

**TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2023
9:00 AM**

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Rd.	Las Vegas	Boardroom
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Boardroom
Department of Education	Virtual/ Livestream	n/a	n/a

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Chair Pam Salazar
Vice Chair Pam Teel
Jeana Blackman-Taylor
Elizabeth Cadigan
Linda Gilkerson
Pamela Goynes-Brown
Darcy McInnis
Dr. Juanita Ortiz
Sue Moulden
Sarah Negrete
Andrew Tiscareno

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (NDE) STAFF IN ATTENDANCE
IN CARSON CITY**

Tina Statucki, Education Programs Professional; Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement (EDLiFE)

IN LAS VEGAS

Kathleen Galland-Collins, EDLiFE
Rick Derry, EDLiFE

SENIOR DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL via videoconference

David Gardner

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

In Las Vegas:

None

Carson City:

None

Virtually:

Members of the public could view the meeting live via live streaming.

1. **CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chair Pam Salazar called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Salazar.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT #1**

There were 3 public comments regarding the class size adjustments submitted via email (see appendix A)

3. **INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 14, 2022, MEETING MINUTES** (*Information/ Discussion/ Possible Action*)

Chair Salazar opened the panel for review of the December 14, 2022, meeting minutes. Member Jeana Blackman Taylor mentioned that there was a minor error with the future meeting date for the meeting in February. Chair Salazar entertained a motion for the approval of the December 14 meeting minutes.

Member Blackman Taylor motion to approve the meeting minutes. Member Linda Gilkerson seconded the motion, and with all in favor the motion carried.

4. **INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING NEVADA EDUCATOR PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK (NEPF) UPDATES** (*Information/ Discussion*)

Tina Statucki, Education Programs Professional, Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement (EDLiFE) gave a presentation on updates within the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) and the Nevada Department of Education (NDE). The December NEPF Liaison Newsletter was emailed to NEPF Liaisons on December 21, 2023, posted to the NDE update which goes out to all educators via OPAL, and posted on the NEPF webpage. Mrs. Statucki added that the department created an NEPF Stakeholder infographic to explain the NEPF process in language for non-educators and it is available in English and Spanish on the NEPF webpage. ([See meeting materials](#)). Member Jeana Blackmon-Taylor expressed gratitude to the Council for creating the NEPF Stakeholder Infographic.

5. **INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE 2023 LEGISLATIVE SESSION** (*Information/ Discussion/ Possible Action*)

Tina Statucki provided legislative updates for the two bills that were currently being proposed for the current legislative session that directly impacts the work of the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) and NEPF implementation. The first bill was Assembly Bill 65 (AB65) and was proposed by the Nevada Department of Education (NDE). There are several items included in the bill; however, sections ten and eleven pertain to the summative evaluation of teachers and administrations. Based on stakeholder feedback the department has collected through interviews and multiple conversations with educators from across the State, sections 10 and 11 of this bill seeks to add clarifying language regarding the exemption of the summative evaluation for eligible educators. If an educator receives two consecutive years of a highly effective rating, the educator is not required to have a summative evaluation in the third year in that cycle. Educators still participate in the observation cycle every year; however, they can be exempt from having a final evaluation. There was confusion as to whether educators CAN receive an evaluation of the third year. The proposed language seeks to

