TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 25, 2021
9:00 A.M.

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

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

MEMBERS PRESENT VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE
Pam Salazar, Chair
Mary Owens
Andrew Tiscareno
Luis Markouzis
Pamela Teel, Vice-Chair
Darcy McInnes
Pamela Goynes-Brown
Danica Hays
Sue Moulden-Horton

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (NDE) STAFF PRESENT
In Carson City
Tina Statucki, Education Programs Professional; Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement

In Las Vegas
Kathleen Galland-Collins, Assistant Director; Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement
Arina Kazemi, Administrative Assistant II; Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE
The Livestream feed allowed public viewing throughout the meeting.

1: CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Meeting called to order at 9:06 AM. by Chair Salazar. Role was taken and quorum was established. Chair Salazar led the Pledge of Allegiance. Chair Salazar reminded members of virtual meeting norms, to state their names, and requested that members use the hand-raising feature if wishing to speak. She reported that the boardrooms in both Las Vegas and Carson City were open to the public.

2: COUNCIL MEMBER UPDATES
Chair Salazar announced that the Council had four vacant positions available. The available positions were a teacher position, school board trustee member position, and a parent position. Ms. Statucki added that the fourth vacant position was for another school board trustee member position (Member Cooney was no longer a school board trustee and was no longer eligible to be on the Council in that position).

3: PUBLIC COMMENT #1
Additional time was provided for the public to submit comments via email due to the delay on Livestream. No public comment was provided via email or in person in Las Vegas, or Carson City.

4: APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR JUNE 23, 2021
Chair Salazar gave members time to review the minutes.

Member Markouzis made a motion to approve the minutes for the June 23, 2021, meeting. Member Owens seconded. Motion passed with no discussion.

5: NEPF IMPLEMENTATION UPDATES
Tina Statucki, NDE, shared updates on actions relevant to the implementation of the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF). Based on legislation passed in the 2021 session (Assembly Bill 57 and Assembly Bill 266), the Department updated the following resources: protocols, FAQs, tools, and created Canvas Courses. The July NEPF Liaison Newsletter was emailed on July 1, 2021, and posted to NDE update (July 6, 2021). The next newsletter would be sent in September. An NEPF Guidance Memo (21-04) was sent by Superintendent Ebert to district superintendents on August 6, 2021. The Monitoring for Continuous Improvement SEA/LEA Interviews would be held virtually in September 2021. Canvas NEPF training courses were being piloted by Carson City School District and Nye County School District and would be available statewide in October 2021. The Department would let NEPF Liaisons know as soon as they were available. NDE would be hosting NEPF Online Training available on 9/15 and 9/22 at 4 PM, and 9/20 and 9/24 at 9 AM. The link to join would be provided to the NEPF Liaisons during their quarterly meeting, posted in the NEPF quarterly newsletter, and posted in the NDE Update. Member Moulden requested Ms. Statucki to repeat the dates and times. Ms. Statucki repeated the dates and times and reiterated that they will be posted in the NEPF quarterly newsletter and posted in the NDE Update.

Member Tiscareno asked for clarification regarding the use of Student Learning Goals (SLGs). Ms. Statucki responded that Assembly Bill (AB) 57 said that teachers were not required to complete SLGs as part of the evaluation system. NDE recommended that school districts continue to use the process to improve instruction and focus on improving student outcomes; however, it was a district decision as to whether they would require their employees to continue using the SLG process. Most districts were going to continue using the SLG process with their teachers and educators, but not for the evaluation. Chair Salazar stated that the SLG was a very important process as it was all about teaching and learning, and TLC would continue to encourage that process to support teaching and learning. Member Tiscareno agreed, and said he just wanted to make sure he was interpreting what the Bill said correctly.

Chair Salazar asked if there were any questions regarding NEPF implementation, but there were none.

6: REVIEW OF NEPF SUMMATIVE EVALUATION DATA AND DEVELOPMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SCORE RANGES TO DETERMINE RATINGS OF HIGHLY EFFECTIVE, EFFECTIVE, DEVELOPING, AND INEFFECTIVE
Tina Statucki, NDE, gave updates on the NEPF evaluation data from the 2020-21 school year.
Ms. Statucki reported that NRS 391.485 requires the annual review of statewide performance evaluation system. Data was reported to NDE by July 16th by all districts. Ms. Statucki shared NEPF data via PowerPoint data, pausing for questions after each slide. See Meeting Materials for the shared PowerPoint.

