

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATEWIDE COUNCIL FOR THE
COORDINATION OF THE REGIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS
TUESDAY, AUGUST 15, 2017

Meeting Locations:

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	9890 S. Maryland Pkwy	Las, Vegas	Board Room (2 nd Floor)
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St	Carson City	Board Room

Draft Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Meeting called to order at 10:05 AM.
Roll Call

COUNCIL MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

In Las Vegas:

- Brent Husson
- Dr. Wendi Hawk
- Lou DeSalvio
- Jeff Zander

In Carson City

- Nicolette Smith
- Dr. Sandra Sheldon

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

In Las Vegas:

- Jerrad Barczyszyn
- Alberto Quintero
- Jeff Zaul
- Sarah Negrete
- Meredith Smith

In Carson City:

- Peter Zutz
- Katherine Fuselier
- Kirsten Gleissner
- Wendi Wyatt
- Sondra Neudauer

Phone In:

- Pam Teel

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

In Las Vegas

- Kelee Dupuis
- Raven Cole

2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

Alberto Quintero of the PIFE Office addressed the council to discuss the Statewide Family Engagement Program. He is excited to see something come to fruition, however he is concerned with possible action being taken today in approving the program. This will be the first time the Council and the Department will be presented this program, and if approved, will not afford them the opportunity to review it. Additionally, NRS requires collaboration with the PIFE office in establishing the program-and, the PIFE Office has not been involved in the creation of the program. Lastly, he would like to gain clarity on the purpose of the training program. The NRS requires the establishment of a statewide training program concerning parental involvement and family engagement; so he wanted to know if the intent was also for it to be for professional development credit or satisfying a provisional licensure requirement.

3. FLEXIBLE AGENDA APPROVAL (*Discussion/Possible Action*)

Motion

- Member Hawk moved to approve a flexible agenda
- Member Husson seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 10:09 AM**

4. APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES FOR AUGUST 15, 2017

(*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*) Jeff Zander, Chair

Motion

- Member DeSalvio moved to approve the August 15, 2017 RPDP Meeting Minutes
- Member Hawk seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 10:09 AM**

5. NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION UPDATES (*Information/Discussion*)

Kelee Dupuis, NDE Staff on behalf of Dena Durish, NDE Deputy Superintendent for Educator Effectiveness & Family Engagement

During the SBE Meeting on October 12, 2017, the RPDP Council will present before the Board nine proposed PD standards that the Council is asking them to adopt. This came from the SB-474 Taskforce Recommendation Report.

Recently, the Department released its NSPF Framework.

6. NEVADA SCHOOL PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK (NSPF) *Presentation*

(*Information/Discussion*) Peter Zutz, Administrator, Assessments, Data and Accountability; Katherine Fuselier, Education Programs Professional, Accountability.

The key take-away of this presentation regards the realignment of the NSPF. The framework is now anchored on the State's goal of becoming the fastest-improving state in the nation. The new NSPF is going to be phased in over the next several months. The first phase was around Data Transparency. On September 15, 2017, the NSPF website was populated with information about student achievement results on State Assessments. Phase two is around educating stakeholders about the realigned NSPF 2.0. Community leaders need to understand the framework so that it can be implemented for continuous improvement. Phase three will be the Release of the Informational Star Rating. The NSPF website will be updated to include a 2017 star rating to aid in the understanding of the NSPF 2.0.

The path toward realigned expectations began in 2010, and in 2014, the State selected new assessments capable of measuring deeper levels of understanding and realigning expectations for proficiency. In 2017, we're able to merge those improvements into the NSPF 2.0. Additionally In 2017, in alignment with the ESSA State Plan and the State Improvement Plan, Nevada set out a goal to be the fastest improving state in the nation. NDE will achieve this by narrowing the focus on what the Department can have meaningful impact on, and the new NSPF can put all three of the State's strategies into practice. The State can: identify schools that are in need of the most support, work with school leaders to create strong plans around school improvement, as well as use data that the performance framework indicates the Department should be focusing their efforts

on. The framework will also show which schools have been successful and how the rest of the state can learn from them.

A star rating system is a tool to receive clear and concise information about how schools are performing on a scale from one star to five stars. It is also a state-designed accountability system; encouraging continuous improvement and support for low-performing schools.

