

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
STATEWIDE COUNCIL FOR THE  
COORDINATION OF THE REGIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS  
OCTOBER 19, 2017  
10:00 A.M.**

**Meeting Locations:**

The meeting will be video conferenced from both locations.

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	9890 S. Maryland Pkwy	Las Vegas	Board Room (2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor)
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St	Carson City	Board Room

**DRAFT MINUTES**

**1. Call to Order; Roll Call: Pledge of Allegiance**

Jeff Zander, Chair

**Meeting called to order at 10:07 AM**

Roll Call

Council members in attendance:

In Las Vegas:

- Brent Husson
- Dr. Wendi Hawk
- Jeff Zander
- Debbie Brockett

In Carson City:

- Nicolette Smith
- Aaron Grossman

Phone in:

- Pam Teel

Audience in attendance:

In Las Vegas:

- Chelli Smith
- Jeff Zaul
- Alberto Quintero

In Carson City:

- Kirsten Gleissner
- Sondra Neudauer

Department Staff in attendance:

In Las Vegas:

- Kelee Dupuis
- Raven Cole

**2. Public Comment #1**

There was no public comment in the north or south.

**3. Flexible Agenda Approval** *(Discussion/For Possible Action)*

Jeff Zander, Chair

**Motion**

- Member Hawk moved to approve a flexible agenda

- Member Husson seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 10:09AM**

**4. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes for September 28, 2017** (*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*)

Jeff Zander, Chair

**Motion**

- Member Husson moved to approve the September 28, 2017 meeting minutes
- Member Hawk seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 10:09 AM**

**5. Nevada Department of Education Updates** (*Information/Discussion*)

Kelee Dupuis, Education Programs Professional

The Professional Development (PD) Standards proposed to the State Board of Education (SBE) were adopted; leading to Item 6.

**6. Adoption of Professional Development Standards** (*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*)

Kelee Dupuis, Education Programs Professional

Last week, SBE adopted the 9 recommendations proposed in the SB474 Taskforce. The first seven of the nine, were taken from the Learning Forward Standards that have already been put into practice from the RPDP. Standard 8 addresses Equity, and Standard 9 addresses Cultural Competency. These 2 standards were added because even though the two elements may be implied in the other seven standards, if they were not specified, the Taskforce worried the standards would not be addressed.

In addition, the Taskforce found it incredibly difficult to get a handle on PD. SBE has asked the RPDP to come up with recommendations that will be included in a report that Districts would be asked to provide to NDE and SBE. Recommendations the Taskforce thought were relevant were presented to get feedback from the Council. The Council was encouraged to provide its own recommendations as well. SB474 came from 2015 legislation. While engaging in the study, Taskforce members frequently noted system limitations which prevented timely, accurate, and actionable access to data for making further recommendations. There is a full report on the Taskforce's website. There were statutory changes due to recommendations of the Taskforce. NRS 391A.205 was revised as shown: Sec.31.5. NRS 391A.205 is hereby amended to read as follows: On or before December 1 of each year, the board of trustees of each school district shall submit, on a form prescribed by the Department, **an annual report concerning the PD training offered by the school district** to the State Board, the Commission on Professional Standards in Education, the Legislative Committee on Education and the Legislative Bureau of Educational Accountability and Program Evaluation. As moved by SBE on October 12, 2017, the RPDP Council is directed to provide recommendations regarding the required content of district annual PD reports. On behalf of this group, Kelee Dupuis will take forth any recommendations or feedback members feel is relevant to this report to the next SBE meeting on November 16, 2017. As a starting point, the Taskforce prepared a list of suggestions of what to include in the report. SB474 taskforce recommendation 4(a): The Legislature should require that school districts submit to the SBE an annual PD report. This report should include, but not limited to: 1) All PD areas of focus throughout the year, 2) Demonstrated alignment to areas statewide and district priorities, 3) Implementation in accordance with proposed statewide standards, 4) Funding (state, federal, and other) sources and amounts spent for PD, 5) Expenditures delineated by categories to be determined by NDE, and 6) Evaluation of impact of PD on educators and/or student outcomes, including identification of those programs which yielded the highest return on investment. This report would have to be completed in addition to all other reports that must be submitted by the districts. However, this is worthwhile in regard to tracking PD money and the results of PD expenses. Member Hawk has a suggestion regarding the investment of funds, measurement of outcomes, and alignment with State and District priorities. If administration is working with teachers and doing individual focuses on a PD of individual staff, then that should be a component with that individual development of priorities for staff. If

