

**NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
NEVADA STATE BOARD FOR CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION**

Thursday, March 17, 2016

Department of Education
Board Conference Room
700 East Fifth Street
Carson City, Nevada

And

Department of Education
Board Conference Room
9890 South Maryland Parkway
Las Vegas, Nevada

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
(Video Conferenced)

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

In Las Vegas:

Tonia Holmes-Sutton
Mark Newburn
Allison Stephens (departed at 1:00 p.m.)
Victor Wakefield
Felicia Ortiz

In Carson City:

Freeman Holbrook
Teri Jamin
David Jensen
Pat Hickey (departed at 12:00 p.m.)

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

In Las Vegas

Dena Durish, Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness & Family Engagement

In Carson City

Mindy Martini, Deputy Superintendent, Business and Support Services
Greg Bortolin, Public Information Officer
Lauren Hulse, Management Analyst
Peter Zutz, Administrator, Office of Assessments, Data and Accountability Management
Dave Brancamp, Director, Standards and Instructional Support
Mark Gabrylczyk, Director, Student and School Supports
Tracy Gruber, Education Programs Professional
Diane Mugford, Education Programs Professional
Julian Montoya, Education Programs Professional,
Tom MacDiarmid, Education Programs Professional

In Carson City:

Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

In Las Vegas:

Linda Quinn, University of Las Vegas
Tierra Tranquillo, Sierra Nevada College
Rob Askey, Touro
Barbara Gnatovich, Sierra Nevada College
Heidi Arbuckle, Clark County School District
Spencer Steward, WGU Nevada
Ben Gerhardt, Nevada Virtual Academy

Carson City:

Melissa Burnham, University of Reno
Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District
Maria Munoz, Washoe County School District
Todd Butterworth, Legislative Council Bureau
Scott Coffee, RLI
Marissa McClish, Washoe County School District
Katrina Midgley, Sierra Nevada College
Shannon Beets, Sierra Nevada College
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association School Superintendents
Dawn Huckaby, Washoe County School District
Sandra Aird, Washoe County School District
Wayne Workman, Lyon County School District
Allison Combs, Nevada System of Higher Education
Karl Spendlove, Southern Nevada Regional Professional Development Program
Barbara Perez, Clark County School District
Michelle Gronemeyer, DRC
David Chayer, DRC
Bonnie Talbot, DRC
Meg Nigro, Clark County School District
Loretta Asay, Clark County School District
Zane Gray, Sierra Nevada College
Barbara Konrad, HOPE
Kim Moody, Clark County School District
Sylvia Lazos, Latino Leadership Council
Manny Lamarre, Governor's Office
Anna Antolick HOPE
Demetria Murphy, Leadership for Ed Equity
Maheba Merhi, National University
Jenn Blackhurst, HOPE

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a. with attendance as reflected above.

Public Comment #1

Shannon Beets, executive president, Sierra Nevada College, informed the Board they are a four year private college with locations in Lake Tahoe, Reno and Las Vegas. She expressed appreciation for funding and implementing the Teach Nevada Scholarships. They were awarded 20 scholarships and gave out all scholarships to students for the accelerated Alternative Route to Licensure (ARL) program. Ms. Beets said the scholarships had the intended effect with increased inquiries to their teacher education and ARL program. In addition to the 20 scholarships awarded, an additional ten teachers were enrolled. Students are on a waitlist deferring enrollment until hearing whether additional scholarship funds are available.

Lynn Quinn, University of Nevada Las Vegas (UNLV), stated she also appreciates the Teach Nevada Scholarships. There has been tremendous interest in the scholarships at UNLV and 50 have been

awarded. An additional eight qualified individuals have applied. Ms. Quinn inquired if more funds are available for their eight additional applicants.

Approval of Flexible Agenda

Member Wakefield moved to approve a flexible agenda. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

President's Report

Vice President Newburn introduced newly appointed board member Felicia Ortiz, District 3. Member Ortiz said it is an honor to be appointed and to have the opportunity to help make a difference for Nevada.

Superintendent's Report

Dr. Canavero provided updates on the following:

- The process for the Governor's emergency teacher licensing regulation to enable Nevada to offer provisional teacher licenses to help with Nevada's teacher shortage. This allows teachers licensed in other states reciprocity with 12 months to fulfill Nevada's requirements. The emergency regulation is valid for 120 days allowing NDE the time required to adopt a permanent regulation.
- The procurement process to select an external consultant contractor to conduct a third party evaluation for program effectiveness and costs for ZOOM and Victory Schools, Read by Third Grade initiative, the Underperforming Schools Turnaround initiative, Social Worker Grants to Schools initiative, Nevada 21 (middle school initiative to bring 21st century skills and professional development to teachers, and tools and instruments for students) and the Great Teaching and Leading Fund. There are seven programs to be evaluated.
- The Charter School Harbor Master has up to a \$5 million match available for a non-profit organization that has a mission and focus on high quality schools for low income students and a successful track record. It is a two year contract. The Charter Harbor Master was awarded to the only applicant, Opportunity 180.
- The Educator Licensure Study has been awarded with the goal to obtain recommendations on how to align licensing laws and regulations for the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF).
- The test security and data integrity, ensuring it is safe and protected.
- The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was created when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was reorganized and the transition removed the highly qualified teachers' requirements. The work needs to begin with establishing goals for Nevada and policy changes to graduation requirements.
- Greg Bortolin was introduced and welcomed as the new public information officer for the Nevada Department of Education (NDE).
- The Nevada Family Engagement Summit, Pathways to Progress for Student Achievement, was announced for October 15, 2016 at the Northwest Career and Technical Academy in Las Vegas.
- The suggested dates to consider for a joint meeting with the Board of Regents include August 26 or October 21, with a strong preference for October 21.
- The State Board of Education/Nevada State Board for Career and Technical Education has been selected by the Sunset Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission for review.

