

Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) Monitoring for Continuous Improvement Summary

Authority

NRS 391.485 Annual review of statewide performance evaluation system; annual review of manner in which schools carry out evaluations pursuant to system.

1. The State Board shall annually review the statewide performance evaluation system to ensure accuracy and reliability. Such a review must include, without limitation, an analysis of the:
 - (a) Number and percentage of teachers and administrators who receive each designation identified in paragraph (a) of subsection 2 of NRS 391.465 in each school, school district, and the State as a whole;
 - (b) Data used to evaluate pupil growth in each school, school district and the State as a whole, including, without limitation, any observations; and
 - (c) Effect of the evaluations conducted pursuant to the statewide system of accountability for public schools on the academic performance of pupils enrolled in the school district in each school and school district, and the State as a whole.
2. The board of trustees of each school district shall annually review the manner in which schools in the school district carry out the evaluation of teachers and administrators pursuant to the statewide performance evaluation system.
3. The Department may review the manner in which the statewide performance evaluation system is carried out by each school district, including, without limitation, the manner in which the learning goals for pupils are established and evaluated pursuant to NRS 391.480.

Guidance Memo 19-03

- NDE collaborated with external experts and several of Nevada’s education stakeholders to establish a guidance document for LEAs to conduct their annual NEPF reviews. This includes:
 - required minimum teacher and administrator survey questions
 - links to relevant resources
 - guidance to review and assess the extent to which their local NEPF implementation is accomplishing its intended goals
- Four (4) distinct tasks to be completed by LEAs:
 - Administer the teacher and administrator surveys
 - Review these data alongside other relevant local information to self-assess
 - Engage in interview with NDE representatives about the local implementation
 - Share information with their local school boards

District Reporting to Local School Boards

- 11 districts have presented data or have dates set to present data to their school board
- 6 districts have not submitted a date

Engagement in LEA-SEA Interview

- 16 districts have completed their NEPF Monitoring for Continuous Improvement LEA-SEA Interview
- 1 is scheduled to be completed in November

Question 1: Please tell us how this first year of local survey implementation went.

School Year	Teachers Reported	State Total Teachers	Response Rate	Admin. Reported	State Total Admin.	Response Rate
17 - 18	4523	26,512	17%	448	1495	30%
18 - 19	6370	27,799	23%	667	1619	41%

Note: 2018-2019 numbers reported by districts.

Findings

Districts reported that they felt response rate would have been higher if survey had been released earlier in the school year.

Question 2: What did the survey results reveal about local NEPF implementation?

- Time Commitment
 - 9 districts reported that the tools and processes are cumbersome
- Focus areas for professional learning (e.g. alignment between standards, evaluation, & PD)
- Feedback around the SLG
 - With high SLG weight, they were not able to focus on setting rigorous goals for their students, taking professional risks, or growth conversations
 - Professionals are still struggling to understand rigorous and appropriate SLGs
 - There was a split opinion about whether the SLG impacts practice and student outcomes
- Additional interesting trends to be explored further
 - Majority of teachers felt that admin were well-trained; administrators felt like they were lacking training
 - Majority of administrators in rural districts felt that NEPF had no bearing on identifying teacher-leaders or making similar personnel decisions
 - Issues with consistency across schools (e.g. rigor of SLG, amount of evidence required, frequency of formal observations)
 - Majority maintain a checklist or compliance mentality
 - E.g. more artifacts = higher rating
 - E.g. compliance with procedures versus NEPF as a tool with which to grow professionals

Question 3: How were other sources of data used in conjunction [...] to help identify areas of strength and growth?

- Data Analyzed in Conjunction with NEPF:
 - Most frequently cited:
 - Anecdotal feedback
 - Other:
 - Needs assessment
 - NDE monitoring conversations
 - Student Assessment (e.g. ACT, MAP, SBAC)
 - NSPF
- Feedback:
 - Many districts reflected the perception that the NEPF is not usable in conjunction with other data because it is an unreliable measure.

Question 4: How is the NEPF being used [...] to improve the practice of educational professionals and impact student outcomes?

- Improvement Opportunities:
 - Provides objective talking points for difficult conversations, allowing a reflection on data rather than subjective feelings but does not add value or reward those who are already effective or above
 - Provides opportunity for collegial discussion and training around students and instruction
 - Leads to the development of assessment literacy among professionals
 - Is used to drive professional learning offerings in the district
- Other Responses:
 - There is lack of alignment between NEPF and NSPF
 - Student data is being used, not the NEPF.
 - If there is no significant difference between averages, how can the NEPF results be used?
 - Evaluation is not the tool to facilitate professional growth; coaching and informal conversation are more valuable or honest

Question 5: What might be next steps [...] to improve the system and the performance of your educational professionals?