there is a teacher who is working on becoming an administrator, can that be a part of the development component if it is documented? If it can be done, it is powerful and helps people reach their professional goals, and that should be a component of measurement. On another note, in regard to the recently adopted standards, Member Hawk sees some of the dialogue happening nationally regarding cultural competencies and there are a lot of people negating the history of America because it may be dark and ugly. That tends to make people want to wipe it out. The trick to history is learning it, so it is not repeated. When the Council speaks on the worry of making people feel uncomfortable, it must keep in mind that America's past is uncomfortable. When States talk about cultural fairness and cultural alignment, sometimes we take it too far. If we start allowing groups of people to be in charge of developing this, then who is really in charge of making sure that training doesn't go too far one way or the other? This applies to more subject areas than just history.

Member Husson wondered if there was a better way to carry out this report. The importance of this report is not disputed, but he questions if there is another way to get it done without burdening Districts with another report. He works with a company that provides data systems to States. The systems allow data to be uploaded daily from Districts, without any effort on the part of the Districts. That way, Districts can carry on with business as usual, and all the information requested would be provided by the data system to the State. We tend to cause ourselves a lot of heartache because we don't often consider new ways to do business. He is not here to advocate for any particular data system, he just wants SBE to consider better avenues of doing business, and this method is inexpensive.

What he knows about what exists today in Clark, is called the Professional Growth System. It runs parallel with the people that aren't in the Professional Growth System, but the idea is that the principal and the teacher work together to determine what needs to be worked on over the next couple years. In the ideal situation, the principal would identify the types of specialists that will be needed in the school in the coming years. The teacher would be willing to take that specialty training in their PD, and in return, identify a specialty in which they would like to gain knowledge. With that information, a Professional Growth Plan for the next two years is developed. The problem with that idea at the moment is there are no structures in the system built around supporting that. The principal and teacher can develop the plan, but there is no credentialing body to guide the teacher through that plan. Member Husson would like to make a recommendation to SBE that they consider developing a credentialing body of practitioners that look for programs that provide PD to educators and credential those programs. Though his ideas may have to go through Legislation instead of a State body, he still finds them important to consider as he sees a real problem with implementation occurring with the recommendation written as it is. His recommendation is 2 fold. Systems need to be put in place to allow for the data to come that don't put a burden on Districts; and there needs to be a support statewide for educators engaging in PD activities.

Member Smith agrees with Member Husson regarding systems needing to be in place for management of the evaluation data, as well as the alignment of systems. She wants to make sure everybody on the Council recognizes how important this is to all RPDP programs. Recently, the RPDPs had an extensive discussion as a group about the need for systems that can support their evaluation of professional learning that they are provided. At this point, there is an expectation that they are designing their own systems; so, any additional support they can get that they know is vetted could help in the collection and management of that data would definitely be supported by the RPDPs. Member Hawk questioned what happens to the reports after they are completed. Who is evaluating them and what is being done with that data to provide meaningful feedback for improvement at all levels? The Council needs to be mindful of what the end result of these reports will be so they are not giving Districts any additional tasks that are not useful or necessary. Fine tuning this is imperative. Chair Zander agrees. This information should be aligned with the District Improvement Plans and the report should be a component of that. The measurement part is tough, because there is not currently a baseline in regards to effectiveness, but for alignment, this should be built into the improvement plan. Member Hawk questioned why District Improvement Plans are done midway through the year. It makes more sense to be given a comprehensive plan in the summer so as to implement the plan all through the year. Chair Zander explained that part of that has to do with the timing of assessment results, but she is correct. Member Hawk suggested having the forms ready in the summer for those that are ready. Chair Zander feels that if the report is shared with multiple committees, it would be a good idea for Legislators or anybody that reviews the District Improvement Plans for each district to align

