



## TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)

DECEMBER 9, 2020

9:00 A.M.

### Meeting Location

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) met via videoconference. In accordance with Governor Sisolak's [State of Emergency Directive 006](#), Section 1, there was no physical location designated for this meeting. The meeting was livestreamed on the [Nevada Department of Education Website](#).

### DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

#### MEMBERS PRESENT via videoconference

Kathleen Galland-Collins  
DeeAnn Roberts  
Dr. Pam Salazar  
Mary Owens  
Nicole Rourke  
Andrew Tiscareno  
Louis Markouzis  
Sue Moulden-Horton  
Brian Rippet

#### DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT via videoconference

Kathleen Galland-Collins, Assistant Director, Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement  
KellyLynn Charles, Education Programs Professional, Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement  
Arina Kazemi, Administrative Assistant, Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement

#### SENIOR DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL via video conference

David Gardner

#### AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE via videoconference

No audience in attendance via videoconference

#### AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

The Livestream feed allowed public viewing throughout the meeting.

## **1: CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The meeting of the Council was called to order at 9:16 A.M. by Chair Salazar. Quorum was established. Chair Salazar led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chair Salazar reminded members of virtual meeting norms and requested that members use the hand-raising feature if wishing to speak.

Chair Salazar welcomed new member Nicole Rourke and asked her to introduce herself. Member Rourke introduced herself to the TLC council and shared that she worked with Clark County for 20 years and represented the District at the Legislature and with the federal government.

Chair Salazar moved to Agenda Item #2.

## **2: PUBLIC COMMENT #1**

Nancy Kuhles submitted public comment regarding Agenda item #6 - a request for a change to the score ranges for Speech-Language Pathologists (SLP) based on the change to the SLP rubric. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Kim Reddig submitted public comment regarding Agenda item #6 - a request for a change to the score ranges for Speech-Language Pathologists (SLP) based on the change to the SLP rubric *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Chair Salazar moved to Agenda Item #3.

## **3: APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR JULY 29, 2020**

Chair Salazar gave members time to review the minutes.

**Member Roberts made a motion to approve the minutes for the July 29, 2020 meeting. Member Owens seconded. Motion passed with no discussion.**

Chair Salazar moved to Agenda Item #4.

## **4: NEPF IMPLEMENTATION UPDATES**

Kathleen Galland-Collins, Nevada Department of Education (NDE), gave updates on the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) and Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) membership. NDE sent names to the Governor's office and they expect to have a full Council by the next meeting.

Ms. Galland-Collins gave updates about NEPF in-person, hybrid, and distance learning webinars. NDE hosted three webinar trainings providing a basic overview of the NEPF in-person, hybrid, and distance learning guidance document. The training was announced via the Department of Education updates, emailed via the On-Line Portal for Applications & Licensure (OPAL), put on the NDE calendar, and sent to the NEPF Liaisons and TLC members. The webinars were held on October 29, November 19, and December 1, 2020. A total of 393 people registered; 84% were building administrators, 4% were district administrators, and 5% were teachers. Attendees were from seven of the 17 districts, plus the State Charter School authority. Of those attending, 83% of the attendees were from Clark County.

Approximately 244 people attended the webinars and responded to the feedback survey. Those attendees will receive a professional development certificate. The webinar held on November 19 had the largest attendance with about 200 attendees.

The Senate Bill 475 (2017) report (NEPF impact and validity study) was shared with the Legislative Committee on Education on August 26 by Dr. Marianno from the University of Nevada Las Vegas (UNLV). NDE reminded LCE that the timeline was essentially 5 weeks for impact and validity study. LCE asked about priority recommendations which is going to be discussed on agenda Item #7. There were some questions around NEPF implementation during COVID and school closure situations. NDE shared the information about NEPF in person hybrid and distance learning guidance. The priority recommendations mentioned by Dr. Marianno in response to the questions from LCE was the possibility of inner rater-reliability certification. He also mentioned the need to invest in data systems that can aggregate data overtime to make better informed decisions. Ms. Galland-Collins then explained that the intent of NDE it to establish a workgroup around developing out the evidence and examples of practices for school administrators to add to the distance learning guidance. However, NDE is still short an NEPF Education Programs Professional. This has led to the delay of that particular project.

