

**Nevada Department of Education  
Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC)**

**May 23, 2018 9:00 AM**

**DRAFT Minutes**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

**Las Vegas:**

Kathleen Galland-Collins  
Kim Metcalf  
Pam Salazar  
Theo Small  
Anthony Nunez  
Meredith Smith  
Veronica Frenkel  
Margaret Marshner-Coyne

**Carson City:**

Brian Rippet  
Michelle Sanchez- Boyce  
Mary Owens  
Dee Ann Roberts  
Teri White

**Elko:**

Jim Cooney

**Staff:**

Eboni Caridine – Education Programs Professional  
Justina Caviglia – Legal Council  
Sylvia Figueroa – Administrative Assistant

**Public:**

**Las Vegas:**

Joni Schmidt  
Chris Daly  
Carie Hornby-Daniels  
Melissa Dougherty  
Kristin Barnson  
Kathy Mead  
Chad Greorius  
Ken Basinger  
Barbara Klein  
Karen Stanley  
Kim Mangino  
Anna Slighting

**Carson City:**

Nancy Kuhles  
Kirsten Gleissner  
Mike Paul  
Jose Delfin

Kimberly Merkers-Bass  
Emily Ellison  
Dawn Huckaby  
Keeli Killian  
Nathan Anderson

### **Agenda Item #1 - Call to Order; Roll Call: Pledge of Allegiance**

Meeting called to order at 9:00 AM

Roll call was taken and is reflected above. It was determined that quorum was met.

Chair Salazar led the Pledge of allegiance.

### **Agenda Item #2 - Public Comment #1**

**Elko:**

None

### **Carson City:**

Nancy Kuhles, speech language pathologist, and is representing NSHA (Nevada Speech Language Hearing Association) Coalition to address personnel shortages. Nancy is serving as Co-Lead for the work group to develop the statewide performance evaluation system for speech language pathologists in Nevada, also a member in NDE's OLEP (Other Licensed Educational Personnel) advisory team and stakeholder group and serves as Co-chair for the NSHA coalition. Nancy would like to recognize Dr. Kimberly Smerkers-Bass, member of the NSHA Coalition Leadership team. For the record, Nancy would like to address a request made in February by the Clark County School District Coordinators of Speech and language therapy services, Mrs. Catherine Unger who served as a coordinator and a representative of CCSD's Director of Speech and Language Therapy Services, Mrs. Regina Goins, and requested that the OLEP pilot for the speech language pathologists be continued through the 2018-2019 school year. Mrs. Unger's request to continue the pilot targeted the use of the tools for a full year from pre-conference to summative report. The timeframe for the pilot was short, and the learning curve in using the tools was steep. Nancy thanks and applauds her colleagues for their dedication throughout the pilot. In light of the request, Nancy pursued conversations with CCSD Speech and Language Therapy Services to determine specific concerns and possible solutions. Per AB447 passed in 2015, school districts are allowed and can apply to the State Board to use an alternative performance evaluation system or tools. A solution could be for the district to request the usage of alternative tools. In view of this alternative for school district, as a representative of the speech language pathologists work group, we are not requesting that the statewide OLEP pilot continue through the 2018-2019 school year for the speech language pathologists. We do support the statewide implementation of the OLEP NEPF evaluation system for speech language pathologists beginning in the 2018-2019 school year. Nancy wishes to thank everyone for their work and time.

### **Las Vegas:**

Member Collins spoke regarding the letter mentioned previously in Nancy's public comment. A copy was sent to all the TLC members and will be posted into public comments record. The letter referred to the reasons Nancy mentioned about why the Clark County Speech Language Pathologists group wanted to extend the pilot for another year so that they may become familiar with the tools and use them from the very beginning. Last year the pilot started in October and went through April/May. The request to extend for another pilot year was outlined in the letter. The coordinators of speech language pathologists in Clark County are dedicated to making sure they are fully ready for the task of writing appraisals of over 400 speech and language pathologists and audiologists in CCSD. Those that have worked on the project have many things to be thankful for: the development for speech language pathologists and audiologists including the fact that it is based on the National Professional Standards and the ongoing support of Nancy and Eboni and the pursuit of excellence by the Teachers and Leaders Council.

### **Agenda Item # 3 – Flexible Agenda Approval**

#### **Motion**

Member White moved for approval of a flexible agenda.

Member Frenkel seconded the motion.

All in favor

**Motion carried at 9:12 am.**

### **Agenda Item # 4 – Approval of March 20, 2018, April 17, 2018 and May 15, 2018 Minutes**

Member Collins asked members to make note of the section highlighted in yellow on third page of the minutes. As Member Collins was listening to the recording of the meeting, it says Member Nunez moved to recommend to the NDE that the

direction of the pilot or field test study answer the question, “Does this set of standards help support the principal in meeting their SLG and PPG?” This was regarding the roll out of the pilot for the principal supervisor framework. The word principal kept going back and forth between principal supervisor and principal. The motion was actually principal supervisor but then in the discussion and reiteration of the motion it became principal. It stated “Does this set of standards help support the principals in meeting their SLG and PPGs?” Member Collins requested confirmation that that was the actual intent. Member Nunez confirmed that was the intent.

### **Motion**

**Member Small moved to approve meeting minutes.**

**Member Smith seconded the motion.**

**All in favor**

**Motion carried at 9:16 am.**

### **Agenda Item # 5 – Nevada Department of Education Updates**

Member Collins stated the NEPF surveys have been sent out. There have been 2,580 responses from teachers and about 297 responses from administrators. The link has been sent out to all TLC members and NEPF liaisons. Any educators that have not received it yet should ask their administrators for the link. It will be put on Twitter through our Teacher Leader in Residence (TLIR). Goal is to break last year’s record and have more responses in hopes to get good feedback to improve the system.

Principal supervisor field test- The tools are complete and the superintendents are aware. It has been brought to their attention at the NASS meeting. NDE is working closely with Pam (TLC Chair) to plan out the field test implementation and move forward with this work. Dr. Matt Clifford who helped developed the rubric and Member Collins were in Phoenix in April for a school leadership regional meeting. It was noted that several states are interested in what Nevada is doing. They have adopted the standards published by CCSSO, but have not developed a rubric or evaluation framework for principal supervisors. There are several states that are looking to what Nevada is doing with principal supervisors as the way to frame the expectations for the principals and school leaders to help improve student performance and improve climate and culture. NDE is also looking into the possibility of doing some focus groups this June with administrators to get some additional feedback.

