MINUTES OF THE
JOINT MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
AND THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Seventy-Sixth Session
April 20, 2011

The Joint Assembly Committee on Education and the Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Chair David P. Bobzien at 4:04 p.m. on Wednesday, April 20, 2011, in Room 1214 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda (Exhibit A), the Attendance Roster (Exhibit B), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/76th2011/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

    Assemblyman David P. Bobzien, Chair
    Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop, Vice Chair
    Assemblyman Paul Aizley
    Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson
    Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz
    Assemblywoman Lucy Flores
    Assemblyman Ira Hansen
    Assemblyman Randy Kirner
    Assemblywoman April Mastroluca
    Assemblyman Richard McArthur
    Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford
    Assemblywoman Dina Neal
    Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart
    Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

SENATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Ruben J. Kihuen, Vice Chair
Senator Valerie Wiener
Senator Don Gustavson

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Moises (Mo) Denis, Chair (excused)
Senator Greg Brower (excused)
Senator Barbara K. Cegavske (excused)
Senator Sheila Leslie (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mindy Martini, Committee Policy Analyst
Kristin Roberts, Committee Counsel
Taylor Anderson, Committee Manager
Sharon McCallen, Committee Secretary
Billie McMenamy, Committee Secretary
Gianna Shirk, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Aimee Rogstad Guidera, Executive Director, Data Quality Campaign, Washington, D.C.

Chair Bobzien:
This is a joint meeting that is probably just going to feature the Assembly since the Senate is still in its Committee of the Whole. [Roll was called. Committee protocol and rules were explained.] This is the sixth joint meeting that we have held with the Senate. The meetings have been arranged to help us understand the context of many of the bills that come before our two Committees.

Today we have a presentation on the Data Quality Campaign (DQC). Historically data systems have been built, primarily, to meet accountability requirements. In recent years there has been a shift in the focus of the use of the data to promote student success from preschool through college and

the workplace. The DQC is a national collaborative effort designed to encourage and support state policymakers to improve the availability and use of high quality education data to improve student achievement. The DQC reviews state progress in obtaining ten essential elements of a robust statewide longitudinal data system. Review of the Nevada report shows that our state has eight of the ten essential elements. However, it appears that we are not effectively linking the elements to create an effective longitudinal data system to improve student achievement.

Today, we are very fortunate to have with us Aimee Rogstad Guidera, Executive Director of the Data Quality Campaign.

Aimee Rogstad Guidera, Executive Director, Data Quality Campaign, Washington, D.C.:
Thank you so much for taking time out of what I know is a very busy season and especially what is a very busy weekday.

Focusing on the importance of data, and the conversation here in Nevada about the importance of data, ensures that every single student is graduating from Nevada's high schools and is ready for college and a career. The tag line of the Data Quality Campaign is "Using Data to Improve Student Achievement." As we just heard from the Chair, Nevada is well poised to have that conversation considering the investments that have been made in building and collecting longitudinal data systems. There is a real crossroads right now in terms of having the conversation of how do we change from merely collecting information to really using it to inform decision making at every single level.

I would like to walk through a couple of quick slides and then hopefully have time for a conversation and questions (Exhibit C).

You all know the imperative that you are faced with in this session and that states across the country are faced with. Expectations are rising like they never have before. We are now expected to educate every single child, in our country, in this state, to a new level of proficiency. For the first time, we expect every child to be ready to be successful when he leaves high school, to be ready to be successful in college, to be successful in the workplace—and bluntly—to be successful in a global, knowledge-based twenty-first century economy. We have never set that goal for ourselves ever before in this country, at any point. It is the right expectation to have, but it is also a daunting one.