The feedback from the NEPF implementation trainings was positive and administrators were encouraged to realize they could leverage what they already knew in digital setting to identify strengths. The NRS, the regulations and the processes have not changed. However, the sources of evidence may be different in that digital setting.

Chair Salazar thanked Ms. Galland-Collins and asked the Council if they had any questions or concerns regarding NEPF implementation.

Chair Salazar moved to Agenda Item #5.

## **5: PRINCIPAL SUPERVISOR IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE**

Chair Salazar explained that at the May 27, 2020 TLC meeting, they reviewed the principal supervisor rubrics and revisions and at that time TLC approved the changes. She reminded the Council that member White raised the question of who would be evaluated under Principal Supervisor NEPF and that Member White would go to Nevada Association of School Superintendents (NASS) for their feedback on developing a definition of Principal Supervisors. Chair Salazar shared that on June 18, 2020 NASS held a meeting and the superintendents developed the definition of the principal supervisor for the NEPF Principal Supervisor Evaluation. She directed the members to the definition that can be found on the NDE website in the [Meeting Material/ Agenda item #5](#).

Chair Salazar then stated she followed-up with Lyon County school district Superintendent Wayne Workman. She got a clarification around the second statement about “at-will.” Mr. Workman shared with her that the superintendents were concerned that if principal supervisors who are at-will employees are evaluated under NEPF they would be treated as post probationary status and have all the rights associated with that status. The concern was that Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 391.730 did not address “at-will” employees; therefore, would superintendents still have the flexibility to move a person somewhere else if they do not keep the employee as a principal supervisor due to being “at-will” employees. After a discussion with Ms. Galland-Collins, they reached out to Deputy Attorney General David Gardner for an opinion. The question asked was if many of the principal supervisors are “at-will” employees and were evaluated with NEPF, are the principal supervisors subject to all of the protections as outlined in NRS, specifically NRS 391.730. Deputy Attorney General Gardner confirmed that the superintendents have a valid point and there is a need to rework NRS 391.730. There is no reference to “at-will”, because of that if principal supervisors are evaluated under the current educator evaluation statute, they would be protected under all the rights therein.

David Gardner agreed with what Chair Salazar shared with Members.

Chair Salazar then continued, because of issues around NRS 391.730, if they remove that segment and make a definition, they still have the issue with principal supervisors that are in “at-will” positions. She suggested going back to the recommendation from Deputy Attorney General, David Gardner to clarify

this issue by having the Nevada Department of Education to work with Deputy Attorney General Gardner and the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) to align the language with the intent of “at-will.”

Chair Salazar asked for clarification on whether the responsibility of TLC is to either accept the definition and move forward, or revise the definition knowing that there is not clarity around “at-will” employees. She stated during the professional development sessions she had with principal supervisors the concern is that they would be limited in how they interact with their principal supervisors due to the at-will status not being defined in NRS 391.730. She recommended TLC make the recommendations to the Department for clarification on that statute.

Ms. Galland-Collins stated the Council can ask the Department to take this on, but any statutory would need to be addressed during the legislative session.

Chair Salazar opened the floor for discussion.

Member Rourke asked if there are any principal supervisors that are not “at-will” employees. Chair Salazar stated that no there were not any principal supervisors who are not “at-will” employees.

Chair Salazar asked for clarification that if the council removes that last sentence, on the definition of principal supervisors provided them and pass that definition, what would be the impact in terms of implementation knowing that their employees “at-will” automatically have to treat them as if they have the rights of probationary and post probationary.

Deputy Gardner answered they wouldn't automatically gain those rights. The concern is they would have the argument that they gain those rights.

Chair Salazar explained 3 options for the council;

1. Motion to approve as it is,
2. Motion to approve with the removal of the last sentence,
3. Do not approve any of the definition and send it back to NDE.

