NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING MATERIALS
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
September 4, 2024

Item a	
Question: Can we change the framing in the intro to better reflect the intent that SBE discussed when we talked about the survey strategy? Specifically, we said that we would gather community input, and then based upon the result would work to create a BDR. The line "One of the ways we are considering addressing these challenges is by adjusting high school start times." may not fully reflect the intent or the jurisdiction of the state board.	**Response:** The Nevada State Board of Education (Board) is committed to enhancing student performance across the state, but the Nevada public school system faces significant challenges, such as chronic absenteeism, behavioral issues, and low academic achievement. One of the ways the Board is considering addressing these challenges is by proposing the adjustment of high school start times. In January 2024, the Board requested the assistance of the Nevada Department of Education to gather community feedback on the adjusting of high school start times through a survey. The survey results will potentially inform the development of a bill draft request for consideration during the upcoming 2025 Legislative Session.
Item 7	
Question: Would it be possible to get more specific data about: a. The current state of our SPED workforce (how many current positions, how many vacancies, retention rates, pipeline #s, psychologist caseloads for these, etc.) b. What the estimated impact on this workforce data would be with a change in each age category? c. Can the Developmental Delay eligibility end date be a school year, or does it need to remain an age? For instance, could the end date be the end of 1st grade for our state? d. Will parents now be able to request that their child who is already in school, say 7, but does not qualify under health impairment or specific learning disability, be qualified under Developmental Delay for the first time? What would the requirements for this be?	**Response:** a. As of 8/29/2024 (dynamic data): 1. There are 10,225 educators who have at least one special education endorsement. Not all are in assignment. 2. There are 721 educators who have an active Interim Route to Certification (IRC) special education endorsement. 3. Of the 721 educators, 442 have both an active special education endorsement and an IRC endorsement. As of 10/1/2023 (the October 1 date is the annual required licensed personnel report, this is static data): 4. There were 6,733 educators who have at least one special education endorsement

e. Are most Developmental Delay IEPs super heavily focused on related services (like OT and PT)? Do you suspect shortages in these professionals?	that had a special education assignment for the 2023-24 school year.
	
	5. There were 400 special education assignments that were reported as vacant. Vacancies will not be collected until November. NDE does not have retention rates, and Universities and ARL programs maintain the pipeline numbers. Currently, districts are not required to report psychologist caseloads to NDE. Only caseloads of Physical Therapists are required to be reported per NAC 399.297.
	
	    b. This is difficult to estimate as NDE does not have all of the background data. Districts are not required to report this data to NDE.
	
	    c. IDEA gives the option of changing the age for eligibility, not a grade level. To align it to a grade level, it would be necessary to choose the age that bests align to that grade level.
	
	    d. This would be up to NDE to determine as the eligibility criteria for Developmental Delay (DD) would need to be looked at for possible revisions if the age limits change. This would involve input from multiple community and district partners. Theoretically, if a student was new to Nevada (or just new to the system), had no previous assessments or testing, and was entering kindergarten at age 6 and was referred for testing, the eligibility team could consider DD if they met the criteria that is/will be established.
	
	    e. Current data indicates that we are experiencing shortages in special services areas such as OT, PT, and Speech (see link to report). Students eligible under DD do tend to have services hours in at least one of these service areas.

Item 9	
Question: Can we get a recap on the context/transcript under which the SBE approved the at-risk definition? (slide 7, artifact 9b)? I seem to remember the discussion at the time with Deputy Supt Haartz was that we were approving the definition but that it would come back before the board at some point in time for us to revisit.	**Response:** That is the intent of the presentation to be given at the Sept. 4 SBE meeting.
Question: At what point did the State Board determine that Grad Score in Infinite Campus was aligned to the definition of at-risk pupil? Did the State Board see which factors were used by Grade Score to determine at risk? Has Infinite Campus ever been transparent in its algorithm?	**Response:** Based on the State Board's adopted definition (Nov. 12, 2020) for at-risk, the Department engaged with a vendor to capture the collection and analysis of the data in alignment with the new definition. In October 2020, the Department provided an overview of the strengths and weaknesses of the Infinite Campus solution. Here is a link to a video explaining the algorithm: Understand GRAD Scores - Video | Infinite Campus As well as the Early Warning Indicator System that utilizes the score to provide supports to students: Campus Early Warning Demo Video · Infinite Campus Here is a document with the metrics

At-Risk Factors (75) |

Question: If the State Board did not vote to approve Grad Score as the measure to determine at risk, who did determine that this was the factor that would be used?	**Response:** As noted above, upon adoption of the metrics by the SBE, the Department engaged with a vendor to collect and report the requisite data.
Item 11	
Question: Can you please research other states that have additional state testing in earlier grades (e.g. Florida) to determine if there are systems that we could imitate so that we could provide annual benchmarks in K, 1, 2 that trigger a retention meeting if students are not on a trajectory to meet reading proficiency requirements by grade 3? That is, what specific guidance could we provide to schools about retention prior to grade 3?	**Response:** **Florida** • Florida's literacy initiative, "Just Read, Florida!," underpins these efforts by focusing on ensuring that every child reads at or above grade level by third grade. The program emphasizes key reading skills such as phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Additionally, the state's benchmarks align with Florida's B.E.S.T. (Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking) Standards, which guide instruction and assessment practices across the state • In Florida, state testing for reading in grades K-2 is conducted through the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) system. This program, which began in the 2022-2023 school year, includes three progress monitoring assessments each year. Students are tested in early literacy and reading skills using the Star Early Literacy and Star Reading assessments from Renaissance Learning. These assessments are designed to track student progress towards meeting the state's benchmarks for reading proficiency. Renaissance Star Assessment overview

	2024–25 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) Fact Sheet K–2 Early Literacy, Reading, and Mathematics **2024–25 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) Fact Sheet Grades 3–10 ELA Reading and Grades 3–8 Mathematics** Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards for English Language Arts