You know better than I do that the resources are incredibly tight and you are making some hard decisions this week, this month in this session. Likewise, your colleagues across the country are making these decisions of how do we allocate resources to make sure that we are having student achievement and outcomes increase. At the same time, how do we also make sure that efficiencies are improved, that system performance is increased, that we reduce burden across the board, and that we increase transparency? These are the new nonnegotiables that policymakers are dealing with across the country and especially as we talk about education. I would claim that you cannot address any of these issues if you do not use data effectively. While there is no silver bullet in education, there is no silver bullet in improving student achievement, I would like to posit for you that we cannot reach any of our goals—improving student achievement, improving system performance, reducing burden, and changing the conversation in education—if we do not change the culture around valuing information as being a critical part of our conversation about improving student achievement.

On that note, this culture is changing. As mentioned in the opening statement, we have always had education data. We are drowning in education data. For as long as we have had financial systems in education, we have had data for compliance purposes. The old rule is, if you wanted money to flow one way, you need data to flow the other way. So, we have always had these data systems, but the not-so-secret secret is that these systems often did not have quality data. People did not trust the data because they did not use the data, and they also understood that it was really not going to be used for anything other than just "box checking." This information flowed one way, it was for compliance purposes, and it was just something you had to do if you wanted the check to flow from the state capitol to federal capitol. It really did not serve anybody's purposes. It did not change conversations and it was an exercise that people went through.

We are firmly in the era of using data for accountability purposes right now. The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 changed the conversation of how we use data in education. You can love the Act, hate the Act, think it needs to be reformed, but one of the lasting legacies of NCLB is that for the first time ever, it required that every single state disaggregate data by subgroup. For the first time we had a picture of what was happening in our schools in terms of proficiency. We can debate about the different measures—if they were appropriate, if they were accurate, if they work, if they are the right measures—but the greatest legacy is for the first time we started talking about how do we use information in a different way to provide transparency that did not exist before?

One of the negative pieces of this is that data, in this era of accountability, has been equated to a single test score. It has also been seen as something to be feared. Oftentimes people see this kind of data as something that is being done to hurt them. Educators have a very rational fear of this information being used against them. To really change this culture, we need to also acknowledge the fact that there are a lot of people who do not trust the data because in the era of compliance it really was not quality data because no one was using it. In this era of accountability, when data was only being used to catch people who were not doing a great job, people also saw this as not being a positive piece. It was something to be feared and questioned, and something they did not want to own.

I would like to argue, and the Campaign argues that the real power of data comes from changing this conversation of seeing it in a negative way and instead seeing it as enlightening. How do we help people realize that data is the most powerful tool in their arsenal? Whether they are a teacher, a parent, or a legislator, that only when we shine a light on what works and are able to really digest that, will we truly be able to form continuous improvement across the system and to help individual students.

The analogy I like to use is the difference between the accountability data and the informed decision making data. It is like using data when you are driving and looking in your rearview mirror. With accountability data, you can see where you have been. You can look back and realize where you took a wrong turn; you can slow down, and analyze what you did wrong. Unless you actually use the information that you gather from your rearview mirror, and then use it to affect decisions you are going to make as you look forward out of the windshield, it does not matter if you have looked behind you if you have not used it to change what you are doing going forward.

That is where we are right now across this country, and I would argue also, in Nevada. With this shift in thinking about using data for accountability purposes and, thanks to the investments in having stronger, richer, more robust data—we do not have to think about data as a hammer; we can think about it as a laser. We can have richer measures of accountability than we have ever had before. We have oftentimes had to use proxy measures for accountability because we did not have refined, longitudinal data. We now can redefine that conversation about accountability.

Equally important, if not more important, we can also change the conversation about how we want to use this data for continuous improvement and how we make sure that people have access to the information they need in a timely

manner so they can affect what they are doing on a daily basis. This is the real opportunity to change this culture.

Why do we need to do this? We need to do this because we need to change the conversation. We have been having the same conversations in education over and over again, and these conversations in education have been informed by anecdotes, hunches, surveys, and what we think feels right; they have not been informed by data. The data is not the end of the conversation; it is the beginning of the conversation.

