



COUNCIL TO ESTABLISH ACADEMIC STANDARDS
THURSDAY, JUNE 27TH, 2019 1:00 PM

DRAFT

Meeting Locations:

OFFICE	ADDRESS	CITY	MEETING ROOMS
Department of Education	2080 East Flamingo Rd, #210	Las Vegas	Board Room
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth Street	Carson City	Board Room

Meeting Minutes
(Video Conferenced)

COUNCIL MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

In Las Vegas:

- Sharon Beatty
- Brent Husson

In Carson City:

- Nikki Haag

Dial In:

- David Sirna
- Yvette Williams

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

In Las Vegas:

- Dave Brancamp, Director, Office of Standards and Instructional Support
- Cindi Chang, Office of Standards and Instructional Support

In Carson City:

- Dr. Jonathan Moore, Deputy Superintendent of Student Achievement
- Karen Johansen, Assistant to the State Board of Education
- Andrew Snyder, Office of Standards and Instructional Support
- Mike Pacheco, Assistant Director of Assessment

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

In Las Vegas:

- David Gardner, Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

In Las Vegas:

- Kathy LeFevre, CCSD
- Amy Raymer, CCSD
- Cynthia Romero, Nevada Succeeds

In Carson City:

- Gabby McGregor, The Ferraro Group

Agenda Item I: Call to Order; Roll Call; Pledge of Allegiance

- Chair Beatty called the meeting to order. After some discussion of the Council's quorum requirements and the arrival of Member Williams via telephone, the meeting began.

Agenda Item II: Public Comment #1

In Las Vegas:

- No Public Comment

In Carson City:

- No Public Comment

Agenda Item III: Approval of October 10, 2018 Meeting Minutes

- Chair Beatty asked for additions, corrections, or deletions from the minutes. Chair Beatty asked if Member Sirna's name was misspelled and noted two possible errors.
 - Member Husson made a motion to approve the minutes; Member Haag seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item IV: Approval of Flexible Agenda

- Chair Beatty asked for a motion to approve a Flexible Agenda. Member Haag made a motion to that effect; Member Williams seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item V: Council Members' Comments

- Chair Beatty asked for comments from the Council Members.
 - Members Husson, Sirna, and Haag had no comments.
 - Member Williams stated that she had been in meetings with CCSD regarding the implementation of the Multi-Cultural Standards, and she expressed her excitement about the work that has been going on.
 - Chair Beatty welcomed the members and noted the presence of a new Governor and Superintendent. The Chair commented that she had worked with Superintendent Ebert in CCSD and was excited by her leadership. She provided a quick review of the role of the council members (the Council reviews the standards for the curriculum developed by the districts). Each member is valuable as each individual brings different perspectives and values. This is vital to establishing standards. The Council needs the voices of the members as they are representing their constituents. The Chair noted that, because of the importance of the Council, members will be looking at some possible bylaws later in the meeting.

Agenda Item VI: Department Update

- Chair Beatty asked Dr. Jonathan Moore, Deputy Superintendent of Student Achievement, to provide an update on the department, the Council's budget, and legislative items.
 - Dr. Moore reminded council members that many members were nearing the end of their appointments; however, he encouraged them to continue to participate and attend until the Governor or Legislature appointed replacements so that the work of the council could continue. Beginning July 1, the Read by Grade Three team will be moving to the Office of Standards and Instructional Support. Beginning July 1, the Office of Special Education will be renamed as the Office of Inclusive Education. The new office will include Special Education, Gifted and Talented Education, and Indian Education. The goal is to open up the scope of the office to improve the ways we include all students in teaching and learning. The 80th Legislative Session was quite robust. AB 219 related to English Language Learners. The bill requires all districts to adopt a plan to eliminate proficiency gaps between ELL and English proficient students. SB 467 was an extension of Victory and Zoom Programs. AB 289, also known as the Read by Grade

Three bill, repealed retention in favor of promotion with services and changed to funding based on a formulaic allocation. It also expanded support for students from K-3 to K-5. AB 92 extended the English Mastery Council. It requires them to serve the lowest proficient students in the state and ELL students.