They review all committees and commissions to determine if entities should be continued, modified, consolidated or terminated.

6. Approval of Consent Agenda

- a) Possible Approval of Appointments to the Special Education Advisory Committee. The individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that each state establish and maintain an advisory panel for the purpose of advising the State special education staff regarding the education of eligible children with disabilities.
- b) Possible Approval of Dual Credit Course request from Ace High School for Truckee Meadows Community College Courses.
- c) Possible Approval of Washoe County School District Mathematics kindergarten through 5th grade, IB Math Studies and AP Calculus Instructional Materials.
- d) Possible Approval of January 28, 2016 minutes.

Member Holmes-Sutton moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Member Holbrook seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Possible Approval of the State Plan to Improve Achievement of Pupils (commonly known as the STIP)

Dr. Steve Canavero, superintendent of public instruction, informed the Board this is the third iteration of the STIP. He explained the graduation rate was added as a common problem. Highlights of the plan included information about:

- Changing demographics;
- Increased enrollment with more students qualifying for free and reduced lunch;
- Student performance;
- Increased enrollment in Career and Technical Education programs;
- HSPE data for informational purposes only;
- Per Pupil expenditures increase;
- Classroom and teacher data;
- Five goal areas with objectives.

Member Wakefield asked to clarify the goal of the STIP and strategic plan to improve pupil achievement plan. He said the plan combines input, process and some outcome information, and commented it was hard to follow. There was not a clear set of goals that unifies the actions of Nevada and recommended a clear agenda to improve outcomes with unifying goals.

Dr. Canavero suggested a one page summary that includes a larger five year plan with annual benchmarks. Member Wakefield suggested less measurement or fewer goals with a clear simple progress that is measured. He did not advocate less accountability, but to be clearer on how it all works.

Member Wakefield moved to approve the STIP. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding End of Course Examinations in English language arts and mathematics, and possible approval of 2015 End Of Course English language arts and mathematics cut scores, Compensatory Model.

Dave Brancamp, director, Standards and Instructional Support, provided a brief history. At the 2013 legislative session A.B. 288 was passed changing the High School Proficiency Exam (HSPE) to the End of Course (EOC) exams that will be discussed today. One year is left as the graduating class finishes the HSPE and it sunsets. The Board has made many decisions regarding the end of course exams and today will discuss the next phase of the exams including the standards to access.

The next phase being considered today is adding the science test. Discussion occurred that if science came on board then ELA would be collapsed with reading and writing into one test, add the science test,

and keep math I with an algebra focus and math II with a geometry focus. In the 2016 testing with the new vendor Data Recognition Corporation (DRC) an integrated math I and math II was created.

Ricardo Mercado, DRC, conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation to discuss the passing scores, or cut scores, for the assessments of math and ELA specific to the 2015 administration. Following the compensatory model, the decision rules used to determine whether or not a student has met the graduation eligibility criteria will be discussed. Highlights of the presentation included:

- Standard setting to establish cut scores for the 2015 EOC tests were recently approved by the Academic Standards Council. The Board will consider approval today.
- The classes of 2017-2018 will need to participate but is not required to pass the EOC exam to graduate.
- The class of 2019 will be the first class required to pass the EOC to graduate.

Mr. Mercado explained the process of conducting standard settings to establish cut scores. Board members discussed the standard setting committees content areas, the policy review committee's recommendations and the technical report with Mr. Mercado. Also discussed was the time allowed for the test, the length of the test, the environment and demographics of participants.

Mr. Mercado continued the PowerPoint presentation addressing proposed EOC 2015 scores. He explained the percent of Nevada students in each achievement level based on recommended 2015 cut scores, in both ELA and math. Graph details were explained about the achievement levels for level I, II and III of grades 3-8.

Chair Newburn commented that he was on the policy review committee and looked at other testing systems, Smarter Balanced, End of Course, ACT and the NAAP tests. The committee noticed all the tests other than EOC, were forming a continuous line. That provided confidence this is what college readiness looks like, they were different, but all claimed they were college ready tests and were consistent with each other. These tests were possibly the hardest tests ever given to kids in Nevada. The committee's goal was to ensure math I and II EOCs were consistent with all the other data. They were confident somewhere on the line explained in the graphs by Mr. Mercado, in 7th and 8th grade; this is what college readiness looks like. It means Nevada's level III is fairly consistent with NAAPs college readiness. Member Newburn explained the work of the standards committee along with the difficulties, and expectation differences between the complexity and the nature of the test.

Mr. Mercado said Member Newburn framed it well, the standard setting committee was looking at the content based expectations, and based on those expectations they recommended cut scores. The charge of the policy review committee was to look at the cut scores and ask, does the impact data reflect reality and if not, how to adjust the cut points so they are more reflective and consistent. He detailed the ranges of scores that will be associated with each achievement level, and the impact data which is the percentage of students from 2015 that will be in each achievement level based on the information from the standard setting.

Member Wakefield explained that due to the transition period, 9th and 10 grade kids will just sit for the test, pass or fail, and can walk to get a diploma. The real issue today is the cut scores set for the kids that were 7th and 8th graders and are now going to become 9th graders. They must pass level III unless a compensatory model is considered. A few years ago the Board set a metric for math scores that was going to be more rigorous. Because the field, kids and teachers had not caught up to it, the score was actually lowered. It was bad policy making. He asked the Board to not fall in the same trap again, which is what was done with HSPEs math a few years ago.

