

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING MATERIALS
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
March 27, 2024

6a. Possible Approval of Perkins V State Plan	<i>Response</i>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can you explain the alignment between all of the quality measures? For example, it looks like the ultimate goal is to prepare young people for high skill/high wage and in demand jobs, but it looks like the goals for in-demand skills several years from now doesn't match that goal i.e. math at 24.5% proficiency and science at 20.75% proficiency. Another misalignment seems to be placement and academic proficiency. If the goal in a few years is 86.5% post-secondary placement, but the goal for that year in ELA is 56% proficiency, are we saying that we are okay with having 30.5% of those placed to not be proficient in reading/ELA? 	<p>Response: In terms of the Perkins V State Plan, there is no direct correlation between academic proficiency and postsecondary placement. Academic proficiency in Nevada is measured by assessments results on the ACT exam and the Nevada Science Assessment. While students must participate in these assessments to graduate, there is not a requirement for students to achieve a specific proficiency score to graduate. Postsecondary institutions have other measures to determine the proficiency of a student such as GPA and transcripts. Additionally, none of Nevada's community colleges require a minimum ACT score or GPA for enrollment in their programs. In terms of workforce placement, most employers do not ask for ACT scores when hiring students. While we recognize the challenges of using the ACT exam scores to measure academic proficiency, a student's success upon graduation is not solely dependent on those scores.</p>
6b. Possible Approval of Proposed K – 12, Health Instructional Materials 2024	<i>Response</i>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the process for appeal? What is the status of the quaver ed letter that was sent to the state board? 	<p>Response: Vendors are sent the following regarding the appeals process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> information regarding the submission of the <u>IM Appeal Process Form</u> Presentation logistics and scheduling <p>The status of the Quaver letter: On February 27th, NDE (Andrew Snyder) responded to Quaver's letter that was sent to Dave Brancamp and the State Board of Education. We informed Quaver that there is, in fact, an appeal process which will begin after the State Board meeting in March. We also informed Quaver that</p>

	<p>there was a minor typographical error in the email that was sent to QuaverEd containing the results from the review committee: we accidentally wrote “6-8 Health” rather than “K-5 Health” in one portion of the email. Regardless of that error, the results Quaver received were, in fact, accurate: the K-5 materials Quaver submitted are not being recommended by the review committee based on the criteria.</p> <p>It was communicated to Quaver that NDE does not offer an appeal process to any vendor <i>prior</i> to the State Board of Education making its final decision; however, there is an appeal process after the State Board makes their final determination.</p>
<p>6c/d. Possible Approval of Proposed 6 – 12, Math Instructional Materials 2024</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Response</i></p>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are we defining instructional materials? It appears that some of the reviewed materials are supplemental resources while others are full curricula. If we are in fact defining materials broadly, are we using different evaluation tools? And what is the guidance given to districts on the appropriate usage and pairing of supplemental resources vs core programs? 	<p>Response: Supplemental Materials are not evaluated in this review process. The review committee only evaluates the core program. If the core program is approved, then the associated supplemental material that comes with it is automatically approved. Below is the legal definition of electronic media where the supplemental or core resources are categorized.</p> <p><i>NAC 389.852 “Electronic media” defined. (NRS 385.080, 389.850) As used in NAC 389.852 to 389.868, inclusive, unless the context otherwise requires, “electronic media” means any electronic medium that is used as the primary basis of instruction pursuant to which information is conveyed to a pupil or that otherwise contributes to the learning process, including, without limitation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Computers, whether stationary or portable, and the hardware and software necessary for the operation of those computers;</i> <i>Interactive videodiscs or other optical discs;</i> <i>Magnetic media, including, without limitation, computer discs, audiotape and videotape; and</i> <i>Services pursuant to which a subscriber may access the Internet or use an electronic mail address, or both.</i> <p><i>(Added to NAC by Bd. of Education by R026-01, eff. 11-1-2001)—(Substituted in revision for NAC 390.005)</i></p>