- Member Williams asked for more information about AB 219. Dr. Moore noted a provision in the bill that requires districts to purchase assessments in Spanish. The Department has not discussed implementation of that requirement at this time.
- Dr. Moore stated that the Council did have a budget of \$5,934 for FY20 and \$5,934 for FY21. Those funds were for travel and other council activities.
 - Chair Beatty asked for a budget report at each meeting, and Dr. Moore responded that this could be a standing item under department updates.
 - Member Williams asked for information about what was spent in previous years. Dr. Moore responded that he did not have current expenditures for the previous year. He did state that the Council does not spend a large part of its budget. It would be useful for the Council to spend these funds. Copying and printing may be allowable expenses, and we should be using this budget if at all possible.
 - Chair Beatty noted that, in the past, the budget had been used so that all the members could meet in one place (either Carson City or Las Vegas).

Agenda Item VII: Presentation, Discussion, and possible Approval of Integrated Technology and Computer Science Standards

- Member Beatty introduced Director Brancamp to present on the Integrated Technology and Computer Science Standards.
 - Director Brancamp began by saying that Code.org recently recognized Nevada for all the work that has been done in the legislature this session with Education Programs Professional (EPP) Cindi Chang leading the way. About 18 months ago, the Council approved the Computer Science Standards. Since then, it was decided to bring the Educational Technology Standards up to the same level. EPP Chang introduced herself and pointed out that the Educational Technology standards were up for renewal as they had been in place since 2010. The national standards were revised in 2016, which prompted the team to review Nevada's standards. The writing team decided to align the Educational Technology standards with the Computer Science Standards, and they decided to rename them from "Educational Technology" to "Integrated Technology". This makes sense since technology has been integrated into all subject areas and all aspects of the classroom. SB 200 from the 2017 Legislative Session amended NRS 389.520 requiring the creation of Computer Science Standards within the Computer Science and Technology Subject area. To make it easier for teachers to find the information they need when lesson planning, the decision was made to combine Computer Science and Integrated Technology. The team is planning to create and distribute a guidance document to assist teachers with the implementation of the standards; in particular, they are thinking of elementary teachers. EPP Chang introduced Kathy LeFevre, a member of the standards writing team, and she asked for questions.
 - Member Williams noted that she was happy to hear that a guidance document was being discussed since teachers would be happy to have it. A similar document was discussed with the Multi-Cultural Standards, but Member Williams did not know if the team had gotten around to it. Such documents were invaluable for implementation.
 - Chair Beatty asked if there was any room for comment on the Computer Science Standards. She then agreed with Member Williams about the need for a guidance document given the standards' rigor.
 - Member Williams expressed her concerns about lack of access to the internet within urban communities. She wanted to put that concern on the record and to note that some kids might have the opportunity to do better due that access. Chair Beatty agreed with those concerns and commented on the lack of computer labs during testing times.
 - Chair Beatty asked about the focus areas. Some of the descriptions under Knowledge Constructor, which might make more sense to others, were a bit vague and heady. EPP Chang responded that the focus areas were taken from national technology standards. Those standards have been the same for the past decade, with one addition. They ask students to use a variety of different digital tools to create an artifact. Chair Beatty commented that the standards were beautifully organized, and the Chair pointed to an editing error. After a discussion of the editing, the Chair wondered about the rigor of

the standards for kindergarteners and other young children. Ms. LeFevre commented that this is where a guidance document would be helpful to insure that elementary students could meet these goals. She noted that these standards were less about specific tools and more about global understanding so that students could use the tools in their day-to-day life. Chair Beatty commented that there were many phrases that referred readers back to the Computer Science section. How would that work? EPP Chang noted that there was quite a bit of overlap between the two. Rather than rewrite, the team thought it would be better to refer back to the Computer Standards so that teachers would recognize the interconnection between the two. Chair Beatty asked for whom the Integrated Technology Standards were intended. General Education teachers? EPP Chang replied that Nevada already had Integrated Technology standards, and had for quite some time. The Computer Science Standards went a step further to encourage computational thinking. Both are connected and for all students. Years ago, Computer Science Standards were just for Computer Science Teachers, but that's no longer the case. Chair Beatty noted that she had some trouble with some of the sentences. She pointed to an example under Grade Three. She pointed to a change in voice/grammatical issue in the 6-8 standards. In the Digital Citizen portion, the Chair asked if this would cover the idea/topic of getting information from multiple sources before making a decision on the validity of a particular piece of information. Ms. LeFevre responded that this would fall under the Knowledge Constructor portion of the standards. The Digital Citizen portion of the standards covered other issues. EPP Chang also commented that this was covered under the Knowledge Constructor portion of the standards.

