

Nevada Department of Education
Consolidated State Plan
Under the Every Student Succeeds Act



U.S. Department of Education

OMB Number: 1810-0576

Expiration Date: November 30, 2019

Paperwork Burden Statement According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0576. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 2181 hour per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this collection, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4537. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this collection, write directly to: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, DC 20202-3118.

Contents


Cover Page	3
Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan.....	9
Letter from the State Superintendent	10
Section 1: Long-term Goals.....	11
Section 2: Consultation and Performance Management.....	32
2.1 Consultation.	32
2.2 System of Performance Management.	35
Section 3: Academic Assessments	39
Section 4: Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools.....	41
4.1 Accountability System.	41
4.2 Identification of Schools.	63
4.3 State Support and Improvement for Low-performing Schools.....	67
Section 5: Supporting Excellent Educators	71
5.1 Educator Development, Retention, and Advancement.	71
5.2 Support for Educators.	74
5.3 Educator Equity.	77
Section 6: Supporting All Students.....	80
6.1 Well-Rounded and Supportive Education for Students.	80
6.2 Program-Specific Requirements.	87
Consolidated State Plan Assurances	106
APPENDICES	107

Cover Page

Contact Information and Signatures	
SEA Contact (Name and Position): Dr. Steve Canavero, State Superintendent	Telephone: 775.687.9217
Mailing Address: 700 E. 5 th Street, Carson City, NV 89701	Email Address: scanavero@doe.nv.gov
<p>By signing this document, I assure that: To the best of my knowledge and belief, all information and data included in this plan are true and correct The SEA will submit a comprehensive set of assurances at a date and time established by the Secretary, including the assurances in ESEA section 8304. Consistent with ESEA section 8302(b)(3), the SEA will meet the requirements of ESEA sections 1117 and 8501 regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.</p>	
Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name) Dr. Steve Canavero	Telephone: 775.687.9217
Signature of Authorized SEA Representative 	Date: 8/4/2017
Governor (Printed Name)	Date SEA provided plan to the Governor under ESEA section 8540: February 10, 2017
Signature of Governor	Date:

Contact Information and Signatures	
SEA Contact (Name and Position): Dr. Steve Canavero, State Superintendent	Telephone: 775.687.9200
Mailing Address: 700 E. 5 th Street Carson City, NV 89701	Email Address: scanavero@doe.nv.gov
<p>By signing this document, I assure that: To the best of my knowledge and belief, all information and data included in this plan are true and correct. The SEA will submit a comprehensive set of assurances at a date and time established by the Secretary, including the assurances in ESEA section 8304. Consistent with ESEA section 8302(b)(3), the SEA will meet the requirements of ESEA sections 1117 and 8501 regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.</p>	
Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name) Dr. Steve Canavero	Telephone: 775.687.9200
Signature of Authorized SEA Representative 	Date: 4.12.17
Governor (Printed Name)	Date SEA provided plan to the Governor under ESEA section 8540: February 10, 2017
Signature of Governor	Date:

*See Next Page for the Governor's Signature

Contact Information and Signatures	
SEA Contact (Name and Position) Dr. Steve Canavero, State Superintendent	Telephone 775.687.9200
Mailing Address: 700 E. 5 th Street Carson City, NV 89701	Email Address: scanavero@doe.nv.gov
Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name) Dr. Steve Canavero	Telephone: 775.687.9200
Signature of Authorized SEA Representative 	Date: April 3, 2017
Signature of Governor (If Applicable) 	Date: April 3, 2017

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. 34
Native Language Assessments	1111(b)(2)(F); 34 CFR 200.6(f)(2)(ii) and (f)(4)	A.3.i-iv	3.B	p. 34
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. 50
Minimum N-Size	1111(c)(3)	A.4.ii.a-e	4.1.C	p. 51
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. 36
Annual Meaningful Differentiation	1111(c)(4)(C)	A.4.v.a-c	4.1.D; 4.1.G	p. 53
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. 62
Annual Measurement of Achievement	1111(c)(4)(E)(iii)	A.4.vii	4.1.E	p. 59
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. 62; p.64; p. 67
Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators	1111(g)(1) (B)	A.5	5.3.B-C	p. 75
School Conditions	1111(g)(1)(C)	A.6	6.1.C	p. 84
School Transitions	1111(g)(1)(D)	A.7	6.1.A-B	p. 79
Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children				

State Plan Requirements by Program	Statutory and Regulatory Requirements	Item(s) from Revised Template	Item(s) from Original Template	First Page Number
Supporting Needs of Migratory Children	1304(b)(1)	B.1.i-iv	6.2.B.ii –iii and vi	p. 86; p. 88
Promote Coordination of Services	1304(b)(3)	B.2	6.2.B.iv	p. 87
Use of Funds	1304(b)(4)	B.3	6.2.B.viii	p. 92
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. 94
Program Objectives and Outcomes	1414(a)(2)(A)	C.2	6.2.C.ii	p. 95
Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction				
Use of Funds	2101(d)(2)(A) and (D)	D.1	5.2.A	p. 74
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. 74; p. 76
System of Certification and Licensing	2101(d)(2)(B)	D.3	5.1.A	p. 71
Improving Skills of Educators	2101(d)(2)(J)	D.4	5.2.B	p. 74
Data and Consultation	2101(d)(2)(K)	D.5	2.C-D	p. 31
Teacher Preparation	2101(d)(2)(M)	D.6	5.1.B	p. 72
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. 96
SEA Support for English Learner Progress	3113(b)(6)	E.2.i-ii	--	p. 17
Monitoring and Technical Assistance	3113(b)(8)	E.3.i-ii	2.2.B and D	p. 29; p. 31
Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants				
Use of Funds	4103(c)(2)(A)	F.1	6.1.A-E	p. 79

State Plan Requirements by Program	Statutory and Regulatory Requirements	Item(s) from Revised Template	Item(s) from Original Template	First Page Number
Awarding Subgrants	4103(c)(2)(B)	F.2	--	p. 81
Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers				
Use of Funds	4203(a)(2)	G.1	6.2.E.i	p. 99
Awarding Subgrants	4203(a)(4)	G.2	6.2.E.ii	p. 100
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. 101
Technical Assistance	5223(b)(3)	H.2	2.2.D	p. 31
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. 101
Dispute Resolution	722(g)(1)(C)	I.2	6.2.G.iii	p. 102
Support for School Personnel	722(g)(1)(D)	I.3	6.2.G.ii	p. 101
Access to Services	722(g)(1)(F)(i)	I.4	6.2.G.v.1 and 2; 6.2.G.iv	p. 103
Strategies to Address Other Problems	722(g)(1)(H)	I.5.i-v	6.2.G.vi	p. 105
Policies to Remove Barriers	722(g)(1)(I)	I.6	6.2.G.vi	p. 105
Assistance from Counselors	722(g)(1)(K)	I.7	--	p. 105

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 meetings 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.

A. Academic Achievement.

- i. **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.

ii. 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)
Hispanic	39.6% (2016)	55.6% (2022)	29.6% (2016)	48.2% (2022)
Asian	71.4% (2016)	78.9% (2022)	63.6% (2016)	73.3% (2022)
African- American	33.0% (2016)	50.8% (2022)	21.1% (2016)	42.0% (2022)
Native American	32.9% (2016)	50.7% (2022)	23.4% (2016)	43.7% (2022)
Pacific Islander	50.9% (2016)	63.9% (2022)	39.7% (2016)	55.7% (2022)
Caucasian	62.0% (2016)	72.1% (2022)	52.5% (2016)	65.1% (2022)
Multi-Race	58.5% (2016)	69.5% (2022)	47.8% (2016)	61.6% (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 II: Baseline Data and Year	Reading/ Language Arts II: Long-term Goal	Mathematics II: Baseline Data and Year	Mathematics II: 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)

Subgroups	Reading/ Language Arts I: Baseline Data and Year	Reading/ Language Arts I: Long-term Goal	Mathematics I: Baseline Data and Year	Mathematics I: Long-term Goal
All students	68.5% (2016)	76.8% (2022)	74.5% (2016)	81.3% (2022)
Economically disadvantaged students	60.7% (2016)	71.1% (2022)	67.7% (2016)	76.2% (2022)
Children with disabilities	32.7% (2016)	50.5% (2022)	53.9% (2016)	66.1% (2022)
English learners	36.9% (2016)	53.6% (2022)	59.5% (2016)	70.2% (2022)
Hispanic	63.1% (2016)	72.9% (2022)	69.7% (2016)	77.7% (2022)
Asian	83.4% (2016)	87.8% (2022)	86.8% (2016)	90.3% (2022)
African American	48.8% (2016)	62.4% (2022)	61.6% (2016)	71.8% (2022)
Native American	69.3% (2016)	77.4% (2022)	68.9% (2016)	77.1% (2022)
Pacific Islander	65.2% (2016)	74.4% (2022)	77.9% (2016)	83.8% (2022)
Caucasian	77.5% (2016)	83.5% (2022)	81.0% (2016)	86.0% (2022)
Multi-race	73.8% (2016)	80.7% (2022)	78.5% (2016)	84.2% (2022)

Nevada also set annual measures of interim progress for academic achievement toward our long-term goals.

Long Term Goals and Measures of Interim Progress: Elementary School ELA/Math (Smarter Balance Assessments)

ELA		2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Elementary School	All	49.9%	52.4%	54.7%	57.0%	59.2%	61.2%	63.1%
	Hispanic	39.6%	42.6%	45.5%	48.2%	50.8%	53.2%	55.6%
	Asian	71.4%	72.8%	74.1%	75.4%	76.7%	77.8%	78.9%
	African-American	33.0%	36.4%	39.6%	42.6%	45.4%	48.2%	50.8%
	Native American	32.9%	36.3%	39.5%	42.5%	45.4%	48.1%	50.7%
	Pacific Islander	50.9%	53.3%	55.7%	57.9%	60.0%	62.0%	63.9%
	Caucasian	62.0%	63.9%	65.7%	67.4%	69.0%	70.6%	72.1%
	Multi-race	58.5%	60.6%	62.6%	64.4%	66.2%	67.9%	69.5%
	Children with Disabilities	18.3%	22.4%	26.3%	30.0%	33.5%	36.8%	39.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37.9%	41.0%	44.0%	46.8%	49.4%	51.9%	54.4%
	EL (Current + Former)	31.7%	35.1%	38.4%	41.4%	44.4%	47.2%	49.8%

Math		2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Elementary School	All	39.9%	42.9%	45.8%	48.5%	51.1%	53.5%	55.8%
	Hispanic	29.6%	33.1%	36.5%	39.6%	42.7%	45.5%	48.2%
	Asian	63.6%	65.4%	67.2%	68.8%	70.4%	71.9%	73.3%
	African-American	21.1%	25.0%	28.8%	32.3%	35.7%	38.9%	42.0%
	Native American	23.4%	27.2%	30.9%	34.3%	37.6%	40.7%	43.7%
	Pacific Islander	39.7%	42.7%	45.6%	48.3%	50.9%	53.4%	55.7%
	Caucasian	52.5%	54.9%	57.2%	59.3%	61.3%	63.3%	65.1%
	Multi-race	47.8%	50.4%	52.9%	55.3%	57.5%	59.6%	61.6%
	Children with Disabilities	16.7%	20.9%	24.8%	28.6%	32.1%	35.5%	38.8%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28.8%	32.4%	35.7%	39.0%	42.0%	44.9%	47.7%
	EL (Current + Former)	25.1%	28.8%	32.4%	35.8%	39.0%	42.0%	44.9%

Long Term Goals and Measures of Interim Progress: Middle School ELA/Math (Smarter Balance Assessments)

ELA		2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Middle School	All	46.4%	49.1%	51.7%	54.1%	56.4%	58.6%	60.6%
	Hispanic	36.0%	39.2%	42.2%	45.1%	47.9%	50.5%	53.0%
	Asian	71.9%	73.3%	74.6%	75.9%	77.1%	78.2%	79.3%
	African-American	27.5%	31.1%	34.5%	37.8%	40.9%	43.9%	46.7%
	Native American	34.0%	37.3%	40.5%	43.4%	46.3%	49.0%	51.5%
	Pacific Islander	45.4%	48.1%	50.7%	53.2%	55.5%	57.8%	59.9%
	Caucasian	60.7%	62.7%	64.6%	66.3%	68.0%	69.6%	71.1%
	Multi-race	54.8%	57.1%	59.2%	61.3%	63.2%	65.0%	66.8%
	Children with Disabilities	9.0%	13.5%	17.8%	21.9%	25.8%	29.6%	33.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35.1%	38.3%	41.4%	44.4%	47.1%	49.8%	52.3%
	EL (Current + Former)	11.7%	16.1%	20.3%	24.3%	28.1%	31.7%	35.1%

Math		2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Middle School	All	26.0%	29.7%	33.2%	36.5%	39.7%	42.7%	45.6%
	Hispanic	17.5%	21.6%	25.5%	29.3%	32.8%	36.2%	39.4%
	Asian	51.7%	54.1%	56.4%	58.6%	60.6%	62.6%	64.5%
	African-American	10.8%	15.2%	19.5%	23.5%	27.3%	31.0%	34.4%
	Native American	16.4%	20.6%	24.6%	28.4%	31.9%	35.3%	38.6%
	Pacific Islander	26.4%	30.1%	33.6%	36.9%	40.1%	43.1%	45.9%
	Caucasian	38.3%	41.4%	44.4%	47.1%	49.8%	52.3%	54.7%
	Multi-race	30.8%	34.2%	37.5%	40.6%	43.6%	46.4%	49.1%
	Children with Disabilities	5.1%	9.8%	14.3%	18.6%	22.7%	26.5%	30.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.4%	21.5%	25.5%	29.2%	32.7%	36.1%	39.3%
	EL (Current + Former)	6.9%	11.6%	16.0%	20.2%	24.2%	28.0%	31.6%

Long Term Goals and Measures of Interim Progress: High School ELA 1, Math 1/Int 1 (End of Course Assessments) Note: For EdFacts reporting, Nevada reports on ELA 1 and Math 1 Performance.

