

TEACHER INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE STANDARDS AND INDICATORS

STANDARD 1 New Learning is Connected to Prior Learning and Experience	STANDARD 2 Learning Tasks have High Cognitive Demand for Diverse Learners	STANDARD 3 Students Engage in Meaning-Making through Discourse and Other Strategies	STANDARD 4 Students Engage in Metacognitive Activity to Increase Understanding of and Responsibility for Their Own Learning	STANDARD 5 Assessment is Integrated into Instruction
<p>Indicator 1 Teacher activates all students' initial understandings of new concepts and skills</p>	<p>Indicator 1 Tasks purposefully employ all students' cognitive abilities and skills</p>	<p>Indicator 1 Teacher provides opportunities for extended, productive discourse between the teacher and student(s) and among students</p>	<p>Indicator 1 Teacher and all students understand what students are learning, why they are learning it, and how they will know if they have learned it</p>	<p>Indicator 1 Teacher plans on-going learning opportunities based on evidence of all students' current learning status</p>
<p>Indicator 2 Teacher makes connections explicit between previous learning and new concepts and skills for all students</p>	<p>Indicator 2 Tasks place appropriate demands on each student</p>	<p>Indicator 2 Teacher provides opportunities for all students to create and interpret multiple representations</p>	<p>Indicator 2 Teacher structures opportunities for self-monitored learning for all students</p>	<p>Indicator 2 Teacher aligns assessment opportunities with learning goals and performance criteria</p>
<p>Indicator 3 Teacher makes clear the purpose and relevance of new learning for all students</p>	<p>Indicator 3 Tasks progressively develop all students' cognitive abilities and skills</p>	<p>Indicator 3 Teacher assists all students to use existing knowledge and prior experience to make connections and recognize relationships</p>	<p>Indicator 3 Teacher supports all students to take actions based on the students' own self-monitoring processes</p>	<p>Indicator 3 Teacher structures opportunities to generate evidence of learning during the lesson of all students</p>
<p>Indicator 4 Teacher provides all students opportunities to build on or challenge initial understandings</p>	<p>Indicator 4 Teacher operates with a deep belief that all children can achieve regardless of race, perceived ability and socio-economic status</p>	<p>Indicator 4 Teacher structures the classroom environment to enable collaboration, participation, and a positive affective experience for all students</p>		<p>Indicator 4 Teacher adapts actions based on evidence generated in the lesson for all students</p>

TEACHER PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES STANDARDS AND INDICATORS

STANDARD 1 Commitment to the School Community	STANDARD 2 Reflection on Professional Growth and Practice	STANDARD 3 Professional Obligations	STANDARD 4 Family Engagement	STANDARD 5 Student Perception
Indicator 1 The teacher takes an active role on the instructional team and collaborates with colleagues to improve instruction for all students.	Indicator 1 The teacher seeks out feedback from instructional leaders and colleagues, and uses a variety of data to self-reflect on his or her practice.	Indicator 1 The teacher models and advocates for fair, equitable, and appropriate treatment of all students and families.	Indicator 1 The teacher regularly facilitates two-way communication with parents and guardians, using available tools that are responsive to their language needs, and includes parent/guardian requests and insights about the goals of instruction and student progress.	Indicator 1 The students report that the teacher helps them learn.
Indicator 2 The teacher takes an active role in building a professional culture that supports school and district initiatives.	Indicator 2 The teacher pursues aligned professional learning opportunities to support improved instructional practice across the school community.	Indicator 2 The teacher models integrity in all interactions with colleagues, students, families, and the community.	Indicator 2 The teacher values, respects, welcomes, and encourages students and families, of all diverse cultural backgrounds, to become active members of the school and views them as valuable assets to student learning.	Indicator 2 The students report that the teacher creates a safe and supportive learning environment.
Indicator 3 The teacher takes an active role in cultivating a safe, learning-centered school culture and community that maintains high expectations for all students.	Indicator 3 The teacher takes an active role in mentoring colleagues and pursues teacher leadership opportunities.	Indicator 3 The teacher follows policies, regulations, and procedures specific to role and responsibilities.	Indicator 3 The teacher informs and connects families and students to opportunities and services according to student needs.	Indicator 3 The students report that the teacher cares about them as individuals and their goals or interests.