	<p>NRS 389.840 Definitions. <i>As used in NRS 389.840 to 389.880, inclusive, unless the context requires otherwise:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>“Basic textbook” or “textbook” means any medium or manual of instruction, including, without limitation, software for computers, containing a presentation of the principles of a subject and used as a basis of instruction.</i> 2. <i>“Supplemental textbook” means any medium or material, including, without limitation, software for computers, used to reinforce or extend a basic program of instruction.</i> 3. <i>A basic or supplemental textbook becomes “unserviceable” when 4 years have elapsed since its removal from the adopted list.</i> <p><i>(Added to NRS by 1967, 168; A 1981, 413; 1999, 3388)— (Substituted in revision for NRS 390.005)</i></p> <p>Link to all Legal Basis used by the Review Committee as guide.</p>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In the profile of the reviewers, it doesn't speak to expertise in math - is it the right assumption that everyone who reviewed are deep experts in the particular grade level / content mathematics? 	<p>Response: Yes. Reviewers are experts in their grade level. Reviewers had to apply and submit a resume to participate in the review process. The majority are Chairs/leaders in their Mathematics Departments, and some are math coaches. Most of them have at least master’s degrees and some Doctoral Degrees, with years of teaching Math in their grade level.</p>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Can you explain the category 1 rubric? It is called alignment to standards, but some of the indicators don't have anything to do with the standards. (i.e. tools for educators are important but are not a direct reflection of standards alignment). 	<p>Response: Rubric 1 is a summary rubric with overall indicators/criteria pertaining to the standards. There is a detailed standard alignment that every vendor submits, which the committee evaluates. All vendors have a submission package on the reviewer’s portal. See example screenshot below:</p>

ID	Submission ID 6-12-67
Company Name	McGraw Hill
Instructional Materials URL	https://my.mheducation.com/login
Reviewer Login User Name	NDEMathReview
Reviewer Password	NDEMathReview1
Instructional Material Title and Edition	Reveal Math Algebra 2
Grade Level Course	Algebra 2
Course Number Description	N/A
ISBN	Reveal Math Algebra 2: 9781265473396
National Reviewer Link	https://edreports.org/reports/overview/reveal-math-traditional-2020
Completed Standards Alignment	https://drive.google.com/open?id=19cCLJDDI6eFzk4gzIZ6Fg11ULu4zqZM_
Completed Access and Equity Alignment	https://drive.google.com/open?id=1LpX2581piXK6EeiGBGQBrmGIYhR6qyF8
Other files	https://drive.google.com/open?id=1FXvyQedPWiz3pq47aiv0LMrXGgiodwaY
Upload PDF Copy	https://drive.google.com/open?id=1vlovKFxW9wg7MIH1KsSZYIFbQCqVNNCc

Standard Alignment Document:

<https://doe.nv.gov/distance-education/course-standard-alignments/>

Access and Equity Alignment Document:

https://webapp-strapipaas-prod-nde-001.azurewebsites.net/uploads/Rubric_Category_2_Social_Justice_Alignment_376f295cc9.pdf

Question:

- Why don't the justifications that are given always align to the specific evaluation criteria?

Response: (Math 6-12): Secondary Math.

Justification paragraphs are general reasons on how both standard alignment (Category I) and equity alignment criteria (Category II) are met. It also gives an overview of how the whole Instructional Material Package meets those criteria. Specific details to a particular criteria/indicator/metric in either of the categories are put on the rubric table itself. (Screen shot from page 99):

B1. Materials provide educators with tools to foster deep academic discussion.		2	The IM meets expectations in providing educators with tools to foster deep academic discussion. Materials provide a variety of tasks focused on student discussion and engagement in mathematics. A variety of activities (graphic organizers, matching, etc.) are included in student materials, and many activities use open-ended questions. The teacher edition includes Questions to Support Discourse for each lesson
--	--	---	--

Question:

- The quality of these programs that received similar scores are not all equal, but the scores would suggest otherwise - how can districts make the best possible decisions for kids if there is no way to distinguish between the quality of programs that are approved?

Response: The current process requires Local Education Agencies to conduct their own instructional material review process to select from the options of materials approved by the Nevada Department of Education. Districts leverage their expertise to make the best selection for their needs – a tenant of local control.