Chair Newburn responded the original intent was initially that no students were to use these tests for high stakes. It is common for states when transitioning from tests such as the HSPE to the EOC to have a hold harmless period. The test is not used for graduation requirements at that time. He pointed out only about

half of the states require passing a test as a graduation requirement. That number is decreasing. The sense that these students will receive diplomas that have no value does not bear out. Most of the high ranking states in graduation requirements do not require a passing score on these tests. At the bottom half are states that require a passing score on tests.

When the cut score was changed and moved it was based on advice from psychometricians. While moving to the new standards, the ability of the test to accurately reflect what was set as proficient was changing. The test was in flux. The shape of the curve was changing and the recommendation was to re-set it during this period of transition. There is a fallacy these tests are a flawless measures of proficiency. They are mathematical tools. The Board discovered students were performing better than they thought. Students in 7th and 8th grade took math classes the Board did not think they were capable of taking.

Dr. Canavero explained the requirement applies to the current 9th grade class. In 2015 students who were in 7th and 8th grade, now in 2015-16 are in 8th and 9th grade. They will be the first class required to meet the law, which is to pass four EOC examinations.

Dr. Canavero and Chair Newburn clarified Nevada law requires students pass four EOC course examinations to graduate. They must include the subject areas the State Board adopted, the Common Core State Standards, and may include other courses of study prescribed by the Board. The Board decided there needed to be a transition period with controls to the cut score. For these two classes the cut score is zero. It was the right thing to do, and it is what all states do when they transition the system. There was a legal limit regarding how long the HSPE exam could be used. It could not be kept intact while rolling out the field tests of EOC. The law forced a transition period.

Member Holbrook stated as a current teacher there is a great deal of worry from the field concerning the immediate expectation of the 2019 cohort to reach the recommended cut score. Some concerns are about remediation efforts. Students have a natural remediation when they take algebra II, but for math II there is no remediation in another course. From what we are looking at today there is a likely failure rate of 70 percent, and there are many of challenges at the site level moving forward. In addition, moving forward with this and remediation efforts, it is worrisome about what we are going to do with this cohort. There has not been a decision about the current 9th graders who do not reach the cut score. He asked if there has been a discussion or a plan for that group. Currently, many are taking a geometry course, then a math I EOC exam. He would like to know what the plan is for the 2019 cohort students that are taking geometry right now. Will they be required to re-take the math I EOC exam this year if a cut score is approved?

Dr. Canavero responded per existing regulations in law that is correct. The student who passed the course and moved on to geometry, but did not meet the cut score as established, would need to re-take the assessment to meet the four requirements.

Member Jensen stated, on behalf of the Nevada Association of School Superintendents (NASS), they had this discussion several years ago. The EOC was intended to be a shift from the HSPE yet it was frequently heard the EOC and the HSPE almost become interchangeable. That is a concern regarding what is trying to be accomplished with the EOC and the concept of college and career readiness. The question we ask is does the EOC as currently defined provide that clear link to college and career readiness. We have that obligation for remediation and on behalf of NASS believe in the rigor. But does it address that. He recalled the statement chair Newburn made, "it was the hardest test ever given."

Member Jensen referenced the STIP that was just adopted and Nevada's goal that by 2020 Nevada will have 85 percent graduation rates, yet looking at the potential cut scores 70 percent of our students are not going to pass. There is a misconnection between the goal and the potential outcomes. Districts were advised there would be three opportunities for students to take the EOC. There are more questions, are those three opportunities paid by the state, and would districts pay for more, or will they only have three opportunities to take the test. He asked what does Nevada want to accomplish with the EOC and does it tie into determining students are college and career ready.

Member Ortiz expressed concern that students in 8th, 9th and 10th grade are probably not taking these classes yet. There are many EL students who have not taken the tests and the tests are in English, so their chance of passing is even less. She questioned the demographics of those that set the standards, it is not clearly reflected. She added the community is affected if students are unable to achieve the standards and receive a diploma and there are not enough graduates to drive the pipeline for business owners. It also affects the morale of students that are unable to pass the tests which then affects dropout rates. She asked if these concerns are considered when discussing cut scores.

Mr. Mercado continued the PowerPoint presentation about the compensatory model for the EOC graduation eligibility requirement. He said the discussion has been about cut scores, or the passing scores for the tests. This discussion is about how the passing scores are put together for individual students. Beginning with this year's 9th grade class, students must pass four EOC tests in order to meet the graduation eligibility criteria. Currently these include ELA I and II and integrated math I and II. Science will probably be introduced soon and the two ELA tests will be consolidated into one assessment with one score instead of two. There is a concern with the requirement that a student must pass each of four tests with a level III score or higher. Students may narrowly miss the graduation requirements by missing the level III cut score by just a few points. If a student misses just a few points of one of the four tests, they would not be eligible to graduate under the existing rules. That is a conjunctive model which means all four tests must be passed to meet the criteria.

The NDE is considering moving toward a compensatory model where a student's performance on one test can compensate for lower performance on another test. He shared three different ideas that address the concern. The NDE would prefer to establish uniform decision rules that can be used over time even if the tests or cut scores change. Looking forward to the 2016 tests given this spring and for all the reasons discussed for 2015, the NDE prefers to depend on the coming year's data when determining a baseline versus last years.

Mr. Mercado outlined three examples to be considered for a model:

- Model based on composite score. Combines test scores for the four EOC assessments meets or exceeds the sum of the level III cut scores.
- Model based on status. Students must meet the level III cut score on three out of the four tests, and must score level II or higher on all tests.
- Model based on new cut score. A cut score below level III, but above level II for minimum graduation eligibility requirement. Students must meet the cut score on all tests.

Mr. Mercado discussed possible challenges for any policy the Board chooses to implement. The ultimate goal is to let students show their overall knowledge, skills and abilities on these tests and courses while still catching students who might miss the cut off by just a few points.