the report to what is happening in each district. Chair Zander asked Kelee Dupuis the intended action on this agenda item. She believes the Taskforce would like to know some recommendations that legislators need to hear about funding for PD. They also would like to know the Return on Investment (ROI) and how effective it is. One goal is to align PD with the NEPF. They would like to see PD reflected in teachers' effectiveness. She cannot speak to the ultimate goal of this task though. For example, it could be to allocate more funds for PD, but she is not sure. Member Husson asked Kelee what would happen if they sent the report back to SBE and said everything was fine. She said it would then come back to the Department, and they would have to hold a workshop on the manner in which this form is prescribed as per NRS. Then, in terms of the collection process, they would present their conclusion to the reflective bodies mentioned in statute. Member Husson stated that if he were the Superintendent of a district, he would reasonably believe that within this year or next, he would be expected to provide a report that evaluates the impact of PD on educators and/or student outcomes, including identification of those programs which yielded the highest ROI. He asked if that is to be done with or without guidance. It is Kelee's understanding that throughout that workshop process they would be able to receive stakeholder feedback on what the report should look like. Member Husson's concern is that there isn't any standard. He doesn't believe that any district in the state would be able to tell her, with certainty, the outcomes or the impact of their PD on student achievement. He believes that because of the currently inability to measure student achievement for the last couple of years. There isn't even a teacher evaluation system that has been in place for longer than a year. For those reasons, the Council would be putting Districts in a position to not be able to implement; at least not with meaningful data. The Council has a unique opportunity right now to avoid starting a process that causes low morality in our system; which is giving people a directive that they cannot fulfill. It is Kelee's understanding that the Council is being asked if there is something the Taskforce did not capture in their report. In terms of a recommendation, Member Grossman would add to the bullet list, the need to be cautious of who we contract with. It seems that we have a huge sweep of vendors, some of whom share information that is antithetical to the Nevada Academic Content Standards. He agrees with Member Husson's point of this potentially not being practical and thinks we should be mindful of the difference between experimental research and generalizable research. Until we have had a conversation about that, we could probably make any assessment result reveal that all PD is effective. This is something the Council really needs to evaluate in regards to what to collect and how to present it. The ROI conversation is an extensive one in regards to how it will be measured. Chair Zander wanted to know if SBE will give the Council some time to evaluate that. He also still thinks the best roll out plan is its inclusion in the District Improvement Plan for alignment purposes. If we could make a recommendation that we agree on the importance of tracking this, then, come together to decide what factors to use in determining ROI, or if that element is something that can realistically be tracked. Member Husson asked the Council if they would be interested in hearing a presentation from the company that manages the data. Member Hawk reviewed the information and noticed that the Taskforce was specifically looking for funding recommendations. She noted that the RPDP Council and the SB474 Taskforce have no fiscal responsibility. She sought clarity as to whether they wanted the general recommendations that the Council has been giving thus far, or if they already have a plan in place and are looking for recommendations on how to make that happen financially. Kelee answered that funding was one category of recommendation sought by the Taskforce.