ELA 1		2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
High School	All	68.5%	70.1%	71.6%	73.0%	74.3%	75.6%	76.8%
	Hispanic	63.1%	64.9%	66.7%	68.4%	69.9%	71.4%	72.9%
	Asian	83.4%	84.2%	85.0%	85.8%	86.5%	87.2%	87.8%
	African-American	48.8%	51.4%	53.8%	56.1%	58.3%	60.4%	62.4%
	Native American	69.3%	70.8%	72.3%	73.7%	75.0%	76.2%	77.4%
	Pacific Islander	65.2%	66.9%	68.6%	70.2%	71.7%	73.1%	74.4%
	Caucasian	77.5%	78.6%	79.7%	80.7%	81.7%	82.6%	83.5%
	Multi-race	73.8%	75.1%	76.4%	77.5%	78.7%	79.7%	80.7%
	Children with Disabilities	32.7%	36.1%	39.3%	42.3%	45.2%	47.9%	50.5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60.7%	62.7%	64.5%	66.3%	68.0%	69.6%	71.1%
	EL (Current + Former)	36.9%	40.1%	43.1%	45.9%	48.6%	51.2%	53.6%

Math1/Int 1		2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
High School	All	74.5%	75.8%	77.0%	78.1%	79.2%	80.3%	81.3%
	Hispanic	69.7%	71.2%	72.7%	74.0%	75.3%	76.6%	77.7%
	Asian	86.8%	87.5%	88.1%	88.7%	89.2%	89.8%	90.3%
	African-American	61.6%	63.5%	65.3%	67.1%	68.7%	70.3%	71.8%
	Native American	68.9%	70.5%	71.9%	73.3%	74.7%	75.9%	77.1%
	Pacific Islander	77.9%	79.0%	80.1%	81.1%	82.0%	82.9%	83.8%
	Caucasian	81.0%	82.0%	82.9%	83.7%	84.5%	85.3%	86.0%
	Multi-race	78.5%	79.5%	80.6%	81.5%	82.4%	83.3%	84.2%
	Children with Disabilities	53.9%	56.2%	58.4%	60.5%	62.5%	64.3%	66.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	67.7%	69.3%	70.8%	72.3%	73.7%	75.0%	76.2%
	EL (Current + Former)	59.5%	61.5%	63.4%	65.2%	67.0%	68.6%	70.2%

Long Term Goals and Measures of Interim Progress: High School ELA 2, Math 2/Int 2 (End of Course Assessments)

ELA 2		2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
High School	All	68.6%	70.2%	71.7%	73.1%	74.4%	75.7%	76.9%
	Hispanic	63.1%	64.9%	66.7%	68.4%	69.9%	71.4%	72.9%
	Asian	83.2%	84.0%	84.8%	85.6%	86.3%	87.0%	87.7%
	African-American	45.0%	47.8%	50.4%	52.8%	55.2%	57.4%	59.6%
	Native American	70.5%	72.0%	73.4%	74.7%	76.0%	77.2%	78.3%
	Pacific Islander	65.9%	67.6%	69.2%	70.8%	72.2%	73.6%	74.9%
	Caucasian	77.2%	78.3%	79.4%	80.5%	81.4%	82.4%	83.2%
	Multi-race	73.9%	75.2%	76.4%	77.6%	78.7%	79.8%	80.8%
	Children with Disabilities	33.4%	36.7%	39.9%	42.9%	45.8%	48.5%	51.0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58.7%	60.8%	62.7%	64.6%	66.4%	68.0%	69.6%
	EL (Current + Former)	29.4%	32.9%	36.3%	39.5%	42.5%	45.4%	48.1%

Math 2/Int 2		2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
High School	All	34.0%	37.3%	40.4%	43.4%	46.2%	48.9%	51.5%
	Hispanic	24.6%	28.4%	32.0%	35.4%	38.6%	41.7%	44.6%
	Asian	57.2%	59.3%	61.4%	63.3%	65.1%	66.9%	68.5%
	African-American	15.3%	19.6%	23.6%	27.4%	31.0%	34.5%	37.8%
	Native American	25.6%	29.3%	32.9%	36.2%	39.4%	42.4%	45.3%
	Pacific Islander	32.0%	35.4%	38.6%	41.7%	44.6%	47.3%	50.0%
	Caucasian	43.4%	46.2%	48.9%	51.5%	53.9%	56.2%	58.4%
	Multi-race	38.5%	41.6%	44.5%	47.3%	49.9%	52.4%	54.8%
	Children with Disabilities	8.9%	13.4%	17.8%	21.9%	25.8%	29.5%	33.0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23.5%	27.3%	31.0%	34.4%	37.7%	40.8%	43.8%
	EL (Current + Former)	8.6%	13.2%	17.5%	21.6%	25.6%	29.3%	32.8%

B. Graduation Rate.

- i. **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
 - a. 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.

ii. 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)
Caucasian	79.9% (2016)	89.0% (2022)
Multi-Race	76.8% (2016)	87.0% (2022)

4-Year ACGR	Class of 2016	Class of 2017	Class of 2018	Class of 2019	Class of 2020	Class of 2021	Class of 2022
Asian	87.9%	88.3%	88.6%	89.0%	89.3%	89.7%	90.0%
Caucasian	79.9%	81.4%	82.9%	84.4%	86.0%	87.5%	89.0%
Multi-race	76.8%	78.5%	80.2%	81.9%	83.6%	85.3%	87.0%
Pacific Islander	75.9%	77.6%	79.3%	81.0%	82.6%	84.3%	86.0%
All	73.6%	75.3%	77.0%	78.8%	80.5%	82.3%	84.0%
Hispanic	69.7%	71.8%	73.8%	75.9%	77.9%	80.0%	82.0%
Economically Disadvantaged	66.7%	69.1%	71.5%	73.9%	76.2%	78.6%	81.0%
Native American	64.7%	67.3%	69.8%	72.4%	74.9%	77.5%	80.0%
African-American	56.5%	59.6%	62.7%	65.8%	68.8%	71.9%	75.0%
EL (Current + Former)	42.6%	47.2%	51.7%	56.3%	60.9%	65.4%	70.0%
Children with Disabilities	29.3%	34.4%	39.5%	44.6%	49.8%	54.9%	60.0%

- iii. 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.

The five-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)

5-Year ACGR		Class of 2015	Class of 2016	Class of 2017	Class of 2018	Class of 2019	Class of 2020	Class of 2021	Class of 2022
High School	Asian	85.5%	86.4%	87.4%	88.3%	89.2%	90.1%	91.1%	92.0%
	Caucasian	78.3%	80.1%	82.0%	83.8%	85.6%	87.4%	89.2%	91.0%
	Multi-race	77.6%	79.2%	80.9%	82.5%	84.1%	85.7%	87.4%	89.0%
	Pacific Islander	76.1%	77.8%	79.5%	81.2%	82.9%	84.6%	86.3%	88.0%
	All	72.0%	74.0%	76.0%	78.0%	80.0%	82.0%	84.0%	86.0%
	Hispanic	64.2%	67.1%	69.9%	72.7%	75.5%	78.4%	81.2%	84.0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65.9%	68.3%	70.8%	73.2%	75.7%	78.1%	80.6%	83.0%
	Native American	52.9%	57.1%	61.2%	65.4%	69.5%	73.7%	77.8%	82.0%
	African-American	56.5%	59.4%	62.3%	65.3%	68.2%	71.1%	74.1%	77.0%
	EL (Current + Former)	31.7%	37.4%	43.2%	48.9%	54.7%	60.5%	66.2%	72.0%
	Children with Disabilities	29.1%	33.8%	38.5%	43.2%	47.9%	52.6%	57.3%	62.0%

C. English Language Proficiency.

- i. **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.

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

Nevada	Expected	Time to	English	Language	Proficiency		
Initial ELP Level	Expected Target	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
1 - Entering	Expected Proficiency Level	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 4	Level 5
	Expected Progress	1.5-1.9	2.0-2.9	3.0-3.9	4.0-4.5	4.6-4.9	5.0+
2 - Emerging	Expected Proficiency Level	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 4	Level 5	
	Expected Progress	2.0-2.9	3.0-3.9	4.0-4.5	4.6-4.9	5.0+	
3- Developing	Expected Proficiency Level	Level 3	Level 4	Level 4	Level 5		
	Expected Progress	3.0-3.9	4.0-4.5	4.6-4.9	5.0+		
4 - Expanding	Expected Proficiency Level	Level 4	Level 4	Level 5			
	Expected Progress	4.0-4.5	4.6-4.9	5.0+			
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

2. 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.

- ii. 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)
EL Proficiency: English learners meeting Nevada’s EL exit criteria over a 6-year period	24.9% (2016)	90% (2022)
EL Progress: English learners achieving adequate growth toward English proficiency	46.8% (2016)	80% (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%
EL Progress toward Proficiency		2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
All English Learners	% English learners achieving AGP toward ELP	Baseline 46.8%	46%	53%	60%	67%	74%	80%

In order to assist eligible entities in meeting State-designed long-term goal for progress in achieving English language proficiency and meeting challenging academic standards, NDE identifies eligible entities to provide technical support through data analysis of the State’s English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA). Districts that have schools in the lowest quartile and/or fail to meet the Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP) on the ELPA - an outcome measure of 50% of English learners at or above the 50th percentile - are targeted for support. Technical Assistance will be provided in one or more of the following areas:

- NDE will develop a system to track annually the LEAs progress in meeting interim and long-term English language proficiency and academic achievement goals.
- NDE will inform eligible entities in August of each school year of their status in meeting the interim and long-term English language proficiency and academic achievement goals. NDE will schedule on-site or virtual consultation.
- On-site district and school visitations that include classroom observations will be conducted to provide feedback to the district and school on the implementation of evidence-based NDE approved Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) models.
- Title III eligible entities will be provided technical support from a NDE cross-functional, collaborative team (subrecipient monitoring) in areas identified through the needs assessment of Title I schools identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) and Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI).
- LEAs will have opportunities to participate in professional development (supporting ELD instruction) conducted by NDE staff or contracted with WIDA for workshops and supports based on the identified need.
- A new model for Nevada EL Professional Development Plan will be implemented in 2017-18. The comprehensive professional State learning plan will build and sustain a system of learning for practitioners leading or teaching English learners. The 2-year plan supported by the WIDA professional

development staff will provide facilitation training to a selected cohort from across the state to provide professional development and support within districts. The intended outcome is to build teacher and administrator capacity to address the academic language and content demands for English learners.

- The Nevada EL Professional Development Plan will be coordinated with the State's four (4) Regional Professional Development Programs and Nevada System of Higher Education programs providing TESL (Teaching English as a Second Language) and ELAD (English Language Acquisition Development) endorsements.
 - The trained facilitators will be a high leverage strategy to build a State's vision for English learners and the English language development and content instructional capacity of educators.
- The State will conduct a correlation study to ensure that English learners who pass the ELPA also meet the state content assessments.
- NDE will assist eligible entities in helping to ensure that English learners meet challenging State Academic standards by implementing the monitoring process of English learners who are reclassified up to 4 years.
- NDE is in the process of developing a protocol to provide additional supports and or program services to English learners not meeting state academic standards.

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.*

A. 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.

- B. 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:
- i. 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.

- ii. 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, Nevada Early Childhood Advisory Council, 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.

C. 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.

- A. 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.

- B. 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 is developing a comprehensive and evidence-based monitoring system that provides a primary focus on indicators that leverage increased student achievement and ensure compliance with federal requirements and the appropriate use of federal funds. Instead of multiple NDE teams independently monitoring their own respective program several times a year within a district and its schools, NDE cross-departmental and –functional teams will operate in a coherent and highly coordinated fashion in a redesigned and evolving monitoring system. These cross-departmental and –functional NDE teams will conduct risk analyses of LEA plans, school plans, and data in order to guide the Department’s monitoring priorities. They will use desktop, fiscal, and on-site monitoring to ensure compliance, support effective implementation of interventions, and identify evidence of impact on student

achievement. In addition to setting clear and high expectations, the Department will provide high-quality training and guidance to the cross-departmental and –functional NDE teams so that monitoring processes and tools are evidence-based, aligned across the Department, and deeply integrated across multiple programs to facilitate synergies and coherency for district and school improvement. The Department is currently redesigning monitoring rubrics, tools, and processes to be evidence-based and aligned with redesigned needs assessment tools, school performance plans, and district performance plans. In addition, NDE is building out a list of evidence-based service providers who can conduct high-quality needs assessments and support school improvement initiatives. Through the outcomes of the comprehensive monitoring process, schools and districts will be able to identify gaps in implementation of interventions and evidence of impact on student achievement. These gaps will inform what schools and districts needs to keep doing or do differently in order to reach their goals.

Collectively, these redesigns aim to create a more holistic and less intrusive monitoring system that leverages and coordinates high-impact work across NDE, LEAs, and schools, so as to amplify strong outcomes and prioritize needs across the state, while addressing financial and human resource constraints.

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
- Create pre-approved evidence based lists to streamline district identification, review, and approval processes.

NDE will expand the performance management tools used to assist the LEAs and schools in the evaluation of programs. The state, LEA and school will reflect on whether a site is effectively implementing the Language Instruction Educational Program models resulting in the desired outcomes. Through NDE’s identification process - identifying LEAs that have schools in the lowest quartile and/or fail to meet the Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP) on the ELPA, including other available data and indicators - will receive additional Technical Assistance.

The Nevada’s English Learners Program Part I and II Monitoring Instrument along with on-site district and school visitations will serve as the means to address program deficiencies, i.e., leadership support, EL program staffing, root cause data analysis, and LIEP model(s) implementation.

Through ePage, an electronic grant management system, the State will ensure that the use of the Title III, Part A subgrant is allocated to ESSA evidence-based instructional practices, professional development, supplemental curriculum, and materials that support high quality English Language Development instruction for all English learners.

- C. 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.

D. 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).

For example, NDE will take further steps to assist eligible entities if the strategies funded under Title III, Part A are not effective:

- Step 1: In year 1, provide on-site Technical Assistance with an NDE cross-functioning collaborative team using information generated from the required needs assessment (CSI and TSI schools) and the English Learners Program, Part I and II a Monitoring Instrument. Monitor LEAs progress quarterly, to monitor the progress of the school. Document progress reports in the State’s monitoring system.
- Step 2: In year 2, require a review of EL evidence-based strategies and evaluation of implementation and effectiveness. Document in the State’s monitoring system the data-driven decision making of the LEAs findings and next steps to support the schools.
- Step 3: At the end of year 3, the LEA must develop an EL Corrective Action Plan with the school. NDE will determine if the key strategies and LIEP model used in the school should continue or restrict the LEAs use of the key strategies/LIEP model in the school.

At least annually, a determination will be made whether to continue forward with the LEAs plan, make adjustments to the approach, or discontinue supports.

In addition, NDE will provide technical assistance for eligible Rural and Low-income School (RLIS) districts through targeted onsite and in-person support; phone and email communications; and the issuance of documents such as guidance memos to connect RLIS school districts to appropriate resources. As such, NDE will identify

and address LEA needs through multi-channeled technical assistance and engage in open, inclusive, two-way discussion. These communications will be results-driven and focused on achieving measurable objectives ensuring alignment of NDE, LEA and Title V, Part B program objectives.

NDE's technical assistance will assist RLIS-eligible LEAs' implementation of RLIS activities by ensuring compliance with statutes, regulations, State Plan and SEA application; grant application management; implementation of program activities; fiscal control and fund accounting procedures; and state and subgrantee reporting requirements, including REAP grant performance metrics. In addition, NDE will provide technical assistance to ensure RLIS eligible LEAs are aware of expanded opportunities allowed under ESSA in Title 1, Part A; Title II, Part A; Title III; and Title IV, Part A ensuring academic achievement for all students. NDE will also ensure that RLIS districts and school know that REAP funds can be used for:

- Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives
- Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers
- Educational technology, including software and hardware
- Parental involvement activities
- Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Activities authorized under Title I, Part A
- Activities authorized under Title III

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.

- A. 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. Per ESSA regulations, only grade 8 students who take the EOC mathematics assessments are exempt from taking the Smarter Balanced grade 8 math assessments. An 8th grade student's performance on the high school end of course assessment is only used in the year in which the student takes the assessment for purposes of measuring academic achievement under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) and section 1111(c)(4)(E). In high school a student who took the end of course math assessment in 8th grade would take more advanced math coursework and the aligned end-of-course assessment, which is often Math II, for their math score.

