NEVADA LEGISLATURE
JOINT INTERIM STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

(*Nevada Revised Statutes* [NRS] 218E.320)

MINUTES

May 15, 2024

The fourth meeting of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education for the 2023–2024 Interim was held on Wednesday, May 15, 2024, at 9 a.m. in Room 4401, Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4100, Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada.

The agenda, minutes, meeting materials, and audio or video recording of the meeting are available on the Committee's meeting page. The audio or video recording may also be found at https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Video/. Copies of the audio or video record can be obtained through the Publications Office of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) (publications@lcb.state.nv.us or 775/684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Chair
Senator Carrie A. Buck
Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop
Assemblyman Reuben D'Silva
Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

Senator Roberta Lange, Vice Chair (Excused)

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Jennifer A. Sturm-Gahner, Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division
Alex Drozdoff, Senior Policy Analyst, Research Division
Crystal Rowe, Senior Research Policy Assistant, Research Division
Asher Killian, Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Cameron Newton, Senior Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division

Items taken out of sequence during the meeting have been placed in agenda order.
[Indicate a summary of comments.]

AGENDA ITEM I—OPENING REMARKS

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Good morning and welcome to the fourth meeting of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education. Before we begin, I want to remind listeners of the Solicitation of Recommendations. It is available on our Committee overview page on the Nevada Legislature's website. If you are interested, please submit recommendations no later than June 28, 2024, and contact Committee staff with any questions. Please check that out if you have an idea for a Committee bill, because we are going to be bringing those forth soon.

If you are presenting or presenting in the future, please make sure the presentation you send for upload does not have any trademarks or copyrights because we cannot upload the presentation you spent so much time on. We had that happen today with our artificial intelligence (AI) presentation. We are working on that and once we can clear up those copyright things, we will get it uploaded.

[Chair Bilbray-Axelrod reviewed meeting protocol and information related to providing public comment.]

AGENDA ITEM II—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

With that, let us get started with our first agenda item, public comment. I will begin with Las Vegas, and no one is coming up.

Is there anyone in Carson City who would like to make public comment? [There were none.]

Is there anyone on the phone line wishing to make public comment?

Broadcast and Production Services (BPS):

Chair, the public line is open and working, but there are no callers at this time.

AGENDA ITEM III—APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING ON APRIL 18, 2024

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

We will move on to Agenda Item III, approval of the minutes for the meeting held on April 18, 2024.

> ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON APRIL 18, 2024.
>
> SENATOR DONDERO LOOP SECONDED THE MOTION.
>
> THE MOTION PASSED (ASSEMBLYMAN D'SILVA WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE).

*****

AGENDA ITEM IV—PRESENTATION ON SENATE BILL 98 (2023) AND THE ACING ACCOUNTABILITY INITIATIVE

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Agenda Item IV is a presentation on SB 98, the Acing Accountability Initiative. Begin when you are ready.

Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Nevada's Department of Education (NDE):

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod and Members of the Committee, we are pleased to be here this morning to share with you Acing Accountability and information in regard to SB 98 (Agenda Item IV A) (Agenda Item IV B) (Agenda Item IV C) (Agenda Item IV D) (Agenda Item IV E). As we know, there is much to celebrate out of the last legislative session when it comes to supporting our students and educators in Nevada, but we also need to ensure there is a stewardship in the investment. Today's presentation will dive into additional accountability measures for Nevada's public education system over the next two years. This work is in collaboration with the Office of the Governor, NDE, the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA), and our public school district superintendents.

During the State of the State in January 2023, Governor Lombardo committed to no less than $2 billion in increased investment in education. In his State of the State address, Governor Lombardo stated that, along with this funding, he expects results and will not accept a lack of funding as an excuse for underperformance. In June, this legislative body passed, and the Governor signed, SB 503 (2023), adding more than $2.6 billion to education. This investment helped to improve the per-pupil funding by approximately $2,200 to support our quality instruction.

As part of the systems of accountability, SB 98 was enhanced to identify specific metrics of performance. These metrics look at student growth, proficiency and engagement, as well as the stability of the workforce in our schools. At this intersection of SB 503 funding, as well as SB 98's metrics, is a new system of accountability for school district and charter school leadership. The system varies from the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) which drills down on individual schools. This system is intended to measure how the increase in education funding will impact student achievement and district data. This will be accomplished by focusing on school districts and the SPCSA and their responses and data related to six essential questions, leveraging annual goals set for the School Year (SY) 2023–2024, as well as SY 2024–2025.

In alignment with the work of NDE, the Commission on School Funding—under SB 98 and Assembly Bill 400 (2023)—was charged with conducting a study and providing recommendations that seek to determine if the historic investments made to the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan will have promoted both positive achievement outcomes and improvements for students and increased teacher retention and recruitment efforts across the entire State. The areas of study under the Commission's purview align with Acing Accountability framework, which includes student achievement, student improvement and supports for improved literacy, staff retention and recruitment, and measures of staff, student, and family satisfaction. The Commission on School Funding will present findings of their studies to support the work of the Department, school districts, and charter schools toward the improvement of student outcomes.

We know that by infusing additional funds into our schools and providing intentional focus on systems, processes, and results, we will improve student achievement and educator

effectiveness. We have demonstrated in the State of Nevada, with the Read by Grade 3 initiative in 2015, when the initial pieces were made available for grant funding. Those who received the funding, and then in subsequent years across the State as all school districts implemented, we reached the national average on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). It was the first time ever. We were intentional, we were focused, and we had additional funds to conduct that work. We fully expect that we will be seeing other gains out of these next two years.

At this time, I will dive into the six essential questions we came up with for school districts, student achievement, and measures. As mentioned, the system uses various metrics to answer these questions. The six essential questions shown here highlight the purpose and function of public education. Namely, utilizing public money and resources in the most effective way to ensure students are performing at expected levels and prepared for life after their pre-kindergarten through 12 education, with the support of a skilled and sufficient team of educators who can successfully respond to a wide range of challenges facing our communities.

The next six slides dive into metrics that will be investigated and measured to determine the effectiveness of school districts and the SPSCA and its charter schools. This first question asks to what degree are the school districts, SPCSA, and charter schools effectively implementing reading and mathematics resources. It is important to ensure all education entities are implementing evidence-based instructional materials. Additionally, we want to know school districts, as captured in the annual district performance plan, and charter school holders, captured in the charter school plans, are strategically focused on improving student growth and achievement. We are looking for a coherent alignment in the system of education. We start with our standards as the base—which we developed with our constituents, looking nationally at what we want our students to know and be able to do. We start with the standards. We go through a process of adopting the instructional materials—the textbooks that are aligned to the standards. Then we have effective and engaging educators. Finally, we measure those outcomes. If you have a coherent aligned system, we would expect the outcomes to be better than they are today. This first one is looking at the materials, because if the materials are not aligned to the standards, we would not expect the outcomes to be as high as they can be.

The next two essential questions are focused on our kindergarten through eighth grade students. The target area for K through 3 is building literacy, while the target area for grades 4 through 8 is focused on building their mathematical skills.

The next two areas are focused on assessment results. It is important to point out that no new assessments were added to this system. We are using assessments that already exist and looking at the data and setting benchmarks which were required by SB 98.

The second essential question is to what degree are kindergarten through eighth grade students demonstrating progress toward mastery in literacy. When it comes to early literacy, at least 65 percent of our kindergarten through eighth grade students should be meeting or exceeding their personalized learning goals. This is monitored using the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment in English language arts (ELA). In the spring, first through third grade students receive a goal and a target for the following spring assessments. These are personalized from the data from one spring looking into the future. What we would expect our students to know and be able to do the next school year. We want to see a full year's growth in a year's time. For those who are behind, we would like to see more growth in a year's time. For our K through 3 students, the goal is also for school districts and charter school holders

to improve the percentage of students above the 65th percentile which indicates proficiency on the MAP ELA assessment by at least 5 percent annually.

The third essential question is to what degree are grades 4 through 8 students demonstrating growth and proficiency in mathematics. For grade 4 through 8 students, there is a metric we use called the adequate growth percentile (AGP). This tracks if a student, who was previously non proficient, is on track to be proficient within three years or by the end of eighth grade. Using this metric, the goal is to see an annual improvement of at least 5 percent for students meeting the AGP as determined by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC). In grades 4 through 8, the school districts, SPCSA, and charter holders should also be improving the percentage of students achieving a proficiency level in three or four on the SBAC mathematics assessment by at least 5 percent annually.

The fourth essential question is to what degree are high school graduates prepared for success in college or a career. For the college and career ready (CCR) diploma, high school students take an assortment of courses including advanced placement (AP), international baccalaureate (IB), dual credit, career and technical education (CTE), work-based learning, and world language courses. Metrics to determine if high school students have the opportunity to be college or career ready include: (1) having at least 75 percent of all high school students enrolled in at least one course unique to the CCR diploma; (2) an improvement by at least 5 percent in the rate of passage for dual credit, CTE, work-based learning, and world language courses, and/or AP and IB exams; or (3) having at least 75 percent of students passing dual credit, CTE, work-based learning, and world language courses and having a three or higher in AP and IB. This essential question is like the other two we talked about, there is a growth measure to it and then a proficiency measure. We want to see increased access and also increased proficiency.

The fifth essential question asks to what degree do school districts and the SPCSA have the workforce to meet the needs of every student. Having licensed educators, specialized instructional support personnel, along with the staff that make our systems coherent and strong, is critical to improving Nevada's education system. This metric focuses on reducing the percentage of open or unfilled positions by filling these positions and not eliminating them. The State goal is to have at least 95 percent of our classrooms led by licensed educators and specialized instructional support personnel. We know it is often more difficult to fill positions at our neediest schools, but we have to ensure all our students benefit from a knowledgeable staff. With this knowledge, the second metric investigates the variance in staff openings between Title I schools and our non-Title I schools to ensure our staff are equally distributed regardless of school designation. To that end, the Commission on School Funding, under SB 98, is charged with studying the number of teachers graduating from the Nevada institutions of higher education relative to the number of teacher positions needed to be filled by Nevada school districts. The last metric we had for our State was that the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) was graduating about 800 students. We will see an increase this spring, but the need is about 2,300 educators every single year. Additionally, the Commission is charged with studying the classification and compensation for teachers and support personnel at public schools in Nevada and whether insufficient compensation is contributing to the difficulty in attracting and retaining teachers and support personnel in the public school system.

The first five essential questions were developed based on consistent data we already had within the State. Again, no unique assessments were added or any other pieces. It is putting numbers and expectations to work that were already transpiring across our State. The sixth essential question, as I was working with the superintendents and SPSCA, they kept saying great, we all agree in measures, but we have an additional story to tell. There was a lot of back-and-forth conversation. What is it that you are going to measure? How are

you going to hold yourself accountable? Initially, the conversation was about developing one for all 17 school districts. If you have heard me talk before, we have 17 school districts. It is not just Washoe, Clark, and the rurals. It is 17 unique school districts. This innovative solution provided the opportunity for school districts to come up with the metrics and stories they want to tell about their own school districts. Eureka, for example, is using the Kagan System of bringing positive components to the classroom. In Clark County, they have the transformation district, and they are going to be measuring specific components there. All 17 districts have submitted to NDE, and we are now in the process of making sure the benchmarks seem reasonable. Through this process, and I hope you will also embrace this, we may find that a metric a school district came up with is not a viable metric, not something we want to use. But we are encouraging people to look at things and think differently. We talk about failing forward. It is okay. We are not going to get to higher ground unless we stretch ourselves and that is what the school districts are doing. We may want to include these when we redo our accountability system. We will be coming to the Legislature asking for support to redo the entire accountability system. As you know, it is almost a decade old, and that work needs to transpire. This entire body of work is about ensuring the effectiveness of the new investments, the $2.06 billion, for our pre-K through 12 education system. It is our goal to work collaboratively and support the districts and SPCSA as they move forward. This is not about individual schools. This data is at the district level to make sure the investment that you as legislators made is moving an entire system—the district—forward and not just individual schools. With that Madam Chair, I stand ready to answer any questions you and your Committee may have.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you, I am sure there will be many questions. I will go to Carson City.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I cannot think of a better way to start my day than to be here. We have been waiting for this a long time. A quick thanks to Senator Mo Denis and you, Chair Bilbray-Axelrod, for making sure we got to have this agenda that we talked about in the 2022 Interim. Then in 2023, we saw these bills come forward, and I think we are on a good trajectory upward. I appreciate the time and thoughtfulness that has gone into this.

With the presentation, thank you, it was so concise. I have a comment and then a question. On the implementation of resources, I was glad to hear you emphasize alignment to understand outcomes. If our curriculum and plans are not aligned to the standards of career and college readiness, whatever that is—whether it is a diploma or plans, then we are not going to get there. I am glad to see that it is being reflected.

My question was on the K through 3 literacy and the mathematics for fourth through eighth grade. The way it is written on the slide, at least 65 percent of K through 3 students meet or exceed. I think I know the answer, but I want to have you clarify, the goal is 65 percent and not where we are right now.

Superintendent Ebert:

Correct.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

There is growth. I was looking at our State Report Card and I think we are currently in the 41.8 percentile on elementary ELA, and then 36.3 percent on math proficiency. Certainly it

is a great standard to try to get us to on that. I am thankful there are no more assessments, and we are going to work with what we have.

One last question, you mentioned 800 graduates in education coming through the pipeline, if I got the number right, we need 2,300. Certainly, that is a discrepancy we are feeling in our schools. I know there has been a lot of talk about recruitment and getting innovative. I do not know if you can answer this, have we looked into the recruitment of retired or those who might have left teaching due to the climate? With student discipline being addressed last session, we heard a lot of stories that were disturbing about the environment our teachers are in at the schools, with the inability to discipline to the extent we need to on severe cases. Are we able to reach out to those teachers to see the temperature for teachers coming back to the classroom, knowing we have heard the pleas of teachers, students, and parents to secure these classrooms and schools to make the climate in our schools better for teaching?

Superintendent Ebert:

There are two things I would highlight with your question. One is we did not have the data, at the State level, of why our educators were leaving the profession. We have our Teacher Recruitment and Retention Task Force which made the recommendation two years ago to have a State-level exit survey, so we had access directly from the teacher to the State. You funded that work, and it has gone live within the last few months. We expect to have more accurate data on why teachers are leaving the profession so we can address those specific issues prior to anyone making those decisions. We want our highly effective educators to stay.

As far as the teachers fully understanding the current landscape and the laws you passed and were signed. It is a great question. We are amplifying and looking at—within our Online Portal for Applications and Licensure (OPAL) system. We have licensed educators in the State of Nevada; there are roughly 50,000 educators in that system and about 30,000 of them are currently working in our classrooms. It includes counselors, psychologists, and teachers—it is not just the classroom teacher. We are going to look at that delta and see if they will answer a survey. To your point, they might ask about student discipline, that is not why they are interested. I know there are a couple of people sitting at the dais right now, who are not in classrooms, that are part of that delta. I would encourage them to come back to the classroom as well. I know there are other reasons, besides what is transpiring in our schools, that keep those people who are already currently licensed. We want to do a marketing campaign around those who are currently licensed in the State and get them back in the classroom. Then, also to work with the school districts to amplify the historic pay raises, that you supported, to amplify the benefits. Here in Nevada, we value our educators. The work we have been doing over the last few years to demonstrate that—again, the pay raises and the laws put into place to make sure they have wonderful working conditions and produce joyful classrooms with wonderful students.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

We will look forward to that data when it becomes available.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Thank you for the presentation. I was happy to hear about, or emotional, when it came to the increase in funding that happened to education. I was proud to vote for that in my Chamber, and I know my Senate colleagues felt the same way—that we voted for it in our Chambers. We are proud to be part of that.

There are a few items that I have questions about. I am happy my colleague brought up the number of educators that are needed, that is my first question under workforce. Is NDE trying to recruit more students into education at the different college levels? I have a friend whose daughter just went through orientation at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), and there was only one person who was going into the College of Education as a freshman. Has NDE been involved in trying to recruit our freshmen and incoming students into those universities in the College of Education?

Superintendent Ebert:

Yes, NDE started the teaching and training program four years ago. It is a partnership with the higher education system making sure that students—while they are in high school, and we are hoping to push it down into middle school as well—have an understanding of the opportunity for teaching. If you are looking for specific data, I will call Craig Statucki, Director, Office of Career Readiness, Adult Learning, and Education Options, NDE, to the table. We have nine of the school districts participating today.

The second part is, AB 428 (2023) had the requirement for both Clark and Washoe County school districts—Clark starting this next school year—to have a program in their high schools so students can understand the pathway they can travel to become an educator. It also has the Paraprofessional Pathways Project (PPP) where they can become support staff professionals. I brought the PPP in early. The University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), is also working with our paraprofessionals to make sure they have a pathway. Their apprenticeship program is 508 students strong, and 62 percent of their students are diverse and has a 95 percent graduation. We are hitting every level starting with the high school students all the way through those who are currently working in our schools and those who want to come back into the profession.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Thank you, it would be good if you could get that data for us.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I wanted to point out you said that UNR had 1 student and UNLV had 500. Once again, UNLV showing up UNR. I wanted to get that on the record.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I knew you would, which was why I was trying to rush it. It was only one day of orientation. My second question had to do with the number of— There were a few times when you spoke about growth measures, especially under the grades 4 through 8 mathematics, as well as K through 3 literacy. Both times there was a statement about making a 5 percent growth. What is the national norm? Is that the national norm and why the 5 percent growth was utilized? Or is there a different reason why the 5 percent growth is consistent across both those items?

Superintendent Ebert:

There were two things we looked at. One was the growth we had locally—year over year, what has transpired? Obviously, we had the pandemic. Prior to the pandemic, we saw several school districts making that target. Also, looking nationally across the data with our vendors. For some of our school districts, these are stretch goals. We believe that many of the school districts will make that 5 percent. I do not have the answer today if 100 percent will, but I will have that answer for you in the fall.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

You mentioned at the end, under innovative solutions, of a need for different metrics being utilized and the accountability system. You lost me when you were trying to say we need to push back. The impression was that we need to push back on what school districts have been utilizing or we need to change what that accountability system would look like. Is that something that would be coming from the Nevada State Board of Education or something that you are looking at legislative language to be changed or is it more of an internal discussion between NDE and the different school districts? If you could dig deeper into that, I would appreciate it.

