

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

**August 29, 2018**

**9:00 a.m.**

**MINUTES**

**Call to Order; Roll Call; Pledge of Allegiance**

**Members Present:**

**Las Vegas:**

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

**Carson City:** (sign in sheet missing after meeting)

- DeeAnn Roberts
- Teri White
- Brian Rippet

**Elko:**

- Jim Cooney

**Staff:**

- David Gardner –Senior Deputy Attorney General

**Public:**

**Las Vegas:**

- Karen Stanley
- Kenny Belknap
- Alex Bybee
- Chris Day
- Bill Garis

**Public Comment #1**

**Elko:**

No public comment.

**Las Vegas:**

Kenny Belknap, Clark County School District teacher and Teach Plus policy fellow, Teach Plus is a national organization that empowers teacher leaders to reach out to lawmakers and decision makers to help shape good policies that affect students. A group of the Teach Plus fellows are working in the NEPF space. We are strong believers in it and want to help the state realize it's goal to become the fastest improving state in the nation. We believe the NEPF can be an effective tool to help improve educator practice and want to help it realize its true potential. We believe it has the capability to help all educators improve their craft and positively impact student learning. We want to work with all of you to help it realize its full potential. We want to be thought partners in how to make the implementation of it more effective for our students. Nevada has the people and the tools to make it the fastest improving in the nation we just have to work together.

**Carson City:**

Jose Delfin, Associate Superintendent for Carson City School District, Administrative kick-off meeting was held and upon review of NEPF it was noticed there were no cut scores for Ineffective, Developing Effective and Highly Effective. He asks the TLC to finalize those cut scores as soon as possible.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes for May 23, 2018 (Discussion/For Possible Action)**

Member Brian Rippet clarified on agenda item #11. He doesn't believe the minutes captured his intent. Even though all teachers should be held to the same standards, but not expected with the same results for new teachers.

**Motion**

Member White moved for approval of meeting minutes with corrections

Member Rippet seconded the motion

All in favor

**Motion** carried unanimously.

## **Nevada Department of Education - Updates** *(Information/Discussion/Possible Action)*

Kathleen Galland-Collins, Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Educator Development & Support gave updates.

Eboni Caridine, Education Programs Professional, has left NDE. Interviews for the position will be held within the next week or so. NEPF now consists of 10 frameworks. All the 2018-2019 tools and protocols are available on the webpage including the two frameworks that are being field tested this year. The field test for the principle supervisors and audiologists are scheduled to move forward this year. Chair Salazar is working closely with NDE on the principal supervisor field test. Member Collins is working with Dr. Hornby-Daniels on the field test of the audiologist framework.

A guidance memo regarding NEPF changes of the 2018-2019 school year is expected to be released soon. It is in its final revision with NDE leadership.

The 2017-2018 NEPF data collection took longer this year due to the inclusion of the educators that were exempt from a summative evaluation. The exemption piece in NRS391.690 states if a teacher or administrator has a highly effective rating for two consecutive years then they can be exempt from the summative evaluation in that third year, but are not exempt from the observation cycle. They still need to go through all the formative components of the evaluation. Member Collins suggested members review the materials for agenda item 4 for details on the preliminary results for 2017-2018 Teacher NEPF ratings data. The Council will determine the summative scoring ranges for each rating at the next meeting Member Collins stated that per the changes made during the 2017 Legislative Session the Student learning goal/Student Performance Domain is 40% (up from last year's 20%). The Educational Practice Category is now weighted at 60% with the Instructional Practice/Instructional Leadership Domain is weighted at 45% and Professional Responsibilities Domain weighted at 15%. All this will be in the guidance memo to the districts. NEPF Liaisons will be given the information in an upcoming meeting.

Chair Salazar has introduced the Principal Supervisor framework to be field tested to the Principal Supervisors in Clark County School District. Dr. Gullette with the Clark County School District suggested that NASS President White add the principal supervisor field test to the agenda for the October NASS meeting.

Member Small asked if the guidance document will be out before the next meeting. Member Collins stated the guidance memo regarding changes required by the passage of AB320 should be going out within the next few days. Liaisons know the Tools and Protocols are online and updated.

Member White asked if the guidance memo will not have the rating cut scores in it because TLC has taken no action in moving those forward and it probably won't have them until after the November meeting. Member Collins stated that is correct. Member White stated that is problematic for schools, teachers, is difficult and not fair. Educators should know coming into the school year what their cut scores are going to be. Member White would like to move that forward next year so those decisions are made at the first meeting to ensure the information is shared sooner rather than later. Member Smith asked if there should be a meeting before the November meeting to make the recommendations. Member Collins responded that she will look into available dates.

Member Collins reported that the SB497 Task Force on School Leader Management has been meeting monthly. They are in the process of studying what it is to be a school leader in Nevada and make recommendations to legislature on budget, policy, regulations or statute regarding the recruitment, preparation, licensure, professional development, evaluation, and compensation of school leaders. Information was heard in last week's Task Force meeting on the comparisons of job descriptions, salary ranges and demographics of administrators across the state.

