



**TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2021
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 OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

MEMBERS PRESENT VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE

- Pam Salazar, Chair
- Pamela Teel, Vice-Chair
- Mary Owens
- Andrew Tiscareno
- Nicole Rourke
- Sue Moulden-Horton
- Sarah Negrete
- Darcy McInnis
- Patricia Michitarian
- Pamela Goynes-Brown

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (NDE) STAFF PRESENT

- In Carson City
- In Las Vegas
- Kathleen Galland-Collins, Assistant Director; Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement
- Tina Statucki, Education Programs Professional; Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement

SENIOR DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL via videoconference

- David Gardner

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

The Livestream feed allowed public viewing throughout the meeting. The board rooms at the Las Vegas and Carson City Department of Education Offices were open to the public. No public attended in either location.

1. **Call to Order, Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance**

Meeting called to order at 9:03 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. Chair Salazar reported that the boardrooms in both Las Vegas and Carson City were open to the public and shared contact information to email public comment.

2. **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 in Carson City.

3. **Council Member Updates**

Chair Salazar announced that the Council had four vacant positions available. The available positions were a teacher position, two district school board trustee member positions, and a parent position. Nominations have been collected for all open positions and were pending Governor approval.

4. **Approval of Meeting Minutes for August 25, 2021**

Chair Salazar gave members time to review the minutes.

Member Negrete made a motion to approve the minutes for the August 25, 2021, meeting. Vice-Chair Teel seconded. Motion passed with no discussion.

5. **Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) Updates**

Tina Statucki, NDE, shared updates on the NEPF. The Department provided additional guidance and professional learning opportunities for educators across the State. The September NEPF Liaison Newsletter was emailed to district NEPF liaisons on September 1, 2021 and posted to the September 21, 2021, NDE update. NDE hosted 4 webinars in September 2021 to provide districts additional guidance on the implementation of Assembly Bill (AB) 57 and AB 266. It was recorded and was available for playback for any educators who wished to view it. NDE completed the annual NEPF Monitoring for Continuous Improvement district liaison interviews with all 17 districts in September 2021 and reviewed survey results as well as the NEPF ratings. NDE created 10 NEPF Canvas available to educators state-wide courses on a variety of topics related to the NEPF. NDE conducted in-person NEPF training in Mineral, Nye, Humboldt County School Districts, and in Elko on November 18, 2021. NDE presented NEPF guidance at the annual Digital Learning Summit in October and at the new CTE Teacher/Admin monthly meeting.

NDE, with Chair Salazar, presented TLC's NEPF 2021-22 Summative Evaluation recommended score ranges to the State Board of Education (SBE) on November 4, 2021. SBE approved the recommended score ranges for the 2021-22 school year and beyond or until/unless changes are recommended. This information was posted in the NDE Update for November 16, 2021 and was shared with district NEPF liaisons at their meeting on Monday, November 22, 2021. The scoring ranges were consistent with TLC recommendations as well as the scoring ranges used since the implementation of the NEPF began in 2015.

6. **Review of NEPF Monitoring for Continuous Improvement Survey Data**

Tina Statucki, NDE, shared results from the 2020-21 NEPF Monitoring for Continuous Improvement Survey. NRS 391.485 provided for the annual review of statewide performance evaluation system and the manner in which schools carried out evaluations pursuant to system. To support this work, the NDE created an annual Monitoring for Continuous Improvement survey and provided it to district NEPF liaisons in the spring to send out to the educators in their district. The document provided (and linked in the presentation) showed the results of last year's Monitoring for Continuous Improvement survey results. Data was shared with the district NEPF liaisons and discussed with them during their annual interviews in September.

The first half of the report showed the results of the administrator surveys. Surveys were completed by 607 administrators State-wide (about 50%). Overall, administrators reported that the time they spent on the NEPF cycle was reasonable (80.04%), the NEPF was positively impacting instructional practice at their school (70.81%), and NEPF implementation was positively impacting student learning at their school (68.72%). Over 95% believed their own evaluation was fair and helped them grow as an administrator (80.64%)

The second half of the report demonstrated teacher responses. The survey was completed by 7,752 teachers (about 1/3). Overall, teachers reported that the time they spent on the NEPF cycle was reasonable (81.41%), the NEPF was positively impacting their instructional practice (74.76%), and the NEPF was positively impacting their students' learning (70.43%). Over 91% believed their own evaluation was fair and helped them grow as an educator (72.48%).

