



Nevada State Teacher Recruitment and Retention Advisory Task Force

JUNE 6, 2020
9:00 A.M.

Meeting Locations:

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Teacher Recruitment and Retention Advisory Task Force (Task Force) met via videoconference. In accordance with Governor Sisolak's [*Directive 021 \(subsection 37\)*](#), there was no physical location designated for this meeting. The meeting was livestreamed on the [Nevada Department of Education Website](#).

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

MEMBERS PRESENT via videoconference:

David Navarette
Magdaline Wells
Eleanor Williams
Elizabeth Rechs
Tammie Smithburg
Elizabeth Vessels
Meridon Fortune
Tamara McCord
William Cox
Kathleen Keene
LaResa Darrington
Vici Cooper
Thomas Brooks
Allison Broisma
Maria Cristy-Fernandez
Laurie Henderson
Kristina Ernest

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT via videoconference:

Felicia Gonzales
Jason Dietrich
Kathleen Galland-Collins
KellyLynn Charles

Senior Deputy Attorney General via video conference:

David Gardner

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE via videoconference:

Alex Jacobson
Mary Peterson
Marissa McClish

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE via Livestream:

The Livestream feed allowed public viewing throughout the meeting.

1. Call to Order; Roll Call: Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting of the Task Force was called to order at 9:11 a.m. by Cristy Fernandez, Task Force Chair. Quorum was established. Chair Fernandez led the Pledge of Allegiance. Members were reminded of the new hand raise feature in Lifesize and meeting norms.

Chair Fernandez moved to Agenda Item #2.

2. Public Comment #1

In accordance with Governor Sisolak's [State of Emergency Directive 006](#), Section 2, public comment was to be submitted via email and read into the record by Kathleen Galland-Collins, NDE Assistant Director, EDLiFE.

Additional time was provided for the public to submit comments via email.

Public comment was submitted by Brian Rippet, high school physics and chemistry teacher from Douglas County and President of the Nevada State Education Association (NSEA), regarding Agenda Items #4 and #6 and by Jordana McCudden on behalf of the Teach Plus work group extending appreciation to the Task Force for the engagement during their presentation at the last meeting. Comments were read into the record and are provided in their entirety in Appendix I.

Chair Fernandez moved to Agenda Item #3.

3. Review of Previous Meeting Minutes (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Chair Fernandez asked members to review the minutes. Ms. Galland-Collins explained that the graphic organizer utilized at the last meeting was posted as a supplemental document to the minutes. Chair Fernandez asked for a motion to approve the summary minutes of the May 16th meeting of the Task Force.

Member Smithburg made the motion to approve the minutes of the May 16th meeting. Member Cox seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Chair Fernandez moved to Agenda Item #4

4. Task Force Work Session #1 (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Chair Fernandez introduced Marissa McClish from Washoe County to share information about the teacher retention program in Washoe County. She reminded members to hold questions until the end of the presentation.

Ms. McClish shared that Washoe has two mentors for every brand-new teacher and one mentor for new to the state teachers. She explained that one mentor is an onsite mentor who has completed professional learning in mentoring and the second mentor is a consulting teacher whose sole role is to support teachers. The consulting teachers often observe teachers, give feedback, assist teachers in navigating the system, and provide resources. Ms. McClish stated consulting teachers will also advocate for additional supports new teachers need. She shared these supports are provided during the first year and that it used to be for two years but with funding changes over the past several years, they are now limited to the first year.

Ms. McClish explained the data shared in the graph depicts retention over time and shows similar trends from cohort to cohort. She appreciated the public comment regarding the exit survey suggestion because they struggle with knowing if they really capture voices and because surveys are always optional they don't know whether they are getting the full picture about why some of their teachers are leaving in those critical first three to five years. One program Washoe conducts is a partnership with The University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) and the Northwest Regional Professional Development Program (NWRPDP) to restructure the student teacher process by realigning the internship semester at UNR to make sure that interns are really getting a coordinated experience from their internship at the university, as well as with their lead teachers in the classroom.

Ms. McClish shared that lead teachers are provided 35 hours of professional learning. She was excited to share that they had the first cohort last semester and all 25 master lead teachers wanted to do it again. They are recruiting for the fall as they want participants to take a break and return the following year. She added they have alternate plans due to the uncertainty of school schedules and they plan to track the retention of preservice teachers who were provided a master lead teacher at UNR hired into Washoe. Ms. McClish stated they want to see whether a higher impact preservice internship really make a difference with teacher retention.

Chair Fernandez thanked Ms. McClish for sharing and asked the members if there were any questions.