clarify that educators may or may not get the evaluation based on whether an administrator chooses to complete the summative evaluation or whether a teacher requests a summative evaluation. There are a variety of reasons why an educator may want to do an evaluation. Chair Salazar opened the floor for questions about the intent of the change in language and the intent with AB65. Member Elizabeth Cadigan asked why the language was written to allow both the administrator or the teacher to choose to complete the evaluation and not just one group or the other. Kathleen Galland-Collins, Assistant Director, Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement (EDLiFE) answered that when TLC initially put the language for the exemption forward for consideration, it was in response to requests from evaluators to lighten the administrator load and give them the option for less paperwork. If an evaluator needed to do an evaluation or wanted to do an evaluation in the third year, he or she could. She added that a teacher could also request it. Teach Nevada Scholarships require recipients to receive an effective rating for five years, so if someone does not receive an evaluation in the third year, it could prevent them from receiving their scholarship. Chair Salazar confirmed the original intent, especially as it pertains to educators who may move or who are new to a building. Member Sue Moulden wanted to know whether an educator, after receiving a highly effective rating and qualifying for an exemption, could a new administrator require an evaluation or would the educator have the right to refuse the evaluation without penalty. Mrs. Galland-Collins responded that with the language as it is currently written, it would be at the discretion of the evaluator. Member Gilkerson added her concern that it appears to be punitive and not beneficial to a teacher. Mrs. Galland-Collins added that the new language gives a teacher the right to request an evaluation, as it has been interpreted in the past that the evaluator has the sole discretion of whether an evaluation is conducted. Chair Salazar reiterated that the original intent was to support administrators, not reward teachers. Member Moulden stated her support for giving teachers the right to ask for an evaluation. Member Blackman Taylor expressed her original misunderstanding of part 2. Chair Salazar said historically part 2 was always an option – the point of this legislation was part 1 – to give teachers a role. Member Cadigan asked whether an administrator could refuse to write an evaluation for a teacher who requests one - whether the administrator have the final say in that situation. Deputy Attorney General (DAG) David Gardner said if a teacher says he/she wants an evaluation, but the administrator says no, the evaluation would still be required under section 10.3(a) item (2) of the NRS 391.690. Chair Salazar clarified three position options: take a stance in favor, take a stance in opposition, or not take a stance. Member Blackman Taylor asked if they could take a split opposition. Mrs. Galland-Collins, with confirmation from the DAG, said any requested changes would be a stance in opposition. Member Cadigan asked what steps TLC could take. Mrs. Galland-Collins said if TLC votes to oppose, they request that the Chair speak on their behalf if the bill is heard again, or they could request that NDE amend the bill. Mrs. Galland-Collins said the next hearing could be in the Senate. The DAG said it would likely go to the Assembly floor first.

Member Elizabeth Cadigan made a motion to oppose a request to remove item 2 to the Nevada Department of Education. Member Gilkerson seconded the motion.

Member Moulden asked why we are adding the language if it is already written that an administrator can do an evaluation. Mrs. Galland-Collins responded that districts were not interpreting it consistently, so the language is being added to ensure that it is understood that either party could request the evaluation. Member Negrete asked why the Council is opposing it if it is already being interpreted both ways – whether the Council’s vote changes anything. If nothing happens, then

nothing changes. Mrs. Galland-Collins said that if they oppose it and the language is removed, then it removes the right of the administrator to conduct an evaluation. The DAG confirmed that position. In response to Member Negrete, Tina Statucki confirmed that not taking a position would mean that an administrator could be the sole decider in whether an evaluation is conducted. Chair Salazar asked the DAG to clarify what the previous language said and confirmed that it lacked clarity and could be interpreted in different ways. Member Moulden suggested the removal of the language of “to the discretion of” as it was negative. Chair Salazar asked whether they could take a vote to change the language. Mrs. Galland-Collins said they would need to make a vote to oppose with a request for a friendly amendment. ([See meeting materials](#)).

Member Cadigan made a motion to change the motion on the floor from removing point 2 to and rewriting the language of point 1 to read “upon request of the post probationary teacher or the administrator who conducts the observation cycle.” Member Gilkerson asked whether they could approve the bill with the deletion but said that because there was already a position on the floor, she would retract her second. **Member Sue Moulden seconded the motion.**

Chair Salazar voted YES to change the language to read “upon request of the post probationary teacher or the administrator who conducts the observation cycle.”

Vice Chair Teel voted YES to change item 1 to read “upon request of the post probationary teacher or the administrator who conducts the observation cycle.”

Member Blackman Taylor voted YES to change item 1 to read “upon request of the post probationary teacher or the administrator who conducts the observation cycle.”

Member Cadigan voted YES to change item 1 to read “upon request of the post probationary teacher or the administrator who conducts the observation cycle.”

Member Gilkerson voted YES to change item 1 to read “upon request of the post probationary teacher or the administrator who conducts the observation cycle.”

Member McKinnis voted YES to change item 1 to read “upon request of the post probationary teacher or the administrator who conducts the observation cycle.”

Member Ortiz voted YES to change item 1 to read “upon request of the post probationary teacher or the administrator who conducts the observation cycle.”