- Chair Beatty asked the members about the rigor of the standards; Member Williams replied that they seemed quite rigorous. Chair Beatty asked about the accessibility of the standards to all students; Member Williams replied that nothing stood out as restricting access. She noted that teachers could remove the barriers for physically disabled students. Chair Beatty asked about connections to other disciplines and commented that it seemed handled well. Chair Beatty asked if the standards seemed like a manageable amount of content and noted that the guidance document would be valuable here. The Chair asked about the coherence, progression, and developmental appropriateness of the standards. Member Williams noted that the progression seemed quite reasonable to her. Member Haag noted that even fourth graders were quite advanced on computers and digital devices. These standards seemed quite reasonable to her. The Chair asked about the specificity of the standards; Member Haag thought they seemed quite reasonable. The Chair asked about the clarity of the standards, and Member Haag thought they were well written and quite easy to understand. The Chair asked about the measurability of the standards and if progress to be assessed. The Chair thought they were verifiable.
 - Member Williams made a motion to approve the proposed Computer Science and Integrated Technology Standards as presented today; Member Sirna seconded the motion.
 - The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item VIII: Health Standards Revision Update

- Chair Beatty transitioned to the next agenda item regarding the Health Standards.
 - Director Brancamp reminded the Council that they had given the Department permission to review the Health Standards in October 2018. He introduced Andrew Snyder, Education Programs Professional for Health, PE, and STEM. EPP Snyder noted that he was just going to give a quick update. They have 17 individuals (15 men, three women) from across Nevada working on the standards. He provided a breakdown of the composition of the group. The standards have been compiled and created, and the group is in the process of aligning and wordsmithing. The standards are grade specific for K-5 and banded for 6-8 and 9-12. They will still use national standards as the framework, and the group is hoping to have them ready for the Council in the late fall (a timeline that is contingent on the public hearing process). Members are more than welcome to attend the meetings, and the next one is on Monday, July 15th.
 - Chair Beatty asked for comments and wished EPP Snyder luck with the wordsmithing process.

- Director Brancamp noted that the standards will include sex education; as a result, members should be prepared for public comments as a public presence might be felt when those standards come before the Council.