The OLEP frameworks timeline for May and June: NDE is still collecting the NEPF pilot study data, and updating the rubrics. Based on feedback, presentations will be given from various groups today on some suggested changes to their frameworks. Protocols are being worked and are expected to be finished and released in July. August will be the full implementation of the OLEP frameworks for all except for the audiologists who will be asking to do a field test for this upcoming year, 18-19. In the Fall TLC will review OLEP data and determine cut score ranges for each group. The four TLC meeting dates for the 2018-2019 school year are: August 29<sup>th</sup>, November 28<sup>th</sup>, February 27<sup>th</sup>, and May 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Member Collins gave an update on the SB497 Task Force with additional information being provided by Member Nunez, the TLC representative on that task force. The SB497 Task Force is tasked with studying what it is to be a school leader in Nevada including, but limited to; preparation, licensing, compensation, and work load. Lately they have been receiving presentations on the preparation and professional development of school leaders in Nevada. NDE is providing data regarding the numbers of school leaders in the state by various ethnicities. Member Nunez confirmed that the task force is in the fact finding stage. Chair Salazar stated that more information will be heard when the RPDPs do their presentations. All of the RPDPs were asked to share data regarding school leadership development with the task force and it was thought that data will also be interesting for the Teachers and Leaders Council. Chair Salazar reminded the Council that Dr. Matt Clifford is with the American Institute of Research (AIR) which is linked to Center on Great Teaching and Leading (GTL) and Lynn Holdheide. She explained that the Principal Supervisor standard work that Nevada is doing is not just of interest to the states in the Southwest REL meeting where Member Collins and Dr. Clifford presented, but other states as well. They are very excited to see that Nevada has, with Dr. Matt Clifford’s help, translated all of the standards into observable behaviors. Several states that have been a part of the Wallace pilot, are now looking at should there be another Wallace follow up grant to do some research with regards to what we have designed here in Nevada? It is really putting Nevada out there on the forefront in terms of principal leadership and supervisors of principals often called principal managers. Chair Salazar complimented Member Collins for her great work because it was started with the presentation with Dr. Clifford in Arizona. Member Smith asked the question, if there had been any follow up discussion about the article or the research study that was mentioned last time out of Brown University where they are seeing a decline in teacher supply when student achievement is tied into evaluations. Is this being talked about at these conferences? Chair Salazar answered that in this particular conference, the focus was on principal

### **Agenda Item 5 Continued**

leadership and principal supervisors and it really wasn’t about evaluation systems or about educator effectiveness which some of the other conferences attended previously where that was the big discussion. She went on to explain that in the terms of her work, she can only talk about the CCSSO work, right now it seems as if the idea of using student achievement data isn’t nearly

so much on the forefront of discussion. Right now people are starting to recognize that it really is about practice, and so the research you see coming out of Brown University, mentioned in the Brown piece, has been studying part of the ESSA work on evidence based practices. The conferences that Chair Salazar has been attending, even the upcoming conference in D.C. next week, student performance measures don't seem to be the hot topic right now. It is all about evidence based practices. It is looking at what is done by people in leadership roles, by people in classroom roles that's going to be leveraged to improve student achievement. Member Small added that most of his work is local so the conversation is really around the interpretation of the 20% from student outcomes and what that would look like at 40%. There are a lot of educators that are thinking how this will change that evaluation if it is at 40% like it is for next year. That conversation has been pretty significant for people who have tried to get down to the data and is something that might be brought up in the 2019 session.

## **Agenda Item # 6 – Development of the Audiologist Statewide Performance Evaluation System**

### **Audiologists update**

Eboni Caridine introduced Dr. Hornby-Daniels. She has worked very hard on the rubric for audiologists. Dr. Hornby Daniels shared a Power Point presentation. She stated that there are very few audiologists in the districts, but that the services needed and provided in Nevada are diverse. Some counties have no audiologists. The two districts with educational audiologist are Washoe and Clark but their services look very different. Clark County provides diagnostics; are out in the field providing assistive technology to students. In looking at the rubric, it was very difficult to incorporate all of the different needs of the state. Globally, she went back to the governing agencies and national association standards to guide building of the framework. When the initial NEPF for teachers was shared and the OLEP groups asked to align their practice with it, Dr. Hornby-Daniels stated it was difficult to insert what audiologists bring to the table as highly specialized individuals into that teacher framework. Additionally, because audiologists are so specialized, often times they have supervisors that know very little about what they do for students. Dr. Hornby-Daniels reached out to several different school districts in different areas for assistance with the development and review of the framework. The first standard addresses the global aspect using the national organizations' codes of ethics, scope of practice, and framing that globally and broadly so that it could encompass all the different needs of the different school districts. That is in line with the national organization standards. Standard 2 addresses the learning environment as in the teacher rubric. The issues of inclusiveness, diversity and access were addressed. The third standard looks at the service delivery piece and what that would look like terms of how audiologists provide services and provide access to students. Standard 4 addresses the professional development. The audiologist field is very technology oriented. They are engineer, mechanic, and have many different roles. It is important within that professional development, to keep current on all of those things. Audiologists also need to take a step back and look at practice and ask if everything that is being done for students is resulting in positive outcomes. If it isn't, what needs to be done to change that? The last standard is the collaboration piece which aligns well with the NEPF. It is interacting with the community and working with the community providers, parents and significant adults to provide improved outcomes for students. The organizations and their websites are listed in the power point presentation. The responsibility of TLC Council today is to determine if they are ready to make a recommendation to the State Board of Education for the pilot of this framework for next year, the 2018-2019 school year.

Member Theo Small thanked Dr. Hornby-Daniels for doing this work. He stated his hope is that this works for her and the professionals that are doing this work. Member Small would like to know; Will this benefit the practice for audiologists throughout the state? What are the actual numbers and who does the evaluations of audiologists? Dr. Hornby-Daniels stated there are 10 audiologists in the state. They are concentrated mostly in Clark County. There are 7 audiologists in Clark County. There are about 1 ½ up in Washoe. The rubric that she presented tried to consider what the NEPF was, but this looks very different and it is geared towards what an audiologist does. She will speak as an audiologist in Clark County because she does not know what they do in Washoe. Clark County has a clinic to which children are brought and their hearing is assessed. Out in the field, when hearing assistive technology is used, audiologists do functional listening tests to determine whether or not the equipment is effective and is supporting the student. Audiologists attend the MDTs and IEPs like any other member of a multi-disciplinary team. They do central auditory processing testing, and a lot of hearing aid work. In terms of student numbers, in Clark County, audiologists have separated the district into quadrants so that each has an area for which they are responsible. Caseloads look a little bit different. Dr. Hornby-Daniels has 67 schools, but not all of those schools have children in them that have hearing loss or are deaf. When a student fails a hearing screening, those kids go to the audiologists. They may not necessarily have hearing loss but they didn't pass their school's screening so they come and get a complete diagnostic assessment. In terms of her caseload or the number of students with hearing loss in the district it is probably around 1,200-1,400. Member Small asked; who supervises the audiologist? Who would be looking at this evaluation system going through