Member Moulden voted YES to change item 1 to read “upon request of the post probationary teacher or the administrator who conducts the observation cycle.”

Member Negrete voted YES to change item 1 to read “upon request of the post probationary teacher or the administrator who conducts the observation cycle.”

Member Tiscareno voted YES to change item 1 to read “upon request of the post probationary teacher or the administrator who conducts the observation cycle.”

With ten members in favor and no objections, the motion passed.

Mrs. Statucki provided an update on Senate Bill (SB) 151. The meeting materials posted on the website showed Assembly Bill (AB) 151, but it should have been SB 151. SB 151 proposed changing the student performance domain of the NEPF evaluation from 15 percent, current weight, to 50 percent. Chair Salazar added that the TLC had always intended that student outcomes be a part of the NEPF teacher and administrator evaluation; however, Chair Salazar has represented TLC at numerous legislative sessions to explain why the weight should not be 50 percent of the evaluation. In 2019, it was decided that student outcomes would be 15 percent. Chair Salazar stated her belief that this was an opportunity for the TLC to take a stance on whether the Council supports SB 151. Vice Chair Teel agreed with Chair Salazar and added that it should be kept at 15 percent or even reduced to 10 percent. Member Linda Gilkerson asked who proposed the legislation. Chair Salazar said that this is a legislative bill request from Senator Carrie Buck that is proposing it be changed from 15 percent to 50 percent, which was where it was originally in 2013.

Member Andrew Tiscareno entertained a motion to oppose SB 151. Member Cadigan seconded the motion.

Mrs. Galland-Collins asked, since the Council is opposed to the bill, was there a specific action that the Council would want to take, such as having the chair speak out or drafting a letter. Vice Chair Teel agreed with Mrs. Galland-Collins and suggested that the Chair speak to this item in opposition and provide the history and background as to why the Council opposes.

Member Tiscareno agreed to the friendly amendment to his motion allowing the Chair to speak in opposition to SB 151 at any legislative meeting on behalf of TLC. Member Cadigan seconded the amended motion. Chair Salazar called for a vote in support of the motion to oppose SB 151. Without further discussion or objection, the motion passed unanimously.

Per member Cardigan's request, Mrs. Statucki provided a review of AB 266 (2021) from the previous legislative session ([see meeting materials](#)). Mrs. Statucki added that there was no current legislation addressing this item, NRS 391.465, but the deadline for proposed legislation was not until March 20, 2023. Chair Salazar said since there was no bill in regard to class size, then one action the TLC could take would be to make a recommendation to the State Board of Education. Mrs. Galland-Collins believes that there was a possibility that the Council could take a position if NRS 388.890 was opened up; however, there was no legislation that was opening up this particular regulation yet. The Council could make a recommendation to go to the State Board, and one of the avenues could be to forward the public comment given at the beginning of the meeting to the State Board of Education since it was not in the Council's purview to set class size or class size recommendations. DAG Gardner suggested that the Council could forward the public comment, vote to allow members to go to the legislative session, write a letter to either the senate education committee or the assembly committee on education to add something to an existing bill request, or ask for an amendment should a bill come out. DAG Gardner added that it depends on what the TLC strategy would be. Chair Salazar added that even though class size is not directly under the TLC purview, in response to the public comments made earlier, the Council can decide to act. Member Blackman Taylor questioned