Superintendent Ebert:

We have the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA) where we must comply with the federal government in an accountability system. We worked as a State to develop that system with teachers, parents, and administrators. The system includes things you have heard of and have brought up before. Chronic absenteeism is part of that system. We agreed ten years ago that it was a good measure, and we wanted it to be part of the system. There are other components that we have no choice on agreeing to. We must administer grades 3 through 8 an annual assessment in mathematics, as well as ELA. Then, we have the high school assessment on all those other pieces. The federal government allows us to make the determination on how much we weight things like proficiency and growth. In Nevada, we chose to weight growth more than proficiency—that is part of our system. As we look to the future, we know this is ten years old and we took this as an opportunity to redo it. We want to get the constituents—who are now in the classroom, parents, and students involved. We took this opportunity in Acing Accountability to test drive those things we may want to include in the next accountability system. I will be happy to send when we finalize all the data. All 17 school districts, as well as the charter schools, send that information. They are looking at the unique pieces of their system they want to highlight. If we find something out of this innovative opportunity that we want to include—because it will be a year from now when we start developing the new system—we have already beta tested it prior. Then, when we submit the plan to the federal government, we have the data that shows we tested this. We believe these are things we want to see measured in the State of Nevada to demonstrate our students are ready for workforce, college, military, or whatever path they choose when they leave our classrooms.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for the question, Assemblywoman, because I had that question too on the different metrics. It was not lining up in my mind. I have a couple of questions. Specifically, about workforce. I am looking at the numbers, I can see the budget allocation. I appreciate what you have. Maybe we are already collecting this because anecdotally it is true. I am going to propose, there are people who have retired but are long-term substitutes. They are not filling the position, but they are. I know we look at that, but is it being captured back? For a variety of reasons, doing the long-term substitute might make the better choice.

I appreciate that you are grabbing the information you are grabbing. I appreciate your office. I talk specifically with your staff about the pipeline and locally grown. Once again, anecdotally, we know that if these kids are coming through our programs, schools, and universities instead of recruiting from out of state—which is not even an option anymore because everybody is dealing with a lack of teachers—they are more likely to stay.
I appreciate that we will be grabbing that data as well.

Superintendent Ebert:

As you know, I value transparency. Whether it is good data or bad data, that we have data to make decisions. We have the OPAL system which has all of our teacher licenses. We also have the Infinite Campus system which has all of the educators in the classroom. What we have been working on, for the last year and a half, is to make sure those two systems can talk to each other. It has been through brute force in some instances making sure the data syncs. It is hard to tell, if a person who is highly qualified, but they are a long-term substitute, as opposed to being in the classroom as a full-time teacher. With the educator shortage, we cannot tell if the school is making a determination. Let us say a school is missing a second grade teacher. They take the students and spread them across the second grade teachers who are there. They know they have someone who is highly qualified, they have worked with, or are they pulling in a long-term substitute and the class size is lower in that example. We do not have access to that information. We are working to have that before school starts. We are in the final stages of working with the school districts to validate the information we have and clean the data up. I would love to report to you, and the entire public, this is how many substitutes are in school XYZ. These are the number of vacancies, and these are the class sizes in school ABC. So we have a clear picture of what is transpiring in every single school across our State.

AGENDA ITEM V—PRESENTATION ON TRENDS AND COMPARISONS BETWEEN GRADUATION AND ACHIEVEMENT RATES OF NEVADA PUPILS PURSUANT TO SENATE BILL 72 (2023)

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

We will move on to Agenda Item V, a presentation on trends and comparisons between graduation and achievement rates of Nevada pupils pursuant to SB 72. We will have Peter Zutz and Dr. Gunes Kaplan with NDE. Begin when you are ready.

Gunes Kaplan, Ph.D., Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management, NDE:

Good morning, members of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education. Today, I will be presenting the Nevada high school four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates (ACGR) of the Class of 2023 and trends shaping the graduation rates (Agenda Item V A) (Agenda Item V B). Before I start my presentation, I would like to explain what the ACGR is. The ACGR is the federally mandated method for calculating the graduation rates across the United States. It is the percentage of public high school freshmen who graduate with a regular high school diploma within four years of starting ninth grade. Students who are entering ninth grade, or the earliest high school grade, for the first time form a cohort for the graduating class. The cohort is adjusted by adding any students who subsequently transfer into the cohort and subtracting any students who subsequently transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die.

This slide compares the 12-year ACGR trends in Nevada and nationwide. The source for the nationwide data is the National Center for Education Statistics. Please note that as of the preparation of this slide, and for the next few slides, the 2022–2023 data for the nationwide trend was not available. We only added Nevada's 2022–2023 data in the slide.

This slide displays the three-year ACGR trends in Nevada alongside nationwide figures. In the upcoming slides for Nevada, we will focus on the three-year graduation trends.

This slide displays the 12-year trend of graduation rates in Nevada in comparison to the states within the western region. The dark blue colored line represents Nevada.

This slide displays the three-year trend of graduation rates in Nevada in comparison to the states within the western region. The dark blue colored bar represents Nevada.

This slide presents a three-year comparison of graduation rates in Nevada against the national average across different race and ethnicity categories. Nevada is represented with the blue color; nationwide is represented with the gray color. While there are seven federally recognized race/ethnic categories, only four are shown in the slide. The data for the remaining three race/ethnic categories were combined at the national level. Whereas in our State, we do not combine them and are thus excluded from the slide.

This slide presents a three-year comparison of graduation rates in Nevada against the national average across different student groups. National data did not have homeless student data available for 2019–2020 and 2020–2021.

Now we are going to deep dive into Nevada's graduation rate trends. This slide shows the three-year trend in graduation rates by the percentage and number of graduates. The statewide graduation rate for the class of 2023 is 81.39 percent, representing a slight decrease of 0.33 percentage points compared to the class of 2022. The State's overall rate has remained above 80 percent for the past three consecutive years.

This graph shows the comparison of the graduation rates for each Nevada school district for the past three years. For your reference, the statewide rates are shown on the leftmost columns of the chart. The blue horizontal dash line is the statewide graduation rate for the Class of 2023, and it is provided as a reference line. On the horizontal axis, we have the school districts. Each entity has three columns representing the last three years of graduation rates.

This graph shows the three largest districts' graduation rate trends. For your reference, the statewide rates are on the leftmost columns in the graph. Please note the vertical scale starts from 65 percent. The reason for doing so is to make the difference between the rates more visible.

In this graph, we display the race/ethnicity distribution of graduates for the Class of 2023. Please note the data displayed here are not graduation rates, but the demographic breakdown of the 2023 graduating class by race and ethnicity. The values inside the bars represent the number of graduates in each race/ethnic category. Percentage values are computed by dividing the number of graduates by the total number of graduates.

This graph displays the three-year trends of the graduation rates for each racial and ethnic population. For your reference, the statewide "all students" rates are on the leftmost columns in the graph, and the blue horizontal dash line is the statewide graduation rate as a reference line. Please note the vertical scale starts at 50 percent to make the graduation rate differences more visible.

This graph displays the distribution of graduates in each student group for the class of 2023. Values inside the bars represent the number of graduates in each student group. Percentage values are computed by dividing the number of graduates by the total number of graduates.

This chart displays the graduation rates for each of our student groups. For your reference, the statewide "all students" graduation rates are on the leftmost columns and the blue horizontal line is the statewide graduation rate as a reference. Career and technical

education students maintain one of the highest graduation rates of all student groups at 95.84 percent. Military connected students are a new collection for ACGR, so there is only data available from the Class of 2023 for the student group.

Next, we are going to look at the diploma types. This slide serves as a reference to the graduation requirements document, which is also accessible on the NDE website.

This slide provides information on the types of high school diplomas awarded in Nevada. During the graduation rate data validation and calculation process, we classify students receiving a CCR diploma, advanced diploma, standard diploma, and alternate diploma as graduates. However, adult diplomas are no longer counted as graduates in the ACGR process based on the recent guidance from the U.S. Department of Education (USED).

This table shows the counts and percentages of diploma types awarded in the Class of 2023. Students who receive one of the four diploma types are considered as graduates. Please note the footnote under the slide about adult diploma. The highest rates are standard diplomas at 58 percent, followed by CCR diplomas at 26.3 percent, and advanced diplomas at 15.4 percent. In the Class of 2023; 31,212 students earned a diploma. This is the sixth year in a row Nevada has awarded more than 30,000 diplomas in a year.

This table shows the type of diplomas broken down by race and ethnicity. You should read the data vertically from top to bottom and note that each column totals to 100 percent.

This is a graphical representation of the previous slide and shows the types and percentages of each diploma type earned by each race and ethnicity.

This table shows the type of diplomas earned broken down by student groups. Vertically or horizontally, the columns do not total up to 100 percent because a student can belong to more than one group.

This slide shows a three-year breakdown by diploma types earned. The CCR diploma has the same requirements as an advanced diploma but includes additional criteria such as completion of AP coursework, dual credit college coursework, IB coursework, and more, and must obtain an endorsement as college and/or career ready.

This slide is similar to the previous slide and shows the diploma type trends by percentage earned.

This slide shows the three-year trend in CCR by percentage and number of graduates.

Before concluding my presentation, I want to highlight that we have an appendix slide, after this thank you slide, that offers a detailed overview of the contents covered in the remaining slides. Please refer to it for quick navigation through the subsequent slides. This wraps up my presentation, thank you for your time and attention.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you, Dr. Gunes, you gave us a lot of information to look at.

Do we have any questions in Las Vegas? [There were none.] Carson City?

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I have one question on the data that deals with our individualized education plan (IEP) students. We have students who age out of the system and will never be to the point where

they could earn a diploma. Is that data captured on page 26, where that would be the non-graduates of the class of 2023? Or are the students aging out of the system receiving a certificate of attendance type of thing based upon their IEPs? Is that data anywhere?

Dr. Kaplan:

We capture IEP students in the ACGR process. We do not capture students who age out. Students enter the cohort when they start ninth grade, in a certain year, and then we track them for four years or five years for the extended graduation rate. If they are older than 22-, 23-, or 24-years-old, we do not capture those students.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Thank you for the clarification, because I know we have specialized schools that cater to our students in that intellectual area. It would be great to have that information as well because sometimes we forget about that. The three Clark County schools and then Marvin Picollo School in Washoe County—those schools. Knowing the number of students we have who age out would also help with the data for us to look at.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

We are going to hear from another presenter in Carson City. Begin when you are ready.

Peter Zutz, Administrator, Office of Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management, NDE:

Thank you for the time today to present trends on the achievement of Nevada students (Agenda Item V C). Today's presentation will provide achievement information for the assessments listed here. All the assessments, except the MAP growth assessment, fulfill and comply with federal law. The MAP growth assessment fulfills the state assessment requirement for Read by Grade 3.

Let us begin with the SBAC. The USED requires all states to annually assess and report results for all students in grades 3 through 8 in ELA and mathematics. The SBACs were adopted as per NRS 390.105 and fulfill NRS 390.125.

This slide presents a seven-year trend for the SBAC ELA assessment. Note in SY 2019–2020, assessments were waived due to the Coronavirus Disease of 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic.

This slide and the next two slides provide a two-year comparison of the SBAC ELA results. Note the two leftmost bars are the State's proficiency rate and the numbers in red, below the zero line, represent the change in proficiency from SY 2021–2022 to SY 2022–2023.

This slide provides a two-year comparison of the SBAC ELA results by the student groups: (1) students with disabilities; (2) English learners (ELs); and (3) economically disadvantaged students.

Lastly, for the SBAC ELA in grades 3 through 8, this slide provides a two-year comparison of the SBAC ELA results by grade.

Moving on to SBAC mathematics. This slide presents the seven-year trend for the SBAC mathematics assessment. Again, please note in SY 2019–2020 assessments were waived due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

This slide and the next two slides provide a two-year comparison of the SBAC mathematics results. This slide presents achievement by race and ethnicity. Note the two leftmost bars are the State's proficiency rate and the numbers in green, above the zero line, represent the change in proficiency from SY 2021–2022 to SY 2022–2023.

This slide provides a two-year comparison of the SBAC mathematics results by the student groups: (1) students with disabilities; (2) ELs; and (3) economically disadvantaged students.

The last slide for SBAC mathematics in grades 3 through 8, this slide provides a two-year comparison of the SBAC mathematics results by grade.

Nevada administers the American College Test (ACT) to comply with the USED mandate to assess and report results for all students in high school in ELA and mathematics. Nevada fulfills the USED's requirement for reporting high school science with its proprietary science assessment, and we will look at those results in a little bit. The ACT assessments were adopted as per NRS 390.600 and NRS 390.610.

This slide presents the five-year trend for the ACT ELA assessment. Note in the pandemic SY 2019–2020, Nevada school districts successfully completed assessing all grade 11 students.

The slide and the next slide provide a two-year comparison of the ACT ELA. This slide presents achievement by race and ethnicity. Again, please note the two leftmost bars provide the State's proficiency rate and the numbers in red, below the zero line, and the numbers in green, above the zero line, represent the change in proficiency from SY 2021–2022 to SY 2022–2023.

This slide provides a two-year comparison of the ACT ELA results by the student groups students with disabilities, ELs, and economically disadvantaged students.

This slide presents the five-year trend for the ACT mathematics assessment.

This slide and the next two slides provide a two-year comparison of the ACT mathematics results. This slide presents achievement by race and ethnicity.

This slide provides a two-year comparison to the ACT mathematics results by the student groups: students with disabilities, ELs, and economically disadvantaged students.

Moving on to the Nevada Alternate Assessment (NAA). The NAA is mandated by Section 1111(b)(2)(D) of ESSA and NRS 390.820, and is designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities. The NAA is administered to less than 1 percent of all students in Nevada who meet the strict criteria required to be assessed by this assessment. The NAA is based on the State's alternative achievement standards, which are aligned to the Nevada Academic Content Standards. The NAA is administered in ELA and mathematics in grades 3 through 8 and grade 11, and in science in grades 5, 8, and 11.

This slide presents a five-year trend for the NAA ELA. In SY 2019–2020, assessments were waived due to the pandemic. Please note the symbol less than five in SY 2021–2022 and SY 2022–2023 indicate data is suppressed in order to protect the privacy of students under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

This slide presents a five-year trend for the Nevada alternate mathematics assessment.

This slide presents a five-year trend for the Nevada alternate science assessment.

Moving on to science. The USED requires states to assess and report results for all students in elementary, middle, and high school science. Nevada assesses and reports student results in grades 5, 8, and 10. The Nevada science assessments were adopted as per NRS 390.105.

This slide presents a five-year trend for the grade 5 science assessment.

This slide and the next slide provide a two-year comparison of grade 5 science results. Again, please note two leftmost bars are the State's proficiency rate and the numbers above and below the zero line represent the change in proficiency from SY 2021–2022 to SY 2022–2023.

This slide provides a two-year comparison of the grade 5 results by the student groups: students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students. English learners were too few in number to report while protecting their identity.

Moving on this slide presents a five-year trend for grade 8 science.

This slide and the next slide provide a two-year comparison of grade 8 science results for races and ethnicities reported in Nevada.

This slide provides a two-year comparison of grade 8 science results by the student groups: students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students. Again, ELs were too few in number to report while protecting their identity.

Moving on to grade 9. This slide presents a five-year trend for grade 9 science students.

This slide and the next slide provide a two-year comparison of grade 9 science results. The slide provides two-year comparison of races and ethnicities.

This slide provides a two-year comparison to the high school science results by student groups: students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students. Again, ELs were too few a number to report while protecting their identity.

I am seeing reactions here. The ability to cross reference data and identify students is part of protecting students' identity. In other words, if you were able to, in a district or on the report card, find a district or school and because you know students there and the number of students, in this case taking an assessment and being reported, you could cross reference it back to this presentation. You can theoretically, in practice, identify who that student is and know what their result was. For that reason, it is the charge of the Department to make all data transparent, while protecting student privacy.

Let us move on to grade 10 science. This slide presents a five-year trend for grade 10 students.

This slide and the next two slides provide a two-year comparison of grade 10 science results. This slide provides student results for races and ethnicities.

The slide provides a two-year comparison of grade 10 science results by the student groups: students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students.

This slide provides a five-year trend for high school students. Nevada reports the combined grades 9 and 10 to comply with the federal requirement to report science achievement once in high school.

This slide and the next slide provide a two-year comparison of high school science results.

This slide provides a two-year comparison of high school science results by the student groups: students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students.

Measures of Academic Progress growth. The NWEA MAP growth assessment is administered to all grade K through 3 students and was adopted as per NRS 388.157 and *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) 388.660.

This slide presents a five-year trend for students taking the MAP assessment in grades K through 3.

This slide and the next slide provide a two-year comparison of MAP growth results. A reminder that the two leftmost bars are the State's rate and the numbers in red, below the zero line, and the numbers in green, above the zero line, represent the change in proficiency from SY 2021–2022 to SY 2022–2023.

This slide provides a two-year comparison of K through 3 MAP results by the student groups: students with disabilities, ELs, and economically disadvantaged students. This concludes this portion of the presentation.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I am not loving these numbers and trends. Thank you for bringing us the information.

Do we have questions? Assemblywoman Hardy.

Assemblywoman Hardy:

Thank you both for this important information. I agree with the Chair, some of it is pretty dismal to say the least. I appreciate that we have the opportunity to, at least, have the numbers so we can look at the trends and what is going on.

The question I have is on the first presentation about the graduation rates. On the diploma types, I noticed the CCR diploma numbers went up. It is great students are choosing to seek that diploma, which is going to help them when once they graduate. I also noticed a majority of the diplomas are standard and the advanced diplomas have gone down. Do we collect any information as to why students are not choosing the advanced or CCR diploma and just going for the standard? As I tie that into the proficiency rates, I am concerned we are graduating students who are not being set up for success. It is great they are graduating and getting a diploma, but if it is a standard diploma, what are they planning to do once they graduate when there are these other options? Do we have any information or find out from students why they are not choosing an advanced or CCR diploma and going for the standard?

Mr. Statucki, Previously Identified:

There are a lot of nuances to earning an advanced diploma or CCR diploma. Some of that is tied to having a minimum grade point average (GPA) of 3.25. If a student does not have a minimum GPA of 3.25, even if they have all the coursework, the advanced diploma or CCR diploma will default to the standard diploma.

Assemblywoman Hardy:

Thank you, that is helpful. They are taking the courses and doing the coursework, but because of the GPA they are not getting the diploma. Does that ultimately help them once they graduate? I am trying to figure out, we are graduating kids. What kind of future are we sending them on to based on the numbers here?