When you have good information, when people have equal access to information, it is in a timely manner, it is in a manner people can understand, that makes sense to them and is tailored to their needs, it changes the conversation:

- As parents, when we go into a parent-teacher conference, if we have the information in a way that is presented differently, contextualized for our child, it changes the entire conversation.

- For a school leadership team, looking at data points across the system, it changes how it thinks about setting goals and how it manages toward those goals.

- For a group of middle school teachers looking at individual students and teams of students, what could they be doing differently with curricula decisions?

- As foundation executives, again, how do they invest their dollars? How do they reinforce returns on investment? How do they know what they need to reinforce and what results to ask for?

- As policymakers, in these tight budget times, how do we afford not to use information to make decisions about allocating scarce resources with regard to what we know works? Where is our dollar going to get the biggest results? How are we going to ensure that we have systems, policies, and programs in place that work?

- It is the same issue with school board members.

We could discuss each of these for an hour, but I want to put forth one specific piece that I know you are dealing with here in Nevada, and that is changing and redefining the conversation about teacher effectiveness. This is something

happening in every single state legislature in this session, thinking differently about:

- How we are going to define what makes a teacher effective?
- How are we going to make sure we are defining that?
- How do we measure it?
- How do we talk about it differently?
- How do we create legislation to support that?
- With that being our end goal, how do we ensure that we have an effective teacher in every single classroom in this state and in this country?

There are amazing implications for the kind of data you need to make sure that conversation is informed. People must trust the data; they must have faith in that data. It is not as simple as just saying we need the data system to connect the teacher data system and the data system about teachers. There are many more pieces. All of these conversations need to be enriched by having access to good, reliable, and longitudinal data.

Why do we have to have this data now? It is because the conversations and the policy discussions that you are having oftentimes connect data points from what have been disparate systems. They have been silo systems that have not had to talk to each other, questions like what is the graduation rate from high school? That is a question we can answer by just pulling information out of our K-12 data system. All of that information is contained. But information about which preschool or early learning programs are best preparing students for kindergarten requires data to be pulled and connected from multiple systems.

Here in Nevada, how many graduates require remediation in college? We cannot answer that question here in Nevada if the information can only flow one way—which it does at this point—in terms of K-12 information flowing to postsecondary institutions. What is really vital is having that report come back from the higher education institutions to the K-12 institutions to say, wait, why are all the students who took calculus in twelfth grade and got A's now being forced to take remediation in the postsecondary system? That is a really big message to be sent back to our schools and also to our policymakers; we have an alignment issue. We are not aligning our policies, our structures, and we are not serving the children nor the taxpayers well by not having that check and balance in those feedback reports of data flowing back in a timely manner.

Similarly, Nevada has specific questions:

- How successful are the Millennium Scholars in postsecondary and in the workforce?
- How do we actually know what the long-term impact is of those investments that we are making in our students?
- What are they doing differently in the postsecondary world and in the workforce?
- How do we use that information to continue to support that program?
- How successful are our college graduates in the workforce by major credentials?

When we are thinking about how we prepare every Nevada school child for success in the workplace, success in this global economy, we need to have information to better understand where the jobs are. Where are the jobs of the future, and how do we ensure that our education system is preparing students for those jobs? We cannot do that unless we have actual data that can do it. There are wonderful examples around the country in places such as Florida. You have a letter from former Governor Bush, who I know was planning on being here, talking about the power of what they can do in Florida because their data systems are able to connect the workforce, postsecondary institutions, and K-12 systems.

Where are we in this country and where are we in Nevada? If we are going to have this culture change, if we are really ready to embrace data and truly have education become a data-driven enterprise, we need to first build these systems, and then talk about how we change the culture to use them. The great news is, over the last five years, there have been unbelievable infrastructure investments across this country. When we launched the DQC in 2005, no state had what we considered a complete or robust longitudinal data system. This past year, when we surveyed 24 states having all ten of the essential elements of a longitudinal data system, every single state told us that they were on track for having the ten essential elements in place by the end of the year. That is truly an incredible statement about the political will and making a priority of focusing data across states.

