

Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF)

Administrator Certification Alternate Application Rubric

SECTION 1: APPLICANT INFORMATION

LEA Name: _____

Review Date: _____

Submission Type: ☐ Initial Submission ☐ Annual Verification ☐ Audit/Monitoring Review

SECTION 2: APPLICATION EVALUATION

Section	Weight	Score (1–4)	Weighted Score	Meets Expectations	Reviewer Feedback
1. Program Overview	5%	___		☐ Yes ☐ No	
2. NEPF & SB 460 Alignment	15%	___		☐ Yes ☐ No	
3. Scope & Sequence	15%	___		☐ Yes ☐ No	
4. Instructional Design & Delivery	10%	___		☐ Yes ☐ No	
5. Practice & Application	10%	___		☐ Yes ☐ No	
6. Calibration & Reliability	10%	___		☐ Yes ☐ No	
7. Assessment of Competency	15%	___		☐ Yes ☐ No	
8. Differentiation by Evaluator Role	5%	___		☐ Yes ☐ No	
9. Duration & Time Requirements	5%	___		☐ Yes ☐ No	
10. Implementation & Fidelity	5%	___		☐ Yes ☐ No	
11. Documentation & Verification	3%	___		☐ Yes ☐ No	
12. Assurances	2%	___		☐ Yes ☐ No	
Overall	100%				

Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF)

Administrator Certification Alternate Application Rubric

SECTION 3: FINAL DETERMINATION

- ☐ Approved – Exceeds Expectations (90–100%)
- ☐ Approved – Meets Expectations (75–89%)
- ☐ Conditionally Approved – Revisions Required (60–74%)
- ☐ Not Approved (Below 60%)

SECTION 4: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Key Strengths:

Key Areas for Improvement:

SECTION 5: REQUIRED ACTIONS (IF APPLICABLE)

Required corrective actions and timeline for Completion:

SECTION 6: REVIEWER SIGNATURE

Reviewer Name: _____

Signature: _____

Review Date: _____

Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) Administrator Certification Alternate Application Rubric

Reviewer Guide & Calibration Protocol

I. PURPOSE OF THIS GUIDE

This guide supports reviewers in the consistent and accurate evaluation of Local Education Agency (LEA) applications for administrator certification programs.

The goal of the review process is to ensure that all submitted programs:

- Align to NRS 391.465 and SB 460 requirements
- Reflect the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF)
- Demonstrate sufficient rigor, structure, and quality to prepare reliable evaluator practitioners

II. OVERVIEW OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

Reviewers must follow a three-step process:

Step 1: Comprehensive Review

- Review the entire application, including all submitted materials
- Identify where each required component is addressed
- Do not score based on assumptions or intent

Step 2: Evidence Identification

- For each section, locate explicit evidence in the application
- Determine whether requirements are:
 - Fully met
 - Partially met
 - Not met

Step 3: Scoring and Feedback

- Assign a score (1–4) using the rubric
- Determine “Meets Expectations” (Yes/No)
- Provide clear, specific feedback aligned to requirements

III. SCORING FRAMEWORK

Score Definitions

Score	Descriptor	Required Evidence Standard
4	Exceeds Expectations	Comprehensive, explicit, and implementation-ready
3	Meets Expectations	All required elements present with sufficient clarity
2	Partially Meets	Some requirements met; gaps limit implementation
1	Does Not Meet	Missing or insufficient evidence

Determining “Meets Expectations”

- Yes = Score of 3 or 4 AND sufficient evidence
- No = Score of 1 or 2 OR evidence is incomplete

Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF)

Administrator Certification Alternate Application Rubric

IV. CRITICAL APPROVAL REQUIREMENTS (NON-NEGOTIABLES)

Applications must not be approved if any of the following are missing or insufficient:

- Clear alignment to NEPF and SB 460
- Performance-based competency assessment
- Calibration and reliability processes
- Required documentation and verification materials

If deficiencies exist in these areas:

- Mark the section as Does Not Meet Expectations
- Flag for Conditional Approval or Not Approved

