

## MINUTES

Present:

**Trustees:**

Thomas Moore, President  
Ross Chichester, Clerk  
Neal Freitas, Member  
Sharla Hales, Member  
Thomas Moore, Member  
Cynthia Trigg, Member

Absent:

Karen Chessell, Vice President

**Personnel:**

Lisa Noonan, Superintendent  
Rich Alexander, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources  
Lyn Gorrindo, Assistant Superintendent, Education Services  
Holly Luna, Chief Financial Officer

**Others Present:**

Mike Malloy, Legal Counsel

### 1. Call to Order

Mr. Moore called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. and asked that everyone present stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Chichester moved to adopt the agenda, seconded by Ms. Jamin.

Mr. Moore called for public comment. There was none.

Motion carried 5/0.

### 2. Consent Items (For Possible Action)

Mr. Moore asked if there were any items to be pulled from the Consent Agenda. There were none.

Mr. Chichester moved to approve the Consent Items, seconded by Ms. Jamin.

Mr. Moore called for public comment. There were no comments offered.

Motion carried, 5/0.

- A. Approve the Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting of February 12, 2013.
- B. Approve payments contained in Special Run Voucher Number 1317 and Regular Run Voucher Number 1318 for FY 12-13.

- C. Approve personnel actions described in Personnel Report No. 13-03.
- D. Approve for second reading Board Policy No. 318, "Positive Action Review."
- E. Approve the Budget Voucher Adjustment for March 2013.

Mr. Alexander arrived at this time.

Mr. Moore stated Item 4 would be heard prior to Item 3.

#### **4. Annual Facilities' Master Plan Update (Administrative Report)**

Holly Luna, Chief Financial Officer, and Gary Cullen, Director of Building/Site Maintenance provided an annual update of the Facilities' Master Plan. Ms. Luna thanked Scott McCullough, John Endter, and Pat Forester for recent Energy Management System software improvements. Ms. Luna provided revised facility site scores in the areas of educational suitability, building condition, technology readiness, and grounds/site assessment. A color coded spreadsheet was provided that indicated overall score increases and decreases from the previous year. The vacant KMS building was noted to be rated lower, due largely to roof deterioration. Through questions asked, Board members learned data was based on interpretation of the individuals who compiled the rankings and did not include specifics for arriving at the score. PWL was ranked higher than CVMS for having received new HVAC systems due to ESCO efforts of the past.

Mrs. Trigg arrived at 3:41 p.m.

Mr. Moore stated in Mrs. Chessell's absence, that she would have liked to have seen the previous scores for comparison. Ms. Luna responded the scoring had been characterized differently than had been offered in years past and that each individual category was not rescored for every building annually. The intent was to guide progress at the sites. However, Ms. Luna stated she would include both years in future reports for comparative purposes. Mr. Cullen offered site specific information through responses to questions that arose.

#### **3. Principal's Report – (Carson Valley Middle School) (Administrative Report/Program Review)**

Bob Been, Principal, Carson Valley Middle School provided student growth data. Upward trends were noted for both reading and math school wide. Data was provided by the Nevada Growth Model introduced in the previous school year and available through the State Department of Education Web site. A chart snapshot was provided for reading and math that reflected proficiency as well as, growth/higher achievement. In the last year, Mr. Been stated he provided data comparing CVMS to other schools in Douglas County and across the State. This particular data was not a similar comparison, instead the Rigorous and Relevant Curriculum chart compared CVMS year over year.

Dr. Noonan explained the median growth percentile. CVMS students were compared to the performance of all students in Nevada. CVMS was commended for having increased in both areas – growth and high achievement.

Mr. Been reported CVMS had been ranked number 8 in the state for middle school academic achievement, up from number 15 the previous year. Technology, improved school scheduling, and overall increasing student and staff abilities were recognized for the good results. Writing was a main focus with data proving an increase in individual real time writing. Staff members received their third year of professional development on Thinking Maps that had been used to incorporate writing in classrooms. Non-academic related assignments had been identified in order to omit unnecessary loss of learning. Training was provided in the area of Common Core math. Continually increasing assessment result trends reflected positive results connected to a School Improvement Plan goal. CVMS exceeded their goal of 5% improvement.

Dr. Noonan expressed thanks to Mr. Been and his staff for the positive CRT results that reflected increased proficiency in math, science and reading for 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades.

