

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
APRIL 26, 2018  
9:00 A.M.

**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)*

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

**In Las Vegas**

Felicia Ortiz  
Robert Blakely  
Tamara Hudson  
Tonia Holmes-Sutton  
Mark Newburn

**In Carson City**

Hunter Drost  
Dave Jensen – departed at 12:09 p.m.  
David Carter

**In Elko**

Cathy McAdoo  
Dawn Miller

**DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:**

**In Carson City**

Brett Barley, Deputy Superintendent, Student Achievement  
Roger Rahming, Deputy Superintendent, Business and Support Services  
Dave Brancamp, Director, Standards and Instructional Support  
Sarah Nick, Management Analyst  
Megan Hanke, Management Analyst  
Peter Zutz, Administrator, Assessments, Data and Accountability  
Russ Keglovits, Assistant Director, Assessments, Data and Accountability  
Greg Bortolin, Public Information Office  
Sarah Hicks, Management Analyst  
Seng Dao Kee, Director, Student and School Supports  
Karl Wilson, Education Programs Supervisor  
Kevin Marie Laxalt, Education Programs Professional  
Karen Chessell, Education Programs Professional  
Andre De Leon, Education Programs Professional  
Randi Hunewill, Education Programs Supervisor

Karen Johansen, Assistant to the State Board of Education  
Shawn Osborne, IT Technician

**In Las Vegas**

Steve Canavero, Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Dena Durish, Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement  
Kim Bennett, Administrative Assistant

**LEGAL STAFF PRESENT**

**In Las Vegas**

Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:**

**In Carson City:**

Bryn Lapenta, Washoe County School District  
Jeannine Bell, Washoe County School District  
Becky Cartright, Washoe County School District  
Ana Warren, Washoe County School District  
Cristal Cisneros, Washoe County School District  
Allison Combs, Nevada System of Higher Education  
Susan Moore, Douglas County School District  
Kimm Rombardo, NWEA  
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents  
Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District  
Terry Whitney, College Board  
Adam Drost, Legislative Counsel Bureau

**In Las Vegas:**

Rebecca Meyer, Clark County School District  
Barbara Lindsay, Clark County School District  
Monte Bay, National University  
R. Gourrier, Tri-Strategies  
Jesse Welsh, Clark County School District  
Kenneth Retzl, Clark County School District  
Kathy Mead, Clark County School District  
Chad Gregorius, Clark County School District  
Erik Skramstad, Clark County School District  
Renisha O'Donnell, Clark County Education Association  
Brandon Mueller, Clark County School District  
Monica Beane, ETS  
Jennifer Williamson, SLAM Academy  
April Key, Clark County School District  
Theo Small, Clark County Education Association  
Zane Gray, Sierra Nevada College  
Mica Lesser, Pearson  
Thea Lawatsch, Pearson  
Yvonne Rohde, Pearson  
Bill Garis, CCASA  
Brenda Pearson, Clark County Education Association  
Doris Watson, University of Nevada Las Vegas  
Phoebe Redmond, Clark County School District  
Patricia Haddael, Opportunity 180  
Stephen Augspurger, CCASA  
Bryan Mortensen, Parent

Tabetha Haley, NWEA  
Barbara Konrad, HOPE  
Lisa Dzierbicki, State Sponsored Charter School Association  
Meg Nigro, Clark County School District

### **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m. with attendance as reflected above.

### **Public Comment #1**

Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District (WCSD), commented on the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF). The WCSD is concerned about the methodology being used in the high school performance framework, including alternative and temporary placement schools, magnet schools and the norming of comprehensive high schools is a flawed methodology. They are also concerned that chronic absenteeism is a constantly changing measure in Nevada. This should be explored so schools can make actionable plans to do better on this important measure. As numerous studies have shown, the ACT is weakly aligned to the Nevada Academic Content Standards. This is not a theoretical concern, there is a real danger the weight the ACT carries and the NSPF will drive instruction. That is significantly more narrow than this Board intended when the standards were adopted in recent years. They believe that a concrete and systemic year-to-year comparison for schools is important for accountability. They want the star system to mean something to schools and they are nervous that the methodology is unclear.