Member Darrington asked when Washoe switched from 2-year support to 1-year support. Ms. McClish answered she believed it was around 2015-2016, but she would have to ask a colleague to be sure.

Member Fortune asked whether the 35 professional development hours were paid. Ms. McClish answered yes, they applied for the Great Teaching and Leading Fund grant that was changed to a block grant during the last legislative session and so our district was able to utilize funds through Title II and are currently under Title II funding program in Washoe County. They offer credits and stipends for the 30 hours but most of the teachers wanted to go with the stipend.

Member Vessels asked what the qualifications to become a mentor teacher are in Washoe County. Ms. McClish answered that there some professional learning requirements in areas of mentorship. She specified there are two courses they need to take and there is also guidance given to the mentor regarding what questions and specifics on how to mentor at that site.

Chair Fernandez shared she has been a mentor for Washoe. She stated that they have two amazing classes to take and when they become a facilitator for the district, they actually send all the lessons to start providing support to the teachers. Member McCord shared Humboldt County has shadowed Washoe's program with two classes as well. She shared Humboldt's data would most likely be very similar to Washoe County's.

Member Navarette asked if they have funding issues or if she foresees issues that could endanger for the program. Ms. McClish stated as far as on-site mentor teachers, no, but with consulting teachers yes. She shared one of the challenges with consulting teachers is that they are funded through a mixture of funding sources. so, as those funding streams change with state funding, it became an issue. She also acknowledges that as state are looking at preparing for revenue stream cuts in Title II and in Washoe County, they always try to protect people first. She stated they have partnered with NWRPDP the entire time because they wanted to see how the program could grow, what worked, what didn't work, and to share the program with other districts.

Member Henderson asked if there was school-level data and could they look at teacher retention at schools to see what certain schools do well. Ms. McClish noted there is a challenge with transition data as teachers move from school to school and not necessarily leave the districts. They are looking at doing case studies and looking at the data in a new way in order to use school transition data effectively.

Chair Fernandez asked if there was support for teachers after their second year. Ms. McClish answered after second year, that don't have anything formal. She explained they have a Peer Assistance and Review Program to assist those who are struggling for probationary as well as post probationary teachers.

Member Darrington asked for specifics about the online mentor program. Ms. McClish answered that they have been doing mentor courses in person, but they are looking to move it to online due to recent events. She would be happy to send that information to the Task Force if they would like. Member Darrington followed up with asking how the information would be a valuable tool to use at their schools even if the Task Force didn't use it.

Ms. McClish thanked the Task Force and noted she would get the information requested to them.

Chair Fernandez moved to item #4 Fishbone Root Cause.

Chair Fernandez reminded the members their task was to identify the challenges and root causes. She introduced Alex Jacobson of WestEd and turned the work session over to him to guide the member in the analysis of the root cause submissions.

Mr. Jacobson shared the analysis of their root cause submissions. He explained how he identified the categories used to group the root causes to help the members determine similarities and see trends. He went through each individual root cause the members identified and identified broad topics they fit. He provided an example of his categorization process. He shared the number of times members identified each root cause.

Member Brooks asked about the "More Attractive Alternative Employment" column on the report and asked Mr. Jacobson to explain how he interpreted that. Mr. Jacobson answered that the member identified root causes specifically stated, "there are other jobs drawing someone away from teaching." The other category was more general in saying there are other careers that are more attractive than teaching.

Mr. Jacobson moved to a visual fish bone diagram display of the same categories. He called attention to the retention category that was more varied than the other categories. He then shared the Venn Diagram to show the overlap of the root causes and discussed the categories he used. Mr. Jacobson moved to the Recruitment to the Profession summary tab on the document and explained he matched the research provided earlier with the categories and pointed out to the members that retention has the bulk of research.

Mr. Jacobson paused for questions.

Member Cox asked if they could get a copy. Chair Fernandez reminded members all documents were posted in the meeting documents.

Mary Peterson thanked Mr. Jacobson and shared that the reason that there is so much interest in retention is no mystery. She reminded members they heard from Clark County School District about the retention of new teachers, She recalled there was a graph that showed within six years, half of the new teachers had left employment. Ms. Peterson recalled the information provided by the Teach Plus Fellows that it cost \$21,000 per teacher to bring them on board. She stated that when you think of losing half your new teachers in six years and the cost of new ones to replace them, retention becomes a really important issue. Mr. Jacobson added to Ms. Peterson's comment there is research as well that finds harm to the achievement with teacher turnover. Member Keene mentioned it takes 3-5 years to become a highly effective teacher and that is when we are losing them. It important to students that we learn how to retain teachers, so they get the teacher they deserve. Member McCord commented the conversation is about an exit survey like we heard about in the last meeting. She added there needs to be discussion about a climate survey to find out why teachers stay as well.