Agenda Item IX: Presentation and discussion of ACT Alignment to Standards

- Chair Beatty transitioned to Agenda Item IX.
 - Mike Pacheco, Assistant Director of Assessment, set up his presentation and began to discuss [Item 9-Act In Nevada](#). Assistant Director Pacheco noted that the ACT was selected in 2013 as a College and Career Readiness assessment. In 2017, AB 7 made the ACT a federal reporting tool. ACT has gone through a Federal Peer Review for Wisconsin. Wisconsin shares Nevada's standards, making it a reasonable comparison. In ELA, all test items aligned to standards, and in Math, all items could be aligned to Nevada standards (56% High School, 44% Middle School). When examining Instructional Domains, 80% of Nevada's Reading Standards, 70% of Writing Ideas & Content, and 67% of Writing Linguistic Production align to the ACT. When addressing Math, Assistant Director Pacheco noted that the ACT is very Algebra heavy and does not address Modeling and some other elements of the Nevada Mathematical Standards.
 - Member Williams mentioned her concerns regarding the percentages and expressed her surprise that ACT and the standards were so far apart. In particular, while 100% of the Algebra standards are covered, some kids are not getting Algebra. In Language Arts, the percentages seem quite low (67% for example). Should we be reevaluating the use of the ACT? Assistant Director Pacheco noted that this was a legislative decision to use the ACT. It is typical to be selective when selecting standards and building an assessment. Without being selective, the assessment would be far too large. In other cases, Nevada has worked with other states and assessments to select standards.
 - Member Williams stated that some teachers have commented to her that the ACT does not match Nevada's Standards. Has this presentation been shared with legislators? Do they know the lack of alignment? Do they know the challenges of using the ACT? Are there any other national tests that could be more effective or a better match to Nevada's standards? Assistant Director Pacheco replied that there has been no request from the legislature for this information. His team has had no reason to investigate other assessments because they have not been asked to do so.
 - Dr. Moore noted that there were two main national exams, SAT and ACT. The methodology that Assistant Director Pacheco described is similar across the board for all assessments. There will come a time when the Department, along with stakeholders, will have a discussion about staying with ACT or going to other vendors. On the national landscape, states are either using the ACT/SAT or are designing their own assessments. When states (such as Arizona, where Dr. Moore was previously) design their own assessments, they can ensure a more direct alignment.
 - Member Williams asked when the ACT contract expires. Dr. Moore did not know the date off hand, but he commented that it was a few years away. The department will begin mapping out a timeline for proceeding as they discuss the exams. That will involve conversations with stakeholders.
 - Member Williams asked about the logistics since session only comes every two years. If we have a contract coming up, when will the legislature be reconsidering that? In addition, she asked Dr. Moore to speak about Arizona's experience in designing an assessment. What kind of feedback did they get? How much did it cost? Dr. Moore replied that one of the challenges for states that designed their own assessments was that there were no points of comparison. One of the advantages of participating in the ACT was that Nevada is a part of a group of states which can compare student performance. However, Arizona can't even compare itself against neighboring states because of its unique assessment tool. Dr. Moore was unsure on the specifics, but he believed that Arizona spent over \$20 million on designing the assessment. Member Williams noted that there was no need to discuss the matter further given that number.
 - Chair Beatty remarked that a main concern was the correlation between the standards and how well students are doing on the standards. Nevada holds students and teachers responsible. If there is a low correlation between standards and exams, how can we know the system worked? The Chair asked that the presentation be sent to all members. She wondered if Wisconsin had the Common Core; Assistant Director Pacheco confirmed that they do. The Chair noted that we have high standards and that we do not

want folks to be frustrated by the lack of correlation. The Chair asked if we had done a comparison of Nevada to the other 17 states that use the ACT; in particular, she was interested in a comparison to those with the Common Core. Assistant Director Pacheco responded that they had not done a comparison to other states with similar standards, but we have done a comparison to other states that use the ACT. Chair Beatty asked how we ranked in that comparison; Assistant Director Pacheco responded that we were at the bottom of the rankings. Chair Beatty stated that this is something that needs to get figured out since we do have great teachers and students here in Nevada. Perhaps we need to reevaluate the standards if they are out of sync with national standards. We need to figure out if the ACT is one of the stumbling blocks to success. Dr. Moore noted that, while we are last in the ACT rankings, we have seen an uptick in our scores. He would like to put together a data set that would show that we have seen improvement.