	<p><u>Here's the link of current instructional materials survey from district)</u></p>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the scoring process different for k-5? Or maybe the k-5 is showing the count across all reviewers and that is not how the secondary documents were organized? 	<p>Response: The second question is more the case here. The K-5 shows the count across the reviewers. Reviewers did not develop a consensus, but rather developed a consensus about the cut score(s) for recommendation and calculated the average.</p> <p>Secondary Math organized the documents by Consensus Scoring as expressed by the reviewers after the deliberation for every Instructional Material.</p>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What percentage of standard/criteria need to be addressed to get a rating in each category of meets, needs improvement, or inadequate? 	<p>Response: Mike (Math 6-12): The rubric requires a Meets (greater than 70%), Needs Improvement (69%-40%), Inadequate (39% below). This is provided to reviewers who then justify the consensus scoring based on their evidence/opinion/discussion points.</p>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When we review do we look at all of the materials or just what the publisher submits and how well they make their case? 	<p>Response: Reviewers are provided with and asked to review all materials submitted by the publisher. Reviewers do not solicit any additional materials beyond the submission. Reviewers have the submitted documentation and rubrics from the publisher. Reviewers additionally have access to copies of all instructional materials (both teacher and student materials).</p> <p>Reviewers look at the materials by grade level or by course. Then we look at the individual Instructional Material on that level as submitted by the vendors.</p>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could we consider the average cost as part of the review process? 	<p>Response: NDE does not determine the cost of materials. We determine standards alignment and equity and access.</p>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the plan for starting to do a more rigorous and precise review of materials? 	<p>Response: We are in the process of gaining feedback from our district Superintendents and Curriculum Directors regarding the process and should have more details at a future Board meeting.</p>

	<p>As it stands currently, our system has 2 phases of review: (1) Content leads from NDE do a technical review ensuring that Standards and Equity Alignment are in place and do research on whether National Independent Organizations (ex. EdReports, etc...) have reviewed the same material; (2) Committee Members review the material for Standards and Equity Alignment. Rigorous and precise review comes with an expanded time for a review process and actual usage of the material. If there is a desire to expand the depth of the review the Department would need to request additional resources.</p>
<p>6d. Possible Approval of Proposed K – 5, Math Instructional Materials 2024</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Response</i></p>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There seem to be more issues with interrater reliability across k-5 math, specifically on the social justice rubric. For example, in one instance item C has one person who says there are 10 or more varying authors and philosophies (meets expectation), 4 saying needs improvement which would suggest under 10, and 1 person says its inadequate, which would imply it's not present. It seems like this should be a pretty clear-cut determination. How do we reconcile the different applications of the evaluation tool? 	<p>Response: The variation in reviewer interpretation is one reason why K-5 elected to report with the transparent “tally and average” system. This method was selected to make the variation transparent. In this example, the rating requires the reviewers to agree on what constitutes an author. Does an author need to be named in the textbook (credited authorship), is it sufficient to have a list of “contributing teachers” and consider them authors, etc.</p>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One issue that seemed to come up in some comments is where the materials are found (i.e. are they embedded into the materials or supplemental materials like videos, links, etc.). Given that the rubric does not make this distinction, are evaluators allowed to use this as a criteria? 	<p>Response: Math 6-12: Yes, that is correct. The rubric is intended to evaluate the main content, not the supplemental materials. As noted in the appendix report, if the content/standard of the Main Material failed to meet the content criteria, automatically the instructional material is not recommended. In most cases, supplemental materials are used to evaluate the equity criteria of the instructional materials. For example, how the material deals with differentiation, etc. As</p>