Mr. Statucki:

I think it depends on the scenario, slightly, because some of those students may be going to one of the two-year community colleges within the State, which does not have a minimum GPA entry into that piece, since those students, their next transition may naturally be into the postsecondary community college system. Additionally, when you start looking at it in terms of CTE and the career readiness endorsement portion, you will have students who have been successful in their current technical education programs, but not as successful, potentially, in their core academic programs. Those employers are identifying the skills they are learning in their CTE programs and utilizing that as part of the hiring process and not necessarily asking for a GPA as part of the application for hiring entry level positions.

Assemblywoman Hardy:

I appreciate the answers and that gives me a little more comfort as far as that goes.

Senator Buck:

Having a background in ELs and language acquisition, I know newcomers get the WIDA assessment, they qualify into the second language program. On slide 4, for newcomers who enter our districts and charter schools, how long is it before they take the SBAC if they test AA in the WIDA assessment?

Mr. Zutz:

Any student arriving new to a district or school in time for testing would test. However, there are considerations when reporting those results within the framework year and school year and district. We could provide that information in detail to the Committee. I am not sure I understand the component of the WIDA. There are exit mechanisms based on a couple of different factors around a student receiving English language services. One of those are the results on the WIDA, I believe it is 4.5. Again, there are other considerations. I am not sure I understand the question about the WIDA—a student arriving new to a school assessing at a certain level of the WIDA and the requirement to take SBAC. To be clear, all students in grades 3 through 8 take the SBAC.

Senator Buck:

Even if they are a newcomer and have zero language acquisition at that point, they take the SBAC assessment for that year. I am asking because what we tend to do in our metric—and maybe we can look, as a Committee, into weighting this more—is if you have a newcomer who enters and then you have an EL student who has been in that school for two, three, four, five years or more and they are weighted the same. Looking at the different weights for the newcomer who has zero language acquisition, as opposed to a student who has been served in a school or school district for multiple years. I know several states do this. It seems fairer because it could be, with these results, there was an influx of newcomers who have zero language acquisition, and then we give them the grade level in English assessment which could pose a problem.

How long do you track EL students after they have exited? I was always frustrated, as an educator, that students would exit out of the EL program but then would not be tracked. Then, the data is swayed to the negative because they are not in the EL category any longer. Although, they were EL, we finally got them to proficiency, then they are taken out because they do not qualify for the WIDA any longer. When I look at this data, it could be they have exited out of language acquisition because they became proficient in academic language and language proficiency. Then, they are no longer counted in this EL data. Can you narrow down what we are looking at on slide 4?

Mr. Zutz:

To answer your question about tracking students who have exited EL services, again, based on multiple criteria, Nevada does track exited ELs. We refer to them, as Ever_ELs and they are tracked all the way through to graduation rates, both four- and five-year graduation rates. To repeat, every EL student who has exited services are tracked for the State's graduation rates.

Senator Buck:

So they are represented in this data?

Dr. Kaplan:

If the question is about the ACGR rates, we track if the students belong to an EL or any other student groups during the four-year high school life. We group them and name them as Ever_EL students. They are included in the graduation rate data sets, as long as they belong to any—

Senator Buck:

What about the SBAC slide?

Dr. Kaplan:

The SBAC does not track the membership of the student.

Senator Buck:

My point is when they exit out, they are no longer represented in this data even though they should be because it is a success in the system or the district. We are getting hit on both sides by the ELA because the data is not representative of an increase in newcomers, as well as on the back end if they are proficient and exit out, then they are no longer tracked.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

We got that on the record. Thank you, Senator.

We are going to go to Carson City.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I appreciate your answer when you saw my look of confusion when it came to the science proficiency comparisons. When I looked at the ACT, I know those scores are grade 11. I shared with my colleague how difficult it is to proctor the ACT test because our students do not have buy-in to it. I have to be realistic with that. But when I compare the number of

individuals taking the ACT test who are ELs, and I look at ninth and tenth grade science proficiency, I am curious if those might be the same students. They are still able to take the ACT, so that is where my confusion was coming from. If you wish to expand upon that you are more than welcome; however, you do not need to. My look of confusion came from, we are able to capture the students when it comes to the ACT test when it is 11th grade, but we are not able to do so when it is science proficiency. Is a science proficiency test required of all students, or is it only for the secondary students who are enrolled in the science class?

Mr. Zutz:

To be clear, the USED requires all states to assess all students in high school, once, on ELA, mathematics, and science. Nevada has, through State processes, as we refer to in NRS and NAC, selected the ACT as our high school assessment. We use that to report, federally, the ELA and mathematics achievement results. Beginning in 2016, NDE—in significant collaboration with our stakeholders—developed a proprietary science assessment. It is used to fulfill the requirement for grades 5, 8, and high school. All students in high school, again, per USED, are required to be assessed once in ELA, mathematics, and science.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Thank you for that clarification.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

A lot of information and I appreciate your diligence with it. My colleague brought up the CCR diploma. Slide 18 shows currently, 26.3 percent of students were accessing that. If my memory is right, I am excited AB 241 (2023) passed last session, credit to our colleague, Assemblywoman Mosca, and I was glad to cosponsor that bill. Now, the CCR diploma is going to be the default diploma instead of an opt in. Correct me if I am wrong in understanding the legislation. Students coming into high school will be on that track, which it has an added requirement of a higher threshold for reading, mathematics, and science to prepare them for the ACT at some point. Then, there is an opt out, after the freshman year, if the student is struggling, in consultation with the high school counselor, administration, and their parents. I see that as a good way to align—as we talked about in the other presentation—our standards and curriculum to an outcome. The outcome, maybe we do not all like it, but the ACT for assessment at some point for these high schoolers.

Mr. Zutz:

Thank you for the question, we are going to divide the answer between us. I will start with the requirement for all students. I mentioned in the previous answer that USED requires all states to assess all students once in high school in the three content areas we mentioned and looked at today. However, there is also a State requirement in NRS—and this is how we ended up assessing our high school students on the ACT in grade 11—that requires all grade 11 students to sit for the ACT as a graduation requirement. There is no requirement for minimal performance on the ACT; however, there is a requirement to sit for the ACT as a graduation requirement in Nevada.

Mr. Statucki:

When you are looking at AB 241, it does require the students who are entering freshman year in 2024–2025 to be enrolled in courses that would make them eligible for the CCR diploma. It goes into effect for the freshman who are starting in August. Through that legislation, there is a piece where if a student and/or parents or guardian determine the coursework for the CCR diploma is not going to work for that student, through the

stakeholders you mentioned would go through a process to move that student off of the CCR track onto a standard diploma track. Most likely that would be the case— The advanced diploma and the CCR diploma are similar so a student probably would not move from a CCR diploma to advanced diploma early on. It would be more towards the standard diploma early on. In our engagement with school districts so far, they have been looking at that interpretation in terms of those pieces and the enrollment pieces and when they would have those communications with students and parents. While they may happen as early as ninth grade, some of the stakeholders we talked to have indicated it may even be closer to tenth grade before they start seeing students, potentially, opting out of those opportunities because of the way the coursework is set up already in the ninth and tenth grade years.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I have a couple more things I would like to address. This has been an issue that I have consistently tried to ask and get answers to, and I think that is where we are today. This disconnect between graduation rates on the rise, but proficiency rates in high school are not where they should be. Historically, if we go back to 2013, I think it was AB 288 to phase out proficiency testing for graduation and not effective until the end of the month in October 2017. When I am looking at the proficiency rates you are showing—elementary, we are doing okay; we fall off in middle school; and then something precipitously drops in high school. As we look over these trends you showed and the trends I look at from 2013 to present and taking into consideration COVID-19, the deeper dive we have to do is look at what is happening between that drop off to middle school. We have all been in middle school, so we get it, a lot of it is the emotional state of a middle schooler. But for high school, when I look back at the effects of no proficiency testing, before that graduation rates were about 73.5 percent in SY 2016–2017. The high school ELA was at 73 percent and math was 55.6 percent. Then, we go to pre-COVID-19 and our ELA is 47 percent and our math is 26 percent for high school. Then, post COVID-19 and it is 41 percent in ELA and then 19 percent in math for those high schoolers. These questions are probably rhetorical. As we go back, we look at the phasing out of proficiency testing. We look at an infusion of $1.3 billion into education in 2015. Then we see this trajectory of falling proficiency rates, especially with high school. I think we are at a loss and just hoping. I do not know if you have input or if there is something I am missing. The whole idea, mentioned early today by Superintendent Ebert, is that alignment with outcomes. Our remediation rates going on to college reflect there is not that alignment. When we are graduating students, where 60 percent in Clark County need remediation, and 50 percent of the State need remediation. Our ACT scores reflect that. I am not saying I am a huge fan of the ACT, but we have to have some sort of assessment. If you have any insight or if there is something I am looking at wrong, I would be humble enough to stand for edification.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you. Any other questions?

AGENDA ITEM VI—PRESENTATIONS ON ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN SCHOOLS, INCLUDING CURRENT USES AND CONTINUING CONSIDERATIONS

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

We will move on to our next presentation, Agenda Item VI. We are going to hear a presentation on AI in schools. I wanted to note the Office of Educational Technology, USED, is also doing work in this space, and they have a 2023 report on AI's role in teaching and learning that is worth a read. Unfortunately, the timing did not work out to have them

present at this meeting, but we are excited to continue to follow this work. As we know, AI is an emerging field, and this Committee has a chance to further explore its impact on education.

We are fortunate enough to hear from an industry leader, Alex Urrea with Eduscape for his work in this developing space. This presentation was the one I was referring to that has issues with copyrighting (Agenda Item VI). We will get it up as soon as we can because it is going to have good information. To the Members, we have the presentation, but I know Mr. Urrea has made a couple changes to the slides. If your slides do not look exactly right, it is on purpose. It is the AI doing it. Begin when you are ready.

Alex Urrea, Founder and CEO, Eduscape:

Good morning, everyone. I would like to thank Dr. Jeffrey Geihs, Executive Director, Nevada Association of School Administrators (NASA), for the recommendation, Chair Bilbray-Axelrod for the invitation, and Ms. Drozdoff for her support on this. We have been working with schools and districts throughout the country for the last 17 years. We have delivered professional learning to over a million teachers in 48 states. We are a company that is privately held, has no investors, and no debt, and we are going to stay that way. I also founded the Rethink Learning Foundation, which does research in partnership with the U.S. National Science Foundation (NSF) and other organizations on how to reimagine learning; teaching; science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education; et cetera. This past Friday, we did an AI seminar, hosted by the Desert Research Institute and sponsored by NASA, with about 65 school leaders and their feedback I will share with you as part of this presentation, but it was also insightful.

The desired outcomes of today are to inform how AI is being used in teaching and learning (Agenda Item VI). What are the benefits for teachers and students? Why we have to address the risks as we embrace the potential. Then, the next steps that should be considered.

To start off, you have read reports that jobs are going to be affected by the latest wave of AI and 300 million jobs could shift, et cetera. Everybody talks about loss, but no one talks about opportunity. There was a young man named Tyrone Powers at the Irvington School District in New Jersey two and a half months ago. He walked up to me after a presentation and said, "Mr. Alex, I pump gas, that is how I help my grandma support us. I am 16 years old. With the emergence of AI and electric powered vehicles, am I going to lose my job?" And I said to Tyrone, "Think about this, how many electric vehicle charging stations are being installed a day in this country right now?" The answer was 357 a day. "How many jobs are open for installers and repair people? If you find your job pumping gas is at risk, take a six-month course on electric vehicle charging and repair and you will walk into a $70,000 job." All this fervor around the AI and losing jobs is incorrect. There will be a shift, and that shift is going to be in the way jobs are designed, but the jobs are not going away. There is going to be a shift and the data supports it. There is an estimated share of employment exposed to automation. What people are surprised about is that 29 percent of computer and mathematical jobs are at risk of being lost. I do not know how many of you said when you are, whatever age your children are, that if you go into computer science, you will never not have a job. Well, that is changing because AI is shifting where coding is going. Artificial intelligence bots can code probably 35 percent of what was not code able, or had to be coded by a human, as little as two years ago. There is a shift happening in that area as well. Artificial intelligence is not a panacea, but it is also not going to replace us. It will, however, replace those who do not embrace it, and that is the simple truth.

I am not a trend follower. Everything we do is based on data. Back in the day, this was a quote,

> If men learn this, it will implant forgetfulness in their souls; they will cease to exercise memory because they rely on that, which is generated, calling things to remembrance no longer from within themselves, but by means of external marks.

This was the Greek philosopher Plato in 370 B.C. talking about writing. We have been here before. I am a self-admitted *Little House on the Prairie* fan. There was an episode where a new teacher came in and he did not want the kids to have slates. He did not want them to bring slates home because all learning needed to happen in the confines of the four walls of the little schoolhouse. They were not allowed to have slates to write on or be empowered without the teacher. Artificial intelligence is no different. It is an empowering tool, but we have to create the conditions for it to be used effectively.

In terms of AI, a term that is used is called generative AI, which is simple. A lot of commercial entities want to complicate what AI is every day. Generative AI is basically constantly creating, being productive, changing, and evolving. Artificial intelligence is learning every day. There is something called meta cognition or meta learning, that some of the educators in this group understand, and that is learning the process of learning. What AI does every day is it learns the questions it is fed, the answers generated, and keeps growing its library. It is constantly generating new information, and that new information is empowering people who ask the right questions.

Tony Robbins has this quote that says, "a good question is better than a great answer," and that is true with AI. Think about a fifth grade classroom, where a teacher who is teaching ELA says, "I want you to come up with the best question." That requires critical thinking and is more complicated than arriving at a predesigned answer. Large language learning models (LLLMs), this is a big word. Everybody loves acronyms in the tech field, much like education. Simply put, LLLMs continue to absorb information being fed to these AI chatbots, collecting and repositioning it. Then, it is being used effectively in terms of intelligent tutoring models as well. Imagine the power of a tutor you do not have to pay, that is the power of AI in education from one facet.

We have to think about policies. A little over a year ago, a school board thought they were proactive, and they put out a policy. No teacher can accept an AI generated work, that was it. Literally, it was about a page long. You are a teacher, and you are told you cannot accept AI generated homework. The resolution did not describe how to check if it is AI generated. What tools do I use? Are you licensing the tools? It was put out there as a typical resolution by a school board, and we cannot react to it that way.

We also have to understand the types of AI that exist. You have reactive AI, which you know about if you have a Nest thermostat. It memorizes the times of the day you come home. It sets itself on certain days of the week, certain times of the day, and certain seasons. You also have traffic lights. The Electric Daisy Carnival is coming later this week with a half million people into Las Vegas. The traffic light patterns are going to change from there to the site. It is all AI generated, and that is simple AI.

There is also reinforcement learning, which is text generated question and answer. This is where the billions of dollars that districts spend on assessment tools go. For simple reinforcement learning, which has not exactly succeeded very well, regardless of the data they put out. It is simple reinforcement learning and it is also applied in Gmail and other email tools. This is an example where we have to exercise critical thinking because AI is not

perfect. This was an email sent to me by the pastor of a school. The email basically said, "Alex, I will be away the next two weeks going on a pilgrimage, et cetera." The email automatically generated a potential response I could hit, "Have a great vacation," "enjoy your vacation," et cetera. I tested it. I used my personal email to send an email to my business email that said "Alex, I am going away to a funeral next week, so I will not be able to attend the meeting." What did the automatic response give me, "Have a great trip." It did not acknowledge the fact that I said I was going to a funeral. Artificial intelligence is not perfect, even the almighty Google. This was back in June 2023, so it may be corrected. I need to use critical thinking to proofread and understand AI has helped save me time, but it does not take me all the way to the finish line.

Another form of AI is theory of mind AI, which is being used with autonomous vehicles, personalized learning, virtual assistance, and content filtering on Amazon. When you order a book from a certain genre or music on your iPhone, it then recommends things in a similar genre—that is simple theory of mind AI. It is somewhat repetitive. It is what is powering Waymo. This is a picture I took in San Francisco two months ago. I was visiting with my son. I saw this vehicle driving and I noticed there was nobody in it. It was in the heart of San Francisco. I chased it down and took pictures. Not only were there several of these in San Francisco, but some of them are acting as taxis already—autonomous taxis. What is this doing? Not creating a new industry but solving problems. The purpose of Waymo, LLC, as stated on their website, is to address the issue of driving. There are over a million crashes a year. In the United States alone, there are over 42,000 deaths, et cetera. There are senior citizens in remote assisted living facilities that if they can call an autonomous vehicle or have one at hand, they could be more independent. Autonomous driving, and the integrated AI, is trying to solve a problem. While it is building an industry, it is also solving a problem.

In the fall of 2019, we were part of an NSF grant called the Early-concept Grants for Exploratory Research (EAGER Grant). The EAGER Grant was intended to analyze the impacts of AI in education. This was over four years ago, pre-COVID-19, pre-ChatGPT, and all these other things. We had the pleasure and opportunity to work with universities and 24 schools on the necessary pillars for a school to be successful with AI. The first pillar was effective AI policies, you need guardrails. You do not react and say no AI because kids get AI at home. This is different than when the Internet came out. We had connectivity issues. There were inequities because people did not have Internet at home. Then, there was a device challenge. We do not have as many of those challenges anymore. Artificial intelligence is not confronted with the obstacles past technologies had. It is free. We have Wi-Fi in many places. Even children who are only eating one meal a day seem to have a cell phone that is a smartphone. There is access, but AI policies are critical.

Rethinking curriculum. For those of you who were educators and teachers, how many teachers say to you over a cup of coffee, "I wish I had more to teach." They do not, but yet some of the leading nonprofits in the country are creating AI lesson plans. They are saying to districts, "We have banks of AI lesson plans for free," which is contrary to what this should do. We have to look at the existing challenges in education, and how AI can help to resolve them. Artificial intelligence can help address teacher shortages. It can help address challenges with ELs. It can help address challenges with neurodiverse learners and special education. I have a quote from a teacher yesterday using a robot assisted tool, using AI, for a child who has autism. As educators, we need to look at AI from the lens of how we rethink existing curriculum, not how we build an AI curriculum—that comes later. Those are career paths. If we are going to address teacher shortages, we have to create better conditions. Better salaries and benefits help, but I have spoken to hundreds of teachers who have said, "That is nice, but the conditions have to change." We need to reimagine curriculum

immediately to integrate AI in a thoughtful way or it is not going to stick. It is not going to have the impact. We have to prepare teachers and that was the third pillar of this NSF funded research.

