CIEE: World Class Teaching and Learning

On Ramps to Personalized, Competency-Based Learning

February 2026

World Class Teaching and Learning

On Ramps to Personalized, Competency-Based Learning

Table of Contents

Purpose and use case

- ***Connect the destination to decision making:*** The PCBL fully realized companion brief describes the student experience the Roadmap is aiming to make coherent and predictable statewide. This brief supports Commission discussion about how districts can move toward that destination through different pathways and on different timelines.
- ***Support decisions on the SB4 appropriation:*** Use the profiles and on ramps to shape an allocation approach that invites districts to propose entry work that fits their current conditions while still producing tangible artifacts and early evidence.
- ***Clarify what to invest in and what to expect:*** Each profile and on ramp points to the kinds of enabling conditions that help progress hold, including professional learning, coaching, tools, routines, and permissions.
- ***Strengthen working group design and charge:*** Use each on ramp to surface who needs to be at the table for key decisions, what those decisions are, and what near term outputs can be produced.
- ***Set clearer expectations for provider selection:*** Use the on ramp descriptions to define what quality support looks like for districts, including job embedded learning, reusable tools, coaching, and follow through that supports implementation.

This brief is not

- ***Not an evaluation of Nevada districts, schools, or educators.*** The profiles describe common starting conditions and normal variation across schools, grade bands, and content areas.
- ***Not a mandate on a single model, sequence, or timeline.*** Districts will enter through different pathways and move at different speeds.
- ***Not a compliance checklist or scoring tool.*** The early proof items are intended to support learning, alignment, and investment decisions.
- ***Not a full implementation plan, procurement package, or professional development curriculum.*** Local planning, budgeting, and sequencing remain necessary.
- ***Not a technology purchasing guide.*** The focus is on routines, artifacts, supports, and permissions, with tool choices left to local context.

Questions to consider as you read

- Which district and school profiles seem most common across Nevada right now, and what does that suggest about the Commission's near term investment mix across classroom practice, leadership routines, and enabling systems?
- What permissions and guardrails are most important for safe pilots, including time protections, data access, grading and reporting rules, and scheduling flexibility, and which of these require state level guidance or support?

- What provider capabilities are essential for success, including job embedded learning, coaching, and usable tools, and how will the Commission set expectations and coordinate providers to reduce burden on districts?

Starting Points: District and School Profiles

Districts and schools across Nevada are already doing parts of personalized, competency based learning. The PCBL fully realized brief describes the destination that becomes coherent and predictable for students across the state. This companion section supports Commission discussion about how districts will move toward that destination through different pathways and on different timelines.

These profiles describe common starting points. They help commissioners anticipate what kinds of supports and enabling conditions make progress coherent and durable. They also help avoid designing one statewide approach that fits only a subset of districts.

A district or school system can reflect more than one profile at the same time. Variation by school, grade band, and content area is common. The goal is shared language that helps the Commission plan supports, investments, and permissions that make progress more feasible across diverse contexts.

Quick view of the profiles

Profile	Short description
Exploring	Promising pockets of PCBL aligned practice with high interest and uneven consistency across classrooms or schools
Coherence building	Several elements exist, and the next lift is connecting them through shared language, shared artifacts, and shared routines
Practice deepening	Strong examples exist and the next lift is making success easier to replicate through tools, routines, and leadership support
Scaling	PCBL is operating across multiple schools and the next lift is system coherence and sustainability at scale

Redesigning	Practice and community support are strong enough to consider structural shifts such as crediting, schedules, and learner records

How commissioners can use these profiles

- **Plan investment mix:** Balance investments in classroom practice, leadership routines, and enabling infrastructure.
- **Shape SB4 allocation strategy:** Invite districts to propose entry paths that match their current conditions while still producing tangible artifacts and evidence.
- **Form working groups with the right roles:** Build groups that include instructional leaders, principals, teacher leaders, student support leaders, data and systems staff, and community facing communications partners.
- **Set provider expectations:** Select providers based on their ability to deliver usable artifacts, job embedded learning routines, and coaching that supports real implementation rather than one time workshops.
- **Clarify permissions and guardrails:** Identify where policy, operations, or guidance needs to reduce risk for districts trying new approaches within defined pilots.

Nevada assets to build on

Nevada has existing assets that can support multiple entry points and multiple timelines.

- A statutory definition of competency based education and a state enabled pilot and network structure
- A statewide learning community and documentation of lessons learned through the competency based education network
- Public facing framing from the Nevada Department of Education that emphasizes learning based on evidence of mastery and the role of flexible pathways and supports
- A statewide Portrait and Future of Learning Network ecosystem intended to anchor shared vision and spread

Conditions that shape a starting point

The profiles draw on enabling conditions that tend to shape whether practices take hold and sustain.