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP STANDARDS AND INDICATORS

STANDARD 1 Creating and Sustaining a Focus on Learning	STANDARD 2 Creating and Sustaining a Culture of Continuous Improvement	STANDARD 3 Creating and Sustaining Productive Relationships	STANDARD 4 Creating and Sustaining Structures
Indicator 1 Administrator engages stakeholders in the development of a vision for high student achievement and college and career readiness, continually reviewing and adapting the vision when appropriate.	Indicator 1 Administrator sets clear expectations for teacher performance and student performance and creates a system for consistent monitoring and follow-up on growth and development.	Indicator 1 Administrator demonstrates a welcoming, respectful, and caring environment and an interest in adults' and students' well-being to create a positive affective experience for all members of the school community.	Indicator 1 Administrator implements systems and processes to align curriculum, instruction, and assessment to state standards and college-readiness standards, continually reviewing and adapting when appropriate.
Indicator 2 Administrator holds teachers and students accountable for learning through regular monitoring of a range of performance data.	Indicator 2 Administrator supports teacher development through quality observation, feedback, coaching, and professional learning structures.	Indicator 2 Administrator provides opportunities for extended, productive discourse between the administrator and teachers and among teachers to support decision-making processes.	Indicator 2 Administrator develops systems and processes to implement a coherent and clearly articulated curriculum across the entire school, continually reviewing and adapting when appropriate.
Indicator 3 Administrator structures opportunities to engage teachers in reflecting on their practice and taking improvement actions to benefit student learning and support professional growth.	Indicator 3 Administrator gathers and analyzes multiple sources of data to monitor and evaluate progress of school learning goals to drive continuous improvement.	Indicator 3 Administrator structures the school environment to enable collaboration between administrators and teachers and among teachers to further school goals.	Indicator 3 Administrator allocates resources effectively, including organizing time, to support learning goals.
Indicator 4 Administrator systematically supports teachers' short-term and long-term planning for student learning through a variety of means.	Indicator 4 Administrator operates with a deep belief that all children can achieve regardless of race, perceived ability and socio-economic status.	Indicator 4 Administrator has structures and processes in place to communicate and partner with teachers and parents in support of the school's learning goals.	

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES STANDARDS AND INDICATORS

STANDARD 1 Manages Human Capital	STANDARD 2 Self-Reflection and Professional Growth	STANDARD 3 Professional Obligations	STANDARD 4 Family and Community Engagement
Indicator 1 The administrator collects high quality observation data and evidence of teacher practice in a fair and equitable manner, and utilizes the results of evaluations to provide supports to improve performance	Indicator 1 The administrator seeks out feedback from colleagues and staff, and uses a variety of data to self-reflect on his or her practice	Indicator 1 The administrator models and advocates for fair, equitable, and appropriate treatment of all personnel, students, and families	Indicator 1 The administrator involves families and the community in appropriate policy implementation, program planning, and assessment
Indicator 2 The administrator uses available data, including teacher effectiveness data, to identify, recognize, support, and retain teachers	Indicator 2 The administrator seeks opportunities to increase their professional knowledge in an effort to remain current on educational research and evidence-based practices	Indicator 2 The administrator models integrity in all interactions with colleagues, staff, students, families, and the community	Indicator 2 The administrator involves families and community members in the realization of vision and in related school improvement efforts
Indicator 3 The administrator supports the development of teacher leaders and provides leadership opportunities	Indicator 3 The administrator pursues aligned professional learning opportunities to improve his/her instructional leadership across the school community	Indicator 3 The administrator respects the rights of others with regard to confidentiality and dignity, and engages in honest interactions	Indicator 3 The administrator connects students and families to community health, human, and social services as appropriate
Indicator 4 The administrator complies with the requirements and expectations of the Nevada Teacher Evaluation Framework		Indicator 4 The administrator follows policies, regulations, and procedures specific to role and responsibilities	