- Member Husson suggested that our ACT average is low because, at least in part, every Nevada student takes the test while other states do not make it a requirement. He agreed with Dr. Moore that there had been an uptick in scores, but he stated that the uptick was minor. We have only had the Common Core Standards and the ACT for the same amount of time (3-4 years), and so students who started with Common Core are not even close to being ready to take the ACT. It's very hard to say that the Common Core standards are aligned appropriately when students have not been taught under those standards for the majority of their schooling. The bigger point is if the standards will make students college and career ready. If we take it as a fact that the ACT accurately predicts success in college (and there are not many who would disagree), then it is not a matter of finding another test, it is a matter of making sure the standards are appropriate. If the ACT shows what matters in college, then that is what it is, and the standards might need to be reconsidered. The Common Core was designed by individuals who were operating in an academic environment. They were not able to test their beliefs. This is the time to test their beliefs about standards and determine if they were rigorous enough or not. We need to be very thoughtful to ensure that we are addressing the correct issues. We need to improve the standards as we go rather than looking for alternate tests. Just because there is a misalignment with ACT does not mean it is ACT that is wrong.
- Chair Beatty thanked Assistant Director Pacheco for his presentation.
- Member Williams thanked Member Husson for his comments and noted that it might be useful to do a more diagnostic look at the standards to determine why there is such a mismatch between the standards and the ACT.
- Member Husson asked if the alignment that exists between the ACT and the Standards is acceptable. Would it be possible to get an analysis of if a student is deemed to be proficient, does that mean they would do well on the ACT? How are students deemed "proficient and at standard" doing on the ACT? That seems appropriate work for the committee. Once we know, we can know that we are setting the right expectations for teachers and students. Member Williams noted that she was going to the same questions via the diagnostic portion. She pointed to some slides illustrating some serious gaps in the alignment. Why are some portions only at 8%? Do other states have higher percentages of alignment? Should we be looking at other states where the alignment/percentages are higher to see why their standards are better aligned?
 - Member Husson asked if the percentages that Member Williams cited on Page 8 really connoted a gap between the standards and the ACT. He understood those numbers quite differently. Assistant Director Pacheco clarified that the first line of the table on slide 8 illustrated that 63% of the items reviewed related back to the Key Ideas & Details standard. Member Williams replied that this meant that 37% of standards were not being addressed. Assistant Director Pacheco responded that that was not correct. 100% of items were covered by the standards, and Member Husson commented that 100% of items align to the standards but just not every standard. He asked if this meant if the standards that are not addressed were considered by the ACT to be irrelevant to success in college. Assistant Director Pacheco replied that ACT data suggests that students who meet their benchmarks have 80% chance of attaining a B or better in their first Math (generally basic Algebra) or ELA (often Composition)

class. Member Husson noted that this answer brought into question the use of the ACT. That suggests the ACT is quite narrow; much narrower than he thought it was.

- Chair Beatty asked that members do their research and come prepared with questions in the next meeting since this discussion should continue.

Agenda Item X: Discussion of Multi-cultural Competencies Standards

- Chair Beatty introduced the Multi-Cultural Competencies Standards discussion and Director Brancamp.
 - Director Brancamp offered up his staff in helping answer the previous questions. He noted that Member Williams had raised this topic in the previous meeting. He wished that Jayne Malorni, Education Programs Professional, was here to answer questions, but she was at a conference. EPP Malorni would come back for another meeting if there were questions he could not answer. Clark County did tell her that they were working on sample lessons for K-12 teachers, and they were using a train-the-trainer model. They have provided some training already (around 3000 educators in the 18-19 school year). Three rural districts (Douglas, Humbolt, and Lyon) have been working with the Northwest Development Team and have been holding meetings. Lyon County puts together a summit in the spring (in May) where 200 students come together at the main office to talk about, and make presentations on, the multi-cultural, economic, and financial literacy standards. They have developed a scope and sequence that they are willing to discuss and share with other districts. Just as a reminder, all the districts have to implement the standards in 2019-20. During 18-19, they were developing curriculum that they plan to share with one another. For example, Washoe has 45 extended lessons/units, and has another 24 coming out. They will be shared. Washoe has been training teachers, about 40 intensively, and they are planning on training teachers in the summer prior to the start of the 19-20 school year.
 - Member Williams asked for clarification on the number of lesson plans and trained teachers in Washoe County, which Director Brancamp provided. Member Williams asked about the 40 Washoe teachers who received in-depth training and what that meant. Director Brancamp noted that those teachers received 30 hours of training in order to create the scope and sequence for grades 4-12. Member Williams commented that CCSD was just now developing curriculum. There are some courses that can be taught in school as an elective (for example, the African American Experience). Those have been highly successful. They are working in teams to develop new curriculum as well.
 - Member Williams asked about the Department developing a library of resources online for state educators/districts. EPP Malorni had mentioned this to her in the past. What was the status of that library? She also wondered about the Great Teaching and Leading Fund grants. Did any grant applications for professional development include multi-cultural education? Director Brancamp responded that the website for Standards and Instructional Support is in the process of being revamped and redone. The new site will include a library of resources for all the standards. He preferred to let Dr. Moore discuss the Great Teaching and Leading Fund grants. Dr. Moore started by mentioning AB 309. AB 309 created block grants for districts use money as they see fit. Nevada Ready 21, the Great Teaching and Leading Fund, and other programs were included in that bill. All these funds were put into block grants that will be given to districts. Each district will be provided a set amount, and the districts have quite a bit of latitude on how to spend that money. Districts can spend all or none of their funds in the Great Teaching and Leading fund. The money will be sent out in July, and the districts will need to provide details on how they plan to spend it. Member Williams asked what happened to the grant applications that were sent in prior to the passage of AB 309. Dr. Moore noted that the law required the Department to return the applications. He could not speak to the applications submitted by districts or if they included any interest in multi-cultural professional development opportunities.