### **Agenda Item 6 cont.**

the whole cycle? Is the evaluator another audiologist or are you working together? Member Small didn't realize the numbers were so small. Dr. Hornby-Daniels stated that ideally it would be another audiologist supervising an audiologist. Presently that is not the case. The supervisor is the Director of the Speech Language Services and the way the district is being changed it may someday be on a principal. Member Smith asked about the scope of practice as an audiologist and taking into consideration the audiologists in Washoe County are not practicing the same manner since they don't do diagnostics, but in

Clark County they are able to do that. Is that correct? Dr. Hornby-Daniels stated that is correct and she has spoken to Kristie on a few occasions. Washoe is structured very differently because their assistive technology department does that instead of the audiologist. Member Smith would like to know what the board or national standards recommends who is doing the diagnostics? Dr. Hornby-Daniels stated audiologists. Chair Salazar is confirming that as it is being built that the standards would reflect the roles all across the state, knowing that they are built on the foundation of the national standards for audiologists. Dr. Hornby-Daniels confirmed that is correct. Member Sanchez-Boyce works in Washoe County schools and works with the two audiologists they do have and clarified that they do diagnostic testing. There is a full time audiologist that has a doctorate in Audiology and is very capable of doing those services. The issue was that there was no one to fill in when the full time audiologist retired. Member Sanchez-Boyce asked Dr. Hornby-Daniels if the work that is done with the cochlear implant is similar or different than what would be done with a child with a hearing issue and is that reflected in the standards. Dr. Hornby-Daniels stated the technology must be looked at. The technology differences would be addressed based on the student, and is addressed in the scope of practice. The technology is a portion of that. Member Sanchez-Boyce clarified her question asked about the needs of students with cochlear implant kids requiring so much collaboration with outside professionals, she was wondering where that was in the standards Dr. Hornby-Daniels stated it is in Standard 5. Chair Salazar reminded that the task of the TLC is to make recommendation to either forward this for pilot next year or not.

### **Motion**

**Member Sanchez-Boyce made the motion to recommend to the State Board of Education piloting the NEPF Framework for Audiologists in the 2018-2019 school year.**

**Member Nunez seconded motion.**

Member Small has a question regarding some flexibility within the recommendation. It seems like a lot of work the State is doing for such a small number of professionals. Member Small suggested that this should be a district decision.

Member Collins suggested the framework move forward to pilot per the original recommendation made by the Council to the State Board of Education. Dr. Hornby-Daniels stated that she knows their number is really small but thinks they bring something different to the table and it is specialized. Dr. Hornby-Daniels is invested in this and believes in what she's done and proposed. It supports audiologist's field of practice.

Member Frenkel believes the small size gives an opportunity to explore particularly the one issue that was mentioned early on which is that the audiologists are supervised by people that are not audiologists, which is the case in Washoe County. T Member Frenkel expressed her desire that the pilot should explore and pay particular attention to the potential issues and challenges that come up for the supervisor using this tool to evaluate an employee who has a skillset that the supervisor themselves does not completely have. ? There are probably other employees in the districts, Other Licensed Educational Professionals that are experiencing that same dynamic. This small group can be an opportunity to dialogue with at least the two supervisors in this case given that it is two counties directly affected by this work. Chair Salazar believes it really lays out the importance of the protocols for how you actually operationalize the framework.

**Motion carried unanimously at 9:53 AM.**

### **Agenda Item #7 - Updates to the School Counselor Statewide Performance Evaluation System**

Eboni Caridine introduced the school counselors that will present the changes they recommended to the rubric.

Kristin Barnson is the Elementary Counselor Specialist for Clark County School District as well as the President of the Nevada State School Counselor Association. The work group met and has some changes to recommend. Changes are outlined in the presentation. In Standard 2, replace the word develop with the word implement. It would then read "School counselors implement a curriculum, offer individual student planning and deliver responsive services in order to assist students in developing mindsets and demonstrating behaviors for academic, college/career and social/emotional development." In Standard 4 Indicator 2, the language was cleaned up to make it a more clear, the group recommended to include "The school counselor utilizes process, perception, and outcome data to identify achievement gaps, and develops appropriate action plans to enhance or improve student success." In Standard 5, Indicator 1, Level 4 language change was to remove the word appropriate and replace it with the word effective. In Standard 6 there originally were 5 Indicators in this Standard, the previous Standards all had 3. The group wanted to make sure it stayed in alignment and had 3. They did some clean up on the wording to make that happen. The document that the American School Counselors Association uses for the Ethical Standards for School Counselors was included. Standard 6 Indicator 2 is to be removed completely and the reason being it reduces the number of indicators in this standard. The work group felt this indicator was less measurable and more subjective. In Standard

### **Agenda Item 7 cont.**

6 Indicator 3 which will now become Indicator 2 because of the removal of the last indicator, this will now include the word or. It will now read as follows: The school counselor coordinates, facilitates, educates, and/or provides leadership in professional meetings and/or organizations. In Standard 6, Indicator 4 will be removed, but some of that language will be added to the next indicator. Standard 6 Indicator 5 which will now become Indicator 3 states the school counselor engages in self-reflection of practice; sets individual goals for professional improvement; stays current on professional issues; and contributes to the advancement of the school counseling profession. The last one is part of the level changes for Standard 6 Indicator 3. The example Level 4 with the inclusion of the earlier phrase that was just mentioned, it would add to each of the



levels to state the school counselor effectively engages in self-reflection of practice; effectively sets and monitors individual goals for professional improvement; effectively participates in professional learning to meet goals, enhance skills, and stay current on professional issues; and effectively contributes to the advancement of the school counseling profession. The school counselors mention that they had 15 trainings with school counselors, and added a professional development education course that school counselors could take 2 credits to learn more about and delve into the practices of what the NEPF evaluation will look like.. Some good input and insight were received. School counselors were feeling more at ease if the implementation continues for 18-19. Keeli Killian with Washoe County School District stated that their current evaluation out of all the evaluations in the State for school counselors most closely aligns with the new one. The counselors in Washoe County were very familiar with some of these particular aspects that are in the new evaluation. In-service credit was also offered around the American School Counseling framework and implementation guide. Counselors have been trained for several years now on all the new framework pieces that the American School Counseling Association has put out in the last few years. Pre-professional development around this has been done and the counselors are pretty comfortable in moving forward with the new evaluation. Chair Salazar reminded that the task of the council is to make recommendation for the State Board of Education to move forward with the implementation of the NEPF for counselors in the 2018-19 school year. Member Michele Sanchez-Boyce asked a question to the Clark County person who implemented this, would like to know if an outline can be made and shared with the council of how it was implemented and how the trainings were done because a lot of the other OLEP groups are just now getting into that phase and would be very interested in how that was set up or how it was done. Eboni Caridine will forward the requested information about the training over to the council.