Chair Zander met with Roger Rahming, who is the Deputy Superintendent of Finance for NDE. We all operate under a chart of accounts. Within that, there are funds, projects, program, function, etc. The budget code is used in alignment with NCES, so they can collect data from every school district in the nation. Nevada has had issues with the collection of PD data for as long as he can remember. No matter who PD was provided to or for what reason, it was labeled with code 101-000. That made it difficult to take a look at the PD costs amongst districts and separate who the PD was provided for and for what reason. He has spoken with all superintendents in NV about coding PD as 2200 for Support Services-Instruction. It is further broken down in code 2213, which is Instructional Staff Training. It accounts for all activities associated with the PD and training of instructional personnel. If every district appropriated monies to 2213 instead of 101-000, then Instructional Staff PD could be distinguished from other PD. Furthermore, when it comes to object codes, most PD is coded as 6330, which is employee training. The problem is that there are criteria within the chart of accounts that distinguish the different types of training and development

services. The second part of the problem is everything is reported to NDE on the 387.303 Report in November of every year. Chair Zander asked Deputy Superintendent Rahming if we could have a section within the 387.303 Report that speaks specifically to PD. Roger agreed to discuss that with his colleagues. The goal is to be able to distinguish PD expenses by funding source, district, and area. They are meeting again on the 15<sup>th</sup> of November and Mr. Rahming is hoping to meet with all the CFOs in the state to see about changing this procedure. Member Hawk suggested that Chair Zander may have found the solution to the previous problem they were trying to address with the SB474 Taskforce. Member Smith clarified that something like this is exactly what was being asked for by the Taskforce, so this very well may be the solution to that problem as well. Member Husson asked how to make a recommendation in regards to changing what is required from accounting. Chair Zander would have to collaborate with Deputy Superintendent Rahming to create business rules around reporting. The RPDP cannot enforce the business rules Chair Zander is proposing; they must come from out fiscal office. Chair Zander agreed to follow-up with Mr. Rahming and Dave Jensen, who represents Superintendents on the SBE, to see if we can get time to evaluate what will be collected, the intent, ROI, and implementation of this report in District Improvement Plans. Member Hawk suggested a process for these changes to take place that entails PD to teach the CFOs. A rating system could then be used to see how many do it right to evaluate the PD. Because there will be further discussion on this topic at the next meeting, there is no action to take at this time. Member Husson will reach out to the data management vendor in the hopes that they can present at the next meeting.

**7. Update on Statewide Family Engagement Program** (*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*)

Dr. Sarah Negrete, Director, Northeastern RPDP; Kirsten Gleissner, Director, Northwestern RPDP; Dr. Chelli Smith, Director, Southern RPDP

The RPDP regional directors did receive feedback from Family Engagement Office. They will respond to that feedback at next meeting.

**8. Administrative Expenditure Discussion** (*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*)

Kelee Dupuis, Education Programs Professional

At the last meeting, it was decided that the \$100,000 allocated to the three RPDPs for administrative training would be distributed evenly by the State amongst the three fiscal agents. Chair Zander shared that with superintendents at their last meeting. All three regions account for that money differently in regards to how they program those funds. There is a pro-rata allocation for the western region based on the number of schools. Southern does it differently, and the northern region does regional trainings. Chair Zander shared with Districts the importance of PD being relevant, and that at some point, they are going to be required to report what is taking place within those trainings. The northeastern region has had several superintendents that have memberships with district administration subscriptions.

As a reminder, the administrative expenditure grants have been switched to reimbursements, meaning that NDE will need to receive a budget from each RPDP in advance to the money being allocated. Since this group is not meeting again until December, Kelee asked if the Council would like to hold off on approving that budget or if they would like for her and Sondra Neudauer to move the budget through. Chair Zander informed the RPDPs that a regional board meeting would be taking place in the next couple weeks. He asked the three RPDP directors if they could have budgets prepared to be approved at the next meeting. They all confirmed.

**9. Future Meeting Dates and Agenda Items** (*Information/Discussion*) Jeff Zander, Chair

The next RPDP meeting is scheduled for December 13, 2017.

**10. Public Comment #2**

There was no public comment in the north or south.

**11. Adjournment**

**Meeting adjourned at 11:28 AM**