Member Hays asked about the lack of disaggregated data by school level, Title I status, geographic region, etc. She said that disaggregated would be helpful to make a more informed choice for cut scores. Ms. Statucki agreed that disaggregated data would be very useful, but she stated that data was not reported to the State in that way, and it was still collected using an Excel sheet. Ms. Statucki said a statewide electronic tool for the NEPF would make it easier to collect that information from the districts. Member Hays expressed her concern about recommending cut scores when there was not accurate information to show systematic differences based on different variables.

Chair Salazar stated that is been a discussion in TLC over the years. TLC has continued to ask for a statewide data system since 2013 when the NEPF was first developed. It has been pointed out that the decisions are made based on limited data in every legislative session. Chair Salazar said it was hoped that, based on recommendations from TLC and the NEPF report done by UNLV, there would be traction to support the need for a statewide system. TLC could get very useful, valuable data from a statewide system to make recommendations and to guide educator preparation and supports for students. Ms. Statucki reported that in 2019, a Bill was passed that said the State was mandated to have an electronic tool for the implementation of the NEPF, but it was an unfunded mandate. Ms. Statucki suggested that TLC may want to explore, through regulation, a mandate to fund the tool in the future, so it could be used more effectively to help improve student outcomes and teachers.

Member Goynes-Brown wondered whether this was ever challenged. She questioned how long the State could stick with an outdated system and whether future funding could be affected without having access to accurate data. Chair Salazar stated that TLC had consistently asked for technology support over the years. In 2019, TLC spent time working with the legislators to help them understand the need for the system. Most of the legislators understood the need, but the request did not make it far enough to get funded. She hoped there would be more traction in the next legislative session to mandate funding to support it and said TLC would continue to work on that effort.

Member Teel stated, from the district standpoint and in small districts, the information the liaisons received was fabulous, but at the same time it was limited. Even a small district did not have time to disaggregate the data differently. The piece on the teacher overview of data, where the lowest standard was on the metacognition, was a concern. Not enough was being done with the data. She questioned whether districts were looking at that and were tailoring that to provide better professional development. She asked whether it would be possible to preface the recommendation to the State Board with the caveat that TLC needed better data. Chair Salazar said there were two pieces to this. For one thing, TLC absolutely needed to make a recommendation for cut scores regarding the rating system, but she said they could again a make statement that TLC would be making this decision based on the limited data that was available because the State did not have a technology platform in place. TLC could add a piece in the presentation of the data and of the recommendation: TLC recommended the scoring ranges;

however, TLC was making this decision based on the limited data that they received from the districts without a technology platform. Ms. Galland-Collins recommended adding the comment to the data limitation slide that would be shared with the State Board of Education.

Member Hays suggested that a slide around data limitations needed to include the consequences of those data limitations in terms of how current recommendations may not serve schools or students.

Ms. Statucki presented information on the NEPF recommended score ranges. She added that the upcoming changes based on the class size adjustment may affect the Council's recommendation next year. Chair Salazar added that this year's scores would not be including the 15% for the SLG and that would come back into play for the next school year. She asked if NDE had any recommendations regarding the score ranges. Ms. Statucki responded that NDE recommended that there were no changes in the rating scores to maintain the consistency of the scores.

Chair Salazar asked members of the Council for recommendations and thoughts around score ranges for this year. Member Goynes-Brown stated that she believed they should leave it as it was. Chair Salazar agreed, especially because of the changes with the SLG. Member Owens agreed that no changes needed to be made right now and liked the idea of the addition of a slide stating the data limitations. Member Hays agreed.

Member Teel made a motion to maintain the score ranges for the NEPF as stated by the department for next year. Member Goynes-Brown seconded. Motion passed with no discussion.

Chair Salazar stated that the recommendation to the Board would be that the score ranges would remain the same, but she would include information about the data limitations and the need for the technology to be funded.

7: FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
Chair Salazar discussed future agenda items, with a focus being on survey results. Ms. Statucki confirmed that survey results would be available to share at the next meeting, which because the NEPF ratings data were presented during the current meeting and the Council made its recommendation, will be on Wednesday, November 17 (TLC will not need to meet in September).