Nevada struggles with math performance in middle school. As a strategy to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school, such as algebra that is taught in all Nevada districts, 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 middle and high school mathematics instruction and assessments. 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.

- B. 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.
- 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.
 - 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.

- iii. 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.

- iv. 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.

- 2. 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.

- 3. 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.

- **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.
 - i. 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).
 - ii. 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).
 - iii. 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.
 - iv. 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
i. Academic Achievement	Math and ELA SBAC (ES); Math and ELA SBAC (MS); Math End-of-Course (MS) Math and ELA End-of-Course exams (HS)	The academic achievement indicator will contribute between 20% and 25% to the total index score given the pooled reporting strategy for the student proficiency reporting category. Elementary Schools Student Proficiency for elementary schools will be determined for the state administered Smarter Balanced Criterion Referenced Tests (CRT) in mathematics, English Language Arts (ELA). The

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
		<p>state CRT in math and ELA are administered to grades three through eight; so, depending on the grade configuration of the elementary school, this results in three or four consecutive years of CRT test data.</p> <p>In support of Nevada’s Read-By-Grade-Three legislation, elementary school status will include an additional measure of 3rd grade ELA proficiency.</p> <p>Additionally, Nevada administers the Nevada Alternate Assessment (NAA) to no more than one percent of Nevada’s special education students who meet the strict criteria required in order to be assessed. The determinations about which students are eligible for this assessment are made through the IEP process. The NAA assesses students in mathematics and ELA. The NAA in ELA and math are administered to students in grades three through eight and eleven. The NAA results will be incorporated in the respective CRT results for mathematics and ELA.</p> <p>Elementary school status rates are determined by content area (mathematics, and ELA) and include students who take the CRT or the NAA. The number of test participants serves as the denominator of the proficiency rate while the number of students who meet or exceed the minimum passing score serves as the numerator of the rate. This rate is referred to as the percent above the cut (PAC).</p> <p>Status rates for elementary schools will be determined through pooled averaging. Pooled averaging enables the number of students participating in each assessment to contribute proportionately to the school’s overall proficiency rate. Additionally, schools not meeting N-size for individual content area assessments, may meet the N-size threshold with pooled averaging, and thus receive a rate.</p> <p>Status rate for Read-by-Grade-Three (the additional emphasis on 3rd grade literacy in elementary schools only) will be determined separately and will not be included in the pooled rates for the other CRT assessments. Since the legislation targets grade three, the measure will be based on the number of grade three students reaching proficiency on the CRT ELA assessment.</p> <p>Middle Schools</p> <p>Student proficiency for middle schools will be determined for the state administered Criterion Referenced Tests (CRT) in mathematics and English language arts (ELA), and the End-Of-</p>

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
		<p>Course exams in mathematics for 8th grade students taking high school courses in middle school that correspond with those exams. The state CRTs in math and ELA are administered to grades three through eight; so, depending on the grade configuration of the middle school, this results in two or three consecutive years of test data.</p> <p>The End-Of-Course exam in mathematics will be available for all 8th grade students who were enrolled in a mathematics class aligned to the content for the End-Of-Course exam in Math I or Integrated Math I. For most Nevada middle schools, proficiency rates will consist of two or three grade levels of the CRT in mathematics and ELA performance, and some number of 8th grade Math I or Integrated Math I End-Of-Course exams in mathematics.</p> <p>Additionally, Nevada administers the Nevada Alternate Assessment (NAA) to no more than one percent of Nevada’s special education students who meet the strict criteria required in order to be assessed. The determinations about which students are eligible for this assessment are made through the IEP process. The NAA assesses students in mathematics and ELA. The NAA in ELA and math are administered to students in grades three through eight. NAA results will be incorporated in the respective CRT results for mathematics and ELA.</p> <p>Middle school status rates are determined by content area (mathematics and ELA) and include students who take the CRT, the End-Of-Course mathematics exam(s), and/or the NAA. The number of test participants serves as the denominator of the proficiency rate while the number of students who meet or exceed the minimum passing score serves as the numerator of the rate. This rate is referred to as the percent above the cut (PAC).</p> <p>High Schools</p> <p>Student Proficiency for high schools will be determined from the state administered End-Of-Course exams in mathematics and ELA. Only those End-Of-Course exams taken while a student is in high school will count for the high school status rate. The number of test participants or 95% of enrolled students in the schools, whichever is higher, serves as the denominator of the status rate, while the number of students who meet or exceed the minimum passing score for proficiency serves as the numerator of the rate.</p> <p>Additionally, Nevada administers the Nevada Alternate</p>

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
		<p>Assessment (NAA) to no more than one percent of Nevada’s special education students who meet the strict criteria required in order to be assessed. The determinations about which students are eligible for this assessment are made through the IEP process. NAA is administered in mathematics and ELA. The NAA in ELA and math are administered to students in grades three through eight and grade eleven.</p> <p>For the ratings from the 2016-2017 school year, proficiency rates for all students in high school who take End-Of-Course assessments in Math I/Integrated Math I, Math II/Integrated Math II, ELA I, or ELA II will be included in the proficiency rate for the high school. Students in this rate will include first-time test takers and re-test takers. This rate will be a pooled rate consisting of all End-Of-Course assessments administered during the year in addition to any students who take the NAA. The NAA results will be incorporated in the respective math and ELA results.</p> <p>Proficiency rates for high schools will be determined through pooled averaging. Pooled averaging enables the number of students participating in each assessment to contribute proportionately to the school’s overall proficiency rate. Additionally, schools not meeting N-size for individual content area assessments, may meet the N-size threshold with pooled averaging, and thus receive a rate.</p> <p>Additional reported information</p> <p>Additional reported information will be included in the school accountability report for Academic Achievement. Proficiency rates will be disaggregated by all ten subgroups. Subgroup rates will be compared to District levels and subgroup’s Measures of Interim Progress targets. There will be no points attached to this reporting, but the reporting will be used to identify schools in need of support and improvement. School failing to meet their goals may be eligible for TSI identification. Additionally, Nevada will include district averages as a point of comparison. Proficiency points are earned on the pooled rate for the all students group. Given that few Nevada schools have a full set of reportable subgroups, it is not possible to assign points at the subgroup level. Note that maximum school rating is capped at three out of five stars if the school is identified as a TSI school. 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.</p>

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
ii. Other Academic Indicator	Math and ELA SBAC Median Growth Percentile and Adequate Growth Percentile and closing opportunity gaps in ELA and Math (ES, MS)	<p>Based on stakeholder input, in the elementary and middle school models, the other academic indicator will contribute 55% to the total index score and consists of growth, growth to target and opportunity gap measures. 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.</p> <p>Student growth in ELA contributes 10%. Student growth in math contributes 10%. ELA growth to target contributes 7.5%. Math growth to target contributes 7.5%. ELA opportunity gap measure contributes 10%. Math opportunity gap measure contributes 10%.</p> <p>Student Growth and Growth to Target 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 ELA 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.</p> <p>SGPs will not vary by grade span and is calculated for all schools in the same manner. SGPs contribute 20% to a school's total index score. (Student growth in ELA contributes 10%. Student growth in math contributes 10%). AGPs contribute 15% of a school's total index score (ELA growth to target contributes 7.5%. Math growth to target contributes 7.5%). AGPs will leverage SGPs in the same manner as described above.</p>

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
		<p>Student growth on the ELA and Math assessments will be disaggregated for each subgroup of students.</p> <p>Closing Opportunity Gaps</p> <p>Opportunity gaps for elementary and middle schools are determined for students in need of improvement. Students in need of improvement are students who scored in the lowest two achievement levels (i.e. not proficient) on the state assessments from the previous year. The opportunity gap measure is the percentage of the students in need of improvement from the previous year who meet their Adequate Growth Percentile target for the current year.</p> <p>The closing opportunity gap measure contributes 20% to the elementary and middle school models. (ELA opportunity gap measure contributes 10%. Math opportunity gap measure contributes 10%). Students evaluated in the opportunity gap measure are those who did not earn a passing score on the prior year’s ELA or mathematics assessments. These assessments are standardized across the state and used by all districts; however, the ability of this group of prior non-proficient students to make adequate growth varies across the state. This fact allows this measure to meaningfully differentiate schools. The percentage of these students meeting their adequate growth percentile (AGP) targets will be measured and assigned points according to the point attribution tables.</p> <p>Due to a high number of schools that do not meet the SEA’s minimum n-size for each subgroup, the SEA, in consultation with stakeholders, reviewed historical data and determined that our historically underserved subgroups were overrepresented in the set of students who were not successful on the state assessments. By creating a group of non-proficient students, the SEA is able to mitigate the n-size problem, focus efforts on underserved subgroups and place emphasis on instruction. Disaggregated student performance will be reported with this measure so that the performance of each sufficiently large subgroup can be seen consistent with feedback from stakeholders during Nevada ESSA plan development. The report will not be a point earning measure.</p> <p>The AGP of this group of students will come from the SEAs student growth percentile (SGP) model. Nevada has a long history of using this valid and reliable student progress measure. Additionally, the SEAs extensive stakeholder input further supports and prioritizes the use of growth measures in Nevada’s elementary and middle school accountability</p>

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
		<p>systems. A technical overview of the SGP model can be found at http://www.nj.gov/education/njsmart/performance/SGP_Technical_Overview.pdf.</p>
<p>iii. Graduation Rate</p>	<p>4-year cohort graduation rate (HS), 5-year cohort graduation rate (HS)</p>	<p>The graduation rate indicator will contribute 30% to the high school model. It will consist of the 4-year and 5-year adjusted cohort graduation rates. The 4-year and 5-year rates will be evaluated separately and will contribute 20% and 10% respectively.</p> <p>The graduation rate indicator is included in the high school model. The measures for this indicator consist of the 4-year cohort graduation rate and the 5-year cohort graduation rate. The cohort graduation rate is determined through the cohort validation process and follows federal guidelines for reporting an adjusted cohort graduation rate. This process results in preliminary graduation rates in October, with disaggregated rates determined in December. Because these dates are past the required state school accountability reporting date of September 15th, the cohort rates used for this indicator lags one year behind the other accountability indicators in the school rating system.</p> <p>Additionally the 4-year and 5-year cohort graduation rate will be disaggregated by subgroups. This Graduation analysis will be computed using the 4-year cohort graduation rate from the previous school year. Since the 4-year cohort graduation rate reported in the NSPF lags by one year, the graduation analysis must also lag by one year. The graduation analysis will not be a point earning measure but will be used for school designations like Targeted Support and to meet federal reporting requirements.</p> <p>Students with disabilities are able to earn a standard diploma through passing end-of-course exams or by proving proficiency by submitting a portfolio of work. An alternative diploma is available to students who are identified as cognitively unable to pass traditional school work, even with accommodations. These options are available to students who are 22 and younger. Both the standard and alternative diplomas count in the state's graduation statistics. These diplomas are state defined and meet all of the statutory requirements under ESSA.</p>
<p>iv. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency</p>	<p>WIDA ACCESS Adequate Growth Percentile (ES, MS, HS)</p>	<p>The English language proficiency indicator in the elementary, middle, and high school models will contribute 10% to the total index score.</p> <p>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</p>

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
		<p>used for the student growth percentiles described above in the Academic Progress indicator. 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The same methodology for calculating AGP using the WIDA ACCESS will be used for all schools across the state.</p>
v. School Quality or Student Success	<p>Chronic Absenteeism (ES, MS, HS);</p> <p>Science Proficiency (CRT for ES and MS, End-of Course Assessment for HS);</p> <p>Percentage of students meeting high school readiness (MS);</p> <p>Percentage of students with academic learning plans (MS and HS);</p> <p>Average ACT Composite Score (HS);</p> <p>Percentage of students meeting the CCR cut score on the End-of-course exams (HS);</p> <p>Percentage of students who are credit sufficient by</p>	<p>The measures in this indicator will contribute between 10% and 35% of the total index score depending on the school level and indicate the contribution of the science assessment to the pooled proficiency rate.</p> <p>The student success indicator at elementary school consists of a measure of student chronic absenteeism and contributes 10% to the total index score. In addition, the science assessment will contribute up to 5% of a school's rating.</p> <p>The student success indicator at middle school contributes 10% to the total index score and consists of a measure of student chronic absenteeism (5%), high school matriculation requirements (3%) and academic learning plans (2%). In addition, the science assessment will contribute up to 5% of a school's rating.</p> <p>The student success indicator at the high school contributes 35% to the total index score and consists of a measure of student chronic absenteeism (8%), academic learning plans (2%), average ACT Composite Score (10%), percentage of students meeting the CCR cut score on the End-of-course exams (10%), High School Readiness (5%). In addition, the science assessment will contribute up to 5% of a school's rating.</p> <p>Chronic Absenteeism</p> <p>Chronic absenteeism will be calculated for all students missing</p>

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
	the end of 9 th and 10 th grade (HS).	<p>10% or more instructional days during the school year, divided by the total number of students enrolled for 30 days or more at the school at the end of the school year.</p> <p>Chronic absenteeism will measure all students and be reported separately for each subgroup of students. Chronic absenteeism is understood to be a leading indicator of student success. Each year, this rate will be collected directly from LEAs using a common set of data collection rules. This approach to data collection and analysis ensures the measure will be valid and reliable.</p> <p>High School Readiness</p> <p>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, 392.033)</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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. <p>Academic Learning Plans</p> <p>Academic Learning plans are required for middle school students per NRS 388.165 and NRS 388.205 for high school. At the middle/junior high school and high school levels, academic learning plans are to be developed for each student on initial enrollment. At this high school level, academic learning plans are developed for all 9th graders, or by the first grade level offered at the high school. 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</p>

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
		<p>number of all students with a signed academic learning plan. This measure is in support of state initiatives in which K-12, higher education and workforce development efforts are being aligned in order to improve outcomes for all Nevadans. The inclusion of this measure will bolster the importance of these plans and lay the groundwork for future improvements to them. The SEA has evidence to suggest that the rates at which these plans are in place are not 100% for all of Nevada schools, and so the collection of this information will provide some degree of differentiation in school ratings. If in the future, academic learning plans are discovered to be in place for all Nevada middle school and high school students, this measure will be considered for removal from the system. Since these data will be collected from all LEAs for all middle and high schools, this measure will be both valid and reliable.</p> <p>ACT Composite Score</p> <p>The average composite score only for the 11th grade census takers during the state testing window will be used for this measure.</p> <p>Ninth and Tenth Grade Credit Sufficiency</p> <p>This rate will be determined by the number of ninth grade students who earned at least five credits by the end of their first year of high school and the number of tenth grade students who have earned at least eleven credits by the end of their second year of high school. This will be a pooled average in which the numerator will consist of the number of ninth grade and tenth grade students with at least five and eleven credits respectively and the denominator will be the total number of ninth and tenth grade students. This measure will consider ninth grade credits earned during the regular school year (i.e. not during summer school after the end of the ninth grader's school year) and tenth grade credits accumulated by the end of the regular 10th grade school year. This rate will include only tenth grade credit sufficiency for schools that do not serve ninth grade students.</p> <p>EOC Achievement Level 3 and 4 Percentage</p> <p>Achieving a level 3 or above on an EOC exam has been determined by the NV State Board of Education the level needed to be considered college and career ready. This rate will be calculated by the total number of students achieving a level 3 or higher divided by the total number of exams given in ELA and in Math. Points will be awarded based on a pooled average.</p> <p>Science Proficiency</p>

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
		<p>Pursuant to section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(II) of ESSA, the science CRT is administered to students in grades 5, 8, and 10. This will be a measure of student proficiency. In making annual determinations of school performance, science will be incorporated with all measures. As part of our calculation process, NDE will pool the ELA, math and science proficiency scores.</p> <p>The pooled averaging methodology will result in an overall test proficiency rate by which the numerator is the total number of ELA, Math and Science assessments passed and the denominator is the total number of ELA, Math and Science assessments administered. This approach enables the SEA to rate more schools because the n-size requirement will be met by sufficiency in the denominator. Small schools that are still unable to achieve the minimum n-size after pooling will be rated by combining multiple years of data.</p>
Other	Climate Survey Bonus Points (ES, MS, HS)	<p>The Climate Survey Participation measure is included in the Nevada Accountability System as a bonus of 2%. Schools meeting or exceeding the state participation threshold can receive up to two bonus points. Although most districts have opted to administer the State Climate Survey, there are some districts administering a district climate survey closely aligned to the State Climate Survey. Grade levels included in the administration of a climate survey vary by district. For the 2016-2017 school year, the participation threshold is 55%. For SY1718 and beyond, the participation threshold will be 75%. Due to the statewide business rules for school climate indicator this is a valid, reliable, and comparable measure that allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance, NDE will measure all students and report separately for each subgroup of students.</p>

B. Subgroups.

- i. 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.

