Meeting Locations:
All meetings will be video conferenced from both locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Meeting Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>700 East Fifth Street</td>
<td>Carson City</td>
<td>Board Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>9890 South Maryland Parkway</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Board Room (Via Video Conference)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLIC NOTICE
The public is hereby notified that the Council to Establish Academic Standards reserves the right to take agenda items out of posted order; items may be pulled or removed from the agenda at any time; and items may be combined for consideration. A time for public comment is provided at the beginning and at the conclusion of the meeting. A time limit of three minutes will be imposed by the Council Chair, for public comments, in order to afford all members of the public who wish to comment, with an opportunity to do so within the timeframe available. The Council Chair reserves the right to call on individuals from the audience or to allow for testimony at any time. Individuals providing testimony must sign in.
Reasonable efforts will be made for members of the public who have disabilities and require special accommodations or assistance of the meeting. Please call the Council assistant at (775) 687-9234 at least five business days in advance so that arrangements can be made.
This public notice has been posted at the offices of the Department of Education (NDE) in Carson City and Las Vegas, and at the main office of the Carson, Washoe, Elko and Clark County School District Offices. Notice of this meeting was posted online through the Nevada Department of Education website or Nevada Department of Education. The support materials to this agenda are available, at no charge on the NDE website at: Meeting Materials under the meeting date referenced above or by contacting Sylvia Verdugo at the Department of Education Office, 700 East Fifth Street, Carson City, Nevada and 9890 South Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas.

— AGENDA —

1. Call to Order; Roll Call; Pledge of Allegiance
   Sharon Beatty, Chair

2. Public Comment #1
   Public Comment will be taken during this agenda item regarding any item appearing on the agenda. No action may be taken on a matter discussed under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. The chair of the Council will impose a time limit of three minutes. Public Comment #2 will provide an opportunity for public comment on any matter within the Council’s jurisdiction, control or advisory power.

3. Approval of January 17, 2017 Meeting Minutes
   (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) Sharon Beatty, Chair

4. Approval of Flexible Agenda
   (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)

5. Council Members Comments
   (Information/Discussion) Sharon Beatty, Chair

6. Department Update
   Members will receive an update on completion of the legislative session and policy that may impact the work of the Council also.
   (Information/Discussion) Brett Barley, Deputy Superintendent, Student Achievement Division

   Members will receive an update on the work on the Computer Science and Fine Arts Standards Revisions
   (Information/Discussion) Dave Brancamp, Director, Standards and Instructional Support

   Members will receive an update on the WIDA and Smarter Balance Assessments.
   (Information/Discussion) Peter Zut2, Director, Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management
7. Presentation, discussion, and possible approval of proposed additions to Nevada Academic Content Standards for Health around Personal Safety
   (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) Dave Brancamp, Director, Standards and Instructional Support; Andre DeLeon, Education Program – Science, Health, World Languages;

8. Presentation, discussion, and possible approval of proposed revisions to Nevada Academic Content Standards for Social Studies
   (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) Dave Brancamp, Director, Standards and Instructional Support; Mary Holsclaw, Education Program – Social Studies, Physical Education, Content Literacy; Jaymie Malorni Coordinator, K-12 Social Studies Department Clark County School District.

9. Next Meeting and Future Agenda Items
   (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) Sharon Beatty, Chair
   Tuesday September 19th 1:00 PM

10. Public Comment #2
    Public comment will be taken during this agenda item on any matter within the Council’s jurisdiction, control, or advisory power. No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. The chair of the Council will impose a time limit of three minutes.

11. Adjournment
Memorandum

To: Carolyn Ross

Date: June 19, 2007

Re: Board Committees versus Superintendent Committees

The Open Meeting Law covers "any administrative, advisory, executive or legislative body of a local government including, but not limited to, any board, commission, committee, subcommittee or other subsidiary thereof." NRS 241.015(3). This is the provision that brings certain committees under the umbrella of the Open Meeting Law. In the school arena, common vernacular designates as "Board Committees" those that must comply with the Open Meeting Law. They have a connection, either in function, purpose, or creation, to the board. On the other hand, "Superintendent Committees" do not need to comply with the Open Meeting Law. These committees are closely aligned to the superintendent and have little interaction with the board, although the superintendent may use the results of the committee as she works with the board. Although it is impossible to draw a definitive line between superintendent committees and board committees, case law and attorney general opinions have given some guidance on which committees are covered and which are not. The following factors are helpful in determining whether any particular committee is a board committee or a superintendent committee.