Member Wakefield asked for guidance about legislative intent. Dr. Canavero responded the three models presented are the bridge from an HSPE type assessment to one that mitigates concerns about students not passing by missing one or two points. That has been a significant issue over time. All three models address prior concerns. Another concern is what is true for Nevada students and are they college and career ready?

Chair Newburn provided a brief history. The EOC committee looked at what was happening across the nation, what courses were being testing and how they are combined. It was discovered that only about half of the states require passing a test as a graduation requirement. These tests began as minimum proficiency tests designed to catch students who were socially promoted and could not do math, read or write. They were just getting promoted through the courses. It was designed to catch them and prevent someone with basically no skills from getting a high school diploma. Over time that purpose has changed, and the tests have been used to drive towards college readiness, educator performance, and metrics. It was

discovered the states that used tests had little alternate routes they could apply if it test was very close. They all seemed to be able to make allowances, to waive one test if within one standard measurement, to giving credit for how many A's and B's the student received, or attendance. They all changed from being what is viewed as a conjunctive model where every test must be passed, to a hybrid model. If it was close, all other states allowed bringing in additional evidence that the student was proficient. The states are getting somewhere between 5-15 percent of their graduates through these alternate programs. Nevada does not have this option.

It was discovered there are mathematical reasons to have these alternate approaches. The first reason is that currently Nevada treats the tests as if they are flawless measures of student achievement. It is known with mathematical certainty that they are not. They are a small statistical sample taken of a student's knowledge and a decision is based on that. The problem is the way the math works; there is a range of answers. In the end, through math done by the psychometricians, a high probability decision about whether a student is proficient is made based on a test score. There is a small probability that a student that is minimally proficient will be incorrectly marked as failing a test. The problem with a conjunctive system is when tests are linked together where all four tests must be passed or the student does not graduate, that small probability grows geometrically. There is also the notion the cut score has been moved in to the middle of the bell curve. With a high level proficiency using a four test conjunctive system, there are going to be cases where a high probability decision is not being made. The concern is that decisions are made that should not be made on possibly the highest stakes decision a kid will ever face.

Other states allow for a possible small error by bringing in other evidence to decide in favor of the student. By trying to measure a student's proficiency, other things are measured such as the familiarity with the testing tool and how well they perform on tests. Some students become so psyched out over taking a test, that the tests are measuring less of the subject and are measuring more of the student's stress. Teachers will confirm this. Kids often underperform on a test and the underlying mathematical model begins to break down. This is another issue other states can handle. This Board has had testimony from students where they were one point short on a test, passed every other test with flying colors, their GPAs were high, and the teachers will verify the kids are proficient. The system was so rigid there was no way to get around the situation and they did not get a diploma. Other states have a mechanism to handle this.

The EOC committee began looking at a compensatory model. Discussions occurred with the NDEs Deputy Attorney General, and options were considered. A full compensatory, such as Maryland's, was considered. An alternate appeal process was rejected because it could force a significant cost on to the system. The law allows the tests to be treated as if they are flawless, but they are not, and we think we can do better for our kids. When more tests are added the conjunctive model becomes less reliable and the opposite is true for the compensatory model. The more tests added to a compensatory model the more accurate it becomes. Chair Newburn stated he wants to be clear that is not going to be easier, we are moving from basic proficiency to college readiness. The compensatory model handles the case of statistical error and the case of the student psychologically underperforming on a test. It allows the consideration of other subjects as evidence of proficiency.

Member Wakefield asked Chair Newburn if he has a recommendation. Chair Newburn responded he would like the Board to consider the possibility of an appeal process or an alternate scoring process. Any of what other state's use is superior to what Nevada is doing. Nevada is treating these tests as flawless. The system is too rigid, it should be high rigor but as flexible as possible. Nothing makes the Nevada test better than other measures, in the end all that is important is evidence the student is proficient. Member Wakefield commented the bar was so low in the past and it is not fair to say to graduates that not passing the HSPE was ok, even if on the borderline, because the bar was set so low at a 10th grade level.

Member Newburn responded when these tests were minimum proficiencies, these anomalies were not an issue. They become an issue as the tests are driven to college level, which is the case with the EOC. It

became significant when the tests became college ready. Right now, feedback is wanted from the Board, the field will provide feedback in the future. This is radically different, but several states have compensatory models. Nevada may be the only state that is so rigid.

Member Holbrook provided feedback about his visit to Tennessee to look at their model. They were moving from a test similar to the HSPE to the EOC. The biggest advice he received from them was to be careful with the timeframe of transition and the expectations of the students. Tennessee had a longer timeframe, five years, to transition which made it easier for them. Some issues mentioned include students being asked to reach level III cut score prematurely. Teachers are limited in resources and professional development in common core standards, which is the reason it is expected that seven out ten students will not reach the level III cut score.

Member Holbrook said he is getting many questions from families and students. It is difficult to tell them that a sophomore needs to participate but the freshman student needs to reach a cut score seven out of ten students will probably not meet. He added we need to be careful going forward, wisely choose the model and make sure we are taking the advice from Tennessee and to not expect too much too soon, instead move towards the process of increasing rigor in a timely way.

Discussion ensued among Board members regarding diagnostic, remediation, and options for establishing the cut scores for assessments given in the 2014-2015 academic year. Member Wakefield asked if they could do a phase in approach and then reassess for the outgoing cohort and move the bar to the aspiration overtime. He said he is not comfortable with students continuing to just sit for the test and suggested considering different approaches of a compensatory model. Dr. Canavero said it is the Board's discretion to establish cut scores. Students are entering into a phase when they would not just have to sit for the assessment.

