



Nevada Educator Performance Framework 2021-22 Summative Evaluation and Monitoring for Continuous Improvement Data Review

Tina Statucki, Education Programs Professional;

Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement

Dr. Pam Salazar, Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) Chair

Dan Sadler, Associate Superintendent of Human Resources;

Carson City School District

State Board of Education - November 2022

Presentation Outcomes

State Board of Education members will receive a summary of the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) Summative Evaluation Data for the 2021-22 school year as well as data from the annual Monitoring for Continuous Improvement surveys and interviews.

STIP Alignment

Goal 2: All students have access to effective educators.

- Equity: Ensure effective educators in low-performing schools
- Access to Quality: Provide quality professional learning
- Transparency: Engage in effective communication

Monitoring the NEPF

NRS 391.485 Annual review of statewide performance evaluation system; annual review of manner in which schools carry out evaluations pursuant to system.

1. The State Board shall annually review the statewide performance evaluation system to ensure accuracy and reliability. Such a review must include, without limitation, an analysis of the:
 - a) Number and percentage of teachers and administrators who receive each designation identified in paragraph (a) of subsection 2 of NRS 391.465 in each school, school district, and the State as a whole;
 - b) Data used to evaluate pupil growth in each school, school district and the State as a whole, including, without limitation, any observations; and
 - c) Effect of the evaluations conducted pursuant to the statewide system of accountability for public schools on the academic performance of pupils enrolled in the school district in each school and school district, and the State as a whole.
2. The board of trustees of each school district shall annually review the manner in which schools in the school district carry out the evaluation of teachers and administrators pursuant to the statewide performance evaluation system.
3. The Department may review the manner in which the statewide performance evaluation system is carried out by each school district, including, without limitation, the manner in which the learning goals for pupils are established and evaluated pursuant to NRS 391.480.

NEPF Summative Evaluation Data Review

Overview of NEPF Summative Ratings

Educator Group	Total Count	Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective		Exempt	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Audiologists	6	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	66.67%	1	16.67%	1	16.67%
School Administrators	1,340	0	0.00%	7	0.52%	947	70.67%	296	22.09%	90	6.72%
School Counselors	978	0	0.00%	1	0.10%	624	63.80%	270	27.61%	83	8.49%
School Nurse	281	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	160	56.94%	106	37.72%	15	5.34%
School Psychologists	238	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	120	50.42%	101	42.44%	17	7.14%
School Social Workers	125	1	0.80%	1	0.80%	57	45.60%	51	40.80%	15	12.00%
Speech-Language Pathologists	459	1	0.22%	1	0.22%	212	46.19%	199	43.36%	46	10.02%
Teacher-Librarians	305	0	0.00%	3	0.98%	204	66.89%	81	26.56%	17	5.57%
Teachers	21,301	16	0.08%	110	0.52%	15,236	71.53%	4,811	22.59%	1,128	5.30%

Overview of NEPF Summative Ratings with Class Size Adjustment

Educator Group	Effective		Effective (Adj)		Highly Effective		Highly Effective (Adj)		Change	
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage
Teacher-Librarians	204	66.89%	204	66.89%	81	26.56%	81	26.56%	0	0.00%
Teachers	15,444	72.50%	15,236	71.53%	4,603	21.61%	4,811	22.59%	208	0.98%


Assembly Bill 266 established a class size adjustment for eligible educators equivalent to the percentage by which the ratio of pupils for which the teacher is responsible exceeds the recommended ratio of pupils per licensed teacher as set forth by the State Board of Education. Educators eligible for the class size adjustment included K-12, non-probationary educators who received an unadjusted rating of effective or highly effective and who did not teach band, choir, and/or orchestra (includes teacher-librarians who provide direct, regular instruction to students) (NRS 388.890, 391.465).

Overview of NEPF Ratings by Standard


Educator Group	Highest IPS/ILS*	Lowest IPS/ILS*	Highest PRS/PPS*	Lowest PRS/PPS*	Average Summative Score	Change
Audiologists	N/A	N/A	3.50 (3)	3.25 (2)	3.36	↓.12
School Administrators	3.42 (2)	3.27 (4)	3.47 (3)	3.26 (4)	3.35	↓.02
School Counselors	N/A	N/A	3.47 (3)	3.31 (4)	3.41	.0
School Nurse	N/A	N/A	3.49 (5)	3.36 (3)	3.43	↑.01
School Psychologists	N/A	N/A	3.58 (2)	3.40 (3)	3.49	↑.05
School Social Workers	N/A	N/A	3.54 (1)	3.42 (4)	3.48	↑.04
Speech-Language Pathologists	N/A	N/A	3.55 (1)	3.43 (2)	3.50	↑.10
Teacher-Librarians	3.42 (3)	3.24 (4)	3.60 (2)	3.39 (5)	3.41	↑.04
Teachers	3.39 (2)	3.21 (4)	3.41 (5)	3.29 (2)	3.33	↑.04

The numbers in parenthesis denote the corresponding NEPF Standard. IPS/ILS refers to Instructional Practice (teachers and teacher-librarians) or Instructional Leadership (administrators) Standards; PRS/PPS refers to Professional Responsibilities or Professional Practice Standards (all educator groups).

Teacher Score Distribution




Teacher Trend Data




Administrator Score Distribution

Frequency



Administrator Trend Data



Data Limitations

- District data may not reflect subgroups with small N-size (less than 10)
- Data does not include educators who separated from district prior to summative evaluation rating
- Data does not allow for tracking individual educator growth from year to year as data is reported without identifying educator information (NAC 391.589)
- Data does not include student performance score (SLG) because SLGs were not required for the evaluation for the 2021-22 school year

NEPF Monitoring for Continuous Improvement

NEPF MCI Survey Data


- 2021-22 Surveys completed by July 15, 2022
- Responses
 - Administrators – 321 (about 24%)
 - ❖ [Survey Results](#)
 - Teachers – 6567 (about 31%)
 - ❖ [Teacher Results](#)

*Average survey response rate is between 20-30%.

How to Increase Online Survey Response Rates. (2022). Retrieved 30 August 2022, from <https://www.qualtrics.com/experience-management/research/tools-increase-response-rate/>




NEPF MCI Survey Data - Feedback




Percentage equals survey responses that agree/strongly agree.

NEPF MCI Survey Data - Growth




Percentage equals survey responses that agree/strongly agree.

NEPF MCI Survey Data – Impact on Time



How much additional time do you believe it took you to understand the new class size adjustment process, assist your educators to understand it, and to physically complete the summative evaluations for the teachers you supervised?



Data Limitations (2)

- Local control of survey distribution



NEPF MCI Interview Data

- NDE representatives meet annually with district NEPF Liaisons
- NEPF Liaisons use survey and NEPF data to inform professional learning plans and to make connections to district initiatives such as Modern Teacher, mentorship programs, and professional development efforts.





Contact Information:

Dr. Pam Salazar: pamela.salazar@unlv.edu

Tina Statucki: tstatucki@doe.nv.gov