Chair Fernandez moved to the next section of the work session and asked Ms. Galland-Collins to share the graphic organizer. Chair Fernandez asked the Task Force to engage in discussion to identify the challenges to recruitment and retention of teachers in Nevada and asked Ms. Galland-Collins to explain the process for this part of the work session. Ms. Galland-Collins shared the graphic organizer on the screen and explained the layout. Ms. Galland-Collins explained the work was split into two work sessions and this part will focus on the root causes. With the permission of the Chair, thoughts will be taken on the root causes and contributing factors on recruitment to the profession, recruitment to employment, and retention.

Member Navarette asked for clarification on whether the expectation was to narrow the root causes down from five or six to four. Ms. Galland-Collins responded she didn't think the need to limit in the number of root causes. but anything that was identified should be a high priority.

Mr. Jacobson offered the possibility that some of the categories in the summary in the fishbone may be contributing factors and not root cause. He added that part of the exercise might be to boil it down to the root cause as they progress.

Chair Fernandez suggested starting on focusing on recruitment to the profession root causes and contributing factors and then move down and do the others the same way. She opened it to discussion.

Members engaged in a discussion of root causes associated with challenges to recruiting to the profession. Topics discussed included the negative perception of teaching, promoting teaching as a profession, licensure pathways, Ms. Galland-Collins typed members comments in the graphic organizer on the screen and adjusted them as the discussion continued. Department staff asked clarifying questions and provided information as necessary. Ms. Galland-Collins ensured the typed words accurately captured the members statements. Chair Fernandez made sure to include all members in the discussion. The completed graphic organizer is included in its entirety in Appendix II.

Chair Fernandez stated that she doesn't have any information about the restorative justice bill, but maybe the Task Force could get some information at the next meeting.

Member Fortune recommended a book called "Culturize" by Jimmy Casas that says be a cheerleader about what we do. The book encourages the reader to think positively so people see that.

Mr. Dietrich asked Member Keene to give him clarification on her comment regarding the advertising of degrees that do not lead to licensure. Member Keene responded she meant in-state institutions and that sometimes people get a Master's Degree and when they apply for a teaching license, they still need to take some classes to get their license In a special education because they were told that they didn't meet the classes along with the license. Mr. Dietrich stated that they had been working with in-state institutions in the past two years and were trying to make sure their programs are aligned to Licensure. He encouraged the members reach out to him if they knew anyone in that situation. Mr. Dietrich reminded the Task Force that if a teacher holds certain base licenses in Nevada, they can test and add those endorsements. He would recommend to the group as they think about licensure requirements, they also consider the pathway portion of that conversation because the Commission of Professional Standards can open pathways. He stated that he will also be working with Ms. Galland-Collins to look and review the recommendations made to see what can be moved to the Commission on Professional Standards to remove barriers identified. Member Keene thanked Mr. Dietrich for opening up pathways and mentioned she has shared the information with teachers. She also stated that people don't know the option to test is available. She recommended getting the word out more.

Chair Fernandez moved the discussion to Recruitment to Employment. Members engaged in a discussion on root causes associated with the challenges to recruiting teachers to employment in Nevada. Topics discussed included incentives offered to recruits, paycheck schedules, and timeline of healthcare access. Ms. Galland-Collins typed members comments in the graphic organizer on the screen and adjusted them as the discussion continued. Department staff asked clarifying questions and provided information as necessary. Ms. Galland-Collins ensured the typed words accurately captured the members statements. Chair Fernandez made sure to include all members in the discussion. The completed graphic organizer is included in its entirety in Appendix II.

Chair Fernandez moved the discussion to the Retention section. Members engaged in a discussion on root causes associated with challenges associated with teacher retention. NDE staff asked clarifying questions and provided information as necessary. Additional topics discussed were the intrinsic motivation and positive aspects of teaching. Member Cox reminded members that compensation is a negotiated item with their local union and pay raises provided by the legislature still need to be locally negotiated for teachers to receive the funds. Members requested additional information on how students are counted on the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF). Mr. Jacobson suggested that working conditions is a large

category and some of the contributing factors may be root causes and could be separated as accountability. The completed graphic organizer is included in its entirety in Appendix II.

Convenience Break 11:50-12:00

Chair Fernandez called the meeting to order at 12:02. She thanked the members for their work

Chair Fernandez moved to Agenda Item #5.

