**Nevada Department of Education**

**Consolidated State Plan**

**Under the Every Student Succeeds Act**

Description: EDSEALC

**U.S. Department of Education**

OMB Number: 1810-0576

Expiration Date: November 30, 2019

Contents

Cover Page 3

Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan 8

Letter from the State Superintendent 9

Section 1: Long-term Goals 10

Section 2: Consultation and Performance Management 18

2.1 Consultation. 18

2.2 System of Performance Management. 21

Section 3: Academic Assessments 24

Section 4: Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools 26

4.1 Accountability System. 26

4.2 Identification of Schools. 38

4.3 State Support and Improvement for Low-performing Schools. 39

Section 5: Supporting Excellent Educators 42

5.1 Educator Development, Retention, and Advancement. 42

5.2 Support for Educators. 45

5.3 Educator Equity. 46

Section 6: Supporting All Students 49


6.1 Well-Rounded and Supportive Education for Students. 49

6.2 Program-Specific Requirements. 55


Consolidated State Plan Assurances 66

APPENDICES 67

# Cover Page



\*See Next Page for the Governor’s Signature



| **State Plan Requirements by Program** | **Statutory and Regulatory Requirements** | **Item(s) from Revised Template** | **Item(s) from** **Original Template** | **First Page Number** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)** | **Citation to ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, and Part 200 regulations** |  |  |  |
| Eighth Grade Math Exception | 1111(b)(2)(C); 34 CFR 200.5(b) | A.2.i-iii | 3.A | p. 24 |
| Native Language Assessment*s* | 1111(b)(2)(F); 34 CFR 200.6(f)(2)(ii) and (f)(4) | A.3.i-iv | 3.B | p. 24 |
| Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities (1111(c) and (d)) |  |  |  |  |
| Subgroups | 1111(c)(2) | A.4.i.a-d | 4.1.B | p. 30 |
| Minimum N-Size | 1111(c)(3) | A.4.ii.a-e | 4.1.C | p. 31 |
| Establishment of Long-Term Goals | 1111(c)(4)(A) | A.4.iii.a-c | 1.A-C | p. 10 |
| Indicators | 1111(c)(4)(B) | A.4.iv.a-e | 4.1.A | p. 26 |
| Annual Meaningful Differentiation | 1111(c)(4)(C) | A.4.v.a-c | 4.1.D; 4.1.G | p. 33; p. 36 |
| Identification of Schools | 1111(c)(4)(C)(iii) and (D); 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D) | A.4.vi.a-g | 4.2.A-B | p. 38 |
| Annual Measurement of Achievement | 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii) | A.4.vii | 4.1.E | p. 35 |
| Continued Support for School and LEA Improvement | 1111(d)(3) | A.4.viii.a-f | 4.2.A.ii; 4.2.B.iii; 4.3.B-D | p. 38; p.39;  p. 40 |
| Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators | 1111(g)(1) (B) | A.5 | 5.3.B-C | p. 47 |
| School Conditions | 1111(g)(1)(C) | A.6 | 6.1.C | p. 54 |
| School Transitions | 1111(g)(1)(D) | A.7 | 6.1.A-B | p. 49 |
| **Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children** |  |  |  |  |
| Supporting Needs of Migratory Children | 1304(b)(1) | B.1.i-iv | 6.2.B.ii –iii and vi | p. 56; p. 57 |
| Promote Coordination of Services | 1304(b)(3) | B.2 | 6.2.B.iv | p. 57 |
| Use of Funds | 1304(b)(4) | B.3 | 6.2.B.viii | p. 58 |
| **Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk** |  |  |  |  |
| Transitions Between Correctional Facilities and Local Programs | 1414(a)(1)(B) | C.1 | 6.2.C.i | p. 59 |
| Program Objectives and Outcomes | 1414(a)(2)(A) | C.2 | 6.2.C.ii | p. 59 |
| **Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction** |  |  |  |  |
| Use of Funds | 2101(d)(2)(A) and (D) | D.1 | 5.2.A | p. 45 |
| Use of Funds to Improve Equitable Access to Teachers in Title I, Part A Schools | 2101(d)(2)(E) | D.2 | 5.2.A; 5.3.E | p. 45; p. 48 |
| System of Certification and Licensing | 2101(d)(2)(B) | D.3 | 5.1.A | p. 42 |
| Improving Skills of Educators | 2101(d)(2)(J) | D.4 | 5.2.B | p. 43 |
| Data and Consultation | 2101(d)(2)(K) | D.5 | 2.C-D | p. 20 |
| Teacher Preparation | 2101(d)(2)(M) | D.6 | 5.1.B | p. 43 |
| **Title III, Part A, Subpart 1: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement** |  |  |  |  |
| Entrance and Exit Procedures | 3113(b)(2) | E.1 | 6.2.D.i | p. 59 |
| SEA Support for English Learner Progress | 3113(b)(6) | E.2.i-ii | -- | p. 16 |
| Monitoring and Technical Assistance | 3113(b)(8) | E.3.i-ii | 2.2.B and D | p. 21; p. 22 |
| **Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants** |  |  |  |  |
| Use of Funds | 4103(c)(2)(A) | F.1 | 6.1.A-E | p. 49 |
| Awarding Subgrants | 4103(c)(2)(B) | F.2 | -- | p. 60 |
| **Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers** |  |  |  |  |
| Use of Funds | 4203(a)(2) | G.1 | 6.2.E.i | p. 60 |
| Awarding Subgrants | 4203(a)(4) | G.2 | 6.2.E.ii | p. 60 |
| **Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program** |  |  |  |  |
| Outcomes and Objectives | 5223(b)(1) | H.1 | 6.2.F.i | p. 61 |
| Technical Assistance | 5223(b)(3) | H.2 | 2.2.D | p. 22 |
| **Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, Subtitle B** | **McKinney-Vento Citation** |  |  |  |
| Student Identification | 722(g)(1)(B) | I.1 | 6.2.G.i | p. 61 |
| Dispute Resolution | 722(g)(1)(C) | I.2 | 6.2.G.iii | p. 62 |
| Support for School Personnel | 722(g)(1)(D) | I.3 | 6.2.G.ii | p. 62 |
| Access to Services | 722(g)(1)(F)(i) | I.4 | 6.2.G.v.1 and 2; 6.2.G.iv | p. 63; p. 63 |
| Strategies to Address Other Problems | 722(g)(1)(H) | I.5.i-v | 6.2.G.vi | p. 64 |
| Policies to Remove Barriers | 722(g)(1)(I) | I.6 | 6.2.G.vi | p. 64 |
| Assistance from Counselors | 722(g)(1)(K) | I.7 | -- | p. 64 |

# Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan

*Instructions: Indicate below by checking the appropriate box(es) which programs the SEA included in its consolidated State plan. If an SEA elected not to include one or more of the programs below in its consolidated State plan, but is eligible and wishes to receive funds under the program(s), it must submit individual program plans for those programs that meet all statutory and regulatory requirements with its consolidated State plan in a single submission.*

Check this box if the SEA has included all of the following programs in its consolidated State plan.

**or**

If all programs are not included, check each program listed below that the SEA includes in its consolidated State plan:

Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies

Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children

Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction

Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement

Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program

Title VII, Subpart B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act: Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program (McKinney-Vento Act)

☒ Check this box if the State has developed an alternative template, consistent with the March 13 letter from Secretary DeVos to chief state school officers.

☒ Check this box if the SEA has included a Cover Sheet with its Consolidated State Plan.  
☒ Check this box if the SEA has included a table of contents or guide that indicates where the SEA addressed each requirement within the U.S. Department of Education’s Revised State Template for the Consolidated Plan, issued March 2017.

☒ Check this box if the SEA has worked through the Council of Chief State School Officers in developing its own template.

☒ Check this box if the SEA has included the required information regarding equitable access to, and participation in, the programs included in its consolidated State plan as required by section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act.

# Letter from the State Superintendent

Dear Nevadans,

Last May we began a statewide conversation about developing Nevada’s Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan. ESSA replaces the No Child Left Behind Act and reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, returning much of the state’s authority and flexibility to set policies, create timelines for progress, and develop school improvement plans that meet the needs of its students. From the start, the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) committed to writing a plan that puts ESSA and the new federal law in service to Nevada’s priorities. After dozens of meeting with teachers, parents, principals, school district leaders, civil rights organizations, the business community, and other engaged Nevadans we believe we have created a plan that does just that.

Our plan offers an honest evaluation of the state of education in Nevada. According to the January 2017 *Quality Counts* report,Nevada ranks **last** among the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Nevada also has the **lowest** average score among states that require all 11th graders to take the ACT. Yet bright spots exist. Nevada’s graduation rate is among the fastest improving in the nation, up from 62% in 2011 to 73.55% in 2016. Nevada was recognized as one of the top states for improvement on eighth grade reading and in science proficiency as measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress. Nevada has also seen the fastest improvement on score of three or higher on Advanced Placement assessments both last year and the previous three years combined.

Still, the disparate impact on our state’s most historically underserved students cannot be ignored, and bold action must be taken to ensure that all students have access to a great education. Our education system’s chronic underperformance and persistent achievement gaps requires a fundamental change. In fact, change is already underway with the passage of close to two dozen new education programs and initiatives during the 2015 Legislative Session.

Nevada’s plan strives to leverage ESSA as a catalyst for improvement and an opportunity to rally the state behind a singular goal: becoming the **fastest improving state in the nation**. The Department recognizes its limitations and will therefore focus on a few key strategies that it has the expertise to implement effectively and will drive the change we need to see.

1. **Developing great school leaders**
2. **Using data to inform decisions impacting our schools**
3. **Identifying and improving our lowest-performing schools**

To secure our place as the fastest improving state in the nation, we must continue to implement recently passed programs, hold ourselves accountable for improving student achievement, reinvest where we are having success, and redirect funds where outcomes are lagging.

I would like to thank the stakeholders who participated in developing Nevada’s ESSA plan. It will require all of us, working together, to achieve the goals outlined within this plan.

Sincerely,



Steve Canavero, Ph.D.  
Superintendent of Public Instruction

# Section 1: Long-term Goals

*Instructions: Each SEA must provide baseline data (i.e., starting point data), measurements of interim progress, and long-term goals for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency. For each goal, the SEA must describe how it established its long-term goals, including its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals, consistent with the requirements in* *section 1111(c)(2) of the ESEA* *and 34 C.F.R.* *§ 200.13. Each SEA must provide goals and measurements of interim progress for the all students group and separately for each subgroup of students, consistent with the State's minimum number of students.*

*In the tables below, identify the baseline (data and year) and long-term goal (data and year). If the tables do not accommodate this information, an SEA may create a new table or text box(es) within this template. Each SEA must include measurements of interim progress for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency in Appendix A.*

1. **Academic Achievement**.
   1. **Description.** Describe how the SEA established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for improved academic achievement, including how the SEA established its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals.

Many indices rank Nevada at or near the bottom of all states in student achievement. Nevada is committed to be the fastest growing state in the nation in student achievement. Nevada is well-positioned to achieve that goal thanks to the passage of dozens of new laws and policies. There is also emerging evidence that Nevada is trending in the right direction. Our graduation rate, English learner performance in early grades, and eighth grade reading and science scores are some of the fastest improving in the country.  
  
Nevada’s leadership team and data department looked at other states’ progress on nationally comparative measures of student success and set targets to match the highest rates of growth. NDE staff took current performance, projected annual growth to match the fastest growth demonstrated elsewhere, and created targets with that trajectory in mind. Most goals are set with a six-year time horizon to allow the existing investments and proposed changes to take hold, so measures are set with outcomes from 2022 in mind. These goals were recommended by the state superintendent, adopted by the State Board of Education, and communicated to education partners and LEAs throughout the state.  
  
The development of Nevada’s Academic Achievement goals was a thoughtful and inclusive process that incorporates Nevada’s vision for being the fastest improving state in the nation. The NDE began the goal setting process with a review of historical student performance, baseline data and literature review of goal setting practices around the country. This information was shared with several stakeholder groups including the NDE’s ESSA Advisory Group, the Accountability Work Group, and a Technical Advisory Group. Additionally, subject matter experts from NDE consulted with other states and considered the impact of the Academic Achievement goals on their program areas.  
  
The following guidelines drove the goal-setting process for Nevada’s academic achievement goals:

1. Set academic achievement goals separately for  
- Elementary school ELA and Math   
- Middle school ELA and Math   
- High School ELA and Math II/Integrated Math II End of Course

2. Long-term for Nevada will be six years. After six years, Nevada will re-establish the baseline and set a common long-term goal for all subgroups by the year 2030.

3. Nevada’s long-term goals will be based on a 5% annual reduction in non-proficiency for all subgroups. Based on research, this trajectory puts Nevada on track to being the fastest improving state in the nation.

4. Nevada believes that all students can achieve and that beyond 2022, the next long-term goal will be that all students achieve at the same high rates.

5. Nevada will set annual measures of interim progress.

6. Nevada will begin with baseline data disaggregated by subgroup because in order for student achievement to occur, Nevada must first acknowledge where Nevada students are.

7. Lower achieving subgroups must improve at greater rates than higher achieving subgroups

8. All subgroups will achieve the same, high proficiency rate by 2030.

9. By 2022, long-term goals will result in goals that are differentiated by subgroup, but the gaps between subgroups will have closed and next goal setting exercise will establish one common achievement goal for all of Nevada students.

* 1. Provide the baseline and long-term goals in the table below.

**Academic Achievement – Grades 3-5**

| **Subgroups** | **Reading/**  **Language Arts: Baseline Data and Year** | **Reading/**  **Language Arts: Long-term Goal** | **Mathematics: Baseline Data and Year** | **Mathematics: Long-term Goal** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **All students** | 49.9% (2016) | 63.1% (2022) | 39.9% (2016) | 55.8% (2022) |
| **Economically disadvantaged students** | 37.9% (2016) | 54.4% (2022) | 28.8% (2016) | 47.7% (2022) |
| **Children with disabilities** | 18.3% (2016) | 39.9% (2022) | 16.7% (2016) | 38.8% (2022) |
| **English learners** | 31.7% (2016) | 49.8% (2022) | 25.1% (2016) | 44.9% (2022) |
| African-American | 39.6% (2016) | 55.6% (2022) | 29.6% (2016) | 48.2% (2022) |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 71.4% (2016) | 78.9% (2022) | 63.6% (2016) | 73.3% (2022) |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander | 33.0% (2016) | 50.8% (2022) | 21.1% (2016) | 42.0% (2022) |
| Hispanic or Latino | 32.9% (2016) | 50.7% (2022) | 23.4% (2016) | 43.7% (2022) |
| White | 50.9% (2016) | 63.9% (2022) | 39.7% (2016) | 55.7% (2022) |

**Academic Achievement – Middle School**

| **Subgroups** | **Reading/**  **Language Arts: Baseline Data and Year** | **Reading/**  **Language Arts: Long-term Goal** | **Mathematics: Baseline Data and Year** | **Mathematics: Long-term Goal** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **All students** | 46.4% (2016) | 60.6% (2022) | 26.0% (2016) | 45.6% (2022) |
| **Economically disadvantaged students** | 35.1% (2016) | 52.3% (2022) | 17.4% (2016) | 39.3% (2022) |
| **Children with disabilities** | 9.0% (2016) | 33.1% (2022) | 5.1% (2016) | 30.2% (2022) |
| **English learners** | 11.7% (2016) | 35.1% (2022) | 6.9% (2016) | 31.6% (2022) |
| Hispanic | 36.0% (2016) | 53.0% (2022) | 17.5% (2016) | 39.4% (2022) |
| Asian | 71.9% (2016) | 79.3% (2022) | 51.7% (2016) | 64.5% (2022) |
| African American | 27.5% (2016) | 46.7% (2022) | 10.8% (2016) | 34.4% (2022) |
| Native American | 34.0% (2016) | 51.5% (2022) | 16.4% (2016) | 38.6% (2022) |
| Pacific Islander | 45.4% (2016) | 59.9% (2022) | 26.4% (2016) | 45.9% (2022) |
| Caucasian | 60.7% (2016) | 71.1% (2022) | 38.3% (2016) | 54.7% (2022) |
| Multi-race | 54.8% (2016) | 66.8% (2022) | 30.8% (2016) | 49.1% (2022) |

**Academic Achievement – High Schools**

| **Subgroups** | **Reading/**  **Language Arts: Baseline Data and Year** | **Reading/**  **Language Arts: Long-term Goal** | **Mathematics: Baseline Data and Year** | **Mathematics: Long-term Goal** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **All students** | 68.6% (2016) | 76.9% (2022) | 34.0% (2016) | 51.5% (2022) |
| **Economically disadvantaged students** | 58.7% (2016) | 69.6% (2022) | 23.5% (2016) | 43.8% (2022) |
| **Children with disabilities** | 33.4% (2016) | 51.0% (2022) | 8.9% (2016) | 33.0% (2022) |
| **English learners** | 29.4% (2016) | 48.1% (2022) | 8.6% (2016) | 32.8% (2022) |
| Hispanic | 63.1% (2016) | 72.9% (2022) | 24.6% (2016) | 44.6% (2022) |
| Asian | 83.2% (2016) | 87.7% (2022) | 57.2% (2016) | 68.5% (2022) |
| African American | 45.0% (2016) | 59.6% (2022) | 15.3% (2016) | 37.8% (2022) |
| Native American | 70.5% (2016) | 78.3% (2022) | 25.6% (2016) | 45.3% (2022) |
| Pacific Islander | 65.9% (2016) | 74.9% (2022) | 32.0% (2016) | 50.0% (2022) |
| Caucasian | 77.2% (2016) | 83.2% (2022) | 43.4% (2016) | 58.4% (2022) |
| Multi-race | 73.9% (2016) | 80.8% (2022) | 38.5% (2016) | 54.8% (2022) |

1. **Graduation Rate.**
   1. **Description.** Describe how the SEA established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for improved four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, including how the SEA established its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals.

Nevada’s leadership team looked at other states’ progress on graduation rate improvement and set targets to match the best rates of growth. The graduation rate has grown significantly over the last five years, from 62% in 2010-11 to 73.55% in 2016.

The proposed six-year time horizon, with 2022 as the target year, allows time for investments and changes to demonstrate results. These goals were recommended by the state superintendent, adopted by the State Board of Education, and communicated to education partners and LEAs throughout the state.  
  
The development of Nevada’s graduation rate goals followed the same process described in the Academic Achievement section above. Through this considered process, the NDE’s graduation goals are driven by the following guidelines:

* + 1. Long-term for Nevada will be 5 years
       1. After 5 years, Nevada will re-establish the baseline and set a common long-term goal for all subgroups by the year 2030
    2. Nevada will set annual measures of interim progress.
    3. Nevada will begin with baseline data disaggregated by subgroup because in order for Nevada to improve its graduation rate, Nevada must first acknowledge where its students are.
    4. Lower achieving subgroups must improve at greater rates than higher achieving subgroups.
    5. All subgroups will achieve the same, high graduation rate by 2030.
    6. By 2022, long-term goals will result in goals that are differentiated by subgroup, but the gaps between subgroups will have closed and next goal setting exercise will establish one common graduation rate goal for all of Nevada students.
  1. Provide the baseline and long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in the table below.

Nevada uses the 4-year graduation rate as well as the 5-year graduation rate in the accountability system.

| **Subgroup** | **Baseline (Data and Year)** | **Long-term Goal (Data and Year)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **All students** | 73.6% (2016) | 84% (2022) |
| **Economically disadvantaged students** | 66.7% (2016) | 81.0% (2022) |
| **Children with disabilities** | 29.3% (2016) | 60.0% (2022) |
| **English learners** | 42.6% (2016) | 70.0% (2022) |
| Hispanic | 69.7% (2016) | 82.0% (2022) |
| Asian | 87.9% (2016) | 90.0% (2022) |
| African American | 56.5% (2016) | 75.0% (2022) |
| Native American | 64.7% (2016) | 80.0% (2022) |
| Pacific Islander | 75.9% (2016) | 86.0% (2022) |

* 1. If applicable, provide the baseline and long-term goals for each extended-year cohort graduation rate(s) and describe how the SEA established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements for such an extended-year rate or rates that are more rigorous as compared to the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress than the four-year adjusted cohort rate, including how the SEA established its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals.

5-year graduation rate is reported on the 2014 cohort, for whom the 4-year graduation rate was 70%. In the 4-year graduation rate reported above, the 2016 cohort is referenced.

**5-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (note, dates reflect original year class of)**

| **Subgroup** | **Baseline (Data and Year)** | **Long-term Goal (Data and Year)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **All students** | 72.0% (2015) | 86% (2022) |
| **Economically disadvantaged students** | 65.9% (2015) | 83.0% (2022) |
| **Children with disabilities** | 29.1% (2015) | 62.0% (2022) |
| **English learners** | 31.7% (2015) | 72.0% (2022) |
| Hispanic | 64.2% (2015) | 84.0% (2022) |
| Asian | 85.5% (2015) | 92.0% (2022) |
| African American | 56.5% (2015) | 77.0% (2022) |
| Native American | 52.9% (2015) | 82.0% (2022) |
| Pacific Islander | 76.1% (2015) | 88.0% (2022) |
| Caucasian | 78.3% (2015) | 91.0% (2022) |
| Multi-race | 77.6% (2015) | 89.0% (2022) |

1. **English Language Proficiency.** 
   1. **Description.**  Describe the State’s uniform procedure, applied consistently to all English learners in the State, to establish research-based student-level targets on which the goals and measurements of interim progress are based. The description must include:
      1. How the State considers a student’s English language proficiency level at the time of identification and, if applicable, any other student characteristics that the State takes into account (*i.e.*, time in language instruction programs, grade level, age, Native language proficiency level, or limited or interrupted formal education, if any).