	<p>mentioned previously, in the NAC, supplemental materials refer to a “Supplemental textbook” -- which means any medium or material used to reinforce or extend a basic program of instruction (NAC 389.872).</p> <p>Math K-5: used any material that is part of the IM in the evaluation. If the content was found in a video, for example, that is acceptable if the video is part of the material made available to any adopter of that IM. It would not be considered if the material was not made available to purchasers (for additional purchase).</p>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are reviewers reviewing all materials in a program (i.e. looking through every chapter, resource, etc.) to evaluate representation? 	<p>Response: Yes. Reviewers are directed to review every page of the materials and evaluate everything including representation. During deliberation diversity is always asked to make sure that materials are culturally diverse and that illustrations are representative of our students of Nevada. Please note that the publisher is also asked to direct reviewers to the evidence of meeting the criteria as part of the application. This assists the reviewer in ensuring they have not missed evidence intended by the publisher in their review.</p>
<p>6l. Possible Approval of Dual Credit Courses for Douglas County School District</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why are Meteorology, Stellar Astronomy, and Physics courses considered electives when Biology, Chemistry, Environmental Science, and Anatomy classes are considered science courses? I know that I have an Astronomy course at my high school that is a science credit, so what is the difference between taking it at the high school and college levels? I'm also currently taking a Physics 100 course that 	<p>Response: Typically, the credits equated to high school credit are decided upon by the <u>district</u> and are not chosen by the state. The regulation that provides governance regarding the Dual Credit approval process can be found in NRS 389.160 Credit toward graduation from high school for courses taken at community college, state college or university. This regulation states:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A pupil enrolled in high school, including, without limitation, a pupil enrolled in grade 9, 10, 11 or 12 in a charter school or a pupil

<p>counts as a science credit; why, then, is it listed here as an elective? On the other hand, Human Anatomy and Physiology I and II are elective credits at my school but listed as science on this list. Why are different students getting different credits for the same classes across the state, and is the department doing anything to streamline this process to make sure that every student is getting the same opportunities and credit for the work they do?</p>	<p>enrolled in a program designed to meet the requirements of an adult standard diploma, who successfully completes a course of education offered by a community college, state college or university in this State which has been approved pursuant to subsection 2, must be allowed to apply the credit received for the course so completed to the total number of credits required for graduation from the high school or the charter school in which the pupil is enrolled or the credits required for receipt of an adult standard diploma, as applicable.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. With the approval of the State Board, the board of trustees of each county school district and the governing body of each charter school shall prescribe the courses for which credits may be received pursuant to subsection 1, including occupational courses for academic credit, and the amount of credit allowed for the completion of those courses. 3. The State Board must not unreasonably limit the number of dual credit courses in which a pupil may enroll or for which a pupil may receive credit. <p>As for the consideration of if a course is an elective or not, that is based also upon how the <u>district</u> decides to put forth the course offerings and tying those to their high school catalogs.</p>
<p>6m. Possible Approval of Commission on Professional Standards in Education R167-22</p>	<p><i>Response</i></p>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do we have any data that suggests whether or not this approach is effective at improving conduct? 	<p>Response: The intent of the regulation is to assist districts in complying with the provisions of NRS 391.2056(2), and to allow them to do so in such a way that teachers are not required to duplicate training that they may have already recently taken. To accomplish this, the Commission is allowing for training by some entities other than</p>

	<p>LEAs to meet the Model Code Educator Ethics (MCEE) training requirements.</p> <p>While the Department does not have any data points indicating that such training, or for that matter the MCEE itself, support substantive change in teacher conduct, there is considerable anecdotal evidence obtained by the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) that having a tool like the MCEE available, and having training in how to apply it in real-world situations, has a significant impact on how teachers approach impactful decision-making in educational settings.</p>
<p>6n. Possible Approval of Commission on Professional Standards in Education R165-22</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Response</i></p>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has there been concern from teachers and districts that one year of work experience is a huge barrier to entry? If not, what is the purpose of revising it? Are students feeling slightly uncomfortable being taught how an industry works and how to succeed by a teacher who has never worked in that industry? 	<p>Response: The pathway to licensure in NAC 391.120 section 2 is intended for individuals who go through a traditional educator preparation program in a career and technical education area. For example, UNR has an Agriculture Education program. Graduates would not come out of this program with a year of industry experience these are traditionally prepared teachers, much like a person completing a Secondary Education with a content area of Mathematics. We do not require a candidate completing a Secondary Education Mathematics degree to have a year of industry experience in Mathematics to be licensed. The preparation, including coursework and student teaching they received in the degree program is what is needed.</p> <p>There is another pathway to obtain career and technical education licenses that should and does require industry experience. This is the Business and Industry pathway in NAC 391.425. This pathway allows for those who were not traditionally prepared as above to obtain a license to teach in the same career and</p>