There are some places we need to work on, and Nevada has several of these. The policy issues that you are dealing with and that every single policymaker across the country is dealing with is effective teaching and how do we make sure we have an effective teacher in every class? Also, the issues of focusing on college and career readiness are the two policy areas that were most lacking in terms of our infrastructure capacity across the country.

Nevada is currently missing the ability to have a teacher identifier system and a student identifier system talk to each other. Our understanding is that you have that potential capacity in high school and at the elementary level, but not in the middle schools; you are working on that. Seventeen states still cannot make this link. That means that you cannot have conversations about effective teaching as defined by the impact on student achievement because you literally cannot even have these systems talk to each other. That is the same in 17 other states. You cannot talk about value add, or effective teaching as defined by student achievement, if the systems cannot even talk to each other.

Similarly, on the conversation about college and career readiness, 15 states are not collecting course-taking information connected to individual students, so they are limiting the conversation about knowing what courses are best predictors of success in postsecondary institutions. Similarly, 11 states still cannot connect K-12 and higher education, which goes back to that feedback piece I was talking about.

Without these key elements, we really cannot have those informed conversations in these states about ensuring that every child is ready for college and career and ensuring that we have an effective teacher in every classroom.

The other issue I should point out Nevada is missing right now is the ability to link individual college readiness test scores such as the ACT and Advanced Placement (AP) scores to individual students. That again is a key piece of information when we talk about college and career readiness.

I want to reinforce that it is so important to look at this and realize that by a state collecting this kind of information, it is changing the conversation about how we describe student success. Student success is no longer defined as a single high stakes test score. That is one piece of it, but it is much more that you have a picture of how courses, demographic information, program participation, remediation, all of that related important information.

While we have made this incredible investment in our infrastructure across the country, all of these investments will be for naught if we do not change the conversation and start focusing on the use of this information—not just the collection—and using it actively to inform our decisions toward the goal of ensuring that every child graduates from college and is career ready.

What is actually critical is the point that this data does no one any good if it is sitting in a state agency in a data warehouse—if it is just a compliance system, just an accountability system with limited impact. This data belongs to the

people of Nevada. You are stewards of this data as policymakers and it is only valuable when we take three main things into consideration. One, we make sure this information can be linked across these different disparate systems. Second, we make sure that there is appropriate access to this information and we are protecting privacy. This information can be shared with parents, teachers, and students themselves at an individual level. It can also be provided at an aggregate level to taxpayers, administrators, and to policymakers so that everybody has equal access, there is greater transparency, and we have the information to make decisions. Finally, people should know how to access and use this information. Without building the capacity of people to know what to do with this, again, we are just heading towards more frustration.

Nevada has a state repository and is also providing some progress reports to teachers in terms of academic growth and different pieces. But there is a lot that needs to happen in Nevada to truly transform the conversation about data from one of compliance and box checking, to using the information to inform conversations about continuous improvement, about making sure the system is working, the systems are aligned, and most importantly, that individual students are being served.

A highlight in terms of where the rest of the country is, Nevada is in good company. Forty-three states still cannot do this link of P-20 and into the workforce. A lot of states are still working on this. Forty-four states are still not providing timely access to this information. While 30 states do provide individual student data to teachers, only 10 states in the country currently are able to provide student-level information to parents and students themselves. Think about what a disadvantage our parents are at when they do not even have their own child's information in a timely manner with which to make decisions.

Finally, we feel only one state has done enough to truly look at the importance of improving educator capacity to:

- Know how to access this information.
- Train them in doing this.
- Change the credentialing and the policies about becoming a teacher.
- Truly value data access.
- Use the information as part of becoming a teacher.

Here are some critical things that we are finding across states. It is important for policymakers to think about, as they leverage these systems that have been built, building a governance structure across the P-20/W spectrum.

