

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)
JANUARY 10, 2018
9:00 A.M.**

MINUTES DRAFT

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

Meeting called to order at 9:07 AM

Pledge of allegiance

Roll Call:

Members Present:

Las Vegas:

- Kathleen Galland-Collins
- DeeAnn Roberts
- Kim Metcalf
- Teri White
- Pam Salazar
- Theo Small
- Peter Keo
- Anthony Nunez
- Brian Rippet
- Michele Sanchez-Boyce
- Meredith Smith
- Margaret Marschner-Coyne

Elko:

- Jim Cooney

Staff:

- Eboni Caridine – Education Programs Professional
- Raven Cole-Administrative Assistant
- Rick Perdomo – Senior Deputy Attorney General

Public:

Las Vegas:

- Karen Stanley
- Kim Mangino
- Lisa O'Keefe
- Chris Day
- Zane Gray
- Bill Garis

Carson: (sign in sheet missing after meeting)

- Kirsten Gleissner

2. Public Comment #1

There was no public comment in the Carson City, Elko, or Las Vegas.

3. Flexible Agenda Approval (Discussion/For Possible Action)

Motion

- Member White moved for approval of a flexible agenda
- Member Nunez seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 9:18 AM**

4. **Election of Council Chair and Vice Chair Pursuant to NRS 391.455** (*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*)
Pam Salazar described the role of the chair and explained that as part of statute, we must elect chair and co-chair. The council has decided on the tradition to vote the first meeting of every year
Responsibility of the chair is to work behind the scenes to prepare for presentations before SBE. And working with legislators to identify what the council suggests in regards to legislation.

Motion:

Member Smith nominated Pam Salazar

Member Small seconded

All in favor

Motion carried

Member Small nominated Maggie Marshner-Coyne as co-chair

Member Smith seconded the nomination

All in favor

Motion carried

5. **Approval of September 27, 2017 meeting minutes:**

Motion: Member Rippet moved to approve, seconded by member White, but requested correction on the bottom of page 3, correct to AIR. Member Collins requested that Greg Ott's job title be added next to his name on the attendance portion of the minutes.

All in favor

Motion carried

6. **Nevada Department of Education—updates** (*Information/Discussion*)

Member Collins acknowledged the work of Member Barker and shared that the council should have her replacement for the meeting in March.

- a. Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) Implementation Updates:

Member Collins referred to Guidance Memo 17-20 on which the changes made by AB7 and 320 are outlined. She stated that NDE is getting questions regarding the exemption from a summative evaluation if an educator had two consecutive years of Highly Effective ratings on their evaluation. There is confusion around observation cycle rules in this situation. A public information request stated that some districts are completing the observation cycle while others are not doing it at all. Member Collins stated that AB320 is very clear that the observation cycle is still required as is the setting of a Student Learning Goal and other Observation Cycle processes outlined in the NEPF Protocols. It is part of the formative process. NDE personnel are currently finalizing a summative evaluation exemption tool that should be released within the next week or two.

Chair Salazar provided additional comment regarding when the statute could take effect. Districts may develop policy choosing to implement the exemption right away by counting the previous two years, or they may choose to start counting the two years of Highly Effective this year. Member Collins provided additional information on changes outlined in Guidance Memo 17-20 regarding Student Learning Goal (SLG) scores and NEPF ratings. In order to receive a rating of Highly Effective an educator's SLG score must be a 3 or 4 and in order to receive a rating of Effective, the educator's SLG score must be a 2, 3, or 4. She provided information about the soon to be available FAQ document that is intended to be a continually updated document that educators may refer to for information. Member Keo asked about parameters of highly effective SLGs. Member Collins explained that there are 4 ratings in the NEPF and the ratings are determined based on evidence documented during the observation cycle. The Educational Practice Category is weighted at 80% (Instructional Practice = 60%/Professional Responsibilities = 20%) and the Student Outcomes Category is weighted at 20% (SLGs=20%) Those scores summed up and the rating is based on that score. Member Collins continued the update by announcing the next NEPF Liaison meeting is January 25. Liaisons serve as the communication channel to districts, RPDPs, and Education Associations.