- Contact RPDP
- Align PD to establish link between NEPF and professional growth
- Design training on effective and rigorous SLGs
- Educate around how the SLG should be viewed as part of instruction, lesson- and action-planning
- Make self-assessment more of a process
- Complete site visits for calibration
- Set due dates
- Establish continuous consistent messaging across districts and schools
- Leverage the Professional Practice Goal to drive growth of educators; develop action plans related to this goal
- Provide additional legal trainings around the NEPF
- Continue with other foci: new curriculum, A-net, T4S, TNTP, etc.

Question 6: What resources will be used and/or are needed to fulfill these next steps?

- Tech platform from state
- RPDPS
- NEPF training for business and industry (CTE) and other non-academic courses
- Professional learning provided on how to use NEPF in conjunction with other sources of data to grow professionals
- Examples of high-quality instruction that align with the indicators along with a feedback session to explicitly highlight those practices
- List of best practices for NEPF use and implementation from other districts
- Will not participate in NDE offerings because of contracts with other providers (A-net, T4S, TNTP)

Question 7: Additional Feedback on Process

- Guidance Document:
 - Re-look at wording of required survey questions to ensure that none have reverse phrasing
 - Add comments boxes after each question on those surveys
- Survey Monkey Feedback:
 - Requested survey link shared around spring break
 - Survey monkey support is nice
 - Does not allow LEAs to track survey completion (may want to use own platform)
- Data Collection
 - “Rural” district designation for OLEP
 - Excel easy, webinar helpful
- Monitoring Process:
 - Showed interest of NDE to hear needs of stakeholders
 - Highlighted that NEPF is a source of data to be used in conjunction with others
 - Connected districts with additional resources or ideas

Best Practices Employed by Districts

- When reporting to school board, include how NEPF is being used to grow educators
- Train central office staff to ensure NEPF is embedded across all work and consistent use of language
- Create an NEPF strategic action plan team and use that to guide professional learning foci
- Build collective efficacy through the SLG process: base off student needs in consideration with school goals and district initiatives and review in conjunction with NSPF and other measures of student impact
- Create a report that highlights differences between school and district scores to inform calibration conversations
- Establish school-based SLG review committees to engage in collegial conversations focused on students and instruction as part of the NEPF process. They are to ensure that the assessment is in alignment with a rigorous SLG prior to sending for administrator approval;
- Utilize a district-wide panel of administrators to review the rigor of SLGs and build calibration
- Complete friendly audits of feedback and share high quality comments to other administrators
- Utilize Highly Effective teachers as walk-through hosts and PLC leaders
- Use self-assessment to drive the professional learning offerings
- Embed the growth of educators via the NEPF into strategic plan

Additional Findings for Discussion

School

- Administrators request a walk-through or “look-for” document when completing observations
- Teachers are still spending time categorizing evidence
- There is still stigma attached to ratings and the human element is not reflected in reporting of numbers alone; Developing still breaks relationships
- Can be used to get people out, but there is no reward for those doing well
- Leads to resentment between teachers, especially those with different evaluators

District

- 12 of 17 districts are using tech tool
- 6 districts requested option to focus on one standard per year to give targeted feedback
- 1 district requested differentiation based on years of experience
- This monitoring triggered use of NEPF pre-post scores to drive professional learning offerings
- Some districts are mandating that all educators use the same assessment with which to measure their SLG progress (and only allowing focus on tested content)
- Some districts have added objective percentages to their SLG scoring rubric with the argument that if some teachers only have to make 50% growth while others have to make 70%, it is unfair and leads to poor school climate
- District built a professional learning system where if administrator attends training, their score is moved up
- When leadership academy is designed, they turn to other professional standards and walk-through tools (e.g. A-Net, TNTP, WestEd, etc.)
- IRR training offered only one time in the district (PDP offers no additional supports)

Other

- Districts responded that K-5 has better compliance and use of NEPF because of pedagogical background vs. 6-12 not as great
- Request for additional guidance around SLGS and what to do for English learners and students with special needs as well as the teachers who support them
- No areas to reflect on classroom management, blatant conduct errors, or the ethics of teaching
- Level 1 is so low that if they reach one student, they automatically receive level 2 e.g. Standard 3, Indicator 3: teacher uses no/almost no...”
- Additional guidance requested
 - If on FML, how can one have an SLG over which they are actually having an impact
 - How do we use for varied roles e.g. math, P.E., band
- Difficult to review all personnel data holistically because systems can’t talk to one another
- Rebranding is required for the NEPF
- NEPF provides good basis for objective conversations but it’s the documentation gathering that is cumbersome
- Call for increased local control / autonomy
 - Will make sure all the “boxes “ are checked, but will continue to use only those pieces that they deem important
 - Not adverse to professional standards, but would like local control over implementation