He suggested an option for students in the graduation cohort of 2019, is that they must pass four EOC exams. It could be proposed for students who sat in the 2014-15 school year, and are currently in 9th grade and participated in the Algebra I EOC exam that their participation in the exam and passing the course could equate for the cut score for that particular test. Dr. Canavero explained there is data for the 2015 administration that suggests students in 8th grade who sat for the algebra I test did well. That provides an indication about the content and rigor of the course versus students in 9th and 10th grade who simply sat to participate in the test. Chair Newburn clarified that the pass rate for math 7th graders was about 89 percent, 8th grade math I pass rate was 70 percent, 8th grade math II the pass rate was under 86 percent. These are the classes that would be affected.

Member Jensen said many factors need to be considered when looking at what we know right now. The conjunctive model is liked because it provides a basis for being able to allow progress. There are still concerns that need to be dealt with regarding remediation. The new cut score, and option III has been discussed and questioned whether there could be a conjunctive collaboration in the new cut scores moving forward. And does it need to be implemented all at once, or over time. He said the school superintendents as a whole do not have a recommendation. They have not had a NASS meeting since this item was discussed. He stated a discussion could occur at their next meeting.

Member Newburn asked the Board if they have enough information or if they would like more time to make these decisions.

Member Jamin commented the Board and districts have asked NDE staff for as much information as possible regarding the results from 2015, and then comparing that with the cut score. Yet, based on the irregularities that occurred, not just the amount of time students had but also the frustration of trying but not being able to complete the test even with additional attempts, that data is flawed and should not be viewed as a baseline under any circumstances. By establishing the cut score it gives more validity to the data then it deserves. She asked if there is the option for the Board to wait and consider the cut score for this year's test administration since it is in process.

Dr. Canavero noted that discussion would occur in a few months. Member Jamin said that would be her preference. Regarding composite scores, having had parents come before a local school board and make the case that their student should graduate because they were so close, she cautioned being careful about how they make that decision. Once a model is established that says they were close but did not quite make it, and so they would be given flexibility, it sends the message to the parents to ask for even more flexibility. It does not create a system that has a line the students must meet. That relates to not just focusing on students graduating but focusing on the value of the diploma. She expressed uncertainty about whether she is ready to give an opinion on which model is correct.

Member Wakefield clarified that 32,000 students will be impacted by the decision today plus some 7th and 8th grades would be taking the test early. Or if the score changes next year, would they be held under the last construct. Dr. Canavero clarified that they would only be establishing a cut score for the operational field test that existed in 2014-15. The real number of students impacted would be the sum total of those who participated in grades 7 and 8 on one or more of the assessments last year. There are approximately 32,000 students in each grade level. In terms of a graduation requirement, this applies to a 7th grade student who participated in a test and an 8th grade student from last year who participated in the 2014-15 administration would be impacted by the graduation requirement when they reach graduation in 2019-2020.

Dr. Canavero said the field would like to know if the student passed the test they took last year. Member Wakefield asked about the test that is being taken now for these courses. Dr. Canavero said they will set standards in the summer for the 2016 administration. That is the normal timeline for full administration standard setting for the current operational field test.

Member Holbrook stated if the Board is going to ask for more time and information before moving forward it will be very difficult for districts and sites to get information out to families in a timely manner so students are prepared to test. He asked for a timeframe and when the information would be available if the concept of participation just for this cohort and the requirement of passing the course aligned with the test is being considered.

Dr. Canavero clarified if established, communication from the school district about whether or not a student passed algebra I would be in summer. Member Holbrook asked if cut scores are not approved today, when will the current 9th graders who took the test last year, get the information that they are may be expected to take the test again this year.

Mr. Zutz explained if the Board approves the cut scores today, they would apply to the data immediately. Currently, it is anticipated full student reports will be provided for last year 7th and 8th graders who took the test, as well as reports for all participants of last year's 2015 EOC. The 2016 data is on schedule for around the first of August.

Chair Newburn suggested three possibilities: adopt the current cut scores, put it off until the next meeting, or adopt the cut scores and make an adjustment to them.

Member Ortiz offered a motion to move for the 2019 cohort to approve the option of sitting for the test and passing the course as a pass for them, and then delay the decision on the cut scores until the 2016 data is reported. Member Wakefield offered it needs to be for two cohorts, not just one, both 7th and 8th grade. Dr. Canavero suggested a cut score for the 2014-15 administration of the EOC exam would be established. The cut score established for the 2014-15 administration of the EOC exam is participation on the exam and passing the course. That motion would count for any student in the 7th and 8th grade who participated in the exam and passed the course. That meets the standard for that particular EOC exam. Students would still be subject to the requirements that you will be establishing in summer of 2016 that identify the cut scores for the remaining assessments. It is narrowed to the 2014-15 administration that is operational field test.

Member Wakefield moved to approve the motion Dr. Canavero suggested. Chair Newburn asked Dr. Canavero to restate the motion. Dr. Canavero said the motion the Board is considering is for the 2014-15 administration of the end-of-course exams, the cut score the Board agreed to is for students who participated in the exam and passed the course. For the 2014-15 administration of the end-of-course exam the cut score is participating in the exam and passing the course. Member Wakefield moved to approve the motion. Member Holbrook seconded.

Chair Newburn asked for discussion.

Member Jamin asked if the motion includes the caveat that these students will still be subject to the requirements of the 2016 standard setting that Dr. Canavero mentioned earlier.

Dr. Canavero asked Deputy Ott to clarify that by narrowing to the 2014-15 administration which has already been administered, then the cut score is narrowed to that administration. It is establishing cut scores going forward in to 2016 for all future administrations of the EOC exams. Deputy Ott agreed adding he understood it only applies to the past test. A new one would be set going forward.

The motion carried.