- ii. 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.

- iii. 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.

- iv. If applicable, choose one 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.

C. Minimum Number of Students.

- i. 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.
- ii. 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.
- iii. 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.

- iv. 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.

- v. 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.

- i. 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.

- ii. 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.

D. 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.

E.

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).

Student performance on the statewide ELA and mathematic assessments, 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:

- i. 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;

	Elementary Schools	Middle Schools	High Schools
Academic Achievement Indicator	ELA Proficiency (10% - 7.5%) and Read by Grade 3 (5%)*	ELA Proficiency (12.5% - 10%)*	ELA Proficiency (12.5% - 10%)*
	Math Proficiency (10% - 7.5%)*	Math Proficiency (12.5% - 10%)*	Math Proficiency (12.5% - 10%)*
	Read by Grade 3 (5%)	NA	NA
Other Academic Indicator	ELA Growth (10%)	ELA Growth (10%)	NA
	Math Growth (10%)	Math Growth (10%)	NA
	ELA Growth to Target (7.5%)	ELA Growth to Target (7.5%)	NA
	Math Growth to Target (7.5%)	Math Growth to Target (7.5%)	NA
	ELA Opportunity Gap (10%)	ELA Opportunity Gap (10%)	NA
	Math Opportunity Gap (10%)	Math Opportunity Gap (10%)	NA
Graduation Indicator	NA	NA	4-year ACGR (20%)
	NA	NA	5-year ACGR (10%)
English Language Progress Indicator	WIDA Growth to Target (10%)	WIDA Growth to Target (10%)	WIDA Growth to Target (10%)
Student Success Indicator	Chronic Absenteeism (10%)	Chronic Absenteeism (5%)	Chronic Absenteeism (8%)
	Science Proficiency (up to 5%)*	Science Proficiency (up to 5%)*	Science Proficiency (up to 5%)*
		High School Readiness (3%)	Percent with Academic Learning Plans (2%)
		Percent with Academic Learning Plans (2%)	End of Course CCR Cut (10%)
			9th and 10th Credits (5%)
			ACT Performance (10%)

*For reporting purposes, science results will be pooled with ELA and Math results. Given that grade configurations vary in Nevada, this total contribution of science assessments can range between 0% and 5%. Some schools do not have a science assessed grade level (k-3 schools) and so 0% of their status points will consist of science results. Most schools will assess science with approximately one-third the number of students who take ELA and Math. This means that science is approximately 1/7th the total number of assessments in the pooled rate. For most schools, this means science will contribute 25 times 1/7 or about 3.5 points to the total score. Still other schools have a higher contribution of science assessments to the pooled average, but none more than 20% of the pooled assessments. This is how we arrive at the maximum of 5%. Please note that given that the science test will be undergoing a standard setting this fall, science will not be a part of the 2017 ratings.

- i. 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.

- ii. 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.

An index score is the sum of the number of points earned divided by the number of points possible and multiplying by 100. Each indicator is a sum of multiple measures that is further broken down into five score ranges. Each score range corresponds to a star rating which is a descriptor of how a school is performing based on the indicators in the framework.

These are the Five Score Ranges by school level:

SY1617 Elementary School Star Ranges	
★	<26
★ ★	>=26 <51
★ ★ ★	>=51 <76
★ ★ ★ ★	>=76 <90
★ ★ ★ ★ ★	>=90
SY1617 Middle School Star Ranges	
★	<29
★ ★	>=29 <53
★ ★ ★	>=53 <73
★ ★ ★ ★	>=73 <90
★ ★ ★ ★ ★	>=90
SY1617 High School Star Ranges	
★	<31
★ ★	>=31 <54
★ ★ ★	>=54 <77
★ ★ ★ ★	>=77 <90
★ ★ ★ ★ ★	>=90

Performance Level Descriptions for each Star Level:

Star Rating	Elementary and Middle Schools Policy Descriptor
★★★★★	Recognizes a superior school that exceeds expectations for all students and subgroups on every indicator category with little or no exception. A five star school demonstrates superior academic performance and growth with no opportunity gaps. The school does not fail to meet expectations for any group on any indicator. These schools are recognized for distinguished performance.
★★★★	Recognizes a commendable school that has performed well for all students and subgroups. A four star school demonstrates satisfactory to strong academic performance for all students. Further, the school is successfully promoting academic progress for all student groups as reflected in closing opportunity gaps. The school does not fail to meet expectations for any group on any indicator. Schools identified for targeted support and improvement are not eligible to be classified as four star school or higher.
★★★	Identifies an adequate school that has met the state’s standard for performance. The all-students group has met expectations for academic achievement or growth. Subgroups meet expectations for academic achievement or growth with little exception; however, no group is far below standard. The school must submit an improvement plan that identifies supports tailored to subgroups and indicators that are below standard. Schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement are not eligible to be classified as a three star school or higher. Schools identified for targeted support and improvement are eligible to be classified as three star schools.
★★	Identifies a school that has partially met the state’s standard for performance. Students and subgroups often meet expectations for academic performance or growth but may have multiple areas that require improvement. Areas requiring significant improvement are uncommon. The school must submit an improvement plan that identifies supports tailored to subgroups and indicators that are below standard. A 2 star school in consecutive years is subject to state intervention. Schools identified for targeted support and improvement or comprehensive support and improvement are eligible to be classified as two star schools.
★	Identifies a school that has not met the state’s standard for performance. Students and subgroups are inconsistent in achieving performance standards. A one-star school has multiple areas that require improvement including an urgent need to address areas that are significantly below standard. The school must submit an improvement plan that identifies supports tailored to subgroups and indicators that are below standard. The school is subject to state interventions.

Star Rating	High School Policy Descriptor
★★★★★	Recognizes a superior school that exceeds expectations for all students and subgroups on every indicator category with little or no exception. A five star school demonstrates superior academic performance and a superior graduation rate. The school does not fail to meet expectations for any group on any indicator. These schools are recognized for distinguished performance.
★★★★	Recognizes a commendable school that has performed well for all students and subgroups. A four star school demonstrates satisfactory to strong academic performance for all students. Further, the school's graduation rate meets expectations. The school does not fail to meet expectations for any group on any indicator. Schools identified for targeted support and improvement are not eligible to be classified as four star school or higher.
★★★	Identifies an adequate school that has met the state's standard for performance. The all-students group has met expectations for academic achievement. Subgroups meet expectations for academic achievement or show progress with little exception; however, no group is far below standard. The school must submit an improvement plan that identifies supports tailored to subgroups and indicators that are below standard. Schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement are not eligible to be classified as a three star school or higher. Schools identified for targeted support and improvement are eligible to be classified as three star schools.
★★	Identifies a school that has partially met the state's standard for performance. Students and subgroups often meet expectations for academic performance but may have multiple areas that require improvement. Areas requiring significant improvement are uncommon. The school must submit an improvement plan that identifies supports tailored to subgroups and indicators that are below standard. A 2 star school in consecutive years is subject to state intervention. Schools identified for targeted support and improvement or comprehensive support and improvement are eligible to be classified as two star schools.
★	Identifies a school that has not met the state's standard for performance. Students and subgroups are inconsistent in achieving performance standards. A one-star school has multiple areas that require improvement including an urgent need to address areas that are significantly below standard. The school must submit an improvement plan that identifies supports tailored to subgroups and indicators that are below standard. The school is subject to state interventions.

- iii. 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 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, dividing by the total points possible and multiplying by 100. Nevada's engagements with various stakeholder groups (NDE's Accountability Technical Advisory Group and NDE ESSA Accountability Workgroup) resulted in the components and weights of the indicators in the rating system, general descriptions of schools at each star level, and informed the development of the

point attribution tables. Point attribution tables are used to assign points along the continuum of school performance within each indicator and measure of the rating system.

The number of points earned is the sum of the points earned for each school based on where their performance lands on the point attribution tables for each measure. The points assigned in the Point Attribution Tables were established using historical data, stakeholder input and guided by stakeholder developed performance level descriptors; so that each of the five star classifications would be distinct and meaningful.

In order for an elementary or middle school to be rated, it must meet the minimum n-size requirements and earn points in at least the following indicators: Student Achievement, Growth, and Student Engagement. In order for a high school to be rated, it must meet the minimum n-size requirements and earn points in at least the following indicators and/or measures: Student Achievement, Graduation, ACT Average Composite, and Student Engagement. A school that does not meet the minimum requirements will receive a Not Rated classification until such time as a sufficient amount of student data over a number of years can be pooled to rate the school and meet the minimum n-size.

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%.

F. 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.

G. 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.

H. 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):

- i. 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;

Nevada intends to rate all public and charter schools. In the past, Nevada has identified small or other schools with an insufficient number of student records for pooled averaging. Nevada will again use this

approach to increase the number of rated schools until all schools are rated. Since the fall of 2017 will be first reporting year for the accountability system and since the pooled averaging will take at least three years in order to accumulate a sufficient number of student records, the goal for the SEA is to rate all schools by the 2019 report year. In the meanwhile, the student achievement data will be made available to the local education agencies and where sufficiency of records exists for select indicators in the system, data will be reported publicly. That is, the SEA will report as much as it can as data are available until such time as pooled averaging will enable the school to be rated in a manner that is comparable to other schools in state. In this way and over time, these schools will be subject to CSI and TSI identification.

ii. 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.

i. 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.

ii. 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

Nevada intends to rate all public and charter schools. In the past, Nevada has identified small or other schools with an insufficient number of student records for pooled averaging. Nevada will again use this approach to increase the number of rated schools until all schools are rated. Since the fall of 2017 will be first reporting year for the accountability system and since the pooled averaging will take at least three years in order to accumulate a sufficient number of student records, the goal for the SEA is to rate all schools by the 2019 report year. In the meanwhile, the student achievement data will be made available to the local education agencies and where sufficiency of records exists for select indicators in the system, data will be reported publicly. That is, the SEA will report as much as it can as data are available until such time as pooled averaging will enable the school to be rated in a manner that is comparable to other schools in state. In this way and over time, these schools will be subject to CSI and TSI identification.

- iii. 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, until such time as a sufficient amount of student data over a number of years can be pooled to rate the school and meet the minimum n-size.

All charter schools not otherwise excluded will receive accountability ratings.

4.2 Identification of Schools.

A. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe:

- i. 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.

In accordance with Nevada’s consolidated state plan, low performing schools and high schools with low graduation rates will be identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) beginning in the 2017-2018 school year. Schools with chronically low-performing subgroups will be identified for TSI in 2017-18 from among Title I schools that were identified as needing additional targeted supports but do not improve within three years will be identified as CSI.

Designation criteria are distinct by school level and consider overall school performance as well as graduation rates at the high school level. CSI schools will be designated annually and will remain as part of a cohort for a three year improvement process. Any school that earns a star rating is eligible for CSI designation.

Elementary and Middle School Designation Criteria

Elementary and middle schools will be designated for CSI using the following criteria:

1. Title I schools will be rank ordered from lowest to highest index score by school level
 - a. The 5th percentile of index score will be identified from this rank order
2. All schools performing at or below the index score identified in step one will be identified for CSI
3. The school is classified as a 1-star school
4. Beginning in the 2018-2019 school year, schools previously identified as 2-star schools that have a current year index score that is less than the index score earned in the prior year (i.e. “downward trending”) will also be identified as CSI
5. Any school that was designated for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) for three years and has not shown an improvement in subgroup student performance over the three years

High School Designation Criteria

Designated CSI high schools will be designated using the following criteria:

1. Title I schools will be rank ordered from lowest to highest index score by school level.
 - a. The 5th percentile of index score will be identified from this rank order
2. All schools performing at or below the index score identified in step one will be identified for CSI
3. The school is classified as a 1-star school
4. Beginning in the 2018-2019 school year, schools previously identified as 2-star schools that have a current year index score that is less than the index score earned in the prior year (i.e. “downward trending”) will also be identified as CSI

OR

1. The school has a 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (ACGR) less than 67%

OR

1. Any school designated for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) for three years and has not shown an improvement in subgroup student performance over the three years
- ii. 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).

Nevada acknowledges that increased student performance at our most challenged schools is an ongoing concern.

Each year, CSI schools will be reviewed for performance against annual benchmarks toward the exit criteria. After implementing a three year improvement plan, CSI schools will be evaluated for exit from this designation. Exit criteria are distinct by school level. Schools failing to meet exit criteria after their first three years of designation will be evaluated annually for exit and subject to state-determined, more rigorous interventions (see below). Additionally, CSI schools must meet both the CSI and TSI exit criteria in order to exit from the CSI designation.

Elementary and Middle School Exit Criteria

CSI designated elementary and middle schools will exit this designation when they achieve a rating of 3-stars and have sustained improvements in total index score. Sustained improvements in total index score will be demonstrated by an increase in total index score during the most recent three years of designation. As such, these schools must move from 1-star or 2-star status in order to exit, which corresponds with an increase in student achievement in critical academic indicators.

For schools identified in CSI due to chronically low-performing subgroups (schools that were previously in TSI status), schools should maintain or reach at least 3-star status and reduce the number of students in low-performing subgroups by 10% or greater.

High School Exit Criteria

CSI designated high schools will exit this designation when they achieve a rating of 3-stars, have a 4-year ACGR of at least 67% for two consecutive years, and show sustained improvements. Sustained improvements in total index score will be demonstrated by an increase in total index score during the most recent three years of designation. These exit criteria ensure that schools not only no longer meet the criteria for identification as a CSI school, but also have improved student outcomes.

For schools identified in CSI due to chronically low-performing subgroups (schools that were previously in TSI status), schools should maintain or reach at least 3-star status and reduce the number of students in low-performing subgroups by 10% or greater.

- **Targeted Support and Improvement Schools.** Describe:
 - i. 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).

All measures in the NSPF for each school level will be disaggregated by race/ethnicity and special population membership. This is a total of ten subgroups of students. The n-size required for TSI consideration is 25. Designated CSI schools will be removed from TSI consideration.