Katherine reviewed the steps to achieve excellent school performance. The first is to understand a school's index score and its components. The second is to identify where a school a school is, and where it would like to be. The third step is to set goals to inform a school's plan for the coming year.. Resources for the NSPF include the: NSPF website, Accountability Data Portal, Approved Nevada ESSA State Plan, NSPF Guidance Document, NSPF Webinars, NV Data Training and School Support Symposiums in November 2017, and Nevada Ready's Facebook and Twitter feeds.

Questions were as follows: Member Husson asked for specific detail on plans to get information into the hands of educators. Peter answered that Phase 2 is the communication phase and they are planning on targeting the entire state Member Hawk asked if star-ratings will be distributed to the schools in December or to the public. She also wanted to know if the point values of the measures that feed into indicators to produce an index score will be disclosed. Peter answered the point structure in each indicator is allotted across measures by setting cut scores within the index. The data will be public facing, but schools can get all necessary information at Nevadareportcard.com. Sometime before December, all ratings will be populated onto the website. That information will be made available to Districts, not schools individually, before December 2017. So, districts will have ample time to review the data prior to it being released to the public in December. Member Shelden expressed one of her concerns with the School Performance Indicator Plan as socio-economic factors relating heavily to student success in schools. Member Husson addressed Member Sheldon's concern by stating that 3 of the 5 performance indicators do address socio-economic factors. Chair Zander commented about the hearing the other side of the story from rural counties, describing an inability to increase star ratings due to lack of opportunity gaps and poverty that larger districts experience. He expressed the significance of using common sense in regards to proportionality. With the initial indicators that were released, Elko County School District (ECSD) went from one 1-star school to eleven 1-star schools. He knows that ECSD does not have eleven 1-star schools. He understands the urgency in illustrating Nevada as the fastest improving state in the nation. He also understands the intent behind the framework being to create a diagnostics tool that schools can use to design their school improvement plans around to increase student achievement; but he also wants to caution potentially sending the wrong message to Nevada communities that has a negative impact on the development, educator morale, parent engagement, etc.

7. UPDATE ON THE STATEWIDE FAMILY ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM

(Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Dr. Sarah Negrete, Director, Northeastern RPDP; Dr. Kirsten Gleissner, Director, Northwestern RPDP; Dr. Chelli Smith, Director, Southern RPDP

Kirsten presented a draft of the developing Family Engagement Syllabus on behalf of all three regions of the RPDP as well as other facilitators engaged in the work. She prefaced her presentation by addressing Alberto Quintero's concern given during public commentary.

The course is described as: training intended for educators that examines theory and research supporting family engagement as well as implements practical strategies that address Nevada's adoption of the National Standards for Family-School Partnerships and invites opportunities for family engagement. Connections will be made to Nevada State and District policies. Class will be presented in a series of seven modules. A State credit option will be made available. The four course objectives are: 1) understand the National Standards for Family-School Partnerships and their relationship to positive student outcomes; 2) Build awareness of the Dual Capacity Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships (USDOE); 3) Read and discuss current research and best practices regarding family engagement; and 4) Evaluate the schools and classroom environment to determine current levels of implementation of Family Engagement standards. The five learning outcomes are: 1) Implement the NV Family Engagement Standards; 2) Conduct self-evaluation (school-wide/classroom) of current family engagement practices; 3) Develop a repertoire of effective family engagement strategies; 4) Create a school/classroom plan to increase the level of family

engagement based on results of self-evaluation; and 5) Collaborate to develop a shared vision of successful family engagement.

Module 1 is approximately 90 minutes. An overview of the course includes: exploring Family Engagement Matters document, introduction of background information surrounding family engagement, understanding the six Nevada Family Engagement Standards, assessing our current implementation levels for each of the six standards, discussing the four core beliefs of family engagement, sharing Nevada State definition of Family Engagement, and reflection. Module 2 is based on Standard 1 of the Family Engagement Standards – Welcoming All Families into the School Community. The contents developed for this module are: Introduction to Family Engagement PD, review of positive outcome, review of six national standards, Standard 1 – introduction and exploration of the standards and indicators, assess current levels of implementation and brainstorm ways to improve, and explore the family engagement rubrics. Subsequent modules (not yet developed) 3-7 address standards 2-6 of the Family Engagement Standards. All modules are expected to be completed by December 2017 and are being created to be self-contained. They come equipped with PowerPoint, facilitator guides, handouts, and videos so they can be accessed and used by anyone. This program cannot be approved by the Council until they see a complete program. At this time, Council acknowledges satisfactory development of its beginning stages, but recommends collaboration between the RPDPs and the PIFE Office. Member Hawk asked is there a way to start measuring certain engagements to meet those expectations? Kirsten answered that her understanding is during the modules there is a self-reflection/ self-evaluation and training on how to assess.

8. REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (RPDP) BUDGET DISCUSSION (*Information/Discussion*)

Last meeting there was a discussion regarding the draw down for RPDP money. In the past, all of the RPDP money was advanced to fiscal agents for the school districts at the beginning of the fiscal year. Now, there is a reimbursement process in place, and all fiscal agents will need to submit reimbursement requests.

9. DISTRICT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECT CODES (*Information/Discussion*)

Kelee Dupuis, Education Programs Professional

The SB474 Task Force Report recommended Districts to clearly define some business rules coding PD expenditures. The Task Force, when tasked with looking at expenses and the ROI on PD, it was challenging to identify and report to legislators what was being spent on PD because districts code PD expenditures differently. She requested suggestions from the Council on ways we can implement business rules for effectively coding PD.

Chair Zander thinks that the issue they have may relate to the Object Code being used to report PD. He thinks the discussion needs to take place with the Superintendent's Finance Committee and Deputy Superintendent Roger Rahming.

Member Sheldon explained that the reason behind making this change is the Task Force was interested in how much money was spent on PD, because originally, the Task Force was under the impression that PD was only provided through RPDPs. She was able to let the Task Force know that school districts do PD from a variety of different funding sources; but there was no way to provide that documentation.

10. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURE PROPOSAL (*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*)

Dr. Sarah Negrete, Director, Northeastern RPDP; Kirsten Gleissner, Director, Northwestern RPDP; Dr. Chelli Smith, Director, Southern RPDP

Sarah Negrete informed the Council that in the past, the \$100,000 has been provided to one of the fiscal agents and the money was distributed equally amongst all three RPDPs. At that time, each local governing board decided how best to spend the money for administrative PD in that region.. Kirsten has had a local board meeting already, and the northwest local board requested the continuation of that format so that they may use the money regionally how they choose. Dr. Negrete suspects a similar settlement from her board, although they have not yet had their meeting.

Chair Zander suggested distributing the funds three ways to the three fiscal agents, but was concerned with the number of fiscal agents that would warrant Sondra Neudauer verified that three fiscal agents could be used. Member DeSalvio asked that if the money is broken up into three, could it be used for

travel expenses. Chair Zander answered that it can be, but throughout the years, it has typically been reserved for regional training throughout the three regions. The Council concluded that the distribution would be \$33,333 to the three regions.

11. REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (RPDP) ANNUAL REPORTS

(Information/Discussion/Possible Action) Dr. Sarah Negrete, Director, Northwestern RPDP; Kirsten Gleissner, Director, Northwestern RPDP; Dr. Chelli Smith, Director, Southern RPDP

On behalf of herself, Kirsten, and Chelli, Sarah presented their current annual reporting formats and seeks recommendations from the council regarding the standardization of new reports to be used by the RPDPs. The Council is familiar with the RPDPs formal annual reports, and on how large they are. The RPDP Directors put together an outline of what their reports will look like from this point forward in regard to unity and data. In the outline presented today, NRS 391A.190 1a, 391A.190 1c, and NRS 391A.175 were all referenced and they will reporting their data as presented. Part 2, Regional Information, is where the three directors will present anything they want to report that is unique to their region. The presentation was deemed a vast improvement from what was in place before.

Motion

- Member Hawk moved to approve the outline format for consistency for the reviews
- Member Husson seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 12:03 PM**

12. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS *(Information/Discussion)*

Jeff Zander, Chair

The Council may not need to meet on all three of the next scheduled dates, but at least one is necessary by December. October 19 and December 13 are the next meeting dates.

13. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

There was no public comment in the north or south.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 12:08 PM