	<p>technical education areas with their industry experience. They are required to complete career and technical coursework during the first three years of their Business and Industry licensure. This would be the same coursework that those individuals prepared in the traditional pathway in 391.120 section 2 completed during their degree program.</p>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you explain the switch from "board" to "department?" 	<p>Response: If this is referring to Section 1 subsection 1(b): this was an LCB correction to be consistent with NAC 391.082. The Department reviews transcripts to determine if coursework meets regulation requirements for licensing.</p> <p><i>NAC 391.082 Approval of courses completed by applicant at regionally accredited institution. (NRS 385.080, 391.038)</i> Upon request by an applicant for a license, endorsement of a license, renewal of a license or removal of a provision under which a provisional license was issued, the Department will approve a course or courses completed by the applicant at a regionally accredited institution that meets the licensure requirements, whether or not the course or courses are part of a course of study and training approved by the board pursuant to <u>NAC 391.557</u> and <u>391.558</u>. (Added to NAC by Bd. of Education, eff. 7-19-96; A by R110-97, 12-10-97)</p>
<p>6p. Possible Approval of Commission on Professional Standards in Education R119-22</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a candidate passes a competency exam, why would they also need to take additional coursework? 	<p>Response: As currently written, only passing a competency exam allows a person to obtain a teaching license without graduating from an approved preparation program with at least a bachelor's degree. The change from "or" to "and" in Section 2 subsection 2(a) closes that loophole. Section 1 creates a clear pathway for an already licensed teacher to obtain a middle or secondary endorsement by competency exam. NAC 391.036 section 1(a)(3) requires an applicant applying for initial licensure to pass content exams that are required for the endorsement area they are seeking.</p>

<p>6q. Possible Approval of Commission on Professional Standards in Education R118-22</p>	<p><i>Response</i></p>
<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the commission think that this change could incentivize programs hoping for ineffective candidates? 	<p>Response: If this question is referring to Section 1 subsection 4, no. This is actually closing a loophole allowing candidates to teach three years on their ARL license without completing any course work, exams, and effective evaluations and to move to different programs and/or areas for their entire teaching career by simply switching providers or areas every three years. This update will allow teachers to change teaching areas and or program providers only once and only during the first year of the ARL license. This will allow flexibility for the teacher to change areas only once and only during the first year if, for example, after teaching elementary and finding elementary is not for them, they can change to special education or secondary. This also allows the teacher to change providers only once and only during the first year if they are not satisfied with their provider.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What evidence is the commission reviewing that helps us to understand the link between licensure exams and effectiveness in the classroom, regardless of licensure type? 	<p>Response: Assembly Bill 428 Section 8 requires the Commission on Professional Standards in Education to conduct a study during the 2023-2024 interim for content area and pedagogy exams and present its recommendations to the Standing Committees on Education during the 83rd session and for the Commission to adopt regulations as it deems necessary and appropriate. The Department on behalf of the Commission has contracted with WestEd to facilitate this study.</p> <p>Sec. 8. The Commission on Professional Standards in Education shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct a study during the 2023-2024 interim concerning the Praxis II and pedagogy examinations; Present its recommendations to the Senate and Assembly Standing Committees on Education during the 83rd Session of the Nevada Legislature; and Adopt regulations pursuant to NRS 391.019, 391.021 and 391.023 as it deems necessary and appropriate based on its findings and recommendations as they relate to the Praxis II and pedagogy examinations.
<p>Item 9. The Addendum for the Statewide Plan for the Improvements of Pupils</p>	<p><i>Response</i></p>

<p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is there an annual approval required by the board by the end of March for the current STIP?	<p>Response: Nevada law requires the State Board of Education to develop a 5-year strategic plan to improve the achievement of students enrolled in public schools across Nevada, officially referred to as a “Statewide Plan for the Improvement of Pupils”. The Board must submit this plan, or a revised plan, on or before March 31 of each year. The STIP is prepared for the State Board’s consideration by the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) and reflects feedback and input gathered from school districts, education partners, and stakeholders across the State. (These requirements are outlined in Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 385.111-113).</p>
---	--

DRAFT