

**TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)  
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24, 2024  
11:00 AM**

| <b>Office</b>           | <b>Address</b>                   | <b>City</b> | <b>Meeting Room</b> |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Department of Education | 2080 E. Flamingo Rd.             | Las Vegas   | Boardroom           |
| Department of Education | 700 E. Fifth St.                 | Carson City | Boardroom           |
| Department of Education | Virtual/ <a href="#">YouTube</a> | n/a         | n/a                 |

**SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**

**MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE**

Danica Hays  
Juanita Ortiz  
Andrew Tiscareno  
Elizabeth Cadigan  
Darcy McInnis  
Louis Markouzis  
Sue Moulden  
Pam Teel  
Linda Gilkerson  
Annie Hicks  
Jeana Blackman-Taylor  
Pam Goynes-Brown

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (NDE) STAFF IN ATTENDANCE**

Kathleen Galland-Collins, Assistant Director, Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement (EDLiFE)

Kathryn Hoyt, Education Programs Professional, Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement (EDLiFE)

Rick Derry, Administrative Assistant, Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement (EDLiFE)

**LEGAL STAFF IN ATTENDANCE**

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General (DAG)

**1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Vice Chair Pam Teel called the meeting to order followed by roll call and the Pledge of Allegiance. Vice Chair Teel announced the resignation of governor appointed member Lola Brooks who served on the council. Member Brooks was thanked for her service. The National Association of School Boards (NASB) has provided three names to take the place of Member Brooks. The Governor will review the board commission today and will notify the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) when an appointment has been made.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT #1**

1. Dr. Erik Skramstad, director of PGS for Clark County School District (CCSD), provided comment regarding agenda item 6.

*(A complete copy of the statements is available in Appendix A)*

3. **INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 28, 2024, MEETING MINUTES** *(Information/ Discussion/ Possible Action)*

Members reviewed the February 28, 2024, meeting minutes. Vice Chair Pam Teel entertained a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Member Elizabeth Cadigan made a motion to adopt the meeting minutes. Member Annie Hicks seconded. Motion carried.

4. **INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING ANNUAL REPORT FROM REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS (RPDP)** *(Information/ Discussion)*

Members received an overview and updates of regional training activities that occurred since the previous report, professional learning planned for the remainder of the 2023-24 school year, summer events, and professional learning planned for the 2024-25 school year from Karen Stanley with the Southern Nevada Regional Professional Development Programs (SNRPDP).

The Southern Nevada RPDP includes 17 full time content, 3 contracted content, and 2 professional development providers, servicing five counties in Southern Nevada which are Clark County, Lincoln County, Esmeralda County, Mineral County, and Nye County. RPDP provides professional learning opportunities in a virtual or face-to-face setting, and work with teachers and leaders to discuss the contents of the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF). In Lincoln County, RPDP led administrators and teachers in monthly NEPF learning walks centered on observation and conferencing to improve teacher and leader practice, prompting coaching, feedback, and discussion, connecting adult action to student learning. In Mineral County, RPDP facilitated participated face-to-face workshops, deepening administrator understanding of the NEPF Instructional Practice standards and Instructional Leadership Standards. An NEPF asynchronous program module was developed so teachers across the state can gain knowledge in the research, resources, and strategies to support learners in the classroom. A first year novice-teacher program, aimed at increasing teacher agency of the NEPF was developed for teachers with less than 3 years of classroom experience, every novice teacher was assigned a mentor. Chair Salazar and Karen Stanley designed workshops for site-based leaders alongside central office administrators to develop greater leader and teacher expertise by exploring research-based best practice. Sessions focused on increasing leader capacity as defined by one or more of the NEPF leadership standards Statewide Administrator Briefs were provided to superintendents to share with site-based leaders. They included the latest research-based best practice as well as a workshop schedule. RPDP was invited to participate in the Nevada Association of School Superintendent's Academy in June for the Future Focused Education Summit where professional development providers will be engaged in dialogue and planning alongside leaders in the districts. Additionally, RPDP is collaborating with the Clark County School District to develop workshops for site-based leaders on the continuous improvement process and leadership standards. There will be professional learning and resources for administrators and teachers to enhance their coaching. Workshops are developed based on district and school requests and offered virtually and in person.