1. ***Shared purpose and shared language:*** A common working definition of mastery or competency aligned to the Portrait and translated into classroom expectations.

2. ***Assessment and evidence of learning:*** Movement toward meaningful demonstrations of learning, common rubrics, calibration, and timely feedback cycles.
3. ***Progress and supports:*** Steps toward progress based on evidence of mastery paired with differentiated supports so students keep progressing without stigma.
4. ***Adult learning routines and leadership moves:*** Time and routines for PLC learning cycles, coaching, looking at student work, and continuous improvement.
5. ***Enabling systems and policy alignment:*** Grading and reporting practices, schedules, credit policies, and graduation requirements that allow mastery based learning to operate.

EXPLORING

Snapshot	Interest is high and there are promising pockets, but efforts are scattered and often driven by individual champions, grants, or site by site priorities. Definitions vary and teams may be using the same words to mean different things.
Common Signals	• PCBL aligned practices exist inconsistently by classroom or program. • Shared language is limited for competency, mastery, evidence, pace, and student agency. • Evidence of learning exists, but scoring expectations vary and tools do not line up. • Professional learning interest is high and capacity is constrained due to competing initiatives and limited coaching time.
Support that tends to help next:	• A shared definition of PCBL for the local context that is simple, specific, and usable in classrooms. • A short list of high leverage practices that unify early work such as learning targets, success criteria, and student goal routines. • A lightweight implementation team and a thin set of baseline indicators so the system can learn what is taking hold.
Rick to watch for:	Jumping to large system changes such as grading overhaul, schedule redesign, or new platforms before shared language and repeatable routines exist.

COHERENCE-BUILDING

Snapshot:	Several elements already exist such as a Portrait or graduate profile, PLC routines, MTSS structures, or performance tasks in some areas. The gap is connection. Practices are not yet tied together through shared language, shared expectations for evidence, and consistent adult routines.
Common signals:	• Leaders can name a direction, and classroom practice varies widely. • Teams are beginning to identify priority standards, competencies, or learning progressions, and assessment and grading connections are still developing. • Some common tools exist such as rubric templates or learner profile elements, and calibration is limited. • Teachers and leaders are seeking clarity about what counts as PCBL locally and what artifacts should show up across classrooms. • Early moves toward standards based grading or more meaningful assessment are underway and use is inconsistent.
Support that tends to help next:	• Common competency language that clarifies what mastery looks like plus routines for calibration through student work and rubric norming. • A clear minimum viable learning cycle that includes instruction, assessment, feedback, and an opportunity to strengthen evidence. • A small set of indicators that signal whether core practices are happening, tracked on a predictable cadence. • A coherent connection between the graduate profile and classroom expectations so the profile lives in daily instruction.
Risks to watch for:	• Expanding to every school or grade before a few routines and artifacts are consistently used. • Treating coherence as communications only rather than building adult routines that make practice consistent.

PRACTICE-DEEPENING

Snapshot:	One or more schools, grade bands, or content teams show strong and visible PCBL practice. Students can articulate goals, rubrics are used well, feedback cycles are tighter, and performance evidence is common. The challenge is unevenness. Strong practice is not yet reliably supported through shared tools, leadership routines, and enabling infrastructure.
Common signals:	• Model classrooms or schools exist and peers visit them. • Teacher leaders and early adopter administrators are present. • The need for consistency is growing in learning evidence expectations, grading and reporting practices, and progress supports. • Tool gaps begin to matter more such as gradebook configuration, rubric banks, or common templates. • Leaders are asking how to make success easier for more teachers, beyond inspiration.
Support that tends to help next:	• A small set of shared tools that capture what good looks like, such as student facing progressions, rubric language, and evidence protocols. • Leadership routines that protect and spread practice including walkthrough look fors, coaching cycles, common planning structures, and onboarding supports. • Data practices that focus on fewer measures collected consistently and reviewed on a cadence that leads to adjustment.
Risks to watch for:	• Tool overload that adds artifacts faster than teams can use them well. • Spreading by showcasing examples without building the supports that allow new sites to implement with confidence.