Kristine Minnich, Assistant Superintendent, Clark County School District (CCSD) said it is being proposed that the high school NSPF consists of the following indicators: student engagement, English language proficiency, graduation rates, college and career readiness and academic achievement. Each indicator is worth a percentage of points used to rate the success of high schools throughout Nevada. While stakeholders may agree the indicators are critical to the success of the schools, there are concerns about how academic achievement is being measured. With the transition of end-of-course exams from high to medium stakes, there is a need to identify a universal assessment at the high school level. Because the ACT is the only universal assessment at the high school level, it is being proposed to use this to measure whether schools are successfully teaching the adopted Academic Content Standards. The ACT may be efficient because it is already in place, but by its nature it is not designed to measure the proficiency of ELA and math standards. Twenty percent of a school's star rating is based upon whether or not students are proficient (inaudible). The ACT predicts the likelihood of success the first year of college. National experts caution against using college admission tests to measure a student's mastery of academic standards, it is not what they were designed to do.

Rebecca Meyer, Director of Assessment, CCSD, said that CCSD recognizes and appreciates the flexibility offered in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) that allows states to measure academic achievement with college entrance exams in lieu of standards based assessments. It is worth noting that national experts are cautioning states against using a college entrance exam as a measure of proficiency. It is critical to highlight the potential implications of using a college assessment to measure students mastery of the Nevada Academic Content Standards. Most achievement tests are based on academic standards and designed to measure mastery of the standards. The ACT is an assessment designed to predict a student's success in college. It is a college readiness, not mastery of Academic Content Standards adopted by the Board in 2010. A recent alignment study conducted by Achieve, a non-profit education policy organization, shows that less than half the items for ELA and math on the ACT were aligned to the Common Core Standards. Recognizing this disconnect, CCSD suggested applying the same logic recommended by the NDE and approved by the Board relative to the end-of-course proficiency levels, which is to include partial understanding, level 2 as proficient along with the proposed levels of 3 and 4 as it relates to the NSPF. By including level 2 as proficient, schools will not be penalized for focusing their instruction on the standards adopted by the Board and implemented in classrooms throughout Nevada.

Theo Small, Vice President, Clark County Education Association, commented on the incentives for attracting educators to Nevada and high-needs schools. A recent memo went out from CCSD encouraging

individuals who are non-title schools to transfer. He commented about the impact on the current educators in those schools to ensure that they have committed to the students. In the 15-17 contract, He asked how educators are incentivized to attract people to the highest needs schools. The highest vacancies are in the highest needs schools. Only new educators are incentivized into coming in to a high-needs school. It is a slap in the face for educators who are doing the work with those students today. He requested consideration for a modification within the current regulations. Before the 15-17 contract, members were surveyed and asked, should an educator who works in a title 1, tier 1, tier II school, be benefited differently than a non-title schools. Over 70 percent of the peers said yes. Even educators working throughout the school district recognize the extra work in these schools.

Renisha O'Donnell, School Organizational Teams (SOT) Project Coordinator, Clark County Education Association (CCEA), informed that part of her role is to facilitate the election process for the licensed educators that are on their SOTs and to meet with SOT members across the district to provide resources. This is the first full year of implementation of A.B. 469. Some of the resources have supported SOTs with training in family engagement and school climate, budgeting, and how to serve on the SOT. She has observed a variety of experiences SOT members have from highly collaborative schools to principle driven in the top-down approach to decision makings of the school. The bill was put into place so schools are able to have autonomy to make the best decisions for their school and the student population they are serving. Ms. O'Donnell said there is an overall culture of fear to bring up any challenges because of retaliation about being too vocal.