V. SECTION-BY-SECTION REVIEW GUIDANCE

1. Program Overview (5%)

- Look-Fors:
 - Clear program purpose and outcomes
 - Defined structure and audience
- Common Issues:
 - Vague descriptions
 - No clear connection to evaluator certification

2. NEPF & SB 460 Alignment (15%)

- Look-Fors:
 - Explicit alignment to:
 - Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF)
 - Educational Growth Goals (EGGs)
 - Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs)
 - Educator Evaluation Reviews
 - Data-informed instructional leadership
- High-stakes section – must be strong for approval

3. Scope & Sequence (15%)

- Look-Fors:
 - **All required topics** included
 - Logical progression of learning
 - NEPF Overview & Framework
 - Instructional Practice & Professional Responsibilities
 - Evidence Collection & Observation
 - Feedback & Coaching Conversations
 - Educational Growth Goals (EGGs)
 - Educator Assistance Plans (EAPs)
 - Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs)
 - Evaluator Calibration
 - Data Use & Progress Monitoring
 - Sufficient depth (not checklist coverage)

Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF)

Administrator Certification Alternate Application Rubric

4. Instructional Design & Delivery (10%)
 - Look-Fors:
 - Active learning strategies
 - Opportunities for practice and reflection
 - Engagement beyond passive training
5. Practice & Application (10%)
 - Look-Fors:
 - Participants must:
 - Conduct observations
 - Analyze educator evidence
 - Practice feedback conversations
 - Develop EGGs/EAPs/PIPs
6. Calibration & Reliability (10%)
 - Look-Fors:
 - Shared scoring experiences
 - Defined expectations for agreement
 - Opportunities to compare and adjust scoring
 - Required for evaluator consistency
7. Assessment of Competency (15%)
 - Look-Fors:
 - Performance-based assessments
 - Evaluation of scoring accuracy
 - Evaluation of feedback quality
 - Clear certification threshold
 - Must demonstrate readiness—not just completion
8. Differentiation by Evaluator Role (5%)
 - Look-Fors:
 - Clear distinction between:
 - Teacher evaluators
 - Administrator evaluators
9. Duration & Time Requirements (5%)
 - Look-Fors:
 - Adequate total hours
 - Balanced allocation (instruction, practice, calibration)
10. Implementation & Fidelity (5%)
 - Look-Fors:
 - Consistent delivery across cohorts
 - Qualified trainers
 - Monitoring systems
11. Documentation & Verification (3%)
 - Look-Fors:
 - Syllabus
 - Training materials
 - Sample assessments
 - Evidence of alignment

Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF)

Administrator Certification Alternate Application Rubric

12. Assurances (2%)

➤ Look-Fors:

- Completed and signed assurances
- Confirmation of compliance

VI. WRITING HIGH-QUALITY FEEDBACK

Feedback must be:

1. Specific
 - a. Reference exact missing or weak components
 - b. Example: "Calibration process is not defined; no evidence of scoring comparison protocols."
2. Actionable
 - a. Tell the LEA what to fix
 - b. "Provide sample calibration activities and define acceptable scoring alignment thresholds."
3. Aligned to Requirements
 - a. Avoid preference-based comments

VII. FINAL DETERMINATION GUIDANCE

Score-Based Determination

Score Range	Determination
90–100%	Approved – Exceeds Expectations
75–89%	Approved – Meets Expectations
60–74%	Conditionally Approved
Below 60%	Not Approved

Override Conditions

Even if score is sufficient, applications may be:

- Conditionally Approved or Not Approved if critical components are missing

VIII. REQUIRED ACTIONS (FOR CONDITIONAL APPROVAL)

Must include:

- Specific required revisions
- Evidence LEA must submit
- Timeline for completion

IX. REVIEWER CONSISTENCY EXPECTATIONS

To ensure statewide calibration:

- Use rubric language consistently
- Base all scores on evidence—not interpretation
- When evidence is unclear → score lower and document why
- Avoid scoring inflation

Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF)

Administrator Certification Alternate Application Rubric

X. QUALITY CHECK BEFORE SUBMISSION

Before finalizing review:

- Ensure all sections are scored
- Confirm feedback is provided for all “No” ratings
- Verify final determination aligns with:
 - Score
 - Presence of critical components