5. Best Practices for Retention of Teachers (Information/Discussion/Possible)

Chair Fernandez introduced Alex Jacobson of WestEd and turned the presentation over to him.

Mr. Jacobson shared an overview of best practices to improve teacher retention. He divided the presentation into two categories. He shared that common factors include financial reasons, working conditions and administrative issues. Mixed research as it is a complicated issue.

Mr. Jacobson shared that working conditions. He stated working conditions are often collected via survey data and the answers are reflecting what teachers are feeling. He added this data may be more accurate as it is what is driving the decision making of the teacher. Mr. Jacobson explained that best practice categories were identified as collecting data, investing in leadership development, and promoting collegial support. He specified that professional development could be included in working conditions, but he pulled it out as it supports a teacher to grow in their capacity and career advancement. Mr. Jacobson did not include induction programs in Professional Development. He shared Teacher Leadership is a best practice.

Chair Fernandez thanked Mr. Jacobson and asked if there were any questions.

Member McCord referred to the Invest in Leadership Development bullet on Slide 10 and commented that due to trainings administrators are often taken out of the building and are not available to teachers. She suggested that having administrator training over the summer could be more beneficial. Mr. Jacobson stated that was a wonderful point and that it is important to see what the researcher's specific implementation of the in the development of leadership entailed.

Chair Fernandez moved to Agenda Item #6.

6. Work Session #2 (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

The Task Force moved to the recommendations section of the graphic organizer. Members engaged in a discussion on recommendations and solutions to address the challenges associated with recruitment to the profession, recruitment to employment, and retention. NDE staff asked clarifying questions and provided information as necessary. The completed graphic organizer is included in its entirety in Appendix II.

Members shared their experiences with student behavior and suspensions, educator preparation program and the changes they have seen, the benefits to working in Nevada, concerns with licensure. Mr. Dietrich clarified the licensure review and approval process and answered questions. He stated NDE has been working with the admission and advising offices at their in-state institution. Mr. Dietrich shared NDE was also rewriting the standards for what educator preparation review and approval looks like in Nevada. He encouraged everyone to reach out to him if they have concerns or the same situation with an institution and specific course requirements. Mr. Dietrich informed the members that the licensure office is funded by licensure fees and the fee paid is the application fee, not a licensing fee. He also clarified that OPAL is only an online application and it's not licensing. Mr. Dietrich further clarified for the members that Nevada has a teaching scholarship program that allows up to \$24,000 toward tuition. Once the scholarship funds are approved by the legislature they are transmitted to the preparation programs, who have specific parameters to follow.

Additional clarification was provided on the Teach Nevada Scholarship. Members refined their root causes as the discussion continued. Members discussed whether recommendations were district or state level authority. Mr. Dietrich suggested marking items if they seemed to be a district decision so they can be

marked a such. Members engaged in conversation on salary schedules, bonuses, incentives, Nevada Educator Performance Framework interrater reliability and implementation, how changes are made to the (NEPF), as well as the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF).

Mr. Jacobson stated a common reason cited for turnover is the measure that is used for accountability and teacher effectiveness. He also shared that research indicates the negative impact of teacher turnover is dependent upon how ineffective the teacher leaving the school is. If an ineffective teacher leaves, and a more effective teacher joins that improves achievement which in turn, improves retention. He added that there is evidence to show that if an accountability system is designed in such a way to where the measurement of effectiveness encourage that process of the replacement to improve overall effectiveness than you can see student achievements impacted by that.

Members discussed overlap of their NEPF recommendations with the work of the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) and asked if they could make recommendations to the Council on their work. Mary Peterson made an observation that the TLC is the equivalent of the Task Force created by the legislators and then she wondered if it could be equally effective to raise the concern directly with the Teachers and Leaders Council or if they need another task force. Ms. Galland-Collins shared the membership of the TLC includes four teachers, one representative for other licensed personnel, two school administrators, a person from higher education, a couple of education policy people, a couple of school board members, and representatives of the Regional Professional Development Programs. She answered that the Task Force could recommend that TLC look into this.

Chair Fernandez moved the Task Force to refining the recommendation language. Ms. Galland-Collins asked if there were any specific recommendations to be made for Recruitment to the Profession. Members worked with NDE staff on the wording of each recommendation. Ms. Galland-Collins noted that some recommendations seem to encompass more than one topic and that it may be an idea to make general recommendations and category specific recommendations. Members engaged in a conversation on recommendations to address teacher preparation programs, restorative practices, and working conditions. Mr. Dietrich suggested wording to delay the implementation of laws that require training of teachers to allow districts to provide training before implementation.