Brenda Pearson, Director of Professional Learning, Clark County Education Association, expressed concern about the parental involvement and family engagement provision. They became a requirement in 2015 to ensure the ability to build relationships within schools, outreach to families and develop an appreciation and understanding of families from diverse backgrounds. The media recently shared there are 900 teachers who have not completed their parental involvement and family engagement provision requirement. Currently there are 450 vacancies within the CCSD, which would add an additional 900 teacher vacancies if it comes to fruition. This is a great concern for the community. The Legislature is discussing an emergency regulation to ensure these teachers are not lost. This would add an additional year so these teachers are not out of compliance. The commitment for this provision is to pursue and achieve three semester hours at a university approved by the NDE. The university cost is usually \$500 - \$1200 which has become a hurdle for teachers, additionally the time commitment is a concern. (inaudible)

**Member Blakely moved to approve a flexible agenda. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion Carried.**

### **President's Report**

Vice President Newburn informed that today is student representative, Hunter Drost's, last meeting. Member Drost attends Oasis Academy and will be graduating with a diploma and an Associate's Degree, which is a goal the Board has been pushing for. Member Drost thanked the board for their generosity and the experience he gained as a board member.

### **Superintendent's Report**

Superintendent Canavero provided updates of the following:

- Discussions are ongoing regarding the timeline for the Parental Involvement and Family Engagement provision for teacher licenses.
- Senate Bill 225 required the NDE to amend the model bullying policy to include the needs of gender diverse students. A third public hearing will be conducted on Friday, May 11, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. with some changes in regulatory language.
- A joint CCSD reorganization implementation plan was created with local input. (inaudible) Recently, the plan was brought to the CCSD Board of Trustees for discussion. It is a very different model of governance.

- The Governor's School Safety Task Force will hold its first meeting May 3. Meetings are also scheduled on July 11, August 27 and October 25. Changes that need to be made along with funding will be discussed.
- The S.B. 178 funding study has launched. In addition to providing the \$1200 per pupil it also provides \$250,000 to contract with an entity to study the funding system to make recommendations. The material for the S.B. 178 working committee is posted on the NDE website, under the funding study working committee.
- Working with the Governor's office, budgets and bill draft requests are being prepared for the 2019 legislative session.
- Stacy Dallas Johnson will join as the Teacher Leader in Residence and will help with adding a teacher's voice to decisions being made across the state. She is currently at the Las Vegas Academy in CCSD, and was one of seven teachers in 2016 to serve as a teacher ambassador under the Obama administration.
- Nevada's lead has been extended over New Mexico in the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) completion campaign. Nevada is in a race to beat New Mexico in the greatest increase of completion of FAFSA. This is access to free federal funds for eligible students who do not believe they can go to college because they cannot afford it.

In response to an inquiry from member Ortiz, Superintendent provided further updates on S.B. 179 and S.B. 225.

#### **Approval of Consent Agenda**

- a. Possible Approval of a revision to Career and Technical Education standards for Marketing.
- b. Possible Approval of the regulations adopted by the Commission on Professional Standards per NRS 391.027; R053-17;
- c. Possible approval of licensing of one Washoe County Private School for a four year period:
  - Brookfield School
- d. Possible approval of textbook materials for Carson City School District
  - Science, Earth Science: Geology, The Environment and the Universe; Grades 9-12
- e. Possible approval of textbook materials for Clark County School District
  - Science, Living by Chemistry ; Grades 9-12
  - ELA, My Perspectives; Grades 9-12
- f. Possible Approval of the following minutes:
  - November 28, 2017 Regulation meeting
  - January 11, 2018 Regulation meeting
  - January 18, 2018 State Board of Education meeting
  - March 15, 2018 State Board of Education meeting

Member Holmes-Sutton noted that member Ortiz's attendance was listed twice in the March 15, 2018 Board minutes.

**Member Holmes-Sutton moved to approve the Consent Agenda with the March 15, 2018 board meeting attendance corrected for member Ortiz. Member Blakely seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Public hearing and possible adoption of proposed regulation R120-17, NAC Chapter 389 requiring the State Board of Education to prescribe criteria for a pupil to receive a standard high school diploma, which must include the requirements that: (1) A pupil enrolled in grade 11 take the college and career readiness assessment administered pursuant to NRS 390.610; and, (2) Commencing with the graduating class of 2022 and each graduating class thereafter, a pupil successful complete a course of study designed to prepare the pupil for graduating from high school and for readiness for college and career.**

Vice president Newburn opened the public hearing at 10:00 a.m. There were 24 individuals present in Carson City and 30 individuals present in Las Vegas.