The professional learning series for administrators is titled, “Leading with Purpose, Building Leadership Efficacy.”

Member Jeana Blackman-Taylor expressed gratitude for Ms. Stanley’s presentation and inquired if RPDP received any feedback from teachers or administrators about the development of these workshops and trainings. Ms. Stanley stated that they work closely with the districts and are able to incentivize all workshops, which are completely voluntary. Different districts define their process to incentivize programs, so teachers will receive workshop credits. NEPF Standard are embedded throughout the programs to support student success. Member Blackman-Taylor asked about tracking the improvement for those who have attended a workshop versus those who have not and do they see any connection to participation in the workshops with higher performance ratings on the framework. Ms. Stanley stated that this is a national question, and there is no clear data to support it. Multiple teachers and leaders return to the workshops and complete an evaluation survey. Several of them comment on the impact of the training. This is shared in the end-of-year report presented to the Nevada Department of Education (NDE). Administrators are provided resources and tools every session. RPDP asks individuals who would like those resources and tools to respond with an email.

Member Elizabeth Cadigan asked if Ms. Stanley could confirm if the salary advancement opportunities that they provide are for the entire state. Ms. Stanley could not confirm that. Member Cadigan asked if there was a way for educators to confirm that professional development provided by RPDP provides salary opportunities for the northern region of the state. Annie Hicks, director of the northeastern region of RPDP, stated that they cannot confirm salary advancement opportunities across the state because they are individually determined by each district in their master contract agreement. All professional learning provided can lead to licensure renewal hours, professional learning certificates, and/or university transcripts with institutions of higher education they partner with. Each district and their master contract with their teacher union and/or administrator union ultimately determines whether those professional learning hours and/or credits are for salary advancement or only for licensure. That would be a question to direct to individual superintendents. Kristen Campbell with northwest RPDP stated that in her region some of the districts require graduate credit for salary advancement. They partner with Southern Utah University for those districts and, in other districts, if it is done outside contract hours it equals in-service credit for salary advancement, but it does depend individually on the school district. Karen Stanley stated that they refer participants back to their district for information.

Annie Hicks introduced herself as the director of the northeastern region for RPDP. She shared that NNRPDP was hosting a leadership summit for Northern Nevada tomorrow. She expressed gratitude of how excited she was to share some of the ways which NNRPDP is supporting both leaders and educators in implementing the high leverage and evidence-based practices both instructionally and in terms of leadership across the region through the professional learning that they provide. NNRPDP currently has seven full-time professional learning leaders as well as Annie herself, who sometimes facilitates professional learning for schools and district leaders. NNRPDP serves Elko County, Eureka County, Humboldt County, Lander County, Pershing County, and White Pine County. Professional learning is provided through a mix of formats to meet the unique needs of the region. Individuals can participate virtually, in-person, or through a hybrid option. Professional learning opportunities that include workshop observations, mentoring, consulting, and coaching are provided per request from district and site leaders within the region or in connection to consulting provided to schools based on