The prioritization of questions, what happens, and who gets access to this are all controlled by a body somewhere that has authority and responsibility for looking at these data systems. We must get out of the silo approach of everybody owning their own data and feeling they cannot share it. Instead, say how do we create a body and a governance structure that asks:

- What is the data that needs to flow across these systems and inform these conversations?
- What is our research agenda?
- How do we want to make sure we are providing access to the data?
- How do we make sure we are coordinating and collaborating across the system?

Last month Nevada sent a team of five people on a field trip to Georgia that DQC sponsored. I understand one of the take-aways was that the Georgia Alliance of Education Agency Heads—which is basically their P-20 council—has transformed the conversation in Georgia. There has been this view of data not being owned by the separate agencies, but instead how do these agencies work together to be stewards of this data and better serve the citizens of Georgia. There are a lot of great models out there.

The idea of how we create common standards and architecture so that these data systems can talk to each other is important. Absolutely critical, as we talk about data linking and sharing, is ensuring privacy at all times, ensuring the data is protected, confidential, secure, and ensuring only the necessary people have any right to see personally identifiable information. That means a parent, a student, or a teacher at that very moment in time.

It is really building this understanding and demand for information. At this point, if you think about it in economic terms, we have an incredible supply of data. We have more, better, and richer data than we have ever had. It does not matter at all and we will never have a market clearing episode if we do not increase the demand for that information. Right now, there is no demand for that information. We have forgotten how to ask questions. We have forgotten how to demand that information. It is there; we just need to ask for it and we need to ensure that people have access to it.

We need to plan for the sustainability of these systems, what sustainability is going to be based on. Are they providing value to people? Are they useful to people? Are people getting the information they need and are they having their questions answered? This is why, in all of our conversations, we say you must start with the policy questions. You have to start with, "What is in it for me?

Why do I care if I have a data system? What is the information I need to do my job better as a parent, as a governor, as a legislator?" It is vital, as Nevada continues to refine its data system, that it is built and refined to meet the needs of the stakeholders and not built just to use by the people who designed the system. We need to make sure there is broad stakeholder input in terms of what we want these data systems to do. What are the priorities? What is most important? What do we want answered? What data do we need these data systems to provide us? The data, again, is the means; it is not the end. We have to use the data to answer and prioritize those questions.

In summary, states are incredibly well positioned to make this shift to focusing on data use. The infrastructure is there, we have built these systems and millions of dollars have been spent across this country to build these systems. We now need to make sure that those investments are leveraged and we switch to using them. There is growing political will and commitment to building and using these systems. This is an issue that five years ago when I said we were going to talk about data, people's eyes rolled back, and nobody wanted to talk about it. It was the ultimate "snoozer." People are realizing we cannot do our jobs and we cannot afford not to use the information we now have. We are at a critical time when we are realizing more and more of that data has to be part of the conversations.

The other piece is that the whole culture has changed. Policy issues that we could not talk about, that were once considered untouchable, are now part of the dialogue. We are able to be more honest and transparent about the role data can play.

I want to leave you with five game-changing steps for Nevada in terms of providing a road map for you to think about, with all of the decisions you have in front of you, what we think those would be really game changing in terms of this culture change.

It is absolutely important for Nevada to put in place the teacher-student data link and making sure that college ready scores can be linked to individual students. This link with K-12, early childhood, postsecondary, and workforce data is absolutely critical. You will never be able to answer all the questions you are wrestling with in all your committees and in legislation until you have the ability to pull information from these systems, link it appropriately, and use it to answer those questions.

This information will never be valuable to people if they cannot see it. At this point, parents do not have access to the information that they need. Teachers

need to have much more timely access. That is starting to happen in Nevada. Students themselves need to have access to this information. They are the Facebook generation. They are used to having complete access to information at all times and if we want students to take ownership of their own academic careers, we need to provide them information about their own academic proficiency, information about choices they can make, what they are on track to do, and what they can do differently. Again, it is a conversation changing piece when we provide people with their information.

