



Education Collaborative Advisory Board

Stan Fulton Building

January 12, 2015

Meeting Goals:

- ✓ Review ECAB Priorities
- ✓ Identify goals and success
- ✓ Begin to develop action plan
- ✓ Identify education and community leaders to invite to future meetings

- I. Welcome, Purpose, and Review Previous Meeting Notes
- II. Review and Discuss Brief on K-20 Education Priorities
- III. Identify Action Plan based on Priorities
 - a. How do we define our short-term goals and success?
 - b. How do we define our intermediate-term goals and success?
 - c. How do we define our long-term goals and success?
- IV. Member Announcements
- V. Wrap Up
 - a. Next Meeting: Monday, April 20, 2015

Upcoming Forum

Investing in Our Children's Future: Adequacy Studies & K-12 Education in Nevada

Tuesday, January 27

8 AM – 11 AM

Smith Center for Performing Arts

K-20 EDUCATION COLLABORATIVE ADVISORY BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

Date/Time: January 12th, 2015; 11:30 AM – 1:30 PM

Location: UNLV Stan Fulton Building

In Attendance:

Edith Fernandez (*Nevada State College*)

Laura Latimer (*College of Southern Nevada*)

Robert Henry (*Clark County School District*)

Proxy for Susie Lee: Cheri Ward (*Communities in Schools*)

Gwen Marchand (*University of Nevada, Las Vegas*)

Ruben Murillo (*Nevada State Education Association*) w/Guest: Jovan Agee

Julie Pippenger (*Andre Agassi Foundation for Education*)

Seth Rau (*Nevada Succeeds*)

Angela Silva (*Clark County School District*)

Victor Wakefield (*Teach for America*)

Magdalena Martinez (*The Lincy Institute*)

Emily Garcia (*The Lincy Institute*)

Caitlin Saladino (*The Lincy Institute*)

Not in Attendance:

Adriane Zaniewski (*Nevada PTA*)

Tiffany Tyler (*Nevada Partners*)

Susie Lee (*Communities in Schools*)

Welcome, Purpose, and Review Previous Meeting Notes

Dr. Martinez gave a brief overview of the last ECAB meeting on October 20th, 2014 and provided the members with the meeting minutes. Dr. Martinez then introduced the draft of the ECAB white paper/brief. The brief summarizes the ECAB's priorities and current Lincy projects geared towards the priorities.

Review and Discuss Brief on K-20 Education Priorities

Dr. Martinez briefly went over the top, short-term, intermediate-term, and long-term priorities, as well as the issues to monitor mentioned in the ECAB white paper. The ECAB members evaluated the brief and discussed one-by-one the most important issues and the short-term issues to better guide future research by Dr. Martinez and The Lincy Institute.

Principal Leadership:

In regards to principal leadership, Mr. Rau suggested that we focus on making sure that administrators/teachers stay within the cohort of the teachers they're hired with. Ms. Pippenger asked, "What are the incentives for teachers to stay?" Mr. Murillo then added that when he was in the leadership program, most of his colleagues were locals so most

of them stayed; it had more to do with geographic location. Mr. Wakefield stated that when looking for applicants, the school district looks for people that have intentions of staying. He was curious about sizing up the need for leadership. He asked, “What other programs should exist or what other strategies should we use for leadership development?” Dr. Marchand added that we should also focus on the “urban” portion of the program of the Urban Leadership degree at UNLV. Members expressed interest in learning more about the effectiveness of the Urban Leadership Program. Mr. Wakefield claimed that there was insufficient teacher hiring and it seemed administrative hiring practices were similar. Dr. Marchand also stated that a big part of the issue was placement, and how long teachers stayed at their designated schools.

Teacher Preparation and Retention:

Dr. Martinez began by mentioning the teacher pipeline consortium that she and some of the ECAB members were currently participating in. She asked those who have been a part of consortium for their input. Dr. Fernandez mentioned that the consortium has sparked conversation to try to understand what institutions produced teachers. Ultimately, understanding the landscape of teacher preparation has been an important priority. She said that understanding the roles of each individual involved was also important. She also stated that the next consortium meeting will focus on what can be brought up to the legislature. Mr. Wakefield, who has also been attending the meetings, felt like a strong landscape analysis had been done, but he wondered if it would drive a change in practice. He stated that, “When you do consortium work, it’s difficult to put talk into practice”. He wondered if The Lincy Institute could have a bigger part in helping create the change. Mr. Murillo mentioned the NSEA (Nevada State Education Association) and their meetings. He said that teachers and students going into the teaching field were concerned with knowing what to expect in the classroom and what evaluations they would face. He asked, “How do we regain the trust of teachers and understand what they want out of teaching?” Dr. Marchand mentioned that there was no specific course on evaluations in the teacher preparation programs at UNLV, but agreed that there should be a seminar course that included such topics. Mr. Murillo asked, “Have we had conversations with education major students and what they need or want?” Mr. Wakefield proposed that the ECAB should provide insights from their meetings to the consortium meetings.