Strand data identifying individual student needs was reported to have resulted in increased student proficiency. A "Make A Difference" program was used to reward students to help provide a positive climate and culture in the school. Enrollment had continued to decline at CVMS as reported from 2009 to present. A question was raised regarding the condition of the facility. Mr. Been responded it was more than adequate overall; although, additional electrical and phone capacity would be helpful.

Mr. Been was thanked for his work toward increased achievement and for providing a positive environment for student learning.

### **5. Administrative Regulation 518(f), "Graduation Ceremony Regulations" (Information and Discussion)**

Lyn Gorrindo, Assistant Superintendent Education Services, provided feedback from students and staff from a survey conducted in the middle and high schools. Survey data was gathered in order to inform the Board of responses to two questions regarding whether or not all diplomas should be awarded in a single ceremony; and if walking in the formal graduation is an incentive for obtaining a standard diploma. Parents participated in a survey through the district Web site. A narrative used with the survey informed parents that "blending of the two ceremonies is under consideration and your response to this brief survey will help the Board to make an informed decision." Nevada districts were contacted in order to learn how the process was conducted elsewhere. The vast majority conducted a separate adult ceremony. Ms. Gorrindo stated the "adult ceremony" did not necessarily mean individuals much older, such as 30-35 years old were among those graduating. She was concerned parents taking the survey might have misunderstood and thought a larger age differential was typical from what actually occurred. Most students were slightly older than the average graduate. At this time, standard diploma recipients participate in an outside early evening ceremony and adult diploma recipients are awarded their diploma in a smaller setting earlier in the day. Board members had participated in both venues. The number of adult diplomas was reported to have increased significantly over the last seven years.

Mr. Freitas questioned the requirements for each of the diplomas offered and inquired about adding HSPE requirements to the Honors Diploma requirements within the Administrative Regulation. Mrs. Gorrindo responded HSPE requirements were implied but could be written in.

The Advanced and Honors diplomas were earned by gaining 24 total units; although the GPA determined which diploma a student might receive. A revision was offered to Administrative Regulation No. 518(f) to distinguish the Honors diploma by adding a clause that 24 credits were necessary to graduate. There is no age or time limit attached to receiving the Adult Diploma. Credit deficient seniors were the typical group who would work to earn the Adult Diploma. All references made to a students' ability to earn a Certificate of Attendance with the Regulation was deleted. It was noted credits could also be gained by taking the GED. The State recognized both the standard and adult diplomas.

Discussion ensued among the Board regarding the survey comments received. Ms. Jamin stated current trends lent themselves to decide the graduation factors based on individual personal circumstances. She asked staff if they had determined how to weigh the input from staff and students who wished to combine the two ceremonies. Dr. Noonan responded with concerns of students needing to meet a more rigorous curriculum base and higher bar for assessments. The upcoming Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) tests were provided as an example.

Mrs. Trigg felt the State recognizes the standard diploma and the District should equally recognize students having received either diploma.

Mrs. Hales stated her support for the district logo, "High Standards for Peak Performance," that served as an incentive to parents and students.

Mr. Freitas stated he was uncomfortable in offering an opinion at this time, but appreciated those who offered their thoughts.

Mr. Chichester referred to survey results indicating 325 students "believed that participating in the formal graduation ceremony is an incentive to obtain a standard diploma." Only 86 students did not agree. He believed the mindset of the students was pride based and aimed at earning a standard diploma.

Mr. Moore supported thoughts provided by the Superintendent and Board members who made statements that followed her line of thinking. He understood staff members have the tough job of speaking to parents and students who were trying to reach the higher bar and were unable to for personal reasons; therefore, supporting different ceremonies for different students.

Dr. Noonan relayed in Mrs. Chessell's absence that she preferred to combine the 2 graduations into one ceremony. Should the Board choose to take action, this topic would need to be brought up under Future Agenda Items.

Board members were reminded this was not an action item.

Mr. Moore called for public comment.

Jackie Koch, DHS senior, stated she would like to continue to hold two separate graduation ceremonies. Her basis was that credit deficient students had not worked as hard to earn the right to walk across the stage; therefore, those who hadn't taken as much initiative should not receive the same diploma and participate in the same ceremony. Ms. Koch expressed understanding that some had family issues.

