN: Yea. I mean, I can tell you
2.4
      they're going to be horrible for Quest. I won't be
```

25

surprised, yeah.

1 MEMBER GUINASSO: We'll wait to ask those 2 questions. 3 That's fine. Thank you. MR. KERN: 4 CHAIR JOHNSON: Are there other questions for 5 Mr. Kern? All right. As always, thank you for the 6 update and the diligent work you're doing with both 7 schools. 8 MR. KERN: Thank you. I just would add, Member Guinasso and the rest of the Board, the financial 9 10 situation for Quest is much better now as I reported in 11 the last meeting, but I will be prepared to answer any 12 questions you have on the last report and also on where 13 the school currently sits. Thank you so much. 14 CHAIR JOHNSON: I actually wanted to go back to Item Number 8. I was unclear whether or not Director 15 16 Gavin will be able to assist us through that 17 conversation, but you are here, and so do you think you'd 18 be up to helping us walk through some of our strategic 19 plan goals and talk about where we are we in relation to 20 those and how we're making progress with that? 21 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Mr. Chairman, I 22 must confess I am not prepared for this. I didn't get 23 clearance from the doctors to get to even drive until 2.4 9:00 something this morning. 25 CHAIR JOHNSON: Well, you're certainly

aggressive. Getting clearance and here you are.

2.4

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: I will confess that the only reason I am here is because of Agenda Item No. 10. Everything else, I am more than happy to, and I know that the team is more than happy to talk about or you guys can talk about. But, Mr. Chairman, I would request to move to Item Number 10.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Yeah. So then we will bring up Agenda Item No. 8 at our April meeting so we can have some more in-depth discussion.

With that said, we'd love to talk about Agenda Item Number 10. Mr. Gavin, please move forward.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Ms. Hoban, will you come and sit next to me so you can be seated on screen? So for those of you in Las Vegas who have never met her, this is Jessica Hoban. She has been our administrative services officer, which basically means she is our CFO and COO, since December of 2015. 2014. Sorry. 2014. So over two years, which is the longest that anyone has ever been in this position in the Authority.

She's the third person to hold the position, and I think in the consensus of the team by far, the finest and most talented and most professional and most driven and conscientious person who has held that role,

and she has been very much the glue that has held this agency together. The team we have is not because of me. It's because of Jessica and the way that she mentors the people who work for her and the way that she supports those of her peers.

And about three weeks ago, I got a call from -- the agency?

MS. HOBAN: Welfare.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Welfare. Sorry.

I get all of these agencies confused -- Department of

Welfare. Jessica had let me know that she had been

approached about an opportunity and I encouraged her to

take it, but it was the hardest thing I've had to do in a

number of years to have to actually give a glowing

recommendation for someone when I really didn't want her

to leave.

Today is Jessica's last day with the Authority. And I think while there's a part of me that doesn't know what we're going to do without her, the fact of the matter is because of her work, we have a really strong team that's grown under her and can do much of what she does. And she's volunteered to be in contact and answer questions, especially when I have no idea what the heck is going on, and ensure that we continue to operate smoothly while we search for a replacement.

I will also note that Jessica has volunteered
also to assist with budget presentations and other items
related to the agency's budget so that we shouldn't have
a hiccup in that area. And actually, I should have
mentioned this before as a legislative update. Our
budget hearing is tentatively scheduled for the 7th of
March, if any of you want to watch it online or come and
see it in person and all of the excitement that ensues
with that. But Jessica will be there by my side making
sure I don't say anything wrong. So I just really want
to thank Jessica for all of the work that she's done, and
I hope you will join me in thanking her.

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: We appreciate you here, and certainly you will be sorely missed. All right.

Well, then, we will move forward on to Agenda

Item No. 11. Is there any public comment in the north,

Danny?

MR. PELTIER: Yes. We have Erica Nannini with Nevada Connections Academy.

CHAIR JOHNSON: All right.

MS. NANNINI: Hi. Erica Nannini on behalf of Nevada Connections Academy. I'm an attorney with Davis Graham and Stubbs. We know that NCA was not on the agenda today, but we would like to note for the record that in the two-year financial measures summary, NCA did

not meet the standard in two categories for the 2014-2015 school year. These two categories were days of cash on hand and enrollment forecast accuracy.

Regarding the former, we note that this metric was a result of a snapshot in time that does not reflect NCA's everyday cash balance, which is normally a healthy one. Therefore, it should not be a significant concern for the Authority.

Regarding the latter, we note, of course, that the Board is looking into this factor as a common issue among schools, and that NCA has actually fixed this issue for the 2015-2016 school year. For that school year, NCA was deficient in only one of eight category's total margin, and this is due to the loss NCA incurred as well as a change in state funding last year and will not ultimately present a real issue for the school. In comparison to some of the other schools listed in the summary, we note that a slight deficiency in one of the categories demonstrates that NCA is in relatively good financial standing. Thank you.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Thank you very much.

Danny, is there any other comment in the

north?

VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: No, there is not.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Any down south? I don't see

```
1
      anyone moving forward.
 2
                  We will move to Agenda Item No. 12. I'll
 3
      take a motion to adjourn.
 4
                  MEMBER SNOW: This is Member Snow. I'll make
 5
      that motion to adjourn.
 6
                  MEMBER LUNA: Nora Luna. I second.
 7
                  VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: Second.
                  CHAIR JOHNSON: All in favor?
 8
 9
                  THE BOARD: Aye.
10
                  CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. Meeting adjourned
11
      at 1:01 p.m.
12
                                 -000-
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
2.4
25
                   —CAPITOL REPORTERS (775) 882-5322 ——
```

1	STATE OF NEVADA,)
2	CARSON CITY.)
3	
4	I, NICOLE HANSEN, Official Court Reporter for the
5	Nevada State Public Charter School Authority,
6	do hereby certify:
7	That on the 24th day of February, 2017, I was
8	present at said hearing for the purpose of reporting in
9	verbatim stenotype notes the within-entitled public
10	meeting;
11	That the foregoing transcript, consisting of pages 1
12	through 124, inclusive, includes a full, true and
13	correct transcription of my stenotype notes of said
14	public meeting.
15	Dated at Carson City, Nevada, this 27th day of
16	February, 2017.
17	representative zore.
18	
19	
20	
21	NICOLE HANSEN, NV CCR #446
22	
23	
24	
25	

—CAPITOL REPORTERS (775) 882-5322 —