Subgroup student performance will be measured against the state’s measures of interim progress (for measures with related long-term goals and measures of interim process) or the established point attribution tables for the NSPF (for measures without long-term goals and measures of interim progress). The point attribution tables define the points that each school earns for each measure in the NSPF. The continuum of student performance for each measure is partitioned into ranges against which a school earns points based on where along the continuum the school achieves. The sum of the points earned across all indicators is the school’s index score, and the index score is then associated with a star rating. For measures not associated with long-term goals and measures of interim progress, subgroups performing in the lowest point ranges on the point attribution tables will be identified. The point attribution tables can be found in APPENDIX I. Some Nevada schools will be unable to meet the n-size requirement in the first year of the rating system. For these schools, the SEA will pool the measures over a number of years until the minimum n-size has been met.

Measures are combined into indicators (Academic Achievement, Other Academic Achievement, English Language Proficiency, Graduation Rates, and Student Success) and subgroup performance among all the measures within all indicators over two consecutive years will be considered when making TSI determinations and identifying schools with consistently underperforming subgroups. Consistently underperforming subgroup is a subgroup that fails to meet target performance two years in a row on the same measure. If the same Subgroup fails to meet target on the same measure for two years in a row, then the Indicator gets flagged. If a school has consistently underperforming subgroups within the Academic Achievement Indicator (indicator flagged two years in a row) then the school will be designated a TSI school, or if two or more of the same remaining indicators are flagged for two years in a row, then a school gets identified as TSI.

Subgroup Identification Methodology by Indicator

Academic Achievement Indicator

Subgroup performance in ELA and mathematics in the Academic Achievement indicator will be measured against the subgroup’s unique associated year’s measure of interim progress. Any subgroup failing to meet their measure of interim progress or failing to reduce the number of non-proficient students within the subgroup by at least 10% will be flagged for not having met these goals.

Other Academic Achievement (Growth)

The progress measures of ELA median student growth percentile, math median student growth percentile, the percentage of ELA students meeting adequate growth targets, and the percentage of math students meeting adequate growth targets will be measured against the established point attribution table. Any subgroup achieving in the lowest point earning category on the point attribution table will be flagged.

English language Proficiency

The percentage of English Learners meeting their adequate growth percentile targets on the WIDA assessment is the ELPA measure in the NSPF. The federal law does not require this measure to be disaggregated; however, schools achieving in the lowest point earning category on the point attribution table for this indicator will be flagged for the EL subgroup only.

Graduation Rates

The disaggregated 4- and 5-year adjusted cohort graduation rates for high schools will be measured against the subgroups unique associated year's measure of interim progress. Any subgroup failing to meet their measures of interim progress will be flagged.

Student Success

Opportunity Gap, Chronic Absenteeism, NAC 389.445 (1) a-d, ACT Composite, Credit Sufficiency, End Of Course CCR Level, and Academic Learning Plans will be measured against the point attribution tables. Any subgroup achieving in the lowest point earning category on the point attribution table will be flagged.

The state assessments in Science are undergoing a standard setting and so goals have not been set for this assessment. These goals will be set during the fall of 2017 and these goals will be used to flag low subgroup performance beginning in 2018.

- ii. 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.

Schools identified for Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (Additional TSI) are any school in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification for comprehensive support and improvement under ESEA section 1111 (c)(4)(D)(i)(I). Additional TSI schools will be designated annually starting with 2018-2019 school year (based on 2017-2018 school year data), and will be designated for three years. Schools will be designated separately as Additional TSI by school level. The designation methodology will be the same for each school level. Schools can have only one designation at a time (CSI, TSI, or Additional TSI).

1. The "all student" group performance on all measures of the highest (top of the 5th percentile) CSI Elementary, Middle and High School identified in the designation year will be identified.
2. This "all student" group performance level will be used as the cut to determine performance level expectations for each subgroup of student, for each measure, for all school levels.
3. If the performance of any one subgroup on any one measure is at or below the cut performance level, then the school is identified for Additional TSI.

This methodology ensures that any school in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification for comprehensive support and improvement(CSI) and would be identified for additional targeted support and improvement (TSI).

- iii. 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).

After completing a three year improvement plan, TSI schools (this includes Additional TSI, and TSI schools) may exit this designation if they do not meet any of the designation criteria for which they have been identified for two consecutive years. TSI schools that do not improve after implementing a three year improvement plan and continue to have subgroup performance less than the lowest “all students” group performance from the current designation year CSI schools will be identified as a CSI school.

4.3 State Support and Improvement for Low-performing Schools.

- A. **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.

Additionally, identified CSI schools, at the time of designation, may 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. Schools not selected for the ASD, will have the opportunity to be designated as Turnaround Schools per Nevada’s NRS 388G.400. This intervention grants the SEA the authority to review and recommend a Principal and provides that Principal with greater autonomy to execute a school improvement plan.

All CSI schools will be offered a performance compact with the Department that establishes year over year achievement targets for three years. Schools that are not receiving a state intervention will pair the achievement targets with a locally identified intervention. For schools that enter the ASD, the compact will be equivalent to a charter contract. These schools will be prioritized for state and federal school improvement funds due to demonstration of strong commitment to student achievement.

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.

B. 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 (including early learning opportunities) and determine a list of state-approved, evidence-based service providers, programs, materials, curriculum, and other resources. NDE will assist schools in identifying the appropriate evidence based intervention to meet their school site needs.

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.

- C. 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).

All schools with a history of underperformance (in the bottom 5% on the three previous administrations of the statewide assessment or failing to meet the state determined comprehensive support exit criteria in three years) will be identified for at least one of the more rigorous interventions contained within this section.

A subset of CSI schools are eligible for entry to the Achievement School District immediately upon meeting the statutory eligibility criteria. The ASD remains an option for schools entering the “more rigorous intervention” designation. 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. State Turnaround designation remains an option for schools entering the “more rigorous intervention” designation.

All CSI schools will be offered a performance compact with the Department that establishes year over year achievement targets for three years. Schools that are not receiving a state intervention will pair the achievement targets with a locally identified intervention. For schools that enter the ASD, the compact will be equivalent to a charter contract. These schools will be prioritized for state and federal school improvement funds due to demonstration of strong commitment to student achievement.

NDE will partner with local districts to identify effective collaborative interventions for their CSI schools. These interventions are built on two central principles: autonomy and accountability. The autonomy will come in the form of alternative governance models that provide greater flexibility for a school and school community from local district policies. The accountability will be anchored on shared student achievement goals aligned to the performance compact.

If a school misses their improvement target the first year the Department may offer training for missed targets on evidence based interventions, recommend evidence-based interventions, recommend revisions to the SPP, and establish interim measures of progress for the school and regular support meetings. If a school misses its target for a second year the Department shall offer training for missed targets on evidence based interventions, recommend evidence-based interventions, recommend revisions to the SPP, and establish interim measures of progress for the school and regular support meetings. If a school misses their improvement target for a third straight year the school enters “more rigorous” support.

For schools that not only miss their target but see student academic achievement decrease those schools are immediately moved to “more rigorous intervention.”

When a school is designated for “more rigorous intervention the LEA and the school site forfeit the ability to conduct their school level Needs Assessment and write their School Site Plan. The Department will select an evidence based support provider to review the school, conduct the needs assessment, and develop the school site plan. The Department can approve or amend the plan and the school and the LEA will be directed on the use of funds and other necessary policy decisions to implement the plan. School improvement options available for the evidence based provider to recommend include but are not limited to:

1. Closure
2. Redesign (led by an evidence based support provider)
3. Restart/Reconstitution (led by a high quality principal)
4. The establishment of a 100% school where an individual school remains under the local control of the LEA yet receives 100% of the funding and the ability to waive district policies that inhibit their ability to execute their transformation plan;
5. Activation of NRS 388G empowerment schools and turnaround schools as intended by the legislation;
6. Charter conversion
7. Partnership with evidence based non-profit
8. Required evidence based professional development
9. Transition to only “strong” or “moderate” evidence based interventions with implementation support from “strong” or “moderate” evidence based provider
10. Or other more rigorous improvement strategies

NDE and the evidence based support provider will work with the school community to implement an improvement strategy that is best suited to create the improvement aligned to student needs. Through the development of the transformation plan, the team may request a waiver of local policy or state regulation necessary to implement the school improvement plan. All schools that go through “more rigorous” process will sign a new performance compact aligned to improving the school to a three star level in three years.

For LEAs with more than 10 percent of their schools, or 3 schools, whichever is greater, that are designated as CSI, the NDE will select an evidence based support provider to conduct an in-depth needs assessment of the LEA to include but not limited to monitoring and support for CSI schools, and implementation of the school and district performance plans. The Department will share these findings with the CSI schools, local education agency, families, and communities to help determine additional needs and gaps in implementation of interventions and strategies. This will also help to identify whether these schools and local education agencies are implementing interventions and strategies with fidelity, the effectiveness and urgency of interventions, and any inequities in resource allocation. The Department may then outline specific actions and practices for the LEA to execute to reduce the percentage of CSI schools identified. It will also provide increased support, technical assistance, and monitoring to those CSI schools and local education agencies. These interventions may include directed use of resources and funds, required or assigned targeted professional learning, increased coaching and on-site monitoring, and required participation in collaborative problem solving sessions, among other interventions. The Department may also establish an alternate governing board comprised of state and local leaders to oversee transformation plans at three or more CSI schools within the same district.

These more rigorous interventions will directly align with and be integrated into the Department’s redesigned school and district performance plans, needs assessments, and monitoring tools and processes.

- D. 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.

A. 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 statute. ([NRS 391.011](#))

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](#) 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.

B. Educator Preparation Program Strategies. Does the SEA intend to use Title II, Part A funds or funds from other included programs to support the State’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, including teachers qualified for the increasing numbers of early childhood 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](#). Pursuant to NRS 391.038, traditional programs are approved by the State Board of Education through the NAC 391.557 and 391.558 regulatory process, and pursuant to NRS 391.019, ARL programs are approved by the Commission on Professional Standards through the NAC 391.461 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.

C. 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. 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. Pursuant to Assembly Bill 320 (AB320) passed by the 2017 Legislature, beginning with the 2017-2018 school year, the weights change to:

- 45% Instructional/Instructional Leadership Practice
- 15% Professional Responsibilities
- 20% Student Performance (2017-2018) and 40% Student Performance (2018-2019 and beyond), as measured by district-level "Student Learning Goals" performance measures described in Appendix A of the [NEPF Tools and Protocols](#).

Based on scores received on various indicators within each standard, educators receive one of four ratings: highly effective, effective, developing, 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, AB320 includes statutory language that will enhance the data collection, storage, and reporting processes. Because NDE has not

previously collected educator evaluation data, Appendix B, which displays Educator Equity Differences in Rates, reflects incomplete data.

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 (changed to “Developing” per AB320) 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.

- A. 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:
- i. Increase student achievement consistent with the challenging State academic standards;
 - ii. Improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other school leaders;
 - iii. Increase the number of teachers, principals, and other school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement in schools; and
- B.** 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).
- C. 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.

NEPF for teachers places a strong emphasis on high quality instructional practices. The Framework requires teachers to meet the academic needs of all students. For example, NEPF Instructional Standard 2, Learning Tasks have High Cognitive Demand for Diverse Learners, provides explicit expectations for meeting the needs of all students by requiring teachers to differentiate learning in order to provide the appropriate level of instruction for all students. This includes meeting the academic needs of children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels.

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.

Other NDE initiatives Strategic Plan focus areas are designed to improve the skills and instructional effectiveness of teachers, principals and other school leaders, with the goal of improving student achievement for all students, and specifically, children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels. As reflected in sections throughout the Plan, the bulleted focus strategies/activities below, and in the Table 5.3 (E), 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.

- Literacy Focus: NRS 388.157 and 388.159 requires that elementary school personnel identify and provide interventions for early grades students who are at risk of not reading at grade level by the completion of third grade. Along with national literacy experts and statewide stakeholders, NDE developed the Nevada State Literacy Plan (NSLP), a literacy guide for all Nevada educators. The NSLP includes a mini-plan for every developmental age-band (Birth – Pre-K, Elementary, Middle School, High

School, and Adult Literacy), with each designed to stand alone. NRS 388.159 mandates that each elementary school in Nevada designate a reading "learning strategist" to provide literacy-based professional learning, coaching, and guidance for all K-3 teachers at the site. All Nevada K-3 programs were required to compose their own local literacy plan and submit it to NDE. Each of these local literacy plans has been aligned to the Nevada State Literacy Plan, which has been nationally recognized as a model state literacy plan. State General Funding of \$22.25 million in FY 2018 and FY 2019, representing an increase of over \$17 million from the 2015-2017 biennium, will continue to support effective activities in improving the academic achievement of students in reading across Kindergarten through third grade (e.g., literacy coaches, grants, contracts, etc.). The Department's grant program will continue to augment reading proficiency programs in district and charter schools not served with Zoom or Victory programs.

- English Language Learners: The EL/Immigrant program is purposely designed to enhance district and school capacity to provide high-quality education to ELL and immigrant students. To achieve this purpose, NDE supports school districts by providing professional development opportunities and technical assistance to increase their capacity to serve these minority students to succeed academically, coordinating ELL initiatives and ELL policy development, providing programmatic leadership to share the knowledge base of issues related to ELL programs, and supporting local institutions of higher education to develop creative professional development programs for teachers, principals, and other school-based educators. Districts have provided intensive services to more than 17,000 of Nevada's ELs in early grades through the Zoom Schools initiatives. Non-Zoom school districts have served more than 1,500 ELs in the more rural areas of the state.
- Victory Schools: SB 447 (2017) maintains the current \$50 million in support of existing Victory schools over the 2017-2019 biennium. The funding will be allocated by the Department to underperforming schools (lowest student achievement levels) in the twenty highest poverty zip codes in the state. Specific services will be required, especially in the areas of wrap-around services and family engagement. The October Victory Schools Symposium will allow Victory School personnel to come together and share, listen, and gather ideas of what is working at Victory Schools. Mini-sessions on programs, services, and interventions that Victory Schools can implement will be provided and Victory School teams will plan the action steps necessary to move forward with Victory strategies.
- School Leadership Network: NDE is offering professional development opportunities to leaders of Nevada's most underperforming schools designed to strengthen the essential skills and competencies of leaders in our neediest schools. In partnership with external stakeholders, the Department developed Nevada's Theory of Action in an effort to improve and support underperforming schools with a structured diagnostic and planning process. The Theory of Action focuses on three priority areas: School Leadership, Tier 1 instruction that is aligned to state standards, and developing a system of Professional Learning Communities that will encourage administrators and teachers to analyze and use data to strengthen instruction.
- Children with Disabilities: The NDE Office of Special Education is committed to ensuring that ALL students in Nevada are college- and career-ready upon exit from the public school system. To accomplish this, the NDE Office of Special Education strives to build and improve on collaborative efforts with state partners and education stakeholders statewide. It is our goal to promote educational success for Nevada's students through increased academic rigor; use of evidenced-based practices; providing sustained professional development for administrators, teachers, and staff; providing technical assistance in data-based decision making; and building meaningful partnerships with districts, schools, and parents. NDE does this in many ways, including but not limited to the following initiatives or programs:
 - The Nevada Center for Excellence in Disabilities, in collaboration with the Department, coordinates the annual statewide Mega Conference, which focuses on research-based school improvement efforts as well as current issues and trends in the education of children. The Mega Conference provides an opportunity for participants to learn about and discuss issues around school improvement, while providing examples of model schools and programs to showcase successful and promising best practices.