Karen Lamb, DHS teacher, stated she had read comments received from the survey and supported Ms. Gorrindo in that she didn't believe people understood the definition of the adult diploma. Ms. Lamb offered that this discussion should be held following an attempt to gain the best results from informed people.

## **6. Heritage Building** **(Discussion and For Possible Action)**

Dr. Noonan shared a picture of the Heritage Building located at GES, noting this would be the second building vacated by the school district that could be placed up for sale or lease. In 2008, the building had been placed on the local historical building registry. Due to the passing of the school bond, GES was remodeled allowing for students to now solely occupy the main GES school building. An aerial photo provided a visual outline of the property. Board members could distinguish the part of the land parcel that could be separated. A fence outlined the area being discussed. A floor plan drawing showed the interior "as is" without listing square footage. A preliminary assessment provided a list of maintenance needs along with the expense necessary to make improvements should the building be leased.

Dr. Noonan reported various entities had expressed interest in the building. The zoning is "public facility." NRS would guide the sale or lease of this property. The law allowed for a lease/purchase agreement should that be desirable. Dr. Noonan was cognizant of sound and safety issues with regard to the type of use the building might receive as it was located right next to the elementary school. Costs associated with research and feasibility, legal considerations and two required appraisals could be as high as \$61,000. Per NRS, the State Superintendent would choose one appraiser and the District would choose a second.

Board members made suggestions with regard to where staff parking could be placed and how the

easement might be used or possibly designated as a street. Ideas were mentioned as possible conditions of sale.

Mrs. Trigg moved to authorize staff to proceed with costs not to exceed \$61,000, associated with the preparation to lease or sell the property including the first appraisal through Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., seconded by Mr. Chichester.

Motion carried 6/0.

## **7. Board Committee Additions (Discussion and For Possible Action)**

Mr. Moore stated new standing committee positions were up for discussion. Board members first discussed adding a legislative representative to their existing list of committees. It was noted the NASB representative participated in the legislature along with the NASB Director, Dotty Merrill. Discussion included that more than one person could be on the committee as this would be a large undertaking, with a main purpose of supporting adequate funding for education and other high profile education issues. The Board could therefore be informed of educational initiatives by the participants.

Dr. Noonan informed the Board she participated in the legislature through the Superintendents Association. Board members were always welcomed to attend any of the legislative events.

Ms. Jamin moved to have Mrs. Hales and Mrs. Trigg represent the school board as legislative representatives for this school year, seconded by Mr. Chichester.

Motion carried, 6/0.

Additionally, Board members were informed the GT Task Force had a Board representative and should also be included on the committee list. Ms. Jamin had attended the GT meetings in the past and wished to continue to do so. Mrs. Hales also expressed an interest in attending these meeting. It was noted that all Board members were always welcomed to attend these and all committee meetings as long as there were no more than 3 present at a time.

Mrs. Trigg moved to add the GT Task Force to the list of standing committees with Ms. Jamin and Mrs. Hales as representatives, seconded by Ms. Jamin.

Motion carried, 6/0.

## **8. eWalk and Teach for Success (T4S) (Discussion and For Possible Action)**

Lyn Gorrindo, Assistant Superintendent Education Services explained classroom observation protocols including Teach for Success (T4S), implemented through RPDP and WNRPDP and designed by WestEd. T4S contained a variety of components implemented for gauging best instructional approaches. Schools were observed by teams that including administrators and RPDP leaders. NWRPDP currently provides the support, but due to loss of state funding, sites are only visited every other year and district wide data is no longer available. The T4S and all observation sheets discussed, were available for review.

eWalk software had first been used with iPhones and iPods, then found to be easier to use with iPads for entering observation data and immediately sharing information with teachers following a classroom visit. Administrator training had occurred over the last few years in order to implement this technique and create templates. The templates became a tool to measure implementation of School Improvement Planning (SIP) in conjunction with T4S. The latest template, "AAA Template" was offered. T4S classroom observation line items had been incorporated and tied data to the District Improvement Plan (DIP). Creation of the template was an Action Step within the DIP. T4S

took place as a 20 minutes snapshot of learning in the classroom, whereas classroom observations now occurred with eWalk - 4 times a year, for ten minutes, to collect longitudinal growth data. Student writing is not included on the T4S protocol, but is part of the AAA template to reinforce writing initiatives, including Thinking Maps. Administrators were now able to better place a value on student engagement with the updated eWalk template.