#### **Motion**

**Member Kim Metcalf moved for recommendation to move forward to the State Board of Education the implementation of the Counselor NEPF for the 2018-19 school year.**

**Member Frenkel seconded motion.**

**Motion carried at 10:04 AM.**

#### **Agenda Item #8 - Updates to the School Social Worker Statewide Performance Evaluation System**

Eboni Caridine introduced the school social workers work group to review the field test and recommend suggested changes to the rubric.

Melissa Dougherty, School Social Work Liaison for Clark County School District stated that after doing the field test, they wanted to change some of the language in the rubric to mimic the goal of student achievement and student success, to make it a more measurable. (See materials for agenda item 8)

In Standard 1, Indicator 2 language was added to now say “The School Social Worker identifies current and applicable school and community resources to maximize student achievement and family empowerment.” The words current and applicable were added to make sure the school social worker is aware about services in the community and on campus as they change often. Standard 1, Indicator 3 includes the addition of new language to say; “The School Social Worker establishes collaborative professional relationships through networking to organize effective intervention(s).” Adding the words “through networking to organize effective intervention(s)” further describes the function of the professional relationships. Joni Schmidt, a school social worker liaison in Clark County School District, stated they also made changes to Standard 3, Indicator 3. The language was also changed to remove “demonstrates direct involvement with families” and replaced with “is directly involved with students, families and/or schools to focus on stability to maximize student achievement.” This was done to make sure a systems approach is used. Social work is not just looking at the student, but also the family, community and the school. That is what is referred to as the systems approach. Also changed was Standard 3, Indicator 3, Level 4’s language to remove “families to” and changed to “students, families, and/or schools to work towards stabilization and” enhance student achievement. This is also to support the systems approach. Standard 3, Indicator 3, Level 3 removed “families” and added “students, families, and/or schools to focus on stabilization and enhance student achievement.” Standard 3, Indicator 3, Level 2 removed “families” to now include “students, families, and/or schools.” Standard 3, Indicator 3, Level 1 again remove “families” and now to include “students, families, and/or schools.” Standard 3, Indicator 4 language was added to now read “The school Social Worker mobilized current and applicable school and community resources to maximize student achievement.” Adding the words current and applicable ensures the School Social Worker remains aware of programs and services, both on and off

#### **Agenda Item 8 cont.**

campus, as they expand and change. Standard 3, Indicator 4, Level 4 the language “foster student academic and behavioral success” was removed and changed to “maximizes student achievement.” That would be at a Level 3. One level down so Level 2, language removed was “foster student academic and behavioral success” and changed to add “maximizes student achievement.” At the lower level of the standard, Standard 3, Indicator 4, Level 1, “foster student academic and behavioral success” was removed and changed to “maximizes student achievement.”

Member Collins had a question regarding with the changing of the language from foster student academic and behavioral success to maximizing student achievement, was anything additional needed in the evidence sources to let people know that it includes behavior? Melissa answered the question to state they still included behavior evidence sources originally with foster

student academic and behavioral success because both pieces are always being looked at evidence it is still there. Member Collins had a question that was brought up from the Superintendent, Dr. Steve Canavero, during the public workshop that was held on May 8<sup>th</sup> for the draft regulation language. One of the concerns that he brought up was will the social worker standards and indicators still support social workers in the role or for example will it be a barrier to billing for Medicare? Will any of these standards or indicators be a barrier to what districts may need to do for billing for Medicare? Joni Schmidt answered that they hope not because they want to move towards that direction. There is nothing in place right now but want to strive to eventually being able to bill for Medicaid. Since the whole rubric focuses on the school social work ethics, the national association of social work (NASW standards, and the School Social Workers of America (SSWA) expectations, there should be no conflict with billing for Medicare or Medicaid. Just like the audiologists across the State, they are trying to keep it general but yet specific to social work. It was decided to focus everything on the NASW and SSWA. Member Collins asked in the implementation of this if we do come across some barriers please make sure that is brought to the council's attention so that it can be addressed. Member Marshner-Coyne wanted clarification in the evidence; does it need to be a systems approach or could it be just engaging students, just engaging families? Member Marshner stated when she first read it she thought it could be one of those three and that it didn't have to be all three. Melissa answered that it was done that way in the evidence, because not all of the social workers work directly with students, for example Joni and Melissa are Social Worker Liaisons, so they work more with the social workers that are in the schools. That is why they made sure to include the "and/or" to make sure that it's not always required to work directly with students or directly work with the families. They do sometimes, but that is not fully within their role. Using the "and/or" is more encompassing. Chair Salazar believes it has been clarified in the evidence segment and would be applicable for the standard across the variety roles.

Member Smith had two questions. Under Standard 3 Indicator 3 level 4, she wanted to hear a little more about the reason for changing the language from foster student, academic, and behavioral success to maximize student achievement. The second question asked; Are all social workers supervised by other social workers? Melissa answered the last question first and stated the answer is no, none of them are supervised by a social worker. Whoever writes the evaluations, none of them are actual social workers. Melissa asked if member Smith wanted to know why foster student, academic and behavioral success was removed and changed to maximizes student achievement? Member Smith stated yes, she feels the old standard was more descriptive and knowing that not all social workers are being supervised by someone who would be familiar with SSWA standards: Is this standard indicator description going to give them enough information to accurately assess? Member Smith also wanted to know if the school social workers association have best practice recommendations for who supervises social workers whether it is a certain type of professional or someone who has a certain type of background? Joni answered that when a person is trying to become a social worker they have to do practicum and be supervised at that time to get their degree and be supervised by someone who is a social worker. If getting a clinical license as a social worker, you must be supervised by a clinical social worker who is licensed by the state. To be classified as a social worker you must be licensed by the state. The school district will hire individuals that are licensed by the state. When they are hired by the state, they carry dual licenses, a state license by the Board of Examiners and a license by the Department of Education. It does not say anything about when working in the field that you have to be supervised by a social worker. Member Smith asked, Is there a best practice recommendation which goes back with the concern of changing the language from academic and behavioral success to student achievement? Melissa stated the best practice is that they are always supervised by a social worker. That is always the best practice, unfortunately a lot of school districts around the country use social workers in very different arenas. So most of the time it is not a social worker who is supervising a school social worker. That is why the language was changed from "foster student academic and behavioral success" to "maximizes student success". We were trying to encompass the overall achievement a little bit more and not focusing just on what their academic achievement is because it might be that their achievement was they've decreased negative behaviors in the classroom from five days a week to at least two days a week or something like that. Member Smith's concern is that by allowing it to just read student achievement that we would defer to behavioral only successes and that could be a disservice to some students. Melissa said when this was discussed in the work groups it defaulted back to it is important for the school social worker to keep communication with the supervisors so they