As chair of the High School Graduation Committee, vice president Newburn provided an overview of the rationale for the change to the standard diploma. Nevada has a standard and an advanced diploma. The advanced diploma targets kids who are interested in attending college, and the standard diploma targets kids who want to go straight into the workforce. The content difference between the two is that the advanced diploma has a fourth year math, and third year for science and social studies. When vice president Newburn graduated from Rancho High School, he said that 75 percent of jobs required only a high school diploma or less. Now that number is down to less than 33 percent. Jobs have been lost due to automation and outsourcing, which has had an impact on the value of the standard diploma.

As early as 2010, CCSD began their 21<sup>st</sup> century course of study as they no longer thought the standard diploma was sufficient to get kids college or career ready. There have been complaints of higher remediation rates for standard diploma students along with requests to use the National Career Readiness Certificate (NCRC) signaling they no longer think the standard diploma has currency. Four years ago the Board created a Graduation Requirement sub-committee to look at what it would take to re-claim value on the standard diploma. A student who is earning the standard diploma and wants to go to a four-year college should be taking a fourth math class at algebra 2 or higher. A student who is in the welding program would be better served completing the final course in the CT sequence. Another issue is the standard diploma is the true bar of the education system. Attempting to change this measure sends earthquakes through the system and there were times it appeared politically impossible to change the standard diploma.

The Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) presented research showing that 70 percentage of students earning a standard diploma, attempting to enter their system, required remediation. The remediation problem in Nevada is basically a standard diploma problem. In addition, research showed that students with an advanced diploma had approximately half the remediation rate. Research showed the importance of the total number and level of math and science credits in predicting success. Their recommendations were to move the standard diploma towards the advanced diploma, or at the minimum require a fourth math. Feedback from the Nevada economic sectors related to career readiness was they appreciated students that were in the career technical programs, and please make more of them. Every economic sector requested students have more advanced computer skills.

Nevada Revised Statute 389.018 provides a recommended course of study that includes four years of math, three years of science and three years of social studies. It also has what some view as an exemption if the standard diploma is a lower standard. The thought was to move the standard diploma towards four years of math and three years of science and social studies. Feedback was received to look at the total credits of 24 and were asked to lower that. Many students were barely making the credit mark and there was a need to give them room in case they had a bad class or parts of a bad semester, and 23 credits was considered. Electives were moved from 7.5 to 5 and that was considered to be too deep a cut. The thought was if you want kids to graduate, you have to keep them in school, and these are the courses that keep them in school. Six credits was decided on. (inaudible).

Students were going to need to make a decision about whether they were going to be a CTE student or be in music or sports. Additional feedback was to have a system with flexibility. The approach taken was similar to the approach taken for the college and career readiness diploma. The requirements were raised from 22.5 to 23, lower the electives from 7.5 to 6 to carve out 2 credits. The philosophy of these two college and career ready flex credits were asking students to take 2 more credits of either college or career ready. In an environment that no longer has high stake exit exams, this was reasonable. Students are being asked to be more accountable. For students in a college track program such as the 21<sup>st</sup> century program, the degree is essentially the same. For students in the career and technical programs, the degree is essentially the same. One of the things this does is taking the two credits, and limit the categories of classes that can be taken in those two credits. The college track categories are a fourth year of math, third year of science and social studies. The career track categories are second or third year of a CTE sequence

and S.B. 200 allows computer science which is both a college and a career track course to count as a fourth year math or a third year science. There are six categories of courses that can be used to satisfy the two credit flex-credit. This re-elevates the career track to be a high bar track at an equivalent level of the college track. The CTE programs have done a fantastic job of graduating students and getting students career and college ready. It creates a system with the new career ready diploma and it brings compliance with NRS 389.018 closer.

Brett Barley, Deputy Superintendent, Student Achievement discussed the extensive stakeholder engagement process in the course of writing the regulation language. Language included in A.B.7 from the 2017 Legislative Session states that the Board shall adopt regulations that prescribe the criteria for a pupil to receive a standard high school diploma. It must include without limitation a requirement that commencing with the graduating class of 2022 and each graduating class thereafter, a pupil shall successfully complete a course of study designed to prepare that pupil for graduation from high school and for readiness for college and career.