*Deputy Ott further clarified that members of the Board expressed concerns with the initial demographics and sample size of the first administration of the EOC examinations. During this assessment transition period, the Board looks to adopt a decision model that includes fully implemented cut scores. Based on these concerns, students who took any of the EOC examinations in spring of 2015 will not be required to re-take that examination, provided that those students passed the course aligned with the EOC examinations in the spring of 2015. **Going forward, a cut score will be established by the Board in 2016 for all future administrations of the EOC exams. Students will still be required to take all other EOC examinations needed for graduation. For example, if a student took Math I in the spring of 2015, he or she will still need to take English Language Arts (ELA I, ELA II and Math II.***

Information and Discussion on state readiness to administer the Smarter Balanced Assessment in Spring 2016. The Board will receive an update on our preparations and contractor performance in order to deliver the Smarter Balanced Assessments.

Mr. Zutz reported the status of the 2016 CAT summative assessment is so far so good. With the metrics received from the DRC on test participation, test completion and issues logged, as well as feedback received from Nevada districts, he is cautiously optimistic on achieving complete success by the end of the testing window. To date there have been about 28,000 test administrations. Discussion occurred with DRC about communication for clear direction to districts on where to go for immediate resolution to any issue associated with testing. It was underscored the need for DRC to adequately staff customer phone lines so real time resolution is available to all Nevada districts every day during the hours of testing. NDE emphasized the need to have quality control processes in place at DRC to ensure the DRC help desk is providing the level of assistance appropriate for any query they may receive at any time.

Information, Discussion, and Possible Action regarding S.B. 511 Teach Nevada Scholarships. The Board will hear an update on the 134 scholarships allocated to ARL Providers in the 2015-2016 school year and consider possible reallocation of unused funds to maximize the impact of the scholarships.

Dena Durish, deputy superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement, reminded the Board that last November they went through the application process for the Teach Nevada Scholarships. The Board decided to award all the scholarships available to Alternative Route to Licensure (ARL) programs. An extension to March was given for institutions to submit their documents. The scholarships were given to Humboldt County School District, National, Sierra Nevada College, UNLV, Washoe

County School District, and WGU. Four are higher education partners and two are school districts that are state approved programs for ARL. As of March 1, Humboldt School District, Sierra Nevada College and UNLV reached their target. The other institutions requested more time. As of yesterday, Washoe County School District and WGU met their target.

National was unable to award six full scholarships for different programs. The cost was \$6,000 for each scholarship and there is \$36,000 remaining. UNLV awarded all their scholarships but has \$78,370 remaining due to the different costs in their programs. Law specifies the Board awards the number of scholarships, and 134 scholarships were awarded. Scholarship recipients must teach five continuous years in an approved public school.

Chair Newburn said his preference is to turn the dollars into teachers quickly. He asked if there are recommendations from the NDE. Member Wakefield asked for clarification about the motion being considered today. Dr. Canavero suggested a motion for the Board's consideration would be to take the remaining unused dollars and reallocate them to institutions that have waiting lists, and assure UNLV can expend their remaining \$78,370.

Member Wakefield asked how can they ensure an equitable process for the list being considered today and not privilege one institution over another. Deputy Durish said National is not being considered because they missed their target, WCSD and WGU were late submitting their original amount and she recommended not awarding additional scholarships to those two at this time. Sierra Nevada College, Humboldt School District and UNLV followed the process. There are eight scholarships for consideration. She recommended that UNLV is allowed to use their \$78,370 and reallocate it to three or four of their students, then use the \$36,000 for Humboldt County School District and/or Sierra Nevada College.

Shannon Beets, Sierra Nevada College, informed the Board that they have three students on a waitlist who are deferring their decision until they can find out if additional funds are available.

Member Jensen, superintendent, Humboldt County School District said they have awarded four scholarships and have one individual they were unable to award in the elementary area. If they were granted an additional allocation that individual could be slotted in the next several days. Each of their scholarships was \$9,200. He confirmed that the Sierra Nevada Scholarship is \$18,000 and recommended that UNLV be allowed to use the \$78,370 for the eight students on their waitlist.

Member Ortiz moved to award one additional scholarship to Humboldt County School District, two additional scholarships to Sierra Nevada College and UNLV will expend their remaining \$78,370 for students on their waitlist for scholarships. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information, Discussion, and Possible Action regarding A.B. 474 Great Teaching and Leading Fund. The Board will receive an update on 2015-16 Great Teaching and Leading awards and consider recommendations to establish the priorities for awarding funds in 2016-2017. Pursuant to Senate Bill 474, the State Board shall prescribe the priorities of programs for which grants of money will be made. Ms. Durish conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation about the Great Teaching and Leading Fund. The fund includes the following areas:

- Professional development for teachers, administrators and other licensed personnel;
- Programs of preparation for teachers, administrators and other licensed personnel;
- Programs of peer assistance and review for teachers, administrators and other licensed educational personnel;

- Programs for leadership training and development; and
- Programs to recruit select and retain effective teachers and principals.

Law specifies that on or before September 30 of each year the Board will prescribe priorities for the grants of money that that will be made from the fund on or before December 31 of that year. However, there was not enough time for the Board to establish priorities. Ms. Durish listed categories to receive the funds: NEPF, Science, Recruitment/Retention, and Leadership Development.

The Board is considering the priorities today so the application can be distributed. The intent is to distribute the funds as soon as they become available this fiscal year.

Ms. Durish explained that based on training needs, statewide initiatives, and areas unfunded by other initiatives, she recommended the Board consider the continuation of the four areas (see below) in 2015-16 but narrowing the focus.