whether it would be better to add subjects to the exemption list or to recommend class size ratios for those already listed so that they would have an ability to take advantage of the class size ratio adjustment as a part of their evaluation. Chair Salazar asked for clarification as to whether a good approach would be to work with the State Board of Education and NDE, as they were already working on the class size recommendations. Mrs. Galland-Collins stated the addition of the class size adjustments has added additional confusion and unnecessary workload to the NEPF process. She added that there is not currently any legislation that is opening NRS 391.465 or NRS 388.890. Mrs. Galland-Collins suggested that the TLC could write a position statement on where they stand on class size adjustments. Chair Salazar added that when the bill was originally passed, TLC was not in support. Chair Salazar clarified that the TLC could reiterate their position that they were not in favor of the bill in a position statement or to support a particular stance. Vice Chair Teel suggested that the bill be removed completely, or it should remain the same. She added that the class size should be effective for all and not just picking and choosing. Member Cadigan stated that after her last meeting she researched who was, within her school, receiving support and who wasn't. She was told that since she teaches music (not band, choir, or orchestra) then she would be eligible; however, she did not receive the adjustment. She says it was not being implemented consistently. She asked to have this brought up because educators need to feel they are being supported regardless of what subject they teach and that there should be recognition that the workload of all educators is strenuous. To exclude groups and not to provide them with any sort of guidelines is detrimental. She believes since the State does not have caseload guidelines for certain subjects, it has caused excuses for lack of support, allowed classes to become dumping grounds, and ultimately impacted the quality of instruction and safety for all the students and staff in the classrooms. Member Cadigan requested to recommend that TLC supports wording that is inclusive to all subjects when it comes to case load numbers. Vice Chair Teel agreed with member Cadigan – the adjustment should be removed or made available to all. Chair Salazar confirmed that the stance TLC would take would be to remove the course/subject exemptions and that all teachers could be eligible for the additional weight. Member Cadigan wanted to know whether, if they oppose whether the bill altogether, could the opposition statement include allowing Council members to speak to the State Board or Legislators to encourage the creation of a bill that creates caseload guidelines for all subjects within the State of Nevada. Mrs. Galland-Collins stated that TLC cannot make recommendations regarding class size caps unless it relates to the evaluation as the role of the TLC is to make recommendations to the State Board of Education regarding the evaluation of educators in the State of Nevada. Member Cadigan asked if they opposed the bill altogether and then make recommendations that the TLC reaches out to either the State Board or to legislators to explain that the lack of caseload numbers for all subjects caused the exclusion in the first place. She stated that explaining the opposition can be done to align within the purview of the TLC while also helping legislators become aware of the larger problem which is that not all educators are being treated equitably. Mrs. Galland-Collins asked for clarification on member Cardigans' request for the Department to draft a statement expressing TLC's recommendation that they remove the class size adjustment from the evaluation or make it inclusive so that every teacher gets the adjustment. Member Cadigan confirmed her position, adding that the statement needed to include the reasons for the opposition. Mrs. Galland-Collins asked for confirmation whether the Council would need to make a motion that the Chair and NDE would work together to draft a statement on behalf of the TLC, and asked whether they would need to get approval of that statement before posting it or would just that motion be approval of the statement. Mrs. Galland-Collins suggested that the statement could be included in the meeting

minutes, or it could be sent to specific bodies. DAG David Gardner said the TLC could delegate the authority to the Department to write it and send it out, knowing that direction has been given as to what the statement should include, or to write it and bring it back to TLC to review and approve it. It depended on the motion made by TLC. Mrs. Galland-Collins also added the suggestion to call it by the regulation. Member Cadigan asked whether the motion could include allowing the Chair to speak on behalf of TLC should the opportunity arise legislatively or otherwise. DAG David Gardner said it could, but it was not necessary as once the position is available any member of the TLC could speak on this matter.

Member Cadigan moved that NDE draft a statement to oppose the class adjustment of NRS 391.465 or to extend it to all teachers regardless of subject area so that it is inclusive of all teachers.

Member Jeana Blackman Taylor wanted to clarify that the position was to recommend making it inclusive of all teachers, not to remove it, as some teachers benefited from it. Member Galland-Collins clarified that the adjustment does not actually adjust class sizes; rather, eligible teachers received an adjustment on the evaluation. Ms. Statucki added that overall, only 208 teachers benefited from having their overall rating effective because only certain indicators were impacted and only if the teacher did not already receive a 4 on that indicator. Member Teel added that this was why TLC originally opposed the bill as it did very little other than add more work to administrators. Mrs. Galland restated that the motion made by Member Cadigan was that TLC would work with NDE to draft a statement to oppose the class adjustment of NRS 391.465 or request that all teachers are eligible regardless of their subject.

Member Blackman Taylor seconded the motion. Without further discussion or objection, the motion passed.

6. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE ELECTION OF COUNCIL CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR PURSUANT TO NRS 391.455 (Information/ Discussion/ Possible Action)

DAG David Gardner explained the procedures for the election of the chair and vice chair pursuant to NRS 391.455.