Convenience break 2:38- 2:50.

Chair Fernandez called the meeting back at 2:52 p.m.

The conversation on the wording and categorization of the proposed recommendations resumed. The members reviewed previously shared recommendations, clarified intentions, asked questions, and refined language. Members discussed recommendations focused on a Public Relation campaign to help attract teachers to the state and compensation. Ms. Galland-Collins reminded the members they would have more opportunities to make recommendations. If they needed more information, they could hold off until the next round. Members engaged in a conversation around the attractiveness of teaching in Nevada.

Members discussed the barriers associated with available, affordable housing. Mr. Dietrich shared that a partnership between developers and districts would be beneficial in housing assistance and a great incentive. Member Navarette agreed and proposed that be a recommendation. Member McCord shared the Home is Possible program (homeispossiblenv.org) that has \$7,500 dollars for a usable down payment and closing cost for teachers. There are programs specifically for Nevada. Member Navarette thanked member McCord for sharing that program. Member Smithburg stated based on the "Home is Possible" website, their closing date is September 30, 2020. Mr. Dietrich stated that generally the September closing date is a federal timeline for grant closures. He suggested to Ms. Galland-Collins research the program and get the answer.

Members discussed providing mentoring, training, and support to new and veteran teachers. Member Wells reminded the members of the suggestions of the hotline. Members also discussed student teaching and residency programs. Mr. Dietrich reminded the members that a residency program would look different in each district.

Mr. Dietrich asked member Vessels to clarify her comment that “every person should have student teaching” when she was referring to the student teaching component. Member Vessels stated she was referring to teachers who do not have student teaching because they never went through a program. Mr. Dietrich stated Nevada requires a minimum of eight semester hours of the student teaching to be a licensed teacher. However, an ARL program does not require student teaching and neither does having a substitute teacher license. He added that substitute licenses are different in some counties, for example, in Washoe and Clark County, substitute teachers are required to have a minimum of 60 credit hours. Mr. Dietrich stated it seemed as if Member Vessels was referring to ARL candidates or substitute teachers serving in classroom positions. Member Vessels replied yes that is what she is referring to. Mr. Dietrich reminded the members to be mindful of unintended consequences to their recommendations regarding pathways to the profession.

Members engaged in discussion regarding compensation and class size and what that looks like in the urban districts and the rural districts. Members engaged in a conversation on the importance of support and mentoring for new hires as we remove barriers. Member Navarette suggested being specific with “for new teachers” and “for all teachers” wording. Members engaged in a conversation about whether each recommendation should be listed separately for clarity.

Members discussed recommendations for the challenges associated with retention. Members and NDE discussed the specifics of their recommendation to focus on the creation, administration, and evaluation of exit surveys. Ms. Galland-Collins typed members comments in the graphic organizer on the screen and adjusted them as the discussion continued. Department staff asked clarifying questions and provided information as necessary. Ms. Galland-Collins ensured the typed words accurately captured the members statements. Chair Fernandez made sure to include all members in the discussion. The completed graphic organizer is included in its entirety in Appendix II.

Member Darrington left the meeting at 4:34 p.m.

Members paused to restart the livestream feed for public viewing.

Ms. Galland-Collins highlighted the recommendations on the graphic organizer. Members reviewed the language and engaged in a conversation to clarify and edit their recommendations

Mr. Dietrich brought up the topic of a state mandated pay scale. He shared that in order to provide an equitable salary model, some states set the structure for pay raises and cost of living increases. He emphasized this makes salaries state level decision and not a district level decision. Member Navarette shared that in Nevada a single pay scale may not be as equitable due to the differences in cost of living in the rural areas and reminded the members that salaries are negotiated by teacher associations. Member Rechs requested data on how often cost of living raises should occur. Member McCord shared that the reason she teaches in the district she does is because the pay scale is higher, and she feels that having one pay scale will take the rural districts’ ability to entice teachers. Chair Fernandez mentioned she’d like more information on salaries and districts’ salary advancement requirements (highlighted green on the graphic organizer) to discuss at the next meeting.

Member Smithburg moved to approve the draft of root cause and analysis and recommendations made by the Task Force knowing the language will be cleaned up. Member Keene seconded. Motion carried.

Chair Fernandez moved to Agenda Item #7

7. Proposed Draft Report Template

Ms. Galland-Collins shared the standard template for reports. Members viewed and checked the drafted parts for errors. Ms. Galland-Collins explained where the recommendations made by the task force will be placed in the report. Chair Fernandez asked for a motion to approve the use of the report template.

Member Smithburg motioned to approve the use of the report template. Member McCord seconded. Motion passed.