### **Public Comment**

Jesse Welsh, Assistant Superintendent, CCSD, introduced his two children, Andres and Zoey, that were participating in “national take your sons and daughters to work day”, and thanked NDE and the committee for their work on this regulation. CCSD supports the recommended changes to the requirements for the high school standard diploma. They recognize the need to raise the bar for students in Nevada to ensure all students are college and career ready. While this increases the overall credit requirement from 22.5 credits to 23 credits for the class of 2022, as required by A.B. 7, it should not create an undue burden on the schools and students.

Andrew Welsh publically recognized the NDE and the committee for their collaborative efforts to receive feedback from the districts and high school principals. Since early November 2017, the NDE has shared draft language and made adjustments based upon comments and questions raised. (inaudible)

Zoey Welsh added to comments shared by the CCSD team and highlight how the flex credit will allow students like her to meet graduation requirements with any two credit combination of a fourth year of math, a third year of social studies, a third year of science.

**Member Holmes-Sutton moved to adopt R120-17. Member Blakely seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Information, Discussion, and Possible Action regarding preliminary allocations of New Teacher Incentives.** Possible action may include approval of preliminary district requests for FY19 New Teacher Incentives funding pursuant to SB544 and AB434 (2017) to enable districts to estimate stipend amounts offered during the final months of recruitment for the upcoming school year.

Dena Durish, Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement stated that in 2015 the New Teacher Incentives were part of S. B. 511. The bill provided \$5 million a year for teachers new to Nevada or second year teachers. The law stated the funds were only for teachers in Title I schools or one and two star schools. In addition, when the Legislature passed the budget bill, another \$5 million was added. In FY16 there was \$10 million and in FY 17 there was another \$10 million to use for new teacher incentives. During the 2017 Legislative session \$7.5 million was moved out of teacher incentives and put into Zoom schools. This meant Zoom schools could (inaudible) for retention of existing teachers, transfer or recruitment of new teachers, or reading centers in Zoom schools. That left \$2.5 million in the biennium.

Assembly Bill 434 from the 2017 Legislative session included a new teacher incentive and added an additional \$2.5 million, for a total of \$5 million in each year of the biennium to use for new teacher incentives. The requirements remained the same, a teacher could not have taught in Nevada the previous year, must teach in a Title I school, or a one or two star school, and special education teachers from any school could receive the new teacher incentive. This is for the current first fiscal year of the biennium, the

board previously approved new teachers that already started this year. The districts were awarded the funds and made projections based on projections.

Today the incentives are only for new teachers. In addition, A.B. 474 included a section that stated an additional \$2.5 million for anyone who is not currently teaching at a Title I or a one or two star school, and if they transfer into a school that meets the criteria, they would be eligible for additional funds. The law is firm that funds must only be used for a teacher transferring into one of the listed schools. A teacher is only eligible to move and be eligible for the transfer money if that the teacher taught for a minimum of three years, with their evaluations effective or highly effective. In addition, the teacher must have full licensure with no provisions on their license. Deputy Durish discussed challenges, including that several school districts are not eligible for these funds because they do not have Title I schools and some districts schools have all Title I schools.

Deputy Durish discussed the [FY19 document](#) for new Teacher Program Incentives reminding the Board they are required to approve teacher incentives. The school districts provided the information in the document, the projected new hires, the amount requested for each new hire and the requested total amount. There is only \$5 million for new teachers but there is an additional \$2.3 million in carry-over funds from the previous year so there is enough funds to approve the \$7.2 million. This will allow the districts to recruit new teachers.

Member Ortiz asked to clarify this only covers a portion of new hires and special education teachers, and not the transfers. Deputy Durish concurred.

**Member Blakely moved to approve the preliminary dollar amounts for each district that has been requested for FY19 funds to offer teacher incentives for new teachers for the school year. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

**Information and Discussion regarding the Nevada Achievement School District.** The State Board will hear an update about schools expected to open in the fall of 2018 and receive information about how recently approved regulations will impact the Nevada Achievement School District process next year, including the possible adoption of a parent petition process.