The fourth pillar was empowering students. When we interviewed students as part of the EAGER Grant, kids did not think of cheating. The over 500 students that were interviewed said, "I want to see myself using AI in the real world, and how that can help me." That is what they were interested in. They were not thinking they could cheat and have it write their paper. Other people think that—and yes, it happens—but we need to create the conditions and culture where we are thinking forward and not fearing.

The impacts of AI in education help to create better tutoring systems, language processing, personalized learning, tremendous opportunities for accessibility, and data analytics. It was nice to see all that data come up on the screens before. But what I have seen with data and education is it has to be actionable. You have to ask teachers, "How do you interpret this data to create change in your classroom?" We have seen a lot of professional learning is necessary. Artificial intelligence helps to disseminate that data and make it actionable much easier if it is used right. In terms of opportunities with AI, we have to think of not just making students creators, but also teachers. We try to make teachers consumers of information, standards and all these things, but we need to give them the space to create the lessons that align to the new standards that may be issued. Artificial intelligence can help do that quicker and more efficiently—more effective shortcuts.

The fourth type of AI is the self-aware AI. This is the integrated self-regulation and human decision making. When you combine AI with robotics, you have an incredibly powerful tool, but it cannot be driven by engineers. It cannot be driven by roboticists because they are not educators. We need to have educators understand the potential and then define and lay out the path for how those two tools can be used effectively.

This is an Indeed job posting. Years ago, the word *creative* was not used in job descriptions. Even more so *solutions*, seeking solutions. These are ads for a marketing generalist, a student brand manager, and a YouTube operations specialist. All three job descriptions have the word creative in them. It is a major shift in the job market. Solutions engineer—also the word *solution* is being used in job descriptions more than ever. In November 2020, the word *solution* was used in the job description 10,000 times. Less than three years later, the word *solution* is used 1.7 million jobs. It is an exponential gain and shift. This is when you talk about CTE, that outcomes-based approach is necessary. You have to backwards design. I had the pleasure of visiting Northeast Career and Technical Academy last Thursday. They have their first data points to demonstrate that kids who barely had a GPA in their prior school are performing exceptionally well. Looking at career trees and paths and designing backwards can work. You have a fledgling school in your backyard demonstrating that and the early data is showing it. It is a phenomenal school with phenomenal leadership. I have been in and out of over 3,000 schools in the last 27 years. I have seen what does not work more than what works and anything we talk about gets balanced with the research.

A couple of scenarios with AI. When you combine robotics with coding software and AI you can create opportunities for kids to learn using AI and robotics. This is a young boy, about 11 years old, working with a robot and AI as a health care companion. He is recovering from an accident and the robot is teaching him how to move his arms again in an effective way. The AI in the robot is memorizing his arm movements and adjusting to his movements for the next occupational therapy session. This is AI being integrated with robotics as a health care companion. These are the opportunities.

We also have AI as an educational assistant. ChatGPT is on the robot's screen. The teacher is asking the robot, "Can you explain the declaration of independence?" The robot speaks it and then the teacher says, "Can you give me that same explanation in Spanish?" and the robot delivers it in Spanish. This is AI combined with robotics. These robots are not cost prohibitive for the most part. Educational assistance in AI is an opportunity. There are already customer service agents with robotics in malls. Japan has 8,700 robots in their malls giving directions to people. What the AI does in those robots is, if I ask, "Can you tell me where the Home Depot is?" It will point and then it will say, "Do you know which aisle the screws are in?" It will tell you; they are in aisle seven. The cool part is Home Depot can opt in to get the data on any questions asked of that robot that pertain to their store. If they are getting a lot of questions around the same product or the same general area, they can use that data to better stock their shelves and to be more responsive to customers. All this programming and AI design requires human critical thinking and design thinking.

On the side of rethinking curriculum, we have been through changes before. Nintendo, we know is a video company. Nokia is a telephone and infrastructure company. Amazon has an all-encompassing online store and Tiffany and Co. is luxury jewelry. This is where they started. Nintendo was initially playing cards in the late 19th century. Nokia sold paper and rubber products. Amazon, as you remember, started as a bookstore. One of my mentors worked with Jeff Bezos, and he knew from the beginning that it not going to be a bookstore. It was going to start as a bookstore to prove a model, but it was going to become a superstore of lots of things and that was the goal. Tiffany was basically a fancy lamp manufacturer; it was not jewelry. There are things that have changed in history, but we also need to rethink what we teach, why we teach it, how we teach it, and when we teach it. Artificial intelligence is going to enable these questions to have better answers and be better defined.

There are also limitations. Those four Cs that are talked about—communication, collaboration, creativity, and critical thinking—still require human intervention to use the tool better. When I was married, my father-in-law brought me every tool in the book. We built the workbench together. It was not until my son turned 14 years old that he unboxed one of the miter drills that was given to me. I had a great tool, but I never used it. It required somebody who was motivated, had the interest, and human intervention necessary to use the right tool. The limitations on AI fall on humans. Humans have to ask the right questions, create the right strategies, and make the right ethical determinations for AI to change. Policy and practice are critical. We did a seminar for mostly Clark County administrators and teachers, people from Odyssey Charter Schools of Nevada, and others. At the end of the seminar, they said, "Can you work with our District to give us guidelines? Right now we do not know where to go. We do not know what to do. We know we have to do something, and we could do something." Educators are interested, they are not afraid. Most of all they are curious.

In terms of opportunities, we cannot get caught up with privacy concerns and copyrights. While we have to put up good guard rails in schools, kids still go home and have access to this technology. We cannot just ban things as some countries have done. Artificial intelligence copyrights absolutely need to be considered and investigated, but we have to have an open debate about this. Our policies need to mirror the culture we want in our schools, and they should be cultures of discovery and self-expression. It is important to look at policies, whether it is an Internet usage policy and how that can change with AI. Homework policies—there is no reason why students cannot use AI homework powered assistance, but the guidelines have to be laid out for them. We cannot just say no AI submitted homework, because when they go into the real world, they are going to be using AI to generate some of their work. We can start creating good habits in the classroom. An

improved policy fosters a learning environment that encourages critical thinking. It must include citation of resources and cannot just say this was AI. You have to uncover what resource it was, the transparency behind it. Also, what applications were used because there are so many AI tools out there. Cyberbullying is a big issue. Kids are using AI powered chatbots to help generate hurtful messages they can post on social media about a fellow student. We need policies around these things that promote digital citizenship. Again, these are policies, guidelines, and guardrails. They cannot be mandates, because if we are preparing kids for the real world, they are not going to enter a world with these types of mandates. Student data policy is important. We need to understand the vendors we bring in that use AI, where is this information being stored? How is the data being processed? Student data privacy is critical. Improved policies include transparency around collection and usage. There must be student consent and parental awareness when using AI powered tools.

The most important thing, as an Education Committee, is that AI cannot be used by teachers to maintain the status quo. This has happened before. We have seen it with the web. We have seen it with one-to-one computing. There is not one empirical piece of research that shows giving kids a Chromebook improved learning and test scores. Anything you share that is generated, was funded by a company that has a vested interest in selling stuff. It has not helped. Artificial intelligence is different. If we look at it as more lesson plans for teachers to teach, it is the wrong approach. If we look at it as something that should be kept out of teachers' and students' hands; no, there is too much opportunity there.

The next steps for a school district that started planning this are defining policy, rethinking curriculum, preparing their staff, and then looking to engage students. These are the conditions that are going to help and the conditions for teacher retention as well because this puts a lot back in the teachers' hands, but we need to make the investments to get them ready. A part of those policies are frequently asked questions (FAQs). As a Committee, I encourage you to create FAQs for the State districts on how they vet the vendors that come to the door. Two weeks ago, I met with one of the largest venture capital firms that invest in education. They told me they were looking at 200 companies building AI tools for education. They will invest in 20 of them knowing only two will survive. They knew they were going to lose hundreds of millions of dollars, if not $2 billion, in that process, but the two that survived will make up for it. Think about that, hundreds of millions of dollars will go into AI education companies that will use the money to market to your schools, be at education conferences and events, and tell your decision makers they have the greatest tool in the world, and they will not be around in a few years. Then, we have to recover from that. This is the danger right now. The danger with AI and education is not how it can impact students, will they cheat, et cetera. It is commercial entities. I lose a lot of friends when I say this, but it is the truth. There are big commercial opportunities here and we cannot let it go down the road of every other major adoption that has existed, especially with assessment companies.

We have to take immediate action because this future is already here. It is not going away. As William Gibson said, "The future is already here; it is just not evenly distributed." Artificial intelligence is an incredible tool to distribute this equally, equity and accessibility, and empower ELs. I did not speak English when I went to kindergarten, even though I was born here because my grandparents raised me from Colombia. I learned English with the television shows Sesame Street and The Electric Company. My daughter, who just graduated college, heard me tell the story at her high school commencement. She said she did not know that and asked if I wished I had ChatGPT. We went on ChatGPT. I pretended I did not speak English and I was a six-year-old going to kindergarten. It was amazing what

ChatGPT did for me in that context, but I had to ask the right questions. These are amazing tools for education. I hope you are making the best decisions on behalf of your kids and teachers in the State and you create the conditions for success. Thank you for the opportunity to present. I hope this has been helpful.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for the presentation, and it is interesting. I am glad you were able to come. I think you are right. You are going to see legislatures and school boards having this knee jerk reaction saying no. I think it is important to get that overview and make sure we are doing the right things. Hopefully, NDE was watching as well. Do we have questions?

Assemblywoman Anderson:

It is not a question; it is more of a statement. The other day, I was meeting with individuals from NDE. I know they are currently engaged in different town hall meetings with educators across our State. I believe they have had 20 of them, and there are two more in the next few weeks that will be virtual. It is on people's radars, both educators as well as our Department. I also think we need to, as a State, look at the earlier presentation on the classes necessary for graduation. As a creative writing teacher and English teacher, I have had to change how I teach because my students can use AI and get the information. It is more important that we also talk about how it is used and go back to discussion about creative thinking, collaborative thinking, and other areas and not just using AI to translate the language or get the information. It is how do you use the information? Thank you for the presentation. I wanted to put it out there that I believe NDE is currently engaged in different town hall discussions to try to create those policies around our State.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Ditto to what my colleague said. This boomer is going to be open-minded and not averse to technology. I am sure there is a place for it. I have a son who is a huge proponent of AI and shares constantly, in the family texts, all the wonderful things you can do. He is a computer science major, defense analysis and autonomous systems and has his master's degree. Yes, there is an application for AI. I can see us, as a legislative body, having to navigate this. There are going to be necessary guardrails, just as we do with many things that come into the classroom. My biggest concern is I see the application in science and other applications when I looked at your case studies and the things on your website, which were interesting. Again, I want kids to learn and think for themselves and not have other things thinking for them when it involves the creativity side. I think that is the balance we are going to have to find as a Legislature and Department of Education. Again, it is fascinating. We are probably on the cusp of real life-changing education things on the horizon, both good and bad. I appreciate the heads-up and insight in what you are doing.

Mr. Urrea:

Understanding AI and its impact on education could be a two-day conference with a lot of breakout sessions to understand. Artificial intelligence can fuel creativity and unpack creative potential in any child, including those who are language challenged and have accessibility issues up and down the spectrum. The strategy has to be there. I have run education companies for 27 years and I have always been hesitant of new stuff, because usually new stuff is not designed by educators for the classroom. We work with Japanese engineers that design interactive projectors, and they say they have this great feature for the classroom because the teacher can do this. Then we sit there and say the teacher does not need to do that, but the engineers thought it was sexy and cool. Artificial intelligence is

different. It can be used by anyone who has the need to be creative, the need to teach, and the desire to reach another learner. It is just the strategy that needs to shift. It does not do it for you. It is hard for people to make that mindset shift and I get it. I am 50 something and this is not something I have seen before. I encourage people, and not that you do not have an open mind, because you are here to talk about it. It is going to give you a lot of creative expression and freedom if you are shown or inspired on how to use it right.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

You said something earlier in your presentation where instead of asking for an answer, you are asking the kids to come up with a question, which is critical thinking. An answer people can regurgitate. Artificial intelligence in a microcosm of way reminds me of math. People used to say you are never going to walk around with a calculator all the time. Well, yes you are, but you need to know how to use the calculator too. I know that is a microcosm of what AI can do, but I think there is something real there. It is going to be amazing to see what this next generation brings to the table with AI.

Senator Buck, you had a question.

Senator Buck:

It is amazing how quickly this has come. In your travels, is there a particular district, state, or country that has put policies or guardrails in place that are model practices you would recommend we look into or research more.

Mr. Urrea:

I would love to say there is a state I could point to. I can tell you, good or bad, China is going all in on this like I have never seen. In their classrooms, from kindergarten through grade 12, they have AI curriculum. They are embedding it. They are not necessarily doing it right, but they are making an all-out effort. I have worked with Beijing Normal University on projects and what they are doing is a little different, which causes me pause, goes back to the teaching profession. The majority of colleges of education in this country are comprised of professors teaching aspiring teachers who they themselves have not been in the modern classroom in two or three decades. This is one of the greatest challenges we have to revitalize education and inspire teachers in the classroom. China is embedding AI teaching strategies at their teaching universities right now. It is not about using or forcing AI use in their schools. They are looking at universities and saying your professors better start adopting this and getting teachers of tomorrow in China to know how to use it effectively. We are not doing it. There are legacy challenges I know about. In terms of states, Nevada has an incredible opportunity because we know the data. We know where Nevada is ranked educationally, which surprised me.

There is an opportunity to leapfrog because some states wanted to rush to do something. I read a report last night and 80 percent of the report references third-party research. They have not done their own. Some of the things coming out of California are not funded by the right institutions, they are predesigned outcomes in the research.

In terms of doing town halls and going around the State and collecting information, it is important to do three things. Inform a focus group of educators what is possible with AI. Let them try it and feel it. Then, collect their feedback, because this State has an opportunity to create AI policy framework and guidelines that are state of the art. Everyone else points to third party research because they want to rush in putting something together. Off the

record, I can tell you some of the states that have put things out, but I can also point out why they are flawed.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for this presentation. You have given us a lot to think about.

AGENDA ITEM VII—PRESENTATION ON NATIONAL TRENDS AND LEGISLATIVE EFFORTS RELATED TO PUPIL GRADUATION AND ACHIEVEMENT RATES PURSUANT TO SENATE BILL 72 (2023)

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

With that, we will move back to the topic of graduation and achievement rates with Agenda Item VII. It is a presentation on national trends and legislative efforts related to pupil graduation and achievement rates pursuant to SB 72. To provide a national perspective on this issue, we have Michelle Exstrom with the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL). Begin when you are ready.

Michelle Exstrom, Director, Education Program, NCSL:

It is a pleasure to be joining you in Nevada for the Joint Interim Standing Committee meeting. For those of you who may not be familiar with us, we are the organization of all 50 state legislatures and territories made up of legislators and legislative staff. Those of us who are on staff at NCSL serve as an extension of the nonpartisan staff that serve the legislative bodies across the country and within the territories. We do not lobby on behalf of policy issues. We are here to provide information, research, and professional development opportunities for state legislators. It is a pleasure to be here with you today.

I am happy to be joining you today on this important topic of graduation rates (Agenda Item VII). It is great I joined you at this point because I think we have had a lot of data laid out before you. I am going to skip through some of the slides to connect the dots for you on what you are seeing and provide information for the questions that may have come up, because you are not unique in wondering about these things.

A bit of background—I think it was mentioned, but I wanted to hit on this about graduation rates—the history of where we have been and where we are now. We know we are making progress. This has been a tough nut to crack for us across the states. In the early 2000s, a number of researchers and experts across the country, including educators, were sounding the alarm that we had low graduation rates. Dr. Robert Balfanz coined the term "dropout factories" and there was a big concern about what was happening. There was also a call to action around the way we measured graduation rates. It was not consistent from state to state or even within districts within states. As we were working on improving our data systems, we also came to understand our data within those systems was not comparing apples-to-apples. There was a big effort, called GradNation, to reform the way all states counted graduation rates focusing on this four-year cohort model. Little-by-little all states adopted the cohort model and then it was codified within the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), and now within ESSA. It requires that all states now measure graduation rates uniformly and we are looking at a four-year cohort—those who enter ninth grade are counted, as was explained earlier, in the percentage of number of students who eventually graduate. Across the country, a lot of states and territories were concerned about what this would look like because they had not been counting them like this. For example, in Washington, District of Columbia, their graduation rates were reported at the time around 73 percent. When they went to this new four-year model, they dropped down to 59 percent.

We know that looking at data honestly and comparatively and having the ability for transparency is important. It shone the light on where states were not hitting the mark and begging folks to look into the research about what we know about previous graduation rates and getting to work in that space. The good news is the majority of states have raised graduation rates to a certain extent from that point, but we are seeing a huge stagnation. Most states in the West especially have, over the past decade or so, hovered between 79 percent and 89 percent. In the eastern states you see a lot more states closer to 90 percent. West Virginia continues to lead the country with around 91 percent. We have this history of work. There has been a lot of research done and information about what we know and the truth about how well we are doing graduating our high school students.

The other point I want to make is we know students of color and students who are economically disadvantaged traditionally have much lower graduation rates than their peers. Typically, it is about a 10 percent, if not 20 percent in some states, difference between those groups. We have this persistent achievement gap within our country in both our academic achievement and with regard to graduation rates as well.

I am not going to get into this because the previous speakers covered this at length. I will say, as I mentioned, in the western states, for whatever reason, we tend to have lower graduation rates than we do in the eastern states. Some of the states that tend to have the highest graduation rates include Iowa, Kentucky, Indiana, New Jersey, Texas, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, and West Virginia, according to United States data.

I would like to connect the information you heard today about what we know about how well your students are doing in Nevada, and what we know about what influences graduation rates. I, like you, always get a lot of heartburn when I look at those achievement scores. In Nevada, they are challenging, and they are in the majority of states. The majority of states have trouble reaching 50 percent proficiency rates on our grade 3 through 8 assessments. We also know in the high school assessments we are measuring the ability to succeed in college or career. Whether you are using the ACT or the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), we are not assessing our state standards. I think that is something state legislators do not have on the top of mind. The ACT or SAT was originally designed to measure the propensity to succeed once you leave high school, but not how well you mastered your state standards within high school. It is something we need to keep in mind as well. We know academic achievement must, in some way, affect students in how they see themselves, and how well they matriculate across our system.