- i. NEPF FAQ Document:

The draft is in the meeting materials, organized by section. It includes a link to the protocol document, and describes the goals of the NEPF and how it was created. Members were asked to review the document and provide suggestions for additions or improvements. It will be placed on NEPF Website. Members asked questions. Member Collins asked education associations that do not have a liaison, notify NDE.

- b. Principal Supervisor Framework Update:

Member Collins reported that there is no a contract with AIR, and the Principal Supervisor Standards are expected to be drafted by the March meeting.

c. OLEP Pilot Study Update: NDE is launching 6 new statewide performance evaluation systems for Other Licensed Education Personnel, the groups included are school counselors, school psychologists, school nurses, school social workers, teacher-librarians, and speech language pathologists.

Pilot study/field test orientation sessions were held in October in Elko, Carson City, and Washoe, and in November in Las Vegas. Member Collins thanked Kathy Mead and her team for helping to find a location to meet in Las Vegas, Bobby Shanks and Robbie Nickel for being instrumental in getting people involved in Elko, Jose and his team in Carson City, and Mike Paul and Yvette in Washoe for helping to find participants and the location for the orientation session. She stated that a webinar with OLEPs is coming soon. She also noted that the national standards for School nurses have changed, so the School Nurse work group is revising the rubric. She has advised them to move forward in the pilot study.

d. TLC Member Update:

Member Collins welcomed new members and reminded to group to always state their name before speaking on the record.

Additional updates: Deputy Durish will be providing an update to the Legislative Committee on Education regarding the status of the changes required in AB 320. She announced the new position of Teacher Leader in Residence that will serve as a liaison between NDE and teachers. Interviews will be on the 19th, the decision is expected in February. The Teacher Leader in Residence (TLIR) will help facilitate the Superintendent's Cabinet. Member Smith asked how teacher and residence position funded. Member Collins replied that funds were provided during the last legislative session. She also noted that NDE has several grants going through external evaluation in the coming months, and gave the Great Teaching and Leading Fund as an example. Member Keo asked questions about the process of choosing the external evaluation vendor. The answer is that NDE did a request for proposal and the company was chosen.

7. NEPF Survey Results (*Information/Discussion*)

Chair Salazar reviewed the Council's request to receive additional information regarding the most skipped questions on the NEPF Surveys. That comprehensive report is on the TLC webpage. Eboni Caridine, Education Programs Professional (EPP), has highlighted the top three most skipped questions and reported that NDE had approximately 300 Administrator responses with approximately 3000 teacher responses. The presentation reviewed the Administrator's top three skipped questions. The question asking if administrator's used the feedback given from their immediate supervisor to complete the goal setting and planning tool: 187 answered a question 185 skipped. For the question: How long after self-assessment did your supervisor discuss it with you? 230 answered 142 skipped. The next most skipped question was about what type of school they are currently in; 241 answered, 131 skipped. Chair Salazar asked for the number of possible administrators that could have completed this survey. Eboni replied that according to the NEPF reported data there were approximately 1100 administrators that should have received the survey, a little over 300 completed. Chair Salazar restated the importance that survey be launched much earlier. Member Keo asked if they are included in comprehensive report. Yes, raw data was included. Member Collins, we have a plan in place to have revisions made by the end of this month if feasible. She also asked if the answer choices were comprehensive enough to include most school types. Could that have been a reason it was skipped? Member Boyce does think the probably with the way the question is written, as there are several administrators that don't fit into that category. She provided an option of including a short answer option. She gave an example of an administrator that oversee early childhood programs in several schools, but is not at one of the school types listed. Chair Salazar suggested that NDE check with HR administrators regarding appropriate options. Ms. Caridine continued the presentation to review the most skipped questions by teachers. The number one most skipped question (2500 answer/ 990 skipped) was regarding which training had the most impact on practice, the second most skipped question was also about training. The third most skipped question (880 skipped) was about how long the teacher had been working in education. Ms. Caridine did remind the group that the questions were not required. Member Smith asked if there was a question regarding if a teacher had received training. Ms. Caridine replied in the affirmative, and there was skip logic to skip over the questions that were no longer relevant. Member Small suggested asking about union led trainings. Member Marshner asked if there was a similar question about which trainings were attended for administrators? The answer was yes. Member Keo asked if the survey would be rolled out every year. Ms. Caridine stated that yes; the plan is to send out the survey at about the same time each year for implementation. Member Cooney asked for the schedule for rolling out the survey this year. Member Collins replied that according to the internal project plan, NDE will finalize revisions near the end of January and will plan to send out the survey in March, close it between April and May and have a preliminary report by June. Member White commented that the survey may have a flaw in the skip logic based on the numbers showing in the report. Staff reported that the skip logic will be checked prior to release. Member Small voiced a concern that if the survey is rolled out prior to due dates for summative evaluations before deciding when to send out the survey. Chair Salazar suggested confirming district summative evaluation timelines, and reminded that Council that the intent of the survey is to provide data for TLC to make recommendations to the State Board of Education to improve the NEPF