the continuous improvement process. Schools partnering with NNRPDP navigate the process in a meaningful way, leading to improved outcomes for students. Ms. Hicks shared highlights from professional opportunities specifically focused on the NEPF for educators or leaders. Leaders in the region had three specific opportunities to grow and elevate their own practice. One of those used the NEPF for educators to dive deeply into each standard and indicator in conjunction with learning about related high-leverage instructional strategies aligned with the standards. Video snapshots from various classrooms were used to observe what is happening in a facilitated real-time scenario and then look at what the instructional practices were in relation to the NEPF. Participants work together to improve the feedback they provide to teachers so feedback is actionable. Furthermore, RPDP has facilitated a workshop, in its second year, using school administrator leadership standards and professional responsibility standards. They pair standards with the Wallace Foundation's report on how principals affect schools and students. She added that they are synthesizing two decades of research, looking at what principals are doing as leaders and how they can improve based on their knowledge of the research. In this workshop series, leaders read research briefs, engaged in critical self-reflection, and worked collaboratively with peers to use their new learning to address problems of practice in order to grow and improve as leaders. This year, NNRPDP added a new opportunity for school leaders in the region to conduct NEPF walkthroughs in partnership with NNRPDP staff. School leaders refined both their observational skills and providing actionable and concrete feedback. One of the ways they focused on the NEPF for educators was through a series of learning sessions that helped new educators in the State of Nevada in the (northeastern) region become familiar with the NEPF and how it connected to instructional practice and planning. In the northeastern region, there were two special learning opportunities for new educators in those districts. They performed an initial skim of the NEPF and worked together on how to apply it in their classrooms. In addition, they added a new educator workshop series where school administrators could request an NEPF day. They could send a group of 8 to 12 educators from their school site to the RPDP professional learning space where they dive deeper into the NEPF research and instructional strategies. Educators work collaboratively using a planning tool. Another way RPDP supported educators was through follow-up coaching. Individuals who had participated in one of the NEPF workshops could request coaching on their own or in conjunction with their site administrator. Furthermore, RPDP conducted NEPF learning blocks with educators to provide substitute coverage while groups of teachers visited classrooms to observe for 10-15 minutes. Teachers debriefed about what they noticed, specifically related to the NEPF instructional practices, and then spent the afternoon collaboratively planning upcoming lessons and units through an NEPF lens. Several schools requested to combine the NEPF learning walks with other professional learning sessions as a micro session of 20 to 30 minutes before school began. These sessions were offered both virtually and in-person. Finally, The NEPF to Cohort Project will provide support to a middle schools in the region for 2 years to ensure that all staff have the opportunity to engage in intentional learning around the NEPF. By the end of the year, all staff in the middle school would have the opportunity to participate in a cohort. Ms. Hicks shared highlights from professional learning opportunities facilitated by RPDP where the NEPF was embedded alongside core content areas or other aspects of professional practice. Last year, RPDP partnered with schools in the Continuous Improvement Process to create meaning and provide an external thinking partner to critically analyze the data being utilized and the conversations about what interventions makes the most sense. Often, RPDP consultants found that several schools had student success goals connected to the NEPF and instructional practices. RPDP facilitated 68 specific sessions for the NEPF for educators and leaders. Within the RPDP NEPF learning sessions, there were 270 school leaders; 1,450 educators; and approximately 150 paraprofessionals.

Kristin Campbell, with northwest region RPDP, shared that her region serves Washoe County, Storey County, Lyon County, Churchill County, Douglas County, and Carson City. Most professional learning was request based, with designed courses providing professional learning to educators in the region. Courses were offered via a mixed format, hybrid, or in-person. Most of the staff were housed in Washoe County School District. There was a full-time staff member housed in Churchill County School District, a part-time and full-time staff member housed in Carson City, and a full-time staff member in Douglas County. In each of the districts, NEPF requests were for new teachers and usually offered at the beginning of the school year. She added that the NEPF was not necessarily offered on its own, but was integrated into all the services that they provided. Northwest RPDP was involved in an intensive teacher clarity project with schools in the region. It involved whole staff professional learning and embedded grade-level PLC's working to support teachers in lesson design through learning walks. The last round of learning walks was in January; data showed that 97% of students at one of the schools RPDP supported were aware of what they were learning and the purpose of learning. Ms. Campbell mentioned they provided multicultural and parent and family engagement courses to educators across the state in partnership with Southern Utah University (SUU). Currently there was a waitlist for courses offered in the fall. They also used the NEPF as a coaching tool in Carson City with TOSA and instructional coaches to align with the Marzano Proficiency Scales. Washoe County was the biggest district so far in the teacher clarity project. In Lyon County School District, they worked with numerous teachers and staff to provide coaching supports for educators around NEPF. Building Thinking Classrooms, using the NEPF and high leverage instruction techniques that have to do with vertical spaces in math classrooms, was a huge request across the northwest region. RPDP was asked to expand the teacher clarity projects to many different schools.

