

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
REGULATION MEETING
AUGUST 21, 2017

Meeting Locations:

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

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

(Video Conferenced)

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

In Carson City

Brett Barley, Deputy Superintendent, Student Achievement
Kris Nelson, Director, Career Readiness, Adult Learning and Education Options
Dave Brancamp, Director, Standards and Instructional Support
Karen Johansen, Assistant to the State Board of Education
Shawn Osborne, IT Technician

In Las Vegas

Dena Durish, Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement
Kim Bennett, Administrative Assistant

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

In Carson City

Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

In Las Vegas:

Barbara Perez, Clark County School District
Cindy Ortiz, SNRPDP
Karl Spendlove, SNRPDP
Craig Stevens, Clark County School District
Sheryl Colgan, Clark County School District
Jesse Welsh, Clark County School District
Kathy Mead, Clark County School District
Amy Raymer, Clark County School District
Mark Schumm, Clark County School District
Jennifer Lite, Clark County School District
Sara Swanson, Clark County School District
Kyle Konald, Delta Academy
Barbara Lindsay, Clark County School District
Abbe Mattson, Explore Knowledge Academy
Kristin Heiss, Clark County School District Turnaround
Marsha Scherz, NCSA
Brian Scroggins, State Public Charter School Authority
Anne Jacklin, Clark County School District
Dana Perich, Explore Knowledge Academy
Becca Meyer, Clark County School District
Jenn Blackhurst, HOPE
Joe Petrie, Principal, Bonanza High School

Carson City:

Keri Pommerening, Lyon County School District
Bryn Lapenta, Washoe County School District
Jeannine Bell, Washoe County School District
Brian Frazier, Douglas County School District
Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District
Alan Reeder, Lyon County School District
Wayne Workman, Lyon County School District
Mike Liu, EDU
Sandra Aird, Washoe County School District
Anne Warren, Washoe County School District
Becky Curtright, Washoe County School District
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents

Call to Order;

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 A.M. with attendance as reflected above.

Public Comment

There was no public comment

Workshop to Solicit Comments on Proposed Amendments to NAC 389.XXX; Administration of Achievement and End-of-Course Examinations and College and Career Readiness Assessments.

The workshop opened at 9:03 a.m.

Peter Zutz, Administrator, Assessments, Data and Accountability clarified this workshop is about the High School Proficiency Exam (HSPE). The consideration aligns with changing the EOCs from a high stakes examination to a medium stakes examination. The NDE is proposing the sun setting of the Nevada HSPE for all students effective for the 2017-18 school year. With the adoption of the EOC, assessments would no longer need to administer the HSPE and the HSPE would no longer be a graduation requirement. Districts would still be responsible for verifying students have fulfilled all other graduation requirements. If a student was previously denied a diploma because he or she lacks passage of one or more subjects of the HSPE and that student otherwise meets the required criteria, a district may give that student a diploma. The regulation establishes the graduating classes for which the HSPE is applicable.

Public Comment

Jesse Welch, Clark County School District, asked if a student had just the HSPE exam as their only outstanding graduation requirement, and students have otherwise met the criteria in regulation, may the district issue a diploma.

Mr. Zutz said yes, that is the recommendation.

The workshop closed at 9:15 a.m.

Workshop to Solicit Comments on Proposed Amendments to “Administration of Achievement and End-Of-Course Examinations and College and Career Readiness Assessments” NAC 389.0482 to 389.0482; NAC 389.0484 Eligibility of pupil to take college and career readiness assessment; NAC 389.051 Times for administration; special administration; NAC 389.0515 General requirements for examinations; NAC 389.054 Confidentiality and security of testing materials; NAC 389.056 Procedures for administration; NAC 389.0565 Use of calculators on examinations; NAC 389.057 Eligibility for reexamination; NAC 389.0574 School district to provide remedial study to pupil who fails end-of-course examination; plan to provide remedial study to be provided to Department; review and approval of plan; times remedial study to be offered; NAC 389.0576 Charter school to provide remedial study to pupil who fails end-of-course examination; plan to provide remedial study to be provided to sponsor; review and approval of plan; times remedial study to be offered; NAC 389.058 Reporting of results to Department; NAC 389.059 Restriction on reporting scores of individual pupils; reporting of aggregated

scores; NAC 389.061 Specific criterion-referenced examinations required; NAC 389.071 Proficiency examinations in writing: High school; fifth and eighth grades; NAC 389.083 Maintenance of results of examinations and list of names and scores.