The state of Nevada considers the student’s initial English proficiency level and the amount of time the student has spent in language instruction programs in establishing the expected timeline for English language acquisition.

* + 1. The applicable timelines over which English learners sharing particular characteristics would be expected to attain ELP within a State-determined maximum number of years and a rationale for that State-determined maximum.

**Nevada Expected Time to English Language Proficiency**

| Initial ELP Level in Year 1 | Years to Achieve EL Proficiency |
| --- | --- |
| 1 - Entering | 4-6 years |
| 2 - Emerging | 3-5 years |
| 3- Developing | 2-4 years |
| 4 - Expanding | 1-3 years |
| 5 - Bridging | Considered EL Proficient |
| 6 - Reaching | Considered EL Proficient |

| Initial ELP Level | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 - Entering | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 4 | Level 5 |
| 2 - Emerging | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 4 | Level 5 |  |
| 3- Developing | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 4 | Level 5 |  |  |
| 4 - Expanding | Level 4 | Level 4 | Level 5 |  |  |  |
| 5 - Bridging | Considered English Language Proficient in Nevada | | | | | |
| 6 - Reaching | Considered English Language Proficient in Nevada | | | | | |

Rationale: The NDE and the ESSA English Learner Work Group reviewed research regarding English language acquisition in the development of the expected timeline for English language development. The research indicated that the average time for English learners to achieve academic English language proficiency was 4-7 years. The studies included:

Hakuta, K., Butler, Y.G., and Witt, D., 2000, *How Long Does It Take English Learners to Attain Proficiency?* Berkeley:University of California, Linguistic Minority Research Institute.

Haas, Huang, Tran, Yu, 2016, *The achievement progress of English learner students in Nevada,* Washington: U.S. Department of Education, Regional Educational Lab at WestEd.

Kieffer, M., Parker, C., 2016, *Patterns of English Learner Student Reclassification in New York City Public Schools,* Washington: U.S. Department of Education, Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast & Islands

* + 1. How the student-level targets expect all English learners to make annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency within the applicable timelines.

The NDE assesses every English learner upon enrollment to understand the level of English proficiency. Based on initial English proficiency level, Nevada gives English learners up to six years to become proficient in English.  
  
To set targets for that goal, Nevada’s leadership team and data department looked at other states’ progress and outlined a path to match the best rates of growth in those states. For English learners, Nevada compared its WIDA Access assessment performance to other states that use the same assessment.   
  
The proposed six-year time horizon, with 2022 as the target year, allows time for state investments and systems changes in EL serves to demonstrate results. These goals were recommended by the state superintendent, adopted by the State Board of Education, and communicated to education partners and LEAs throughout the state.

* 1. Describe how the SEA established ambitious State-designed long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for increases in the percentage of all English learners in the State making annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency based on 1.C.i. and provide the State-designed long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for English language proficiency.

Nevada annually assesses English learners with the WIDA assessment, a summative assessment that meets U. S. federal requirements. Nevada is one of thirty-nine states in the WIDA Consortium, which develops standards and assessments that promote educational equity for ELs. As a member of the WIDA Consortium, Nevada can compare its results with other states and set growth goals.  
  
The long-term goal for English language proficiency, currently measured by the WIDA ACCESS assessment, is 90%. This would be a significant change from the current state of 24.9%. The NDE goal is that 90% of English learners will exit EL status within six years of initial EL identification and 90% of Long-term English learners will exit EL status by 2022\*.

\*This will be measured by aggregating the number of English learners who achieve Nevada’s EL exit criteria over a six year period.

| **Subgroup** | **Baseline (Data and Year)** | **Long-term Goal (Data and Year)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **English learners** | **24.9% (2016)** | **90% (2022)** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EL Proficiency |  | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| **All English Learners** | % English learners achieving Proficiency | Baseline 24.9% | 25.0% | 38.0% | 51.0% | 64.0% | 77.0% | 90.0% |

# Section 2: Consultation and Performance Management

## 2.1 Consultation.

*Instructions: Each SEA must engage in timely and meaningful consultation with stakeholders in developing its consolidated State plan, consistent with 34 C.F.R. §§ 299.13 (b) and 299.15 (a). The stakeholders must include the following individuals and entities and reflect the geographic diversity of the State:*

* *The Governor or appropriate officials from the Governor’s office;*
* *Members of the State legislature;*
* *Members of the State board of education, if applicable;*
* *LEAs, including LEAs in rural areas;*
* *Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State;*
* *Teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, and organizations representing such individuals;*
* *Charter school leaders, if applicable;*
* *Parents and families;*
* *Community-based organizations;*
* *Civil rights organizations, including those representing students with disabilities, English learners, and other historically underserved students;*
* *Institutions of higher education (IHEs);*
* *Employers;*
* *Representatives of private school students;*
* *Early childhood educators and leaders; and*
* *The public.*

*Each SEA must meet the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(b)(1)-(3) to provide information that is:*

1. *Be in an understandable and uniform format;*
2. *Be, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English proficiency, be orally translated for such parent; and*
3. *Be, upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. 12102, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.*
4. **Public Notice**. Provide evidence that the SEA met the public notice requirements, under 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(b), relating to the SEA’s processes and procedures for developing and adopting its consolidated State plan.

To align ESSA to Nevada’s State Plan, the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) created an Advisory Group and six Focus Area Work Groups to develop and recommend strategies to ensure that all students are college, career, and community ready.  
  
Work began in May 2016, and the six work groups that were convened included:  
- Accountability   
- Assessments   
- English Language Learners   
- Funding Streams   
- School Improvement   
- Teaching and Leading   
  
Based on responses to the survey that was posted on the NDE website, various stakeholders, including teachers/other licensed personnel, school leaders, district-level administrators, business members, representatives from higher education, parents/family members, and other community representatives, who were specifically assigned as members of each group. All meeting dates/times were open for members of the public to attend.  
  
Over two hundred Nevada citizens and advocates signed up to participate in the Work Groups and Advisory Group. Each Work Group met a minimum of three times and others met as many as five times. Each meeting were a minimum of two hours long. The Advisory Group met thirteen times between May 2016 and March 2017. Each of their meetings was at least two hours long. These work groups, as well as work groups initiated before ESSA and those continuing after this planning process, are composed of trusted advisors to the state department as the voices of schools and communities.  
  
These work groups are critical and routine in how NDE serves its district and charter partners. With a commitment to grassroots engagement and just 18 LEAs across the state, the state department ensures federal compliance, provides guidance and technical assistance, and cultivates self-advocacy at the LEA level. Nevada’s unique geography and population distribution is reflected in the fact that one of the county-wide districts enrolls approximately 70% of Nevada students, and schools are classified as urban, suburban, rural, and frontier. LEAs collaborate on common interests. Professional development is provided within the district or via one of three Regional Professional Development Programs, which are opt-in cooperative organizations. LEA leaders serve on the boards of RPDPs and align service offerings with identified development needs.

1. **Outreach and Input**. For the components of the consolidated State plan including Challenging Academic Assessments; Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools; Supporting Excellent Educators; and Supporting All Students, describe how the SEA:
   1. Conducted outreach to and solicited input from the individuals and entities listed above, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(b),during the design and development of the SEA’s plans to implement the programs that the SEA has indicated it will include in its consolidated State plan; and following the completion of its initial consolidated State plan by making the plan available for public comment for a period of not less than 30 days prior to submitting the consolidated State plan to the Department for review and approval.

More than thirty participants were a part of the Accountability work group. This group’s four meetings were facilitated by the Assistant Director of the Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management Office at NDE. The participants reacted to NDE questions around school and district accountability models and ways to incorporate equity into the systems, provided feedback, and finalized a set of recommendations, which was presented to the ESSA Advisory Group and submitted to the State Board of Education in January 2017.  
  
The NDE designed and conducted an Assessments work group. Twelve participants from districts, advocacy organizations, professional associations, and an education non-profit were facilitated by the Administrator for the Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management Office. Through four meetings from August to October 2016, participants reacted to NDE concepts, provided feedback, and finalized a set of recommendations, which was presented to the ESSA Advisory Group, which approved it and submitted it to the State Board of Education in January 2017.  
  
The English Learners work group was led by the Education Programs Supervisor for English Learners in the Office of Student & School Supports. Over four meetings from June to October 2016, participants reacted to NDE questions about accountability, funding, identification and reclassification of ELs. The group members, representing superintendents, district EL directors, and non-profit partners, provided feedback, and finalized a set of recommendations to the ESSA Advisory Group, which was submitted to the State Board of Education in January 2017.  
  
One of the groups convened focused on understanding and advising on Federal Funding Streams in the ESEA recertification. Led by the State Superintendent, this group met four times between September and December 2016 and made recommendations to the ESSA Advisory Council. Key areas of interest were the creation of consolidated application for LEAs, NDE guidance memos to LEAs on federal funding flexibility, and district federal funding audits. The Funding Streams Work Group presented its recommendations to the ESSA Advisory Group, which approved it and submitted it to the State Board of Education in January 2017.   
  
Forty-eight participants from districts, higher education, policy centers, advocacy organizations, professional associations, and an education non-profit participated in the School Improvement work group and were facilitated by NDE’s Office of Student and School Support leaders. Through four meetings from June to October 2016, participants reacted to NDE concepts, provided feedback, and finalized a set of recommendations, which was presented to the ESSA Advisory Group and submitted to the State Board of Education in January 2017.   
  
The Supporting Excellent Educators work group included forty participants from districts, higher education, business, advocacy organizations, professional associations, and an education non-profit. The Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement facilitated the group and was assisted by NDE staff members. Through four meetings from June to November 2016, participants reacted to NDE concepts, provided feedback, and finalized a set of recommendations, which was presented to the ESSA Advisory Group, which presented the recommendations to the State Board of Education in January 2017.  
  
Specific recommendations from the ESSA work groups are available in Appendix D.  
  
The New Nevada Plan was made public in January 2017, and the draft Consolidated Plan was made available in February. Public comment was solicited from the State Board of Education and citizens for the 30-day public comment period. NDE staff adjusted the plans for the submission of this document.

* 1. Took into account the input obtained through consultation and public comment. The response must include both how the SEA addressed the concerns and issues raised through consultation and public comment and any changes the SEA made as a result of consultation and public comment for all components of the consolidated State plan.

The six work groups analyzed data, researched options, and made recommendations to the Advisory Group, which was convened by the state superintendent and facilitated by NDE staff. Through presentations to the ESSA Advisory Group, NDE leadership monitored the progress of the work groups and created opportunities to collaborate. As the work groups were composed of representative groups, so too is the work of this plan coordinated across groups inside and outside the Department.  
  
Through regular meetings with NDE Cabinet and staff, discussions of this plan with the Nevada Department of Higher Education, Nevada Workforce Development, other state agencies, non-profit and corporate partners throughout the state, the State Superintendent and his team are planning for the administration of successful P-12 programs and alignment with other initiatives throughout the state.  
  
The NDE team made this plan available to the public for 30 days to provide perspective and feedback for a period ending March 10, 2017. Through this process, the NDE team incorporated feedback to make the plan complete, clear and inclusive. Following the end of the public comment period for the New Nevada Plan and the Consolidated Plan, NDE convened the Advisory Group to review the public comment and made adjustments were necessary.

1. **Governor’s consultation**. Describe how the SEA consulted in a timely and meaningful manner with the Governor consistent with section 8540 of the ESEA, including whether officials from the SEA and the Governor’s office met during the development of this plan and prior to the submission of this plan.

The State Superintendent kept the Governor apprised of work on the ESSA plans through conversations. When the New Nevada Plan became available for public comment on January 19th, the State Superintendent submitted the plan to the Governor. The Consolidated Plan was also shared with the Governor on February 10, the day it was made available for public comment.

Date SEA provided the plan to the Governor: 2/10/2017

Check one:

The Governor signed this consolidated State plan.

The Governor did not sign this consolidated State plan.

## 2.2 System of Performance Management.

*Instructions: In the text boxes below, each SEA must describe consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.15 (b) its system of performance management of SEA and LEA plans across all programs included in this consolidated State plan. The description of an SEA’s system of performance management must include information on the SEA’s review and approval of LEA plans, monitoring, continuous improvement, and technical assistance across the components of the consolidated State plan.*

1. **Review and Approval of LEA Plans.** Describe the SEA’s process for supporting the development, review, and approval of LEA plans in accordance with statutory and regulatory requirements. The description should include a discussion of how the SEA will determine if LEA activities align with: 1) the specific needs of the LEA, and 2) the SEA’s consolidated State plan.

NDE is creating a consolidated planning system that will encompass a needs assessment, school and district performance plan (SPP and DPP), monitoring, and funding streams aligned to state goals and prioritized strategies. The needs assessment will specifically guide LEAs in the determination of needs, examine gaps and root causes to set priorities for focused planning. The NDE will conduct strategic consultations between cross-functional teams and district leadership to discuss and examine whether the goals were met or not met in the previous year. This reflection and feedback will guide LEAs in the development of actionable, evidence-based plans. Plans will be due no later than 60 days after State Accountability Framework results are released and will be reviewed to ensure LEA goals are aligned and attainable and resources are available to ensure a high probability of success to meet the needs of all learners.

1. **Monitoring**. Describe the SEA’s plan to monitor SEA and LEA implementation of the included programs to ensure compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements. This description must include how the SEA will collect and use data and information which may include input from stakeholders and data collected and reported on State and LEA report cards (under section 1111(h) of the ESEA and applicable regulations), to assess the quality of SEA and LEA implementation of strategies and progress toward meeting the desired program outcomes.

The NDE will develop a comprehensive monitoring system that provides primary focus on indicators that leverage increased student achievement and ensure compliance with federal requirements and the appropriate use of federal funds. Monitoring the LEA plan and data will be conducted by cross-departmental teams.

The NDE will monitor effective use of funds and the quality of the implementation of the evidence-based strategies by utilizing one or more of the following differentiated steps:   
- Regularly scheduled problem-solving meetings with district personnel and/or external partner   
- Calls between NDE and  district personnel and/or external partner following the problem-solving meeting   
- 90-day status update meetings between district personnel and/or external partner focusing on goals and action steps written in the School Performance Plan or District Performance Plan   
- NDE may conduct district visits if deemed necessary  
  
To support LEAs in spending federal funds strategically and effectively, the NDE will:  
- Annually collect data on local grant spending   
- Design local-to-state application for federal grant funds to drive alignment between local needs, activities, and spending   
- Have cross-functional NDE teams review and approve LEA applications   
- Assist LEAs in developing an innovative plan to strategically use funds.   
-Assist LEAs and schools in identifying and selecting ESSA evidence-based interventions, strategies and activities

1. **Continuous Improvement**. Describe the SEA’s plan to continuously improve SEA and LEA plans and implementation. This description must include how the SEA will collect and use data and information which may include input from stakeholders and data collected and reported on State and LEA report cards (under section 1111(h) of the ESEA and applicable regulations), to assess the quality of SEA and LEA implementation of strategies and progress toward meeting the desired program outcomes.

Effective continuous improvement processes require transparency, strategic collaboration, skill in employing data-based decision-making, reflection, and expertise in providing successful interventions for struggling schools and students.  
  
- NDE will annually gather comprehensive data related to student, school, educator, and LEA achievement/performance through the student information system and other contracted sources, including external evaluations.   
- NDE will annually review data that is collected at the school and district levels to determine whether LEAs and schools are achieving state goals and interim benchmarks.  
  
The NDE will periodically gather stakeholder input regarding program effectiveness and recommendations for continuous improvement.  This will be collected through external councils that include but are not limited to:  
- English Mastery Council (EL)   
- Teachers and Leaders Council   
- Special Education Advisory Council  
- School Improvement Advisory Committee  
  
Based on data gathered and stakeholder input received, the NDE will evaluate the effectiveness of SEA plan and implementation to determine next steps in the continuous improvement process. The NDE will consider the development/continuation of state advisory groups to review state progress in implementing state goals and strategies and to make recommendations for continuous improvement.

1. **Differentiated Technical Assistance**. Describe the SEA’s plan to provide differentiated technical assistance to LEAs and schools to support effective implementation of SEA, LEA, and other subgrantee strategies.   
   NDE has discretion to decide which LEAs have a sufficient plan and sufficient capacity and commitment to improve, and which LEAs will need additional support in order to improve. The SEA will create a prioritized list of LEAs that have the highest percentage of Comprehensive Support & Improvement (CSI) and Targeted Support & Improvement (TSI) schools and demonstrate the greatest commitment to school improvement (e.g., voluntarily joining a Performance Compact). These LEAs and their schools will be given prioritized technical assistance from the SEA to specifically address the overall performance and the achievement gaps of sub-group populations (e.g. students with disabilities, English learners, economically disadvantaged, and race/ethnicity).   
     
   The NDE wants district leaders, school principals, and instructional teams to take responsibility for improving their schools. The NDE will give consideration to other evidence based indicators of commitment provided by the district to improve lowest-performing schools. NDE may also decide to partner with LEAs where they are already providing support to ensure their schools are making sufficient improvement.   
     
   Once a district has been notified that it is designated as a priority and is therefore eligible for increased support, there is a range of steps that NDE may take with that district.   
     
   **No further action by the NDE needs to be taken in the district at this point.**The NDE may conclude that the district has a sufficient plan for improvement in place, which is rigorous and credible, and that the leadership has the capacity to implement this plan; or, the district plan includes bringing in external support to meet a challenge the district has identified – and so the district will be allowed time to complete the plan.  
     
   **The district needs additional support**The NDE may determine that additional support is necessary to enable the district to make sufficient improvement. The NDE will work with the LEA to identify where this support may come from and may recommend that the district enter into an arrangement to access this support. For example, working with an external vendor, working with internal training opportunities, or developing a partnership with high performing LEAs.   
     
   **Differentiated School Support**The Department’s multi-tiered approach to differentiated school improvement identifies the roles and responsibilities for NDE, districts, and charter schools for each tier, in addition to community actions, to facilitate system level alignment and coherence on accountability and supports. Nevada will use this approach to prioritize its work and more effectively target resources, supports, and interventions. This will ensure that NDE, districts, and charter schools are aligned and responsive to specific school needs.  
     
   Additional information about differentiated school support is in Section 4 of this plan.

# Section 3: Academic Assessments

*Instructions: As applicable, provide the information regarding a State’s academic assessments in the text boxes below.*

1. **Advanced Mathematics Coursework.** Does the State: 1) administer end-of-course mathematics assessments to high school students in order to meet the requirements under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA; and 2) use the exception for students in eighth grade to take such assessments under section 1111(b)(2)(C) of the ESEA?  
    Yes. If yes, describe the SEA’s strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 C.F.R. § 200.5(b)(4).  
    No.

The state of Nevada administers end-of-course assessments in mathematics to students who have passed or are enrolled in aligned courses of study to the adopted mathematics standards. These mathematics course(s) may be offered in both middle and high school settings. Mathematics course work may take either of two pathways; a traditional route of Algebra I, Geometry and Algebra II, or an Integrated route of Integrated I, Integrated II and Integrated III. Either pathway will result in a student being exposed to the necessary standards of mathematics through Algebra II upon the completion of either pathway. Due to these two pathways, NDE offers both an EOC Math I and Math II and/or EOC Integrated I and Integrated II examinations. Thus students will have the opportunity to take the proper examination based on their pathway of study.  
  
The state does not have an extra emphasis on Algebra enrollment and completion in middle school. Nevada demonstrates adequate math performance in the early grades (Grade 3-5), but performance decreases in middle school. In response, the state will develop a support for upper elementary and middle school math teachers on effective standards-based instruction with a focus on closing the instructional gap for our struggling students so they are prepared for high school mathematics instruction. The Nevada Ready Network will lead this initiative by connecting the data from both summative, interim and formative assessments to instruction and standards to support our teachers and students. The Nevada Ready Network will consist of the three Regional Professional Development Program directors, the seventeen District Curriculum Directors, the State Charter School Authority director and the staff from the NDE Office of Standards and Instructional Support.

1. **Languages other than English.** Describe how the SEA is complying with the requirements in section 1111(b)(2)(F) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(f) in languages other than English.
   1. Provide the SEA’s definition for “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population,” consistent with 34 C.F.R. §200.6(f)(4), and identify the specific languages that meet that definition.

Of the 15% of Nevada’s K12 students who are English language learners, the predominant native language is Spanish (91.5%). Tagalog speakers are 1.9%, Chinese speakers are 1.0%, Vietnamese speakers are 0.6%, and Korean speakers are 0.5%. For purposes of identifying the “languages present to a significant extent in the participating student population,” Spanish meets that definition.

* 1. Identify any existing assessments in languages other than English, and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available.

Nevada administers required assessments in English. Smarter Balanced Assessments in English Language Arts and Mathematics, grades 3-8, have been implemented throughout the state. Smarter Balanced Assessments support the following accessibility features: Braille, stacked Spanish translations, videos in American Sign Language, glossaries provided in 10 languages and several dialects, as well as translated test directions in 19 languages, side-by-side bilingual test version, directions translated into native language, and bilingual glossary.