I want to touch on a few of the factors we know are influential in graduation rates. In other words, if you are looking for policies that can help bump up your graduation rates, these are the areas you are going to want to look to. I love the way the Colorado Department of Education has indicated factors that influence whether or not a student is going to graduate. They break it down into four simple phrases I want you to keep in mind—things that we know influence students and student outcomes.

One is "life events." What is going on with the student? How is their family life? Are they hungry? Are they being bullied? What are those things happening in their life that influence their ability to learn?

The second is "fade outs." We know there are students who fade out and, for whatever reason, they do not continue to flourish. They do not continue to be successful once they hit middle and high school, and that was alluded to earlier as well. It happens for a variety of reasons, and I will talk, in a little bit, about the efforts across the country to address that.

We know those students who feel like they are "pushed out," or in other words, do not feel at home at school. It could be because they have had behavioral or discipline problems. Maybe they feel different or are having challenges with the language. Maybe they generally feel unwelcome at the school and have not made connections with adults in the way we know is so important in schools.

Then, there are those who have "failed to succeed." Those who literally cannot and do not feel like they are able to meet the mark once they get to high school. Students in those categories tend to be those who decide not to persist within high school and pursue other opportunities.

Now, I will talk about the areas we know are directly linked to outcomes. Early learning. We know that children who have opportunities for effective early learning and come to kindergarten ready. It is not necessarily a state-sponsored universal pre-K program, that means whatever the state and the community is doing to ensure children have an opportunity to come to school ready to learn—that influences graduation rates. Those who have had those opportunities, according to the National Institute for Early Education Research, on average have a 6 percent higher graduation rate than other students. There is also a 5.5 percent increase in their college going rate as well.

Let us move to achievement. All these test scores we have been looking at, we know have an impact on students. We know literacy, and early literacy in particular, is tied to graduation outcomes. According to the Institute of Educational Sciences, a low reading score indicates that one in six with a low reading score will not necessarily graduate from high school. We know if they are in the lowest quartile of performance in those early years in reading, 23 percent of them will eventually drop out from high school. There is a close connection between what we know about reading outcomes in those early years and what happens to students as they move through our system.

Math is similar, but we see the influencing factors for math tend to happen later. The drop off in performance in math happens around middle school or high school. It is where we begin to see students become frustrated and think they are not math people. You will hear students say these things. Sadly, about 80 percent of students have reported if they were not able to pass Algebra 1, they felt like they needed to drop out of high school. An interesting study just came out of Washington University in St. Louis. The more rigorous math and science expected of all students within high school has a direct correlation, unfortunately, to students dropping out because they feel like they are not doing well, and they feel like failures. It goes back to what I pointed out earlier.

We also know attendance has a direct correlation. If you are not in school, you are not learning. It is also an indication of other things going on with students. Right now, we have a tremendous amount of students who are chronically absent. Over 30 percent of students in the majority of states right now are chronically absent. It could be for a variety of reasons, and we are still trying to unpack what is causing it. But it means those students are missing out on learning. They get behind, they get frustrated, and again, their performance may lag behind. They may not see themselves as the kinds of learners they were previously. The interesting thing about attendance too is the majority of the challenges in attendance has traditionally been with high schoolers, but now it is coming at the earlier grades. We are seeing more children in K through 2 not coming to school regularly and it is a big concern. Along with attendance, comes the conversation around suspension and expulsion. When a student has been suspended or expelled, it has a close correlation to them dropping out of high school. It also affects their attendance. If they are expelled or suspended, they are not in attendance at school, again, that is a direct connection to dropout rates.

Finally, encouragement and support. We know students who have relationships with the adults in the school, feel well-supported, and getting the personalized learning they need, tend to flourish, and do much better. Also, those students who report in high school that they feel their high school experience is relevant, rigorous, interesting to them, and connected to what comes next, stay more engaged, and graduate at a higher level.

Again, I am not going to get into this much because you covered this deeply earlier. The one thing I will say is the NAEP scores also indicate that Nevada's achievement is lower than the majority of the other states as well, but across the country, NAEP scores are lagging. For those of you who are not familiar, NAEP is known as our Nation's Report Card. You can look up individual state data at www.nationsreportcard.gov. It goes into depth in comparing, fourth graders, eighth graders in math and reading. Also, there is a 12th grade exam administered every four years, and it compares how your students did compared to students across the country. Every state sets their own test scores and has their own statewide assessment. National Assessment of Educational Progress the congressionally mandated assessment that helps us understand apples-to-apples across the country. The NAEP scores are another interesting piece of data to help you understand how well students are doing within your State.

I wanted to mention the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) scores. I know we have presented to you before. We had members of your Legislature involved in studying other high performing jurisdictions. It bears reminding that we, as a country, are average, if not below average, when compared to other developed countries, and how well we do in math and reading. In fact, the PISA scores indicate some of our students are as much as three to four years behind students in other countries. You might imagine that graduates in Nevada, who have the CCR diploma, are competing against students from other places in the world because it is a global economy these days and people can work remotely, from all over the world, and are willing to relocate. Now we know the future workforce in our states need to be globally competitive. When we know, as a country, our education system is mediocre, if not lackluster, it is a reason to be concerned about the economic development, and how well our students will fare in the workforce going forward.

Remembering the policies I referenced before, think about those policy options, the areas where you could focus to improve graduation rates and graduation outcomes for your students. I want to mention some interesting trends going on and has a lot to do with redesigning high school. This is an opportunity for not just high school, but to reimagine the relationship between middle school, high school, community college, higher education, and workforce. We work a lot with Jobs for the Future, and they have an excellent report called the Big Blur. Colorado happens to be one of the states working right now to implement the Big Blur. This report references that in order to build the future ready workforce we need in our states—that industry is telling us they need, in order to have the skills and aptitudes for our students to succeed—we need to rethink our education systems. We need to connect them, and it needs to be more seamless. We are seeing a number of states working toward this and thinking about career pathways in a meaningful way. For example, in my own kid's high school, we offer 27 concurrent enrollment courses. We have 20 career pathways in our school district. We have the ability for students to earn non degree credentials while they are in high school. The world is a different place from what it used to be. When we think about those kids who said, "I am not good at math. I am not doing well in Algebra 1. I do not like geometry. It must mean I am not going to graduate from high school." What we are seeing is this whole new effort to engage them in a different way. It can be through project-based learning. It can be through workplace-based learning. There are a number of states, I would point to Indiana and Colorado, who are leading the charge around high school apprenticeships where students get on-the-job training, they are working in a place

of business, making career connections, getting paid, and earning an associate degree while they are in high school. These models are based off of what we know occurs in Switzerland and other places. It is one example of innovative work going on. At that point, it seems like a no brainer for a lot of kids. Of course, they are going to graduate from high school, why would they not graduate from high school? They have this amazing apprenticeship opportunity. They can continue through high school because they are going to get a cosmetology degree or be certified welder by the time they graduate. There are a lot of interesting ways we are better engaging middle and high school students so they can begin to see themselves as a completer and setting themselves up for whatever comes next, because we are giving them those opportunities.

A number of states are seriously reconsidering their math and science requirements. This conversation, obviously, needs to happen in coordination with higher education because there are higher education courses required. One state to look to right now is New Mexico, eliminating the requirement for their more rigorous math and rethinking what math and science looks like. For example, a course in AI or data science. Rather than taking physics, could you be taking anatomy in preparation for a health care pathway? Those things are making space for students to find their path and not feeling like they are not good at high school because they are not good at the traditional college preparation pathway. There is a lot of innovation going on in those areas as well.

I will leave you with this interesting information from Dr. Balfanz. As I mentioned, he was one of the early researchers who sounded the alarm around graduation rates. He recently released a report that looks back at the efforts we have been making around increasing student achievement, graduation, and where we are with things. Overall, his assessment is that we are making progress because we are making high school more relevant. We are able to connect college and career to high school, which by definition is making it more relevant and interesting to students. In his report, he specifically calls out eight policy recommendations for states to consider in order to continue to move the needle around graduation. The first is to continue to improve graduation rate data collection and reporting. As I mentioned before, that is where it needs to begin. You need to have a deep understanding of who is graduating and why and why not? Why is this subgroup not doing as well? How can we change what we are doing to target that particular population so we can see a growth in their graduation rates. Promote policies that reduce detrimental academic disparities—that gets back to the achievement gap. It does not matter whose data we are looking at, we know students who are economically disadvantaged, students of color, ELs, and students with disabilities always have lower achievement scores. This is a nut we cannot crack. States have been working at it and you have to continue to work at it because this is a challenge. Even the highest performing state—Massachusetts, and secondly, New Jersey—will say, "Pat us on the back for increasing our student outcomes and in student performance. But we know it is not good enough because we have too many kids not meeting that threshold." We have risen all boats but still need to rise some even higher.

Another is to strengthen the transition from high school to postsecondary careers. Align state graduation requirements with college admission requirements, especially for those places where you are trying to open up opportunities for, perhaps, free community college or automatic admission for students. You need to make sure their high school experience is aligned to whatever comes next. Whether it be attaining workforce credentials, non degree credentials, degree credentials of any kind. Examine credit recovery programs. This is something we know continues to be a problem—remediation, the inability for students to get credit for prior learning, credit for learning outside the classroom and so forth. Continue to monitor and impact COVID-19. We are all doing our best at that. Expand the use of next generation early monitoring and student success systems. We have seen states making

progress in trying to personalize learning and better understand the challenges for each unique learner. Then, continue to grow your efforts and double down on your efforts around this particular issue.

At NCSL, we have a phenomenal education bill tracking database. Within this database, you will find about 111 bills we have been tracking in 33 states that have addressed, in some way, high school graduation rates this particular year. We have been seeing this bigger conversation around the kind of high school diploma, what will be required of the high school diploma, trying to signal college and career readiness. This is a lot of the work happening in the states.

Finally, I want to call out the resources we have in NCSL. All the ways you are able to connect with us through social media. We have a biweekly newsletter where we publish all of our research. We have training videos. We have resources on pretty much any topic you might want to tackle. We will have sessions on all these topics at our Legislative Summit and upcoming meetings. If you are able to attend, I would encourage you to attend to meet with your colleagues. We have a whole track on AI in education that will be a part of it. We have a legislative task force on AI. We are also informally partnering with the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) which is the collaborative coalition of the southern states around education issues. Legislators are part of that, and they have an AI commission on education in the workforce. If you are curious about what they are finding and what is going on in the southern region around AI, how that is being utilized in schools, or how it is being connected to workforce training and workforce skills I would keep an eye on SREB. As I mentioned, we are going to have a lot of conversations around all of this at our Legislative Summit. Here is my contact information if you would like any additional information.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for the presentation, and you were thorough. We have one question for you from Assemblyman D'Silva.

Assemblyman D'Silva:

I had a question for you regarding the math and science requirements for graduation. We have struggled with this throughout this country and here in the State, even when we have this emphasis on the rigors of a 21st century education focused on STEMs. On the same token, we also see that is where our students struggle. In this State, we instituted proficiency testing and then removed it. I think the data showed most of the students did not get a high school graduation credential because of the failure in those math and science tests. They were passing the classes but not passing the proficiency exam. Have there been any states that have also seen similar struggles, and what have been the responses to marry this notion that we should have a strong rigor when it comes to the STEMs but we are seeing students not graduating because they were not doing well in those courses.

Ms. Exstrom:

I think this goes back to the conversations we had years ago around college and career ready or college versus career ready. Ten years ago, everyone was focused on college ready and preparation for STEM and rigor within high school so our students would be able to effectively compete across the world for those STEM positions. We have seen that it has propelled students who have an aptitude for STEM to reach soaring heights, especially when they have opportunities for concurrent enrollment. You have some students who are taking Calculus 2 or 3 in high school, for free through concurrent enrollment. Imagine how well they will be positioned to succeed once they get into a four-year institution. We are also

seeing this new eagerness to acknowledge there are students who are not going to be STEM majors. Who may also want to go on to college, may not be a STEM major, may have an aptitude for math, but do not need to take Calculus 1, 2, or 3 necessarily. Then, there are those who may not go to college. They may take a completely different career path and making high school more relevant for them. Not necessarily tracking them out of the system or shoving them into less rigorous opportunities around CTE. We are seeing CTE is being repurposed in a meaningful, rigorous way. Career and technical education for STEM majors, the next ambulance driver, or the next welder. We are seeing is a lot of states saying it should not be one or the other. It does not need to be one or the other and then working with the colleges and universities to figure this out. I pointed to New Mexico. This has been a rigorous debate in New Mexico about the level of high school math that should be offered and required. Not shying away from offering rigorous math, but maybe it should not be required for all students. Maybe some students need to better understand how to apply math to the real-world setting they are going to be working in. Maybe it is more of a computer space. Maybe it is more of understanding and manipulating data. Maybe instead of Algebra 2, kids need statistics. Those sorts of conversations about what is the future of learning. When we think about what the future of learning is, it begs what is the future of our workforce. Many states are trying to understand what the future workforce looks like and, what do we need to be preparing students for because if we are preparing them all for our current workforce, that is not going to hit the mark. If we are preparing them all to become college STEM majors, we are probably going to have a high dropout rate because not all kids are going to do that, and they are not going to find their place. We are thinking more broadly about career pathways for lots of students, including STEM students.

AGENDA ITEM VIII—PRESENTATION ON THE NATIONAL LANDSCAPE OF KINDERGARTEN THROUGH THIRD GRADE LITERACY POLICIES

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

We will now go to Agenda Item VIII, a presentation on the national landscape of kindergarten through third grade literacy policies. We have Adrienne Fischer with the Education Commission of the States (ECS). Go ahead when you are ready.

Adrienne Fischer, Senior Policy Analyst, ECS:

Good afternoon, Chair Bilbray-Axelrod, and Committee Members. Thank you for the opportunity to present. I have been asked to provide a look at the top trends in state kindergarten through third grade literacy policies nationally, and how states are progressing in those efforts (Agenda Item VIII). For those of you who might not be familiar, ECS is a national education policy organization that has been serving state policymakers in all 50 states and the District of Columbia for nearly 60 years. We are nonpartisan. We cover the full spectrum of education issues from early care and education through postsecondary and the workforce.

Today, I will be giving a brief overview of the national landscape of K through 3 literacy and the major policy levers that states are employing to address low rates of proficiency. I will also touch on the recent state action we are seeing in addition to those major policy trends. Then, I will discuss outcomes and walk through a state example from Mississippi. Afterwards, I will be happy to answer any questions that might come up.

First, I want to talk about where we are as a nation in terms of reading proficiency. You heard Ms. Exstrom mention briefly the NAEP that was released in 2022. I am sure you are familiar with these numbers, but I think it is worth centering ourselves before we dive into the policy pieces. In 2022, NAEP released, what were the first post pandemic reading and

math scores. They showed, for reading in fourth grade, a nationwide decline of three points. Most states had a statistically significant score decline and the rest of the states showed no significant change. Overall, 37 percent of fourth graders scored below the NAEP basic achievement level. To provide context around what that means, most state level third grade reading assessments set an achievement level that is comparable to somewhere between the NAEP basic and the NAEP proficient level. This means that more than a third of fourth graders are likely also not meeting the standards set within their own states. Finally, the newest NAEP scores showed that score disparities between student groups continue to persist. Those gaps are not shrinking. While it is relevant to note the pandemic, obviously, contributed to these numbers to some degree, I want to point out we had already seen a downward trend in the previous NAEP results from 2019. We cannot ignore the fact this was already a problem before the pandemic. Some of the more recent national studies, that have come out in the last six to eight months, have shown small improvement from these 2022 scores, but still lagging behind those prepandemic numbers. Knowing how much attention states have begun paying to this in the last several years, and how much time and effort they are putting into trying to improve literacy scores, I think it is telling that the best we seem to do is hold ground and stop that slide. Which is good, but we still are not back to those 2019 numbers which, as I said, were already showing decline. To give a little context on where we are as a nation.

What are states doing to address this? Last year, ECS updated our 50-state comparison on kindergarten through third grade policies, and we looked at several data points related to literacy. A lot of states, including Nevada, have adopted multiple policies related to literacy in the early grades, taking a more comprehensive approach than states with only one or two policies in place. I am going to touch on three of the most common policy levers states are using and go through what that looks like nationally. The first and most common approach is related to reading instruction. A lot of states have policies in place to require either preservice training or in-service professional development related to evidence-based reading instruction. The next policy element is related to reading curricula. We have seen more states taking steps to ensure the instructional materials used in classrooms are high quality and incorporate evidence-based practices. The third data point looks at state requirements for interventions for students reading below grade level.

If we look at instructional requirements across the country. This map shows that nearly every state has some kind of policy in place. States highlighted in purple require preservice training in educator preparation programs. Orange indicates requirements for in-service professional development. Green indicates states that have both preservice and in-service requirements. In recent years, we have seen more states adopt policies addressing both preservice and in-service requirements with nearly half of states taking that dual approach.

This next map shows the distribution of states with policies related to reading curriculum. We identified at least 17 states and the District of Columbia with such policies. Many of these have been adopted recently. These requirements look different across the states with some specifying only general criteria that schools or districts must meet for their curriculum and others stipulating they must be chosen from a list or model approved by the state education agency or board.

The map for the third data point shows states that require the use of interventions for struggling readers. As with instructional requirements, nearly all states have some kind of policy in place related to interventions. Again, these requirements will look different from state to state. Interventions might range from adding additional instructional time for struggling readers to individualized reading plans and summer reading programs. Some states allow local districts to determine the types of interventions that should be administered to students.

The majority of the recent state action we are seeing continues to fall into the three buckets of policy levers I just covered, whether it is states adopting new policies or making changes to existing policies to improve implementation. One area of recent state action, I wanted to highlight briefly, is we are seeing more states looking to improve literacy outcomes by focusing on developmentally appropriate preliteracy skills in preschool environments. A few states have aligned their pre-K requirements with existing K through 3 requirements. For instance, in Connecticut, approved reading curricula must be adopted for all pre-K through third grade classrooms. In Florida, lead pre-K teachers have to complete preservice coursework on emergent literacy as well as alignment with foundational K through 12 backgrounds in the science of reading. Then, beginning in 2025, all pre-K through fifth grade teachers in Indiana must complete a literacy endorsement prior to licensure or renewal. Additionally, we are seeing states looking at ways to use kindergarten entry assessments to approve alignment between preschool and kindergarten, using the data to identify struggling readers and tailor interventions to support students as they are entering the K through 12 system. Finally, many states are looking for ways to expand overall access to high-quality preschool experiences, whether it is through targeted eligibility for children from low-income backgrounds or a more universal approach to expand program availability.