Member Negrete nominated Pam Salazar as chair. All council members were in favor of the reelection of Chair Salazar. Member Negrete nominated Pam Teel as vice chair. All council members were in favor of the reelection of Vice Chair Teel.

7. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE POSSIBLE CHANGE OF FUTURE MEETING TIMES (Information/ Discussion/ Possible Action)

Members of the council discussed meeting times for future meeting dates.

Vice Chair Teel made a motion to move the meeting to a 2:00 PM start time. Member Moulden seconded the motion. All were in favor, and with no further discussion or objections, the motion passed.

8. **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS** (*Information/ Discussion*)

Chair Salazar suggested that the next meeting include any other legislative updates, as well as the usual NEPF/ Department updates. Mrs. Statucki recommended reaching out to RPDP (Regional Professional Development Program) to do their annual presentation and provide information on all the support they give in the implementation of the NEPF.

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT #2**

One public comment submitted via email regarding the Assembly Bill 65 (see appendix A)

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 11:20 AM.

APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS GIVEN DURING PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Tina Dolbeare, Donner Springs Elementary, Music Teacher, Washoe County School District provided public comment regarding discussion being held on whether the council should recommend that the state make class size adjustments inclusive of all educator groups.
2. Darrell Crowther, Choir Teacher, Depoali Middle School, Reno, NV Washoe County School District provided public comment regarding discussion being held on whether the council should recommend that the state make class size adjustments inclusive of all educator groups.
3. Kelly Mitchell, PE Teacher, Desert Skies Middle School, Sun Valley, NV Washoe County School District provided public comment regarding discussion being held on whether the council should recommend that the state make class size adjustments inclusive of all educator groups.
4. Marissa McClish, Professional Growth Systems Project Coordinator, Washoe County School District, provided public comment on the teacher evaluation rubric.

ITEM A1: TINA DOLBEARE

To the Members of the Nevada State Teachers and Leaders Council,

My name is Tina Dolbeare and I am a teacher at Donner Springs Elementary in WCSD.

I am writing to share my opinion on the discussion being held on whether the Council should recommend that the state make class size adjustments inclusive of all educator groups.

I teach preschool-5th grade and have been a music educator for 35 years. Class size truly impacts student learning and accessibility. Example: I have over thirty 5th graders in each section for 30 minutes twice a week. They have had large class sizes since they were in primary grades. Each year they advanced we didn't have enough allocations for an extra teacher. Passing out materials or instruments is so time consuming I have had to greatly simplify my course. Class management is difficult as well. Last year the kindergartners had 27 students. It was very challenging to teach my curriculum and the classes were more chaotic than I was comfortable with. Even staying in a line moving to a circle was a challenge by March. This year we had smaller classes and the students could do these tasks in August.

Please allow the Council to recommend that the state makes class size adjustments inclusive of all educator groups.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Tina Dolbeare

Donner Springs Elementary Music Teacher

ITEM A2: DARREL CROWTHER

To the Members of the Nevada State Teachers and Leaders Council,

My name is Darrell Crowther, and I am the choir teacher at Depoali Middle School in Reno, Nevada.

I am writing to share my opinion on the discussion being held on whether the Council should recommend that the state make class size adjustments inclusive of all educator groups.

Approximately 10 years ago, I worked at an elementary school in Clark County where the population of the school required that music specialists have more than one 1st grade class and more than one second grade class meet during the same class period. This placed 56 second graders in my care at once, and 43 first graders in another class. The school librarian had a similar situation, including double Kindergarten classes. It is not difficult to understand why having 56 7-year-olds in the care of one adult is both dangerous and ineffective. During this school year, I applied for teaching positions in international schools and left with my family to teach in India and the United Arab Emirates. In my first position, the school did not have classes larger than 15 students and every teacher had an aide. While I would not expect a similar scenario in public schools, the situation in India underscored the value and efficiency that the school community saw in small, manageable class sizes. Students at this school were widely accepted into Ivy League universities and notable institutions around the globe. I felt spoiled because of the depth of knowledge both my students and I got to explore.