SCALING

Snapshot:	PCBL is operating in multiple schools and is becoming a recognizable way of doing learning. The central challenge becomes coherence and sustainability at scale across curriculum, assessment, grading and reporting, student supports, professional learning, and enabling data systems.
Common signals:	• Multiple schools are moving and variation increases as scope expands. • District leaders are pulled into system level questions such as curriculum alignment, assessment systems, professional learning coherence, data systems, and partnerships. • The work can remain in a pilot posture unless district conditions are built intentionally. • Cross school networks and shared professional learning exist. • Some common artifacts are standard such as rubrics, learner profile elements, or conferencing routines. • Leaders are balancing consistency with room for local design.
Support that tends to help next:	• A district operating model for PCBL that clarifies decision rights, coaching approach, data routines, and what should be consistent statewide within the district. • Stronger instructional system coherence that reduces contradictions across curriculum materials, assessments, grading practices, and intervention structures. • Sustainability routines such as onboarding, turnover supports for principals and teachers, annual calibration cycles, and regular review of tools and policies.
Risks to watch for:	• Scaling faster than coaching capacity and shared artifact quality can support. • Expanding schools without scaling the support infrastructure at the same time.

REDESIGNING

Snapshot:	PCBL practices are strong enough and community support and leadership commitment are strong enough that the system can consider structural redesign. This can include flexible scheduling, mastery based crediting, redesigned transcripts or report cards, expanded learning beyond school walls, and policies that better reflect learning outcomes over time based structures.
Common signals:	• Evidence practices are consistent and adult calibration routines are strong. • The system is integrating learning across settings into credit or competency recognition such as work based learning, community projects, or community based experiences. • Leaders are ready to address policy, operations, and communications along with classroom practice.
Support that tends to help next:	• A deliberate policy and operations pathway that identifies constraints such as credits, grading policy, reporting requirements, and instructional time structures, then builds a staged redesign plan. • Proactive community engagement that explains how transcripts, grading, and student supports operate under new structures. • Systems for documenting evidence of learning and ensuring equitable access so redesigned pathways do not advantage only students who already navigate systems well. • Shared learning from other states and districts that have revised instructional time and credit structures while protecting quality and equity.
Risks to watch for:	• Structural redesign that moves faster than classroom level evidence practices and calibration routines can support.

On Ramps: A menu of entry paths

The PCBL fully realized companion brief describes the destination. This section shows that districts will reach that destination through different entry paths and on different timelines. The goal for the Commission is to make those paths easier to start and easier to sustain through coherent supports, clear permissions, and smart use of the SB4 appropriation.

These on ramps are designed to fit common Nevada routines such as PLCs, RPDP days, principal meetings, MTSS teams, grading committees, and master scheduling cycles. Many systems use a term length pilot window for an on ramp so teams can produce usable artifacts, learn from real implementation, and identify what supports and permissions help the work spread without adding burden.

How commissioners can use the on ramp menu:

- Design SB4 investments that produce usable outputs: Fund work that results in concrete artifacts, repeatable routines, and evidence that informs next steps.
- Cultivate professional learning that matches real entry paths: Build learning opportunities around the specific practices districts are trying, with coaching and artifacts that travel.
- Form working groups with clear tasks: Use each on ramp to identify who needs to be at the table and what decisions they need to make.
- Select providers with clear expectations: Choose providers who can deliver job embedded learning, coaching support, and practical tools aligned to each on ramp.
- Set shared expectations for outcomes: Look for early proof that teams can implement with consistency and equity, then use that proof to decide what to scale and what to simplify.

Summary of On Ramps

On Ramp	Short description
On ramp A Performance tasks and common rubrics	Builds shared expectations for quality through common tasks, shared rubrics, and calibration using real student work
On ramp B Learner agency routines	Builds student goal routines, conferencing, feedback cycles, and evidence portfolios that support ownership and clarity
On ramp C Grading and reporting alignment	Builds clearer communication of learning by aligning grading practices to learning evidence and separating academic learning from habits of work
On ramp D Advisory and student supports	Builds predictable structures for connection, goal check ins, and referral pathways that link supports to student evidence
On ramp E Instructional planning for differentiation	Builds tiered pathways inside instruction using checks for understanding, flexible grouping, and targeted supports
On ramp F Schedule pilots	Builds time structures that make personalization feasible through small flex pilots that can expand when routines and outcomes are clear

On Ramp A: Performance tasks and common rubrics

What this on ramp strengthens on the path to PCBL fully realized

Meaningful demonstrations of learning, shared criteria for proficiency, and adult calibration that improves reliability and equity.

What a pilot typically produces within a term

- A common performance task used across a defined team.
- A common rubric with a small set of criteria aligned to priority standards or competencies.
- Calibration notes that capture where scoring differed and how expectations were aligned.
- A small set of anchor examples that illustrate rubric levels.
- An instructional response plan tied to common strengths and gaps in student work.

