

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
COUNCIL TO ESTABLISH ACADEMIC STANDARDS  
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 2018 (1:00 PM)

**Meeting Locations:**

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	9890 S. Maryland Pkwy	Las Vegas	Board Room (2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor)
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St	Carson City	Board Room

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

*(Video Conferenced)*

**Agenda Item I - Welcome, Call to Order, and Roll Call**

- Chairwoman Sharon Beatty called the meeting to order, 1:00 PM

**Council Members in Attendance:**

**In Las Vegas**

- Sharon Beatty
- Brent Hussan
- Dina Neal

**In Carson City**

- Nikki Haag

**Dial In:**

- David Gardner
- Yvette Williams

**Department Staff Present:**

**In Carson City:**

- Brett Barley Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement
- Sylvia Verdugo, Assistant to the Superintendent's Office
- Dave Brancamp, Director, Office of Standards and Instructional support
- Peter Zutz, Director, Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management

**Legal Staff Present:**

- Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:**

**In Las Vegas:** Kristine Minnich

**Carson City:** None

**Agenda Item II - Approval of Meeting Minutes**

- Member Hussan moved to approve the 1-10-2018 meeting minutes
- Member Haag seconded
- Motion carried unanimously

**Agenda Item III - Approval of Flexible Agenda**

- Member Hussan moved for approval of a flexible agenda
- Member Williams seconded the motion
- The motion carried unanimously

**Agenda Item IV – Public Comment #1**

**Las Vegas:**

- Kristine Minnich, Assistant Superintendent Clark County School District, discussed the establishment of Cut Scores. Her statement concluded with a request that partial understanding (i.e. Level 2) be considered “Proficient” since the ACT examines College Readiness, not proficiency.

**Carson City:**

- No public comment

**Agenda Item V - Department Update**

- Mr. Barley went over the STIP that was adopted by the NDE and the recently released NAPE scores. He reported that Nevada students advanced in NAPE Reading and Math scores and argued that this showed that Nevada students moved forward in the face of higher standards. In particular, Latino/Hispanic, African-American, and Asian students advanced considerably.
  - Member Williams asked about some of the specific numbers regarding 8<sup>th</sup> grade proficiency for African-American and Asian students. Mr. Barley responded that the influence of various implemented programs (RBG3/Victory) should be felt next year.

**Agenda Item VI: Presentation, discussion, and possible approval of the Nevada ACT Cut Scores**

- Mr. Barley reviewed the adoption of AB7, the need to develop a new assessment as a federal reporting tool, and the plan to use ACT to determine proficiency. Peter Zutz began his presentation by suggesting the establishment of four cuts to be applied to Spring 2018 administration of the ACT.
  - Member Hussan and Member Beatty asked for brief clarifications that were provided by Mr. Barley and Mr. Zutz.
- Ricardo Mercado began his presentation by discussing the structure of the ACT and the group of seven stakeholders who examined possible standards/Cut Scores at the end of February 2018. Stakeholders used a variety of tools to consider data, and they took into account Nevada college career readiness standards to craft Nevada specific standards.
  - Member Neal asked a question about exact relationship between specific ACT scores and the displayed PLD breakdown/Cut Scores and was answered by Mr. Zutz.
- Mr. Mercado discussed the difference between College Readiness (which the ACT is designed to assess) and Career Readiness and the ACT’s own benchmarks. The committee looked for consistency across tests and recommended that Level 3 be considered proficient.
  - Member Hussan asked about the percentage of students being impacted by Cut Scores. Mr. Mercado replied that the committee was searching for consistency and non-skewed results.

April 11, 2018

- Member Williams asked about the performance of sub-groups, if they would be disproportionately disadvantaged by these scores, and if there were any differences in performance on exams based on sub-groups. Mr. Barley provided a complete response.
- Member Neil asked about consistency and signals sent by SBAC scores given that SBAC and ACT exams are taken two grades apart. Mr. Mercado and Mr. Zutz provided detailed responses.
- Member Beatty referred back to the assistant superintendent's comment about the correlation between the ACT and standards and stated that a 50% correlation of standards seems somewhat daunting. Mr. Barley stated that this is allowable according to federal law and will cut down on the number of tests students need to take. Mr. Zutz responded that he will be seeking peer review for these numbers.
- Mr. Mercado discussed the proposed cut scores and their impact on students, the correspondence between ELA 3-8 scores and ACT scores, and the need to create scores that match ELA scores.
  - Member Hussan asked about the necessity of creating standards that limit impact instead of creating meaningful standards and expecting teachers to get students to those standards. Mr. Mercado responded that impact data was minimally used in favor of other factors. Member Hussan asked for clarification as to if impact data was used in determining Cut Scores, and Mr. Mercado and Mr. Zutz responded in the affirmative. Mr. Barley stated that this was the recommendations of the committee, and Member Hussan again expressed his frustration with the use of impact data.
  - Member Williams echoed Member Hussan's concerns, asked how aligned the proposed Cut Scores are with the ESSA plan, and asked if a non-ACT exam should be used to set benchmarks. Mr. Barley stated that the Cut Scores are 100% aligned with the ESSA plan. Member Williams asked for more information, and Mr. Barley responded.
- Mr. Mercado resumed his presentation by going over math scores, distributions, and the lesser correlation between math scores in 3-8 and the proposed ACT Cut scores when compared to the ELA scores. He concluded by stating that the committee looked at a great deal of information, and all the committee members wanted students to do well. Right now there are different levels of preparedness, and they felt that these proposed Cut scores would be the best way to address the expected outcomes for students.
  - Member Neil asked about the correlation addressed on slide 35 and wanted to know more about where they saw a correlation between the top two tiers.
  - Member Beatty asked who the stakeholders were on the committee. Mr. Zutz responded that he did not have the list but mentioned that there were content experts, a superintendent, board members, and others. Member Beatty asked for a clarification of the number of people on the committee, and that was confirmed as being seven individuals.