Dr. Henry then stated that teachers are not valued the same way they are in other parts of the country which also affects preparation and retention. He wondered how we could potentially elevate the value of teachers and their importance. Dr. Henry stated that when looking at candidates, CCSD applicants are those who could not get a job somewhere else and so they typically do not stay in Southern Nevada for long. In terms of advocacy, he claimed that we should advocate for funding that would increase teacher salary in order to recruit better teachers. Ms. Latimer then added that the reason other countries make teachers prestigious is the rigorous application process. “I don’t think we do this. It has to start with rigorous criteria of who can become a teacher”, she stated.

K-12 Governance:

Mr. Rau began the conversation by mentioning that BDR would create a commission that would study the best way to break up the district. Dr. Fernandez stated that most people focus on the fear that if we break up the Clark County School District, poor schools would be further disadvantaged. She wondered if there was a way that The Lincy Institute could ease that fear and provide more accurate insight. Dr. Fernandez felt that if that question were answered in a concise way, the conversation about restructuring CCSD could continue and not end there. Mr. Murillo stated that we should also include a conversation on the funding of the school district. For example, what is the tax revenue for Henderson compared to North Las Vegas? He also asked how we might suggest dividing the school district (pie shape, neighborhood based, etc.). Dr. Henry suggested beginning the conversation of adequate funding at the school level not the district level. Mr. Wakefield stated that we do not actually know how we spend our money. He wondered if there was a way for us to find accurate data. Dr. Martinez agreed that there seemed to be a movement on that front, but not as quickly as they would like. Dr. Martinez mentioned that if the bill passes to study governance, The Lincy Institute would scan the landscape and provide a brief. Mr. Wakefield asked if charter schools could be added to the conversation since they offer examples of different governance structures. Mr. Murillo suggested we look at different models of governance and create a new system that meets the needs of our neighborhoods. Dr. Martinez agreed that The Lincy Institute could provide a white paper with different models of governance. Mr. Rau mentioned that we might also have research behind private school choice.

Charter Schools:

Dr. Martinez spoke about her preliminary analysis of charter schools in North Las Vegas and said the results were varied. According to Brookings research, urban charter schools have better outcomes than suburban charter schools. Mr. Murillo asked if Dr. Martinez's data look at teacher retention. Dr. Martinez responded by saying that it did not because most of the information attained was basic information from the Nevada Report Card. Mr. Ague spoke on unionized California charter schools and mentioned that those schools that were unionized had higher performance. He suggested studying comparisons between unionized charter schools and non-unionized charter schools.

Higher Education Equitable and Adequate Funding:

In regards to the funding formula, Ms. Latimer stated that 20% of the funding would be based on performance and hurt those institutions that serve low income students (like CSN) while advantaging research institutions. She stated that the new funding formula provided additional resources, but there were still some questions about it.

Quality Early Childhood Education:

Dr. Silva began by mentioning that Dr. Sonya Douglas Horsford provided a framework for early childhood education with suggestions through a brief. She stated that CCSD implemented action based on the suggestions made in Dr. Horsford's report. Dr. Marchand wondered if it would be possible to use her brief to see what actions have been taken a few years from now.

Identify Action Plan Based on Priorities

The ECAB members then went over tangible deliverables for the *short-term* priorities.

K-12 Adequate Funding:

Mr. Rau began by stating that he felt this was a priority to monitor since the Adequacy Studies were currently being addressed already. Dr. Fernandez then suggested that The Lincy Institute could translate the research findings of Dr. Anna Lukemeyer and Carrie Sampson into a one or two page document.

Teacher Preparation and Principal Leadership:

The ECAB members chose to group Teacher Preparation and Retention with K-12 Principal Leadership Preparation because they saw common solutions between them. Dr. Fernandez asked, "What do we hope to get out of this? What is the Urban Leadership Program doing about ELL?" Dr. Martinez suggested that we invite Patti Chance, the program director for the Urban Leadership program, to speak with the ECAB members about the program and its outcomes. Dr. Fernandez agreed that in doing so, it might give the ECAB members a direction towards research and finding alternative pipelines that may not exist in the state of Nevada.

K-12 Governance:

Mr. Murillo began by stating that K-12 Governance would not be high on his priority list. He felt there were other issues that were more important at present. Dr. Marchand stated that she liked the idea of having some kind of white paper on the models of governance as suggested earlier in the meeting.

Charter Schools:

After a brief discussion, the ECAB members decided to make charter schools a short-term priority over K-12 governance since they felt it was more urgent. Dr. Silva suggested that The Lincy Institute might create a comprehensive list of charter schools with details about their type, and funding source.

Next Steps/Wrap Up:

- Dr. Martinez ended the meeting by ensuring the ECAB members that she would look into their recommendations for the short-term priorities over the next 16 to 18 months.
- Dr. Martinez will also bring in someone to talk about the Urban Leadership Program for the next ECAB meeting in April.

Meeting concluded at 1:30pm

Next Meeting – April 20th, 2015

Recorded by:
Emily Garcia