- Assess Plan Teach (APT) is a program designed to provide teachers of students with IEPs high-quality professional development in reading and writing strategies. The model incorporates a structured, data-based consultation model, combined with training on research-based, explicit, systematic instruction and lesson plan development. Trained teachers are then continuously supported through an assigned an instructional facilitator that provides coaching and mentoring to ensure successful implementation.
- Instructional Consultation Teams provide one-on-one support for teachers who are struggling to design instruction that meets the needs of individual students, small groups, and/or whole classes. IC Team members are trained to conduct assessment in reading, writing, math, and behavior, as well as collaborative communication and systematic problem solving. Schools that implement IC Teams develop the internal capacity to sustain ongoing professional development, increased student achievement, and efficient use of resources.
- NDE staff work closely with district personnel to plan Early Childhood Inclusion Programs, including finding sources of funds to braid for such programs. Additionally, the Department hosts an annual meeting to bring district teams together to discuss best practices for inclusion of special education students, and help them work on their inclusion plans.

5.3 Educator Equity.

A. 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 “developing” or “minimally effective” rating on the Nevada Educator Performance Framework during the prior academic year. (Note the change in language due to passage of AB320 by 2017 Legislature.)
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	NDE’s Offices of Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management and Educator Development and Support are working with 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-

Key Term	Statewide Definition (or Statewide Guidelines)
	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.

B. 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.

C. 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):

- i. The rates and differences in rates calculated in 5.3.B;
- ii. 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;
- iii. The percentage of teachers categorized as out-of-field teachers consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.37; and
- iv. 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](#) and the [Nevada Report Card site](#).

D. 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.

E. 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:

- i. Designed to address the likely causes of the most significant differences identified in 5.3.D and
- ii. 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 21 st Century Classrooms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Great Teaching and Leading Fund to address the quantity and quality of new educators prepared by in-state EPPs
District Recruitment/Hiring/Retention Practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teach NV Scholarships (NV general funds via 2015 SB511) New Teacher Incentives (NV general funds via 2015 SB511) T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood© Nevada 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
Inadequate Quantity of Teachers Prepared via In-State Providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teach NV Scholarships New Teacher Incentives (NV general funds via 2015 SB511); Great Teaching & Leading Fund
Inadequate Resources for Mentoring/Coaching/Induction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Great Teaching & Leading Fund; NEPF Professional Development
Skills Gaps Due to Unaligned Initiatives and Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEPF Professional Development

F. 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

Throughout the 2015 Educator Equity Plan process, an analysis of data by the Department and various stakeholder groups resulted in evidence that there were statewide (and district-to-district) differences in the rates at which low-income and minority (and special education) students are served by teachers who were inexperienced, out-of-field, and not Highly-Qualified. Additional information about the specific differences are documented in Table 1 and Appendix D of the [June 2015 Nevada Educator Equity Report](#). Prior the 2016-2017 school year, NDE did not collect educator effectiveness ratings, therefore no identification of a difference in rates was possible. In collaboration with the Department’s Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management Office, the Office of Educator Development has developed new business rules for “out-of-field,” “ineffective,” and “inexperienced” as outlined in Table A above.

Additionally, collection of 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 data from districts and schools has begun, reconvening of Equity Plan Stakeholder Groups are scheduled for Fall 2017, and revisions/updates to the Equity Plan will be completed in Spring 2018. An additional level of data analysis that was not done for the 2015 Plan will be conducted to disaggregate and compare schools assisted under Title I, Part A to those which are not identified as such. Once the new rates are calculated, the Department and stakeholder groups will require districts with identified gaps in any areas to submit updated plans with strategies for how, and timelines by when, the gaps will be addressed. Not only will this information be publicly reported on the Educator Equity Report website, the data will be available (by district and school) in the new Educator Equity data portal section of the [Nevada Report Card](#).

G. Consultation. How will the SEA use ongoing consultation for all required stakeholders consistent with ESEA section 2101 (d)(3) which includes teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals (including organizations representing such individuals), specialized instructional support personnel, charter school leaders (in a

State that has charter schools), parents, community partners, and other organizations or partners with relevant and demonstrated expertise in programs and activities designed to meet the purpose of Title II.

In preparation for submission of Nevada's ESSA Plan, the Division of Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement Deputy Superintendent convened the [Nevada ESSA Teaching and Leading Workgroup](#) to provide input from various stakeholders. This Workgroup provided guidance on the Department's use of Title II-A State Activities funds that are formula-driven 4% as well as the additional allowable 3% set-aside for school leader development. The Office of Educator Development and Support has scheduled a follow up meeting with this Workgroup for Fall 2017 to share new data collected, provide implementation status updates, and request stakeholder consultation on implementation of Title II-A State Activities. NDE has also requested that the Commission on Professional Standards, the Teachers and Leaders Council, and the Special Education Advisory Council (which all provided feedback during the development of the 2017 ESSA Plan) add recurring ESSA Educator Equity/Teachers and Leaders agenda items to future meeting dates. Each of these stakeholder consultation efforts will occur at least bi-annually, with additional meetings scheduled as needed.

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.*
- A. 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 \(QRIS\)](#). 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.

USE OF FUNDS

The Department may use funds from Title IV, Part A and other programs for state-level activities to support, in whole or in part, identified state priorities that align with several programs described above, subject to availability of funding and as permitted by the requirements of ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(A). These priorities include:

- Identifying approved evidence-based strategies, activities, and interventions for programs that directly align to local needs and context;
- Supporting schools and districts to implement these evidence-based strategies, activities, and interventions with fidelity and use data informed decision-making to drive rapid and significant school improvement;
- Expanding access to advanced coursework and career and technical education (CTE) courses, particularly for local educational agencies with the greatest need and with consideration for underrepresented subgroups. Access will also include building a strong pipeline for college and career readiness starting in elementary and middle school;
- Using technology to improve academic achievement, digital literacy, and access to advanced and CTE courses; and
- Building a comprehensive, integrated, and differentiated plan for improving school conditions, climate, and culture.

The state will use the five percent of Title IV, Part A set-aside funds for administrative costs and developing the resources, tools, professional learning, and outcome evaluations in the following areas (though not limited to):

- Strengthening capacity and coordinating collaboration within districts and across the state with programs funded by Title IV, Part A; and
- Monitoring progress and adjusting strategies and implementation across local education agencies receiving Title IV, Part A funds.

- B.** 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.

- C. Does the SEA intend to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to support strategies 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:
- i. Incidents of bullying and harassment;
 - ii. The overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom; and
 - iii. The use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety?

Yes. If yes, provide a description below.

No.

The State will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning including through reducing: (i) incidences of bullying and harassment; (ii) the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom; and (iii) the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety through several strategies. Currently, 17 out of 18 districts receive Title I, Part A funds. This allows an eligible LEA to develop an aligned plan using Title IV, Part A funds. The funds will assist districts to braid other State and Federal funding into a comprehensive, integrated and differentiated plan for improving school conditions. Nevada has implemented many local programs that can be incorporated with Title IV, Part A funds to deepen the impact of the interventions.

- Climate Survey - NDE is collaborating with AIR to design and 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.
- 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, expand social emotional learning, and provide 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. Currently, 212 positions through the Nevada School Social Work Grant have been awarded to 143 schools. Also, 40 positions have been created through Project Aware, Safe Schools Healthy Students, and School Climate Transformation grants.
- Social Workers in Schools Initiative - 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 workers and other mental health professional positions filled serving 149 school sites statewide.

- D. Does the SEA intend to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to support strategies 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.

- E. Does the SEA intend to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to support strategies 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.

A. 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.

B. Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children.

- i. 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.

- ii. 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 identify the unique educational needs of migratory children, the Nevada Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) committee consisting of all migrant funded district coordinators has been formed to work together on this important foundation task and other issues related to migrant programs. The CNA committee meets semi-annually to discuss migrant issues. To pinpoint the unique educational needs of migratory children has been one of the crucial topics on the meeting agenda. The meeting migrant program discussion and migrant students' needs assessment process were facilitated by the State Educational Research & Training Corporation (ERTC), an external migrant program contractor. In addition to the input from the CNA committee, five different evaluation surveys are used to assess the needs of migratory children: 1) Language Arts Needs Assessments rated by teachers; 2) Mathematics evaluation rated by teachers; 3) Nevada Migrant Program Needs Assessment responded by administrators and teachers; 4) Nevada Migrant Program Needs Assessments responded Parent Survey (available in both English and Spanish versions) responded by migrant parents, 5) Nevada Migrant Program: Pre-school Needs Assessment responded by administrators. The specific questions to identify the needs of pre-school migratory children are included in the pre-school needs assessment survey. The specific questions to identify the needs of migratory children who have dropped out of school were discussed by the CNA committee. For the future CNA meetings, Nevada will develop a set of survey questions to assess the needs of migratory children who have dropped out of school in a similar fashion to the pre-school migratory children. The input and feedback data collected from four different groups (district/program administrators, teachers who have migrant students, migrant parents, and migrant students) were used to analyze to identify the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school.

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.

To 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, the state completes a CNA in migrant education and uses the results of needs assessment to guide service delivery plan in the state. According to the results of the CNA, the CNA committee identifies and finalizes major concerns of the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschoolers and dropped-out students. The current identified concerns include the needs being proficient in reading, writing, Math, and English. These concerns are identified and addressed in the State Migrant Service Delivery Plan for program implementation (see 6.2 B.vi below). The state plan for service delivery describes the strategies the state will pursue on a statewide basis to help migrant children achieve a set of performance targets/objectives and measurable program outcomes based on student needs data. This service delivery plan is considered the basic for the use of all MEP funds for local programs.

This is continuous improvement model that incorporates an assessment of students, establishing performance targets and measurable program outcomes to meet needs, targeting services based on those needs and to meet the performance targets and measurable program outcomes, and then evaluating the impact of services to measure the impact.



As members of the overall student population, migrant students are affected by a number of local, state, and federal programs (e.g., Title III-EL, Title I, state PreK Zoom program, etc.). Therefore, local program must ensure that migrant students receive full access to all available program services they are eligible for. However, to ensure that these identified needs must be met, the state plan for service delivery will have a joint planning, integrate of services available under Title I, part C with services provided by other programs, and evaluate the full range of services provided by those services to achieve a set of performance targets and measurable program outcomes based on student needs data. Roughly at least 50% of migrant students are EL students; migrant services will work with Title III programs at the state and local levels to ensure the second language instruction is implemented effectively.

On August 15, 2017, the state will hold the first statewide professional development workshop for migrant program personnel addressing how they can support EL students and work with content teachers more effectively. The agenda workshop will also address working with migratory children who have dropped out of school. In Nevada, being a migrant PreK student is a privilege to be admitted to a PreK program. It is considered as one of the criteria of the selection process when there are limited seats of a program.

Every other year, Nevada holds a statewide Family Engagement Summit where the state migrant program coordinator works with the summit committee in order to have Spanish interpreters available for all migrant parents who attend the sessions. At the end of the event, the migrant parents then meet with the state migrant coordinator and the local migrant program coordinators to provide their input regarding the migrant services and student needs. The state migrant coordinator will follow with their requests and prioritize the needs. Currently, migrant parents would like to learn more about higher education admission. The CNA committee will coordinate with a higher education institute and have migrant parent visit a campus in the fall of 2017 or early spring 2018.

Also, one of the important strategies is develop individual academic plans for all migrant students including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school (Recommendation #3, 6.2 B. vi). This plan is an electronic Success plan embedded in the Migrant Literacy NET web site that is available to all district migrant programs. The plan identifies specific educational needs of individual migrant students based on student needs assessment. The local migrant program personnel will share the evaluation of this plan with content teachers and administrators. At the state semi-annual meetings, each local program will share best practices with others.

- iii. 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 when they move from one school to another during the regular school year or summer/intersession, the state currently is using both the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) and Nevada Migrant Assessment Performance System (MAPS) as reliable and consistent resources to obtain migrant students' school and health information records. To support intrastate coordination, moving notification to inform other states is completed through the moving notification feature of the MSIX. If a move occurs between districts in Nevada, the moving process is done through the Nevada MAPS. The Nevada MAPS contains up-to-date information of migrant students, including health information, and they are being uploaded in the MSIX database system weekly. When a move occurs between schools within a district in Nevada, the district can easily transfer those required information records from one school to another because each district migrant coordinator has authority to manage all migrant student information in his/her own district. This coordination process is consistent and remains the same throughout the school year. Moreover, to ensure migratory children receive educational continuity, the receiving school/district can require any missing school and health information from either State Migrant Program Coordinator or State Migrant Data Coordinator. Finally, for each move notification, state Migrant Program Coordinator and/or Migrant Data Coordinator will follow and review the records of each individual migrant student to verify all school/health information transferred correctly.

Furthermore, on August 15, 2017, a statewide Migrant Data Training will be held in Reno, Nevada. In addition to the Identification and Recruitment, the new COE, the use of the Migrant Literacy Net web site and other issues related to migrant data, the training agenda will also include the process of moving notification, as well as interstate and intrastate coordination regarding migratory children mobility.

- iv. 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.

- v. 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.

Below are the current performance targets/objectives and measurable program outcomes (MPOs) included in the existing Nevada Service Delivery Plan:

The performance targets were revised to match the statewide performance goals set for students in the EL subgroup, which most closely matches migrant student needs based on the CNA.

Performance Target #1 English Language Acquisition: Eighty-four percent of all returning migrant students enrolled in Nevada migrant programs will increase .5 rubric point each year from an initial baseline on the ELPA to English language fluency to a minimum of 2.50.

Performance Target #2 Language Arts Achievement: Eighty-four percent of all returning migrant students enrolled in Nevada migrant programs will increase .5 rubric point each year from an initial baseline on the Nevada State CRT toward a minimum language arts proficiency of 3.00 (4 = Advanced, 3 = Proficient, 2 = Basic, and 1 = Below Basic).

Performance Target #3 Math Achievement: Eighty-four percent of all returning migrant students enrolled in Nevada migrant programs will increase .5 rubric point each year from an initial baseline on the Nevada State CRT toward minimum math proficiency of 3.00 (4 = Advanced, 3 = Proficient, 2 = Basic, and 1 = Below Basic).

Measureable Program Outcomes

Measurable program outcomes allow the MEP to determine whether and to what degree the program has met the special educational needs of migrant children that were identified through the comprehensive needs assessment. The measurable outcomes should also help achieve the State's performance targets." 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, preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school 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.

The CNA/Service Delivery committee reviewed the data analysis and results for the needs assessment process and provides the following recommendations to local program for service delivery. These recommendations are considered as parts of the strategies the state will pursue on a statewide basis to achieve these objectives and measurable outcomes:

Recommendation 1: Incorporate tutoring and small group instruction in reading and math for migrant students into regular academic year classrooms, summer programs, after-school or before-school programs, or in services provided to Out of School Youth.

Recommendation 2: Recommend local program to utilize instructional materials and online tutorials specifically designed for migrant students (e.g. materials from the Migrant Literacy NET) as a required supplemental support afterschool and/or in the home.