I returned to Nevada after 5 years abroad upon the request of my children to take advantage of the State's magnet schools. Since this time, I have been working at Depoali Middle School and have watched in dismay the lack of adults in the building. While many schools in the U.S. and in Nevada have hall monitors, for instance, our school has three administrators covering 187,343 square-foot and providing duty for a student-body of approximately 900 students. Likewise, we have only two full-time school counselors to serve students in a vulnerable age group. The lone daytime school custodian and groundskeeper are often left alone to provide supervision during lunch and before and after school since there are so many entrances and locations to cover. Large areas of school hallways are without supervision due to the number of staff available. I have often felt unsafe, and some of my students have expressed unease, because there is not enough intervention or preventative measures to maintain student behavior.

As a music teacher, I am also disappointed that we are not included in class size considerations available to other core teachers. Music teachers provide a crucial role in schools and in the lives of students. As someone who has taught at both the elementary and secondary levels, I am keenly aware of our role in hooking students into enjoying school and learning. We recently were passed up for an opportunity to receive a bonus negotiated in our district for teachers with large roles. We were made aware of this exclusion due to the State's inability to determine a class size for music classes.

Please allow the Council to recommend that the state makes class size adjustments inclusive of all educator groups.

Thank you,

Darrell Crowther - Depoali Middle School Choir

ITEM A3: KELLY MITCHELL

To the Members of the Nevada State Teachers and Leaders Council,
My name is KELLY MITCHELL and I am a PE TEACHER at DESERT SKIES MIDDLE SCHOOL in SUN VALLEY .

I am writing to share my opinion on the discussion being held on whether the Council should recommend that the state make class size adjustments inclusive of all educator groups. I am the only PE teacher at Desert Skies and was the only PE teacher at Dilworth Middle school. It seems as though the GYM has a larger classroom space and therefore becomes a "dumping ground" for 40-50 kids per teacher. Bigger space should not mean more kids. Let's think about what 40-50 kids look like. One teacher is responsible for the learning and performance of all kids. One teacher is to maintain behavior in a large open space, and we all know behavior is harder to manage in a larger space, especially 40-50 kids outside. One teacher assesses 40-50 kids and determines whether these kids have learned the task, needed more help, or needed a lot more help to reach the set outcomes, aka DIFFERENTIATION. That one teacher then separates kids into those groups and now through the process of Zone of Proximity Development, to get maximize growth kids need to be taught at their existing levels, that one teacher helps three different groups achieve their set outcomes. Let's now look at the classroom teacher who has maybe a max of 32 kids doing the same thing and expecting set outcomes. All teachers are set to grow these kids during a 9-week period of time. Does it seem like it would be harder to grow kids with more kids in a classroom? Does it seem like it would be harder to get behaviors under control with more kids? Does it seem like it takes extra time every day to just do the daily task of getting that many kids to listen to the teacher so the day can begin? The answers to all of these questions are YES....it is very difficult. It is a difficult and exhausting daily challenge. Lastly, imagine you're at a kids birthday party and you look around at 50 kids running around enjoying themselves and you think what if I was the ONLY person responsible for the safety, growth, behavior, and TEST SCORES for all these kids. What would that feel like? Could you, do it? *50 kids can* cause many, many unforeseen problems. One pair of eyes makes it such a challenge to manage that many kids at one time. Now put equipment into the mix, bats, racquets, La Crosse equipment, golf clubs etc. Now to manage the impulse of an 11- to 14-year-old "goofing around". By the end of one class period, I am exhausted from classroom management let alone teaching. Multiply

that by 4 periods DAILY.... and that is us in survival mode. Now let's add in that one class period has 11 IEP's, individual educational plan, and 5-10 ELL kids, and 4-5 dual kids...On top of a maxed out per period case load.

Please allow the Council to recommend that the state makes class size adjustments inclusive of all educator groups.

Thank you,
Kelly Mitchell

PE TEACHER, ATHLETIC DIRECTOR

ITEM A4: MARISSA MCCLISH

Hello,

I wanted to share that our district receives a few requests from administrators every year to evaluate a teacher during their Observation Only year. This occurs when an educator changes roles. For example, from a Teacher to a Teacher on Special Assignment or a Counselor to a Teacher. This is not meant to be punitive, rather to support the educator in their new role on their new evaluation rubric.

Marissa McClish

Professional Growth Systems Project Coordinator

Department of Human Resources

Washoe County School District

775.348.3844 office