**5. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING NEVADA EDUCATOR PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK (NEPF) UPDATES** *(Information/ Discussion)*

Kathryn Hoyt, Education Programs Professional with NDE, provided updates on an upcoming hearing regarding Legislative Council Bureau (LCB) file number 138-23, amending NAC 391.571. The meeting will be held on June 12, 2024, to revise NAC 391.571 to reflect the current domain percentages. The updates were needed to due to reflect the reduction of the student outcome domain from 40% to 15% in 2019. The LCB file number 138-23 proposed to amend the percentages of the domains to 65% for instructional leadership, 20% for professional responsibilities, and 15% for performance evaluation. These percentages have been applied in practice since 2020 and were needed to adjust the language in the Nevada Administrative Code.

The NEPF Winter Liaisons Newsletter was shared on March 15th and posted to the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) Update and the NDE website on March 21. She added that they distributed the annual NEPF Implementation (Monitoring for Continuous Improvement) survey link to NEPF Liaisons on April 1, 2024, and the survey will close on July 15, 2024. The NEPF Excel spreadsheet template would be sent to NEPF Liaisons to submit summative district educator ratings on May 1, 2024, and would be due on July 15, 2024. Also, a letter of recommendation has been drafted for a Budget Draft Request in support of funding an electronic tool for NEPF data collection (see meeting materials).

6. **INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING NEVADA EDUCATOR PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK (NEPF) REDESIGN DRAFTS** (*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*)

Mrs. Hoyt shared updates regarding the NEPF redesign. It was recommended that the NEPF rubrics be redesigned as they have not been reviewed since their creation in 2011. When looking at the Monitoring for Continuous Improvement (MCI) data, it showed that the primary feedback from teachers and administrators regarding the NEPF was not about the process that takes place or the standards themselves, but the amount of time it takes to implement the system throughout a school year. MCI data from 2023 indicates that an update may be warranted, as 31.36% of administrators surveyed disagreed or strongly disagreed that the time spent on the NEPF evaluation cycle for each teacher was reasonable (pulled from question 27 on the survey) and 30.42% of administrators surveyed indicated that the addition of class size adjustment on the summative evaluation for all eligible teachers took considerable additional time or substantial additional time to physically complete the summative evaluations for the teachers they supervised (pulled from question 28 on the survey). Overall, the class size adjustment ratio impacted less than 2% of teachers in their final evaluation score. She added that the redesign goals were not meant to alter the original intention of the NEPF as a developmental tool, but to streamline the NEPF and consolidate it for better accessibility with the hope of resulting in a reduction of time spent on implementation.

The original NEPF rubrics consisted of standards and indicators for instructional practice and professional responsibilities, as well as evidence, sources, descriptions, and notes for each indicator with detailed performance levels for each score. The combined teacher rubrics were 24 pages long. There were 10 standards and 34 indicators making up the teacher rubrics. The proposed redesign did not alter the standards, but the goal was to integrate the standards as descriptors to show a deeper connection to the standard itself. The indicators would no longer be scored individually but would be integrated as part of a score for the standard. The concise view would eliminate the extra verbiage and consolidate the pages down to 11, including a keyword glossary for each performance level to add extra level of clarity. It would allow for a single source of evidence to be applied to multiple descriptors within the standard. While this had always been allowed for multiple indicators, it was not always followed by LEA's. The redesign highlights this practice in its layout with the intention of shortening the amount of evidence required to be collected. The current score practice required a 1 through 4 performance level assigned to each indicator and for each standard, which are then averaged to calculate the score for each standard. There was also the additional weight of class size adjustment for some teachers. The same approach was utilized for the administrative standard rubrics.