Agenda Item XI: Council Policies

- Chair Beatty transferred to Agenda Item XI. In particular, she drew the Council's attention to the [Meeting Guidelines: NDE Academic Standards Council](#) document posted on the Council's webpage. The Chair noted that much of the document was taken from the Legislative commitment/regulations. It may be helpful for the Council to focus on the later parts of the document; in particular, she asked the Council to

examine the Ten Ground Rules for Meetings portion. She asked Director Brancamp to discuss this portion of the document.

- Director Brancamp thanked Chair Beatty for her work in putting this document together. Director Brancamp noted that the Council cannot act without a quorum. As individuals are aware, without five members, the Council grinds to a halt. The work is important, and members of committees, NDE staff, and members of the public come in to advise the Council. Once standards are passed, they have to go to the State Board of Education, and then they go through a legal adoption process. If the Council does not meet, the standards grind to a halt. The Guidelines ask members to come prepared, and to attend in-person if at all possible. We do have a budget, so perhaps we will be able to schedule in-person meetings in the future. He expressed his thanks to AG Gardner for taking a look at these items.
- Chair Beatty noted the importance of arriving to the meetings on time. These rules would hopefully make the council be a bit more efficient. Member Williams noted that she had access to the document via the website, but Members' Haag and Sirna noted that they had not reviewed the document in advance. As a result, Dr. Moore put the document up on the screens.
 - Member Williams noted a few typos within the document, and there was some discussion of those items.
- Chair Beatty continued going through the Ten Ground Rules. The Chair noted that there were issues meeting quorum when some members missed the entirety of the meeting. This document suggested that Members should not miss more than one meeting per year or risk being removed from the Council.
 - Member Sirna stated that he had no issues with the document.
 - Deputy Attorney General Gardner noted that individuals could not be automatically removed; instead, they could be recommended for removal. That is the way the document was written.
 - Member Williams noted that she completely supported the document and that she had seen too many cases of trying to round up members at the very last moment. There is nothing worse than to go to a meeting that turns out to be a waste of time since there is no quorum.
 - Member Husson made a motion to approve the guidelines. Member Williams seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item XII: Next Meeting and Future Agenda Items

- Chair Beatty pointed out that a continuation of the ACT discussion had already been decided during the discussion of that item.
 - Director Brancamp noted that the Math and ELA standards were adopted in 2010, and it would be an Agenda item in the fall to request for the Council's approval to create a committee to review those standards. He noted those standards had been built with the aid of the College Board. He asked that some of his staff be involved in the discussion of those standards and of the ACT.
 - Member Williams asked for a report from the Department on the implementation of the Multi-Cultural Standards by district. It should be rolled out in the fall, so she would like to know where we are by district.
- Chair Beatty asked about meeting dates (the afternoons of Tuesday, October 22nd, Tuesday October 29th, Monday November 4th, or Wednesday November 6th).
 - Member Williams stated that November 4th would not simply work for her; either of the October dates would be acceptable.
 - Chair Beatty asked if someone could make a motion for October 22nd.
 - Member Williams made a motion setting the motion for October 22nd, and Dr. Moore voiced an objection to making a motion for the dates.
 - Chair Beatty put on the record that the Council would prefer to hold the next meeting on either the October 22nd or October 29th dates.

Agenda Item XIII: Public Comment #2

In Las Vegas:

- No public comment

In Carson City:

- No public comment

Agenda Item XIV: Adjournment

- Member Husson made a motion to adjourn; Member Sirna seconded. The motion passed unanimously.