Absolutely critical, if we are talking about getting an effective teacher in every single classroom in this state and in this country, is that we need to bring the schools of education into this conversation. At this point, only two states in the nation automatically provide feedback reports to schools of education about how well their graduates are doing in terms of improving student achievement. That is something I believe every single state legislature, this year, should change, and they should mandate it as information that is automatically shared with every school of education.

I know in Nevada that many of your teachers are trained outside the state, but I also think this sends a very strong message that this can happen across state lines.

In order to reinforce the importance of data to educators, in particular, think about changing licensure certification processes to require that teachers show competency in knowing how to access and use data for becoming a teacher. Again, that is a symbolic but real way of helping improve the capacity of educators to know how to use this information.

In closing, I would leave you with some ideas we have learned from other states. This whole conversation about data is not an information technology issue. For too long it has been seen as something that somebody else in the data basement is going to handle. In the states where they have been successful in changing this conversation, it is because there has been very strong leadership that has said, "This is a policy issue. It is a policy priority. We need to be data champions at the highest level of our policymakers."

In defining success—this is not about a checklist of getting the DQC ten elements or the twelve "competes" elements, or these new actions—it is going to be defined as, have we improved student achievement, and have we improved system performance.

Success and sustainability are going to be determined by meeting the people's needs. Are these systems adding value to people? Are people waking up and saying they cannot live without this data? We are not there yet and we have a long way to go, but there are some very specific steps that Nevada can take to help get there.

Everything I have talked about and all the Nevada results are available on the Data Quality Campaign website. There are survey results if you would like to do comparisons with other states and see their best practices. I also want to encourage you to listen to our national webcast next Thursday on security and privacy issues and on the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FIRPA).

We will be sponsoring a series of regional meetings this summer and would invite a team of Nevada representatives from the Office of the Governor, the legislators, the State Board of Education/State Board for Career and Technical Education, the Chancellor of the Nevada System of Higher Education and Nevada's representative of the Chief State School Officers, Superintendent Rheault to join us in a meeting to talk about exactly how to build these cultures of value in education. I look forward to continuing the conversation.

Chair Bobzien:
I know we have some questions.

Assemblywoman Neal:
Can you give me a practical example of the application of these ten essential elements within a Title I school format? Have you even applied this in a Title I school? If you have, how was the parent-student data access piece applied and created within that program, since that was one of the goals?

Aimee Rogstad Guidera:
These are state systems and we will absolutely not have success in terms of using student achievement unless we also have great collaboration between state systems and district data systems. The majority of the data collection and work is happening at the district level. But in the Title I schools, there is some very powerful use of this state-level information. The No. 1 example that is very compelling is the use of early warning indicator systems. With these data systems now in place, we know what the predictors are if a student is going to fall off track and drop out or not be ready for college and career. It varies depending on whether you are in a rural or urban school, whether or not you are reading by third grade, whether your attendance is at a certain level, or whether

or not you have discipline issues. There are certain triggers that happen that are now being collected in the state data system. The state can now alert the district that it is going to lose this student. There are now indicators that enable us to know when we need to make some interventions to get the student back on track. That is the district's role, not the state's role, to do that but we have that system at the state level; the information is there, there is analysis being run, and because of longitudinal studies, we know what interventions work. There is also assistance that the state can give the district informing it about the following four programs that are getting results with students who are dropping out of the fourth grade for certain reasons.

Again, it is this collaboration between the districts and the state piece, but it is also a larger conversation about how do we change this culture of state agencies from being compliance agencies to being agencies that are customer-service focused? That is a really big change. We have not staffed agencies that way; they have been compliance officers. They have been middlemen in putting money in one direction and data in another, and what we are saying is how do you use rich information effectively and efficiently, not just to look at system alignment, but to serve students in the system now? Use that great analysis at the state level to help districts identify students who need help now.