* 1. Indicate the languages other than English identified in B.i. above for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed.

Not applicable. No languages other than English and Spanish are present to a significant extent in the student population.

* 1. Describe how the SEA will make every effort to develop assessments, at a minimum, in languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population by providing:
     1. The State’s plan and timeline for developing such assessments, including a description of how it met the requirements of 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(f)(4);

After Nevada has administered consecutive years of successful testing under our new assessment system, Nevada will examine this system and its effects on English Language Learners. Nevada will quantify its populations of students who may require assessments in languages other than English in partnership with LEAs. Nevada will then meet with stakeholders and LEA representatives to define languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population and make decisions at that point.

* + 1. A description of the process the State used to gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English, collect and respond to public comment, and consult with educators; parents and families of English learners; students, as appropriate; and other stakeholders; and

To be determined, based on outcomes of analysis and stakeholder engagement.

* + 1. As applicable, an explanation of the reasons the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort.

Not applicable.

# Section 4: Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools

*Instructions: Each SEA must describe its accountability, support, and improvement system consistent with 34 C.F.R. §§ 200.12-200.24 and section 1111(c) and (d) of the ESEA. Each SEA may include documentation (e.g., technical reports or supporting evidence) that demonstrates compliance with applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.*

## **4.1 Accountability System**.

1. **Indicators**. Describe the measure(s) included in each of the Academic Achievement, Academic Progress, Graduation Rate, Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency, and School Quality or Student Success indicators and how those measures meet the requirements described in 34 C.F.R. § 200.14(a)-(b) and section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the ESEA.
   1. The description for each indicator should include how it is valid, reliable, and comparable across all LEAs in the State, as described in 34 C.F.R. § 200.14(c).
   2. To meet the requirements described in 34 C.F.R.§ 200.14(d), for the measures included within the indicators of Academic Progress and School Quality or Student Success measures, the description must also address how each measure within the indicators is supported by research that high performance or improvement on such measure is likely to increase student learning (e.g., grade point average, credit accumulation, performance in advanced coursework).
   3. For measures within indicators of School Quality or Student Success that are unique to high school, the description must address how research shows that high performance or improvement on the indicator is likely to increase student learning, graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment, persistence, completion, or career readiness.
   4. To meet the requirement in 34 C.F.R. § 200.14(e), the descriptions for the Academic Progress and School Quality or Student Success indicators must include a demonstration of how each measure aids in the meaningful differentiation of schools under 34 C.F.R. § 200.18 by demonstrating varied results across schools in the State.

The Nevada School Performance Framework was designed to ensure that the statewide system of accountability for public schools complies with all requirements for the receipt of federal money under ESEA. The statewide system of accountability applies to all public schools, and includes annual ratings for each school, based on the performance of the school and whether each school meets the annual measurable objectives and performance targets in the system. The system includes consequences, rewards, and support, based on the ratings, and it designed to direct available state money to public schools receiving one of the two lowest ratings of performance. Student subgroup performance and growth is reported, including economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, English learners, and the required federal race and ethnicity subgroups. Subgroup performance is measured by the statewide test for elementary and middle schools, and is measured by graduation rate and attendance rate in high schools. Reports are issued annually. Each of these measures aligns directly to federal accountability standards.

| **Indicator** | **Measure(s)** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Academic Achievement | Math and ELA SBAC, and Science CRT, Math End-of-Course, Math and ELA SBAC and Science CRT (MS)  Math, ELA, and Science End-of-Course exams (HS) | In the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF), the proficiency rate on the Smarter Balanced (SBAC) and End-of-Course exams is determined by dividing the number of proficient students by the number of students tested. Proficient students will be those who meet the state adopted proficiency level cut and will be reported as the percent at or above the cut (PAC). These assessments are subject to peer review and have been designed to provide valid and reliable student achievement information. These assessments are common across the state. Student performance on these statewide assessments is disaggregated for each subgroup of students. Points earned on this indicator are based on the SEA’s long term goals and measures of interim progress and contribute 25% to the total index score.  Test participation on the ELA and Mathematics assessments is expected to be at least 95% and low test participation will result in a reduction in NSPF star rating.  See Academic Progress measure indicator for more information. |
| 1. Academic Progress | Math and ELA SBAC Median Growth Percentile and Adequate Growth Percentile | The Nevada Growth Model was designed in response to the Nevada Legislature’s 2009 call for improving the measurement of student achievement through Assembly Bill 14.  The Growth Model is a result of collaboration between Nevada district and state education leaders who worked with other states such as Colorado and with Dr. Damian Betebenner of the Center for Assessment. Nevada has a long history of using student growth as an effective measure in determining student progress. It has proven to be a highly reliable measure for Nevada and has proven to be a good measure of increased student learning.  Student growth is a measure of student achievement over time. Nevada has adopted the Nevada Growth Model of Achievement (NGMA) to measure student progress. The NGMA yields two measures of student progress, a Student Growth Percentile (SGP) and an Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP). These measures require at least one score on a prior assessment and so are determined for grades four through eight using the SBAC Reading and Mathematics content assessments. Student Growth Percentiles are a norm-referenced measure which compares individual student achievement against the achievement of students with a similar score history. Adequate Growth Percentile is a criterion-referenced measure, which compares the student’s SGP against the percentile needed to become proficient or stay proficient on the state assessment in the next three years or by the end of the eighth grade.  SGPs will not vary by grade span and is calculated for all schools in the same manner. AGPs will leverage SGPs in the same manner as described above.    Student growth on the ELA and Math assessments will be disaggregated for each subgroup of students.   Based on stakeholder input, student growth contributes 35% to the total index score for elementary and middle schools. Therefore, by weight, this measure carries the most influence in the overall index score for a school. Based on the historical inclusion of growth in our previous school rating system, Nevada has evidence that growth is one of the most influential factors in a school’s rating. |
| 1. Graduation Rate | 4-year cohort graduation rate  5-year cohort graduation rate | The four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (ACGR) and the 5-year ACGR will be calculated and included in the graduation rate indicator.  The 4-year ACGR is the number of students who graduate in 4 years with a regular high school diploma, as well as all students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the cohort, as adjusted, who are assessed using the alternative assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards and awarded a State-defined alternative diploma, divided by the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for the graduating class. From the beginning of 9th grade (or the earliest high school grade), students who are entering that grade for the first time form a cohort that 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.  The 5 year cohort graduation rate is an extended-year ACGR and is calculated to include students who graduate from high school in one year beyond their cohort’s original four years in high school. The 5 year extended-year cohort follows the same rules as calculation of the four-year ACGR.  This cohort methodology is valid and reliable as it is the methodology that follows the federal guidelines. This methodology is applied evenly across all high schools in the state for which a graduation rate can be determined.  Graduation rates will be disaggregated by subgroup. Points for this indicator are based on long term goals and measures of interim progress. The goals for the 5-year rate are greater than the goals for the 4-year rate. |
| 1. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency | WIDA ACCESS Adequate Growth Percentile | Nevada has computed student growth percentiles (SGP) and adequate growth percentiles (AGP) for the past two years under the consultation of Dr. Damian Betebenner from the Center on Assessment. The methodology is analogous to the methodology used for the student growth percentiles described above. By design, this measure is longitudinal and based on at least two years of student performance on this assessment. This measure is valid, reliable and comparable statewide. This measure does not include English learners in pre-school.  Student performance on the WIDA ACCESS assessment is included for students at all three school levels and will contribute 10% to the total index score. The percentage of students meeting their Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP) is the measure used for this indicator for elementary, middle, and high schools. Growth to target calculations for the WIDA ACCESS data are set to five years or by the twelfth grade. A student who meets their AGP target has a score history that predicts they will earn a scaled composite score that is associated with a five achievement level within five years or by the twelfth grade, whichever comes first.  The same methodology for calculating AGP using the WIDA ACCESS will be used for all schools across the state. |
| 1. School Quality or Student Success | Closing opportunity gaps | This measure in the elementary and middle school system contributes 20% to the overall school index score and as such allows for the meaningful differentiation of schools.  Closing Opportunity Gaps for elementary and middle schools determines the percentage of students meeting their Adequate Growth Percentile who did not pass the state assessment from the previous year. This rate can be determined for students in grades four through eight on state administered SBAC in mathematics and ELA.  Closing Opportunity Gaps for high schools is a graduation gap analysis. The Opportunity Gap analysis will be computed using the 4-year cohort graduation rate from the previous school year. This report is also used to apply conjunctive triggers against the points earned for this measure when subgroup performance fails to meet measures of interim progress.  Closing Opportunity Gaps results for all three school levels are disaggregated by the seven race/ethnicities and three special populations, i.e., Students on Individual Education Plans, Students who are English Learners, and Students who are Economically Disadvantaged. The Opportunity Gaps Measure is designed to highlight student groups/population in need of academic interventions to ensure all students groups have opportunities to be academically successful.  Calculation for Closing Opportunity Gaps varies by grade span. The calculations for elementary and middle schools are AGP dependent (see above). The calculation for high schools is dependent on the 4-year cohort graduation rate (see above).  Points earned in the Graduation Indicator will be conditioned on the subgroup graduation rates. |
| Other Indicator – Elementary School | Student Engagement | The student engagement Indicator consists of a measure of student chronic absenteeism and school climate and contributes 10% to the total index score. Chronic absenteeism will be calculated for all students missing 18 school days or more during the school year, divided by the total student population at the school. |
| Other Indicator – Middle School | Student Engagement | The student engagement consists of a measure of student chronic absenteeism, school climate, a measure of high school readiness, and a percentage of students with academic learning plans and contributes 10% to the total index score. Chronic absenteeism will be calculated for all students missing 18 school days or more during the school year, divided by the total student population at the school.  High School Readiness is determined through district submitted data consisting of the number of students at the end of grade 8 of the current school year meeting the requirements in NAC 389.445 (1) a-d.  NAC 389.445  Required units of credit; pupils with disabilities; pupils who transfer between schools; recognition of certain programs of homeschool study. ([NRS 385.080](https://www.leg.state.nv.us/NRS/NRS-385.html#NRS385Sec080), [392.033](https://www.leg.state.nv.us/NRS/NRS-392.html#NRS392Sec033)) 1.  Except as otherwise provided in subsection 4, a pupil must earn at least the following units of credit during the seventh and eighth grades for promotion to high school: (a) One and one-half units of credit in English with a passing grade; (b) One and one-half units of credit in mathematics with a passing grade; (c) One unit of credit in science with a passing grade; and (d) One unit of credit in social studies with a passing grade.  Academic Learning plans are required for middle school students per NRS 388.165. At the middle/junior high school level, academic learning plans are to be developed for each student on initial enrollment. An academic learning plan rate is determined through district submitted data consisting of the number of all students at the school by the end of the school year and the number of all students with a signed academic learning plan. |
| Other Indicators – High School | College and Career Readiness & Student Engagement | The college and career readiness indicators for high schools consist of five measures: Average ACT Composite Score, Post-Secondary Pathways Options (including AP / IB / Dual Credit and industry-aligned and state board-approved CTE credentials), Ninth and Tenth Grade Credit Sufficiency, Academic Learning Plans, and percentage of students achieving college and career readiness status on the math, science, or ELA end-of-course exams. The indicator will contribute 25% to the total index score.  The student engagement indicator consists of a measure of student chronic absenteeism and contributes 10% to the total index score. Chronic absenteeism will be calculated for all students missing 18 school days or more during the school year, divided by the total student population at the school.  There is an additional added value for pathway diploma options for students pursuing college and career options. Specifically, standard diplomas are worth a value of 1, while college-endorsed or career-endorsed diplomas earn a value of 1.25. |

1. **Subgroups.**
   1. List the subgroups of students from each major and racial ethnic group in the State, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(a)(2), and, as applicable, describe any additional subgroups of students used in the accountability system.

American Indian / Native American   
Black / African-American   
Hispanic / Latino   
Asian   
Pacific Islander   
Two or More Races   
White / Caucasian   
Special Education   
English Learners   
Economically Disadvantaged as measured by eligibility for Free and Reduced Lunch status.

* 1. If applicable, describe the statewide uniform procedure for including former children with disabilities in the children with disabilities subgroup for purposes of calculating any indicator that uses data based on State assessment results under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) of the ESEA and as described in 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(b), including the number of years the State includes the results of former children with disabilities.

Nevada does not identify former children with disabilities in our student information system. As such, Nevada does not track the performance of this group of students.

* 1. If applicable, describe the statewide uniform procedure for including former English learners in the English learner subgroup for purposes of calculating any indicator that uses data based on State assessment results under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) of the ESEA and as described in 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(1), including the number of years the State includes the results of former English learners.

Nevada will include ELs in this subgroup for four years after exiting.

* 1. If applicable, chooseone of the following options for recently arrived English learners in the State:

Exception under 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(3)(i) or

Exception under 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(3)(ii) or

Exception under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(4)(i)(B). If selected, provide a description of the uniform procedure in the box below.

District and school staff will assess and report math and ELA for recently arrived English learners, but will exclude the results in accountability measures for the first year, until growth data are available. At that time, recently arrived EL results will be included in both growth and status measures.

Specifically, Nevada will assess and report performance of English learners on the ELA and math assessment in each year of the student’s enrollment in school, and for the purposes of the state-determined accountability system, for the first year of the student’s enrollment in the school will exclude the results. NDE will include a measure of student growth on the assessment in the second year of the student’s enrollment in school, and include proficiency on the assessments in the third year of the student’s enrollment in school, and each succeeding year of enrollment.

1. **Minimum Number of Students**.
   1. Provide the minimum number of students for purposes of accountability that the State determines are necessary to be included in each of the subgroups of students consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a).  
      In order for the SEA to determine any of the measures in the school accountability system, there must be at least ten student records. For reported elements, if the number is less than ten, results will be suppressed. For point-earning measures with fewer than ten student records, measures will not be determined.
   2. If the State’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for purposes of accountability, provide that number consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(2)(iv).   
      Not applicable.
   3. Describe how the State's minimum number of students meets the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(1)-(2);

The minimum number of student records required for calculation in each measure is ten. This number was chosen during the development of Nevada’s ESEA waiver. The decision for this size was made because it enabled the state to include more schools in the accountability analysis than were included under No Child Left Behind (NCLB), provided sufficient protection from identifying individual students and could be used to determine statistically reliable measures in the accountability model.  
  
The N size of ten will apply to all school classification where a school classification refers to the school’s star rating; however, with respect to school classification for TSI and CSI, the N size will be increased to 25. In the SEA’s experience and through stakeholder input, the N size should be increased for these type of high stakes designations.

* 1. Describe how other components of the statewide accountability system, such as the State’s uniform procedure for averaging data under 34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a), interact with the minimum number of students to affect the statistical reliability and soundness of accountability data and to ensure the maximum inclusion of all students and each subgroup of students under 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(a)(2);

Nevada will not average data as a part of the accountability system. When the state accumulates enough historical data, NDE may revisit this decision.

* 1. Describe the strategies the State uses to protect the privacy of individual students for each purpose for which disaggregated data is required, including reporting under section 1111(h) of the ESEA and the statewide accountability system under section 1111(c) of the ESEA;

Nevada will use a minimum N size of 10 for reporting data for all students and all subgroups of students. When reporting data, cell sizes of fewer than ten are suppressed to protect students from being identified.

* 1. Provide information regarding the number and percentage of all students and students in each subgroup described in 4.B.i above for whose results schools would not be held accountable under the State’s system for annual meaningful differentiation of schools required by 34 C.F.R. § 200.18;



Historically, Nevada has defined the full academic year or year in school (YIS) status as being satisfied for students who are continuously enrolled from the SEA’s validation day (October 1st) through to the first day of the assessment window in March. Students meeting the SEA’s YIS condition will be included in the aggregated school level measures. Furthermore, a statistical analysis of school ratings will need to be conducted to determine at which level and under which conditions a yielded rating would be statistically unreliable. Under the SEA’s previous accountability system, Nevada was able to determine the maximum number of measures that could be excluded from a school’s rating in order to be statistically durable. Given this experience, the SEA believes that status, growth and at least one other measure must be measurable in order to rate an elementary and middle school. By extension, a high school must have at least status, graduation rate and one other measure in order to be rated.

* 1. If an SEA proposes a minimum number of students that exceeds 30, provide a justification that explains how a minimum number of students provided in 4.C above promotes sound, reliable accountability determinations, including data on the number and percentage of schools in the State that would not be held accountable in the system of annual meaningful differentiation under 34 C.F.R. § 200.18 for the results of students in each subgroup in 4.B.i above using the minimum number proposed by the State compared to the data on the number and percentage of schools in the State that would not be held accountable for the results of students in each subgroup if the minimum number of students is 30.  
     Not applicable.

1. **Annual Meaningful Differentiation**. Describe the State’s system for annual meaningful differentiation of all public schools in the State, including public charter schools, consistent with the requirements of section 1111(c)(4)(C) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. §§ 200.12 and 200.18.

Meaningful Differentiation is established by incorporating a multi-faceted indicator system for all three school levels that will result in the continuous improvement of all schools. This system is called the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) and results in a summative school rating of 1- to 5-stars. This rating system will be applied to all public and charter schools that meet the minimum N size requirements.  
  
The ratings of schools will be determined by adding the points earned for each indicator in the school rating system. The indicators are described in section 4.1 (a) and do include measures of ELA and mathematics achievement.  
  
Student performance in the status, ELPA, and graduation rates will be measured against the state’s defined long-term goals and measures of interim progress. Schools identified for targeted supports and improvements will be identified using the status and graduation rate reporting elements that will be associated with the respective indicators. Each of these reporting elements will be disaggregated to take into consideration the performance of each subgroup. Additionally, the school quality indicators described in section 4.1 (a) is designed to further call attention to the performance of low achieving students and subgroups. The system is designed to identify schools for both comprehensive and targeted supports.   
  
*Describe the following information with respect to the State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation:*

* 1. The distinct and discrete levels of school performance, and how they are calculated, under 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(a)(2) on each indicator in the statewide accountability system;  
     Nevada’s public schools receive an index score from 1-100 and an associated 1-5 star rating under the Nevada School Performance Framework. This index score is calculated by adding the points earned in each indicator at the school. The indicators described in section 4.1 a have been chosen to be technically sound and defensible. Nevada has a long history of rating schools on 1- to 5-stars and has been well received and understood by our stakeholders.  
       
     Nevada is currently engaging stakeholders in an accountability standard setting that will result in clear performance level descriptors for each star rating level. The performance level descriptors will then serve as the basis for establishing the point distribution for each indicator in the model.
  2. The weighting of each indicator, including how certain indicators receive substantial weight individually and much greater weight in the aggregate, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(b) and (c)(1)-(2).

The following graphs demonstrate the weights of the system indicators.  
  
   
  
These weights reflect the values expressed during multiple stakeholder engagements and place substantial weight to each of the academic achievement, progress, graduation rate, and ELPA indicators. Schools with an insufficient number of English learners needed to determine the ELPA measure will receive an adjusted rating. An adjusted rating will be determined by dividing the total number of points earned by the total number of points possible. In the instance of a missing ELPA indicator, the school will be rated as a percentage of points earned out of 90 total possible points.  
  
In Nevada’s experience, this methodology results in proportionate redistribution of points among the remaining indicators and allows for statistically comparable ratings between schools.  
  
The weights expressed above were established directly from stakeholder input and were chosen to reflect Nevada values. They are determined to be clear and understandable. These weights are applied evenly by grade span in order to provide a fair and consistent evaluation of each school within grade spans.

* 1. The summative determinations, including how they are calculated, that are provided to schools under 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(a)(4).

The NSPF index score is a single summative rating for each school that is divided into five score ranges corresponding to a star rating. Ratings or classification of schools will be established through a standard setting process that credibly reflects the state’s vision for the accountability system.

* 1. How the system for meaningful differentiation and the methodology for identifying schools under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19 will ensure that schools with low performance on substantially weighted indicators are more likely to be identified for comprehensive support and improvement or targeted support and improvement, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(c)(3) and (d)(1)(ii).

Nevada’s public schools will receive an index score from 1-100 and an associated 1-5 star rating under the Nevada School Performance Framework. This index score is calculated by adding the points earned in each indicator at the school.  
  
In accordance with NRS385.007, “charter school” means a public school that is formed pursuant to the provisions of chapter 388A of Nevada Revised Statutes. As such, all charter schools receive accountability ratings aligned with the system for public schools.  
  
Seventy percent of Nevada’s elementary and middle school accountability system is based on student performance or progress on both the state administered content assessments and English language proficiency. Aggregated student performance in proficiency, English language proficiency and graduation rate will be measured against the state’s defined long term goals and measures of interim progress. Given this distribution, these indicators are more substantially weighted than the school quality indicator described in section 4.1a; however, the SEA has designed the school quality measure to further call attention to the performance of low achieving students and subgroups. As such, schools identified for comprehensive supports based on total index score will be influenced heavily by the performance and progress based measures. Similarly, sixty-five percent of Nevada’s high school accountability system is based on student performance, graduation rate and English language proficiency. As such, schools identified for comprehensive supports based on total index score will be influenced heavily by the performance and progress based measures.  
  
Targeted Support schools at all levels will be identified based on subgroup performance relative to the SEA’s measures of interim progress for proficiency and graduation rate. As designed, this will be a reporting attribute of our school accountability system that will also enable the SEA to apply conjunctive triggers (i.e. a reduction in total points earned) to the total index score for any school with subgroups failing to meet the measures of interim progress or failing to reduce the number of non-proficient students by 10%. 