**Agenda Item 8 cont.**

know what that success is and what that achievement should look like. Member Collins clarified the description notes for Standard 3. It is embedded in all the indicators. Social/emotional curricula should include but is not limited to social skills, anger management, suicide prevention, anti-bullying etc. Member Smith clarified her concern wasn't with being more explicit about social/emotional. The concern is with removing reference to academic achievement. Member Frenkel commented that looking at the language change towards student achievement, some of the other indicators had already said student achievement. So wondering if we can recall why originally there was a differentiation between those two indicators. Indicator 1 and 4 both originally reference student achievement but Indicator 3 did not. Melissa answered that when Standard 3 was being changed, they wanted it to become more universal. It defaulted back to the original other standards that already had student achievement included. Joni commented that because social work is a systems approach they want to show that even when they are working with families in the home that sometimes that can affect student success. Situations going on in homes can also effect academic achievement in the school. Community agencies also play a big role in families. One example is the

free and reduced lunch. It is known if children go to school hungry, they will not learn academically and that is where social work has ground work in that if their home life is very supportive of the child and they have the resources it will increase their academic grades. Member Smith appreciates that but her point is they are social workers and there are social workers in schools and the reason there is an additional license for school social workers is so that there is a more specialty, a license that recognizes the nuance of being a social worker within an academic context. Member Smith wants to ensure there is enough focus on the academic achievement and the value and expertise the social workers bring to ensuring that students are able to achieve academically. Not saying it is the responsibility of the social worker to ensure that that happens, but just making sure there is enough consideration and attention paid to this given that children are sent to school to learn. Melissa stated that the mission of the school social worker is to eliminate any barriers to the students' academic success. The mindset is to reduce any barriers so that they can achieve academically. That is the focus when they are working with students. Member White asked if in the evidence if something is added to track academic growth or some kind of data. It was mentioned previously, but not listed in any of the evidence sources, but is it an optional evidence source that is looked at before and after growth data pre-intervention to help make the point? Member Collins stated that is the school social workers role to help student access the curriculum. Is it feasible to have a data source for student achievement, especially if a school social worker is not working with students, but with families? Melissa answered that the hard thing with tracking academics is the direct link to achievement. They wouldn't be tracking academic outcomes other than in discussions with teachers or looking at Infinite Campus. She struggled to include that in the evidence especially because not all of them are going to be directly in the classroom working with students where there would be a direct impact on their academics. Member White's concern was how are they going to measure maximizing student success? Perhaps it is in that language that the change needs to occur. Joni stated that there are so many variables that they are looking at of what constitutes education and academic success. The challenge is that all the roles of social workers are not the same. They want to make sure that if you have a social worker that is not working directly with a child, or a social worker who has more than one school and is visiting those schools, How are they going to measure student success by what they are doing in their job? Perhaps the wording can be looked at again. Member White suggested if they add the word opportunity in the descriptors because that is what the social workers are doing. They are removing barriers and creating opportunities. They are not maximizing instruction. That is left up to the teachers. They are creating the opportunity to maximize instruction. Chair Salazar commented that is acceptable and that change might better reflect really what they do. Chair Salazar stated if, during the first year of implementation, they find that the descriptor notes are not quite right, or the lists of the evidence pieces aren't quite there yet, they can come back and make adjustments to the rubric. The pilot is a small group and we didn't reach everyone in terms of the various roles they have across the state. No doubt, as this is implemented the first year, there still may be tweaks that may need to occur. That is a process prescribed in law for TLC to continually review NEPF frameworks to make sure they really are doing what they intended to do. Member Collins commented that it could be a matter of simply adding some additional items to the confirmatory evidence sources that would indicate increased student attendance. For example if students feel more comfortable in school they will go more often. It could be data points, simply a bullet that says other student data that indicates student success. It could be any number of data sources. Member White expressed concerns about that because of the inability to make the direct correlation. She would be more comfortable leaving the confirmatory evidence list as is because the things listed in there knowing the social workers in her district would provide adequate evidence. She would be more inclined to change the description and the indicator. Bottom of page 14 Indicator 3 perhaps add in schools to focus on stability to maximize opportunity for student achievement, and likewise with Indicator 4. It would be adding the word opportunity. Member Sanchez-Boyce commented that when people look at maximizing student achievement they expect student achievement data. That is not what is being collected under the descriptor. The two are not aligned. Member Sanchez-Boyce fully supports the idea to put in the word opportunities to maximize student achievement. Chair Salazar asked social worker liaisons Joni and Melissa if this is an agreed upon change since they are the ones presenting the rubric to the council and then they will make the recommendation. Joni stated she thinks the word using opportunity definitely changes it and makes it a little less measurable. That appears to be where the problem is

#### **Agenda Item 8 cont.**

coming in, looking at data and how is it going to be measurable. Chair Salazar asked if that is a recommendation that they would have in changing of the language of what goes in front of TLC because they have to move the rubric forward with recommendations to the State Board of Education. Melissa and Joni agreed that they will add the word opportunity. Member Frenkel likes the addition of the word opportunity, but looking at Indicator 3 raises the discussion and as it is written the school social worker is directly involved with students or families and/or schools to focus on opportunity to maximize student achievement. Member Frenkel would like to know what the measure is there. Is it being involved with what we are measuring or providing opportunity for student achievement? It is almost like there are two measures that can be looked at differently. What are they being evaluated on? Have they provided the opportunity or are they being directly involved? Member Frenkel would like to know what is being measured. She believes as part of the pilot that would be an interesting question to see. It is important to get clear what is being evaluated. Member Collins clarified the pilot has already been done which is why they have come forward with these changes so they wouldn't be doing a pilot again. But, as items come across in implementation in the first year, things that need to be revised in practice they can bring that forward to TLC. Member Frenkel Clarified that what she meant to say was as they implement these changes. Chair Salazar informed the council that the revised document



that everyone has does have the change Standard 3, adding the word opportunities to maximize instruction. Chair Salazar reminded that the responsibility of the TLC is to make recommendation for implementation in the 2018-2019 school year. Member Metcalf had a question for the State, before this is finalized but believes the word maximizes should be singular to maximize. Chair Salazar thanked Member Metcalf and stated they know there will be some editing that needs to be done before it is presented to the State Board of Education.