Chair Fernandez moved to Agenda Item #8.

8. Future Meeting Dates Agenda Items (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Members were reminded they were asked in a poll if June 11th would be an acceptable meeting. Chair Fernandez asked for a motion to hold a June 11th meeting starting at 9 a.m. as indicated by the member poll to review and approve the final report.

Member Smithburg motioned to hold a meeting on June 11th starting at 9 a.m. as indicated in the member poll. Member Navarette seconded. Motion passed.

Chair Fernandez moved to Agenda Item #9.

9. Public Comment #2

In accordance with Governor Sisolak's [State of Emergency Directive 006](#), Section 2, public comment was to be submitted via email and read into the record by Kathleen Galland-Collins, NDE Assistant Director, EDLiFE.

Public comment was submitted by Snehal Bhakta, CTE Administrator for the Clark County School District. Comments were read into the record and are provided in their entirety in Appendix I.

10. Adjournment

Chair Fernandez thanked the members for eight hours of hard work and adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m. with no objections.

APPENDIX I

PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE TEACHER RECRITMENT AND RETENTION ADVISORY TASK FORCE JUNE 6, 2020

Public Comment #1-1

Good Morning, for the record my name is Brian Rippet. I am a high school physics and chemistry teacher from Douglas County currently serving as the President of the Nevada State Education Association. As you know, the NSEA has been the voice of Nevada educators for over 100 years.

For the past 4 years I have also served as a member of the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC). My experiences managing the NEPF as part of TLC and being evaluated with the NEPF tool have informed my belief that the intellectual and emotional costs of the NEPF system are at cross purposes to attracting and retaining high quality educators. My belief was solidified at the Council's most recent meeting on 5/27/2020 when the findings of the NEVADA EDUCATOR PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK: IMPACT AND VALIDITY REPORT were presented. The study was stemmed from SB 475 which required a study of the "impact and validity of the NEPF." It was prepared by the Center for Research, Evaluation and Assessment (CREA) at the UNLV College of Education and presented by lead author Bradley Marianno.

I'd like to share some "Key Takeaways" from the study and candid comments from the author. While much time and consternation has been expended over the weighting of domains over the past several legislative sessions. The study concludes: **"The Weighting of the NEPF Domains Do Not Measurable Impact Final Scores or Ratings."** The study found: "in short, the weighting does not appear to matter much."

The NEPF is often held up as an instrument of growth and improvement. The study debunks this notion stating: **"We find that schools and districts grow very little in their NEPF scores over time. The mean year-to-year change in teacher and administrator NEPF scores is essentially zero."** So much for "growth" model. The study did find that NEPF scores are associated with levels of achievement. However, there is no evidence of causality. The study concludes "...these relationships should not be interpreted as the NEPF causing higher achievement..." and **"When looking at the impact of NEPF growth on growth in reading and math achievement, we find no significant impact."** After the presentations, the lead author took questions from the TLC. He was asked for a simplified overview and told the council that the NEPF is not currently valid.

An additional takeaway in the executive summary **"most teachers and administrators believe the NEPF is a valid measure of their performance"** on the surface seems to be a positive. Yet in the context of the full report, this

takeaway is very disturbing. The NEPF has been exceptionally well marketed but does not stand up to its promises when actually put into use. Slick marketing does not change the facts that the NEPF is ineffective and exceptionally time consuming. I'm reminded of the old TV huckster Ron Popeil and "Ronco" who promoted 'game changing can't do without products.' What the buyer actually received in the mail did not do the intended job as described. Like Ronco, the NEPF is well marketed, but poorly constructed and ultimately not worth the costs.

In conclusion, teachers know the time and effort spent on the NEPF is not in line with the benefits received. This significant weight on the backs of educators is wearing them out and reducing the joy of teaching. I urge this committee to consider the costs of the NEPF system in actual time spent, the intellectual energy used, and the effect on physical and mental well-being of educators. The negative impact on retention is only beginning to be realized.
Sincerely,

Brian Rippet
NSEA President

Public Comment #1-2

My name is Jordana McCudden, and I am a Senior Policy Fellow for Teach Plus Nevada. On behalf of my working group, we would like to extend our appreciation to this task force for the engagement during our presentation on the research and recommendation of a statewide exit survey at your meeting on May 16, 2020. Teach Plus Nevada strongly encourages this group to include the implementation of a statewide exit survey as a means to better understand why teachers leave Nevada so that policy can be improved in such a way that teacher retention across the state increases. Teach Plus Nevada suggests that embedded in that policy request, there is a recommendation for a uniform exit survey throughout the state with the opportunity for each district to add its own questions specific to the needs of their own region. With this flexibility, both the state and each district will obtain actionable data. As presented on May 16th, the teachers of the working group recommend:

- using a 3rd party to administer the survey
- delivering the survey in an online format
- including a monetary incentive to increase participation

Thank you for the work you are doing to improve the recruitment and retention of teachers across the state. As fellow educators, the Teach Plus Nevada fellows recognize the importance of this work and look forward to seeing the fruits of your labor.