**Motion:**

- Member Haag moved to discuss the proposed standards.
- Member Williams seconded

**Motion:**

- Member Neil moved to move the Cut Scores so that 17 is a part of Level 2 and 18 is the lower limit for Level 3.
- Member Gardner seconded
- Member Hussan stated that he was not prepared to recommend the Cut Scores because the Council members were not given enough information about how the scores were

April 11, 2018

- designed by the committee. The methodology and use of impact data seems unsound, and he stated that Nevada should set the bar higher, not lower.
- Member Beatty stated that Nevada has high standards and that the standards dictate teaching. Nevada needs to have an assessment that matches what is being done in the classroom, and this is a solution.
  - Member Hussan responded that standards are higher; however, future public reports will influence policy makers, and those policy makers don't have time to delve into the specifics of the materials. The Member stated that this data will make policy, so it is more important to do it right, even if it takes more time. Nevada should not set standards that simply meet what teachers are doing now.
    - Mr. Zutz stated that the ACT does offer a clear indication of rigor. There are national benchmarks on the ACT, and we can compare the performance of Nevada students against students from across the country.
  - Member Williams said that she was open to changing the scores.
  - Member Beatty asked for a vote on changing the scores in Level 2 from 12-17 and Level 3 to 18-23.
    - The members vote 3-2 in favor of the amendment.
  - Member Beatty asked for a vote on the amended Cut Scores in the area of Language Arts.
    - The members vote 3-2 against the motion.
  - Member Beatty asks for a clarification on how to proceed, Mr. Barley asks for clarification, and Member Gardner says that he agreed with the amendment but not the motion.
  - Member Williams asks for clarity.
  - Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott explained the parliamentary procedure, and Member Beatty clarifies that the main issue is a lack of consensus on the cut scores and the exact numbers, and there is some discussion over the exact numbers to use and if the NSHE and ACT numbers should be aligned. Mr. Barley states that this will not be the final step in this process.

**Motion:**

- Member Gardner motioned to approve the ACT cut scores with an amendment that Level 2 be 12-19, Level 3 be 20-23, and the other Levels stay the same.
- There was no second.

**Motion:**

- Member Haag motioned to accept the committee recommendations.
- Member Williams seconded.
- The vote is 2-2, Member Beatty cast the deciding vote in favor of the motion, and it passes 3-2.

**Motion:**

- Member Williams moved to accept the Math cut scores as presented.
- Member Haag seconded.
- The motion passes 3-1
- Member Beatty asked if it would be possible to revisit these standards, and Mr. Barley responded in the affirmative. Member Beatty stated that it would be useful to make sure that the standards reflect the hard work of Nevada teachers and students.

**Agenda Item VII: Presentation, discussion, and possible approval to begin the review/revision of the Nevada Academic Content Standards for Computer Technology and Health**

- Dave Brancamp discusses the computer technology standards and asks for permission to bring a committee together to see if the standards need to be revised. He addresses SB108 and potential additions to Social Studies and the recommendations of the state board subcommittee that the additions actually be added to health.

**Motion:**

- Member Williams moves that the standards for computer science be revisited.
- Member Neil seconded.
- The motion passed unanimously

**Motion:**

- Member Neil motioned to reexamine the standards for health.
- Member Haag seconded.
  - Member Williams asked if this will be a wholesale review or just a review of these additions. Mr. Brancamp responded that it would be a complete review.
- The motion passed unanimously.

**Agenda Item VIII: Next meeting and Future Agenda Items**

- Member Beatty asked about future meetings on either July 11<sup>th</sup> or October 9<sup>th</sup>.
  - Mr. Barley replied that the main future item will be standards, and Mr. Brancamp replied that the standards could be done by October 9<sup>th</sup>.
- Member Williams asked about standards for Magnet Schools and asked that the Council examine the standards surrounding Magnet Schools (particularly accessibility and racial isolation).
- Member Beatty asked for statements.
- Member Neil asked about the public comment period for the cut scores, and Mr. Barley responded.

**Agenda Item IX: Public Comment #2**

- Member Beatty asks if there is any public comment.

**Las Vegas**

- None

**Carson City**

- None

**Agenda Item X: Adjournment**

**Motion**

- Member Neil motioned to adjourn.
- Member Haag seconded.
- The motion passed unanimously.