and its implementation. Data will be used internally at NDE to adjust protocols, determine what can be done to best support implementation, and to help improve the system. Last year it was very quick. Member Small asked if TLC could consider asking for funding for projects like this as part of the 2019 legislative session.

- 8. NEPF Summative Evaluation Rating: Recommend Scoring Ranges used to Determine Educator Evaluation Ratings of Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)** Chair Salazar introduced the topic and explained that the Council’s task is to review the data and determine if the cut score ranges should remain the same or be changed for the 2017-2018 school year. Eboni Caridine presented the data on administrators by district for each of the four NEPF ratings, and reminded the Council that it is important to note that the numbers presented are averages. NDE does not collect individual data, but collects schoolwide averages. Data tables included range of average scores from highest to lowest and identified the highest and lowest average scores by standard. The data showed that most districts average standard scores were highest and lowest on the same standards. Average Student Learning Goal scores were also shared. Member White was curious as to why only ten districts were shown. Ms. Caridine clarified that some smaller districts, because of N size, did not report NEPF data. Member Rippet commented that the data for Carson City School District was missing. Ms. Caridine stated that it should be included and will look into the matter with the external team that analyzed the data for NDE. Ms. Caridine continued with the presentation of teacher NEPF data. Member Small reminded the Council that the teacher data does not include those educators that left the district prior to receiving an evaluation. He wanted to encourage NDE to capture that data set in the future. Member Collins explained to the group that the collection of that data is a complex issue and NDE will continue to try and find a way to capture the data on teachers that left the district prior to evaluation. Ms. Caridine continued with her presentation and reviewed the data available on the average standard scores. It was pointed out that for both administrators and teachers the standard with the lowest average score is Family Engagement. She went on to review average SLG scores. Chair Salazar led the discussion on the current NEPF cut scores, asking the Council to determine if they wish to change the current ranges. Member Collins reviewed the history of change with the NEPF, recalling that in the first year there was no Student Outcome data, second year Student Outcome data was a combination of schoolwide aggregate and SLG weighted at 10% and this year Student Outcome data consists of the SLG score weighted at 20% and next year the weight will be 40%. Members had opportunities to ask questions and discuss the history of the cut score ranges.
- Motion: Brian Rippet moved to change the cut scores, no one seconded. Motion: Member White moved to keep cut scores the same for one more year, seconded by Member Cooney. 1 no vote, motion carried.**
- 9. NEPF School Site Visits Summary (Information/Discussion)** Ms. Caridine presented information on the monitoring of NEPF implementation; including the criteria for school selection and overview of the school visit process. The feedback revealed that in Elementary schools administrators would like clearer communication and guidelines regarding the SLG process, additional training on the Mid-Cycle Goal Review process, and support with family engagement initiatives. They identified their own growth areas to be family engagement, data collection, self-reflection and keeping rigor over time. Middle School administrators reported the need for exemplars for SLGs, additional training for teachers on metacognition, calibration training regarding observations and system processes, simplified shorter summative evaluation form, guidelines for discussing final summative ratings. They identified their areas of growth to be Instructional Leadership Standards 1-3 and Professional Responsibilities Standards 2 and 4. High School administrators reported the need for assistance/guidance for non-content/specialty areas and special education in developing and measuring SLGs, assistance in understanding what discourse and metacognition look like in the classroom, ongoing continual training of how the standards are intertwined. They identified areas for growth to be family engagement, managing human capital, creating and sustaining structures/systems and using data. Common themes across all levels include: SLG processes, family engagement, analyzing/using data, support on understanding metacognition and discourse in the Instructional Practice Standards. Ms. Caridine summarized that this data shows the need for calibration efforts across the state. Members asked clarifying questions and commented on the data shared.
- 10. Student Performance Domain: Recommendations Regarding the “Business Rules” (Criteria and Conditions) Under Which Student Performance Data May Be Used As Part of an Educator’s Evaluation (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)** Chair Salazar reviewed the history of this particular agenda item. The Council had recommended to the State Board of Education (SBE) that there was no need for additional business rules for Student Outcomes/SLGs because of the removal of state assessment data as part of the Student Outcomes Domain. Most states that have business rules on the use of student growth measures use state test scores in their SLGs. Since that part has been removed there is no need for business rules. However, the SBE disagreed and asked the Council to reconsider and recommend business rules at the March SBE meeting. Chair Salazar led discussion on the NEPF Protocols and discussed anecdotal data that reveals educators are not aware of the NEPF Protocols that NDE provides and are prescribed by SBE. The Council discussed recommending a business rule to ensure that educators have access