- Nevada Academic Content Standards – Science
- Nevada Educator Performance Framework
- Recruitment/Retention
- Leadership Development

The bill provides just under \$4.9 million and 36 entities applied for a total of \$13 million. It is a challenge when it is broader because there are more categories for which people can apply. If the four areas are retained, she suggested narrowing any of the areas. This does not mean that this would be a continuing of funds; rather it is a continuing of priorities. The intent of the law is to have a new application process.

Member Wakefield recalled that he recused himself last year from the discussion about the award grants because his employer is Teach For America and he works on a national team. However the Nevada chapter applied for an award. He consulted with Deputy Attorney Greg Ott and was advised it is within his purview and it is his responsibility serving his term on the Board to engage in the conversation about priority setting. He said he would recuse himself when the discussion is about reviewing the awards if his employer is an applicant.

Member Wakefield encouraged reviewing the categories and the intent of the law rather than grandfathering in priorities that were a stop gap measure. He recalled lessons learned last year that it was too much of a catch all and too many applications. He has had questions from applicants about why they were not more favorably considered in the process when they had cause and a good application. He added because there is not good information from the RPDPs that all the information the Board has received this year should be considered when decisions about the fund. He suggested keeping recruitment and retention for teacher preparation and leadership development for teachers and leaders, and consider prioritizing high need areas such as STEM and EL. He recommended confining the fund to a core purpose which would create a better experience for applicants and a better re iew for the grant committee. It will also allow the legislature next session to better access the fund. It has one purpose and it not a catch all.

Discussion ensued among Board members and Deputy Durish about priorities and concerns.

Deputy Durish clarified the information provided today from the Regional Professional Development Programs (RPDP) is what they submitted, but is not the report requested by the bill. The Board should be considering the RPDP report today but that report and the assessment of training needs were not provided. Instead the information received is a recommendation from the RPDPs.

Member Wakefield clarified he would like to prioritize the science recommendation as a part of the pipeline for teacher and administrative leadership, narrowing it to the pipeline and teacher professional development and leadership for retention. It could benefit an application if it could be shown that a

program was focused on the STEM pipeline of educators or similar. He explained he would like the purpose of the funds to be simple and clear resulting in a better public application process.

Member Jensen provided a different perspective when considering the priorities of programs prescribed by the Board, and the five areas listed. He suggested it is important to note that the three RPDPs work directly with all 17 school districts. Through feedback they are clear on what the needs are for the schools and districts. There is consistency with what the Board supported this year and what the RPDPs through the districts think is a priority, and what is being recommended. He suggested more specific activities to target instead of more broad categories that the review committees will need to consider.

Chair Newburn explained this was the slot for funds for professional development for the new science standards. If the money goes elsewhere, the southern half of the state will not have professional development for the science standards.

Discussion continued among the board members.

Member Wakefield moved to suggest the 3rd and 4th bullet recruitment and retention and leadership development with science professional development. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion.

Member Jensen questioned whether the Board is following Member Wakefield's motion. He clarified the board is viewing slide six, titled 2016-17 Board Considerations. The first bullet is Academic Content Standards – Science. There is already an inclusion of Science, and he asked for clarification about the recommendation for a subset under recruitment and retention. Member Wakefield clarified the motion is to strike out the first two and not to include a bullet for Nevada Academic Content Standards – Science, or the NEPF. Included is Recruitment/Retention and Leadership Development for educators and administrators. Science would be included as a main item.

Board members and Deputy Durish discussed the inclusions of the bulleted recommendations for approval.

Chair Newburn stated using bullets 1 and 3 and 4 is so much clearer in the intent of what the Board is trying to do. Once we have actually gone through a round where we can get funding for the new science standards, especially Southern Nevada, it could be restructured. It is a glaring need. This is how the standards end up not getting professional development, they get stuck with other stuff, and the other stuff gets funded and then people question why there is no professional development for the Common Core State Standards. The Board is trying to do it differently this time and he would prefer to approve bulleted Items 1) 3) and 4) as they are presented.

Member Wakefield pulled back the motion. He adjusted his motion to approve keeping:

- 1.) Nevada Academic Content Standards - Science**
 - ✓ **Integration of effective use of instructional technology**
 - ✓ **Real-World applications**
- 3.) Recruitment/Retention**
 - ✓ **Student learning goals**
 - ✓ **Inter-related reliability**
- 4.) Leadership development**
 - ✓ **Designed to increase retention of effective educators and/r expand effective models of school improvement.**

Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Information and Discussion on the High School Graduation Committee. The Board will receive a brief update on the past meetings of the High School Graduation Committee and the direction of the

Committee's work.

Chair Newborn informed the Board that the first two meetings of the High School Graduation Committee discussed what graduates need to have from the employer's viewpoint. Mr. Bob Potts, Governor's office of economic development provided information about job needs, economic sectors, job gaps and the direction the state needs to go, where it is weak versus where it needs to be strong. Many of the large growing areas that need skilled workers are related to STEM, computer science and IT robotics.

TESLA provided information at the meeting about traditional manufacturing workers, technician level and high-end level workers. The county is gaining jobs back but there are fewer low skilled worker jobs, and a mix between the skill levels.

Representatives from industry including manufacturing, aerospace and defense, tourism and more spoke at the February 24 meeting about their employment needs. The National Career Readiness Certificate was discussed by many as the high school diploma is beginning to mean less and less. The certificates help prospective employers evaluate students coming from different high schools, school districts and states. The credential has significance.

Soft skills and employability skills were addressed by everyone. Students coming out of the CTE programs take an employability skills test. All the sectors had high praise for CTE students and there are not enough for their workforce. Sectors were asked how they would they change the graduation requirement. All of them stressed computer science should be a required class.

Higher Education including NSHE and CSN provided a briefing. NSHE had charts showing they can map the increasing success rate of students based on the total math and science class they have completed. In response to what would be the one change Crystal Abba from NSHE and CSN both said the most important change would be more math, and not just any math but the most challenging possible.