Mrs. Gorrindo shared the eWalk template through the Web in the same manner administrators accessed and entered information. While the new template was not yet a site requirement, the initial template used by administrators allowed for district wide data gathering through eWalk that would be comparable once the new template was fully implemented. A clipboard and paper is no longer used to gather real time classroom information. The goal was to have all sites trained and using the software this year in order to begin tracking longitudinal data.

The Nevada Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) framework was provided in a flowchart to show instructional practices for teachers and administrators. This legislative session would result in updated laws regarding evaluations following the study of recommendations made by the TLC.

Dr. Noonan stated eWalk offered the ability for acceptance by staff of high quality results rather than compliance to a system, such as seen with T4S. While all bugs had not been worked out of the new template, Leadership was coming to a final, best effort that was pliable and streamlined.

Discussion ensued among Board members with respect to improving the classroom protocol, the mix of administrators performing the observations, data obtained, and professional development to support findings. Concerns were expressed for alignment of the template with new legislation and how this information might be used in the evaluation process.

## **9. Closed Session**

There was no Closed Session this evening.

A break was taken from 6:20 – 6:32 p.m.

Mr. Malloy left at this time.

## **Public Comment**

There were no public comments offered.

## **10. Nevada School Performance Framework 102 (Information and Discussion)**

Brian Frazier, Director of Assessments and Grants, explained the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) for the high school level. The NSPF is one of three parts of the Nevada Education Performance System. The NSPF is based on a 100 point rating system. This report would be issued by the State reflecting student growth and proficiency. High school reports would include more data than elementary or middle schools based on various points, including college and career readiness, graduation, subgroup proficiency and other indicators. Growth percentile gaps would be viewed through a lens of comparison to state averages for reading and math. Supergroups were a new way to cluster small subpopulations such as Free/Reduced Lunch (FRL), Individual Education Plans (IEP), and English Language Learners (ELL) when a population size (N-size) is under 10 students. Attendance was being newly reported in the category of “other indicators” along with data reporting 9<sup>th</sup> grade credit deficiencies. The report system point values corresponded to the same 1 to 5 star system used with the elementary and middle school levels. Definitions were provided for the performance indicators as well as, the number of points possible vs. points earned in each category. Two years cumulative data was necessary for reporting comparisons.

Mr. Frazier explained how points were derived and compared across the State for Status/Growth

Measures of Achievements. For subpopulation Proficiency Gap Reduction, values near 0 indicated no difference in scores between groups and were noted to be very good on the School Performance Report. The subpopulation gap reduction data provide additional performance information between subpopulations and the total student performance group rather than schools receiving only the all-inclusive final score, as in the past. The three subpopulations were not compared among themselves. The Free and Reduced Lunch population showed less deviation from the main student population than the IEP or ELL groups. For ease, the slides presented gave the "Average Subgroup Gap" in blue text.

Graduation Measures were explained with a supergroup example used to show that when a subpopulation N-size falls below 10 students the subpopulations (FRL, IEP, LEP) are grouped together, with duplicate students removed and calculations performed. Subgroups could be assigned a maximum of 5 points in the rating system for each subgroup unless the group was too small, resulting in a "supergroup." College Readiness would reflect participation in Advanced Placement (AP), ACT and SAT testing. CTE was not included under college readiness at this time and would most likely evolve to be different than this first stage of reporting. The definition of college and career readiness might be yet to be determined due to standards now incorporated in CTE courses.

Mr. Frazier stated the official report would be ready in September.

Due to the meeting running behind, Dr. Noonan asked if the Board desired to table the next item on the Agenda. Mrs. Hales inquired about how to prepare for the discussion suggesting that a spreadsheet be provided to connect data points to the Strategic Plan to help identify priorities. Mr. Freitas asked to have the dashboard sheet laid out as cohorts to track achievement progress, rather than organized by grade levels. Consensus was to delay Item 11 to next month. Negative reporting numbers were possible only at the high school level.

## **11. Data Dashboard Revisions (Information and Discussion)**

This Item was tabled until the April 9, 2013 Board Meeting.