The redesigned summative evaluation tool would consolidate scoring to each standard as opposed to assigning individual indicators per standard. Scoring domain percentages would remain the same: 65% for instructional practice, 20% for professional responsibilities, and 15% for student performance. Final ratings would not change from highly effective, effective, developing, or ineffective. There would be no changes to the scoring formula, but what would change is with a 1 to 4 score being given for each standard instead of each indicator per standard. It would require less evidence to be collected throughout the evaluation cycles. The total pages of the tool would be cut down from 5 to 2. NRS 391.465 would need to be revised as the current class size adjustment is now applied to specific indicator scores with the NEPF rubrics. The class size adjustment for the professional responsibility standards of family engagement and student perception would remain the same as they are already

eligible for class size adjustment for each indicator. Mrs. Hoyt showed examples of the tools and rubrics.

Member Cadigan asked if there was an administrator or educator in disagreement regarding the evaluation whether the new form would hinder the ability for a rebuttal or to provide additional pieces of evidence to skew a score. Assistant Director Kathleen Galland-Collins, of EDLiFE, asked for clarification. Member Sue Moulden asked that, by combining the indicators into one standard, where are you able to dive down to where the deficiency may be? Ms. Galland-Collins responded that the indicators have been rolled up into descriptors for the standard and administrators and educators can still have a conversation about how the educator met those descriptors, through observations and other evidence sources. The reduced amount of evidence required will help reduce the workload.

Member McInnis commented that after talking to new educators and having new administrators, during observations it falls on the teacher to provide confirmatory evidence. She asked is there any way to delegate who provides evidence? The workload is falling on the teacher, adding to their frustration. She asked if there was an emphasis in the training that teachers don't need to provide all of the evidence. Assistant Director Galland-Collins responded that any confirmatory evidence provided should not be created for the purpose of the conference but should already exist. This is in the protocols and should be mentioned when training; having a binder was never intended.

Member Cadigan commented that she hesitated to include student surveys or interviews because it is not organic. Ms. Galland-Collins said that administrators should be the ones interviewing students, not the teacher. Vice Chair Teel commented that when administrators are doing class walks, they can collect informal data by interviewing students. If an administrator is not trained to follow protocols correctly, this can lead to more work for the teacher. RPDP provides training to do this correctly for administrators and teachers. If a teacher is struggling to provide evidence for a particular descriptor, that is where the conversation needs to take place to support their growth. Member Moulden commented that even though it looks streamlined, as an admin she would still need to score each indicator to come up with a total score for the standard. Assistant Director Galland-Collins shared she would not, and that scoring has not changed from a 1-4 scale.

Member Blackman-Taylor inquired about the 15% for the student learning goal (SLG) and asked how a teacher who has only had a student for a few weeks demonstrate the growth of that student in a short amount of time. Vice Chair Teel clarified that within the goal you would only track the students that you've been able to measure all year, per the protocols, in the goal. The SLG should be an actionable goal.

Member Cadigan inquired as to why there is a heavier emphasis on student perception within the teacher rubric (professional responsibilities) but not in other positions, such as Teacher Librarians and OLEP's. Assistant Director Galland-Collins shared that this was discussed during the original design of the NEPF. It was incorporated for teachers because student perception has a large impact on student learning. For OLEP's, a lot of student perception is built into other standards. Member Hays commented that this could be incorporated as an evidentiary source for those positions. Member Moulden recommended that teacher perception data would be pertinent for administrator evidence. Member Ortiz agreed that librarians and administrators should incorporate this. Vice Chair Teel commented that administrators could provide a culture and climate survey.

Member Tiscareno commented that the new rubric may cause admin to struggle due to subjectivity in their ratings. Ms. Galland-Collins emphasized the importance of interrater reliability. Member Moulden agreed with Member Tiscareno that the new rubric may cause new admin to struggle, without having to score each indicator, to ensure the standard is being met. Member Hays commented that this concern could be addressed through training. Vice Chair Teel commented that in her experience new administrators can pick up the process faster than veteran administrators. RPDP has a fabulous training program that they could adjust. Member McInnis suggested that teacher to admin feedback could be incorporated to assist admin and lead to needed training for them. Member Hicks reminded TLC that RPDP has limited staff and that RPDP should not be the sole source of training. Without capacity training will not be done well. Training for interrater reliability and implicit bias should be separate to ensure these conversations are happening at all levels. Teacher survey data regarding their administrator would need to be kept confidential.