Assemblywoman Neal:
Building upon that, you had listed a goal for a research agenda as one of the pieces. Within that model, has it been fleshed out or even tried where a principal, vice principal, or certain teachers have a specific research knowledge on campus? Then when data is given, they can apply their substantive knowledge to that area and apply the intervention onsite. I thought that was one of the unique things about having a research agenda or having the capacity at the local level to bring in an organization, not a state agency. That agency would have established data and representatives would come in and operate on campus and say, "This is what we know. This is how we can apply it today and over the next six weeks in order for you to get this outcome." Has that been tried?

Aimee Rogstad Guidera:
Absolutely. That is exactly what these data systems are allowing people to do. Better data is allowing us to quickly pinpoint issues. It is also allowing us to tailor the interventions and the programs to meet individual student needs, rather than using one intervention for all students, even though there may be very specific needs. They are research based; they have been proven.

If you look at any turnaround school, high performance school, or beat-the-odds school, in every single school, one of the hallmarks of those systems—whether they be at the classroom, school, or system level—is that they are using data and they have a data-driven culture as part of that system. What we are saying is it needs to be a culture that is statewide for it to be truly effective.

Assemblyman Anderson:
Are those just concepts? Are they done uniformly around the country, and does every state do it differently? My concern is that recently we have had discussions on education in trying to compare ourselves to other states to make policy decisions, so I am wondering if it is a good idea to make sure we are doing these in a uniform way across the country.

Aimee Rogstad Guidera:
This is back to the issue of common data standards and definitions that all of these systems have been built for compliance purposes. They are built for different purposes than what we are trying to use them for now. You are at a disadvantage. So many of your teachers are being trained outside the state. If the data systems cannot talk to each other, you can do it, but it is much more costly and less effective; you have to chase down all those programs, and probably do it in paper format because the systems are not able to talk to each other, or they are not written in the same code. One of the issues is how do we get these data systems to talk to each other so that there is comparability, but also there is this interoperability of the systems to do that.

We think this is something that the nation is able to think about. Part of it was that states were so into building their own systems over the past five years. Now, as we are talking about the fact that we have mobile societies—our workforce is mobile and our students are mobile—how do we ensure that these records can cross state lines and how do we not lose those feedback reports when half of our students are going to college in a different state? You do not know how you have prepared them if New Mexico cannot send back information to Nevada. Likewise, within the K-12 system, if we do not have ways of being able to code kids and know that a student actually transferred from a school district in Clark County to a school in Santa Fe—because the systems cannot talk to each other—the student gets counted as a dropout. Actually, that student's family just moved. It should not be a negative thing for Nevada.

Again, I think it is a huge issue, this interstate interoperability. It is the same issue in terms of intersystem interoperability: getting systems to talk to each other, and linking and sharing information, to meet people's needs. It is thinking

about what policy questions we are most interested in. If one of them is being able to follow our graduates into the workplace and into postsecondary institutions, wherever they may be, then we need to start thinking about how we make sure we do that.

The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education is actually working with a group of five states to develop interoperable data systems because, in studies, they know that their populations are very mobile. They are thinking of how to get their data systems to talk to each other. That is exciting news.

Assemblyman Anderson:
Have you talked to the Uniform Law Commission at all? I am not sure how much education they are involved in, since they basically have a number of areas that we have looked over this session in different committees on different topics, but it sounds like . . .

Chair Bobzien:
I am not sure that is a topic for that particular body. However, I will say that the DQC is part of the National Conference of State Legislatures; there is a network there. We will have a presentation on common core standards and what role they play in essentially plugging into how the states do these sorts of things.

Assemblywoman Flores:
I am familiar with what Florida has done with their data system, how effective it is, and the cost savings associated with this type of work. However, we have heard a lot of testimony in this session from various committees about the work that needs to be done within our own infrastructure and how far away we are from really implementing something like Florida has. Can you tell us if you have looked at Nevada, how far away we really are, what type of work is necessary to achieve what you have just presented, and, obviously, the cost associated with something like that?

