

TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2024
2:00 PM

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/ YouTube	n/a	n/a

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Pam Salazar
Pamela Teel
Jeana Blackman-Taylor
Elizabeth Cadigan
Linda Gilkerson
Pam Goynes-Brown
Annie Hicks
Darcy McInnis
Sue Moulden
Susan Neal
Juanita Ortiz
Andrew Tiscareno

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)

Kellylynn Charles, 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)

Tina Statucki, Contractor, Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement (EDLiFE)

LEGAL STAFF IN ATTENDANCE

Nicole Ting, Deputy Attorney General (DAG)

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

Chair Pamela Salazar called the meeting to order at 2:04 PM following the Pledge of Allegiance. Chair Salazar welcomed TLC's newest appointed member Susan Neal, a member of the Elko County School Board. She is also a former Elko school teacher, staff development specialist, and a volunteer for CASA, among other roles in her district. Member Neal expressed her gratitude on being on the council.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT #1**

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

3. **INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 24, 2024, MEETING MINUTES** (*Information/ Discussion/ Possible Action*)

Chair Salazar entertained a motion to approve the April 24, 2024, meeting minutes. Vice Chair Pamela Teel made a motion. Member Annie Hicks seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

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

Kathryn Hoyt, Education Programs Professional with the Nevada Department of Education, provided updates regarding NEPF implementation. The Spring NEPF Liaison Newsletter was emailed to NEPF Liaisons on May 9, 2024, and posted to the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) update on May 16, 2024. NDE distributed the Annual NEPF Implementation (Monitoring for Continuous Improvement) Survey link to NEPF Liaisons on April 1, 2024. The department distributed the NEPF districts ratings spreadsheet template and guidance document to NEPF Liaisons on May 1, 2024, due for return on July 15, 2024. Only one district did not submit ratings data. The Annual Monitoring for Continuous Improvement interviews with district liaisons were almost complete. Furthermore, TLC submitted a Budget Enhancement Request letter to the State Board of Education (SBE), and NDE responded to vendor inquires regarding the request for information for the NEPF electronic tool for data collection as of August 2024.

Mrs. Hoyt also gave an update on the NEPF Redesign Field Study. During the last TLC meeting, members voted to share the NEPF redesign rubrics and tools with the SBE. During the SBE's June 12, 2024 meeting, the Board approved a field study, which would be conducted over the next three school years to field test and refine the NEPF rubrics, tools, and protocols for school administrators and teachers. For the 2024-25 school year, a limited number of schools in Clark County and the Public Charter School authority and all schools in Elko, Lincoln, and Lyon Counties would be participating in the Field Study - approximately 85 schools. Introductory meetings took place to support school site leaders, who would be asked to provide feedback and document samples throughout the school year. Workgroups were established to encourage discussion, feedback, and refinement of the NEPF Redesign prior to the 2025-2026 school year. The Department would share progress with TLC throughout the school year and with the SBE in June 2025. Mrs. Hoyt added that, in the future, the Department planned to have workgroups for teachers-librarians and Other Educational Licensed Personnel (OLEPs) to determine whether there was an appetite for revising their NEPF rubrics and tools, likely during the upcoming winter. NDE wanted to make sure that they were consulting those groups that would be impacted (see meeting materials).

5. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE 2024-2025 NEVADA EDUCATOR PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK (NEPF) SUMMATIVE EVALUATION RATINGS AND MONITORING FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT SURVEY RESULTS

(Information/Discussion)

Per. NRS 391.485, which required an annual review of the statewide performance evaluation system and an annual review of manner in which schools carry out evaluations pursuant to system, Kathryn Hoyt presented 2023-24 NEPF Summative Evaluation Data. Ms. Hoyt shared the NEPF Summative Ratings, noting that there were 20,000 teachers evaluated with the NEPF during the previous school year.

Mrs. Hoyt also presented information on the Summative Ratings Class Size Adjustments (CSA) , clarifying that educators were eligible for the CSA based on the recommended ratios set by the State Board of Education (SBE) and included K-12, non-probationary educators who received an unadjusted rating of effective or highly effective including teacher-librarians who provided direct, regular instruction to students but not including educators who teach band, choir, and/or orchestra (NRS 388.890, 391.465).