1. **Participation Rate**. Describe how the State is factoring the requirement for 95 percent student participation in assessments into its system of annual meaningful differentiation of schools consistent with the requirements of 34 C.F.R. § 200.15.

The SEA is required to “annually measure the achievement of not less than 95 percent of all students, and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup of students who are enrolled in public school…” (ESSA 1177-35(E)). Specifically, the ESSA requires 95 percent participation on the state mathematics and English language arts assessments. Given the requirement to measure participation for all students and each of the ten subgroups over two content areas, there will be 22 distinct participation measures determined for each school.  
  
Participation on the State assessments is important because it helps ensures equal access to educational opportunity as well as enables meaningful measurement of academic performance. To ensure that this high standard continues, Nevada has established three levels of participation rate penalties for schools that test fewer than 95% of its eligible student population: Participation Warning, Participation Penalty and Continuing Participation Penalty. Additionally, the participation rates for each of the ten subgroups for mathematics and English language proficiency will be publicly reported on the school rating report.   
  
Schools failing to meet the subgroup participation rate of 95 percent and failing to meet the weighted average calculated participation rate of 95 percent over the most recent two or three years for the first year will be publically identified as failing this important metric. The NSPF school report will prominently display the “Participation Warning” with the school index score and Star Rating. If the school fails to meet the ESEA subgroup participation rate of 95 percent and fails to meet the weighted average calculated participation rate of 95% over the most recent two or three years for a second consecutive year, the Status Indicator will be reduced by a significant number of points and the NSPF school report will prominently display the “Participation Penalty” designation with the school index score and Star Rating.  
  
If a school fails to meet the subgroup participation rate of 95 percent and fails to meet the weighted average calculated participation rate of 95 percent over the most recent two or three years for a third consecutive year, the school will be identified as and subjected to a “Continuing Participation Penalty.” Schools designated as such will earn zero points for the Student Proficiency indicator.   
  
Furthermore, schools failing to meet the 95% participation rate will be required to review, approve, and monitor an improvement plan developed in partnership with stakeholders. For LEAs with a significant number of schools missing the 95% goal, NDE will work with those organizations to determine the process for improvement.

1. **Data Procedures**. Describe the State’s uniform procedure for averaging data, including combining data across school years, combining data across grades, or both, in a school as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a), if applicable.

Some schools in Nevada do not have a large enough student population to be reliably rated, but are otherwise traditional public schools. Where possible and when sufficient years of data are accumulated, three years of student achievement data are combined in order to use the Nevada School Performance Framework to rate this group of small schools. The method of combining data is pooled averaging, which results in a weighted average where the weight is proportional to the number of students in each of the three years of data. This method accounts for the year-to-year fluctuations in N-size for these small schools. If a school rating is derived from this averaging procedure, the process and definition of the procedure is clearly indicated on the rating report.   
  
95% Participation: Schools who do not meet the 95% participation expectation are allowed to meet the participation expectation through a 2-and 3-year average. The same uniformed procedure is used to combine data across school years and grade spans. The current school year data is combined with the school year data immediately preceding for a 2-year average. For a 3-year average the current school year data is combined with the immediately preceding data from the previous two years. When combining data across school years, the total number of students in each subgroup is summed in order to determine if the subgroup meets N-size requirements.

1. **Including All Public Schools in a State’s Accountability System**. If the States uses a different methodology for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in D above for any of the following specific types of schools, describe how they are included, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(d)(1)(iii):  
   1. Schools in which no grade level is assessed under the State's academic assessment system (e.g., P-2 schools), although the State is not required to administer a standardized assessment to meet this requirement;

There are P-2 schools in Nevada in which no grade level is assessed under the State’s mandated academic assessment system. These schools would not be rated under the accountability system. However, under Nevada’s Read by Grade 3 legislation, Kindergarten through grade 2 student populations will be assessed using a Nevada State Board Approved assessment. These results will be reported in the accountability system but points will not be assigned. These P-2 schools do not have a population that will support a sufficiently complete set of indicators needed to determine a comparable school rating.

* 1. Schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., P-12 schools);

Nevada has schools with variant grade configurations. The school accountability system is adjusted by scoring only the sections relevant for each school. For example, if there is a K-8 school, the NSPF categories for both elementary and middle school would be included.

* 1. Small schools in which the total number of students who can be included in any indicator under 34 C.F.R. § 200.14 is less than the minimum number of students established by the State under 34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(1), consistent with a State’s uniform procedures for averaging data under 34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a), if applicable;

Some schools in Nevada do not have a large enough student population to be reliably rated, but are otherwise traditional public schools. Where possible and when sufficient years of data are accumulated, three years of student achievement data are combined in order to use the Nevada School Performance Framework to rate this group of small schools. The method of combining data is pooled averaging, which results in a weighted average where the weight is proportional to the number of students in each of the three years of data. This method accounts for the year-to-year fluctuations in n-size for these small schools. If a school rating is derived from the uniformed averaging procedure, the process and definition of the procedure is clearly indicated on the rating report. Schools with an insufficient number of students needed to determine a measure within the system may receive an adjusted rating. An adjusted rating will be determined by dividing the total number of points earned by the total number of points possible. In Nevada’s experience, this methodology results in proportionate redistribution of points among the remaining indicators and allows for statistically comparable ratings between schools.

* 1. Schools that are designed to serve special populations (e.g., students receiving alternative programming in alternative educational settings; students living in local institutions for neglected or delinquent children, including juvenile justice facilities; students enrolled in State public schools for the deaf or blind; and recently arrived English learners enrolled in public schools for newcomer students); and

The primary driver in determining whether or not the SEA can rate a school is N size. Schools with a sufficient number of students over a significant number of measures will be rated. The SEA cannot support a summative rating for any school without a sufficiently large population of students regardless of school type or special population membership. Additionally, the SEA acknowledges that some special Nevada schools may have a sufficient population of students but the system would not accurately reflect the achievement of the school. Schools that exclusively serve special education students are examples of this type of school. In these instances, the SEA will assign a rating of Not Rated to these schools.

* 1. Newly opened schools that do not have multiple years of data, consistent with a State’s uniform procedure for averaging data under 34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a), if applicable, for at least one indicator (e.g., a newly opened high school that has not yet graduated its first cohort for students).

Schools with a sufficient number of student records within a significant number of system measures and who are not otherwise excluded from the rating (see section iv above) will be rated. Schools must be rated in order for them to be identified for comprehensive support and improvement by index score, or must have a valid graduation rate. Conversely, a school must at least have a sufficient number of student records over the requisite number of years needed to determine subgroup performance on the state ELA and mathematics assessments in order to be considered for targeted support and improvement.   
  
Schools without a sufficient number of student records will not be rated.  
  
All charter schools not otherwise excluded will receive accountability ratings.

## 4.2 Identification of Schools.

**A. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools**. Describe:

* 1. The methodologies, including the timeline, by which the State identifies schools for comprehensive support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(a) and (d), including: 1) lowest-performing schools; 2) schools with low high school graduation rates; and 3) schools with chronically low-performing subgroups.

Based on results of the system for meaningful differentiation, the NDE will use the summative determination of each school to identify Comprehensive Support and Improvement schools. Schools will be identified every year, starting with the identification for the 2017-2018 school year. Schools will be placed in rank order by index score, and elementary and middle schools in the lowest 5%, all 1-star schools and downward-trending 2-star schools will be identified for comprehensive support and improvement. All high schools in the state with a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates below 67% will be identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement. In addition, all schools that receive the lowest ranking in accordance with the SEA system of school accountability or the second-lowest ranking that has not demonstrated improvement will be identified as CSI. Any school previously identified for Targeted Support and Improvement because of low-performing subgroup(s) performance, and has not shown improvement after implementing a 3-year improvement plan, will be identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement based on chronically low-performing subgroups. This process will identify new schools each year for inclusion in the three-year improvement process. CSI schools will remain as part of a cohort for three years, beginning in their year of identification.

* 1. The uniform statewide exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement established by the State, including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria, under section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i) of the ESEA and consistent with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(f)(1).

The exit criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvements will be based on sustained improvements in total index score. Schools must achieve a rating of 3 stars on the NSPF to exit. High schools must have a graduation rate above 67% for two consecutive years and a three star rating in order to exit. School accountability reporting for all schools will include historical trend data.  
  
Nevada acknowledges that increased student performance at our most challenged schools is an ongoing concern.

1. **Targeted Support and Improvement Schools**. Describe:
   1. The State’s methodology for identifying any school with a “consistently underperforming” subgroup of students, including the definition and time period used by the State to determine consistent underperformance, under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)(1) and (c).

On an annual basis the NDE identifies consistently underperforming subgroups of students as those schools failing to meet measures of the interim progress for ELA and mathematics performance as described in Section 1 of this plan, or those schools with subgroups who failed to reduce the number of non-proficient students by at least 10% over the previous year. Schools identified for additional targeted supports are those not already identified for comprehensive support and improvement. Consistently underperforming will be identified as those subgroups that demonstrate underperformance for two consecutive years. In order to be identified as consistently underperforming, the same subgroup must be identified as such within the same content area for two consecutive years. Additionally, high schools with consistently underperforming subgroups in 4-year graduation rate will be identified for additional targeted supports. Historical information affirms that this methodology is likely to identify schools that are not making progress toward meeting goals and closing statewide gaps.

* 1. The State’s methodology, including the timeline, for identifying schools with low-performing subgroups of students under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)(2) and (d) that must receive additional targeted support in accordance with section 1111(d)(2)(C) of the ESEA.

Targeted Supports schools will be identified no later 2018-2019 school year and will be identified every year to participate in a 3-year cohort. The SEA will rank order the student proficiency rates for each designated Comprehensive Support and Improvement School in ELA and mathematics and will identify the lowest proficiency rates in each content area. These rates will establish the cut points at which additional targeted supports schools will be identified. As such, any school with subgroup performance at or below these cut points will be identified for additional targeted supports. Schools that do not improve after implementing an improvement plan over three years (the duration of the improvement plan) will identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement.

* 1. The uniform exit criteria, established by the SEA, for schools participating under Title I, Part A with low-performing subgroups of students, including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria, consistent with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.22(f).

In order to exit targeted support and improvement, the identified subgroup must meet the interim progress measure for which they received failing scores for two consecutive years or must reduce the number of non-proficient students in that subgroup by 10% in each of two consecutive years and meet the specific expectations of SEA monitoring. By meeting the measure of interim progress or reducing the number of non-proficient students, these schools will no longer meet the additional targeted support identification criteria. Historical information affirms that this methodology is likely to identify schools that are making progress toward meeting goals and closing statewide gaps.

## 4.3 State Support and Improvement for Low-performing Schools.

1. **School Improvement Resources**. Describe how the SEA will meet its responsibilities, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.24(d) under section 1003 of the ESEA, including the process to award school improvement funds to LEAs and monitoring and evaluating the use of funds by LEAs.

The SEA will create a prioritized list of LEAs that have the highest percentage of CSI and TSI schools. The LEA is required to choose the schools with the greatest needs. SEAs will then accept or deny these schools based on the LEA’s strength of commitment to school improvement. The SEA may prioritize those LEAs for funding that demonstrate the strongest commitment to school improvement (e.g. schools that voluntarily join Performance Compacts, schools and district that join consortia).  
  
The 1003(a) funds will be offered as a competitive grant for all CSI and TSI schools. Additionally, schools that choose a multi-year, NDE-approved school improvement strategy can expect to be prioritized for continued funding until the strategy is complete, subject to availability of federal funds. Each spring the schools will have an opportunity to propose their school improvement evidence-based strategies.  
  
These funds will be prioritized within the three priority areas of the SEA: 1) strong school leadership team development; 2) analysis of data for decision-making, and 3) turning around the lowest-performing schools. Schools that agree to enter into a voluntary performance contract with the SEA that establishes year-over-year achievement targets for three years will be prioritized due to their demonstration of strong commitment to student achievement.  
  
The 1003(a) plans will be reviewed and evaluated annually by cross-functional NDE teams to ensure funds are being effectively implemented to meet the needs of all learners. Monitoring will be on-going as needed.  
  
Charter schools that have been identified as CSI and TSI will also be eligible to access 1003(a) resources in accordance with the prioritized categories above. The SEA is one layer removed from the oversight of the plan’s implementation, due to its oversight role with the charter school sponsor. Therefore, the SEA provides direct accountability to charter school sponsors, and charter school sponsors provide direct oversight and accountability to the schools in their portfolio, in accordance with both Nevada law and individual charter contracts, including student performance targets. In the instance that a charter school does not improve, the sponsor may take action to close or restart the school. The SEA reserves the right to intervene if the charter school sponsor does not meet its obligation.

1. **Technical Assistance Regarding Evidence-Based Interventions**. Describe the technical assistance the SEA will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, including how it will provide technical assistance to LEAs to ensure the effective implementation of evidence-based interventions, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.23(b), and, if applicable, the list of State-approved, evidence-based interventions for use in schools implementing comprehensive or targeted support and improvement plans consistent with § 200.23(c)(2)-(3).

1) NDE will define evidence-based practice and determine a list of state-approved, evidence-based service providers.   
2) NDE will coordinate professional development activities to disseminate information and build local capacity around evidence-based practices.   
3) NDE will provide differentiated support to low-performing schools, depending on the level of performance and the diagnosis of services needed. The state approach to differentiated school improvement consists of four tiers:   
- Self Support and Replication (highest achieving schools)  
- Coordinated Support,   
- Priority Support, and   
- Accelerated Support (highest need schools)  
  
The Self Support tier comprises schools that are sustainably 4- and 5-star schools. These schools are recognized and considered for replication for their demonstration of promising practices. They will be models and mentors to the low-performing schools.  
  
The Coordinated Support tier is comprised of schools that have sustained 3- and 4-star ratings, yet are not defined as Self Support schools.   
  
The Priority Support tier comprises schools that are non-sustained 3-star schools and may also include Targeted Support Schools. These schools have the option to voluntarily agree to a Performance Compact.  
  
The Accelerated tier comprises schools that have may have been designated as State Turnaround Schools (aligned with SB 92), those schools that have entered Performance Compacts, those schools that are receiving a whole school local intervention such as Reinvent Schools, Empowerment or engagement with non-profit partners, and schools in the Nevada Achievement School District.   
  
This multi-tiered approach to differentiated school improvement identifies the roles and responsibilities for NDE and districts for each tier, in addition to school community actions, in order to facilitate system level alignment and coherence on accountability and supports.

1. **More Rigorous Interventions.** Describe the more rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State’s exit criteria within a State-determined number of years consistent with section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(f)(3)(iii).

CSI schools are also subject to more rigorous state and local action. They can be considered for State Turnaround designation and be considered for inclusion in the statewide Nevada Achievement School District (NV ASD). The NV ASD may accept up to six schools per year for transformation and pair those schools with high quality school operators or transformation teams. The NV ASD will seek to match operators or transformation teams with school profiles that match their experience and host community meetings to learn about families’ and communities’ vision for the school. The NV ASD has its own superintendent to lead the intensive, collaborative effort of transforming schools to achieve successful outcomes for students. In addition, schools that agree to enter into a voluntary performance compact with the SEA that establishes year over year achievement targets for three years will be prioritized for state and federal school improvement funds due to demonstration of strong commitment to student achievement.

1. **Periodic Resource Review**. Describe how the SEA will periodically review, identify, and, to the extent practicable, address any identified inequities in resources to ensure sufficient support for school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement consistent with the requirements in section 1111(d)(3)(A)(ii) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.23(a).

Equity is an overarching theme throughout all of the SEA and LEA work with underperforming schools. Beginning with the LEA needs assessment, equity of resources will be determined to ensure all students have the resources needed to reach their full potential. The SEA annually collects data around effective and ineffective, new and veteran teachers who are teaching at each of the Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Intervention Schools. The comprehensive consolidated planning tool that is being developed will track schools funding allocations of both federal and state monies. During the annual SEA consultation during the LEA planning sessions, any inequities will be discussed and strategies to remove these inequities will be implemented.

# Section 5: Supporting Excellent Educators

## 5.1 Educator Development, Retention, and Advancement.

*Instructions: Consistent with sections 2101 and 2102 of the ESEA, if an SEA intends to use funds under one or more of the included programs for any of the following purposes, provide a description with the necessary information.*

1. **Certification and Licensure Systems.** Does the SEA intend to use Title II, Part A funds or funds from other included programs for certifying and licensing teachers and principals or other school leaders?

Yes. If yes, provide a description of the systems for certification and licensure below.

No.

The NDE certifies and licenses educators who are U. S. citizens or lawful permanent residents and meet all requirements for academic preparation, student teaching, and competency testing for the specific area of licensure for which they are applying. Prior to issuance of licensure, passing a criminal background check is required of all applicants. The public body responsible for adopting regulatory requirements for licensure is the Commission on Professional Standards, which is comprised of nine appointed members whose roles are outlined in statue. ([NRS 391.011](https://www.leg.state.nv.us/NRS/NRS-391.html#NRS391Sec011))  
  
Nevada issues the following **educator licenses**:   
- Standard licenses for educators who are qualified and who do not have a Master’s degree. It is valid for five years.   
- Professional licenses are issued to educators who have master’s or more advanced degrees, have three years’ teaching experience, and have met all other requirements. Professional licenses are valid for 6-10 years, depending on education.   
- Non-renewable/provisional licenses are issued to educators who have certain deficiencies in coursework, testing, or student teaching but are otherwise qualified. The deficiencies must be satisfied before the expiration of the license (within 1-3 years) prior to applying for a Professional or Standard license.   
- Conditional licenses are issued to those who have met the initial licensure requirements of a state-approved alternative route to licensure (ARL) program, as well as preliminary qualifications. Those who are issued this license must meet all remaining ARL program requirements within 2-3 years prior to applying for a standard or professional license.   
- Retiree licenses are available for ten years to educators who have retired with at least 15 years of service in Nevada public or private schools.  
  
Nevada issues licenses in early childhood, elementary, middle, and high school, and several areas of special education. Additionally, those who meet prior employment and/or certification requirements in an area outside of education may apply for one of several Business and Industry licenses. To receive a school (or program) administrator endorsement, an applicant must hold a master’s degree, with at least 24 credit hours in school administration, have a valid renewable teaching license, and have taught for at least 3 years.  
  
As a result of the past few Legislative sessions, Nevada licensure requirements have been modified to ensure that educators have the necessary knowledge and skills to work with 21st century students and families. This includes, but is not limited to the following:  
- Based on recommendations from the English Mastery Council created by the 2013 Legislature, the Commission recently transitioned from offering an additional endorsement in TESL to ELAD (English Language Acquisition and Development) to better prepare educators working with second language learners. Those who hold a standard license and have not yet added this additional endorsement are required to take one 3-credit ELAD course prior to each licensure renewal.  
- Following the 2013 session legislative requirements, Nevada now requires that all licensees meet a family engagement coursework requirement. All state-approved traditional and alternative route programs are required to have this as part of their completion programs. Licensees who move to Nevada from another state have three years to meet this requirement.   
- Assembly Bill 234 passed during the 2015 Legislative session requires that all new license holders have three years to complete a course in multicultural education prior to application for renewal.  
  
To ensure that the existing requirements for licensure are in alignment with 21st century college and career coursework that is offered in schools and districts, NDE intends to use Title II, Part A funds to update the existing [Correlation Directory](http://www.doe.nv.gov/Educator_Effectiveness/Educator_Develop_Support/Educator_Preparation/Correlation_Directory/) that outlines areas of licensure for statewide teaching assignments. Modernization of this 2011 resource, which was previously used to identify Highly-Qualified Teacher status designations, will ensure that “full state certification” in each area is reflective of the content and pedagogical requirements necessary to demonstrate competency.   
  
Another area of focus related to licensure is the renewal requirements and processes that need to be updated and modernized to truly reflect meaningful professional growth and/or effectiveness. NDE will be utilizing Title II-A funds to engage in a rigorous stakeholder review of existing requirements and to develop recommendations for possible regulation adoption by the Commission.

1. **Educator Preparation Program Strategies**. Does the SEA intend to use Title II, Part A funds or funds from other included programs to support theState’s strategies to improve educator preparation programs consistent with section 2101(d)(2)(M) of the ESEA, particularly for educators of low-income and minority students?

Yes. If yes, provide a description of the strategies to improve educator preparation programs below.

No.

For Nevada to achieve our goals of all students being proficient in reading by the end of 3rd grade, all students entering high school with the skills necessary to succeed, all students graduating college, career, and community ready, and all students learning in an environment that is physically, emotionally, and intellectually safe, it is essential that all students are served by effective educators. While NDE continues to support districts/charter schools with strategic implementation of LEA Title II-A funds, it is essential that NDE maximize the impact of SEA Title II-A funds in alignment with other programs to ensure the maximum return on investment.  
  
Based on an internal needs assessment, an honest evaluation of existing resources, a 2015 root cause analysis, and feedback from the ESSA Teaching & Leading Work Group (See Appendix D), NDE will use the 4% of Title II, Part A funds allowable for statewide activities to improve the preparation, recruitment, evaluation, development, and retention of effective educators. Funds will be prioritized to focus on strategies in the following areas:   
- Educator Preparation Program Approval/Accountability Systems;   
- Licensure Requirements Modernization/Reform;   
- Recruitment for Hard to Staff/Shortage Areas;   
- Teacher Induction/Mentoring/Coaching;   
- Teacher Leadership; and   
- Implementation of the Statewide NEPF System.  
  