Member Moulden asked if P.E. could be added to the class size adjustment. Assistant Director Collins shared that per the NRS physical education was not included. TLC does not have authority over this, but TLC could make a recommendation to the State Board. Members Cadigan and McInnis suggested that all class types should be included. Vice Chair Teel recommended that this be discussed at a future meeting.

Vice Chair Teel offered an overview of proposed changes to the NEPF Rubrics and the class size adjustment.

**Member Danica Hays moved to accept the NEPF Rubric Redesign Drafts and Summative Evaluation Tool Draft changes as is and recommend them to the State Board of Education (SBE), as well as taking a position on potential statutory changes that may be needed regarding the class size adjustment weights (NRS.361.465). Member Pamela Goynes-Brown seconded. A roll vote was called to determine if each member was in favor of the recommendations.**

**Member Danica Hays voted YES.**

**Member Juanita Ortiz voted YES.**

**Member Andrew Tiscareno voted YES.**

**Member Elizabeth Cadigan voted YES.**

**Member Darcy McInnis voted YES.**

**Member Lou Markouzis voted YES.**

**Member Sue Moulden voted YES.**

**Member Pamela Teel voted YES.**

**Member Linda Gilkerson voted YES.**

**Member Annie Hicks voted YES.**

**Member Jeana Blackman-Taylor voted YES.**

**Member Pamela Goynes-Brown voted YES.**

**Member Sue Moulden made a motion to include all standard 2 and 3 under instructional strategies, as well as all of standards 4 and 5 under professional responsibilities which will stay the same. Member Cadigan seconded the motion following a roll call vote.**



**Member Danica Hays voted YES.**  
**Member Juanita Ortiz voted YES.**  
**Member Andrew Tiscareno voted YES.**  
**Member Elizabeth Cadigan voted YES.**  
**Member Darcy McInnis voted YES.**  
**Member Lou Markouzis voted YES.**  
**Member Sue Moulden voted YES.**  
**Member Pamela Teel voted YES.**  
**Member Linda Gilkerson voted YES.**  
**Member Annie Hicks voted YES.**  
**Member Jeana Blackman-Taylor voted YES.**  
**Member Pamela Goynes-Brown voted YES.**

**7. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING 2024-25 MEETING DATES**

*(Information/ Discussion)*

Members viewed the tentative meeting dates for the upcoming school year: Wednesday, September 25, 2024; Wednesday, November 20, 2024; Wednesday, February 26, 2025; and Wednesday, April 30, 2025.

**8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS *(Information/ Discussion)***

Vice Chair Teel added the NRS 391.465 on class size reduction for discussion and recommended changes to the SBE.

**9. PUBLIC COMMENT #2**

There was no public comment in Carson City and no public comment in Las Vegas.

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

## **Appendix A: Statements given during public comments**

1. Dr. Erik Skramstad, director of PGS for Clark County School District (CCSD), provided comment regarding agenda item 6.  
*(A summary of the statement is available in Appendix A1)*

### **Appendix A, Item 1: DR. ERIK SKRAMSTAD**

Rick, please know, as the CCSD NEPF Liaison to NDE, I would like to provide public comment to Item 6 of the 4/24/24 TLC Meeting Agenda regarding NEPF evaluation redesign drafts. CCSD is in support of the redesign drafts shared by NDE and encourages the TLC to move to accept the NEPF Rubric Redesign Drafts and Summative Evaluation Tool Draft changes as is and recommend them to the State Board of Education, thus also taking a position on potential statutory changes that may be needed regarding the class size adjustment weights (NRS 391.465).