Recommendation 3: Continue to create and enhance individual academic plans for each of all migrant students including all priority for service migrant students, EL migrant students, preschool migratory children, and migratory children who have dropped out of school based on student needs (e.g. assigned online tutorials from the electronic Success Plans on the Migrant Literacy NET).

Recommendation 4: Utilize bilingual and bicultural staff whenever possible for instruction and communication with migrant parents to enhance effective communication and instruction.

Recommendation 5: Target writing and reading comprehension for migrant students in all local migrant education plans.

Recommendation 6: Target problem-solving and mathematical communication in all local migrant education plans.

Recommendation 7: Create programs and opportunities for parents to become directly involved in supporting the academic achievement of their children (e.g. State Migrant Parent Advisory Committee, Nevada Family Engagement Summit, Parent Literacy Nights, Take Home Book Bags, utilizing the parent resources in English & Spanish form the Migrant Literacy NET etc.).

Recommendation 8: Implement ESL and cultural awareness training for all teachers and staff working with migrant students. This topic will be included in the statewide migrant professional development/data training agenda on August 15, 2017.

Recommendation 9: Continue working and having a strong relationship with other programs such as PreK, Title III programs, and office of Parent Involvement and Family Engagement.

Recommendation 10: Share best practices among local migrant programs and include investigation the strategies that higher proficiency districts are using to facilitate student success as part of the ongoing evaluation process.

- vi. 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.

- vii. 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.

C. Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

- i. Describe the SEA's plan for assisting in the transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs.

With NDE'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. To assist in the transition of youth between locally operated

programs to correctional facilities and correctional facilities back to locally operated programs, a Student Transition Planning Tool (STPT) will be utilized. The STPT will need to be completed within the first 30 days of a student's placement in a facility in collaboration with the student, his/her family, program personnel, and representatives from other involved entities, as appropriate. It is created to support students, their families, and other involved entities by outlining specific action steps to assist in academic and program decisions concerning the student's transition process and timelines. Once the STPT is completed, program personnel will be responsible for implementing the plan, monitoring the student's progress, and revising it accordingly to align with any change in circumstances. NDE will conduct annual monitoring of the STPTs. Once a student is ready to be transitioned out of a facility to a locally operate program, a new STPT will be created, 30 to 60 days prior to the completion of the long term stay, that will outline clear transition action steps, goals and strategies relating to independent living, employment, education, and community participation for the student. In addition, a list of programs and supports that the student can access for more assistance will also be included in the STPT. This process will help to ensure a smooth and successful transition to Title I, Part D programs and from Title I, Part D programs back to locally operated educational programs.

In addition, Subpart 2 programs (local agencies programs) will also be required to provide transitional services (although no specific funding percentage is outlined in the law) to assist students in both the transition to a Title I-Part D program and returning to locally operated schools and to promote positive academic and vocational outcomes for youth who are neglected and/or delinquent.

- ii. 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.

Title I, Part D programs are critical in maintaining student' academic progress in both short and long term neglected and delinquent situations. The importance of these programs to engage and work collaboratively with families and student's "school of origin" (when appropriate and applicable) cannot be overlooked. The following program objectives and outcomes have been established to assess the effectiveness in improving the academic, career, and technical skills of youth who are served through Title I, Part D state agencies/local education agencies:

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 tailored educational services and supports 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. The state will ensure that these services and supports are effective through periodic program review and ongoing collaboration with each Title I, Part D entity. Additionally, through annual data collection each program will be required to report on the following:

- Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams
- Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams
- Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to posttest exams for reading and math

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. Success will be determined by calculating the percentage of students that improved from the pre- to post-test exams after the annual collection of data has occurred for Neglected and Delinquent programs.

Objective 3: Title I, Part D programs will use a Student Transition Planning Tool (STPT) to ensure that all long term neglected and delinquent students are prepared 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. The STPT (completed 30 to 60 days prior to the completion of the long term stay) will summarize the student's academic progress as well as short and long term goals related to graduation requirements, post-secondary education and/or career technical education, or employment goals.

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. To this end the following will be collected during the annual data collection for Neglected and Delinquent students:

- Students that enrolled in their Local District School
- Students that earned high school course credits
- Students that enrolled in a GED program
- Students that earned a GED
- Students that obtained a High School Diploma
- Students that accepted and or enrolled into Post-Secondary Education
- Students that enrolled in job training course/programs
- Students that obtained employment

Objective 4: Title I, Part D programs will ensure (particularly for long term students) that neglected and delinquent students have the resources and completed Student Transition Planning Document related to their participation in post-secondary education and/or job training programs.

Outcome: Title I, Part D programs will annually report on the number of neglected and delinquent students who participated in postsecondary education and job training programs. Data analysis of student participation and achievement outcomes will be used to determine the effectiveness of the program in improving career and technical skills of children in the program.

D. Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students.

- i. 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.

In Nevada, the entrance and exit criteria and procedures are standardized and are implemented consistently, and with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State. Each school administers the home language survey (HLS) to all students enrolling for the first time in preschool, kindergarten, or any of grades 1 through 12. Three (3) HLS questions in the HLS are used across all LEAs to screen students who have a language background other than English. For those students who have a positive response to questions on the HLS and are potential English

learners, schools will administer the WIDA Screener to assess English language proficiency. Based on the statewide entrance criteria, each student whose score on the screening instrument is “not English proficient” shall be considered an English Learner and eligible for an appropriate language assistance program.

Nevada’s standardized entrance and exit procedures will include the use of WIDA assessments:

The WIDA Screener (grades 1-12) and the W-APT (kindergarten), the current prescribed screening instruments, will be used for identification (levels below English proficient) within 30 days of the student’s enrollment.

The WIDA ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS will be administered annually for all English learners to determine English proficiency levels. The performance levels for both the Composite (minimum score of 5.0) and Literacy sub-score (minimum score of 5.0) are the exit criteria. The state will establish protocols to consider individual circumstances in eligibility determination for which an exception may be warranted. The English learner subgroup for Title I reporting and the ELP indicator in the accountability system is the same English learners subgroup under Title III funded program. Therefore, the exit criteria will be the same criteria used for exiting students from the English learner subgroup for Title I reporting and accountability on the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator.

In 2012 when NDE joined the WIDA consortium, a common entrance and exit criteria were established for the state of Nevada. The statewide entrance and exit criteria was reviewed in 2015 and 2016, by three established work groups - the English Mastery Council, the ESSA EL Work Group, and the Title III district (LEA) directors. These groups represented the geographically diverse LEAs in Nevada. The recommendations derived from the three work groups regarding the ESSA and EL District Policy and Plans (inclusive of the Entrance and Exit Criteria) were presented to the State Board of Education. As required by statute, the opportunity for public comments from stakeholders and others was provided. Written comments from stakeholders and others were also submitted to NDE.

NDE will assist eligible entities in meeting the State-designated long-term goal for progress in achieving English language proficiency and ensuring that English learners meet challenging academic standards in a variety of ways. In addressing the State and LEAs’ legal obligations under Title III, Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and EEOA, the Nevada Revised Statute (NRS 388.409) established one of the work groups, the English Mastery Council, to provide recommendations to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Board of Education, Commission on Professional Standards, Board of Regents, and school districts. The recommendations were to help ensure that English learners in Nevada’s public schools (Pre-Kindergarten through grade 12) have access to quality education programs (NRS 388.405). NDE works with the sixteen-member English Mastery Council from differing backgrounds and responsibilities to fulfill this charge. Individuals are nominated by statutorily defined representative organizations and are appointed by the Governor, the Chancellor of the Nevada System of Higher Education, or the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Through a facilitation process with the support of NDE, the English Mastery Council established a recommendation for EL District Policy and Plans that include the entrance and exit indicators.

NDE meets with Title III district (LEA) directors in the annual fall and spring meetings, and additionally with small focus work groups of members from districts with expertise in a specific topic addressed. The entrance and exit criteria was reviewed, and the opportunity to consider a recommendation for an

adjustment to the entrance and exit criteria. The entrance and exit criteria review was discussed in the annual meeting and small work groups of district and school experts in the development of the EL District Policy and Plan criteria and the State ESSA Plan.

The ESSA EL Work Group (2016) was established to address the Title III requirements and Title I accountability and reporting requirements within the ESSA Consolidated Plan for Nevada. The ESSA EL Work Group met four (4) times: June 30, 2016; August 12, 2016; September 19, 2016; and October 18, 2016.

At various times the three work groups (Title III district directors, English Mastery Council, and ESSA EL Work Group) met during a period beginning in 2014 through 2017. The entrance and exit criteria, along with other specified program indicators and expectations were addressed.

The statewide District EL Policy recommendation - that included the entrance and exit indicators - was approved in regulatory workshop by the State Board of Education on 9/15/15. The Legislative Counsel Bureau drafted the proposed regulation (R106-15) on December 21, 2015.

In providing meaningful consultation with the LEAs to establish and implement entrance and exit criteria, the established approach included the following:

- Title III district directors meetings (fall and spring annually);
- Onsite or virtual consultation with the NDE EL Team;
- NDE webinars to provide guidance on the implementation of the entrance and exit criteria; and NDE is currently developing an EL program guidance document to be available on the website (released in fall 2017).

- ii. Awarding Subgrants: 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 to local education agencies for Title IV, Part A, through a competitive grant application and review process to eligible entities in accordance to the Consolidated Appropriations Act 2017. The subgrants will be at least \$10,000 and for a term of one year. In the competitive grant application and review process, the Department will prioritize those local education agencies that demonstrate the greatest commitment to school improvement and use evidence-based support providers and interventions. To facilitate this process, the Department will create approved lists of evidence-based support providers. In addition, the Department will prioritize “local educational agencies that have the greatest need based on the number or percentage of children counted under section 1124(c)” to ensure that subgrant recipients represent geographic diversity across the state (i.e., rural, urban, and suburban areas). This may include the creation of priority points and consortia opportunities for those local education agencies with the greatest need in the competitive grant application process, as well as prioritizing targeted support and technical assistance to these local education agencies throughout the application process and implementation efforts.

Furthermore, Title IV, part A, will prioritize its awards according to those applications that align with Nevada’s State Goals.

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

- i. 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 and ensure that evidence-based community learning centers will help participating students meet challenging state and local academic standards. NDE will use these funds to award subgrants, through a competitive grant process, to eligible evidence-based 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. All eligible entities and interventions must be evidence-based. Title IV, part B, will provide subgrants to eligible entities to establish evidence-based 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).

- ii. 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 will implement a rigorous review process for 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." In addition, the Department will prioritize those local education agencies that demonstrate the greatest commitment to school improvement. Only evidence-based interventions will be funded. Non-profit support providers and districts can apply independently, or in partnership, but these eligible entities must demonstrate they are evidence-based and meet the evidence requirements. The Department will create a list of evidence-based non-profits to help facilitate the matching of evidence-based interventions with the local needs of districts and schools, in alignment with Title IV, Part B. NDE will also prioritize funds to applications that align with Nevada's state goals, as well as those with the greatest needs (e.g., as shown through school performance plans (Sec. 1111(d)); or having 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)).

The competitive grant applications will be reviewed and scored by an external Peer Review Committee comprised of specialists from public and private schools, local organizations, and agencies as selected from the state grant team reviewers list. The reviewers must submit a reviewer application and resume to the state's grant office to determine the appropriate skill level and qualifications necessary for eligible reviewers. The Department will provide required training for reviewers to ensure they understand evidence-based requirements for interventions and non-profit support providers, review grant applications consistently, and only grant funding for those applications that meet all requirements (e.g., evidence requirements). The committee will have up to 5 days to preview the applications and 2 days to meet as a group to discuss and determine scores. The Peer Review Committee will determine quality and score of proposals according to the rubric. In order for the application to be recommended for funding, it must receive at least 126 points out of the 180 possible points and all required elements must be addressed. An application receiving a score of 0 on any required/section of the rubric will not be funded. Applications must use funds for evidence-based non-profit support providers and interventions; if applications do not, they will not be funded. Applicants may receive up to an additional 15 points under competitive priorities. These points

(if applicable) will be added to the overall application total. Only those grants receiving a base score of 126 points or higher will be considered for funding. Funding will be allocated based upon the final scores with equitable geographical distribution of programs and continue until funding is exhausted or all eligible programs receive funding. After the selection process, applicants will receive the readers' comments and feedback from the review process, as well as information on the state appeal process.

The Nevada Department of Education (NDE) requires applicants to consult extensively within their communities to ensure that parents, community organizations (public or private), faith-based organizations, colleges/universities, businesses, arts and cultural organizations and other youth development agencies can work in meaningful collaboration with schools in order to become 21st Century Community Learning Centers. The application process includes providing details and additional information to support this process. As well as, requires the applicant to provide details on the alignment of the center's activities to the student academic needs. This includes identifying and use of research-based curriculum aligning with the school's Performance Plans and/or Nevada Common Core Standards to guide the programming and activities delivered through the center. All approved grantees are monitored monthly (desktop) and evaluated annually to determine if the center has met the stated annual performance goals.

The state performance goals for Nevada's 21st CCLC program are listed below. They are a part of the state Performance Indicator report and have corresponding clearly defined benchmarks, which are utilized for monitoring the progress of programs. All activities provided at the site level must align with one of the performance indicators categories.

- Regular attendees who need to improve will demonstrate improvement in math grades.
- Regular attendees who need to improve will demonstrate improvement in math on state assessments.
- Regular attendees who need to improve will demonstrate improvement in reading grades.
- Regular attendees who need to improve will demonstrate improvement in reading on state assessments.
- Regular attendees who need to improve will demonstrate improvement in behavior.
- Regular attendees who need to improve will demonstrate improvement in completion of homework.
- Regular attendees who need to improve will demonstrate improvement in class participation.
- Programs will offer enrichment and support activities.
- Programs will offer enrichment and support activities in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM)
- Programs will offer enrichment activities in Civics Education.
- Programs will offer enrichment activities in Physical Fitness.
- Programs will offer enrichment activities in drug and Alcohol Prevention, Violence Prevention, and/or Character Education.
- Programs will provide support for literacy and related educational service to families of program youth.

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

- i. 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 measurable 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.

G. McKinney-Vento Act.

- i. 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 and runaway youth 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 who have run away or are 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 who are 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 or who have run away, how liaisons can meet the needs of these students and their families, and requirements of the McKinney-Vento Act, as well as school registration practices that can be useful in identifying families experiencing homelessness and runaway and/or unaccompanied youth, and common student behavior that might indicate homelessness or runaway situations. 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, health records, residency requirements, uniform and dress code requirements, and guardianship issues, and other school records as needed and refer them to appropriate resources in the community. In all cases, students are immediately enrolled in school as liaisons and advocates assist families in gathering required documentation and supplies. The LEAs processes for identifying homeless, runaway, and unaccompanied children and youth will be reviewed during regular monitoring of the LEAs.

- ii. 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 or living as runaway or unaccompanied youth.

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 or living as runaway or unaccompanied youths, as well as maintaining records of attendance. School registrars are trained to identify potentially homeless or runaway 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 in the community who will notify them of homeless youth.

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.

- iii. 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 was 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.

- iv. 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.