This map shows the distribution of kindergarten entry assessment policies, with the purple states requiring an assessment for all entering kindergartners. We have seen more states requiring these assessments over the last several years, along with specifications about how the data must be reported and used.

The question that is top of mind for everybody who deals in this topic area is how have these policy changes in states affected student outcomes? Unfortunately, it is a complicated question that does not have an easy answer. As with most educational research, it is difficult to connect policies to outcomes. We often have limited access to the data that would allow us to attribute correlational effects to specific policies. Not to mention the fact there is always a lag between policy enactment, policy implementation, and the evaluation and analysis process. A lot of states have enacted their literacy policies relatively recently or they have enacted multiple policies over a period of years, so we do not have robust enough data to make those connections. Now, there is evidence that states with comprehensive literacy policies, meaning policies that address multiple aspects of literacy, show more improvement in standardized state reading exams. A recent study from the Education Policy Innovation Collaborative at Michigan State University examined the effects of state policies on student test scores and found that states with comprehensive policies have greater improvement in student reading scores than states with no policies or less comprehensive policies. This is an area of research that is clearly still evolving. It does suggest these policies can have an impact.

To ground this in a specific example, I want to talk about what we have seen in Mississippi over the last decade. The Literacy-Based Promotion Act was passed in 2013. It incorporates most of the policy elements we associate with a comprehensive policy, including preservice and in-service requirements for teachers, coaching supports, required interventions—such as an individual reading plan and a multitude system of supports, and a mandatory retention policy for third grade students scoring below the required achievement level. We have seen that since 2013, Mississippi has seen an 11-point increase in their fourth grade NAEP reading scores. They now rank around the national average for fourth grade reading. This is a big improvement and I think it is cause for celebration, but I want to outline a few caveats about policy takeaways from the Mississippi context. While the Literacy-Based Promotion Act was enacted in 2013, there have been several amendments over the last decade, which you would expect as policies are implemented and changes need to be made based on feedback and evaluation. Because of that, as I mentioned earlier in talking about

outcomes research, it is difficult to parse out what exactly is driving these results. A recent study from Boston University concluded that retaining students reading below grade level was, in part, contributing to higher scores, but this study used data from an earlier version of the state's literacy policy which has since been amended to change retention requirements. I put this out only to say we should be cautious in interpreting the connections between policies and outcomes. Mississippi's retention policy is probably the most stringent in the nation but because the state simultaneously enacted policies requiring intensive interventions and providing other literacy supports, I think we should be careful about attributing score improvements to discrete policy levers.

I will leave you with a few considerations, as you think about the work to be done in this policy space in Nevada. The first is related to data. Thinking about what data is available and how it is being collected, analyzed, and utilized. For the policies currently in place or being considered, it is important to understand what data you have access to and what that data can and cannot tell you. The second is whether or not stakeholders are being engaged to maximize implementation and fidelity. When it comes to a comprehensive approach to literacy, it is vital to have buy-in from families and teachers. Ensuring those groups have meaningful input and a deep understanding of the intent behind the policies in place can help smooth the way during that implementation and evaluation process. Lastly, how can an enhanced alignment impact continuity, outcomes, and investments. If we look beyond K through 3, there are opportunities to build preliteracy skills in high-quality early childhood environments and extend those foundations into the K through 12 system and improve the transition between early childhood education and K through 12.

To highlight a couple of resources, I embedded links into the PowerPoint, including the full 50-state comparison on K through 3 policies I referenced earlier, our upcoming work, as well as our ongoing state education policy tracking. With that, thank you again for inviting us to present. I will be happy to take any questions you have.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for the presentation. Members, any questions?

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Thank you, that was a great presentation. They all have been and the amount of information for us to— I love how we can look at other states. If you want to enlighten me more, I know I am not the expert, and you are. As I look at this, what is interesting, and a relief, is we do not have to do this by ourselves in our State. We belong to a bunch of other states that are doing this. The Mississippi model is encouraging. There are some similarities. We are prone to being careful about comparing other states to Nevada. We will look at our neighboring states, and we have similar issues that we deal with. I know states spend different amounts of money. As I look at the color coding you did, there are consistencies in those states that were mentioned—Connecticut, Florida, Indiana. They are doing all of them. I noticed the one deficiency in Nevada is we do not have the curriculum requirements that were mentioned in the portion on pre-K requirements in the K through 3 component. The takeaway I have is, maybe Nevada needs to visit that curriculum requirement in the K through 3 component. The states that tend to stand out, not just Connecticut, Florida, and Indiana, but other states that I have seen doing a good job; Idaho, Indiana, Texas, and now Mississippi. It was interesting and something I never thought about before. I appreciate you highlighting that.

On the NAEP results for 2022—the nationwide decline of three points. Are we defining that as a COVID-19 related decline? Do we have the average increase or decline? Do you keep that statistic before COVID-19, or is it all over the place?

Ms. Fischer:

I would have to double check on the 2019 results because I cannot remember if it was. We may have stayed statistically, the same more or less, in 2019. Previously, I think there had been somewhat of a downward trajectory. I think where we were in 2019 was down from say ten years prior. I can double check those numbers for you. I think everyone would agree COVID-19 was a contributing factor and there were already signs that downward trajectory was starting to become a problem in 2019.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Thank you for clarifying that. If we take out COVID-19, it did seem like there was a ten-year period where there was a decline, not as big as the drop we saw with COVID-19, but something over that ten-year period seemed to be going on. Could you provide follow up material on those declines or increases before COVID-19 and the NAEP results?

Ms. Fischer:

Yes, I am happy to put that together for you. I am looking at the numbers right now. We were at 221 in 2009 and 220 in 2019. Obviously, a small decline, but the fact it was remaining flat and we were not improving, especially in those gaps between student groups, I think was one of the things raising alarm bells in those 2019 results.

Briefly, I want to respond to your comment about the curriculum requirements for K through 3 in terms of where Nevada is. I want to emphasize that is one of the more recent policies that states have been enacting. Also, to remind you when we do these 50 state comparisons, we are only looking at statute and administrative regulation, which does not encompass everything being done in terms of the policy work in states. I know there are states where it is not mandated through statute or regulation but may provide detailed guidance to districts through their state education agency or might even provide incentives. I believe New Mexico provides financial incentives for districts to adopt high quality evidence-based curricula. They just do not have that as a legislative requirement. I did want to give that broader context there.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for the clarification. Assemblywoman Hansen, we were on the same wavelength, you took my two clarification questions.

AGENDA ITEM IX—PRESENTATION ON STATE AND NATIONAL EDUCATION RANKINGS AND PERFORMANCE PURSUANT TO SENATE BILL 72 (2023)

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I am going to open Agenda Item IX, a presentation from the Kenny Guinn Center for Policy Priorities, who is here to talk about the state of education rankings, how Nevada fits into that picture, and how it might adjust moving forward. With us to present is Anna Colquitt and Todd Butterworth. Begin when you are ready.

Anna Colquitt, Director of Education Policy, Kenny Guinn Center for Policy Priorities:

Thank you for inviting us here today. Prior to turning it over to Mr. Butterworth to present on national education rankings, I want to take a moment to introduce the work of the Guinn Center and our current education projects (Agenda Item IX). The Guinn Center is a statewide nonpartisan policy institute, and we have several subject areas including education policy, health and social policy, economic policy, governance, and land and natural resources.

We are currently working on three major projects in the education space. First, we are working on a project with NDE looking at the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan, and how that is playing out across the State. For this project, we are doing geographic information system (GIS) mapping as well as interviewing principals from sample schools across the State to see how that funding has played out across the State. Second, we are doing a project, which we have the honor to present to you in March, on early childhood systems. Specifically, looking at governance and how other states are approaching early childhood governance systems, and how we could possibly replicate some of those systems in Nevada. Finally, we are working on a project with NDE on school-based behavioral health and looking at other states as best models for how we could improve our behavioral health systems in Nevada. We are also producing briefs. We recently published a brief on competency-based education, which plays well with the other presentations we heard today. We are also working on briefs that better align the educational standards to workforce needs. I will turn it over to Mr. Butterworth to share findings from our national education report.

Todd Butterworth, Senior Education Researcher, Kenny Guinn Center for Policy Priorities:

In 2022 and 2023, the Guinn Center presented a three-part series of reports requested by the Commission on School Funding. The report series examines widely publicized national education rankings and apparent disparities in their assessment of Nevada's K through 12 education system compared to other states. In recent rankings, Nevada placed at or near the bottom of some, while also being ranked a respectable 18th in K through 12 achievement by another. The Phase I and Phase II reports, which predate my tenure with the Guinn Center, explored and clarified how these widely varied assessments could simultaneously be valid. National education rankings are considered by many to be proxies for school quality. They are frequently referenced to support various narratives about education and used in conversations and negotiations regarding education funding. Some folks will say that Nevada's poor performance and ranking necessitates more funding to improve education quality. Others may use the same ranking to argue it shows that funding is not the issue.

Phase III of our report, which was presented to the Commission on School Funding in November and the State Board of Education in January, considers how Nevada should respond or proceed given the findings from our 2022 reports. The Phase III final report further explores the value and shortcomings of existing State education rankings. It also outlines critical concepts for measuring State educational performance and proposes essential considerations for establishing a fair and robust system for state-to-state comparisons. The report concludes with a suggested approach for creating a Nevada specific scorecard to measure the relative performance of the State's K through 12 system, and that is going to be my focus with you here today.

First, it would be helpful to briefly revisit the findings from the Phase I and Phase II reports and the benefits and drawbacks of K through 12 rankings. National rankings of all types

attract attention because they typically offer a nice digest of information and helpful context for how entities perform compared to their peers. But the media has also discovered that rankings are effective at generating headlines and clicks. The magazine *U.S. News and World Report* has built its various rankings into the signature products of its brand. The magazine now offers rankings of the best countries in the world, the best states and healthiest communities in the United States, and various rankings in the education space. The leading national K through 12 education rankings include, and you are probably familiar with these, the Kids Count Data Book produced by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Quality Counts from *Education Week*, Best States for Education from *U.S. News and World Report*, and Most and Least Educated States in America from Wallet Hub.

Our reports show there are challenges with these rankings. First, each system is unique and should not be compared to the others. Because of the disparate data included in the individual rankings, each should be considered independently. Second, their choice of data points significantly influences the rankings. This finding is most prominent when looking at the results of Quality Counts and Kids Count. Three of the four indicators in Kids Count are also included in Quality Counts. However, Nevada is ranked 46th in Kids Count and 18th in Quality Counts. Third, it is noteworthy that the rankings may be based on a sample of students or challenging to interpret data. Some testing regimes use a scientific sampling of students which can be reliable and representative. But in other cases, students participate solely on a voluntary basis. This can make a big difference in the data. Fourth, the data can sometimes be old. Therefore, any new programs intended to improve Nevada's national rank might not quickly be reflected in certain data sets. As an example, the NAEP tests students in math and writing only every two years, but it had a 13-year hiatus between state-level science tests. Finally, all rankings are relative. When Nevada improves an educational outcome, it does not guarantee the State will gain in its national ranking on a related indicator because other states might have also improved. Therefore, it would be misleading only to look at the change in Nevada's performance relative to other states. Equating Nevada's academic results with national rankings can miss important nuances. What we learned in those first two reports is national rankings might be interesting, but they cannot be the foundation of a strategy for improvement or even a logical target at which to aim in and of themselves. Therefore, using existing rankings to inform Nevada's K through 12 policy appears to have more drawbacks than benefits. Still, looking at other states can put Nevada's education system in context, and we believe can be a beneficial endeavor.

Given the benefits of interstate comparisons and the drawbacks of existing national rankings, how might Nevada proceed? Our Phase III report explores the various ways K through 12 performance can be measured. I am going to mostly skip that content today, but you are welcome to check out the report online if you are interested. Instead, I am going to jump directly to the recommendation we made to the Commission.

The Guinn Center believes Nevada should consider creating a proprietary system, an annual statewide scorecard for comparing the Silver State's progress and achievement relative to other states. If it were created and updated by an independent entity, it might carry credibility with the media and the public. Such a scorecard could use existing national or multistate data sets. Our report lists ten possible data sources that includes SBAC tests, the ACT, the National Center for Education Statistics, the Census Bureau, and others. At the recent Commission on School Funding meeting, the folks from WestEd suggested it is even possible to create a synthetic or statistical entity that can act as a current and relevant basis for comparing outcomes. In any case, an annual statewide scorecard should consider the performance of other states in ways that enable meaningful comparisons. Depending on the individual data set or performance metric, Nevada might be compared to all states,

other states with similar demographics, states in the Western region, or some other subset of states, or as suggested by WestEd, even a synthetically created comparative state. The choice of which to use should depend only on data relevance for each data set and not on whether the states make Nevada's performance appear better or worse.

I want to highlight this point by going on a brief tangent. Our report offers the ACT as a detailed case example. In many states, the ACT is only taken by students who plan to go to college. These tend to be a better performing, test-ready students. Nevada, however, administers the ACT to all eleventh graders so it is at a comparative disadvantage when comparing scores with some states. For example, in 2019, the average score among the states giving the ACT to all students was 8 percent lower than the national average. However, it was 28 percent lower than those states testing a quarter of their students or less. The choice of states for comparison matters. Therefore, if Nevada decided to use ACT scores as a performance measure for college and career readiness, the benchmark should probably compare Nevada only to those states that require all students to take the test. I hope this example is helpful to see the possible challenges in blanket national comparisons.

Now back to our regularly scheduled programming. Our report suggests that each performance measure in Nevada's proprietary scorecard might seek to answer one or more of these essential questions. How is Nevada performing against a fixed objective or measure of achievement? How did the State perform compared to a previous period, or how did Nevada perform or progress compared to other states during a given period? In any case, it is imperative the dataset being used logically and fairly supports the answer being sought.

Nevada already has robust systems for internally measuring education performance. These include the NSPF, the Nevada Alternative Performance Framework, the Growth Model, and the Nevada Report Card. These are helpful tools to see how entities within the State are progressing against their own performance over time. How do we externally measure the State's performance in a way that is more effective than all those national rankings in the media. To answer this question, our report offers a variety of options for the contents and format of an interstate scorecard, imposes a long list of questions to contemplate about the scorecard in general and the performance metrics, specifically.

Topics for special consideration covered in our report include the general scorecard contents which performance metrics to measure, data considerations related to each metric, the scoring format, and other possible questions. The exercise of working through these vital considerations will help whoever is constructing the scorecard to produce a product that captures those subtle things necessary to understand how Nevada compares to other states. Additionally, AB 400 and SB 98, from last year's session, give the Commission on School Funding a broad mandate to look at K through 12 performance and resources to do the job well. These bills prescribe an extensive list of performance metrics to be tracked and also enable the Commission to add some of its own. The statutory list would be an excellent starting point for determining the contents of a Nevada scorecard.

In conclusion, based on the findings from our Phase I and II reports, Nevada would benefit from a more thoughtful and relevant process for comparing its K through 12 system to other states. Our Phase III report explores existing rankings, value, and shortcomings and shows how they lacked context and nuance. It also highlights critical concepts for measuring state-level performance and suggests essential considerations for establishing a fair and robust system for state-to-state comparisons. It concludes by offering an approach for creating a Nevada specific scorecard to measure the relative performance of our K through 12 system. The Guinn Center believes objective interstate comparisons are achievable. Thank you for your interest in this project. Are there any questions or comments?

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for the presentation. Members, questions?

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Have you looked into AI's work when it comes to education or the distance learning of early childhood education currently happening in homes by the computer systems. Has there been any discussion about that? I do not know if that is part of the report you are presenting today. It might be more of an offline conversation.

Mr. Butterworth:

It is not a specific element related to this report. However, as Ms. Colquitt mentioned, we are separately looking at early childhood considerations in a comprehensive way. Certainly, we are also looking at AI, and it is going to be having an increasing impact on many things in education.

Ms. Colquitt:

I would like to add, we have AI and education briefs that will be published shortly. We are doing one on K through 12 education and one on higher education. These will be high-level explainer briefs. Then, we will be producing more specific reports following that tailored towards what the actual needs are for education research in AI policy.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I enjoyed the presentation and the work you do. I look forward to that AI report as well. I get it on the state-to-state comparisons. Even as I do my research, I realize there are a lot of differences between the states. As I mentioned earlier, per-pupil funding, demographics, all kinds of variables. At the end of your remarks, you mentioned there are metrics to compare state to state. Can you give us examples of comparisons we could place value in? I think we are nervous to do those comparisons because we know there are differences that are hard to measure. Could you give us an illustration of where more vetting is done and there is more equality in the comparison?

Mr. Butterworth:

I do not know that I can point to a specific existing set of comparisons that we can rely on and if I could summarize this issue. Its unique in comparing Nevada to other states. Each state is unique. When you are looking for comparisons that are valid, you need to consider the data set you are looking at and what comparative states you are looking at—and that is what our report is saying. It is fine and helpful to compare to other states because it provides perspective and context, but it needs to be done not in a shotgun approach by taking all data from all states, putting it on the table and comparing it. But to be more thoughtful in what states are used for comparisons and how the data is used. Each individual data set. As I mentioned during my presentation with the ACT, let us say we decided the ACT was a good and valid measure of college and career readiness and we are now going to compare Nevada to other states on the ACT. We are suggesting that we should only compare Nevada to those states that test all their students to give us a fair basis for comparison. Now, if we were going to do other metric related to early literacy, we would want to dive into what the metric is and what states would be a good source for comparison. We might consider demographics. We might consider states with Read by Grade 3 policies. There are tons of considerations, but we believe it needs to be done more thoughtfully on a data set-by-data set basis.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I agree. Thank you for using the ACT example because not a lot of people know all Nevada students have to take it. They are comparing our ACT scores to other states where a portion of the students take it, and that understanding is important in order for us to be fair in our analysis.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I just did a search to see what states require all students to take the ACT. There are only four and we are one of them—Hawaii, Nebraska, Nevada, and Wisconsin. There are a few more states that do the ACT, without the writing component, that might give us a better baseline in the math area as well.

It looks like there is another question. Please go ahead.