Rebecca Feiden, Director, Achievement School District (ASD), said the ASD is focused on improving outcomes for student zone to the lowest performing schools, and the addition of neighborhood option achievement charter schools aligns with that intent. The addition of two new neighborhood options schools this coming fall is exciting. Director Feiden conducted a [PowerPoint presentation](#) regarding the ASD. She shared that Urban Prep charter school has deferred to the 2019-2020 school year and that both Urban Prep and the ASD are committed to a strong start that will meet the needs of students. Further updates were provided about Urban Prep, Nevada Rise Academy and the school selection process. Ms. Feiden discussed the school selection process, the petition process and the importance of elevating the parent voice in the decisions (inaudible).

Director Feiden reviewed the Board's role and responsibilities regarding the parent petition. The Board is responsible for approving a standard petition form. A draft form is provided today and feedback is requested to bring the form back for approval at the June board meeting. In addition, the Board is responsible for adopting a resolution approving valid petitions by December 31. The ASD will receive, validate and verify the petitions, and will notify the Board of those petitions in advance of the December board meeting. Details were provided about the petition process, what a school can petition for, eligibility, and protections in place for parent, students and teachers. The goal is to have a form that is simple and easy to use for parents and families.

Member Jensen inquired about the petition process and the paid collector, inquiring whether the achievement charter or a non-provider can initiate the petition process? Director Feiden responded the regulation states that no public funds can be used in the petition process. The intent is to ensure that dollars (inaudible) are not used to petition. A school's PTA or a non-profit organization could raise

dollars. Member Jensen asked whether a potential provider could reach out to schools that are on the potential list to try to secure business. Director Feiden responded they could, the threshold for a successful petition is fifty percent. It is a high bar for the number of people required to commit to the plan. Extensive work would need to be done to convince people that the plan and intention is good.

Member Jensen inquired about people collecting signatures on school property and that that must obey school rules. NRS 293.127565 requires that counties provide a notice of designated areas to collect signatures. Humboldt county has no specific notices of locations to collect signatures for their schools. Is the interpretation that schools are open for pollsters to be on school properties to collect signatures? Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott responded he has not reviewed the individual county statutes referenced. The intent would be the petitioners would need to follow all rules in place. Member Jensen said if school rules do not allow pollsters to be on school properties, will that be appropriate per this regulation? Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott responded he will need to further review the regulation. Director Feiden pointed out that petitions cannot be circulated on school property during school hours which protects the educational learning time for students.

Member Holmes-Sutton expressed concern for families that are not secure in a residence or undocumented and for families that do not have a home or address. Some families live in vehicles and other places that are not secure or safe. Deputy Barley responded her concern about vulnerable students is valid. Director Feiden said she would add guidance for parents and families that do not have permanent addresses and will research recommendations.

Member Ortiz expressed concern about the information becoming public record for those families that are undocumented or families and that women and children in domestic violence situations may not want their information public. She asked to research the ability to redact that information if it becomes public record.

### **Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding the Read by Grade Three Act (SB 391-2015)**

This presentation is meant to provide the Board members with an overview of their statutory responsibilities regarding the Read by Grade 3 retention requirements (to begin in July, 2019). The Board must first identify the required score that Grade 3 pupils must obtain on the State's English language arts examination in order to be promoted to Grade 4. The Board must then identify the name of the alternative examination for Grade 3 pupils who do not obtain a passing score on the State's English language arts examination, and also identify the required score that such pupils must obtain on the identified alternative assessment in order to be promoted to Grade 4.

Deputy Barley said the Board will discuss decisions that need to be made regarding the Read by Grade 3 (RBG3) law. A workshop is scheduled for May 8 and then it will return to the board in a public hearing. The RBG3 Program was created to provide effective early interventions for all K-3 students who are struggling in reading.