8: PUBLIC COMMENT #2
Additional time was provided for the public to submit comments via email due to delay on Livestream.

Member Moulden asked for more information for upcoming ratings for class sizes and why Physical Education (PE) was not included with band in music. Chair Salazar reminded members that information regarding class sizes was presented at the previous meeting and asked Ms. Statucki to provide an update. Ms. Statucki explained that the new tool automatically calculated the adjusted scores for teachers who were eligible. The first 3 sections of the tool were similar to the original, and the administrator only needed to complete section 4 if the teachers were eligible. The class size adjustment only applied to those probationary teachers who were ranked effective or highly effective prior to the adjustment for the current school year. Teachers who taught band, choir, or [orchestra] were not included because the State Board of Education never set recommended class sizes for those subject areas. Grades K through 3 were 15 to1 and grades 4 through 12 were 25 to 1, with a maximum score of 4 on any indicator. The tool was designed to automatically calculate that for school administrators. Administrators only needed to enter the grade level, number of classes, and the total pupil count. Districts determined their own count date, but they had to be flexible to account for any significant staffing changes.

Chair Salazar asked if there was any information about PE. Ms. Statucki did not know why PE was not included in class size recommendations. Ms. Galland-Collins clarified that the teachers who were exempt from the class size adjustment are choir, band, orchestra, not math or PE. PE was eligible.

Member Moulden wondered if the regulation was for the 2021-22 school year. Ms. Statucki confirmed that is for the next school year and all school years beyond that unless it was changed legislatively.

Chair Salazar stated that the revised protocols were available and additional guidance would also be available. Ms. Statucki confirmed that the protocols and FAQs were updated on the NDE website, and the tools would be up there within next week or two as the Department was just waiting for final approval to post.

Member Moulden reported receiving a question from Dr. Delfin asking how the student to teacher ratios would affect the final rating. Ms. Statucki explained that the tool automatically calculated the percentage of students over the recommended ratios. If a K-3 teacher had 20 students, but the recommended ratio was 15-1, that teacher would get a class size adjustment based on the 5 students over the recommended ratio. If a teacher next door had 21 students, that class size adjustment would be slightly higher because they had 6 students over the recommended ratio. The form automatically calculated the percentage based on how many students total the teacher had over the recommended ratio.

Ms. Galland-Collins stated that districts that were using an online tool, like Evaluawise, may need the formulas and NDE was willing to share the formulas with those companies. Ms. Galland-Collins reminded members that she and Ms. Statucki would be hosting 4 webinars around these changes to the NEPF. The link would be sent out to the NEPF Liaisons, and all were welcome to join.

Ms. Statucki announced that public comment was submitted by Marissa McClish, Professional Growth Systems Coordinator, Washoe County. Comment was read into the record and provided in its entirety in Appendix I.

Chair Salazar asked if there was any additional public comment or closing questions or comments of the Council. There were none.

9: ADJOURNMENT
Chair Salazar adjourned the meeting at 10:12 AM.

Appendix I

PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL, AUGUST 25, 2021

I would like to respectfully push back on the "limited data" discussion on evaluation disaggregation ability. Districts provide individual data which has a random identifier so that the certified educator remains anonymous. Thus, NDE has data for individual teachers, counselor, etc. with a random identifier. On these sheets we do provide the educator's school and from there NDE can determine Title 1 status, geographic region, etc. We would be happy to help show you how to do this, but the State does have this data.

Saying you "see what data looks like coming from districts" sounds like this is our fault. We use the spreadsheets you give us. It would be easy to add a field for experience for any district using an HCMS system such as CCSD and WCSD.

The data submitted is accurate. The data analysis capability you are looking for many questions TLC members have exists. I would encourage the TLC to look at a spreadsheet from WCSD or CCSD submitted before engaging in a high-level discussion as occurred today.

The only way to track a teacher over time is to submit identifiable data. We do not have to submit when there are less than 10 individuals in a group (such as Audiologist or Social Worker) because the individual can be identified. This privacy issue will be problematic for a state-wide system and I would encourage NDE to open dialogue with certified educator associations as unions will push back on it.

Marissa McClish
Professional Growth Systems Coordinator