Senator Buck:

Out of the four states you mentioned, how do they rank because then it would be comparing apples-to-apples.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I do not know, and I do not imagine you probably know that.

Senator Buck:

If you are comparing apples-to-apples that way.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I think that is what we are going to do later. The apples have not been compared yet.

Mr. Butterworth:

What I recall about the ACT data, and I was looking at the 2019 data, Nevada still was ranked, it may have been lowest in ACT scores nationally. But its score was much closer to those states testing all students versus the national average or those states only testing college bound students.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I appreciate that. When we are collecting data, oftentimes it is quite nuanced. I appreciate the work you are doing.

Any other questions? No more apples? Thank you for being here.

AGENDA ITEM X—PRESENTATION ON GRADUATION RATES OF NEVADA PUPILS AND HIGHER EDUCATION CONSIDERATIONS PURSUANT TO SENATE BILL 72 (2023)

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Next, we will go to Agenda Item X. We will continue with our exploration of graduation rates by hearing about them from a higher education perspective. To present, we have Daniel Archer with the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE).

Daniel Archer, Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs, NSHE:

Thank you for the opportunity to join you today. I have spent the majority of my career in the middle part of the country. I have been here about six months, but I have enjoyed it. I am excited to be here and work with you all. At the outset here, I want to jump in and look at graduates by diploma type. Obviously, this was touched on during the presentations from NDE. To recap that, as well as set a foundation for the things we will look at in this presentation (Agenda Item X).

We are looking at the percentage of graduates who completed the diploma by type. You will see there are four types. The alternative is less than 1 percent, so it does not show up, but that category is there. In recent years, the percentage of the standard diploma recipients has gone down. The non-standard diplomas, specifically the advanced and the CCR, when you add those together have gone up, which has been good. Obviously, we would be partial to the advanced and CCR because the students who complete that curriculum are far less likely to need college remediation, which is significant. They are more likely to be successful in college, that is important. They are more likely to complete a college credential, which we will cover in a later slide.

One of the big questions legislators and Nevadans have is, what happens after high school graduation? What is the next step? This gets into a higher level. The blue is the percentage of Nevada public high school graduates who enroll at an NSHE institution within a one-year period after graduation. Looking at that 2012–2013 data, you will see that 41 percent of the class of 2013 enrolled at an NSHE institution within a one-year period immediately after high school graduation. It has been close to 40 percent when you look at the years represented. The orange or yellow represents the students who pursued postsecondary education but did so at a non-NSHE institutions. They went to a private institution here or a public or private institution out of state. You will see 2019–2020 took a significant dip. Obviously, that was the class of 2020, during COVID. It changed the plans for people, and they were more likely to hunker down and there were not as many people who ventured out of state during that year, but that proved to be an anomaly. In green, you have the percentage of those who are in the workforce within a one-year period after graduation. Then we have that unknown category in purple. It is important to note this data comes from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System. There are efforts to improve that to tie up the loose ends and iron out the kinks. We are hopeful that unknown category will shrink in future years because it puts us in a position to have a more reliable and comprehensive data set. These are the graduates by year who have continued on to NSHE. These are raw numbers.

These are the raw numbers broken down by tier, when we look at community colleges or two-year colleges versus universities. The two-year sector is represented in the blue line. You will see is started 5,157 and trended upward to a high of 7,237 in 2018–2019. It then took a sizable dip and leveled out. The universities are in the darker line on the bottom. They had an upper trajectory and then leveled out but did not have a significant decrease during that time period. This is representative of the national data. Community colleges have taken a larger decrease, or hits, in enrollment over the last several years. Whereas universities have taken some hits and challenges but have had more stable enrollments recently.

This shows the percentage of Nevada high school graduates who complete a general education English course one year after high school graduation. This is a significant data point because when you break down college success, we try to identify checkpoints and if students meet those checkpoints. What are the reliable predictors we can look at that will put them in a better position to ultimately be successful and, in the long term, complete

a degree? One of those significant checkpoints is completing a gateway English course or a general education English course, often titled Freshman Comp 1, or English Comp 1. We are looking at the percentage of Nevada high school graduates who complete a general education English course one year after high school graduation. Most students are able to go directly into that gateway English course, without a need for remediation. They are college ready and able to jump right in. Those students are represented in the light blue color at the top. Some students do need remediation, they are below the collegiate level and need to brush up on their skills. Traditionally, we have utilized more of a prerequisite remediation system where a student will have to take one, two, or sometimes even three classes that do not count for college credit before they can elevate and qualify for the gateway course. It is a system that has not worked. It has not worked anywhere; it has not worked in Nevada. It is not a hit on any institution, it just shows that particular type of strategy has largely been ineffective. We have done the same thing over and over in higher education expecting a different result. Finally, we made some changes.

We have since flipped to something called corequisite remediation. This is a large-scale change. You go from more of a sequential long-term remediation strategy to compressing it into one semester. You remediate and complete a gateway course in one semester. It makes it more affordable and effective. When you look at the data, every student shows marked improvement. When you compare corequisite traditional remediation, when you look at everything by race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. You look at the rural students and the more metropolitan or urban students. It is one of those strategies that works for everyone, and we have seen increases. The corequisites are that middle line and the traditional remediation is the dark line at the bottom. We have made improvements there. It is important to note with the corequisite, it went down a little and 2021–2022 was the first year we did this full scale. It is similar to what we talked about earlier with the ACT because all students who were not college ready were doing corequisites. Consequently, you had those lower performing students, who had done traditional remediation, now they are in the corequisite group and as a result that did go down. But it still worked better than the traditional remediation and that is evident when we look at the math outcomes.

Math has been an Achilles heel for a lot of students. The old joke is people are afraid of public speaking more than they are of death, or something along those lines. My experience is math has been the real challenge in talking to students and the anecdotal conversations you have. You will see we flipped to corequisites 2021–2022 versus the traditional remediation, which again is the dark line at the bottom. We made significant improvements. In 2018–2019, we were mostly doing the traditional remediation. Only 26.1 percent of those students were completing a general education math course in one year. When you look at 2021–2022, when we had everyone doing corequisites, we went well above 50 percent at 55.1 percent. Nearly a 30-percentage point increase. It was a significant increase. This was a powerful policy lever for us. It was not a popular decision among faculty, but they did the right thing. This was a data-informed decision. We looked at data in California, Georgia, Tennessee, and Texas. Our Board did the right thing, and it is a benefit to our students in the end.

This gets into credential completion by diploma type. We are looking at the percentage of graduates who completed a college credential within six years after graduation. We are comparing those who complete a standard diploma versus those who complete a more advanced diploma. You will see a stark contrast when we look at this. To break this down more, obviously, there are multiple differences when you talk about the standard diploma versus the more advanced diploma, or CCR is an option. Nevada's Department of Education is best positioned to get into the details on that. One of the things that stands out to me is under the standard diploma, three maths are required. Whereas under the advanced

diploma, four maths are required so they are taking a math course each year of their high school experience. When students do not have a math course, especially during their senior year, math often is one of those things if you do not use it, you lose it. Then students start out behind, they are frustrated, and it carries over into postsecondary education. When you look at the national data on high school courses that are linked to success, a fourth math course is a significant predictor of success. We understand the challenges of the teacher shortage in math especially, but consistent with the national data, if we could somehow get to a point where all students were doing a math course over the duration of that four-year experience it would be great. Again, to build off the things we talked about earlier. We are not suggesting that all students are going to be on a baccalaureate STEM track. We understand the realities of the situation. There are other avenues we can explore, such as doing a data science, a statistic class, or a practical everyday math. There are all kinds of things we could do, but that is something we would support going forward if there were provisions made to the graduation requirements.

This gets into things with dual enrollment. You will see the credentials that have been awarded to dual enrollment students over the last ten years. We had very little dual enrollment participation ten years ago, so we had few opportunities to award those credentials. This population has significantly grown over the last ten years. With that, you will see more credentials are being awarded. We are having more students earning an associate degree when they graduate high school, which is great. It is a tremendous head start. We were under 10 associate degrees in 2012–2013; the number has elevated to well over 300 in 2021–2022. Concurrent enrollment is a huge success factor. It is a great opportunity for us to collaborate with our K through 12 partners. Not only that, it is easily one of the better predictors of success. When you look at data, it is powerful. The students who do concurrent enrollment, even the ones who were mediocre high school students, are more likely to persist to postsecondary education. They are more likely to be retained, earn a 3.0 GPA, and graduate. They are less likely to have debt. They are more likely to graduate in four years. Everything we want to do concurrent enrollment is a significant checkpoint in that process. If you want to build on the last conversation about apples-to-apples, if you look at two mediocre students and you look at the one who participated in concurrent, they are more likely to hit on those things in terms of going to college, being successful in college, and graduating. This concludes my presentation.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for those links. As you we are talking at the end, I jumped on the NSHE dual enrollment dashboard. Members, any questions?

Assemblyman D'Silva:

I am a big fan of dual enrollment and these programs. I just found out Senator Dondero Loop's granddaughter was a recipient of a degree from the College of Southern Nevada (CSN) this Monday. My question is on the funding mechanisms here? I heard there are challenges when it comes to funding the dual enrollment programs with the school districts throughout the State. What is your perspective and thoughts on that?

Vice Chancellor Archer:

We have taken a proactive stance in that space. We have discounted the tuition for those concurrent enrollment partnerships where students are getting a lower cost than the students who are taking the courses on the campus. Which is great, and it has provided more avenues for students to participate. There are some school districts that pay for that and some school districts that cannot. You have those challenges and some of those local

partnerships. At the end of the day, the states that have moved the needle on concurrent enrollment, like Washington or Colorado, have made them where they are tuition free. With that you have books and things, but you have open educational resources (OER) now that are free and reduced cost textbooks. There are all kinds of opportunities to use those, especially in these general education courses most students across the country are taking. I think there would be great opportunities for partnerships, for us to adopt OER in conjunction with legislative investments. Down the road, if something like was possible, it would be a huge thing for K through 12 and higher education. We would see benefits.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I am going to piggyback on Assemblyman D'Silva and ask the question in reverse. Are we seeing collegiate level professors in these dual enrollments? I know that has been an issue with different universities within NSHE.

Vice Chancellor Archer:

In some cases, there will be college professors going out there. In most cases, it is a high school instructor and there is a system in place where the instructor is evaluated and overseen directly by a department chair or a college faculty member. They are being observed, they are getting feedback, and student surveys are done. All those things done on campus are also done in that environment on the high school campus.

In terms of the credentialing, it does vary a little bit. The regional accreditors over the NSHE institutions states the policy you have on campus has to equally apply when you do the concurrent enrollment partnerships and off-campus courses. We have some institutions that take a hard line and say you have to have a master's in English to teach English or maybe you have a master's degree in education administration, you have to have at least 18 hours of graduate work in English. There are some that are looking at the high school instructor though. If someone has taught for a long time, they have a good track record, and maybe they have taught AP classes. They are allowing them to do so as well. It is something we are looking at as a system, to look at policy infrastructure and address those types of issues. Those are real issues in our world at NSHE.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Since I have been in the Legislature for four terms, I have watched this dual enrollment issue come up. The way I recall seeing it is the intent that it was a collegiate level. It worries me that we are not having that level, because if it is truly a college credit, a dual enrollment, that is the level they should be getting. I think when you have this, "Well, they have taught for a while," or "They have done this," it is a slippery slope. What is good for the goose has got to be good for the gander. When you have a college level professor teaching one course, then down the street at another school, it is just somebody who has been teaching a while, it is not the same. When we are legislating and you are looking through the NSHE lens, it needs to be consistent. It is something we need to keep in mind. Senator Buck—

Senator Buck:

You took the words right out of my mouth because I was wondering if all dual enrollment programs were created equal. I know there have been issues, when it is in the high school as opposed to going to the college, to maintain the excellence. Students are not going into remedial coursework out of the dual enrollment program. Are you aware of that number?

Are there students who are going through it in the high schools and then having to go into remedial programs and entering college?

Vice Chancellor Archer:

I do not have that off the top of my head. There could be anomalies here and there. For example, somebody I grew up with, that ended up becoming an attorney, had a 33 and 34 on the reading and writing portion of the ACT and they were an 18 or 19 in math. You are going to have some of those cases. I imagine there are a few here and there. I think for the most part, there are intentional efforts to get folks who are more college ready and putting them in a position where they get those gateway courses like English and math done. Therefore, they would not need remediation when they are a full-time college student.

Senator Buck:

Then, along the line of Assemblyman D'Silva's question with funding. Does it differ on the price per institution for dual enrollment or how do you quantify that? I come from the K through 12 and I know in the high school we write a check for an amount to pay their tuition. We take our distributive school account (DSA) or student dollars and then write a check to CSN for our tenth, eleventh, and twelfth graders in dual enrollment and going to a college campus. What is the discount?

Vice Chancellor Archer:

Everybody pays the same when it is a concurrent enrollment partnership. In other words, if it is on the high school campus and typically a high school instructor is teaching that course, everyone pays the same. If you are at a university or a community college, we have a flat rate. I am trying to remember; it is either 75 or 80. We can follow up and get you the number. Conversely, when a student goes to the campus, and they take it at the college campus, they are paying a discounted rate that is less than the typical student would pay. They are paying that $75 flat fee when it is a concurrent enroll partnership. Those partnerships are the access points where we can reach a lot more students so we have been intentional about making those as affordable as we can.

Senator Dondero Loop:

I will weigh in on both of my positions, one as a grandmother and one as a legislator. You are right, it depends what institution is being funded. From a family standpoint, my granddaughter went to CSN for her classes and had a professor or teacher hired by CSN to do those classes. The funding model for UNR being dual enrollment in Las Vegas is a totally different funding model and that is a funding model to fund UNR. I think it is that simple. It was a way for them to have access to students outside of their area to keep UNR funded by students. I do not know if I can make that any clearer, but that is the way it is.

Vice Chancellor Archer:

Your point is heard and something we are going to be talking about at the next Board meeting.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for saying that. I know this is not the first time we have rung this bell, and we will continue to ring this bell. We need to make sure our students are getting what we are promising them.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Thank you for being here, and I appreciated the data. I am going to refer to the slide on Nevada high school graduates' degree completion within six years following high school graduation. Those stats were amazing to me. With a standard diploma at about 28 percent the last time it was noted in 2016–2017, and then it almost doubles if they had an advanced diploma. Will we be able to get the stats in the future that show the CCR diploma and what effect that has for those students on their path in college?

Vice Chancellor Archer:

Yes, we will be ready to integrate that into this report whenever the time frame becomes available because it is six years after they graduate. Once we hit the timeline and are able to put two and two together, we will have that information.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I appreciated your comments about when we can do more math and these subjects that will help our students to get into college and not take as long. I have another question on the Nevada high school graduates continuation by institution type. You might not have this now, what is the number or percent of students who go in at the two-year institution and then move on to the four-year? I know some degrees are associate degrees and that is great, they do not need to move on. But I am curious what the rate is?

Vice Chancellor Archer:

It is a great question. I do not have it off the top of my head, but we are happy to go back and get that for you.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

If you want to send it to the Committee, and we will make sure to get that out to our members.

We have one more question from Assemblyman D'Silva.

Assemblyman D'Silva:

How granular is the data here? Are we able to track Nevada high school students who are going to enroll in an NSHE institution and complete a degree school by school. Is that data available so we can see how many Rancho, Coronado, or Hug High School graduates go on to complete degrees at these different institutions.

Vice Chancellor Archer:

I think we can. José Martinez is in Carson City and may be able to address that.

José Martinez, Director of Institutional Research, NSHE:

Yes, that information is available. We have access to the student level data, and we can tell the high school where those graduates came from.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Assemblyman D'Silva, most of this information is on their dashboard. We have the links in the presentation and there is a ton of information, which is great.

AGENDA ITEM XI—PRESENTATION ON THE UPDATES AND CHANGES TO ACCOUNTABILITY IN NEVADA'S EDUCATION SYSTEM

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Next, we will move on to Agenda Item XI. We will end our presentations with school accountability and efforts to reshape what accountability looks like in Nevada. To present, we have Adam Young presenting on behalf of the Nevada Association of Superintendents (NASS). Please go ahead when you are ready.

Adam Young, Vice President, NASS, and Superintendent, White Pine County School District:

It is my pleasure to be with you this afternoon. I enjoyed speaking with you not long ago, and of course, the opportunity to contribute to this great conversation (Agenda Item XI). I want to say how much I have appreciated what has been talked about today, as a practitioner, and what I have learned and taken away from today as part of this larger conversation. Obviously, everybody has a lot of care for this important topic of education in our State. I want to reiterate, from the superintendents, we have high expectations for our students, educators, schools, districts, and ourselves as leaders. Everything I say today will come from my lens as a practitioner, K through 12 Nevada graduate, UNLV graduate, and lifelong resident. I have a lens, and many of our superintendents do, that may be different than the others you heard today. But there is a lot of overlap.

One of those areas of overlap is this idea of high expectations. We want to continue to emphasize, as I did in my last presentation, that we believe high levels of learning can be shown and demonstrated in many ways that are not currently being taken advantage of that would contribute to this wonderful discussion you had today. We believe the best systems are built collaboratively. They are co-created, which you heard in several presentations today as well. We have heard a number of times today this is complicated work. It is filled with a lot of nuances. I would add, it is also messy and nonlinear. In the policy world, we want to be able to draw a line from input to outcome and it is tough to do that in education. Every 1 of the 500,000 students in our State is unique, different, and individual. There is no way to quantify all those differences in numbers.

You have seen a lot of this before, and I do not want to dwell on it, but I find it important to emphasize there is an impact on the discussions you have in these meetings. A lot of times that impact is not a positive one on our educators and students. I want to highlight two of these. Invested levers, this is recent research from Jeremy Glazer that talks about our most experienced and competent teachers who move on from education because of what they perceive as being intrusive policies on learning practices. We have a teacher shortage. We have people who leave the profession nationwide because of the things talked about today. I want to highlight Kennedy Wilkins' opinion in the *Reno Gazette Journal*. Kennedy is a Washoe County School District student and wrote a great opinion editorial, a month and a half ago, that talked about the impact high-stake tests have on students.

"So, by any account, what policymakers have put in place in American schools is precisely what is needed to cancel out students' desire for creative and entrepreneurial talents." We heard a lot of talk earlier about creativity. The presentation on artificial intelligence was compelling about how that is such an in-demand attribute for our graduates as they go into life after high school. Yet, when we limit what is taught to only what is measured, then creativity goes out the door. If you only measure things in one particular way, then you are missing the creative ways students can show what they have learned.