Member Moulden-Horton concerned if the council sends it back to NDE for revision, would there be someone who would be qualified to complete those evaluations, or would those principals be exempt for the remainder of the year.

Chair Salazar answered this doesn't impact evaluation of principals. Principals supervisors have not yet been implemented the NEPF for principal supervisors' evaluation system. They are some districts that are using it as their evaluation by their own decision, but the evaluation of principal supervisors has not yet implemented. They have been on hold and principal supervisors continue to be evaluated by whom districts determine are the evaluators for principals. That's not impacted by this in terms of a specific designation of a principal supervisor who can evaluate principals.

Member Rippet asked if there is a way to remove the language of “probationary, post probationary” with regards to this group.

Chair Salazar turned the question to Senior Deputy Attorney General, David Gardner.

Senior Deputy Attorney General Gardner pointed out the problem they have is that principal supervisor doesn't have a great definition in statute, and because the statute says administrator, we have to treat all of them as administrators. They all have to be treated as administrators which means they're stuck in “probationary” or “post probationary” unless we get some clarification in statute that gives him a way out. He explained that you can collective bargain out some of this, but not all of it. NRS 391.730 has to be complied with and he doesn't have a place in the NEPF that gives a third way beyond “probationary” and “post probationary” and there are no other options in the statute.

Member Rippet asked for clarification that it's not a NEPF technicality that council can work on, that this has to go to legislature.

Chair Salazar confirmed member Rippet's assumption and asked for other questions or comments on the response of action by TLC. As a reminder, Chair Salazar repeated the 3 possible motions to the council.

**Member Rippet made a motion to put NEPF Principal Supervisors framework on hold and send to it back to NDE for further clarification around NRS 391.730. Member Rourke seconded. No further discussion. Motion carried.**

Chair Salazar moved to Agenda Item #6.

**6: REVIEW OF NEPF SUMMATIVE EVALUATION DATA AND DEVELOPMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE 2020-2021 SCORE RANGES USE TO DETERMINE RATINGS OF HIGHLY EFFECTIVE, EFFECTIVE, DEVELOPING, AND INEFFECTIVE.**

Kathleen Galland-Collins from NDE thanked Tannaz Rezai, Data Management Analyst at Department of Education for her work in compiling the data and created the pivot tables and charts.

Ms. Galland-Collins shared the slides of Educator Evaluation Data from the 2019-20 school year. See meeting material on the [TLC Meeting Webpage](#).

Member Owens wondered if the social workers that are not under NEPF are evaluated in some manner and if so, do we know what that is.

Ms. Galland-Collins answered for the social workers that are not district employees are not evaluated with the NEPF. Their evaluation is up to who they work for because they're not district employees.

Ms. Galland-Collins continued sharing the next slides. She asked if there were any questions on the data.

Chair Salazar asked about the number of data points shown in relation to the total. For example, you show data points on 799 school administrators, do we know how many administrators we have in Nevada.

Ms. Galland-Collins answered they usually have reported around 1,100 administrators and teachers are around 26,000. One way we can more accurately determine the total is to request the number of exemptions in the data request. Chair Salazar mentioned that would be a good idea since they know the small number of ineffective or developing educators is usually brought up at State Board meetings. She stated this is important data that would help the Council address this issue.

Member Markouzis asked for clarifications on Chair Salazar's comment and if that was because we continuously looking at the NEPF and correlating it to Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF), star rating systems, and making assumptions that there is higher preponderance of 1- and 2-star schools in state and that should loosely correlate to more ineffective or developing teachers.

Chair Salazar answered whenever they have this data and report the number of ineffective educators, she shares that the ineffective educators have already been identified and have possibly resigned prior to receiving an evaluation and don't show up in the count.

Ms. Galland-Collins pointed out that there are people who wonder how 1- and 2-star schools have highly effective teachers, but without diving deeper into that data and seeing the amount of growth happening in individual classes or what feedback administrators are giving to improve practice, it would be hard to make that call.