Respectfully,

Jordana McCudden
Clark County School District, *Instructional Coach*

Public Comment #2-1

For the record, Snehal Bhakta, CTE Administrator for the Clark County School District. When considering teacher recruitment, please consider and address recruiting non-academic teachers like CTE teachers. Especially when considering marketing and promotion of the teaching profession. Many teachers don't

follow a traditional path of a college degree. Yet various requirements like licensing and advancement require it.

Furthermore, when considering teacher retention, we need to be mindful of educator's mental health as well as students. We have counselors, psychologists, etc. for students. However, are health plans for educators inclusive of those services that we provide to students. How can we expect teachers to help and support students educationally and mentally if we don't have systems in place to support them each and every day.

In conclusion, we live in a different world now due in part to the global pandemic and need to consider all options even those that are different and disruptive to what we are familiar with and we should not go back to the way education was. This is an opportunity to improve, revamp, and completely change education for the benefit all...especially our students.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Snehal Bhakta
CTE

Administrator

APPENDIX II

NEVADA TEACHER RECRUITMENT & RETENTION ADVISORY TASK FORCE

June 6, 2020

Topic/Challenge	Root Cause(s)	Contributing Factor(s)	Recommended Solution(s) <i>(Consider the evidence: has this solution worked in other settings similar to ours?)</i>	Draft Recommendations	Draft recommendations-not topic -specific
Recruitment to the Profession	Respect for the profession/Attractiveness of proficient	Media coverage (focus on the negative) Student perception of what it is like to be a teacher Lack of respect for teachers Relationships with public/parents - asking for help-seems like we cannot help ourselves Lack of respect from admin, leaders, judicial system Issues of school safety Impact of AB168	More support/experiences to provide realistic expectations regarding the career of teaching and skills needed Building a relationship with Juvenile justice system/Shared understanding Training on restorative practices for teachers in classroom management courses in prep programs	The state implements an advertising campaign to promote the education profession (Highlight positive impact educators have, provide opportunity for students to advocate and promote)	Recommend that legislative changes to educational practices come with training and support that occurs prior to implementation of that legislative changes and delay the start date of the Statuary requirements to allow time for that training and support to occur.
	Insufficient compensation	Ability to afford home purchase, cost benefit/ return on investment	Provide housing assistance to new teachers- entire state		
	Alignment of the EPP requirements and licensure requirements	Colleges are advertising a degree in reality, it doesn't lead to licensure Timely availability of courses Lack of awareness of routes to licensure	Develop a class/training/document that will show candidates how to apply for licensure, what the requirements are, etc.		

Topic/Challenge	Root Cause(s)	Contributing Factor(s)	Recommended Solution(s) <i>(Consider the evidence: has this solution worked in other settings similar to ours?)</i>	Draft Recommendations	Draft recommendations-not topic -specific
	Lack of PR about education as a career	Teacher negativity, teachers not having or taking advantage of emotional supports Public relation-Need to have the public to be informed with accurate information	Highlight positives of the profession-benefits packages, longevity/job security- gets easier as career progresses – time off Social Emotional Support for teachers Teachers work together and show respect for themselves and others and portray the that to others Add teachers to career fairs-promote education at career fairs - visiting teachers come to school career fairs Ask for funding to advocate and promote the profession- teach in Nevada		
Recruitment to Employment	Attractiveness of Employment	Availability of employment in the community (for spouses) Vast differences in settings (very rural, very urban) Delay in access to benefits	Benefits package specific to area, housing package, etc. Timing and frequency of paychecks No state income tax-highlight this as a positive Encourage districts to revise pay schedules to a biweekly vs once a month	Recommend LCE write a letter to district superintendent to provide information to potential employees regarding the benefits of coming to their districts, housing assistance, etc...	Recommend that the Legislature explore the idea of working with developers to provide affordable housing to educators in all rural and urban areas (Hard to find housing in rural areas, high cost of living in some areas)