I have a colleague who we tease that he sometimes has a tinfoil hat. I am going to put on my tinfoil hat for a moment, if you will indulge me, and share this, probably conspiratory minded quote, from the writing of Buddy Richards in 2018. Call your attention to the last couple of sentences. "Testing corporations are raking in billions of dollars in profits," and that is true. Then, "Schools are graded and ranked on criteria that will financially line the pockets of a few at the expense of the very groups they claim to serve." I am being upfront and telling you that this could be viewed as a conspiratory type of a quote, and it probably is, but there are educators who feel this way. I think there is probably evidence that would warrant that feeling.

Let us talk about families. I shared this information with you last time I was here, and I briefly want to call your attention to it again. How does this fit in accountability? It fits because many of these comparisons talked about today are limited on a few criteria. Those criteria almost always come from these standardized tests. Our families across the country do not value standardized tests as the most important way to quantify learning for our students.

A couple more reviews here to keep calling your minds to this. This is from the National Center on Education and the Economy. This is helpful and valuable information and reinforces what we talked about today. Not everything is on this list. In fact, very few things on this list are currently measured as intended outcomes of our educational system in the United States and Nevada. There are a lot of them that cannot be measured. As a system, we have to come to comfort with the discomfort that we may not be able to gather data on these things. If we only focus our data collection on a few metrics, then by definition, people are going to default to those things that are being measured.

I want to, again, amplify the idea that student voice is so important. I told you before that my lens is as a current practitioner, besides being the Superintendent, I teach every day. Our students, in 2024, are different than they were five years ago before COVID-19. If our students do not see value in the types of activities and actions they are being asked to do, they simply disengaged. They use their agency, whether we plan for that or not. For example, you had a presentation about ACT data earlier today. Every junior in Nevada takes the ACT. The way students exercise their agency on that is, since they do not have a voice in choosing not to take it—and maybe taking something more meaningful to them—they exercise their voice by bubbling through letter C for the entire test. To be fair, there are many students who value that exam and plan on using it well. Our educators do an amazing job to encourage students as to the value that exam can hold, but frankly, those efforts do not work sometimes. If students do not see the value, and if they are not able to exercise their agency in a way that is helpful to them, then they will exercise their agency in a way that is not helpful to them. We see that happening a lot.

You heard today about Acing Accountability. I want to highlight our appreciation for the sixth question that Superintendent Ebert talked about today—to what degree are districts using innovative solutions to meet the unique needs of their students? We appreciate the chance, as school districts, to weigh in and share data that is helpful, shared data that maybe is not being shared in other ways. I also want to point out that most of the metrics in Acing Accountability double down on standardized tests and this narrow vision of what education is supposed to look like. One of the things I think we have room to grow on is this idea of alignment. Superintendent Ebert did not talk about it today, that I heard anyway. You are aware of the Portrait of a Nevada Learner, North Star that has been created through feedback across the State, throughout school districts, and with student voice. If this accountability system—we are working to reshape—does not align with the North Star of the Portrait of a Nevada Learner, all that work has been wasted, and we will continue to

have the frustrations with lack of alignment because what we are measuring does not line up with this vision is that has been articulated.

Current accountability models—you are aware of the NSPF Acing Accountability. The Governor and his staff released his audit on school districts. We have the Governor's three-year education policy, which is rigid on the goals outlined. The superintendents and school districts are attempting to quantify all the other ways we are accountable. In one case, there are more than 400 reports provided to various entities where accountability is required. There is discussion about what accountability means, and I think there are different versions of that right now. This is our version as superintendents. I want to highlight three of these items and ask you to think deeply about them. On the left, compliance-based to benefits-based. This is a shift in mindset more than anything else. We have to have a hammer in order to get people to do their jobs—that is the compliance-based. Versus how do we celebrate and amplify the benefits a system, organization, teacher, or student bring to the table? Then, how do we work on the things that need to be worked on? Those are two different mindsets. I also want to highlight the top down versus co-created. The wonderful thing about the Portrait of a Nevada Learner is it had a voice from many stakeholders. We encourage the esteemed individuals on this panel and other folks working on accountability to create this together. The best systems are done with everybody's voice involved, and it is not one group doing it to another group.

Lastly, I will highlight one more. Change demoralizes stakeholders to empowers stakeholders' collaborative ownership. We know as educators and legislators how important stakeholder ownership is to education. I purposefully avoided the word buy-in because buy-in is different than ownership. We want ownership. As you said today, some of the ways learning is being quantified right now can be disenchanting. It is not that anybody wants to avoid or that students can learn better than they are currently learning. All of us can perform better than we are currently performing. I think there is a widespread acceptance of that. I think we would say in this shift there are many ways to show learning. If students' agency and voice is honored and they are allowed to show their learning in ways that make sense and is meaningful for them, then you are going to see a lot of different numbers than what you have seen today. They still will not be 100 percent. They will still probably be lower than what we want, but it will be a more realistic conversation. In the process, people will be empowered to own the problem versus trying to shift blame and other things we see happening.

What are some of the things currently going on? You are aware that individual school districts are being asked to share their data and thoughts to the Interim Finance Committee's Subcommittee on Education Accountability, which is new. The Commission on School Funding is tackling this problem. The Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education has a subcommittee whose purpose is to think about this. I mentioned the innovative measures for Acing Accountability. I want to thank Superintendent Ebert and her staff for their commitment to come to you in the next session for funding to do this work. It is going to take some money. It does need to be thoughtful. As I said before, it is going to be messy and nonlinear. There needs to be a specific task force to sort through this problem and figure out how to incorporate these voices and change the system in a way that is going to help us move forward in the way we want to move forward.

A couple of things that are also currently underway. Thank you to Mr. Zutz and his team in the accountability office at NDE. With his partnership and the Superintendent's advocacy, the SBAC blueprints that will be administered one year from now are the shortened blueprints. Students will spend approximately 90 fewer minutes testing than they did this year. This is a huge win for honoring student voice and agency and for having meaningful learning within classrooms at the end of the year. We are excited about that. There is also a

pilot in the works. This has not been formalized yet, but it is important you know about it. Many school districts use the NWEA MAP as a formative model to gather information that is immediately available for teachers, students, families. Whereas the SBAC information is not available for months after it is administered. There is a pilot the NDE team is working on. If it is approved, the districts who opted-in will be able to forego the SBAC, saving several more hours of testing time, and instead administer the NWEA, which they are already doing, and have that feed into the current accountability model with NSPF. Districts are extremely excited about this. I had a discussion with my teachers yesterday, and I cannot tell you how elated they were to have fewer testing requirements and a more meaningful source of data collection that is readily and immediately available to them and their families versus waiting on the SBAC. It is exciting.

The Technical Advisory Group is a working group of school district folks, along with Mr. Zutz and his staff at NDE. They are in the process of making recommendations about the student engagement indicator on the NSPF. When I was with you last time, I talked about chronic absenteeism—which, again, nobody is going to argue that is unimportant—but there are many other majors of student engagement as well. Capturing those is a part of telling the story and allowing for a school or district who has experienced a lot of growth in reducing chronic absenteeism, but maybe still has not met the benchmark is also an important part of that process.

Last, this collective desire, which I hope you share. I have heard this expressed with Superintendent Ebert among my colleagues and with the Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education that whatever is created needs to be aligned with this North Star if we intend to use the North Star as a North Star.

I appreciate your time, and I know that it is the end of your day. I am going to try to drill in on a couple of things and not get to everything here. There are discussions on accountability and whether there is enough overlap in synergy for progress to be made. Or are there too many cooks in the kitchen? It is a real concern. You can see the other questions here, but I am not going to go over them.

As a practitioner, because this is my unique lens, I would like to share a couple of ideas about what superintendents believe could be helpful in measuring, understanding that not everything that counts can be counted. These are examples of student engagements that are not accounted for in any measure of accountability right now. As a fine art and performing arts teacher, I am offended these things are not accounted for. My students come to school every day to come to my class, they come to school for other reasons too, but they come for my class. If we want to capture student engagement, we need to find a way to measure, quantify, report, and share the successes of these organizations that are not only focused on literacy, math, and science because these are the ways students learn skills like analytical thinking, creativity, curiosity, and problem solving. These are the types of things that students—not to say they do not learn them in English and math too, because they do—but they are amplified and refined in these other types of activities. Policy that encourages these asset-based practices is more helpful than policy that sanctions students or schools based on a perceived deficit. I ask you to consider that as a policy point.

You have heard a lot of information about this data earlier today. Some of this is captured in the NSPF, but a lot of it is not. Some of it is captured in Acing Accountability, some of it is not. Some of it is not there at all. Again, schools and districts are placed in a tough spot when they might have their own internal vision of what learning is and it might not completely align with what is being measured at the State level so sometimes tough choices have to be made.

This is even more meaningful data. But again, not all of this is explicitly connected to a measurable, quantifiable outcome. For example, the student led conferences. There is emerging research about meta cognition and learning to learn. As students are able to authentically share in their own language and manner, what they have learned aligned with the grading scales, the outcomes of the course, and how it connects to their future, there is emerging research that talks about how promising of a practice that is and how students begin to then own their deficits and make plans to improve. Again, this is honoring student agency and voice and bringing them into the conversation versus having them feel like they are objects being acted upon by everybody else. In my mind, the more students I can get in my system, to have a meaningful student led conference multiple times per year, I want to tell that story. I want to share it with you. Most of all, I want to do that for my students so they can show their learning in a way that is not just sitting down at a test at the end of the year. I will not go into greater detail on these unless you have questions. I want to offer this as an example of what internal accountability systems already look like. If there was flexibility granted to districts to report these things, they would be reported, and you would have the opportunity to have more information to make decisions about systems and their effectiveness.

Last, I want to share from the strictly academic standpoint. I know ESSA is a requirement, but we have to continue to push for that policy to change too if we want to honor personalized learning. I have heard that phrase used multiple times today. If we personalize learning on the input side of things, what educator is going to argue with that? What system does not want to personalize learning for students? Everybody wants a more personalized system. If the only way we personalize is on the inputs and we still measure learning in the same standardized way, that is not personalized learning. We are going to have a disconnect. We have to give options to kids. What is wrong with—despite what ESSA says—pushing for a policy that allows students options in the ways they show their academic learning. What if a student wanted to take the SBAC, the MAP, do a portfolio, and present evidence to a committee, we would want to say absolutely, please do all those things. But what if a student did not want to do all those things? What if they only wanted to do one of them? If they did not show their competence in that one then we could come back and say you are not there yet, let us look at a different way. Let us let us figure out how you can show your learning or if the learning is not there, what are we going to do to help you get there? It honors voice and choice. It is not an option kids have right now.

The last example is competency is important to a local system. This is from my school district. Our portrait and vision of learning is leadership development for each and every student. We see each student as a leader, and these are some of the competencies snipped from our portrait of a student leader. My system, community, and stakeholders said they would buy into this. If there was such thing as 80,000 percent, then they would buy into it 80,000 percent. Gathering data on this type of competency development, which is different from what is typically measured in an accountability system. This is the type of data I am interested in and there is no test that is going to measure these things. Again, I want to highlight this is the type of data that could be collected, and in a lot of cases is being collected, but it is only being shared within one system. It is not being elevated to your level because the framework does not exist. Furthermore, to highlight there is no way to quantify these competencies in a test. Students have to show these things, which means I need to develop opportunities to get them to show these things.

Here are our invitations, which I always like to leave you with. You are going to get the best picture, and I know many of you do this, but please come into our schools. I would love to have any of you here in Ely. This is the best time of the year to come because it is hot in Clark County. It is beautiful up here. We welcome you at any time. We all have our cell

phones publicly available. We answer our phone calls and return texts. Come and see for yourselves. Again, I appreciate you for this partnership, opportunity, and the invitation to share our perspective and add our voices to what has already been said today. We know you are champions of education, and you want the system to be the best it can be for students. We thank you for that and ask for your continued support in advocating for policy that offers flexibility and personalized ways for learners to show what they know. With that, if you have questions.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

I did go to read Kennedy Wilkins' opinion editorial, unfortunately, I am not a subscriber to Reno's paper. If we could get a copy of it, I would love to read it. Senator Buck—

Senator Buck:

I wanted to reiterate, I know ESSA mandates the SBAC for math, reading, and science. My question is, do you have to throw that out and replace with the other? Why can we not still assess math, reading, and science and then build in the extra assessments you are talking about that are more fluid or not as quantifiable?

In the last legislative session, we had students come and talk to us in the Education Committee. They stated it is hard to have a substitute in math where the teacher is not necessarily competent in the subject matter. I think it is an issue. We need to make sure there are qualified math teachers, in particular, in every room, especially in our most at-risk areas—focusing more on making sure students meet those levels of proficiency. Then, having different ways in which they can highlight their strengths. You have to budget, do math, and be able to read as an adult. There are so many things you need to be able to do in life that I think there is a minimum proficiency we could compromise on.

Superintendent Young:

On behalf of the superintendents and myself, I was a high school principal for 13 years and math achievement was one of my priorities every single year, and it remains so. I do not want to represent or suggest that having a minimum demonstration of mathematical competence is unimportant and something we should let go of. I do not believe that at all, and I know none of my colleagues believe that either. I think we would say there are many ways for students to show competence on those items you talked about that may not come down to the test in front of them. We try to focus our hands on types of learning experiences and inquiry learning based experiences. In a perfect world, every student would be able to demonstrate that outcome in the same type of way, hence standardized. Standardized tests are efficient for that purpose. The nuance comes in if we are going to meet students where they are and differentiate based on their learning styles and input on the instructional side, there should be flexibility in meeting whatever that competence is defined as. I agree it has to be there, and I would say there are multiple paths to show that beyond one. As you know, in a classroom there are multiple paths to do that. It does not necessarily manifest itself in the standardized testing environments.

To respond to your SBAC question, ESSA does require that, and I do not think it is going anywhere anytime soon. Although, in my perfect world it probably would. I would still say the expectation that there is a high level of learning cannot go away. Nobody wants that to go away. I would also argue there are probably higher levels of learning that can be shown in ways other than the standardized test, but a lot of times kids do not get the opportunity to do that.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod, thank you for that point on Kennedy's article, and I will see what I can do.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I have a question on slide 16 under the efforts to reshape policy, when you mentioned multiple districts are opting into the pilot with NWEA to replace the SBAC. Is that happening as we speak? When will we see the fruits of that pilot?

Superintendent Young:

It is an iterative and collaborative process with NDE. Initially, we hoped to apply for an innovative assessment design waiver. In the end, we opted not to do that. Ann Marie Dickson, Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement, NDE, is doing a phenomenal job of working through all the regulations about what this potential pilot could look like and what flexibilities would be offered and would not be offered. We hope, as districts, that within the next four weeks we have answers to those questions. In the best-case scenario, the NWEA would replace the SBAC. There is also a possibility it would not replace. The districts would be allowed to pilot it, in addition to giving the SBAC, which I think fewer people would be excited about but are still interested in as alternatives. It is not that anybody wants to vilify the SBAC. I think the data available through MAP and NWEA is more valued by our educators and students, and it is immediate. In that way, it is more helpful than the SBAC which comes three or four months after it is administered. I hate to be vague but that is the best answer I have to that question.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for being here.

AGENDA ITEM XII—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

With that, we will move on to Agenda Item XII, which is public comment. We have cleared the room in Las Vegas, so we do not have public comment here.

Carson City, do you have any public comment? The room has been cleared in Carson City as well.

BPS, is there anyone on the phone lines?

BPS:

Thank you, Chair. If you would like to provide public comment, please press *9 now to take your place in the queue.

Dora Martinez, Legislative Liaison, Nevada Council of the Blind, and Activist, Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:

Good afternoon, Chair and Members of the Committee. It is interesting that I did not hear anything relating to students with a disability, 504 Plan, or IEP. Maybe it happened earlier today, and I just clocked in at 11:45 a.m. We need to be aware there are those students who are American sign language learners and students who are blind who needs Braille lessons, and they are not getting that met in the State. I am working with some parents who are not getting the teachers who knows Braille to teach their students. Imagine

yourself as a blind person who is being read to, instead of being taught how to read. This is how the Nevada education is treating some students in the rural area. Please put that on your radar. If it is not being reported, it is probably because the superintendent, or whoever is running the show, is not aware. I am bringing it to your attention and hope we can work together, instead of the school district being sued, that we are paying attention to our students and including them and their parents at the table, so they have the equal playing field as their sighted counterparts as students. Thank you for your attention and enjoy your day.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you. BPS, next caller.

BPS:

Chair, the public line is open and working, but there are no other callers at this time.

Chair Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you to the Members and everyone who came today. An archived version of today's meeting will be available online. Our next meeting is June 20, 2024.

AGENDA ITEM XIII—ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Crystal Rowe
Senior Research Policy Assistant

_____

Jennifer A. Sturm-Gahner
Principal Policy Analyst

_____

Alex Drozdoff
Senior Policy Analyst

APPROVED BY:

_____

Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Chair

Date: _____

MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item IV A	Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Nevada's Department of Education (NDE)	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item IV B	Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, NDE	Handout
Agenda Item IV C	Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, NDE	Handout
Agenda Item IV D	Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, NDE	Handout
Agenda Item IV E	Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, NDE	Handout
Agenda Item V A	Gunes Kaplan, Ph.D., Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management, NDE	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item V B	Gunes Kaplan, Ph.D., Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management, NDE	Handout
Agenda Item V C	Peter Zutz, Administrator, Office of Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management, NDE	PowerPoint Presentation

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item VI	Alex Urrea, Founder and CEO, Eduscape	PowerPoint Presentation This is on file in the Research Library of the LCB, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6825.
Agenda Item VII	Michelle Exstrom, Director, Education Program, National Conference of State Legislatures	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item VIII	Adrienne Fischer, Senior Policy Analyst, Education Commission of the States	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item IX	Anna Colquitt, Director of Education Policy, Kenny Guinn Center for Policy Priorities; and Todd Butterworth, Senior Education Researcher, Kenny Guinn Center for Policy Priorities	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item X	Daniel Archer, Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education	PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item XI	Adam Young, Vice President, Nevada Association of School Superintendents, and Superintendent, White Pine County School District	PowerPoint Presentation

The Minutes are supplied as an informational service. All meeting materials are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Library/About/Contact/feedbackmail.cfm.