The workshop opened at 9:16 a.m.

Mr. Zutz explained this workshop is about transiting the EOCs away from a high stakes graduation requirement in Nevada, to a medium stakes district administered and scored, true EOC exam. He explained this is the administration of an assessment within the course that would become a certain percentage of the final course grade. This is a significant change, the considerations for taking the EOC out of a high stakes mode and putting it into a medium stakes has many considerations. These include:

- How the test is administered, whether it is an online administration or a paper and pencil administration, or a hybrid combination of both.
- What form would the transition take away from a high stakes EOC examination to a medium stakes
- If a student earns a certain grade or a proficiency expressed as a percentage in their course work, then takes the EOC as the final to that course, should that EOC have a minimum score performance associated with it.
- Reliability and validity is only maintained if best practices for test security are adhered and employed by all testing sites and people.
- Would the EOC exam, as part of the final grade, have a minimum passing score on the test to be considered by the Board, or what would the percentage be of the grade that the test would have for that course.

Mr. Zutz clarified that medium stakes is defined as an assessment that is not a graduation requirement and in this case is not an assessment that is not administered by the state. Rather it is administered by the districts, and will count as a certain percentage of a student's grade. Mr. Zutz has had discussions with Nevada stakeholders about setting a minimum score and understanding that there are considerations regarding remediation should a student do well in a class but not do well on the EOC final. Should the student be responsible for repeating the course or just the EOC, or neither, or both? Researching other states that have an EOC examination showed that the approximate percentage of the grade hovers around 20 percent. The regulation will identify the percentage.

The EOC consideration is not relevant for science due to the requirement of the high school assessments in ESSA, the new federal law. Through engagements with district stakeholders, a hybrid model has been identified as the preferred mode of administration. This would include paper and pencil with a test booklet and students would answer the multiple choice responses on an answer sheet. Those would be scored by the districts. The online component would be the constructive response of the ELA content area. Each individual assessment of x number of pages of writing would need to be scored. Because of that and the concern about norming, the essay question would be entered online by the student and scored by the vendor.

These assessments would be offered later in a semester to allow students to complete the curriculum. A challenge is if it is a true EOC and it is folded into the final course grade, is to ensure the scores on the assessment are available to the classroom instructor.

Mr. Zutz addressed graduation requirement recommendations. The transition away from a current high stakes EOC to a medium stakes EOC will begin immediately this year, 2017-18. Any students having taken line course or any other EOC in previous years, and passed or failed either, is captured. Students who have taken a course EOC in the past do not need to be considered moving forward in the fall 2017. If a student took an aligned course in the past or an EOC in the past, it is not a consideration moving forward. Any student, any grade, any level this fall, articulating in a math I aligned course, or a math II aligned course, or ELA aligned course, will need to take the EOC as a course final. It was clarified that if a junior took the math I, ELA I and II and is now enrolled in a math II aligned course, they would take the math II EOC exam and they would need to meet the requirements that are adopted in regulation. The EOC

is no longer a graduation requirement but is associated and tied to a course and is a required EOC exam. A senior must complete math II or geometry to fulfill their graduation requirements and they would need to take the EOC math II at the end of that class. The performance on the math II EOC would become part of that math II or geometry course final grade.

Mr. Zutz discussed further topics that may be included in the regulation including the minimum score, which is the purview of the Board, and remediation.

Workshop Public Comment

Becca Meyer, CCSD, listed considerations for establishing regulations regarding the EOC test administration. She suggested that with the change to a medium stakes assessment, the EOCs should be treated similarly to the current final exams with the intent to inform teacher's instructional practices and support student learning. A composite of ten percent is an appropriate weighting for the impact that the EOCs will carry on a student's overall grade for the course. Schools are in need of direction on how to proceed with level 1 student's and are seeking immediate guidance. Clark County School District supports students moving forward in their academic plan if they pass the course, yet fail the exam. Remediation opportunities for students needing extra support will be embedded in the curriculum to address any academic gaps students possess. Clark County School District does not agree with assigning a passing cut score to the EOC exams. Placing a passing cut score on the EOC to pass the course does not support sound grading practices as no single score should be used to determine the mastery level of a student. The EOC should be a tool used to inform and improved teaching and learning. These medium stakes exams should enable teachers to align their instruction to ensure they are providing students the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge. Superintendent Canavero asked clarifying questions.