### **Motion**

**Member Owens motions to move forward the revised rubric for 2018-2019 implementation for school social workers. Member Nunez seconded.**

**All in favor**

**Motion carried at 10:41 AM.**

### **Agenda Item #9 - NEPF Implementation: Requirement of Local School Boards.**

Chair Salazar stated the task of the Board of Trustees of each school district is to report on implementation of the NEPF. Local school boards are being required to monitor and present information to the Department of Education. Dr. Laura Goe from the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders (GTL), designed a document early on about what districts should look at, what questions should be asked in the evaluation of their evaluation system. Chair Salazar revised and edited these three questions to put them into context. (see materials for agenda item 9) These questions simply reflect those recommendations out of Dr. Goe's work. 1. How has the NEPF system resulted in improved student performance in the district? 2. How has the NEPF system resulted in improved teacher and leader performance/practice? How has that impacted practice? 3. What areas does the district need to focus on in the NEPF system to see greater improvement in student performance and practice? Any of Dr. Laura Goe's work is straight forward and these are the questions that would be asked of any kind of system with some new initiative that would be put in place. 4. What resources are needed in order to increase effectiveness of the NEPF system in the district? There was a great deal of discussion last time trying to figure out all of the questions. Member Jim Cooney made commented that if we get too much in the weeds and get too specific, we probably will not get data, let alone value added to the district by them engaging in this process. After lengthy discussion, Chair Salazar asked members to review the questions and provide their thoughts or comments. Member Collins stated it is inferred, but does it need to be made explicit about how NEPF informs professional development. NRS mentions part of the Council's task is to make sure the system informs PD. Is that something that needs to be asked specifically or is it embedded in questions three and four? Member Collins believes it can be inferred, but does not know if they can make that connection explicit. She brings this up because in some of the Title II Part A monitoring, the question has been asked how districts using NEPF data to inform professional development. Some were surprised by that question it was not a connection they automatically see. If it can potentially be addressed in these questions, it would go a long way in helping them see the connection between the NEPF and professional growth. Member Small had the same exact thought as Member Collins. Member Small is curious what the two board members, who are trustees, which sit on the Council think about these questions. How would they know the cycle is working or not? The second item is counselors and social workers Member Small is assuming a school administrator evaluates these folks. Member Small would like to know what support the district gives an administrator around the NEPF for other licensed educational personnel. Member Small expressed curiosity about this because he never hears the school board in Clark County talk about the evaluation and how it is implemented. Chair Salazar thanked Member Small and stated it goes back to what their task is on this agenda item, and the reason why it was included during the last legislative session. The responsibility of the TLC is to provide feedback to the Department on what kind of questions districts should ask and report on. Member White is looking at the legislation specifically Section 1.2 and reads it as it is the school boards job to do this work and not TLC's job to tell them to do this work and is curious where this comes from. Member Collins stated the actual request is from the Nevada

### **Agenda Item 9 cont.**

Department of Education asking TLC for their feedback on what they need to be asking local school boards in order to adhere to the requirement in AB320. a Member Frenkel, as one of the two school board members, but will not speak for Member Cooney, but both did a presentation to the Nevada School Board Association about the TLC and did raise this particular statute. She agreed with Member White and believes it is their obligation and responsibility to make sure district staff asks questions and reports. She also appreciates direction and support to boards on what that should look because it is a big conversation. How should it be done? Is it a discussion at a board meeting? Is that review just getting those questions answered and what do we do with those answers? Those are some guidance points that Member Frenkel believes would be helpful. Member Frenkel understands Member White's comment, is it a mandate or is it guidance. Member Frenkel believes guidance is the right word because each board may want to use different pieces of it and use it differently, but does believe that kind of support to the boards in identifying how that conversation and dialogue with their staff, particularly Human Resources staff, should look like and what should they do with that information. Member Frenkel believes it is their job and she thinks guidance is helpful. Member White stated she is not opposed to guidance, or even the questions, but wondered given the statewide data particularly starting with question number one; How are we going to know, given that the data doesn't necessarily reflect those teachers who could be or should be at a level two or level one. Member Metcalf would like to clarify this is not asking districts in any way, about whether NEPF really does make a difference. The goal is to find out if they

use a system in the way we intended them to use it, and not whether the system itself actually does what we think it does. He believes the first two questions might be better asked, How has your districts used the results of NEPF to improve student performance or improve teacher and leader practice? It is not quite the same question that Member White asked but it seems to him there is an implicit assumption that the system works. Chair Salazar directed question to Member Collins and asked what level of guidance is needed from the TLC. What levels of questions are needed in terms of recommendations going to NDE. Member Collins stated AB320 does say “the manner in which school districts carry out the evaluation of teachers”. It is about the implementation. When the line is read it is not so much about the results of, but the manner in which it is being implemented. That is what boards of trustees are being asked to monitor. Chair Salazar asked Member Collins to restate how she would re-word question one. Member Metcalf stated it is actually question one and two and it changes the focus from how has it improved those things to how has the district used the results to improve those things. The focus isn’t on whether it really does improve student performance because he is not convinced it will, but how are the districts using it in ways that are likely to promote student performance growth or teacher and leader practice. Member Frenkel stated she understands Member Metcalf’s point and that it is not the same as what Member Collins stated before because the identification of the language in those two questions is very important, but she would change it to something like; how has the NEPF system impacted student performance more generally, but thinks there are questions before that which you are alluding to the way the statute is written. How have we implemented the NEPF? What’s the status of implementation? Going back to the previous power point slide, where are we in our practice around self-assessment, pre-evaluation conferences, observations and reviews of evidence? How is that going? What percentage have we seen completed? Member Frenkel does think the additional questions that Member Metcalf is getting at are also important. It’s not just the manner, but also what impact has it had. What do we see? What are we learning from this experience both in terms of implementation, but also the impact on student performance and achievement? Member Frenkel stated she would change it from improved student performance to just how it has impacted student performance so that it doesn’t infer bias. Member Frenkel wants to make sure they get to the implementation, because that is important for boards to know and believes that is the actual intent of the legislation Chair Salazar stated the goal is to give conceptual guidance. Member Collins said if they receive the basic concepts, they can generate some questions for review for TLC. Chair Salazar read the first question which is how have districts used NEPF system results in improving student performance in your district and asked if that reflects pretty much? Member Metcalf said that Member Frenkel raised a good point. None of those ask the district the extent to which they feel they have effectively or fully implemented the system. He believes that is a fundamental question that needs to be asked, looking back at the legislation that is probably the key question that is being asked. Member Metcalf was hoping to get away from looking at its impact. Asking districts to evaluate its impact and instead say to encourage them to take a look at the ways that they have taken advantage of the data they get from this to try to make improvements rather than jumping ahead to whether there were improvements as a result of it. Member White stated in looking at the language of the legislation in slide 3 believes that something that captures the process and the fidelity to the process needs to be the very first question because it seems that is the intent of the legislation. How they are using the data and what we glean from the implementation of the process. Chair Salazar stated they would be adding or introducing all of the questions then with a question first with regards to something around fidelity of implementation and the use of data collected. Member Sanchez-Boyce requested to please broaden the people that are being included so that it doesn’t just say teacher. Member Sanchez-Boyce would like it a little broader with the questions that get developed.. Member Frenkel wondered if part of the process is getting some input from other board members. She stated she has given her perspective as to what would be helpful as a board member and she would be interested to ask her colleagues, but she is wondering if part of the process would be connecting with the Nevada Association of School Boards. Member Jim Cooney stated he has a problem with the NDE dictating to the Boards they have to do. The approach that is being taken here, at least the questions are out on the table and can move forward with those. Member Smith a if the Council is being specific enough in these guidance questions. Member Frenkel stated that she would still leave it broad to help the districts identify what it is that needs more focus. Chair Salazar asked Member Collins if she has enough guidance from TLC in order to develop some key questions that Superintendent Canavero can use. Member Collins answered that yes they do.

