

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 COMMISSION ON INNOVATION AND EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION
 MEASURING WHAT MATTERS SUBCOMMITTEE
 October 15, 2024
 2:30 PM**

Office	Address	Meeting Room
Virtual	Zoom Videoconference Link	Dial-In: 1-301-715-8592 Meeting ID: 845 0736 1269 Passcode: 614003

**SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE MEASURING WHAT MATTERS
 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patty Charlton, Chancellor, Nevada System of Higher Education
 Tim Hughes, Nevada State Board of Education
 Sean Parker, Representative, Organization Advocating for Public Instruction
 Erica Mosca, Nevada State Assembly
 Sebastian Rios, Nevada Youth Legislature Representative
 Adam Young, Superintendent, White Pine County School District

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Tina Quigley, President and CEO, Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance
 Amy Stephenson, Director for the Governor’s Finance Office, State of Nevada

AGENDA

1. Call to Order, Roll Call

Chair Erica Mosca called the meeting to order and took roll for the Subcommittee Commission members.

2. Public Comment #1

There were no public comments provided.

3. Introduction of Agenda, Goals, Process and Deliverables *(Information and Discussion)*

Subcommittee members will situate their work within the Commission’s broader work between now and December 2024 and consider the deliverables to be produced.

- Nathan Driskell, Chief Policy Officer, National Center on Education and the Economy
- Janice Case, Regional Director, West, National Center on Education and the Economy
- Leah Moschella, Senior Designer, Leader Experiences

Nathan Driskell introduced the goals process and the document that was sent out ahead of time, explaining that it aimed to tease out areas of consensus and disagreement. Janice Case added that the next subcommittee meeting was scheduled for November 12th at 9:00 AM. The meeting then moved on to agenda item 4.

4. Review of Policy Design and Implementation Considerations *(Information and Discussion)*

Subcommittee members will review the synthesis of their work to date and offer suggestions on how to refine and improve it in light of their research on Nevada and on top performing systems globally.

- Nathan Driskell, Chief Policy Officer, National Center on Education and the Economy
- Janice Case, Regional Director, West, National Center on Education and the Economy
- Leah Moschella, Senior Designer, Leader Experiences

Student Voice and Choice in Education Pathways

Nathan Driskell asked for feedback on the document, specifically what resonated with the members of the subcommittee. Tim Hughes and Sebastian Rios agreed with Nathan's points, particularly about stakeholder communication and transparency. Sebastian Rios and Adam Young discussed the importance of student and educator voice and choice in education pathways, with a focus on future orientation. Adam Young suggested the idea of providing agency for students in the realm of non-negotiables, such as literacy, math, and science, and proposed the possibility of allowing students to show their learning in multiple ways. Sean Parker agreed with the need for more flexibility in accountability of learning, suggesting that the current focus on the school level might be limiting. Sean Parker also appreciated the document's capture of the history of the project and its potential for improvement.

Discussing Rigor and Flexibility in Learning Systems

Tim Hughes and Sean Parker discussed the importance of rigor in demonstrating progress and skill sets in different districts. Tim Hughes emphasized the need for a consistent research-backed approach to ensure equal validity across different methods of demonstrating progress. Sean Parker agreed but also highlighted the need for flexibility in learning systems to allow for innovation and testing of new hypotheses. Tim Hughes further suggested the need for a rigorous data analysis process, regardless of the method's scientific backing. Sean Parker agreed with this point but also stressed the importance of allowing for flexibility in learning systems to foster innovation. Both agreed on the need to measure beyond the system to determine the true impact of their innovations on young people's lives.

Refining Educational Outcomes Tracking and Evaluation

The meeting focused on refining the implementation of a system for tracking and evaluating educational outcomes. Nathan Driskell suggested mapping out a process for systems evaluation that links education outcomes to broader community indicators, which would not be ready for legislative recommendations by January 2025. He also proposed the idea of action research cycles for new and innovative measures. Erica Mosca emphasized the need for a detailed summary of the discussion, including aspirational goals, to be presented to the legislature. Tim Hughes raised concerns about the potential misuse of data for ranking schools, while Adam Young agreed that this was a significant issue that needed to be addressed. The team agreed to continue refining their recommendations and improving the user experience of the system.

Balancing Short-Term and Long-Term Education Reform

Nathan Driskell, Erica Mosca, Sean Parker, and Tim Hughes discussed the need for a culture shift and stronger public communications recommendations in the document. They debated balancing short-term, legislatively passable recommendations aligned with the current system and the Funding Commission's proposals, with longer-term aspirational recommendations for systemic change. Sean Parker suggested doing a crosswalk between their recommendations and the Funding Commission's to highlight the bridge from current to future paradigms. Erica Mosca noted her focus had been on near-term goals like measuring student progress, which may not fully capture the long-term vision. Tim Hughes cautioned that implementing an interim system could make further reform difficult if it becomes entrenched. The group aimed to refine the recommendations to clearly articulate both actionable policies and an aspirational future vision.

Exploring New Accountability System & Change Management

The subcommittee team discussed the potential for a new accountability system that would allow for flexibility and choice, rather than a complete overhaul of the current system. They considered the importance of buy-in from various stakeholders, including students, families, and schools. The idea of creating a roadmap for future changes was also discussed, with a focus on change management. The team also explored the possibility of allowing students to have access to their own progress metrics, which could increase engagement and adoption. The conversation ended with a recognition of the need for a shift in perspective, from focusing on schools as the unit of measurement to considering individual students and their unique needs.

Student Portfolio System for Skill Mastery

Adam Young proposed the idea of creating a student portfolio system that would showcase a student's mastery in various skills, such as literacy, math, problem-solving, and collaboration. He suggested that this system could be used by students upon graduation, potentially replacing traditional resumes. The team discussed the potential benefits of such a system, including its potential to bridge the disconnect between students and high-stakes exams. They also discussed the importance of aligning the system with higher education and workforce readiness, and the need for validation and iteration to ensure its effectiveness. The team also considered the potential for a seamless vertical alignment between K-12 and higher education systems.

Data Literacy, Integration, and Communication Strategies

The subcommittee team discussed the importance of data literacy and the need for a system that can provide actionable information. They also considered the integration of the network's work into their vision and the necessity of communicating the "why" behind their proposed changes. The team also deliberated on the need for more concrete examples and the potential for a dashboard to incentivize schools. Lastly, they discussed the idea of a simple, few-item menu for public understanding and the potential for a designation system for outdoor education.

5. Final Reflections and Next Steps (*Information and Discussion*)

Subcommittee members will discuss any additional analysis needed between now and the next full Commission meeting on October 29th.

- Subcommittee Chair

Sean Parker proposed creating a mock-up to visualize the future of the system and suggested a potential design competition to gather more ideas. The team discussed the importance of cross-conversations among subcommittees, with Sean Parker suggesting a focus on competency-based recommendations. The next steps include a virtual meeting in two weeks to further discuss and coalesce ideas. The team expressed satisfaction with the productive meeting.

6. Public Comment #2

There were no public comments provided.

7. Adjournment

Chair Erica Mosca adjourned the meeting.