**Board Committees**

**Factors Indicating a Committee Must Comply with the Open Meeting Law:**

- Board members ask that they be given reports or proposals from the committee
- The board creates the committee
- The board appoints members of the committee
- Board members ask to serve on the committee
- The board directs the work of the committee
- The board treats the committee as though it has done any of the above
- The committee is involved in creating or changing policy

You should note that a committee may be subject to the Open Meeting Law even if no board members serve on it.
Superintendent Committees
Factors Indicating a Committee Need Not Comply with the Open Meeting Law:

- There is no board involvement in the creation of the committee
- The board has not been included in discussions regarding selection of committee members
- The committee reports to the superintendent, not the board
- The superintendent creates the committee
- The superintendent appoints the members of the committee
- The committee performs administrative, rather than policy work

A board member may attend a committee meeting, even at the invitation of the superintendent, without bringing the committee under the requirements of the Open Meeting Law.

Walking the fine lines described above is not easy. Differences in factual scenarios create gray areas and fine distinctions. Therefore, you may want to confer with me whenever you are unsure about whether a committee is covered by the Open Meeting Law.

Clearly, no one in Churchill County School District wants to circumvent the Open Meeting Law, so it may seem like a good idea just to treat all committees as board committees. As you know, this would have a serious negative impact on the district. Every meeting that must comply with the Open Meeting Law demands resources because the agenda must be created and posted; supplemental materials must be copied, scanned, posted and mailed; the meetings must be recorded; and minutes must be created. All of these steps consume a considerable amount of staff time as well as expense. Every time there is a meeting in the District that is covered by the Open Meeting Law, there is a significant cost to the District.

Because meetings covered by the Open Meeting Law are costly, it is wise to assess whether that cost is the best use of resources by always considering how a meeting will impact student achievement, and whether there may be a more efficient way of accomplishing the same purpose. More efficient ways may include:

- Focusing on the difference between policy work and administrative work. When a board relies on staff to do administrative work, they are less likely to feel the need to be involved via a committee. They can reserve their time and resources for true policy work.
- Having the board do the work of policy committees during their regular board meetings. By keeping regular board meetings running efficiently, the board can move through all of the work that they would like to be involved in.
- Piggybacking committee meetings with regular board meetings. While this may mean a long stretch of meetings for those involved, it saves time and resources in posting the agenda, convening those involved, and setting up the recording.

Let me know if you would like further discussion or clarification of committees working under the Open Meeting Law.
Memorandum Addressing Policy 2120 Superintendent of Schools-Responsibilities

First I appreciate the opportunity to have robust discussion on this policy; NASB encourages robust discussion in Board meetings. It is important to hear different points of view. On occasion I change my vote from what I hear.

Secondly, I truly want you to know this in not personal it is policy and sets precedence. One of the main functions of the Board is to govern through policy.

**************************************************************************

Note: Discussion on my recommendation that we leave line 60 and 61 on page 85 the same as originally written for the following reasons:

"In conjunction with a maximum of 3 Board members (Board President and two rotating Board members) prepare the agenda for each Board meeting........................................

By law, and under NRS, Board Trustees hold regular Board meetings. It is their meeting to conduct the business of the School District and give direction to the Superintendent. To assist in preparation for this meeting, The Board has established a 3 member Agenda Setting Board Committee (refer to Sharla Hales Memorandum on Board Committees and Superintendent Committees). This committee, with recommendations from the Superintendent, sets the agenda for the open-public-Board meetings and all 7 of its members. This committee determines what can and cannot be discussed and what may or may not have action taken on or be voted on in the public School Board meeting. Anything that is not placed on the agenda cannot be discussed. So as you can see, there is REAL power in the Agenda Setting Committee.

I feel that 2 Board members who meet together on a regular, constant basis in the Agenda Setting Committee with the Superintendent and who constantly have the ear of the Superintendent, can potentially become a "privileged class", receive more information limited to others, can overwhelm one rotating member and can form a majority block on key pivotal issues that may be time sensitive. They can potentially form an alliance and may rally for consensus building on hotly contested issues. Anyone who has worked in politics knows and understands this; I have witnessed it. Two persons, who by the way form a quorum or majority of this committee of three, can control the Board by what is put on the agenda.

Currently the one rotating Board member attends Agenda Setting only once every 2 ½ months (four meetings have passed between one agenda setting meeting and another. The 2 permanent members (President and the Vice President) attend the meetings two times monthly, 5 times every 2 ½ months. To me, this becomes a huge issue of fairness and equity for all Board members. I feel this is in violation of the spirit of the open meeting law. Not all Board members have equal and fair opportunity to access what is put on the agenda where REAL POWER lies. In the past some BMAR items have sat on the list for over a year while others put on much later get attended to. The committee determines this.

Therefore it is my recommendation, and I would like to make a motion that two Board members rotate through the agenda setting meeting as originally written and only one person (could be the president or vice president) remains constant. This portion of the policy remains unchanged.
A fail safe would be:

All Board members can call in and make desired changes on the draft agenda.