A [PowerPoint](#) presentation was conducted by Karl Wilson, Education Programs Supervisor and Kevin Laxalt, Education Programs Professional regarding promotion, retention and decision making for RBG3. The purpose of Nevada's RBG3 program is to dramatically improve student achievement by ensuring all Nevada students are able to read proficiently by the end of third grade. The goals of Nevada's RBG 3 Program include:

- Goal 1: Improve student achievement
- Goal 2: Improve K-3 literacy instruction
- Goal 3: Establish a statewide K-3 reading assessment framework
- Goal 4: Develop cultures of literacy
- Goal 5: Ensure Accessibility for all learners.

The presentation included discussions regarding:

- Identification of Passing Score on Grade 3 Smarter Balanced ELA

- K-3 reading policy by State
- National look at Read by Grade 3 promotion/retention decision –making
- Overview of smarter Balanced Performance Levels
- Nevada’s Spring Reading CRT results – Grade 3
- NDE’s recommendations and rationale
- Identification of an alternative assessment as a good-cause exemption
  - National look at Alternative Assessments
  - Nevada’s history with NWEA MAP Growth K-3 reading assessment
  - NDE’s recommendation and rationale
- Identification of passing score grade 3 MAP growth assessment
  - Grade 3 MAP reading assessment levels
  - Nevada’s winter 2017-2018 MAP growth results – grade 3
  - NDE’s recommendation and rationale

In response to questioning from member Ortiz, Deputy Barley responded that impact data would be brought back to the Board. The data will be more accurate when the spring MAP results become available. Regarding questioning about full RBG3 interventions, Deputy Barley said the RBG3 law is a requirement of every school across Nevada. Every school will have a literary strategist and every school is using the MAP assessment to identify struggling readers to create individual student literacy plans. Some of the lowest performing schools have been prioritized and received funding. He added the total number of students in Nevada schools will not change as a result of the retention or promotion decision, but the distribution of students across 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade level could be impacted. Discussions with school districts are occurring to make sure that is taken into consideration.

Member Hudson expressed concern about every school having a learning strategist. Deputy Barley said by law every school in the state every school is to designate a learning strategist, whether there is a teacher in the building that is doing double duty is a school based decision.

Member Ortiz asked if a student is EL and they can read fluently in Spanish or another language, is that taken into consideration. Deputy Barley said for that decision a student support team could take it into consideration. Member Ortiz said she was struggling with the large number of students that would potentially be retained, and the schools will be challenged in accommodating them. In addition, there are many ways to get out of the retention, which invalids the process. Member Barley said the good news is there is time for additional discussions with the upcoming workshop and public hearing. Decisions will not be made today.

Member Blakely said students who are reading two grade levels below the grade they are in may never graduate from high school if the problem continues through their school career. If it is not addressed in third grade, then when?

Member Carter commented that students with disabilities may have additional challenges functioning in society, and helping them progress as far as they can may be more important than holding them back.

**Information and Discussion regarding the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) high school model.** The Board will receive a briefing on the updated high school component of the NSPF designed to comply with the approved Every Student Succeeds Act.

Deputy Barley recalled this past fall the NDE released star ratings for elementary and middle schools in alignment with the new Every Student Succeeds Plan (ESSA). The stars were not released for the high school framework due to the transitions with the End of Course examinations becoming district administered, the statewide final exams and the need to find the different measure of academic achievement in the high school framework.

The assessment office has been working with stakeholders across the state to develop the high school framework in alignment with the framework values that were included in the ESSA plan. The

presentation show the point totals that were approved through the ESSA plan and five year strategic plan remain, however some components within those measures that contribute to making the point totals have shifted.

Peter Zutz, Administrator, Assessments, Data and Accountability (ADAM) and Russ Keglovits, Assistant Director, ADAM, conducted a [PowerPoint](#) presentation regarding the High School Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF). The presentation informed about the NSPF history and evolution from 2012 to the present. Because of the 2015 testing irregularity there was not sufficient data to calculate growth and the 2014 school ratings were carried over. In 2017 a new accountability system was created and provided informational ratings that supported the shift from the 2014 ratings to the 2017 ratings.