Member Markouzis thanked Ms. Galland-Collins and stated that anytime he has conversations with his colleagues throughout the state, he compares the education profession with the medical field. There is an extreme amount of professional development and vetting process to get hired and asks how many ineffective cardiologists are in our state. He would like to think only a handful and those that aren't will leave the profession.

Chair Salazar asked for additional comments regarding the data that Ms. Galland-Collins presented.

Member Owens stated if districts have a peer assistance review process it plays into this process because if they want to stay in the profession and go through that process, they may move pretty quickly into effective, not staying at the lower ranges. That could be a factor as well.

Ms. Galland-Collins shared slides on the NEPF score ranges for educators. See meeting material on the [TLC Meeting Webpage](#).

She stated a possible motion to be considered is the TLC recommends that the historical score ranges for teachers and building administrators be used for all NEPF educator groups for the 2020-21 school year. She added speech language pathologists could be included if the council wishes.

Chair Salazar stated as Ms. Galland-Collins mentioned there are two options:

1. Accept the scoring ranges including speech language pathologist on 2020-21 school year.
2. Make changes to scoring ranges for the 2020-21 school year and determine what those new scoring ranges might be.

Chair Salazar opened the floor for discussion and entertained a motion regarding recommendations from TLC.

Chair Salazar opened the floor for discussion and entertained a motion regarding recommendations from TLC.

**Member Rourke motioned to approved historical score ranges with no change for the 2020-21 school year. Member Moulden seconded. No further discussion. Motion carried**

Chair Salazar moved to Agenda Item #7.

### **7: REVIEW OF THE NEPF IMPACT AND VALIDITY STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS.**

Chair Salazar asked members to have a brief look at Dr. Marianno's presentation on August 26, 2020. Ms. Galland-Collins gave a brief look at the recommendations to the members. See Agenda item #7 meeting material on the [TLC Meeting Webpage](#). Ms. Galland-Collins suggested members look through the detailed report for the next meeting. One of the things Dr. Marianno considered was the provision of ongoing inter-rater reliability trainings similar to when we started the NEPF implementation. The Regional Professional Development Programs still offer the inter-rater reliability training. Another recommendation was embedding inter-rater reliability training in an ongoing rater certification program. Chair Salazar encouraged the members to read the full report and suggested including the link to Dr. Marianno's LCE presentation in the materials for the next meeting for the council members.

Chair Salazar moved to Agenda Item #8.

### **8: FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

TLC suggested the following items for the future agenda;

- Update from the Regional Professional Development Programs

Ms. Galland-Collins reminded members February 24, 2021 is the next meeting.

Chair Salazar moved to Agenda Item #9.

### **9: PUBLIC COMMENT #2**

Additional time was provided for the public to submit comments via email due to delay on livestream for public. Member Galland-Collins double checked her emails to see if there was any public comment. Marissa McClish submitted an email stating she would be submitting comments at the next meeting. No other public comment was submitted.

Chair Salazar moved to Agenda Item #10.

### **10: ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Salazar adjourned the meeting at 10:52 A.M.

# APPENDIX I

Public Comment #1



*NSHA/NV Coalition to Address Personnel Shortages  
in Special Education and Related Services*  
[www.nvcoalition.com](http://www.nvcoalition.com)

October 5, 2020

Nevada Teachers and Leaders Council  
700 E. Fifth Street  
Carson City, NV 89701

Re: Agenda Item #6: A request for a change to the score ranges for Speech-Language Pathologists (SLP) based on the change to the SLP rubric

Dear Chairwoman Salazar and Members of the Teachers and Leaders Council,

My name is Nancy Kuhles. I am a Speech-Language Pathologist, co-Chair of the NSHA Coalition to Address Personnel Shortages and serve in the role of Lead for the Speech- Language Pathologist OLEP Workgroup that revised the NEPF Framework for Speech Language Pathologists (SLPs).

For the record, I would like to address Item #6 on the Teachers and Leaders Council's agenda and the information that will be presented.