As a result of these findings, NDE is committed to ensuring that Educator Provider Programs (EPPs) are adequately preparing pre-service candidates to meet the needs of Nevada’s 21st century classrooms and that programs are aligned with the NEPF and Nevada’s Academic Content Standards. Developing a system in which an EPP is approved, reviewed, and evaluated based in part on the performance of their program completers allows the EPP to reflect and improve programs.

Nevada has both traditional and alternative routes to licensure (ARL) [educator preparation programs](http://www.doe.nv.gov/Educator_Development_and_Support/Educator_Preparation/). Pursuant to [NRS 391.038](https://www.leg.state.nv.us/NRS/NRS-391.html#NRS391Sec038), traditional programs are approved by the State Board of Education through the [NAC 391.557](https://www.leg.state.nv.us/NAC/NAC-391.html#NAC391Sec557) and [391.558](https://www.leg.state.nv.us/NAC/NAC-391.html#NAC391Sec558) regulatory process, and pursuant to [NRS 391.019](https://www.leg.state.nv.us/NRS/NRS-391.html#NRS391Sec019), ARL programs are approved by the Commission on Professional Standards through the [NAC 391.461](https://www.leg.state.nv.us/NAC/NAC-391.html#NAC391Sec461) regulatory process. NDE is currently holding stakeholder workgroups to make statutory, regulatory, and/or policy recommendations for these approval processes. Additionally, Title II-A funds will be used in concert with a partnership grant from the National Governor’s Association to develop and implement a coherent and rigorous review, approval, evaluation, and accountability system for in-state Educator Preparation Programs. This will ensure alignment with the statewide educator evaluation system Standards and Indicators and the NVACS, and will also reflect inclusion of the new licensure requirements indicated above to improve the skills of teachers and school leaders in identifying and providing high-quality instruction and supports to students and families with specific learning needs, particularly those with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels.

1. **Educator Growth and Development Systems.** Does the SEA intend to use Title II, Part A funds or funds from other included programs to support the State's systems of professional growth and improvement for educators that addresses: 1) induction; 2) development, consistent with the definition of professional development in section 8002(42) of the ESEA; 3) compensation; and 4) advancement for teachers, principals, and other school leaders. This may also include how the SEA will work with LEAs in the State to develop or implement systems of professional growth and improvement, consistent with section 2102(b)(2)(B) of the ESEA; or State or local educator evaluation and support systems consistent with section 2101(c)(4)(B)(ii) of the ESEA?

Yes. If yes, provide a description of the educator growth and development systems below.

No.

The first year of full statewide implementation of the [Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) was 2015-16.](http://www.doe.nv.gov/Educator_Development_and_Support/Nevada_Educator_Performance_Framework(NEPF)/)  The goals of the NEPF system are to foster student learning and growth, improve educators’ instructional practice, inform human capital decisions based on a professional growth system, and engage stakeholders in the continuous improvement and monitoring of a professional growth system. Both principals and teachers are evaluated using this system, which is comprised of three domains: Instructional Practice for Teachers/Instructional Leadership Practice for School Administrators, Professional Responsibilities, and Student Performance. The Instructional Practice for Teachers domain includes standards for measuring teacher and student behavior during instruction in the classroom that is aligned with rigorous content area standards, and the Instructional Leadership Practice for Administrators domain measures an administrator’s behavior as an instructional leader, while also monitoring teacher performance. The Professional Responsibilities domain includes Standards for what occurs outside of instruction to influence and prepare for student learning at each student’s highest ability level in the classroom (Teachers) and Standards that support improvements in teachers’ practice as well as providing the structural supports to ensure teacher success (Administrators).

See Appendix G for Standards and current domain weights. Beginning with the 2017-2018 school year and continuing thereafter, the weights change to:

* 45% Instructional/Instructional Leadership Practice
* 15% Professional Responsibilities
* 40% Student Performance
  + 20% statewide performance measures
  + 20% district level performance measures

Based on scores received on various indicators within each standard, educators receive one of four ratings: highly effective, effective, minimally effective, or ineffective. In November 2016, the NDE was granted regulatory approval to request educator evaluation data from districts in aggregate by school, and is currently working with districts to collect and report the 2015-2016 ratings and set up processes for annual collection. Additionally, NDE has submitted proposed language for the 2017 Legislature to consider that would enhance the data collection, storage, and reporting processes. As a result, however, NDE has incomplete data for Appendix B, which displays Educator Equity Differences in Rates.

NDE collected educator effectiveness data for the first time following the initial 2015-2016 NEPF implementation year, which included no student performance measures, but only Instructional Practice and Professional Responsibilities as rated by the evaluator. As reported by districts, less than 2% of teachers and administrators received an Ineffective or Minimally Effective Rating. In contrast, more than 90% of administrators and 80% of teachers received an Effective rating, with over 13% and 5% of teachers and administrators receiving a Highly Effective rating, respectively. Given the abnormal distribution of effectiveness ratings, NDE will be using a portion of the allowable 4% Statewide Title II-A funds to continue to make improvements in the statewide NEPF evaluation system to ensure reliability, validity, fairness, consistency, and objectivity.

NDE also intends to use a portion of the additional 3% set-aside allowable for professional development for principals/other school leaders for work related to NEPF implementation. Planning is underway to build capacity of school leaders through a statewide NEPF professional development implementation network that will improve inter-rater reliability and accurately reflect a meaningful distribution of effectiveness ratings.

## 5.2 Support for Educators.

*Instructions: Consistent with sections 2101 and 2102 of the ESEA, provide a description with the necessary information.*

1. **Resources to Support State-level Strategies**. Describe how the SEA will use Title II, Part A funds and funds from other included programs, consistent with allowable uses of funds provided under those programs, to support State-level strategies designed to:
   1. Increase student achievement consistent with the challenging State academic standards;
   2. Improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other school leaders;
   3. Increase the number of teachers, principals, and other school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement in schools; and
2. Provide low-income and minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders consistent with the educator equity provisions in 34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c).
3. **Skills to Address Specific Learning Needs**. Describe how the SEA will improve the skills of teachers, principals, or other school leaders in identifying students with specific learning needs and providing instruction based on the needs of such students, consistent with section 2101(d)(2)(J) of the ESEA.

**A. – C.**   
NDE will engage in the State-level strategies below to increase the quality and quantity of teachers, principals, and other school leaders who (1) increase student achievement consistent with challenging State academic standards; (2) identify and provide high-quality instruction to students with specific learning needs (with disabilities, English learners, gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels); and (3) ensure that these students are not taught at higher rates by inexperienced, not-fully-certified, or ineffective teachers at greater rates than their peers.

* Revise the Nevada Educator Equity Plan to identify and address equity gaps and monitor district-level equity plans,
* Develop and implement a coherent and rigorous review, approval, evaluation, and accountability system for in-state Educator Preparation Programs (traditional and alternative) that is aligned with NEPF and NVACS,
* Modernize the educator licensure application, management, and reporting system; and ensure that licensure requirements support reciprocity, reflect meaningful readiness measures, meet 21st century educator workforce needs, and promote professional growth in NEPF identified areas,
* Build capacity of school leaders through a statewide NEPF implementation monitoring system that improves inter-rater reliability and accurately reflects a meaningful distribution of effectiveness ratings, and
* Recognize and support effective educators and enhance statewide teacher leadership opportunities.  
    
  NEPF Standards (New Learning is Connected to Prior Learning and Experience, Learning Tasks Have High Cognitive Demand for Diverse Learners, Students Engage in Meaning-Making Through Discourse and Other Strategies, Students Engage in Metacognitive Activity to Increase Understanding of and Responsibility for Their Own Learning, and Assessment is Integrated into Instruction) and corresponding Indicators reflect and measure the extent to which educators are proficient (Levels 1-4) in each of these areas. Therefore, Nevada’s Theory of Action for Educator Effectiveness and Equity is based on the premise that effective implementation of the statewide educator evaluation and professional growth system will allow for the identification of teacher and principal areas of need, and provide a vehicle through which common patterns of non-proficiency in specific areas may emerge statewide, by district, and/or by school. NDE intends to use Title II, Part A funds (basic 4% formula award and additional 3% set-aside) to support ongoing NEPF professional development, with a focus on school administrators, to ensure that the system is implemented with fidelity.  
    
  Additionally, research shows a direct and positive correlation between the retention of effective educators and systems which are designed with meaningful feedback structures, personalized support, and increasing levels of opportunities and growth throughout the career continuum. While working to improve the quality of Nevada’s educators overall, it is essential that those who exhibit passionate levels of commitment to the profession, utilize highly effective instructional and family/community engagement strategies that address the needs of all learners, and demonstrate ongoing growth in student achievement outcomes be supported and encouraged to share best practices with colleagues. Therefore, Title II-A funds will be used to recognize and support effective educators and enhance statewide teacher leadership opportunities.  
    
  As reflected in sections throughout the Plan and in the 5.3 (E) Table below, NDE will continue “braid” allowable federal grant funds (particularly Title I, II, and III) with State-funded categorical programs to ensure that our students most typically at-risk of not having access to effective (as well as fully certified and experienced) educators have increased opportunities for success in each of these areas. Prioritization of formula, categorical, and competitive funds will focus on supporting school leaders, transformation/turnaround of lowest performing schools, and data-informed instructional decision making.

## 5.3 Educator Equity.

1. **Definitions.** Provide the SEA’s different definitions, using distinct criteria, for the following key terms:

| **Key Term** | **Statewide Definition (or Statewide Guidelines)** |
| --- | --- |
| Ineffective teacher\* | An ineffective teacher is defined as one who receives either an “ineffective” or “minimally effective” rating on the Nevada Educator Performance Framework during the prior academic year. |
| Out-of-field teacher\*+ | An out of field teacher is defined as one who holds licensure in an area other than the grade level or subject area of a t current teaching assignment. This may include, but is not limited to, one who is issued a conditional or provisional license or one who is teaching Special Education via the Nevada Alternative Route to Certification (ARC)/Option Program. |
| Inexperienced teacher\*+ | An inexperienced teacher is defined as one who has less than three full years of contracted teaching experience. |
| Low-income student | Low-income is defined as student who is eligible for the free or reduced-price lunch program. |
| Minority student | A minority student is defined as one who is identified as a member of a minority race or ethnicity, e.g., African American, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander. |
| Vacancy | Pending. Proposed language has been submitted to the 2017 Legislature, which would allow for the Commission on Professional Standards to adopt this statewide definition. |
| Provisional Licensee | One who is issued a license, but is missing one or more requirements identified in NAC regulations and has one year to meet the requirement. (i.e. basic skills, subject area content knowledge, or pedagogy competency exams; up to 6 remaining credit hours; student teaching) |
| Conditional License | One who is issued either an Alternative Route to Licensure (ARL) or Special Qualifications License (SQL) and has up to three years to meet additional requirements to apply f or non-conditional licensure. |
| ARC/Option Program Teacher | One who currently holds a license in Early Childhood, Elementary, Secondary, or Special Education, but whose current assignment is in a special education setting for which they do not hold the appropriate license/endorsement. |

\*Definitions of these terms must provide useful information about educator equity.

+Definitions of these terms must be consistent with the definitions that a State uses under 34 C.F.R. § 200.37.

1. **Rates and Differences in Rates.** In Appendix B, calculate and provide the statewide rates at which low-income and minority students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A are taught by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers compared to non-low-income and non-minority students enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A using the definitions provided in section 5.3.A. The SEA must calculate the statewide rates using student-level data.
2. **Public Reporting.** Provide the Web address or URL of, or a direct link to, where the SEA will publish and annually update, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c)(4):
   1. The rates and differences in rates calculated in 5.3.B;
   2. The percentage of teachers categorized in each LEA at each effectiveness level established as part of the definition of “ineffective teacher,” consistent with applicable State privacy policies;
   3. The percentage of teachers categorized as out-of-field teachers consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.37; and
   4. The percentage of teachers categorized as inexperienced teachers consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.37.   
        
      The web addresses for the SEA equity plans are on the [NDE site](http://www.doe.nv.gov/Educator_Effectiveness/Educator_Develop_Support/Nevada_Equity_Plan/) and the [Nevada Report Card site](http://www.nevadareportcard.com/di/).
3. **Likely Causes of Most Significant Differences.** If there is one or more difference in rates in 5.3.B, describe the likely causes (*e.g.*, teacher shortages, working conditions, school leadership, compensation, or other causes), which may vary across districts or schools, of the most significant statewide differences in rates in 5.3.B. The description must include whether those differences in rates reflect gaps between districts, within districts, and within schools.

Based upon the NDE’s root cause analysis conducted in 2015 in collaboration with various stakeholder groups, it was determined that the following were the most likely reasons for Nevada’s equity gaps:  
  
- Inadequate Teacher Preparation for 21st Century Classrooms,   
- District Recruitment/Hiring/Retention Practices,   
- Insufficient Quantity of Teachers Prepared via In-State Providers,   
- Inadequate Resources for Mentoring/Coaching/Induction, and   
- Skills Gaps Due to Unaligned Initiatives and Infrastructure.   
  
Although gaps between districts and within districts exist (data not analyzed for within-school gaps), the extent to which each of these occurs may vary. Each district in which a data analysis of in-district gaps existed was required to submit a separate plan. These plans required stakeholder engagement to further identify specific root causes and district-specific strategies for equity gap reduction in areas identified.

1. **Identification of Strategies.** If there is one or more difference in rates in 5.3.B, provide the SEA’s strategies, including timelines and Federal or non-Federal funding sources, that are:
   1. Designed to address the likely causes of the most significant differences identified in 5.3.D and
   2. Prioritized to address the most significant differences in the rates provided in 5.3.B, including by prioritizing strategies to support any schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19 that are contributing to those differences in rates.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Likely Causes of Most Significant Differences in Rates** | **Strategies**  **(Including Timeline and Funding Sources)** |
| Inadequate Teacher Preparation for 21st Century Classrooms | 1. National Governor’s Association Project; Preparation Project and Title II-A statewide activities for development of a rigorous EPP review, approval, evaluation, and accountability system 2. [Great Teaching and Leading Fund](http://www.doe.nv.gov/Legislative/Great_Teaching_and_Leading_Fund/) to address the quantity and quality of new educators prepared by in-state EPPs |
| District Recruitment/Hiring/Retention Practices | * [Teach NV Scholarships](http://www.doe.nv.gov/Legislative/Teach_Nevada_Scholarships_and_Incentives/) (NV general funds via 2015 SB511) * [New Teacher Incentives](http://www.doe.nv.gov/Legislative/Teach_Nevada_Scholarships_and_Incentives/) (NV general funds via 2015 SB511) * Zoom School Initiatives (as described in sections above) * Victory Schools Initiatives (as described in sections above) * Implementation of NRS 391A.450 Enhanced Performance Pay and Compensation Plans * National Board Certification partnership and supports * Teacher Recognition and Leadership via CCSSO’s Teacher of the Year Program, Milken Educator Awards, and other statewide leadership initiatives |
| Insufficient Quantity of Teachers Prepared via In-State Providers | * Teach NV Scholarships * New Teacher Incentives (NV general funds via 2015 SB511); * Great Teaching & Leading Fund |
| Inadequate Resources for Mentoring/Coaching/Induction | * Great Teaching & Leading Fund; * NEPF Professional Development |
| Skills Gaps Due to Unaligned Initiatives and Infrastructure | * NEPF Professional Development |

1. **Timelines and Interim Targets.** If there is one or more difference in rates in 5.3.B, describe the SEA’s timelines and interim targets for eliminating **all** differences in rates.

| Difference in Rates | Date by which differences in rates will be eliminated | Interim targets, including date by which target will be reached |
| --- | --- | --- |
| To Be Determined using updated 2017 baseline data collection | To Be Determined using updated 2017 baseline data collection | To Be Determined using updated 2017 baseline data collection |

# Section 6: Supporting All Students

## 6.1 Well-Rounded and Supportive Education for Students.

*Instructions: When addressing the State’s strategies below, each SEA must describe how it will use Title IV, Part A funds and funds from other included programs, consistent with allowable uses of fund provided under those programs, to support State-level strategies and LEA use of funds. The strategies and uses of funds must be designed to ensure that all children have a significant opportunity to meet challenging State academic standards and career and technical standards, as applicable, and attain, at a minimum, a regular high school diploma.*

*The descriptions that an SEA provides must include how, when developing its State strategies, the SEA considered the academic and non-academic needs of the following specific subgroups of students:*

* *Low-income students;*
* *Lowest-achieving students;*
* *English learners;*
* *Children with disabilities;*
* *Children and youth in foster care;*
* *Migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school;*
* *Homeless children and youths;*
* *Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk students identified under Title I, Part D of the ESEA, including students in juvenile justice facilities;*
* *Immigrant children and youth;*
* *Students in LEAs eligible for grants under the Rural and Low-Income School program under section 5221 of the ESEA; and*
* *American Indian and Alaska Native students.*

1. The State’s strategies and how it will support LEAs to support the continuum of a student’s education from preschool through grade 12, including transitions from early childhood education to elementary school, elementary school to middle school, middle school to high school, and high school to post-secondary education and careers, in order to support appropriate promotion practices and decrease the risk of students dropping out; and

The Nevada Department of Education, in collaboration with Governor Brian Sandoval and the state legislature, has led a dramatic increase in the focus and investment in public education. An additional $340M was allocated in the 2015 legislative session. Program expansions and new program launches are planned in the 2017 legislative session. These programs and strategies, led by the state and administered by LEAs, affect students from cradle to career and are focused on driving equitable outcomes for all students in alignment with the goal of preparing students for success in the 21st Century economy. The strategy may be best understood through descriptions of the relevant programs.  
 **EARLY CHILDHOOD TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
  
B-3 Plan**As part of the Preschool Development Grant goal of building state infrastructure, NDE is working to cultivate practices and policies to develop a comprehensive birth to 3rd grade (B-3) system. This project uses data to support the implementation of developmentally appropriate, research-based, rigorous practices for all teachers and administrators across the B-3 continuum, and aims to connect policy with practice. In partnership with many of Nevada’s experts and stakeholders, this team will facilitate deep and lasting cultural shifts in B-3 schools, communities, and programs that are essential to meaningful changes in practice.

Scale: FY17: Implementing pilot sites in three communities to build school-community partnerships which are a core value of the B-3 continuum and aims to bridge the two different systems 0-5 and K-3rd grade.  
**Early Childhood Leadership Series**The Leadership Series provides professional development designed specifically for the leaders of early childhood centers and schools across Nevada. The purpose of the series is to build the capacity of leaders in developing their teachers’ instructional practice and to dramatically increase learning outcomes for our youngest learners. The series is offered in six sessions over a period of six months. Part 1 of the series is focused on language and literacy with plans to develop additional content in math, science, and social-emotional development.  
Scale: FY17: Two cohorts of 35 total participants have completed part 1 of the leadership academy. A third cohort of 27 participants is currently taking place with an expected completion date of June 2017.  
  
**Full-Day Kindergarten (FDK)**Economically disadvantaged, historically underserved students, and English learners who attend full-day kindergarten have significantly higher long-term math and reading scores in 3rd and 5th grades compared to half-day kindergarten students   
Scale: Statewide FDK access at all schools without tuition  
  
**Preschool Development Grant**The purpose of the Preschool Development Grant (PDG) is to support states to build, develop, and expand voluntary high-quality preschool programs for children from low- and moderate-income families. In January 2015 Nevada was awarded the four year grant. The $66.5 million budget includes $43.7 million in Federal funds and $22.7 million in State matching funds. Funds are being used to: 1) Expand existing State Pre-K seats from half day to full day seats, 2) Develop new full day seats in school districts as well as community child care programs 3) Build state infrastructure to implement high quality classrooms to ensure kindergarten readiness and support the goal of all children are proficient in reading by the end of 3rd grade  
Scale: NDE is working with seven sub-grantees in five high-need communities to expand the number of children participating in high-quality Pre-K programs. Year 1 (2015/16) of the grant 782 four year olds were enrolled in 27 sites. Year 2 (2016/17) of the grant 1,665 four year olds are currently enrolled in 57 sites  
  
**QRIS**Studies have shown that high-quality early education can result in children building a solid foundation for achieving desired academic, health, and social outcomes. Children who attend high-quality education programs are more likely to do well in school, find good jobs, and succeed in their careers than those who don’t. To improve the quality of its early childhood education programs, Nevada has instituted the [Silver State Stars Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)](http://www.nvsilverstatestars.org/nevada-qris). The QRIS is a method to assess, improve and communicate the level of quality in early childhood programs. Programs that participate are assessed by trained and experienced assessors. After a program has been assessed, they work with a coach to draft and implement a plan to help them improve their quality. Programs may work with their coach for up to 18 months prior to receiving their star rating.   The Silver State Stars QRIS assigns a rating, from 1 to 5 stars to each program which can help families find high quality early education programs that fit their needs and the needs of their child. Nevada has sought to not only expand the availability of early childhood education but ensure its quality as well.   
Scale: There are currently 206 programs participating in the QRIS with an additional 93 centers participating in coaching, but not rated and 61 centers on the waiting list.   
  
**ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TO MIDDLE SCHOOL  
  
Read by Grade 3 (RBG3)**This program is designed to dramatically improve student achievement by ensuring that all students will be able to read proficiently by the end of the 3rd grade. This program requires all school districts and charter schools to develop locally-based literacy plans, aimed at improving the literacy of all K-3 students. Within thirty days of enrollment, all K-3 students are screened using state board-approved assessments. Parents of students identified as struggling readers will receive written notification of the deficiency. Teachers, in collaboration with the learning strategist, are responsible for designing a plan of intervention and progress monitoring tailored to the individual student. The classroom teacher, learning strategist, principal, and parents must approve this plan. It also requires every elementary site to have a Reading Learning Strategist to oversee professional learning.   
Scale: 307 school sites currently being served through RBG3 grants and all elementary schools are required to follow the law.  
  
**MIDDLE SCHOOL TO HIGH SCHOOL  
  
Climate Survey**NDE is collaborating with AIR to design & administer a statewide School Climate / Social and Emotional Learning Survey that serves as the needs assessment for the social worker in school block grants.   
Scale: The survey is web-based for all students in grades 5-12 statewide.  
  
**Nevada Ready 21**Nevada Ready 21 engages select middle school students in a personalized, learner-centered education. The program’s teachers provide students with a 21st Century education that builds a vibrant, diverse economy by infusing technology into students’ daily experience. Nevada Ready 21 is a multi-year plan with middle schools as the initial focus and high schools in following years.   
Scale: 23 middle schools awarded grants including over 19,000 student devices and 1,000 teacher devices  
  
**HIGH SCHOOL TO POST-SECONDARY  
  
Career & Technical Education**Students who concentrate in CTE perform higher than state assessment averages, graduate at higher rates, drop out of school less, and transition to postsecondary education and training with a focus on the future. Nevada is expanding its career & technical education programs identified by workforce councils through both increased formula funding and competitive grants, open to districts and charter schools.  
Scale: 9,000 students enrollment increase in CTE programs between 2013-2014 school year and 2015-2016 school year  
  
**College & Career Readiness**NDE is supporting college & career readiness through a competitive grant process focused on science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) for middle and high school students, an increase in AP enrollment and support for AP success, and an increase and expansion of dual enrollment for students enrolled simultaneously in high school and college courses.   
Scale: FY 2015 17,243 students enrolled in AP courses FY 2016 18,094 students enrolled in AP courses (4% increase)  
  
**Jobs for America’s Graduates**The Jobs for Nevada’s Graduates is a program that raises graduation rates, prepares participants with work readiness skills, and helps them enroll in post-secondary education or the military.   
Scale: Currently serves over 2,500 students across the state in 53 programs in 43 high schools.  
  
**SYSTEM-WIDE APPROACH**  
 **Great Teaching & Leading Fund**Through a competitive grant process, GTL funds are awarded to districts, charter schools, institutions of higher education, non-profit organizations, and RPDPs to prepare/recruit teachers, focus on leadership, and provide professional development for science standards implementation.  
Scale: FY 2016 $4.2 million to 13 entities to support leaders, teachers, and pre-service teacher candidates  
  
**New Teacher Incentives**Funded at $10 million annually, districts may provide salary incentives up to $5,000 per teacher to recruit and/or retain first and second year teachers at Title I and 1- and 2-star schools.  
Scale: FY16 1,753 teachers received funding, FY17 3,003 expected.  
  
**Safe & Respectful Learning Environment Initiative**The Office for a Safe and Respectful Learning Environment was created within NDE in 2015 with a goal to empower schools to grow safe and respectful school climates, provide multiple tiers of support, social emotional learning, and coping skills for students and families—acknowledging that not all students come to school ready to learn.   
Scale: 10 counties have published their district-wide bullying prevention policies and programs. 212 positions through the Nevada School Social Work Grant have been awarded to 143 schools. 40 positions through Project Aware, Safe Schools Healthy Students, and School Climate Transformation grants.  
  
**Social Workers**NDE is supporting school districts and charter schools with funds to contract with social workers or other mental health workers to support social emotional learning, a caring school climate, and intervention and treatment services to students and families who are struggling with food and shelter insecurity, behavioral health concerns, or overcoming trauma.   
Scale: 194.5 social worker and other mental health professional positions filled serving 149 school sites statewide.  
  
**Teach Nevada Scholarships**Up to $2.5 million per year is distributed to state-approved traditional and alternative route teacher preparation providers to award scholarships to preservice candidates wanting to enter the profession. Candidates may receive 75% of up to $24,000 for tuition assistance, with the remaining 25% given upon completion of 5 successful years of teaching, three of which must be at identified high-need Nevada public schools.  
Scale: FY 2016 - 142 candidates awarded funding; 110 completed program and hired for the current school year. FY 2017 - 112 awarded and are pending completion/ hire; 2nd round of applications in Feb. 2017  
  
**T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® Nevada Scholarships**T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® is a nationally licensed scholarship and compensation program operating in 23 states and the District of Columbia. The mission of T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® Nevada is to provide professional development opportunities to early care providers and teachers through scholarships designed to increase education, compensation, retention, and professional recognition. T.E.A.C.H. is designed to provide a variety of scholarship and compensation models to meet the needs of program participants. The purpose of the program is to build the workforce of highly qualified early childhood teachers, to provide advanced educational opportunities, encourage attainment of educational goals, increase individual compensation, and reduce turnover.   
Scale: FY17: 60 recipients working towards an Associate’s degree 25 teachers on the waiting list 25 recipients working towards a Bachelor’s degree 16 teachers on the waiting list.   
  
**Victory Schools**SB 432 invested $50M over the biennium to Victory Schools identified as the lowest performing schools (receiving a one or two-star rating) in the highest poverty zip codes in Nevada. The focus is to provide programs and services supporting the improvement of student achievement through the implementation of specific strategies as outlined in the bill. The allowable uses of Victory funds include: pre-Kindergarten programs free of charge, full-day kindergarten classes, summer academy or other instruction for pupils free of charge at times during the year when school is not in session, additional instruction or other learning opportunities free of charge at times of day when school is not in session, professional development for teachers and other educational personnel, employment of paraprofessionals, other educational personnel and other persons who provide any of the programs or services, provision of Reading Skills Centers, provide evidence-based social, psychological or health care services to pupils and their families, including, without limitation, wrap-around services, provide programs and services designed to engage parents and families, provide programs to improve school climate and culture, and provide evidence-based programs and services specifically designed to meet the needs of pupils who attend the school.  
Scale: 35 Victory schools across the highest poverty areas of Nevada  
  
**Special Education Weighted Funding**Pupils with disabilities are now funded in accordance with a funding multiplier calculated by the Department. The Department calculates the multiplier by dividing the total enrollment of students with disabilities by the money appropriated for such pupils and that enrollment must not exceed 13% of total student enrollment for a school district or charter school.   
Scale: 2016-2017 54,114 special education students enrolled in public schools Average per pupil is $3,034 (ranging from $2,968 - $9,090), which can be expressed as multiplier of 0.53 of the basic state guarantee  
  
**Well-Rounded Education**Nevada values equitable access to a well-rounded education including rigorous academic and other programs and options, such as CTE programs, health and wellness programs, advanced and accelerated learning options such as AP and gifted education programs, IB, and dual credit, music and arts programs, culturally-relevant experiences, athletics and physical education programs, and educational technology options. A dashboard will be created to determine the extent to which LEAs are providing students with a well-rounded education. The dashboard will serve as a springboard to attending to the needs of all of Nevada's students where deficiencies may be evident.  **Zoom Schools**Senate Bill 405 and 515 invested $100M over the biennium to expand Zoom Schools. The Zoom Schools Program supports schools with the highest percentage of ELs and lowest academic performance. Services such as providing pre-Kindergarten programs free of charge, full-day kindergarten, summer academies, professional development, recruitment and retention incentives, extended school day and reading skills centers are all a part of the Zoom Schools Program.   
Scale: 2014-2015 16 Clark County School District Zoom schools 8 Washoe County School District Zoom schools. 2015-2016 38 CCSD Zoom schools & 23 Zoom schools in WCSD. In districts other than CCSD and WCSD that receive Zoom grants, 6,089 English Learner students are being served.

1. The State’s strategies and how it will support LEAs to provide equitable access to a well-rounded education and rigorous coursework in subjects in which female students, minority students, English learners, children with disabilities, or low-income students are underrepresented. Such subjects could include English, reading/language arts, writing, science, technology, engineering, mathematics, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, geography, computer science, music, career and technical education, health, or physical education.

Nevada will strive to provide equitable access to a well-rounded education to all students including rigorous academic and other programs and options, such as CTE programs, health and wellness programs, advanced and accelerated learning options such as AP and gifted education programs, IB, and dual credit, music and arts programs to include culturally-relevant experiences, athletics and physical education programs, and educational technology options. A dashboard will be created to determine the extent to which LEAs are meeting this recommendation. The dashboard will serve as a springboard to attending to the needs of all of Nevada's students where deficiencies may be evident. Strategically using permissible federal and state funding mechanisms, the NDE will prioritize and incentivize expanding access to advanced coursework (i.e., Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and dual credit) and Career and Technical Education (CTE) courses across the state. In particular, the strategies will target rural districts that typically struggle to provide a wide variety of advanced course offerings and CTE courses to students, as well as urban schools with low participation rates of underrepresented subgroups. Currently, seven districts offer AP courses to less than 20 students district-wide, and four districts have no approved AP courses this year. These strategies will help to widely spread and deeply embed into the state’s educational systems the strong instructional practices and high levels of critical thinking associated with advanced courses and innovative CTE courses. Furthermore, it will ensure that all students in Nevada, regardless of where they live, have access to rigorous advanced coursework that prepares them for success in college and career.   
  
Moreover, the Department of Education, in collaboration with the Governor and the state legislature, has dramatically increased the focus on and investment in public education. Recently created programs and strategies, led by the state and administered by LEAs, allow for meaningful and impactful learning opportunities for underrepresented student populations, in addition to providing students with a more well-rounded education. For example, students may have access to rigorous academic courses through the College and Career Readiness grant. English Language Learners may have access to small-group instruction in literacy through the Zoom grant. LEAs and schools may cultivate safe and respectful school climates, provide multiple tiers of support, and offer social emotional learning opportunities and coping skills to students and families through the Safe and Respectful Schools Initiative.

*If an SEA intends to use Title IV, Part A funds or funds from other included programs for the activities that follow, the description must address how the State strategies below support the State-level strategies in 6.1.A and B.*

1. Does the SEA intend to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to supportstrategies to support LEAs to improve school conditions for student learning, including activities that create safe, healthy, and affirming school environments inclusive of all students to reduce:
   1. Incidents of bullying and harassment;
   2. The overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom; and
   3. The use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety?

Yes. If yes, provide a description below.

No.

1. Train and support Social Workers and Behavioral Health Workers to embed screening procedures into early school discipline policies and procedures to: 1) early identify students with behavioral health concerns and connect them to school and community supports, and 2) divert students from the discipline process into a support process.  
  
2. Expand school ability to implement evidenced based comprehensive multi-tiered systems of support that will allow children and youth to successfully deal with challenges they may face in order to improve and support learning.  
  
3. Train and support schools, Social Workers, and Behavioral Health Workers for Social Emotional Learning, Trauma informed policies and practices and Creating Positive School Climates.

1. Does the SEA intend to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to supportstrategies to support LEAs to effectively use technology to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students?

Yes. If yes, provide a description below.

No.

In addition to other funding mechanisms, the SEA intends to use these funds to support strategies for the purposes of expanding access to rigorous academic courses and curricula for rural and underserved students, with a focus on Advanced Placement courses, International Baccalaureate, dual enrollment, and Career and Technical Education. This strategy requires the SEA to support LEAs so they may effectively use technology to improve access and student achievement, as well as cultivating strong digital literacy skills among students and educators.

1. Does the SEA intend to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to supportstrategies to support LEAs to engage parents, families, and communities?

Yes. If yes, provide a description below.

No.

The Department of Education will support districts to engage parents, families, and communities to facilitate deeper understanding of the importance of a well-rounded education, including enrolling and succeeding in advanced coursework and Career and Technical Education courses. This may include collaborative meetings between the SEA, LEAs, parent organizations, and community leaders to identify areas of opportunities to move this work forward, or training to build and sustain strong networks of different stakeholder groups focused on holistic development of students and preparing them to succeed in college and career within a competitive global economy.

## 6.2 Program-Specific Requirements.

1. **Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by State and Local Educational Agencies**

Describe the process and criteria that the SEA will use to waive the 40 percent schoolwide poverty threshold under section 1114(a)(1)(B) of the ESEA that an LEA submits on behalf of a school, including how the SEA will ensure that the schoolwide program will best serve the needs of the lowest-achieving students in the school.  
Criteria:

Under section 1114(a)(1)(B) of the ESEA as amended by ESSA, Nevada’s Title I poverty threshold flexibility waiver allows for underperforming schools with less than 40% of students in poverty to qualify as Title I schoolwide programs if all required components are in place.  
  
Schools / LEAs considering applying for this waiver must factor into its planning the work that may have already begun with school improvement planning.   
Criteria for waiver application:   
- Schools serving less than 40% of enrolled students in poverty; AND   
- Schools Identified as underperforming by the Nevada Department of Education; AND   
- Schools agree to implement evidence-based interventions aligned with school, district, and state achievement targets   
  
Process:  
- Submit waiver request directly to NDE   
- Provide agreement assurance to submit and implement the school wide requirements below:   
1 - A comprehensive needs assessment that is based on academic achievement information about all students in the school.  
 A - The needs assessment helps the school faculty and families understand the subjects and skills for which teaching and learning need to be improved and identifies specific academic needs of students and groups of students who are not yet achieving the State’s academic standards;  
 B - The comprehensive needs assessment must be developed with the participation of individuals who will carry out the schoolwide program plan and must document how it conducted the needs assessment, the results it obtained, and the conclusions it drew from those results and assess the needs of the school and students it serves;  
2 - A comprehensive school performance plan that describes how the school will improve academic achievement throughout the school but particularly for those students furthest away from demonstrating proficiency, so that all students demonstrate at least proficiency on the State’s academic standards, and;  
3 - An annual evaluation on the implementation of and the results achieved by the schoolwide program, using data from the State’s annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement, determine whether the program has been effective and revise the plan as necessary; and  
4 - The plan must also include a detailed budget summary that coordinates and integrates all available federal, state, and local funds.

1. **Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children.**
   1. Describe how the SEA and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will establish and implement a system for the proper identification and recruitment of eligible migratory children on a statewide basis, including the identification and recruitment of preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and how the SEA will verify and document the number of eligible migratory children aged 3 through 21 residing in the State on an annual basis.

The SEA trains recruiters of the district migrant programs to use the national Certificate of Eligibility (COE) template when recruiting migratory children. The training topics include identification and recruitment of eligibility migratory children (including preschool migratory children and migratory youth who have dropped out of school). The recruiters will receive the notification of potential migratory children based on the school enrollment form regarding the parents’ occupation. Then, the recruiters will conduct a home visit to interview the family to verify the eligibility of the migratory children.  The recruiter will complete, verify, and submit the COE to the district migrant coordinator. The district migrant coordinator approves and submits the COE to the state migrant data system. Finally, the state migrant coordinator and/or state migrant data coordinator will verify and approve each COE within the state migrant data system called “MAPS.”  
  
To verify and document the number of eligible migratory children aged 3 through 21, Nevada’s Migrant database is used to verify that only those children who are ages 3-21. For example, for the performance period for SY2015-16, this includes those who were born after September 1, 1995 and before September 1, 2013. The same system verifies that children who have turned three years of age have resided in Nevada for at least one day to be included in the system.   
  
The eligibility of migratory children also includes:   
- Only children who were within 36 months of a qualified arrival date (QAD). This means that the State Migrant Program personnel (including recruiters, district program directors/coordinators, state data coordinator, and the state director) ensure that the eligibility of each child is valid and has an active status until September 1, 2015 (for SY2015-16).   
- Only children who were resident in the State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31) were eligible. The recruiters conduct a home visit to interview the family to verify that children who have recently turned three years of age have resided in Nevada at least one day during the performance period between September 1 and August 31. This information is then entered into the Nevada Migrant database. The State Migrant Data Coordinator generates a report from this database for the two year olds to recheck when they turn three and whether or not they have resided at least one day in Nevada. She then informs the district Migrant Program to include these children as eligible migrant students in the system.

* 1. Describe how the SEA and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will identify the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and other needs that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school.

To assess the unique educational needs of migratory children, the State Educational Research & Training Corporation (ERTC) as external contractor conducted a meeting to facilitate the design and implementation of the comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) process. The assessing tools are the survey questions related to the needs of migratory children and responded by teachers, parents, and current migrant students. Then, ERTC also analyzed data collected from both the quantitative and qualitative assessments and provided consultation to the CNA Committee regarding interpretation of the data and the results. The CNA committee last met on September 11, 2015, in Carson City to review and revise the concern statements for the comprehensive needs assessment.  

* 1. Describe how the SEA and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will ensure that the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and other needs that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school, are addressed through the full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs.  
     From the comprehensive needs assessment process, the CNA committee identifies major concerns of the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschoolers and dropped-out students.  The concerns include the needs being proficient in reading, writing, Math, and English.  These concerns are identified in the State Migrant Service Delivery Plan for program implementation.
  2. Describe how the State and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will use funds received under Title I, Part C to promote interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children, including how the State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records, including information on health, when children move from one school to another, whether or not such move occurs during the regular school year (*i.e.*, through use of the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX), among other vehicles).

To promote interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children including migrants’ student record transformation or moving notification, the State uses a small portion of the migrant funds to hire the State Migrant Data Coordinator to assist the State Migrant Coordinator. We are able to respond to the request with 5-7 business days.  Nevada is also the member of the Interstate Migrant Education Consortium (IMEC) and West Region Work group.

* 1. Describe the unique educational needs of the State’s migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and other needs that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school, based on the State’s most recent comprehensive needs assessment.

The unique needs of migratory in Nevada identified by the CNA Committee are as follows:   
  
a. Migrant students have a wide variety of needs in terms of English language proficiency;   
b. The academic needs of migrant students are not being effectively identified in reading and writing; and   
c. The academic needs of migrant students are not being effectively identified in mathematics.   
  
However, with the small number of migrant preschoolers, all of them are in the Pre-K programs provided by other state Pre-K programs.

* 1. Describe the current measurable program objectives and outcomes for Title I, Part C, and the strategies the SEA will pursue on a statewide basis to achieve such objectives and outcomes consistent with section 1304(b)(1)(D) of the ESEA.

The following measurable program outcomes were developed based on the results and analysis of the comprehensive needs assessment:   
***Measurable Outcome #1 English Language Acquisition:*** One hundred percent of all migrant students identified as limited English proficient will have an IAP (Individual Academic Plan) in place (e.g. the Success Plan on the Migrant Literacy NET). All IAPs will be implemented and evaluated at least annually.   
***Measurable Outcome #2 ELL Writing Achievement:*** Eighty-four percent of ELL students will demonstrate an a .50 rubric point increase from baseline in proficiency in specific writing skills as identified in Nevada State Content Standards based on teacher ratings and/or other assessments of student performance and/or available state assessment scores.   
***Measurable Outcome #3 Reading Comprehension:***Eighty-four percent of priority for service students targeted for reading instruction will demonstrate a .50 rubric point increase from baseline in proficiency in specific reading comprehension skills based on teacher ratings and/or other assessments of student performance in relation to state content standards in reading in order to facilitate reading achievement and progress towards high school graduation.   
***Measurable Outcome #4 Writing:*** Eighty-four percent of priority for service students targeted for writing instruction will demonstrate a .50 rubric point increase from baseline in proficiency in specific writing skills based on teacher ratings and/or other assessments of student performance in relation to state content standards in writing.   
***Measurable Outcome #5 Language Arts Achievement:*** One hundred percent of all migrant students identified as priority for service will have an IAP (Individual Academic Plan) in place (e.g. the Success Plan on the Migrant Literacy NET) which targets reading and writing needs.   All IAPs will be implemented and evaluated at least annually.   
***Measurable Outcome #6 Problem Solving in Math:*** Eighty-four percent of priority for service students targeted for math instruction will demonstrate a .50 rubric point increase from baseline in proficiency in problem solving based on teacher ratings and/or other assessments of student performance in relation to state content standards in math in order to facilitate math achievement and progress towards high school graduation.   
***Measurable Outcome #7 Communicate Mathematically:*** Eighty-four percent priority for service students targeted for math instruction will demonstrate a .50 rubric point increase from baseline proficiency in communicating mathematically based on teacher ratings and/or other assessments of student performance in relation to state content standards in math in order to facilitate math achievement and progress towards high school graduation.

* 1. Describe how the SEA will ensure there is consultation with parents of migratory children, including parent advisory councils, at both the State and local level, in the planning and operation of Title I, Part C programs that span not less than one school year in duration, consistent with section 1304(c)(3) of the ESEA.

Nevada Migrant Parent Advisory Committee (NV-PAC) was created formally in 2014. The committees originally were migrant parents from five districts: Churchill, Esmeralda, Humboldt, Lyon, and Nye. For the 2016-17 school year, the committee members are from four districts since Esmeralda does not have any migrant students. The statewide PAC meets annually to discuss needs and concerns. In addition, the two districts (Humboldt and Nye) where there are high incidences of migrant students conduct migrant parents’ meetings and home visits to meet with families in order to address concerns and their needs. The frequency depending on the population of the districts.