Topic/Challenge	Root Cause(s)	Contributing Factor(s)	Recommended Solution(s) <i>(Consider the evidence: has this solution worked in other settings similar to ours?)</i>	Draft Recommendations	Draft recommendations-not topic -specific
	Effectiveness of recruitment	Lack of transparency about the area they are being recruited to	<p>Share benefits of living/working in location</p> <p>Subsidize housing, incentives/bonuses, Provision of resource/information to help new hires find housing and other necessities</p> <p>Recommend that districts share housing information with potential employees</p> <p>Statewide list of open positions – provide additional details on the position to help potential employees make an informed application decision</p>	<p>Recommend the development of state education specific job opening website- (have employment opportunities for all districts on the website)</p>	
	Insufficient Compensation				

Topic/Challenge	Root Cause(s)	Contributing Factor(s)	Recommended Solution(s) <i>(Consider the evidence: has this solution worked in other settings similar to ours?)</i>	Draft Recommendations	Draft recommendations-not topic -specific
Retention	Working conditions	<p>Lack of support – insufficient time for mentors to support, lack of substitutes, Inconsistent/unrealistic expectations set by school administrators – climate and culture of the school hostile work environments Disrespect of teachers by others (Students, etc.) change in social norms of students (instant gratification, access to devices, etc.)</p> <p>Lack of motivation to continue in the profession (perception of the work- higher workload, not a fan anymore, burnout)</p> <p>Seems to be a reduction in teacher appreciation/recognition efforts</p> <p>Large class sizes</p> <p>Distribution of students- (putting majority of students with behavioral issues in one class etc.)</p>	<p>Revise ARL programs to ensure candidates have the support they need to be successful (awareness of time and effort)</p> <p>Recognize teachers more – local and statewide</p> <p>Need mentoring programs to support new teachers</p> <p>Require that training occur prior to implementation of new practices</p>	<p>Recommend that LCE write a letter to school district superintendents asking them to ensure that training around new educational practices occur prior to implementation of those practices</p> <p>Recommend that the State explore a variety of options and best practices and make to support new teachers including mentoring, and veteran teachers (e.g. mentoring, reduced workload for new teachers, teacher hotline)</p> <p>Recommend that class-size/student teacher ratio calculation should be done at the school level and not averaged at the district level (Roy language regarding rural district)</p> <p>Recommend that the legislature implement a study of class-size/student-teacher ratios including equitable distribution of high needs students</p>	<p>Recommend that the LCE select a third-party evaluator develop, implement and analyze the results of a statewide exit survey in consultation with the Task Force and Districts</p> <p>Recommend that LCE select a third-party evaluator to develop, implement and analyze a statewide climate/working conditions survey of current employees in consultation with the Task be used to punish)</p>

Topic/Challenge	Root Cause(s)	Contributing Factor(s)	Recommended Solution(s) <i>(Consider the evidence: has this solution worked in other settings similar to ours?)</i>	Draft Recommendations	Draft recommendations-not topic -specific
	Insufficient Compensation	Pay scales plateau, lack of cost of living raises, education requirements for pay scale/ cost of additional education, equity of pay and pay scales	<p>State provide direct compensation/bonuses etc. to teachers</p> <p>Recommend a state-sponsored loan forgiveness program- targeting rural, traditionally hard to staff schools- include forgiveness for master's degrees</p> <p>Recommend that districts add steps to their pay scales</p>	<p>Recommend a state sponsored loan forgiveness program- targeting rural, traditionally hard to staff schools- include Exploring options (with stakeholders) regarding grants were loan forgiveness for Master's degree/Coursework /professional development(Find the on how often salaries should increase to address cost of living)</p>	
	Accountability Systems	NSPF growth does not seem to be taken into account... some student results impact the NSPF multiple times Performance expectations –NEPF implementation	<p>Inter rater reliability training for evaluators Making NEPF less burdensome</p> <p>NSPF- revise growth goal schools should be recognized for growth toward the goal and not an all or nothing points system</p> <p>Recommend the creation of a state task force to identify issues and make recommendations to resolve issues regarding the NEPF</p>	<p>Recommend NEPF Inter-rater reliability training for evaluators be required</p> <p>Recommend the creation of a state task force to identify challenges and success to make recommendations to resolve challenges regarding the NEPF</p>	

Essential Questions:

Once you have identified solutions to address the root cause(s) of the challenge, prioritize the solutions you will recommend by considering the following questions:

- Which solutions will have the greatest positive **impact** on the affected population?
- Is the solution **feasible**? Can it be accomplished within existing budgetary and legal parameters?

- Will there be **unintended consequences** that negatively impact the affected population?
- Will the solution(s) work equally well in all **geographic locations** (urban, suburban, rural, remote)?