Additional information was provided about:

- The requirement to desegregate data, and the measures for all indicators will be desegregate by the 10 sub-group populations and the performance of the sub-groups will contribute to the overall school rating.
- Measuring School Performance
- How Schools Earn Stars
- 2017 and 2018 High School NSPF
- Summary of Changes

Member Newburn inquired if there will be a way to count National Career Readiness Certificate (NCRC) to encourage more students to take that test. Deputy Barley said it might be a year or two premature because it is a new diploma. Member Newburn said it is his understanding that components from the College and Career degree were taken and attempting to break them out separately but the NCRC component was not taken out. Deputy Barley concurred adding the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB), another assessment for the College and Career readiness diploma, is included. Member Newburn responded that the College and Career Readiness category is more a college readiness category and less a career category because the ASVAB and NCRC were not included.

Member Ortiz expressed concern that the ACT is the academic achievement measure, is not aligned to Nevada standards, and was not intended for this purpose. She asked if there has been discussion about other potential measures. She also expressed concern about what she considers highly inflated graduation rates (inaudible). Many kids require remediation when they get to college indicating kids are being passed that should not be. Is there consideration about lowering the graduation rate (inaudible).

Deputy Barley responded that as graduation rates climb it becomes a less precise measure determining which high schools are having success and which are not. He added that ESSA had a requirement that all standards are aligned with the entrance requirements for college course work in higher education. Using a college entrance exam in the framework is aligned with the intent of ESSA. The ACT has longevity, validity and is a nationally data sample on college readiness across multiple states. Providing a college entrance exam that is provided for free to all students is an equity win, and satisfies state and federal reporting requirements is efficient at the high school level.

**Information and Discussion regarding the report submitted by Senate Bill 108 subcommittee.** The Senate Bill 108 subcommittee of the State Board of Education was created to study the manner in which to include certain instruction in criminal law in the required units of credit in social studies and specifies certain crimes which frequently involve persons under the age of 18 years that must be included in the instruction. In addition, this bill requires that such instruction emphasize personal responsibility for understanding and complying with the law and lists specific topics to be included as part of this instruction.

Mary Holsclaw, Education Program Professional, conducted a brief [PowerPoint](#) presentation. She informed that S.B. 108 required the Board to create a committee to study the incorporation of instruction relating to crimes involving persons under the age of 18 into a course of 3 credits in Social Studies. The instruction must include, without limitation, crimes involving:

- Sexual conduct
- Alcohol and controlled substances
- Domestic violence
- Stalking
- Destruction of property

Information was included regarding personal responsibility for understanding and complying with the law, and information to assist victims and witnesses of such crimes. The subcommittee held several meetings and when the study is completed the subcommittee will provide recommendations regarding curriculum, licensure or endorsement, professional development and similar instruction to the Commission on Professional Standards, Council to Establish Academic Standards, and the Board.

**Information, Discussion and Possible Action regarding Class Size Reduction.** The Board will receive reports for each elementary school for which the State Board of Education approved a class size reduction variance, as well as the justification for any such variances for Q1 and Q2 of FY18. Senate Bill 544, Section 11 (2017 Legislature), requires pupil-to-teacher ratios of 17:1 for grades 1 and 2 and 20:1 in grade 3 through the 2017-19 biennium. In accordance with NRS 388.700(4), the State Board of Education may grant a variance from the required pupil-to-teacher ratios to a school district for good cause, including the lack of available financial support specifically set aside for the reduction of pupil-to-teacher ratios. Additional action may include the submission of FY14 Q3 and Q4 reports for which the Legislative Counsel Bureau has no record.

Megan Hanke, Management Analyst, presented the quarterly Classroom Size Reduction for Q1 and Q2 of FY 18 in addition, Q3 and Q4 of FY14, which were found not to be on record per the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

There was discussion between member Ortiz and Superintendent Canavero regarding concerns about the effectiveness of CSR.

**Member Ortiz moved to approve the Classroom Size Reduction report. Member Hudson seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

#### **Future Agenda items**

Member Newburn noted the School Safety Task Force as a future item.

#### **Public Comment #2**

Bryan Mortensen provided written comment that he read into the record. (Attachment A)

The meeting was adjourned at 1:28 p.m.