Can you also cite a few examples of the cost savings that were achieved because of the implementation of this type of program in the other states?

Aimee Rogstad Guidera:
I can send some written pieces in terms of cost. I do not, off the top of my head, talk about cost savings, but there are all kinds of great examples in terms of Florida. Again, I have a whole paper I can send you. Looking at duplication of effort across the states, state agencies do not have to do things three or four times but only have to enter the information once. There have been increases

in the quality of the information, which reduces errors and costs. In Florida, there have been phenomenal stories about being able to attract businesses because of showing the impact on education.

In terms of how far Nevada has to go, there is a lot of work to be done in terms of changing the conversation. This is not about software and hardware; it is about changing people's behavior. A story that was in *The Wall Street Journal* two weeks ago, talked about medical records and the transition to electronic records, which is very similar to what we are talking about. They had spent billions of dollars in the medical industry in terms of changing how people access and use information for research and diagnostics. If you substitute student for patient, it works in education. The No. 1 issue they are having in implementing those electronic medical records is getting doctors to change their behavior. The example they give is that pediatricians are used to asking about vaccines at the end of the appointment; with the new electronic systems they want to ask about it in the beginning so that the nurse can have the vaccinations ready at the end. They said changing human behavior is the hardest part of this. That is what I would say about the educational roadmap of "to do's" that you have available online. It is getting people out of their comfort zone to sit down together and ask what they are trying to do here in Nevada, asking, "How does what I do relate to this bigger goal that we have in Nevada of getting every child to be college and career ready and what other information do I need?" There is cost savings in terms of breaking down silos and getting people to work together towards a common goal.

It is hard to legislate changing behavior, but the DQC believes that the state actions we put forward are exactly that. They are policies that state policymakers can implement that begin to put together a culture that says, "We are going to value this information and we are going to start requiring people to use it differently."

In terms of cost, yes, there is going to be cost to expand these systems and to use them to meet user needs. The minute they are not meeting user and stakeholder needs, they are useless. Just like roads, every year or two you build road maintenance into your budget. The same thing needs to happen with these data systems. There will be maintenance costs. There can be a huge cost savings at all levels by changing how we report accountability.

We are asking the federal government to stop asking for so many compliance data points and reduce the burden on states and districts. You do not need to ask about seat time, when actually what you are trying to understand is did a student learn something by the end of the year?

Chair Bobzien:
The medical records analogy is perfect. At the end of the day, this is not just about information technology or collecting data; it is about informing and improving business processes. It is a two-way street between those two worlds and hopefully that will be the sort of change this effort can foster here in Nevada.

Can you give us some quick details on the presentation for tomorrow in case members would like to join you for that?

Aimee Rogstad Guidera:
It is in the Annex in the Capitol Building. We are gathering stakeholders in Nevada's system. We hope stakeholders of Nevada's data system will talk about what their policy priorities are. By the end of the day, we would like to have a conversation about what Nevada's data system is doing, and what are the priorities to ensure that Nevada's system is being developed, used, and refined to meet the needs of Nevada stakeholders. It will be a very interactive session. The Governor, legislative leadership, the state Superintendent, and the panel from Georgia will be in attendance. We will start at 8:30 a.m. with breakfast and we will end at 1:30 p.m.

Chair Bobzien:
I want to express my appreciation to the Governor's Office for assisting with bringing this group together.

We do have a moment for some brief public comment if anyone wishes. [There was no one.]

Meeting is adjourned [at 4:52 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Sharon McCallen
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblyman David P. Bobzien, Chair

DATE: _____

_____
Senator Mo Denis, Chair

DATE: _____

<u>EXHIBITS</u>

Committee Name: <u>Assembly Committee on Education/Senate</u>
<u>Committee on Education</u>

Date: <u>April 20, 2011</u>   **Time of Meeting:** <u>4:04 p.m.</u>

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
	C	Aimee Rogstad Guidera	Data Quality Campaign PowerPoint Presentation