* 1. Describe the SEA’s priorities for use of Title I, Part C funds, specifically related to the needs of migratory children with “priority for services” under section 1304(d) of the ESEA, including:
     1. The measures and sources of data the SEA, and if applicable, its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will use to identify those migratory children who are a priority for services; and
     2. When and how the SEA will communicate those determinations to all local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, in the State.

A. Nevada adopted the definition of “priority for services” (PFS) defined by the Office of Migrant Education, U.S Department of Education. This term is described in Section 1304(d) of the statute as “migratory children who are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the State's challenging State academic content standards and challenging State student academic achievement standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.” The State includes this definition in the state Migrant Directors’ Meeting/Training agenda to ensure the district migrant program coordinators and recruiters to understand the definition.  
  
B. The migratory students who are eligible as a PFS are indicated on their COEs and then recorded in the state migrant database system. The districts are required to create an educational plan for these PFS students. The plan needs to address their assessment results, areas of concerns both academic and non-academic issues, and goals/plan to assist them in those areas of concerns.   
  
C. When a migratory child qualified as a PFS, he or she will receive priority migrant services based on their unique needs for the first year of their eligibility. The timeline can be discussed individually with the district/school team regarding the continuation of priority services supported by other supplemental funding sources.  The PFS students should have their individual education plan so the districts are aware of the timeline and determination.

1. **Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk** 
   1. Describe the SEA’s plan for assisting in the transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs.

The focus related to transition for neglected, delinquent, or at-risk youth encompasses four areas: independent living, employment, education, and community participation. All Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs (State agency programs) will annually identify transition activities that take place at their respective programs and meet the 15 to 30 percent reservation of funds for re-entry or transition services as required by law.   
  
In addition, Subpart 2 programs (local agencies programs) will be also be required to provide transitional services (although no specific funding percentage is outlined in the law) to assist students in returning to locally operated schools and to promote positive academic and vocational outcomes for youth who are neglected and/or delinquent.

* 1. Describe the program objectives and outcomes established by the State that will be used to assess the effectiveness of the program in improving the academic, career, and technical skills of children in the program, including the knowledge and skills needed to earn a regular high school diploma and make a successful transition to postsecondary education, career and technical education, or employment.

**Objective 1**: Title I, Part D programs will provide for individualization of instructional experience beginning with an intake process that includes an identification of each student’s academic strengths and weaknesses in reading and math.   
*Outcome:* Each Title I, Part D program will provide educational services for children and youth who are neglected or delinquent to ensure that they have the opportunity to meet challenging State academic content and achievement standards.   
**Objective 2**: Title I, Part D programs will ensure that all neglected and delinquent students accrue school credits that meet state requirements for grade promotion and secondary school graduation.   
*Outcome:* Each Title I, Part D program will post-test each student using a standards-based test to determine academic growth during the student's placement in the academic program.   
**Objective 3**: Title I, Part D programs will ensure that all neglected and delinquent students have the opportunity to transition to a regular community school or other education program operated by an LEA, complete secondary school (or secondary school equivalency requirements), and/or obtain employment after leaving the facility.   
*Outcome:* Title I, Part D programs will annually report on the types of transitional services and the number of students that have transitioned from the facilities to the regular community schools or other education programs, completed secondary school (or secondary school equivalency requirements), and/or obtained employment after leaving the facility.   
**Objective 4**: Title I, Part D programs will ensure (when applicable) that neglected and delinquent students have the opportunity to participate in postsecondary education and job training programs.   
*Outcome:* Title I, Part D programs will annually report on the the number of neglected and delinquent students who were given the opportunity to participate in postsecondary education and job training programs.

1. **Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students.** 
   1. Describe the SEA’s standardized entrance and exit procedures for English learners consistent with section 3113(b)(2) of the ESEA. These procedures must include valid and reliable, objective criteria that are applied consistently across the State. At a minimum, the standardized exit criteria must:
      1. Include a score of proficient on the State’s annual English language proficiency assessment;
      2. Be the same criteria used for exiting students from the English learner subgroup for Title I reporting and accountability purposes; and
      3. Not include performance on an academic content assessment.

Nevada’s standardized entrance and exit procedures will include the use of the WIDA assessments. The WIDA Screener will be used for identification (levels below English proficient). The WIDA ACCESS or Alternate ACCESS will be administered annually for all English learners to determine English proficiency. The performance levels for both the Composite (minimum score of 5.0) and Literacy sub-score (minimum score of 5.0) is the exit criteria. The state will establish protocols to consider individual circumstances in eligibility determinations for which an exception may be warranted. The exit criteria will be the same criteria used for exiting students from the English learner subgroup for Title I reporting and accountability.

* 1. Awarding Subgrants *(ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(B))*: Describe how the SEA will ensure that awards made to LEAs under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 are in amounts that are consistent with ESEA section 4105(a)(2).

NDE will award funding for Title IV, Part A, through a competitive grant application and review process to eligible entities in accordance to Section 4103. The priorities used to award sub-grants are based on those outlined in in Sec. 4105(a)(2), which states that “No allocation to a local education agency may be made in an amount that is less than $10,000.”   
  
Furthermore, Title IV, part A, will prioritize its awards according to those applications that align with Nevada’s State Goals.

1. **Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers.**
   1. Describe how the SEA will use its Title IV, Part B, and other Federal funds to support State-level strategies that are consistent with the strategies identified in 6.1.A above.

The NDE will administer and supervise funds and programs under Title IV, part B.  NDE will use these funds to award subgrants, through a competitive grant process, to eligible entities that propose to serve students who primarily attend schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under 1111(d) and schools that are in need of intervention and additional support. Title IV, part B, will provide subgrants to eligible entities to establish centers that provide academic enrichment activities for students during non-school hours in an effort to increase academic performance and educational outcomes.  In addition, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program activities connect with Nevada’s Academic Content Standards in order to complement the regular academic program and help students succeed in Math and ELA, as well as, in alignment to the Nevada State Goals and 21st CCLC Performance Indicators. Based on lessons learned, and in alignment with state-level strategies, the SEA will provide support and technical assistance to districts and schools in order to facilitate strategic blending and braiding of these funds to leverage their resources with other Federal and State funds and programs (e.g., ZOOM, Victory, and Read by Grade 3, to name a few).

* 1. Describe the SEA’s processes, procedures, and priorities used to award subgrants consistent with the strategies identified above in 6.1.A. above and to the extent permitted under applicable law and regulations.

NDE will award funding for Title IV, Part B, through a competitive grant application and review process to eligible entities in accordance to Section 4204. The priorities used to award sub-grants are based on those outlined in in Sec. 4203(a)(3), which states that “State educational agencies will make awards under this part to eligible entities that serve students who primarily attend schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvements activities under section 1111(d); and other schools determined by the local educational agency to be in need of intervention and support; and the families of such students.”   
  
Furthermore, Title IV, part B, will prioritize its awards according to those applications that align with Nevada’s State Goals.  In addition, NDE will  prioritize funds to those with the greatest needs based on factors such as school performance plans (Sec. 1111(d)), students who may be at risk for academic failure, dropping out of school, involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong positive role models (Sec. 4204(i)(1)(A)(II)).

1. **Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program.**
   1. Provide the SEA’s specific measurable program objectives and outcomes related to activities under the Rural and Low-Income School Program, if applicable.

Currently Nevada has one county that is eligible for these funds. Nevada uses a narrative application, with needs assessment information on specific measureable goals. The desired outcomes are: increased student academic achievement and decreased student dropout rates. The county uses benchmark tests, writing assessments, classroom observations and parent/community surveys to determine growth towards goals. Nevada does not have a school district that meets 3 year qualification for continued participation.

1. **McKinney-Vento Act.** 
   1. Consistent with section 722(g)(1)(B) of the McKinney-Vento Act, describe the procedures the SEA will use to identify homeless children and youths in the State and assess their needs.

Nevada Revised Statutes mandate that each school district appoint a liaison for the homeless to coordinate with local social service agencies, homeless service providers, and other programs to assist homeless children and their families, and ensure that each school within the school district has identified an on-site advocate for the homeless to assist any homeless children and their families and to serve as a contact for the liaison.   
  
Nevada’s school district liaisons visit locations where homeless children are most likely to be living (shelters, motels, campgrounds) in order to identify homeless children and youth. Additionally, they build relationships with people who administer these locations to alert the district liaison when students experiencing homelessness move into the location.   
  
In these locations, as well as in schools, posters/flyers have been posted that inform families experiencing homelessness of their rights. Additionally, contact information is listed for professionals available to assist families experiencing homelessness (state coordinator and district liaison).   
  
Nevada schools provide brochures produced by the National Center for Homeless Education that describe the rights of children and youth experiencing homelessness and provide contact information for professionals available to assist families experiencing homelessness.  
  
Nevada’s State Coordinator of Education for Homeless Children and Youth (EHCY) provides training to school district liaisons focused on recognizing students experiencing homelessness, how liaisons can meet the needs of these students and their families, and requirements of the McKinney-Vento Act, school registration practices that can be useful in identifying families experiencing homelessness, and common student behavior that might indicate homelessness.  Additionally, district liaisons are encouraged to attend the NAEHCY national conference for professional development opportunities.   
  
School district liaisons and site advocates assist families in acquiring immunization records, birth certificates, or other school records as needed and refer them to appropriate resources in the community. The LEAs processes for identifying homeless children and youth will be reviewed during regular monitoring of the LEAs.

* 1. Describe the SEA’s programs for school personnel (including liaisons designated under section 722(g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Act, principals and other school leaders, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel) to heighten the awareness of such school personnel of the specific needs of homeless children and youths, including such children and youths who are runaway and homeless youths.

Each year, the Nevada Department of Education hosts Title I Director meetings in which all eighteen of the Title I LEA Directors or their designees attend.  The Nevada State Coordinator of Education for Homeless Children and Youth presents new materials, reviews old materials, and distributes information from NCHE and NAEHCY. The Title I Coordinators then distribute these materials to the district liaisons and advocates. This information is regularly used for district level trainings.   
  
The State Coordinator of EHCY sponsors an annual conference with school district liaisons.  During this conference, national experts on homeless education, LEA practitioners, and others present information designed to provide professional development, guidance on the McKinney-Vento Act, and best practices for identifying students experiencing homelessness.   
  
Funds from the state-level activity account are provided to new and existing homeless liaisons to attend the NAEHCY National conference and state trainings.   
  
District Liaisons are required to provide training to school personnel about the requirements of the McKinney-Vento Act and best practices in identifying and meeting the needs of students experiencing homelessness, as well as maintaining records of attendance.   
  
The State Coordinator of EHCY provides trainings and technical assistance meetings to districts and schools. These trainings can be requested by the LEA or initiated by the state coordinator when a need is evident in monitoring. Additionally, the state coordinator collaborates with community organizations working with homelessness to bring visibility to the issues facing families experiencing homelessness and strengthen available services.

* 1. Describe the SEA’s procedures to ensure that disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youths are promptly resolved.

The school must immediately admit the child or youth to the school selected by the parent/guardian or youth pending resolution of the dispute. The District Liaison must ensure that the student is immediately enrolled, and that the decision made promptly and based on the best interest of the child or youth. The school must provide the parent/guardian or youth a written explanation of the decision, including a statement of the parent/guardian or youth’s rights.   
  
Where disagreements or disputes continue, the site administrator, the family or its representative should contact the Title I Director of the LEA to settle the matter. If the disagreement or dispute is not settled to the satisfaction of all concerned, the family or its representative should contact the State Coordinator of EHCY to appeal the decision.  This appeal must include an explanation of the dispute and a record of the steps taken thus far. The State Coordinator of EHCY will contact the LEA for its explanation of the dispute and record of the steps taken thus far.  A meeting with both the LEA representative and the family or its representative will be scheduled to offer help in facilitating a resolution. The State Coordinator of EHCY will make a ruling on the dispute based on the best interests of the child or youth.   
  
Records will be kept at the Nevada Department of Education regarding all paperwork and the resolution of the dispute.

* 1. Describe the SEA’s procedures to ensure that that youths described in section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Act and youths separated from the public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, including by identifying and removing barriers that prevent youths described in this paragraph from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies.

Training is provided to school staff members and community organizations working with families experiencing homelessness on identifying children and youth who are not enrolled in school.  Once identified, these students are immediately enrolled in school, provided with free lunch and school supplies, and the family or youth is assisted in acquiring needed documents for school enrollment.   
  
The State Coordinator of EHCY will work with school districts in Nevada, and possibly lawmakers to assist in establishing policies and procedures to provide appropriate credit for partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a school, in accordance with state, local, and school policies.   
  
School registrars are trained to identify potentially homeless youths when they register or change addresses by noting certain zip codes that indicate areas of high density motels that house homeless families/students. Homeless children school advocates have established relationships with people who will notify them of homeless youth.

* 1. Describe the SEA’s procedures to ensure that homeless children and youths:
     1. Have access to public preschool programs, administered by the SEA or LEA, as provided to other children in the State;
     2. Who meet the relevant eligibility criteria, do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities; and
     3. Who meet the relevant eligibility criteria, are able to participate in Federal, State, and local nutrition programs.

Nevada’s Administrative Code 392.205 states the following:   
“Within 7 working days after receiving the name and location of a child who is homeless and who meets the age requirements of NRS 392.040, a school district shall provide the homeless child with education and services that are provided to the other pupils within the school district.”   
  
In listing their priority of needs for possible preschool students, applicants for state early childhood funding will be required to include homeless students as one of their priorities. In listing their locations for recruitment of preschool students, applicants will be required to coordinate with homeless liaisons for those districts and to include homeless shelters, motels where homeless children may be found, and any other places suggested by the homeless liaisons. The State Coordinator of EHCY will collaborate with the Nevada Director of Early Childhood to create training materials for day care providers and preschool settings and review enrollment data to ensure children experiencing homelessness are being enrolled.  
  
Special after-school tutoring is offered, through the use of Title I and McKinney-Vento funds, for those elementary students who are homeless.  These tutoring services are offered at schools with a large population of homeless students, with transportation from other schools being offered by bus for the young students. These tutoring services are not labeled as “homeless classes,” and, where capacity is available, other students do participate. School districts are required to waive fees for academic or extracurricular programs for students experiencing homelessness. In situations where fees cannot be waived, the school district will explore using donation accounts, McKinney-Vento or Title I set aside funds.  
  
All of Nevada’s students who meet the relevant eligibility criteria for federal, state, or local food programs are served under the Child and Adult Care Food Program, the National School Lunch Program, and the National School Breakfast Program.  In addition, those elementary schools offering after-school tutoring programs usually offer after-school snacks for those participating in the tutoring programs. It is the responsibility of the district liaison and school advocate to ensure that the name of the child or youth and their status as homeless is communicated to the nutrition director so that free meals are provided immediately.   
  
The Nevada Department of Education Child and Adult Care Food Program Coordinator ensures that shelters with children residing there are receiving reimbursement for nutritious meals served by the shelter. Finally, those homeless students who are not currently attending school because they are on a track break or summer break may receive meals free of charge through the Summer Food Service Program.  
  
Organizations involved in this program distribute information through the press and neighborhood flyers to notify the community of these free meals. The State Coordinator of EHCY meets with the individuals providing these services to determine if all needs are being met. Each District Homeless Liaison will be sent the brochure written by the Food Research and Action Center in Washington, D.C., entitled “Wondering How to Feed the Children in Your Homeless or Domestic Violence Shelter?” and will be asked to disseminate this brochure to each shelter in his or her district. By virtue of their enrollment in a public school, students in schools which have before- and after-schools programs are eligible for those programs.  If the funds to establish and run those programs are from Title I, districts are mandated to give priority to homeless students.

* 1. Describe the SEA’s strategies to address problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youths, including problems resulting from enrollment delays and retention, consistent with sections 722(g)(1)(H) and (I) of the McKinney-Vento Act.

The State Coordinator of EHCY and district liaisons provide trainings on best practices for school staff members and service providers. These practices are designed to meet the unique needs of students and youth experiencing homelessness and ensuring that these students attend school regularly.  
  
The district liaison, site advocate, and classroom teacher will coordinate efforts to identify needs of the student or youth and plan enrichment or remediation strategies as needed.

* 1. Assistance from Counselors *(722(g)(1)(K))*: A description of how youths described in section 725(2) will receive assistance from counselors to advise such youths, and prepare and improve the readiness of such youths for college.

Homeless children and youth are provided access to educational and other services that they need to enable them to meet the same challenging State student academic achievement standards to which all students are held. Nevada works with the National Association for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth to provide access to the NAEHCY Higher Education Helpline. This service offers assistance to:

* + 1. Unaccompanied Homeless Youth who want to attend college but aren’t sure what options are available to them to assist in paying for it.
    2. Financial Aid Administrators seeking to assist students experiencing homeless with accessing financial aid.
    3. Higher Education Professionals seeking to link homeless students with the supports they need to succeed in college.
    4. High School Counselors seeking to assist homeless students with applying to and finding resources to pay for college.
    5. State Coordinators for Homeless Education and Local Homeless Education Liaisons seeking to understand what educational rights students experiencing homelessness have in regards to college access and what support options may be available to them.
    6. Parents of students experiencing homelessness who wish to understand what supports may be available to their students to help them attend college.

# Consolidated State Plan Assurances

*Instructions: Each SEA submitting a consolidated State plan must review the assurances below and demonstrate agreement by selecting the boxes provided.*

**Coordination.** The SEA must assure that it coordinated its plans for administering the included programs, other programs authorized under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the Rehabilitation Act, the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, the Head Start Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, the Education Technical Assistance Act of 2002, the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act, and the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act.

**Challenging academic standards and academic assessments.** The SEA must assure that the State will meet the standards and assessments requirements of sections 1111(b)(1)(A)-(F) and 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA and applicable regulations.

**State support and improvement for low performing schools.** The SEA must assure that it will approve, monitor, and periodically review LEA comprehensive support and improvement plans consistent with requirements in section 1111(d)(1)(B)(v) and (vi) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(e).

**Participation by private school children and teachers.** The SEA must assure that it will meet the requirements of sections 1117 and 8501 of the ESEA regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.

**Appropriate identification of children with disabilities.** The SEA must assure that it has policies and procedures in effect regarding the appropriate identification of children with disabilities consistent with the child find and evaluation requirements in section 612(a)(3) and (a)(7) of the IDEA, respectively.

**Ensuring equitable access to Federal programs.** The SEA must assure that, consistent with section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), it described the steps the SEA will take to ensure equitable access to and participation in the included programs for students, teachers and other program beneficiaries with special needs as addressed in sections described below (e.g., 4.3 State Support and Improvement for Low-performing Schools, 5.3 Educator Equity).   
Available in March 2017.

# APPENDICES

| **APPENDIX LETTER** | **Page Number** | **Document Title** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| A | 65 | Measurements of Interim Progress |
| B | 67 | Educator Equity Differences in Rates Tables |
| C | 68 | Educator Equity Extension Plan and Differences in Rates Tables |
| D | 70 | ESSA Work Group Recommendations |
| E | 78 | Nevada’s Approach to Differentiated School Support & Improvement |
| F | 80 | Overview of ESSA Programs and Budgets |
| G | 82 | Nevada Educator Performance Framework for Teachers |
| H | 83 | Staffing / Vacancy Data Comparisons (2015-16 to 2016-17) |

**Appendix A: Measurments of interim progress**

*Instructions: Each SEA must include the measurements of interim progress for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency consistent with the long-term goals described in Section 1 for all students and separately for each subgroup of students (except that measurements of interim progress for English language proficiency must only be described for English learners), consistent with the State's minimum number of students. For academic achievement and graduation rates, the State’s measurements of interim progress require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that are lower-achieving or graduating at lower rates, respectively.*

**A. Academic Achievement**

**Smarter Balanced**

| **Nevada Goal Description** | **Current Percent Proficient** | **Annual**  **ELA Targets** | **Annual Math Targets** | **Interim Proficient Goal: 2020** | **Long-Term Proficient Goal: 2022** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The fastest improving state on Smarter Balanced | 2015-16  ELA  48%  Math 34% | 2016-17  51%  2017-18 54% 2018-19 57% | 2016-17  36% 2017-18 37% 2018-19 38% | ELA  59%  Math 39% | ELA  61%  Math 41% |

**ACT**

| **Nevada Goal Description** | **Baseline Composite Score** | **Annual Targets** | **Interim Score Goal: 2020** | **Long-Term Score Goal: 2022** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The fastest improving state on the ACT composite score. | 2015-16  17.7 | 2016-17  17.9  2017-18  18.1  2018-19  18.3 | 18.5 | 20 |

**B. Graduation Rates**

**Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate**

| **Nevada Goal Description** | **Class of 2015 Rate** | **Annual Targets** | **Interim Graduation Rate Goal: 2020** | **Long-Term Graduation Rate Goal: 2022** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The fastest improving state on graduation rate | 70.77% | 2016-17  73%  2017-18  75%  2018-19  77% | 80% | 84% |

**5-year adjusted cohort graduation rate**

| **Nevada Goal Description** | **Class of 2015 Rate** | **Annual Targets** | **Interim Graduation Rate Goal: 2020** | **Long-Term Graduation Rate Goal: 2022** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The fastest improving state on graduation rate | 72%% | 2016-17  74%  2017-18  76%  2018-19  78% | 82% | 86% |

**C. English Language Proficiency**

| **Nevada Goal Description** | **ELP Baseline Score** | **Annual Targets** | **Interim Score Goal: 2020** | **Long-Term Score Goal: 2022** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The fastest improving state on the English language proficiency assessment | 24.9% | 2016-17  25%  2017-18  38%  2018-19  51% | 64% | 90% |

**Appendix B: EDUCATOR EQUITY DIFFERENCES IN RATES**

*Instructions: Each SEA must complete the appropriate table(s) below. Each SEA calculating and reporting student-level data must complete, at a minimum, the table under the header “Differences in Rates Calculated Using Student-Level Data”.*

Nevada Department of Education does not currently have a system in place to calculate educator equity rates using student-level data.