Kyle Konald, Delta Academy, agreed with Ms. Meyer, that one score should not determine whether a student passes a course and he does not agree with a cut score for the EOC. Currently there are juniors that have passed algebra 1 but failed math 1. There is a disconnect between remediation and the amount of time lapsed before the next administration of the EOCs.

Jesse Welch, CCSD, reiterated the majority of people think that 10 percent is an appropriate weighting for the EOC aligned courses. Currently the ELA assessment is integrated, the questions on the multiple choice assessment lead into the constructive response, if the test were to be given as a semester exam it cannot come after the writing. Otherwise the test would need to be administered earlier than exams are currently are given. He asked about moving towards English 9 and English 10 being a single English assessment and if there is clarification about whether those will continue to be one assessment or will they continue to be two.

Joe Petrie, Principal, Bonanza High School, echoed Ms. Meyer's comments. He added that regarding the ten percent of the EOC, through best practices, one grade should never be more than one letter grade for the summative. Keeping it at ten percent is in alignment with research that shows one assessment and no more than one letter grade. He expressed gratitude for going to a pencil and paper format because the logistics of administering the online test took six to eight weeks to test the school. He discussed funds for remediation; particularly for students who earned a level 1 on an EOC, would pass the exam. The remediation needed by those kids is impacted by this regulation, and he is working on those plans to best serve his students.

Bryn Lapenta, WCSO, suggested that if a student passes the common final and does not pass the course, that it would be considered a mastery exam under NAC 389.670.

Wayne Workman, Lyon County School District, expressed concerns about setting a minimum cut score and hopes there is not a minimum cut score because it would make it a high stakes test. He asked about the percentage to which will be applied to the students final grade and which semester that would apply to. If a student does well on the EOC exam second semester, but failed first semester, could a minimum score be set to prove proficiency for the student to where if they had not passed the first semester, they

could receive credit for both semesters with a particular score. He asked if students could take the exam more than once during the course of the semester. He expressed concern with the class of 2018 and said he appreciated the flexibility regarding those who have taken the exam, but the class of 2018 was told this was a participation exam. There is still a possibility there are seniors this year that are just now being enrolled in one of those courses that has an EOC exam. His concern is bifurcating the graduation requirements for those students, especially if a minimum cut score is set. Then those students who received a memo about participation will no longer be under those requirements, they will need to have a minimum score on the exam. It is concerning to have different graduation requirements for the same class.

Brian Frazier, Douglas County School District, said the kids of 2018-19 have been told the test is participation only. To change those rules mid-stream is going to set up problems later on. He said we could be getting back to a cycle of test, re-test and remediation with a minimum cut score. There is an incentive for students in those classes with the test being a percentage of a final grade, that a minimum score on that only adds an additional layer. He suggested a minimum cut score is avoided to keep it a medium stakes test.

Sandra Aird, Assessments, WCSO, said in light of the change from high stakes to medium stakes, is there guidance for districts regarding the aligned courses and their requirements for a standard diploma and is algebra and geometry required for a standard diploma. Ms. Aird agreed with comments regarding students who received a level 1 and participated in the exam and also agreed with maintaining the participation rule for the class of 2018. She noted there are opportunities for aligning course instruction with the rigor with the medium stakes test.

Becky Curtright, Assessments, WCSO, presented an option that even if bound to a contract with DRC this year, perhaps the plan could allow for releasing items to the district after one year of DCR, printing them so districts could build their own test and tailor them to student needs. It would continue to be a hybrid option where DRC would score the essay portion of the ELA exam, but districts would be responsible for maintaining control and scoring for the multiple choice items for both ELA and math exams. The state could provide districts with test blue prints and item samples with which districts can write their own exams. This would allow for maximum flexibility for districts to tailor the test content to their students and they could deliver content in a first semester second semester format. This would replace the final exams given each year because most high schools operate on a semester based schedule and give .5 credit each semester, and give semester exams. By splitting the EOC into two semesters it would help replace the final exams. Ms. Curtright acknowledged challenges to smaller districts with writing their own exams but she suggested the larger districts could collaborate and with and help the smaller districts.

Public Comment #2

There was no public comment

The meeting adjourned at 11:04 a.m.