Further, the State Coordinator of EHCY is working with school districts in Nevada to revise current board policies, and where appropriate, assist in establishing new policies and procedures to provide appropriate credit for partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a school, in accordance with state, local, and school policies. Additionally, during a state-wide training on April 26, 2017 school districts were instructed that federal law now requires schools to award homeless, runaway, or unaccompanied youth partial credit for successfully completed course work. The State Coordinator of EHCY will ensure districts are in compliance with this provision of the law during desktop and onsite monitoring of the McKinney-Vento Program. School districts found to be out of compliance will face corrective action from the state, which could impact the district's ability to apply for McKinney-Vento Subgrants or receive Title I funds. Finally, during the 2019 state legislative session a bill draft request will be created by NDE to ensure homeless, runaway, and unaccompanied youth receive partial credit for successfully completed course work.

- v. 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.

NDE has policies in place that prohibit schools from using outstanding fines or school attendance issues as factors in or barriers to the students being immediately enrolled in school and fully participating in school activities. NDE will monitor district enrollment practices during annual desktop monitoring, as well as on site monitoring to ensure these policies are being followed. NDE will periodically review these policies to removing barriers and revise, as necessary.

After-school tutoring is offered in most school districts, through the use of Title I and McKinney-Vento funds, for those elementary students who are homeless. By virtue of their enrollment in a public school, students in schools which have before- and after-school 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. 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. Additionally, homeless,

runaway, or unaccompanied youth meeting the relevant eligibility criteria are able to participate fully in magnet schools, summer schools, career and technical education, advanced placement, JUMP Start College Participation, online learning, and charter school programs when and where available. District staff and school staff are required to work with students and their families in accessing application materials, learning about enrollment procedures and opportunities, and removing barriers that interfere with the students attending and participating fully in the selected program/programs. The state coordinator will monitor student access to academic and extracurricular activities annually in desktop or on-site monitoring.

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 and will provide and coordinate support as necessary. In addition, each District Homeless Liaison will be provided with relevant information, when available, to share with shelters in his or her district.

- vi. 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, are immediately enrolled, and are able to fully participate in school. Schools are prohibited from using outstanding fines or school attendance issues as factors in or barriers to the students being immediately enrolled in school and fully participating in school activities. NDE will monitor district enrollment practices during annual desk top monitoring, as well as on site monitoring.

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.
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.

All McKinney-Vento youth will receive individualized counseling from school counselors to prepare and improve their readiness for college, including college selection, application processes and supports available during application processes, financial aid, and other on-campus supports available. School districts will be required to maintain records ensuring that McKinney-Vento youth have received this

counseling. Additionally, the district must also verify that all unaccompanied youth were informed of their status as independent students and have obtained verification of that status. The NDE will review records verifying counseling focused on college readiness for homeless youth and information provided to unaccompanied youth informing them of their status as an independent student. Districts unable to produce such records or who do not demonstrate that all of these youths are receiving appropriate counseling services will receive technical assistance from NDE. This assistance will be targeted toward putting the necessary student supports in place and revising and updating school policies to better meet the needs of students.. Districts unwilling to put better supports in place or revise or update these policies may face corrective action from NDE.

Additionally, 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 (NAEHCY) 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 homelessness 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).

The Nevada Department of Education will create and distribute an informational flyer regarding access to educational programs and opportunities. The flyer will be developed in collaboration with Nevada's PTI and Special Education Advisory Committee. These organizations will also be leveraged to allow for widespread distribution.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX LETTER	PAGE NUMBER	DOCUMENT TITLE
A	109	Measurements of Interim Progress
B	111	Educator Equity Differences in Rates Tables
C	112	Educator Equity Extension Plan and Differences in Rates Tables
D	114	ESSA Work Group Recommendations
E	122	Nevada's Approach to Differentiated School Support & Improvement
F	123	Overview of ESSA Programs and Budgets
G	126	Nevada Educator Performance Framework for Teachers
H	127	Staffing / Vacancy Data Comparisons (2015-16 to 2016-17)

APPENDIX A: MEASUREMENTS 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	2016-17	2016-17	ELA	ELA
	ELA	51%	36%	59%	61%
	48%	2017-18	2017-18	Math 39%	Math 41%
	Math 34%	54%	37%		
		2018-19	2018-19		
		57%	38%		

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	2016-17	18.5	20
	17.7	17.9		
		2017-18		
		18.1		
		2018-19		
		18.3		

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	80%	84%
		73%		
		2017-18		
		75%		
		2018-19		
	77%			

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	82%	86%
		74%		
		2017-18		

Nevada Goal Description	Class of 2015 Rate	Annual Targets	Interim Graduation Rate Goal: 2020	Long-Term Graduation Rate Goal: 2022
		76% 2018-19 78%		

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	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	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:

- Two of the three measures (out-of-field and inexperienced) were included.
- “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.
- “Out of field” was defined as one who has licensure in an areas other than the subject of a teacher’s current assignment.
- 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.)
- 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](#) 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	N/A	0.88%	-0.65%	5.29%	8.89%
Minority students	N/A	N/A	0.26%	-0.86%	14.83%	8.27%
Non-minority students	N/A	N/A	1.12%	-0.86%	6.56%	8.27%

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%	3.30%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Minority students	7.57%	3.98%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non-minority students	3.59%	3.98%	N/A	N/A	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	Study impact

#	Recommendation	ESSA Advisory Group Decision
	include ESSA's Section 1111(c)(4)(F) "Partial Attendance" requirement.	
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	Approved

#	Recommendation	ESSA Advisory Group Decision
	students.	

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

#	Recommendation	ESSA Advisory Group Decision
11	<p>Long-term English Learners:</p> <p>Define Long-term English learner as an English learner who has not achieved English language proficiency within 6 years of initial classification.</p>	Approved
12	<p>Long-term English Learners:</p> <p>Schools/districts should be required to provide language instruction educational program models, which are specifically designed, for long-term English learners.</p>	Approved
13	<p>Long-term English Learners:</p> <p>Ensure that 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.</p>	Approved

School Improvement Work Group

#	Recommendation	ESSA Advisory Group Decision
1	<p>NDE's role in school improvement should move from compliance to collaboration. This means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<p>NDE should provide districts and schools with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assistance with capacity building • a gradual release of support to schools as they improve • hierarchy of supports at state, district, school levels 	Approved

#	Recommendation	ESSA Advisory Group Decision
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • regular school support meetings • action plan and aligned timelines • clear and consistent messaging of federal and state requirements • clearly defined expectations • competence 	
3	<p>NDE should help districts and schools create strong improvement plans by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<p>Expectations for Level 1 and 2 Schools:</p> <p>Level 1 (Accelerated Support includes Comprehensive Schools)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Level 2 (Priority Support includes Targeted Schools)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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	<p>Expectations for Level 3 and 4 Schools:</p> <p>Level 3 (Coordinated Support)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LEA reviews and monitors the School Performance Plan 	Approved

#	Recommendation	ESSA Advisory Group Decision
	<p>(SPP);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Must complete a needs assessment every 3 years; ▪ NDE and/or LEA supports schools in area of need. <p>Level 4 (Self Support)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	

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	<p>The Department identifies and communicates the SEA strategies that will drive the stat's strategic use of federal funds.</p> <p>Leadership: Investment in evidence-based programs to provide sustained support of school leaders (and district teams in certain cases).</p> <p>Professional Development: NEPF</p>	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	<p>Definition of Inexperienced/Experienced Teachers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “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	<p>Not Fully Licensed/Out of Field Teachers: Grades/Subjects/Areas of Licensure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Core Content Areas – Math, Language Arts, Science, Social Studies ○ Elementary ○ Early Childhood ○ Special Education • Possible consideration of other areas to report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Business and Industry ○ Art/Music/PE ○ Foreign Languages ○ Other Licensed Personnel 	Approved Areas Under First Bullet (future consideration for second bullet)
3	<p>Not Fully Licensed/Out of Field Teachers: Types of Licensure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nevada should report the number/percentage of teachers at each school who are teaching with the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provisional Licenses ○ Conditional/Alternative Route to Licensure ○ ARC/Option Special Education Program 	Approved
4	<p>Requirements Permitted for Provisional Licensure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following requirements should continue to be permitted for provisional licensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Basic Skills Proficiency ○ Subject Area Proficiency ○ Pedagogy Proficiency ○ Up to 6 Credits of Coursework <p>Provisional licensure should not be permitted if student teaching requirement has not been met.</p>	Approved (including student teaching)
5	<p>Other Areas of Data Collection/Reporting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number/percentage of teachers with the following licensure endorsements should be reported by school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TESL/ELAD ○ Reading Specialist 	Approved

#	Recommendation	ESSA Advisory Group Decision
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ National Board Certification ○ Teacher Leadership* • Numbers/percentages of the following staffing data should be reported by school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teacher Vacancies ○ Teacher Absences ○ Long Term Substitutes ○ Teacher Turnover/Retention Rates 	
6	<p>Educator Effectiveness: Statewide Educator Evaluation System for Licensed Personnel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<p>Educator Effectiveness: Definition of “Ineffective” Teachers and Reporting (Ratings, Standards, Indicators)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<p>Data Collection/Reporting for School Administrators/Leaders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of the following should be considered for school-based administrator/leader reporting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inexperienced/Years of Experience ○ Effectiveness Ratings ○ Areas of Licensure/Endorsements 	Not Required for ESSA/For Further Consideration (possible dashboard)
9	<p>Title II-A Fund Use: State Activities and Districts/Charters</p> <p>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.</p>	Approved
10	<p>3% of Title II-A for Statewide “Principal and Other School Leader” Development</p> <p>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.</p>	Approved

APPENDIX E: NEVADA'S APPROACH TO DIFFERENTIATED SCHOOL SUPPORT & IMPROVEMENT

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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 95% to LEAs= \$3,800,000 • 5% for administrative and

Title	Program	Funds Available to Nevada*
		state-level activities= \$200,000
Title IV, Part B*	21 st 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	Preschool Development Grants	National authorized appropriation for 2017–18:

Title	Program	Funds Available to Nevada*
9212		\$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%
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%
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%

APPENDIX I: Point Attribution Tables for the Nevada School Performance Framework

SY 1617 Elementary School Point Attribution Table					
Academic Achievement (25 Points Possible)					
Points	20	15	10	5	0
<u>Pooled Proficiency Rate</u>	>= 67	< 67 and >= 58	< 58 and >= 50	< 50 and >= 39	< 39
Points	5	4	3	2	0
<u>Read by Grade 3</u>	>= 67	< 67 and >= 58	< 58 and >= 50	< 50 and >= 39	< 39
Growth (35 Points Possible)					
Points	10	7	5	2	0
<u>Math MGP</u>	>= 67	< 67 and >=55	< 55 and >=45	< 45 and >=35	<35
<u>ELA MGP</u>	>= 67	< 67 and >=55	< 55 and >=45	< 45 and >=35	<35
Points	7.5	6	4	2	0
<u>Math AGP</u>	>= 79	< 79 and >= 66	< 66 and >= 46	< 46 and >= 34	<34
<u>ELA AGP</u>	>= 79	< 79 and >= 68	< 68 and >= 48	< 48 and >= 35	<35
English Language Proficiency (10 Points Possible)					
Points	10	7	5	2	0
<u>WIDA AGP</u>	>= 48	< 48 and >=44	< 44 and >=39	< 39 and >=35	<35
Opportunity Gaps (20 Points Possible)					
Points	10	7	5	2	0
<u>Math</u>	> = 40	< 40 and >= 35	< 35 and >= 30	< 30 and >=25	< 25
<u>ELA</u>	>= 50	< 50 and >= 45	< 45 and >= 40	< 40 and >= 35	< 35
Student Engagement (10 Points Possible)					
Points	10		5	0	
<u>Chronic Absenteeism</u>	<=5		>5 and <=10	>10	
Bonus Points					
<u>Climate Participation</u>	If Participation is >= 55%, then 2 points. If not, 0 points.				

SY1617 Middle School Point Attribution Table

Academic Achievement (25 Points Possible)

Points	25	20	15	10	0
<u>Pooled Proficiency Rate</u>	>= 67	< 67 and >= 58	< 58 and >=50	< 50 and >= 39	< 39

Growth (35 Points Possible)

Points	10	7	5	2	0
<u>Math MGP</u>	>= 67	< 67 and >=55	< 55 and >=45	< 45 and >=35	<35
<u>ELA MGP</u>	>= 67	< 67 and >=55	< 55 and >=45	< 45 and >=35	<35
Points	7.5	6	4	2	0
Math AGP	>= 79	< 79 and >= 66	< 66 and >= 46	< 46 and >= 34	<34
ELA AGP	>= 79	< 79 and >= 68	< 68 and >= 48	< 48 and >= 35	<35

English Language Proficiency (10 Points Possible)

Points	10	7	5	2	0
<u>WIDA AGP</u>	>= 48	< 48 and >=44	< 44 and >=39	< 39 and >=35	<35

Opportunity Gaps (20 Points Possible)

Points	10	7	5	2	0
<u>Math</u>	> = 40	< 40 and >= 35	< 35 and >= 30	< 30 and >=25	< 25
<u>ELA</u>	>= 50	< 50 and >= 45	< 45 and >= 40	< 40 and >= 35	< 35

Student Engagement (10 Points Possible)

Points	3	2	1	0
Meets requirement NAC 389.445 (1) a-d	>=90	<90 and >=75	<75 and >=60	<60

Academic Learning Plan If 95% of students have ALP then 2 points, If not, 0 points

Points	5	2	0
<u>Chronic Absenteeism</u>	<=5	>5 and <=10	>10

Bonus Points

Climate Survey If Participation is >= 55%, then 2 point. If not, 0 point bonus.

SY 1617 High School Point Attribution Table

Academic Achievement (25 Points Possible)

Points	25	20	15	10	0
<u>Pooled Proficiency Rate</u>	>= 78	< 78 and >= 66	< 66 and >= 58	< 58 and >= 45	< 45

English Language Proficiency (10 Points Possible)

Points	10	7	5	2	0
<u>WIDA AGP</u>	>= 43	< 43 and >= 33	< 33 and >= 25	< 25 and >= 17	< 17

Graduation Rates (30 Points Possible)

Points	20	15	10	5	0
<u>4-year ACGR</u>	>= 84	< 84 and >= 78	< 78 and >= 72	< 72 and >= 67	< 67
Points	10	7	5	2	0
<u>5-year ACGR</u>	>= 86	< 86 and >= 80	< 80 and >= 73	< 73 and >= 67	< 67

College and Career Readiness (25 Points Possible)

Points	10	7	5	2	0
<u>ACT Composite Score</u>	>= 21	< 21 and >= 19	< 19 and >= 17	< 17 and >= 15	< 15
Points	5	4	3	2	0
<u>9th & 10th Grade Credit Sufficiency</u>	>= 95	95< and >= 90	< 90 and >= 80	< 80 and >= 67	< 67
Points	10	7	5	2	0
<u>End Of Course CCR Level</u>	>= 67	< 67 and >= 58	< 58 and >= 50	< 50 and >= 39	< 39

Student Engagement

Points	8	4	0

<u>Chronic Absenteeism</u>	<= 5	> 5 and <= 10	> 10
Points	2		0
<u>Academic Learning Plans</u>	>= 95		< 95
<i>Bonus Points</i>			
<u>Climate Participation</u>	If Participation is $\geq 55\%$, then 2 points. If not, 0 points.		