Member Rourke asked whether the areas that had nearly a quarter of the teachers disagree were because of training issues and whether there were plans to address that. Tina Statucki stated that NDE also saw that as an issue and the data, when broken down by district, illustrated differences in how the NEPF is implemented within districts. In response, NDE focused on providing additional training, especially through Canvas, so that there was a consistent message and greater consistency in implementation. Ms. Statucki related that in her prior role as a building principal she received training on the teacher standards, but not as much on the administrator standards, so she focused on increasing training to administrators on the administrator standards and how to use them more efficiently. There were a larger number of new administrators this year, so NDE encouraged district liaisons to reach out the Regional Professional Development Programs for additional support.

Member Goynes asked about the differences among the responses between elementary and secondary. Ms. Statucki responded that question 2 refers specifically to the grade level of the respondent, but not to their overall opinion of the process. The responses to the actual questions are not broken down by grade level, but they could be broken down by level in the future if TLC thought it would be useful.

Member Negrete asked why there was such a large number of respondents who did not answer some of the questions. Ms. Statucki stated that NDE does not know specifically why some chose not to answer, but she acknowledged that some respondents were unclear whether they were answering the survey based on their evaluation for 2019-20 or 2020-21, so that is something that will be addressed prior to the next iteration of the survey. Some districts sent out the survey in March and some sent it out in May. With input from the NEPF liaisons who serve as the workgroup, the language will be revised before it is sent out.

Member Tiscareno asked whether the survey data disaggregated by district will be made available to TLC. Ms. Statucki responded that the data is broken down by district to share with district liaisons; however, NDE does not compile it that way. Ms. Galland-Collins provided additional context for the survey. NDE created the original survey and when it was first sent out, there was a terrible response rate. NDE then worked with Regional Educational Laboratories (REL West) and WestEd and stakeholders from across the State including administrators, teachers, and Other Licensed Educational Professionals (OLEPs) to revise and draft out a simple survey. The administrator survey was longer as they answered from two different lenses, but the questions were narrowed down to those that focus on NEPF implementation. The data was owned by the districts, not NDE, to guide their continuous improvement efforts. That was why it was only aggregated at the State level. District level data was reviewed during the district NEPF liaison interviews – to guide conversations to drive continuous improvement.

Member Teel reiterated the usefulness of those conversations as the data was used to help administrators focus on what they need to pay attention to for the next cycle. Member Teel added a comment about

question 8, the question pertaining to the Student Learning Goals (SLGs), saying that it showed that the SLG was working.

Member Owens pointed out that only 25% said “strongly agree” and questioned what could be inferred from that low number. She added that those who responded “agree” was 51%. Chair Salazar said that a score of 74% reflected a tipping point that we look for as demonstrating a positive correlation. Ms. Statucki reiterated that the SLG response rate demonstrated that when implemented as intended, the process helped teachers focus their instruction and planning, and that guided the conversations NDE had with the districts.

7. Future Agenda Items

Chair Salazar asked for future agenda items. Ms. Statucki responded that potential items of discussion included an annual report from the Regional Professional Development Programs (RPDP) on training they provided to support the NEPF and on Open Meeting Law training as there may be 4 new members.

Member Moulden asked if there would be any update on the extra weighting for educators on their summative evaluations. Ms. Statucki responded that districts will be required to provide both unweighted as well as weighted scores, which will be shared with TLC in the fall. Member Moulden asked if the evaluation tools were updated to calculate the weighting. Ms. Statucki responded that the tools available on the NDE website calculate the weight (section 4 was added for this purpose). NDE met with the two top vendors that provide an electronic evaluation tool to ensure their tool was revised to calculate the weight correctly. NDE asked the vendors to share their tool with the Department prior to releasing it to districts to ensure the tool complies with the law. Member Moulden said their vendor told them their tool would not be ready until the end of January. Ms. Statucki confirmed that the vendor said it would be ready by the time the districts needed it.

Member Moulden asked what date is used to determine class sizes for educators. Ms. Statucki responded that NDE’s guidance to the districts provided that each district had to set its own date, but the date must be prior to November 1 and consistent across the district. Districts also had to set a contingent date for educators hired after November 1 and/or for those educators who have significant class size changes due to enrollment or staffing changes.

Ms. Statucki added that a future agenda item should include the election of a Chair.

8. Public Comment #2

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 9:35 AM.