10 minute break

#### **Agenda Item #10 - Curriculum and Instruction Recommended by TLC and Statewide Training for Teachers and Administrators Pursuant to NRS 391.544**

Chair Salazar introduced Karen Stanley, SNRPDP administrative consultant, who will give an update on behalf of Chelli Smith who is the director of SNRPDP. Chair Salazar and Karen presented back on April 17, 2018 at the SB497 Task Force Meeting regarding the numbers and types of professional development provided to their counties, which are Lincoln, Clark, Esmeralda, Mineral and Nye. (see materials for agenda item 10) The first slide is Administrator Participation . Karen reviewed the data on the slide including the total number of administrators that received professional development and the number of unduplicated administrators that received professional development. Additional data showed the numbers of central office administrators that attended trainings. For example, there were trainings with the associate superintendents, trainings with CPD (the Curriculum Professional Development division). She explained that the asterisk indicates all site-based

administrators during that 2015-2016 school year, were required to participate in NEPF Inter-Rater Reliability Training and they kept counts of data and sent that to the Associate Superintendents for them to monitor. The topics included Administrator Standards. There were 46 sessions during that school year focusing on these types of topics (see power point presentation.) One of the things that Karen and Chair Salazar do at every training is connect leadership standards to principal practices, key practices to support teachers both in their meeting of the instructional standards and professional responsibility standards as well as looking at their own leadership standards and collecting evidence. There were 46 sessions offered during that year. 18 sessions were offered specifically on the Teacher Standards. Training included a session for each standard, during which they looked at evidence sources, watched videos, and compared evidence notes on videos vetted by Dr. Heritage. She reviewed the Inter-Reliability numbers: there provided 63 sessions, knowing this was a required training. Training also included 29 sessions for SLG / Goal Setting training. The unduplicated number for Clark was 967 and the duplicated number was over 3500 individuals that attended trainings. They again focused on the student learning goal for that mandatory training. Moving into the 2016-2017 school year, there were 46 sessions offered on Tuesdays and Thursdays. They always go to Lincoln County on Wednesdays. They serve at the request of the other districts, but for Clark it is every Tuesday morning from 8:00 AM to 11:00 AM and from 11:30 AM to 1:30 PM. On Thursdays from 8:00 AM to 11:00 AM they offer trainings. Teacher Standards there were 14 sessions. For Inter-Reliability they offer 22 sessions. Karen emphasized that they tell administrators it is not the type of training is which a person attends one training and they are finished. It is an ongoing process. As of April 1<sup>st</sup>, there were no required trainings this year. Administrators can go onto Pathlore and can call Chair Salazar or Karen Stanley. They can request assistance from RPDP, but there were no required administrator trainings for the 2017-2018 school year. There will be considerable drop in numbers. The other piece Karen pointed out is that Nye County, while they didn't have any specific administrator trainings, their administrators participated in SNRPDP's content area training. They actually went out to schools and were one-on-one with staff members as well as administrators. These were specifically administrators coming to our trainings, or us going to them under the direction of their superintendent. Karen stated they are still counting numbers for May as well as June and they have their RPDP Summer Institute which will be in June. They have over 100 administrators signed up at this point in time for that session which will be over at Southwest CTA. Those numbers will be added and these were approximations on what they could gather based on preliminary numbers. Karen stated they have offered many sessions focusing on the administrator standards and they looked at the administrator standards under the guise of school improvement. It is not just how a school leader satisfies the requirements of the NEPF, but how the school leader provides the focus on school improvement and student achievement through the improvement of their staff. They have also offered a number of book based sessions. They look for book studies that will provide specific activities examples that administrators can go back to their buildings and implement immediately. The researched based sessions based on Chair Salazar's work nationally, they have had the opportunity to get these research based articles. The focus is on building leadership skills to positively impact students, especially in high poverty schools Karen went on to review feedback from participants and the professional development evaluation scores. They are consistently at 4.8-5.0. They found that administrators really appreciate the opportunity to talk with other administrators and work with other administrators as they begin to think about how they can improve student achievement at their school. It is not just a sit and get. They challenge them to explore what types of actionable items they can come back to their schools and work with their collaborative teams as they look specifically at their school buildings. T Member Smith had a question and asked about the slide that stated there will be no administrator training next year, does that also include new administrators? Karen Stanley answered that this year there were no required

#### **Agenda Item 10 cont.**

administrator trainings. They answer to the direction of their local school boards so they don't know if there will or won't be any required training. As far new administrators, at this point in time they are not aware of any required trainings. For Lincoln County they always meet with their entire team. They are not necessarily required, since they are a smaller number they are all there. Member Sanchez-Boyce asked about how they incorporate the new OLEP standards and if there will be any specific training on those since they are all being rolled out and being implemented this fall. Are there plans to do any training? Karen Stanley answered that she does not believe that will be under RPDPs jurisdiction and will probably go back to the district level. At this point in time there has not been any discussion on that. Member Sanchez-Boyce stated she has some concerns about that because someone should be doing some training. Member Collins stated Member Sanchez-Boyce's concerns are heard and will pass them on to NDE leadership. Member Collins and Eboni are working with Nancy Kuhles to develop a video that could be used by districts to provide training on the OLEP standards, but is not a formal NDE presented training. It is a resource that can be used to help a facilitator dive deep into the standards. Member Frenkel is curious about any opportunities to evaluate the success of the trainings on other levels. The application of what they learned which is level 2 evaluation for training and then level 3 which is what kind of change in practice have we seen as a result of training. Is it too soon for that or what have you got in place to look at that? Karen Stanley stated that would be a state evaluation and not RPDP evaluation. That is not part of the RPDP purview, but when they get several administrators requesting that they come out to their school and walk with them and work with their administrative team it is an anecdotal type of feedback. They are talking about consistency when they have several administrators working together, but that is only when they go out to the building by invitation. Member Marshner asked regarding the SLG training, how are they evaluating for example a group of administrators from a particular district that have gone through the training. Have they seen an improvement in the way that



the SLGs are written? She knows it's early, but she is thinking long term in terms of evaluating the success of the training and the impact of the training on actual implementation. Karen stated they've also had that discussion as well and have talked associate superintendents and those who supervise principals because, as they work with their school and administrators they should be looking at that level of SLG, and they should be looking at the overall scores that teachers are receiving and the data that connects the SLG to support student learning overall as part of their evaluation process.