Summary of NEPF Literature Review

STANDARD 1 New Learning is Connected to Prior Learning and Experience	STANDARD 2 Learning Tasks have High Cognitive Demand for Diverse Learners	STANDARD 3 Students Engage in Meaning-Making through Discourse and Other Strategies	STANDARD 4 Students Engage in Metacognitive Activity to Increase Understanding of and Responsibility for Their Own Learning	STANDARD 5 Assessment is Integrated into Instruction
<p>Literature Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When activated in an appropriate context before presentation of new knowledge, prior knowledge aides comprehension and memory • Learners organize new concepts based on prior knowledge. When knowledge is acquired, schemata adapt to incorporate and organize new learning • Misconceptions can be detrimental to future learning. While students may be resistant to altering their views, explicitly addressing the incorrect understandings is highly important to the acquisition of new knowledge • They concluded that multiple modes, forms, and methods should be used to get a complete characterization of students' prior knowledge 	<p>Literature Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High cognitive engagement includes learning skills that are relevant across subject matter, opportunities to engage in these in authentic scenarios, and support for deep learning for all students through acknowledgement of each student's zone of proximal development 	<p>Literature Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active learners construct understanding for themselves • Productive discourse includes written and oral modalities used to argue, explain, critique, and give evidence to support a claim. Discourse opportunities must promote language development as well as content learning • To achieve high level of understanding, students must engage in multiple modes of representation across all modalities and modes of language • Children learn by explicitly making connections to prior experiences, current learning or contemporary situations, and future purpose or relevance of the learning. This relationship is brought forth by peers and/or careful construction of learning by teachers. • Classrooms provide supportive community-centered environments and cultures in which all members are encouraged to be active, constructive participants willing to make mistakes and learn from one another. Collaboration and psychological safety are key elements. 	<p>Literature Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metacognition, or thinking about thinking, supports learning and can be divided into two sub-components: knowledge and regulation. • Metacognitive knowledge includes knowledge of and when to use learning strategies, knowledge of oneself as a learner, and knowledge of factors that might impact learning. • Metacognitive regulation refers to monitoring, or becoming aware of strengths and weaknesses so that responsive action may be taken. • Metacognitive regulation also includes the monitoring of progress towards a learning goal and can be used to plan future learning steps like goal setting and time management. • Learning tasks should have personal relevance and allow for control over the learning process or produced products. • Metacognitive strategies must be explicitly taught promote self-efficacy, learning attribution, and a learning goal orientation. 	<p>Literature Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular assessment integrated into instruction ensures progress towards learning goals by providing teachers an understanding of current knowledge and misconceptions and allowing teachers to alter instruction in response. • Descriptive and evaluative feedback powerfully impacts student learning.

References Cited in Literature Review that Specifically Focus on ELs:

Reference	Type	Summary
<p>Bunch, G. C., Kibler, A., & Pimentel, S. (2012). Realizing opportunities for English learners in the Common Core English Language Arts and Disciplinary Literacy Standards. In K. Hakuta & M. Santo (Eds.), <i>Understanding language: Commissioned papers on language and literacy issues in the Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards</i> (pp. 1-16). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University.</p>	Theoretical	<p>This paper opens a larger conversation about what must be done to realize opportunities presented by the Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts and the literacy standards in other subject areas. It emphasizes the simultaneous challenges and opportunities for ELLs. The paper emphasizes that texts are approached differently for different purposes. Students need opportunities to approach texts with these varied purposes in mind. It also highlights how ELLs may be well served by opportunities to explore and justify their own "textual hypotheses," even if their initial interpretations diverge from those of the teacher.</p>
<p>Chiang, C. S., & Dunkel, P. (1992). The effect of speech modification, prior knowledge, and listening proficiency on EFL lecture learning. <i>Tesol Quarterly</i>, 26(2), 345-374.</p>	Empirical	<p>This study investigates the listening comprehension of 388 high-intermediate listening proficiency (HILP) and low-intermediate listening proficiency (LILP) Chinese students of English as a foreign language. These students listened to a lecture, the discourse of which was (a) familiar-unmodified, (b) familiar modified, (c) unfamiliar-unmodified, or (d) unfamiliar-modified. The modified discourse contained information redundancies and elaborations. After the lecture, the subjects took a multiple-choice exam testing recognition of information presented in the lecture and general knowledge of the familiar ("Confucius and Confucianism") and unfamiliar ("The Amish People") topics. A significant interaction between speech modification (redundant vs. nonredundant speech) and listening proficiency (HILP vs. LILP) indicated that the HILP students benefited from speech modification, which entailed elaboration and redundancy of information, but the LILP students did not. A significant interaction between prior knowledge (familiar vs. unfamiliar topic) and test type (passage-independent vs. passage-dependent items) was also found. For both the HILP and LILP subjects, prior knowledge had a significant impact on subjects' memory for information contained in the passage-independent test items on the post lecture comprehension test. Those EFL subjects who listened to the familiar-topic lecture on Confucius had higher passage-independent than passage-dependent scores. There was no difference in the performance on the passage-independent and passage-dependent items of those who listened to the lecture on an unfamiliar topic (the Amish). However, the passage-independent performance of subjects who listened to the familiar topic lecture was superior to that of those who listened to the lecture on the unfamiliar topic. Subjects' performance on passage-dependent items did not differ significantly whether the familiar or unfamiliar topic was presented. Implications of the findings for assessing and teaching EFL listening comprehension are suggested.</p>
<p>Gibbons, P. (2009). <i>English learners, academic literacy, and thinking</i>. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.</p>	Theoretical	<p>Deep understanding, critical thinking, subject knowledge, and control of academic literacy are goals held for all students. Educators face challenges in finding a way to help everyone, including English Language Learners (ELLs), reach these high expectations. This book presents an action-oriented approach that gives ELLs high-level support to match high expectations. The author details five broad areas that enable ELLs in the middle grades to participate in high-quality learning across the curriculum. She then presents guidelines on designing long-term, high-quality instruction that simultaneously provides explicit scaffolding for ELLs.</p>

<p>Moschkovich, J. (2012). Mathematics, the Common Core, and Language: Recommendations for Mathematics Instruction for ELs Aligned with the Common Core. In K. Hakuta & M. Santo (Eds.), <i>Understanding language: Commissioned papers on language and literacy issues in the Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards</i> (pp. 17-31). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University.</p>	<p>Theoretical</p>	<p>Within the framework of the Common Core Standards for Mathematics, the author addresses three main questions. (1) How can instruction provide opportunities for mathematical reasoning and sense making for ELLs? (2) What instructional strategies support ELLs' mathematical reasoning and sense-making skills? (3) How can instruction help ELLs communicate their reasoning effectively in multiple ways? The central recommendation is that teachers prioritize communication about mathematical concepts over low-level language skills by encouraging all students, regardless of their English proficiency level, to participate in conceptual discussions in which sophistication of mathematical reasoning, rather than pronunciation or vocabulary, is emphasized. The author notes the difficulty in assessing ELLs' content knowledge, apart from their fluency in English-based expression or comprehension.</p>
<p>Nee-Benham, M. K. P. (2002) <i>Indigenous educational models for contemporary practice: In our mother's voice</i>. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.</p>	<p>Theoretical</p>	<p>This book offers an answer to the question, "What is the philosophy that should drive native education policy and practice?" In July of 1997, a group of native educational leaders from the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand gathered to define a potential solution to this question. This book presents the individual educational philosophies of the participants and frames these philosophies in a holistic model, "Go to the Source." This model offers a collective vision of native language- and culture-based educational philosophy that should inform the work of educational leaders, teachers, policymakers, and curriculum developers.</p>
<p>Quinn, H., Lee, O., & Valdes, G. (2012). Language Demands and Opportunities in Relation to Next Generation Science Standards for English Language Learners: What Teachers Need to Know. In K. Hakuta & M. Santo (Eds.), <i>Understanding language: Commissioned papers on language and literacy issues in the Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards</i> (32-43). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University.</p>	<p>Theoretical</p>	<p>The authors address learning opportunities for ELLs in English-speaking classrooms in which the Next Generation Science Standards have been adopted according to the framework for K-12 science education set forth by the National Research Council in 2011. This framework calls for "inquiry-based science," which refers to a set of science and engineering practices that mirror what scientists do as they engage in scientific inquiry. The authors see a clear parallel between inquiry-based learning and ELLs' need to use language meaningfully in context. Instructional situations in which students are required to speak, listen, read, and write about science promote language development and content learning. The authors do not ask that science teachers function as language teachers, but rather that they support the language learning that occurs in a content-rich and discourse-rich classroom environment.</p>
<p>Savignon, S. J. (1991). Communicative language teaching: State of the art. <i>TESOL Quarterly</i>, 25(2), 261–278.</p>	<p>Theoretical</p>	<p>This paper looks briefly at the beginnings of what has come to be known as communicative language teaching (CLT) and discusses current issues and promising avenues of inquiry. From an international perspective, the author argues that CLT is not a British, European, or U.S. phenomenon, but rather an international effort to respond to the needs of present-day language learners in many different contexts of learning.</p>
<p>Walqui, A., & Heritage, M. (2012). Instruction for diverse groups of English language learners. In K. Hakuta & M. Santo (Eds.), <i>Understanding language: Commissioned papers on language and literacy issues in the Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards</i> (pp. 93-104). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University.</p>	<p>Theoretical</p>	<p>In an effort to aid teachers in the complex challenge of providing ELLs with opportunities that allow them to attain the Common Core State Standards despite their various needs and abilities, the authors outline five principles of classroom instruction. These principles, which stress sensitivity and responsiveness to individual students, include the significance of prior knowledge in the learning process, the connection between language and cognition, and the importance of contextualizing learning.</p>