**DIFFERENCES IN RATES CALCULATED USING STUDENT-LEVEL DATA**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STUDENT GROUPS | Rate at which students are taught by an **ineffective** teacher | Differences between rates | Rate at which students are taught by an **out-of-field** teacher | Differences between rates | Rate at which students are taught by an **inexperienced** teacher | Differences between rates |
| **Low-income** **students** enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Non-low-income** **students** enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Minority students** enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Non-minority students** enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

**Appendix C: EDUCATOR EQUITY EXTENSION**

*Instructions: If an SEA requests an extension for calculating and reporting student-level educator equity data under 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d)(3), it must: (1) provide a detailed plan and timeline addressing the steps it will take to calculate and report, as expeditiously as possible but no later than three years from the date it submits its initial consolidated State plan, the data required under 34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c)(3)(i) at the student level and (2) complete the tables below.*

**DIFFERENCES IN RATES CALCULATED USING DATA OTHER THAN STUDENT-LEVEL DATA**

NDE does not currently have a system in place to calculate educator equity rates using student-level data. The most recent analysis and reporting of Nevada educator equity data is outlined in the Nevada Plan for Equitable Access to Excellent Educators that was submitted to US ED in June 2015 and approved on September 10, 2015. This information is reflected in the table below and reflects 2013-14 educator data. Regarding this data, it is important to note the following:

1. Two of the three measures (out-of-field and inexperienced) were included.
2. “Inexperienced was defined as teachers who are in their first year of practice (Due to limitations with data collection / reporting processes, this data reflects those who are in their first year of practice in the state of Nevada only). Future plans will reflect overall total years of experience.
3. “Out of field” was defined as one who has licensure in an areas other than the subject of a teacher’s current assignment.
4. The ineffective measure is not included, as the NEPF was not yet implemented statewide. (Educator evaluation data was collected by NDE for the first time in 2017, using 2015-16 school year ratings.)
5. Rates for “Non-Highly Qualified” teachers (pursuant to the NCLB definition) are included, since these data were collected and used to develop the 2015 Plan. “Full-state certification” will be used in future plans.

[The Plan](http://doe.nv.gov/Educator_Effectiveness/Educator_Develop_Support/Nevada_Equity_Plan/) in its entirety is available on the NDE website.

| STUDENT GROUPS | Rate at which students are taught by an **ineffective** teacher | Differences between rates | Rate at which students are taught by an **out-of-field** teacher | Differences between rates | Rate at which students are taught by an **inexperienced** teacher | Differences between rates |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Low-income** **students** | N/A | N/A | 0.23% | -0.65% | 14.18% | 8.89% |
| **Non-low-income students** | N/A | 0.88% | 5.29% |
| **Minority students** | N/A | N/A | 0.26% | -0.86% | 14.83% | 8.27% |
| **Non-minority students** | N/A | 1.12% | 6.56% |

If the SEA has defined other optional key terms, it must complete the table below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STUDENT GROUPS | Rate at which students are taught by Non-Highly Qualified Teacher | Differences between rates | Rate at which students are taught by ENTER STATE-IDENTIFIED TERM 2 | Differences between rates | Rate at which students are taught by ENTER STATE-IDENTIFIED TERM 3 | Differences between rates |
| **Low-income** **students** | 7.86% | 3.30% | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Non-low-income** **students** | 4.56% | N/A | N/A |
| **Minority students** | 7.57% | 3.98% | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Non-minority students** | 3.59% | N/A | N/A |

**Appendix D: eSSA WORK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS**

*Accountability Work Group*

| **#** | **Recommendation** | **ESSA Advisory Group Decision** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Accountability measures of workforce/college and career (CCR) readiness should only apply to high schools. | Approved |
| 2 | Use the ACT and ACT Work Keys Assessment as a measure of CCR. | Approved |
| 3 | Indicate the percentage of students taking the ACT and/or ACT Work Keys and the average score earned on the ACT and ACT Work Keys in the NSPF school rating. | Approved |
| 4 | Clarify/communicate the NSPF measures and meaning. | Approved |
| 5 | Revise the NSPF to include trends in accountability measures including reporting on subgroup measurements (EL, FRPC, etc.). | Approved |
| 6 | Ensure the rating system addresses the progress that all student groups make in order to provide an equitable picture and demonstrate school achievement. | Approved |
| 7 | Measure school offerings of courses with supports and accommodations to all students. | Review feasibility |
| 8 | Track the growth of students as individual learners. | Included in NSPF |
| 9 | Promote and track student access and participation in before and after school clubs, sports, enrichment, and/or activities. | Review feasibility |
| 10 | Compare percentage of clubs and capacity to the percentage of students enrolled. Schools allocate adequate funding and personnel for before and after school activities. | Review feasibility |
| 11 | Track staff attendance. | Recommend for District framework |
| 12 | Track staff continuity and transiency. | Recommend for reporting but not Accountability framework |
| 13 | Use an N-size of 10 for all accountability determinations. | Convene technical advisory group to review |
| 14 | Calculation of 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (ACGR) should also include ESSA’s Section 1111(c)(4)(F) “Partial Attendance” requirement. | Study impact |
| 15 | Identify “Comprehensive Intervention” high schools based on more than just the 4-year ACGR graduation rates. | Approved |
| 16 | At the District level, measure access to a Well-Rounded Education. | Approved |
| 17 | Measure a District’s collaborative communication plan. | Reporting and transparency only through link to school or district communications plan, if feasible |

*Assessment Work Group*

| **#** | **Recommendation** | **ESSA Advisory Group Decision** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | End of Course Exams (EOCs) should be offered more often than once per year, and extend the testing window to include the last week of the school year for all Nevada school districts. | Approved |
| 2 | Implement multiple assessments for the Nevada Alternative Assessments (NAA). | Approved |
| 3 | Provide educational institutions with a more accurate measure of EL students’ progress over time (i.e. after they have exited EL services). | Approved |
| 4 | Create assessment advisory group for communication from Nevada Department of Education (NDE) to Nevada districts. | Approved |
| 5 | Assess social and emotional skills (soft skills) development. | Consider for dashboard, if feasible |
| 6 | Utilize non-profits, community partners, institutions of higher learning, and others, to build a network of providers to support the Nevada State Assessment System and assessment related services. | Not Approved |
| 7 | Leverage Smarter Balanced Digital Library, interim assessments and summative assessments to provide actionable feedback to educators that can be used to adjust ongoing instruction to meet the need of individual students. | Approved |

*English Language Learner Work Group*

| **#** | **Recommendation** | **ESSA Advisory Group Decision** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Accountability: Use Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP) as English learner accountability measure. | Approved |
| 2 | Accountability: Include English Learner performance in reporting annually. | Approved |
| 3 | Accountability: Include English Learners performance across all grade levels in accountability system. | Approved |
| 4 | Accountability: Ensure that the weighting of English language development in new accountability determinations is meaningful. | Approved |
| 5 | Accountability: Include former English Learner performance in accountability for four years | Approved |
| 6 | Accountability: Include recently arrived English Learners in assessment in first year; include them in accountability results beginning year three | Approved |
| 7 | Statewide Identification and Reclassification: Nevada should adopt the updated Nevada English Learner Program Flowchart as the standardized, statewide procedure to identify and reclassify English learners. | Approved |
| 8 | Statewide Identification and Reclassification: Convene multi-specialty expert work groups to establish formal protocols to ensure consistent implementation that ensures appropriate decisions are made and that the rights of English learners are safeguarded. | Approved |
| 9 | Statewide Identification and Reclassification: Seek state funding to support districts in the monitoring and support of students reclassified English proficient during the 4- year period following reclassification. | Approved |
| 10 | Statewide Identification and Reclassification: Periodically review the proficiency scores on the WIDA ACCESS assessment used to determine English language proficiency for the state of Nevada to ensure that the criteria are appropriately aligned with the academic language needs of students to ensure access to state academic content standards. | Approved |
| 11 | Long-term English Learners:  Define Long-term English learner as an English learner who has not achieved English language proficiency within 6 years of initial classification. | Approved |
| 12 | Long-term English Learners:  Schools/districts should be required to provide language instruction educational program models, which are specifically designed, for long-term English learners. | Approved |
| 13 | Long-term English Learners:  Ensurethat teachers and administrators receive the professional learning necessary to build capacity to provide language instruction educational program models that are designed to meet the unique needs of long-term English learners. | Approved |

*School Improvement Work Group*

| **#** | **Recommendation** | **ESSA Advisory Group Decision** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | NDE’s role in school improvement should move form compliance to collaboration. This means:   * providing structure/framework for the consolidated application (needs assessment, school performance plan, grant applications, etc.) * facilitate the sharing of resources and best practices * data collection/monitoring * collaborate and support when completing required documentation throughout the year, i.e., needs assessment to monitoring reports. Emphasis on working collaboratively to set goals when creating the SPP and choosing evidence-based programs for improvement. * technical assistance * identifying funding aligned to needs assessment * articulate course of action for those not meeting goals * identifying schools (designations) ensuring timeliness and quality of data | Approved |
| 2 | NDE should provide districts and schools with the following:   * assistance with capacity building * a gradual release of support to schools as they improve * hierarchy of supports at state, district, school levels * regular school support meetings * action plan and aligned timelines * clear and consistent messaging of federal and state requirements * clearly defined expectations * competence | Approved |
| 3 | NDE should help districts and schools create strong improvement plans by:   * providing examples * building a hierarchy of support with action plan and timeline (MTSS model) * creating flexibility to address unique needs * providing resource lists * providing PD on data-based decision making and evidence-based strategies * Technical assistance * Have clear, consistent, well-defined expectations/requirements for school improvement aligned to Framework for 3-stars and above * Guide/facilitate the SPP process for priority districts/schools based on needs/capacity. | Approved |
| 4 | Expectations for Level 1 and 2 Schools:  Level 1 (Accelerated Support includes Comprehensive Schools)   * SEA and LEA approves School Performance Plan * Complete interim needs assessment every year and full assessment every 3 years; * SEA monitors progress in collaboration with the LEA and school team * Must show rapid improvements (within 3 years) in Conditions for School Effectiveness; * Schools receive priority assistance from NDE, both in strategies, technical assistance and funding; * Schools can be designated Turnaround.   Level 2 (Priority Support includes Targeted Schools)   * LEA approves School Performance Plan * Complete interim needs assessment every year and full assessment every 3 years; * Schools receive priority assistance from NDE, both in strategies, technical assistance and funding; * LEA monitors benchmark progress throughout the year; * Schools can be designated Turnaround. | Approved |
| 5 | Expectations for Level 3 and 4 Schools:  Level 3 (Coordinated Support)   * LEA reviews and monitors the School Performance Plan (SPP); * Must complete a needs assessment every 3 years; * NDE and/or LEA supports schools in area of need.   Level 4 (Self Support)   * Considerable autonomy and flexibility; * LEA reviews and monitors the School Performance Plan (SPP); * Must complete a needs assessment every 3 years; * LEA led support as needed; * Has access to NDE tools and resources as needed. | Approved |


*Funding Streams Work Group*

| **#** | **Recommendation** | **ESSA Advisory Group Decision** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Create a process by which the Department solicits, reviews, and establishes a list of evidence-based programs. In this work, the Department will include learnings from the field (teachers, existing NV providers, etc.) | Approved |
| 2 | In an effort to create efficiency, the Department will work with districts to create a consolidated application that better facilitates strategic planning. This work would result in the alignment of the needs assessment, strategy selection, and available funding resources. It would also free up time spent on applications so that school site, district, and NDE staff can spend more time in service to students. | Approved |
| 3 | The Department provides written guidance on the allowable uses of federal funds. Guidance must be both relevant and actionable. | Approved |
| 4 | The Department identifies and communicates the SEA strategies that will drive the stat’s strategic use of federal funds.  Leadership: Investment in evidence-based programs to provide sustained support of school leaders (and district teams in certain cases).  Professional Development: NEPF | Approved |
| 5 | Districts perform an audit of existing use of federal funds and identify short, mid, and long-term goals to align funding and high-impact programming. | Approved |

*Teaching and Leading Work Group*

| **#** | **Recommendation** | **ESSA Advisory Group Decision** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Definition of Inexperienced/Experienced Teachers   * “Inexperienced” teachers should be defined as those with less than 3 full years of contracted teaching experience in a K-12 public school. * In addition to “inexperienced” teachers being reported, experience levels of teachers at 5-year intervals (i.e. 5-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 26-30, 31+ years) should be reported for each school. | Approved (with intervals based on capacity for dashboard reporting) |
| 2 | Not Fully Licensed/Out of Field Teachers: Grades/Subjects/Areas of Licensure   * Nevada should report the number/percentage of teachers at each school who are "teaching out-of-field or are not fully state certified" in the following areas:   + Core Content Areas – Math, Language Arts, Science, Social Studies   + Elementary   + Early Childhood   + Special Education * Possible consideration of other areas to report:   + Business and Industry   + Art/Music/PE   + Foreign Languages   + Other Licensed Personnel | Approved Areas Under First Bullet (future consideration for second bullet) |
| 3 | Not Fully Licensed/Out of Field Teachers: Types of Licensure   * Nevada should report the number/percentage of teachers at each school who are teaching with the following:   + Provisional Licenses   + Conditional/Alternative Route to Licensure   + ARC/Option Special Education Program | Approved |
| 4 | Requirements Permitted for Provisional Licensure   * + The following requirements should continue to be permitted for provisional licensure:     - Basic Skills Proficiency     - Subject Area Proficiency     - Pedagogy Proficiency     - Up to 6 Credits of Coursework   Provisional licensure should not be permitted if student teaching requirement has not been met. | Approved (including student teaching) |
| 5 | Other Areas of Data Collection/Reporting   * The number/percentage of teachers with the following licensure endorsements should be reported by school:   + TESL/ELAD   + Reading Specialist   + National Board Certification   + Teacher Leadership\* * Numbers/percentages of the following staffing data should be reported by school:   + Teacher Vacancies   + Teacher Absences   + Long Term Substitutes   + Teacher Turnover/Retention Rates | Approved |
| 6 | Educator Effectiveness: Statewide Educator Evaluation System for Licensed Personnel   * Nevada should maintain a statewide system for evaluation for licensed personnel. * Current measures and percentages of state and district-determined measures should be maintained. | Approved |
| 7 | Educator Effectiveness: Definition of “Ineffective” Teachers and Reporting (Ratings, Standards, Indicators)   * Nevada should use NEPF ratings to define ineffective/effectiveness. * Ineffective and Minimally Effective NEPF ratings should be combined for purposes of federal reporting of “Ineffective” teachers. * For state reporting, all ratings (including Effective and Highly Effective) should be reported separately. * Standard and Indicator-level scores should be reported to identify areas of strength/professional growth. | Approved |
| 8 | Data Collection/Reporting for School Administrators/Leaders   * None of the following should be considered for school-based administrator/leader reporting:   + Inexperienced/Years of Experience   + Effectiveness Ratings   + Areas of Licensure/Endorsements | Not Required for ESSA/For Further Consideration (possible dashboard) |
| 9 | Title II-A Fund Use: State Activities and Districts/Charters  Use of Title II-A funds at state and district/charter levels should be targeted and focused, and aligned with identified state and local human capital needs. | Approved |
| 10 | 3% of Title II-A for Statewide “Principal and Other School Leader” Development  3% of Nevada’s Title II-A allocation should be used for statewide activities related to principal/other school leader development. The funds should be spent on a variety of areas related to leader development, but a portion should focus on NEPF implementation and school turnaround/transformation. | Approved |

**Appendix E: Nevada’s Approach to differentiated school support & improvement**


******

**Appendix F: overview of essa programs and budgets**

| **Title** | **Program** | **Funds Available to Nevada\*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title I, Part A\*** | Improving Basic Programs Operated By State and Local Educational Agencies | Estimated 2017–18 funding: $123.1 million   * + 99% to LEAs=   + $121,869,000   + 1% for state administration= $1,231,000 |
| **Title I, Part B\*** | State Assessment Grants | Estimated 2017–18 funding: $4.7 million |
| **Title I, Part C\*** | Education of Migratory Children | Estimated 2017–18 funding: $210, 361 |
| **Title I, Part D\*** | Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk | Estimated 2017–18 funding: $355, 832 |
| **Title II, Part A\*** | Preparing, Training, and Recruiting High Quality Teachers, Principals, and Other School Leaders | Estimated 2017–18 funding: $12.2 million   * + 95% to LEAs= $11,590,000   + %4 for administrative and state-level activities= $488,000   + 1% for administrative costs = $122,000 |
| **Title II, Part B** | National Activities: Variety of competitive grant opportunities including:   * + Literacy Education for All, Results for the Nation   + Teacher and School Leader Incentive program (Formerly the Teacher Incentive Fund)   + School Leader Recruitment and Support   + STEM Master Teacher Corps | National authorized appropriation for 2017–18: $468,880,575 |
| **Title III\*** | Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students | Estimated 2017–18 funding: $7.6 million |
| **Title IV, Part A\*** | Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants | Estimated 2017–18 funding: $4 million   * + 95% to LEAs= $3,800,000   + 5% for administrative and state-level activities= $200,000 |
| **Title IV, Part B\*** | 21st Century Community Learning Centers | Estimated 2017–18 funding: $7.9 million |
| **Title IV, Part C** | Expanding Opportunity Through Quality Charter schools | Information not yet available. The NDE anticipates that Nevada will apply for funds in 2017–18. |
| **Title IV, Part D** | Magnet Schools Assistance | SEA not eligible for funding |
| **Title IV, Part E** | Family Engagement in Education Programs | SEA not eligible for funding |
| **Title IV, Part F** | National Activities   * + Education innovation and research   + Community support for school success     - Promise neighborhoods and community schools   + National activities for school safety   Academic enrichment | SEA not eligible for funding |
| **Title V\*** | Rural Education Initiative | Estimated 2017–18 funding: $91,429 million |
| **Title VI** | Indian, Native Hawaiian, and Alaska Native Education | SEA not eligible for funding |
| **Title VII** | Impact Aid | SEA not eligible for funding |
| **Title VIII** | General Provisions and Definitions | SEA not eligible for funding |
| **Title IX, Part A\* (Title VII, Subpart B of the McKinney Vento-Homeless Assistance Act)** | Education for Homeless Children and Youth | Estimated 2017–18 funding: $685,268 |
| **Title IX, Part B, Section 9212** | Preschool Development Grants | National authorized appropriation for 2017–18: $40,993,152 |

\*State allocations are preliminary estimates based on currently available data and subject to change. The estimated amount of funds that may be used for state-level administration in Titles IA, IIA, III, and IV A is provided for planning purposes. However, NDE may use a portion of the funds for administrative purposes across programs.

**Appendix G: Nevada educator performance framework for teachers**

******

**appendix H: Staffing/Vacancy Data Comparisons (2015-2016 to 2016-2017)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | | | | | | |
|  | **November 2016**  **Total Staffing** | **Nov 2016 Total Vacancies** | **November 2016 % Vacant Positions** | **December 2015 Total Staffing** | **December 2015 Total Vacancies** | **December 2015 % Vacant Positions** | # Diff from 15-16 to 16-17 | % Diff from 15-16 to 16-17 |
| Statewide | 22,781 | 578 | 2.5% | 21,972 | 817 | 3.7% | -239 | -1.18% |
|  |  |  |  |  | 698 |  | -239 |  |
| Clark | 15,808 | 437 | 2.8% | 15,695 | 698 | 4.4% | -261 | -1.68% |
| Washoe | 4,004 | 34 | 0.8% | 3,127 | 27 | 0.9% | 7 | -0.01% |
| Others/ Rurals | 2,969 | 108 | 3.6% | 3,151 | 92 | 2.9% | 16 | 0.72% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | #DIV/0! |  |  |
| Victory | 1,168 | 47 | 4.0% | 1,071 | 95 | 8.9% | -48 | -4.85% |
| Zoom | 2,638 | 87 | 3.3% | 1,660 | 94 | 5.7% | -7 | -2.36% |
| Focus | 1,153 | 62 | 5.4% | 1,135 | 74 | 6.5% | -12 | -1.14% |
| Priority | 1,371 | 59 | 4.3% | 1,328 | 99 | 7.5% | -40 | -3.15% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-Star | 516 | 25 | 4.8% | 460 | 39 | 8.5% | -14 | -3.63% |
| 2-Star | 4,811 | 218 | 4.5% | 4,729 | 304 | 6.4% | -86 | -1.90% |
| 3-Star | 10,071 | 204 | 2.0% | 9,813 | 354 | 3.6% | -150 | -1.58% |
| 4-Star | 3,672 | 61 | 1.7% | 3,548 | 67 | 1.9% | -6 | -0.23% |
| 5-Star | 3,076 | 40 | 1.3% | 3,000 | 39 | 1.3% | 1 | 0.00% |