Kirsten Gleissner, Director of the NWRPDP, gave an update on some of the numbers and topics that were explored over the past few years. In 2015-2016, they were able to train all of their administrators on the NEPF in the Northwest region. Unduplicated numbers were about 312 but the duplicated numbers were 843. There were multiple touches and conversations with their administrators across the region. In 2016-2017, they were in the throes of actually practicing all of the information so the numbers went down. The topics over those two years included focusing on the administrator and teachers standards. NWRPDP trainers helped with writing teacher evaluations using the tools, protocols, and procedures for the NEPF. They also spoke with administrators about diagnosing mediocre teaching and how to work with the teacher. They also provided NEPF refreshers as needed. The following year they focused more on the NEPF Inter-Reliability (IRR), and student learning goals. They collaborated with the Southern RPDP. Kirsten stated they supported districts in doing learning walks at schools with administrators, and they are doing individual mentoring. Evaluations of the trainings during that time were consistently high. Administrators are always invited to attend content training. Leading for Impact, onsite mentoring for observation, coaching and writing evaluations were included for the 2017-2018 schoolyear. Four days of leadership training will be provided in support of using rubrics for coaching purposes. They will be working with Carson City to train all of their administrators and professional learning providers as well. Planning with districts for next year to include IRR for new administrators that may need as well as book studies and mentoring support.

Sarah Negrete, Director of NNRPDP, phoned in from Elko and updated numbers that were given to the leadership task force. In the Northern region there are 79 total administrators across the 6 districts. In 2016-2017 62 of those 79 were in trained at least 1time. Duplicated number was 261. Administrators have been encouraged to bring small groups of teacher leaders to trainings. Leadership productivity work has been done with administrators and their administrative assistants to discuss what type of work can be given to the administrative assistant to allow the administrator to do more instructional work. NEPF training will be provided next year for administrators because there will be new ones and there will be teachers transferring to administrative roles. These trainings are offered in a workshop style so administrators can choose any and all to attend. Next year a teacher academy will be held for which teachers are nominated by their principals. This academy is purely focused on the NEPF. This is the first year to allow alumni from the Teacher's Academy from years past to be nominated and attend. Currently in the initial stages for the data analysis for this year and looks like there are over 60% of trainings on the NEPF. All three of the RPDPs are required to use a particular evaluation tool. They also have very high evaluations. In addition the trainers are required to write a small report based on data they have collected during the year on one of their projects. More information is available on the website NNRPDP.com and click on evidence and then click on regional projects.

### **Agenda Item #11 - 2019 Legislative Session Considerations**

Member Collins stated that there have been a few meetings of the legislative committee on education and legislative commission meetings in last few months. The regulations on the criteria for assessments were approved at the legislative commission meeting on May 16. The legislative counsel bureau (LCB) is currently working on the regulations on the business rules for SLG, the cleanup of the standard language on R021-16, and changing from peer evaluations to peer observers. LCE met on April 20<sup>th</sup>. The theme was A Day in the Life of a Teacher. NDE presented on the NEPF showing the ratings results from 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 school years. There were no questions from the council at that time. There was a public workshop on the OLEP standards and Indicators on May 8. Revisions will be made based on the recommendations from the council today then they will be sent to LCB. The State Board of Education will hear them at the Public Hearing when they come back from LCB. Member Metcalf mentioned the notion of seeking funding for validation of the NEPF and its system and related tools. Member Rippet would like to allow for developing teachers especially new teachers. Member Smith asked how the boards and commissions within the Department of Education coordinate as appropriate. Member Collins stated the NRS regarding post probationary employee period is NRS 391.730 in case that is to be brought up next agenda. Member Sanchez-Boyce commented about the OLEPs and the need for professional development to maintain licensure. Member Collins stated she will discuss with Jason Dietrich, Director of Licensure, but this is not in TLC's purview to make recommendations regarding licensure. Member Smith wants to make sure the Council is considering the whole picture to make recommendations. Member Collins stated internally we work closely with licensure but legally cannot make recommendations to the Commission. Member Frenkel stated even though we cannot make recommendations, we can support and advocate. The challenge is around how do we continue to help our education professionals and administrators develop. Member Collins stated updates on the SB474 task force can be provided at the next meeting. Member Small would like to



know when the NEPF survey closes. Member Collins stated it closes around June 30<sup>th</sup> to give administrators time to take the survey. The Council should expect a preliminary look at the results at the August meeting.

Member Nunez left at 12:08 PM

**Agenda Item #12 - National Issues and Legal Landscape (*Information/Discussion*)** Chair Salazar introduced new website just recently launched on principal leadership for inclusive schools. This was a collaboration of many educational agencies and organizations that have any kind of say regarding principal leadership. There are a lot of resources on that webpage. Nevada is one of the states being considered as possible pilot state. Identifying invitations for certain states will be done and will require approval from the group. The website received very positive reviews when it was released last week.

**Agenda Item #13 - Future Agenda Items**

Look at everything that was discussed.

Updates with where some of work is being done and some reports on how it's being done.

Principal standards that were approved in January will be moving forward to State Board of Education on June 7<sup>th</sup>.

**Agenda Item #14 - Public Comment #2**

**Elko:**

None

**Las Vegas:**

Anna Sliding, CCSD teacher and policy director for Hope for Nevada, an advocacy group for public education. She was just in Washington D.C. and met with other education reform researchers and found that many from other states experienced high percentages of effective teachers with low student achievement. This is indicative of the national narrative of low education funding and high burden that educators feel to fix everything. Anna is requesting to visit their website [Fundourfuturenevada.com](http://Fundourfuturenevada.com). If more information is wanted by the council, they will come out to discuss further.

**Members:**

Member Small introduced Former Assemblyman Gardner in his new role as Deputy Attorney General.

Member Collins introduced Stacey Dallas Johnston the Teacher Leader in Residence.

**Agenda Item #15 - Adjournment 12:39pm**