Important Presentation Web Links

- NEPF Overview and timeline:
[http://www.doe.nv.gov/Educator_Development_and_Support/Nevada_Educator_Performance_Framework\(NEPF\)/](http://www.doe.nv.gov/Educator_Development_and_Support/Nevada_Educator_Performance_Framework(NEPF)/)
- 2018-2019 Protocols:
http://www.doe.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/ndedoenvgov/content/Educator_Effectiveness/Educator_Develop_Support/NEPF/Tools_Protocols/NEPFTeacher_Admin_Protocolsrev.pdf
- Administrator Instructional Leadership Rubric:
http://www.doe.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/ndedoenvgov/content/Educator_Effectiveness/Educator_Develop_Support/NEPF/Administrator/Admin_Instructional_Leadership_Rubric2017.pdf
- Administrator Professional Responsibilities Rubric:
http://www.doe.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/ndedoenvgov/content/Educator_Effectiveness/Educator_Develop_Support/NEPF/Administrator/Admin_Professional_Responsibilities_Rubric2017.pdf
- Teacher Instructional Practice Rubric:
http://www.doe.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/ndedoenvgov/content/Educator_Effectiveness/Educator_Develop_Support/NEPF/Teacher/Teacher-Instructional%20Practice%20Rubric.pdf
- Teacher Professional Responsibilities Rubric:
http://www.doe.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/ndedoenvgov/content/Educator_Effectiveness/Educator_Develop_Support/NEPF/Teacher/Teacher-Professional%20Responsibilities%20Rubric.pdf
- Teacher Self-Assessment Tool:
http://www.doe.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/ndedoenvgov/content/Educator_Effectiveness/Educator_Develop_Support/NEPF/Teacher/1TCHSelfAssessmentTool.docx
- Teacher Pre-Post Observation Conference Tool:
http://www.doe.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/ndedoenvgov/content/Educator_Effectiveness/Educator_Develop_Support/NEPF/Teacher/3TCHPre_Post_ObservationConferenceTool.docx
- Teacher Observation / Evidence Review Tool:
http://www.doe.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/ndedoenvgov/content/Educator_Effectiveness/Educator_Develop_Support/NEPF/Teacher/4TCHObs_EvidenceReviewTool.docx
- Teacher Summative Evaluation Tool:
http://www.doe.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/ndedoenvgov/content/Educator_Effectiveness/Educator_Develop_Support/NEPF/Teacher/6TCHSummEvalScoringToolupdatedrev.docx
- NV ELD Standards:
[http://www.doe.nv.gov/English_Language_Learners\(ELL\)/ELD_Standards/](http://www.doe.nv.gov/English_Language_Learners(ELL)/ELD_Standards/)