## **12. Follow-Up to January 25, 2013 Special Meeting Workshop (Information and Discussion)**

Comments were offered regarding points for future discussion in the Minutes of the January 25, 2013 Board Workshop. During the discussion this evening Board members stated:

- 1) The opportunity to meet and discuss topics in a free speaking atmosphere was positive.
- 2) Mrs. Hales did a great job of keeping the discussion to the allotted 2 hour timeframe.
- 3) Board members can agree to disagree.
- 4) In a future agenda item, Board Bylaws need to be changed to reflect:
  - (a) Topics requested as future agenda items need to be connected to the Strategic Plan.
  - (b) Wording needs to be changed to allow someone to speak for the Board other than the president for instances such as, acting as a representative at the legislature.
- 5) An approach to internal governance had not been arrived at to focus on a "team" approach.
- 6) Dr. Noonan provided a handout in response to the Board's desire to better understand Strategic Plan initiatives. Cabinet was credited for assisting in preparing two lists. The possible topics for future reports on Strategic Plan Priority Areas would be taken home and studied for discussion and prioritization in the future. Following review, Board members could state the topics they would like to learn about. The result would be reports of interest to be heard throughout the year with relevant data, rather than only having these presentations at the Strategic Plan workshop. It was noted the Strategic Plan Committee now met every other year. Proper calendaring would assist in delivering of current assessment data, such as when new data is received by the district in September and October each year.

- 7) Clarification was requested with regard to administration providing reports related to the Strategic Plan vs. professional development for Trustees. Providing this type of information to the Board was described as providing the reasoning or philosophy for various initiatives; therefore defined as professional development. Learning how to govern was tied by some persons to the Strategic Plan professional development described above, and by others to the express meaning of "governance."
- 8) In rare instances wherein the Board/Superintendent relationship was stressed, a document might be prepared to assist future board members with approaches to best communication. This document could state successes and challenges of the past. Views were not necessarily shared by all in this instance making it difficult to instill particular action steps; therefore, conflict would arise.
- 9) Individuals championed different items from the January 25<sup>th</sup> Minutes that were of interest to them individually.
- 10) Consensus was to hold this type of workshop/free speech meeting once a year for two hours, on a morning in the summer.
- 11) Consensus was also reached to begin with an approach to professional development through Strategic Plan initiatives. Trustees would review Dr. Noonan's list and note items of interest. While a difference of opinions was present, development of the most effective ways to govern, using each individual's philosophy was the goal. The title of this future agenda topic, professional development vs. report, was discussed but not determined. The use/implementation of information gained would play out to be of the most importance.

### **13. Superintendent's Report (Administrative Report)**

Dr. Noonan provided the new iNVEST 2013 pamphlet as prepared by the Superintendent's Association. This would be posted on the district Web site. Basically, this was the 10<sup>th</sup> year the Superintendent's supported the same information as had been provided to the legislature over the past 10 years. Various educational issues before the legislature included full day kindergarten; maintaining class size reduction; and allowing guns on campus for employees who hold a Nevada Concealed Carry Weapon permit.

### **14. Nevada Association of School Boards (NASB) Report**

Mrs. Trigg reported the NASB Web site included a newsletter specific to current legislative happenings entitled, "Quicksilver." A presentation to the legislature of the Superintendent's iNVEST document would take place the day after this Board Meeting. The NASB Executive Board Meeting was reported to be scheduled for March 23<sup>rd</sup>. Trustees were reminded the National School Board Association (NSBA) convention in San Diego was upcoming in April.

### **15. Board Reports and Possible Agenda Items for Future Board Meetings**

Dr. Noonan stated she changed the title of this item in order to allow Trustees to mention activities they had attended.

Mr. Freitas offered he had attended a fundraiser for the American Heart Association that was a basketball game between the PWLMS and CVMS staff. Ms. Jamin participated as a judge at the PHES and JVES science fairs as well as, she spoke to a Leadership Class for education day regarding what it takes to be a good leader. Ms. Jamin also stated she was a rural representative to a State advisory council for family engagement. Mrs. Hales offered that she had set up school site visits.

The Board reviewed the Future Agenda Items list and deleted topics that had been discussed.

## 16. Correspondence

There was no correspondence.

## 17. Adjournment

Mr. Chichester moved to adjourn at 8:25 p.m., seconded by Mr. Freitas.

Motion carried, 6/0.

Submitted by,

---

Carolyn Moore  
Secretary to the Board of Trustees

Approved:

---

Clerk of the Board

Note: Upon approval by the Board of Trustees in a public meeting, these minutes become the official minutes of the meeting held on the above date. Board minutes are kept on a permanent basis and are available for public review in the office of the Superintendent.