Dr. Canavero said in regulation, the definition of College and Career Readiness, which is the advanced diploma with two years of foreign language, hits the mark. He provided statistics from partners in NSHE utilizing the state's longitudinal data system from the class of 2014.

Member Jamin mentioned the two year graduation requirement of a foreign language. Of interest is this is a requirement not because of international opportunities for students who speak a foreign language, but because it requires students to learn in a different way and provides an ability to move forward in career and college.

Member Ortiz shared that as a fellow STEM advocate and working in technology, one of the biggest challenges she faces when hiring new staff is a lack of basic technology skills, including the basics. In addition, her dual language staff is more successful. Half of her clients are global and require that skill set and that relates to many jobs in the economy.

Information and Discussion regarding Senate Bill 508, Modernizing the Nevada Plan. A key Governor's initiative is to modernize the Nevada Plan through increased transparency and a transition to a weighted student funding formula. The Board will receive an update on the work underway and the balance of the work moving forward.

Mindy Martini, Deputy Superintendent, Business and Support Services conducted a [PowerPoint](#) about Modernizing The Nevada Plan for School Finance. She said S.B. 508 revised three primary components:

- Revises enrollment and how it is calculated
- Addressed the Equity Allocation Model
- Weighted Funded for specific populations; Special Education, English Learners, High Poverty Learners and Gifted and Talented Learners.

Deputy Martini provided history about how Nevada determined enrollment with a single count day in the past. Count Day was removed and instead now requires a reporting of Average Daily Enrollment (ADE) on a quarterly basis. Now there is a positive financial benefit for school districts to encourage students to stay in school throughout the year.

Adrienne Monroe, director of support services, provided information about Hold Harmless which assists charter schools and school districts when there are significant decreases in enrollment. Historically the provision specified if a school district's enrollment decreases less than five percent when compared to the immediate preceding school year the larger enrollment from the current or preceding school year must be used. When the enrollment decline is less than five percent, Hold Harmless provisions were repealed. The requirement is to look back one year instead of two when the enrollment decline is five percent or more. Ms. Monroe said they are currently monitoring the impact of this revision on the DSA. Information was shared about the impact of the change.

Ms. Monroe informed the Board that NRS 387.121 specifies that the Nevada Plan *is the proper objective of state financial aid to public education is to ensure each Nevada child a reasonably equal opportunity.* The Nevada Plan was adopted in 1967 and continues to be the basis of the funding formula used in Nevada. It is referred to as an *Equity Allocation Model*. Details were provided about the Nevada Plan and funding and the Equity Allocation Model that allows for the calculation of each school district's basic support guaranteed based on wealth, salary and transportation. The Equity Allocation Model is now included in NRS.

The 2016 Equity Allocation Working Group is currently developing a new, more user-friendly transparent model. It will be tested against the traditional 23 module system and will consolidate the required data from 12 workbooks to one. It will be posted on the NDE website.

Deputy Martini provided information on the new changes to weighted funded and reporting requirement for those four populations, Special Education, English Learners, High Poverty and Gifted and Talented.

- Special Education: Contingency Fund - \$5 million in FY 2017
- English Learners Zoom Schools - \$50 million in each fiscal year of the 2015-17 Biennium. Per pupil approximate \$1,015.
- High Poverty Learners, Victory Schools - \$24 million in each fiscal year of the 2015-17 Biennium. Per pupil approximately \$1,137.45.
- Gifted and Talented Learners - \$5.2 million in each fiscal year. Approximately \$5,174.243 in both fiscal year 2015-16 and 2016-17.

Member Jensen said as the school districts developed their budgets, they do not have the prerogative to reduce staff if they lose enrollment during the year. The savings that have been identified go back to the state and negatively impacts school districts and charter schools. He added that under the weighted funding it is essential it goes through. The fear is looking at a fixed pot of money and trying to shift within that to meet weighted components. It needs to be a true additional allocation to make this work.

Member Jamin echoed Member Jensen and adding districts that are not as impacted with EL and high poverty students have concerns about the proposed formula. They do not want to minimize the needs in the districts that have students that need additional help but do not want to step backwards in the achievement of the rest of the state.

Chair Newburn asked if the board has a role in this process. Deputy Martini said the requirements in S.B. 508 specify the Board is to receive reports on recommended weights but they do not make a decision about the weights. Dr. Canavero confirmed this report was provided to the Board so they remain informed.

Information, discussion and possible action regarding the adoption of the selected High School Science Standards for the 2017 End of Course Examination in Science.

Dave Brancamp, Director, Standards and Instructional Support recalled that in February 2014 the Board adopted the Nevada Academic Content Standards for Science, based on Next Generation Science and funding through a grant to help with professional development was discussed.

As noted this morning, the EOC was originally assigned four tests. When that decision was made, it was suggested that science would be considered in the future. In May of 2014 about 25 teachers, administrators, district representatives met to discuss the Science Standards that were recently adopted as being part of the EOC. Mr. Brancamp provided details about putting the standards together and bringing them to the Council to Establish Academic Standards for approval. The Academic Standards Council approved the Science Standards on March 7, 2016. He requested the Board's approval today.

Member Holmes-Sutton moved to adopt the science standards. Member Wakefield seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Public Comment #2

There was no public comment

Future Agenda Items

Dr. Canavero recalled that Member Wakefield requested an item about teacher retention, what they are doing to meet the needs and inviting school districts to discuss the issue. Dr. Canavero noted additional topics to consider include a joint meeting with the Regents, the teacher pipeline, college going rates, college readiness, post-secondary career certifications, pathways, rubric for the Great Teaching and Leading funds, and scholarships and distributing scholarship funds.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:53 p.m.