On behalf of the Speech Language Pathologist OLEP Workgroup, I respectfully request the members of the Teachers and Leaders Council to approve the change to the score ranges for Speech-Language Pathologist based on the change to the Speech-Language Pathologist's rubric.

The NEPF Framework for SLPs was revised in 2019-2020 and fully implemented in 2020- 2021. The revised SLP rubric, developed by SLPs for SLPs, is clear, concise, and captures the essence and real work of a Speech-Language Pathologist.

The revised SLP rubric aligns with ASHA's national standards and practices, nationally recognized practice guidance standards (IPEC), federal regulations (ESSA/Nevada Plan) and where applicable, the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) and the High Leverage Practices for Special Educators developed by the Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability and Reform (CEEDAR), and the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC). The High Leverage Practices are

organized around four aspects of practice: Collaboration, Assessment, Social/Emotional/Behavioral and Instruction.

The revised SLP NEPF rubric has 17 Indicators, of which 17 Indicators are High Leverage Practices.

The proposed change to the score ranges for SLPs based on the change to the SLP rubric are 3.6 to 4.0, Highly Effective; 2.8 to 3.59 Effective; 1.91 to 2.79 Developing; and 1.0 to 1.9 Ineffective. These score ranges align with Nevada's Other Licensed Educational Personnel (OLEPs) NEPF scoring ranges, which includes Educational Audiologists, School Counselors, School Nurses, School Psychologists, School Social Workers, and Teacher-Librarians.

The SLP OLEP Workgroup supports the proposed change to the score ranges for Speech- Language Pathologists.

On behalf of the Speech-Language Pathologist OLEP Workgroup, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Chairwoman Salazar and the Members of the Teachers and Leaders Council for all the work you do. Thank you for opportunity to submit public comment on agenda item #6 addressing the change to the score ranges for SLPs based on the change to the SLP's rubric.

I respectfully request your consideration in approving the change to the score ranges for Speech-Language Pathologists for the 2020-2021 school year based on the change to the Speech-Language Pathologist's rubric.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,  
Nancy Kuhles, M.S. CCC-SLP ASHA Fellow  
NSHA Coalition co-Chair  
SLP OLEP Workgroup Lead  
[Nkuhles119@gmail.com](mailto:Nkuhles119@gmail.com)





October 5, 2020

Teachers and Leaders Council 700  
E. Fifth Street  
Carson City, NV 89701

Re: Agenda Item #6: A request for a change to the score ranges for Speech-Language Pathologists (SLP) based on the change to the SLP rubric

Dear Chairwoman Salazar and Members of the Teachers and Leaders Council,

The Nevada Speech-Language Hearing Association (NSHA), the professional organization of Speech-Language Pathologists (SLPs) and Audiologists in the State of Nevada, is in strong support of the score range changes proposed in Agenda Item #6.

The performance evaluation holds school-based SLPs to the highest professional standards and aligns with the expected competencies and standards outlined by the American Speech-Language Hearing Association (ASHA). Not only does this evaluation ensure that SLPs are successfully demonstrating the expected level of professionalism, but feedback can also be applied in future professional growth opportunities. Aligning the scoring ranges to Nevada's Other Licensed Educational Personnel (OLEP) groups makes it easier for evaluators to be consistent in their ratings and understanding of educator expectations.

NSHA works in conjunction with the University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada State College, and the State of Nevada Speech-Language Pathology, Audiology, and Hearing Aid Dispensing Board to ensure that the professionals in our beloved field adhere to professional standards of excellence. We believe that this performance evaluation will demonstrate the value and contributions of the SLPs who are school-based in the State of Nevada.

NSHA is proud to support this effort, and the NSHA Board of Directors hopes that the Teachers and Leaders Council will approve the proposed change to the score ranges for Speech-Language Pathologists based on the changes to the Speech- Language Pathologists' rubric.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Reddig, MS, CCC-SLP  
Speech-Language Pathologist  
President, Nevada Speech-Language Hearing Association (NSHA)  
[info@nsha.org](mailto:info@nsha.org)  
[kreddig0804@gmail.com](mailto:kreddig0804@gmail.com)