to the Protocols, Rubrics and Tools. Members discussed the fact that although local school boards may adopt policy that includes additional requirements, individual schools should not. Districts should be making the effort to align practices among all schools with the prescribed protocols. Chair Salazar suggested that a place to start with business rules is to make sure all are aware of the NEPF Protocols that are already in place. The Council had a robust discussion on this topic.

Motion: Member Sanchez-Boyce made the motion to recommend the business rules proposed in the presentation. Member Cooney seconded.

All in favor - motion carried.

- 11. Curriculum and Instruction Recommended by TLC and Statewide Training for Teachers and Administrators Pursuant to NRS 391.544 (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)** Karen Stanley from the Southern Nevada Regional Professional Development Program (SNRPDP) reported that they provide many NEPF trainings to all 5 of their counties. In January they are providing trainings on the Mid-Cycle Goal Review, additional trainings on inter-rater reliability, evidence review, and how leadership standards are applied to overall school improvement. They are doing several book studies to support development of leadership skills. All leadership trainings are “package ready” and can be used by administrators to provide professional development on their own. Additionally, RPDP personnel do learning walks, content trainers embed the NEPF into all content trainings. Chair Salazar mentioned that Twenty-two sessions are offered just in January and 7 of these are all on calibration. Kirsten Gleissner from the Northwest Regional Professional Development Program (NWRPDP) stated that they are offering the Leading for Impact professional development in almost all of their districts and have trained over 40 administrators in their region. They are extending the training into the spring. They provide 1 to 1 support in Storey County and will be providing specialized support to Lyon County’s early learning programs, and are offering training in Churchill County as well. Sarah Negrete from the Northeastern Nevada Regional Professional Development Program stated that at the beginning of the year they held a series of NEPF workshops for new administrators and for veteran administrators that wanted to attend. They also hold a teacher academy during which they dive very deeply into the Standards and Performance Levels. Most recent professional development has been on how to dive deeply into discourse and strategies were provided for teachers. This is the fourth year NNRPDP offered the teacher academy and it fills up every year. They have also provided 40 teachers with opportunities to receive coaching on content and NEPF. They have recently received a request to perform learning walks on the NEPF specifically looking at Math content. Training for administrators is focused on Tier 1 instruction for high cognitive demand. They embed NEPF in all that they do to help educators understand that the NEPF is not a stand-alone system.
- 12. National Issues and Legal Landscape (Information/Discussion)** Chair Salazar provided an update regarding the national landscape. The biggest concern right now is the education budget. There is the possibility that the Title IIA funds may be cut. That impacts professional development for educators nationwide. There has been a Harvard study in Massachusetts that looked at schools that implemented the cycle of ongoing classroom observation followed by feedback. They found that these practices led to success in climate, culture and student performance. The title of the study is “Investing in Development”. A report by ECS providing information related to the ESSA allowances and reported that multiple states are continuing to move away from using state assessments in educator evaluation systems.
- 10. Future Agenda Items (Information/Discussion)** May possibly have survey results from site visits and the school nurse presentation on their revised standards in addition to the NEPF data update with the missing school districts.
- 11. Public Comment #2** No public comment.
- 12. Adjournment**
Meeting adjourned at approximately 1:15 PM.