Roles that often need to be involved

- Content area teacher teams and PLC leads.
- Instructional coaches or teacher leaders who can facilitate calibration.
- Special education, multilingual learner, and assessment leads to support access and quality.
- Building leaders who can protect time for calibration and follow through.

Examples of supports that enable success

- Professional learning on what makes a high quality performance task, what makes a usable rubric, and how to run calibration protocols.
- Coaching support for the first task administration and calibration cycle.
- Templates for tasks, rubrics, calibration protocols, and student work collection that protect privacy.

Early proof to look for

- Evidence that teams can score more consistently over time and can explain why.
- Student work that improves after feedback and revision opportunities.
- PLC minutes or artifacts that show student evidence leading to instructional adjustment.

Policy and operating considerations

- Agreement on how the task counts within the unit assessment for the pilot scope.
- A protected calibration block within existing routines.
- A safe method for sharing anonymized student work within the team.

On Ramp B: Learner agency routines

What this on ramp strengthens on the path to PCBL fully realized

Clarity and ownership of learning targets, routines that help students navigate their learning pathway, and evidence that travels with the learner.

What a pilot typically produces within a term

- A simple goal setting and reflection routine used consistently in a defined scope.
- A predictable conference rotation that ensures regular check-ins.
- A basic evidence folder structure that students and advisors can use.
- A small set of student examples that show what strong goals, reflections, and next steps look like.

Roles that often need to be involved

- Classroom teachers and grade level teams.
- Instructional coaches who can model short conferences and feedback routines.
- Advisors or student support staff when conferences and goals need to travel beyond one classroom.

Examples of supports that enable success

- Professional learning on metacognition, self regulation routines, and feedback that leads to revision.
- Coaching that models efficient conferencing routines that protect instructional time.
- Goal templates, reflection prompts, and conference note tools that are simple and reusable.

Early proof to look for

- Student goals that become more specific and connected to learning targets.
- Student reflections that show follow through on next step actions.
- Reductions in missing work or improved engagement signals for students who participate consistently.

Policy and operating considerations

- Local flexibility to protect a small amount of time each week for goals and reflection.
- Shared agreement that conferencing time counts as instructional time.
- Access to basic student data for teachers and advisors with clear guardrails.

On Ramp C: Grading and reporting alignment

What this on ramp strengthens on the path to PCBL fully realized

Reporting and communication that reflects learning evidence and next steps, plus shared expectations for what grades communicate.

What a pilot typically produces within a term

- A small set of grading principles for a defined pilot scope.
- A gradebook structure aligned to priority learning targets rather than task types.
- Separate reporting for academic learning and habits of work.
- A family and student communication set that explains what changes and what stays stable.

Roles that often need to be involved

- District or school leaders responsible for teaching and learning.
- Teacher leaders from pilot teams who can surface friction points.
- Student information system and gradebook support staff.
- Communications partners who can support clarity for families.

Examples of supports that enable success

- Professional learning on proficiency based grading principles and separating habits of work from academic achievement.
- Facilitation support for the policy conversations that surface predictable concerns.
- Technical support for gradebook configuration within existing systems.
- Communication templates and a short FAQ that can be adapted locally.

Early proof to look for

- Gradebook examples that clearly show strengths and gaps by learning target.
- Improved student and family reports of clarity about what is being learned and what comes next.
- Evidence that pilot grading decisions align more closely with common assessment and student work evidence.

Policy and operating considerations

- Approval for a defined scope pilot and clarity on how pilot grades translate to transcripts, eligibility, and reporting.

- Flexibility in systems for alternate categories or standards tags.
- Shared guidance on what can vary locally during pilots and what should remain consistent.

On Ramp D: Advisory and student supports

What this on ramp strengthens on the path to PCBL fully realized

Predictable structures for connection and support, plus a consistent place for goal check ins and support triage that links to student evidence.

What a pilot typically produces within a term

- A clear purpose statement for advisory.
- Stable rosters and a predictable advisory routine.
- A starter scope and sequence and basic facilitation guides.
- A referral pathway into counseling, tutoring, and MTSS supports.
- A short data snapshot that advisors use with guardrails.

Roles that often need to be involved

- Principals and assistant principals.
- Advisory coordinators or teacher leaders.
- Counselors, deans, social workers, and MTSS leads.
- Data and privacy leads who can set access and guardrails.

Examples of supports that enable success

- Professional learning on advisory facilitation, referral protocols, trauma informed basics, and social emotional learning integration.
- Coaching supports that help advisors build confidence and use routines consistently.
- Templates for agendas, check in routines, referrals, and data snapshots.