Mrs. Hoyt explained the NEPF ratings by standard data, pointing out that it shows the average scoring for the highest and lowest standards across the state for NEPF Instructional Practice (teachers)/ Instructional Leadership (administrators) Standards and Professional Responsibilities Standards. This was discussed with individual districts during their annual Monitoring for Continuous Improvement (MCI) interviews to use as a data point to reference when they were thinking about the needs of their educators and planning for professional development.

Mrs. Hoyt explained that the numbers displayed along the bottom of the chart in the Teacher Score Distribution slide referred to the summative scores that teachers received. The columns were indicative of the number of teachers across the state that earned those scores, and the lines between showed where the scores were based on their assigned rating (i.e., ineffective, developing, effective, or highly effective).

Mrs. Hoyt shared a data trend sheet illustrating the last five years. The data showed percentages and ratings for the 2019-20 school year through the 2023-24 school year. The dark blue represented ineffective, orange was developing, green was effective, light blue was highly effective, and purple was for those educators who were exempt.

Mrs. Hoyt shared the teacher Student Learning Goal (SLG) Distribution slide. The SLG was 15% of a teachers' overall summative score, and teachers could not be rated effective or highly effective without an SLG of at least 3 out of 4. The SLG represented the teachers' ability to demonstrate student mastery or growth on a specific skill or standard.

The Admin Score Distribution slide showed which summative evaluation ratings category administrators fell into, with most within the effective category. Mrs. Hoyt also shared a five-year trend chart of score distribution and student learning goal data, comparable to that shared for teachers.

Mrs. Hoyt acknowledged that there were a few data limitations. One was that data was subject to human error as it was still being collected via Excel spreadsheets. In the case of teachers, that was over 20,000 lines of data to review. This was the reason that the Department is requesting funding for an electronic tool to be able to collect, compile, and desegregate NEPF summative ratings data.

Mrs. Hoyt explained that NEPF MCI Survey data was collected from each district by July 15. There were a larger number of responses than the last two years. There were 6,688 responses of all licensed positions: 489 administrators (about 41%) and 5,440 teachers (about 27%). MCI survey responses were provided by administrators and teachers regarding their evaluation process and the feedback they received that impacted their practice and student learning. The light gray represented data collected from administrators, the dark blue was for the teachers, and the percentages represented those who responded either agree or strongly agree. 92% of administrators believed that the evaluation was fair while teachers were at 91%. 80% of administrators felt that the feedback they received positively impacted instructional/leadership practice while teachers were at 70%. 67% of administrators surveyed shared that the feedback positively impacted student learning while teachers were at 69%. They were also asked about their professional growth as an educator. 63% of administrators said that the evaluation helped identify areas of growth while teachers were at 68%. 65% of administrators surveyed agreed that their evaluation focused more on their professional growth rather than awarding a score or rating, while teachers were at 76%. 65% of administrators said they had access to the professional development they needed to implement feedback and/or directives provided by their supervisor, while teachers were at 78%.

NDE representatives met/would be meeting with district NEPF Liaisons from all 17 districts. NEPF Liaisons said they used survey and NEPF data to inform professional learning plans and to make connections to district initiatives such as mentorship programs and professional development efforts.

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

Members were told that the next regular session of the Nevada Legislature, the 83rd session, was scheduled to begin on February 3, 2025. Chair Pam Salazar mentioned that they would not have all of the data for the NEPF redesign yet but would have some information based on progress reports that NDE and districts have conversations about. The next TLC meetings were scheduled for November 20th, February 26th, and April 30th. An update on the NEPF Redesign Field Study would be provided. The November meeting would depend on if there is enough information at that point in time to warrant meeting. If not, then the meeting on February 26th would be during the legislative session should the TLC need/choose to take any action.

7. **PUBLIC COMMENT #2**

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

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting was adjourned at 3:05 PM.