Early proof to look for

- Student survey signals on belonging and adult connection.
- Improved attendance or fewer course failures for targeted groups supported through advisory routines.
- Short case examples that show how advisory helped a student stay on track.

Policy and operating considerations

- Clarity on schedule time allocation and supervision expectations.
- Appropriate data access for advisors with privacy guardrails.
- Clear role boundaries across advisory, counseling, and student support staff.

On Ramp E: Instructional planning for differentiation

What this on ramp strengthens on the path to PCBL fully realized

Planning for learner variability through tiered pathways, checks for understanding, and targeted supports that keep students progressing.

What a pilot typically produces within a term

- A tiered unit plan with a core pathway, targeted supports, and extensions.
- A small set of quick checks aligned to priority standards or competencies.
- A simple progress monitoring tracker that informs grouping and supports.
- A shared intervention menu linked to common misconceptions in the pilot course or unit.

Roles that often need to be involved

- Course teams or grade level PLCs.
- Instructional coaches and MTSS problem solving teams.
- Special education and multilingual learner supports for equitable design.

Examples of supports that enable success

- Professional learning on MTSS aligned classroom differentiation and using evidence to drive tiers.
- Coaching that supports co planning, modeling small group instruction, and using progress monitoring routines.
- Planning templates, quick check banks, and trackers that reduce workload.

Early proof to look for

- Pre and post evidence on priority standards or competencies for the pilot unit.
- Early reductions in D and F rates in the pilot scope or reduced need for credit recovery.
- Teacher notes that identify which supports produced the strongest gains for which learners.

Policy and operating considerations

- Flexibility for regrouping students during class without tracking concerns.
- Protected time for common planning that supports tiered design.
- Access to screening and progress monitoring data for instructional use with clear expectations.

On ramp F: Schedule pilots

What this on ramp strengthens on the path to PCBL fully realized

Time structures that make personalized learning routines feasible, including targeted support, conferencing, and enrichment.

What a pilot typically produces within a term

- A small flex block pilot in a defined scope.
- A routing approach that determines how students access flex time.
- A supervision plan and operational norms.
- A utilization snapshot that shows how time is being used and where barriers exist.
- A simple playbook that captures rules and routines for the pilot.

Roles that often need to be involved

- Principals and assistant principals including operations.
- Master schedulers.
- Counselors and intervention leads when routing includes supports.
- Teachers who refer students or run targeted sessions.

Examples of supports that enable success

- Operational professional learning for staff on routing, supervision, and using flex time for targeted support.
- Coaching for the master scheduler and site leaders during early iterations.
- Simple tools for tracking utilization and targeted outcomes.

Early proof to look for

- Utilization data showing students used flex time for targeted support and enrichment.
- Student stories tying flex time to stronger assignment completion, improved evidence, or improved attendance.
- Operational stability such as clear supervision coverage and predictable routines.

Policy and operating considerations

- Approval for a limited schedule pilot with a defined scope and end point.
- Clarity on attendance accounting and supervision responsibilities.
- Coordination with transportation and extracurricular schedules when expanding.

References

Aurora Institute. *What Is Competency-Based Education? An Updated Definition* (2019).

Aurora Institute (CompetencyWorks). "CBE Starter Pack 4: Progress Based on Mastery" (Nov. 17, 2022).

Sturgis, C., & Casey, K. (iNACOL/CompetencyWorks). *Quality Principles for Competency-Based Education* (2018).

Center for Implementation Practice (NIRN/CIP). *Implementation Stages: Best Practices and Tools to Use a Stage-based Implementation Approach* (July 2021).

Education Commission of the States. *Policy Approaches to Competency-Based Education* (Feb. 23, 2021).

Education Commission of the States. *50-State Comparison: High School Graduation Requirements* (May 23, 2023).

Nevada Legislature. *Assembly Bill 110 (2017): Competency-Based Education Network and Pilot Program* (enrolled bill PDF).

Nevada Department of Education. *Nevada Competency-Based Education Network Comprehensive Report: 2022* (submitted to Governor and Nevada Legislature).

Nevada Department of Education. “Personalized, Competency-Based Learning in Nevada” (web page; describes PCBL definition and the shift from seat time to mastery).

Nevada Department of Education. “Future of Learning Network” (web page; describes Nevada’s PCBL systems-change ecosystem and Portrait activation supports).

KnowledgeWorks. “State Policy Framework for Personalized Learning” (web page; includes Nevada example: Future of Learning Network, Portrait, and phased action plan).