The next TLC meeting date is scheduled for November 28. A Meeting will be scheduled prior to that to go over cut scores decisions made. After November the meetings are scheduled for February 27<sup>th</sup> and May 22<sup>nd</sup>. Member Metcalf asked when that just added meeting will be. Member Collins stated probably late September or early October to give time to analyze the data.

## **NEPF Preliminary Survey Results** *(Information/Discussion/Possible Action)*

Kathleen Galland-Collins, Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Educator Development & Support. The NEPF Questionnaire/Survey was sent out to both teachers and administrators in May of 2018. The presentations for this agenda item contain the preliminary results.

For the teacher survey there were 4,523 total responses and 3,279 complete responses. Member Collins went over the survey questions and asked members to review the data and provide feedback or share thoughts regarding what the data may indicate. Member Cooney had a concern with question #29. There isn't a clear cut approach that the districts are taking. Member Rippet pointed out questions #24 and #25 where 40% of respondents disagreed that it positively impacts student learning and/or instructional practice had the highest negative responses. Member White stated only 15% of educators are responding which seems to be a big concern. The question is how to increase response rate. Maybe timing of survey and when it went out could be a reason. Could there be better results sending the survey out in the fall? Member Collins suggested March or April. Member Rippet likes the idea of sending survey at the beginning of the school year and suggests including the Teacher Associations to help with the survey.

Member Small stated CCEA really pushed this and that might be the reason why Clark had such a high response. He stated that he is hoping districts will share and look at the reasons why some are not taking the survey. He doesn't believe it is the timing of the survey but is more the perception of the importance of the survey. Member Marshner asked if there was information regarding other trainings anywhere and/or what teachers are spending time preparing for their supervisor. Member Collins answered that the survey doesn't ask what they were preparing only the amount of time spent preparing items for their supervisor. In answer to the other question, if they submitted a short answer response then we'd have that information. Member Collins will contact Member Rippet next time the survey goes out to help reach the associations up in the north. Member Cooney found it concerning to see the number of non-respondents on several of the questions. What assessment tools are the districts using in helping students?

Member Collins went on to present the results of the building administrator survey. She stated that she didn't have the exact number of building administrators at this time but was estimating the total to be around 1,400. The total number of respondents to the administrator survey was 448. Member Smith asked what percentage of total administrators in the state took the survey. Member Collins stated that information isn't available, but will have the answer at the next meeting. Member Metcalf believes it would be interesting to see how responses differed if at all on the basis of the number of Inter-rater Reliability trainings people attended. It would also be interesting to look if there are differences across geographic settings. Member Small stated it would be interesting to do a comparison between the two along with a comparison between this year and last year. He is confused with question #14, who your supervisor is. Maybe there needs to be clarification on some of the questions. Member Collins stated there were some definitions given. Member Cooney commented on question 17 about the SLGs up from 20% to 40% with administrators. Would like a better understanding of how they are using SLGs. Chair Salazar responded that speaking from the RPDP side, they suggest using an aggregate of a sub group of teachers and the assessments that those teachers are using. Most states approach it this way. Member Smith would like to know if there is a guidance memo to administrators or principal supervisors for establishing that type of Student Learning Goal. Chair Salazar stated within NEPF protocol there is an outline of the process of the Student Learning Goals. Member Collins stated that the Goal Setting and Planning Tool, available online, has step by step instructions, guiding questions and criteria to help guide SLG development. It is located on the NDE website under NEPF Tools and Protocols. Member Marshner believes it is important to see how the teachers see Inter-rater Reliability as the weakest and the administrators think the trainings were sufficient. Member White stated in her district some of the concern around Inter-rate Reliability is not within a building but from school to school. Administrators within a building have strong Inter-rate Reliability but there is a disconnect is from site to site.

### **NEPF Implementation: Requirement of Local School Boards** (*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*)

Kathleen Galland-Collins, Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Educator Development & Support. Any decisions made can be included in the guidance memo that will go out to the districts. Member Collins reviewed Department's responsibility by sharing the language from AB320(2017) and clarified that the responsibility of the local school board to monitoring the NEPF and explained that it is more about the implementation of rather than the impact of the evaluation system.

The presentation included the guiding questions from the previous meeting with are: The local school boards will identify:

- What evidence is there that district NEPF implementation aligns with applicable NRS and NAC?
- How has the district used the NEPF system results to improve educator practice?
- What areas of NEPF implementation does the district need to focus on to potentially see greater improvement in student performance and educator practice?
- What resources are needed in order to increase fidelity of NEPF system implementation?

Member White asked about the evidence school board members need to report back to the Department. Member Collins will need to discuss that with Dena Durish and Dr. Canavero. At the least it should be the agenda and may possibly include back-up documents for when they discuss NEPF implementation. NDE leadership will make the final decision. Member Metcalf asked to consider including a question that paralleled the first question but asks what evidence is there that the NEPF has helped the district improve student performance. Chair Salazar stated that question was included in the early drafts but can be brought to the council again. Member Cooney agrees with goal #1 which addresses student learning and growth. Member Collins stated it can be taken to NDE leadership to see if it's allowable. Member White questions TLC or NDE's authority over State Boards and believes it is up to local boards and will abstain from any vote. Member Smith would like to know what is the role of NEPF liaisons with local school boards and how are they educated on the NEPF? Is there a process for NEPF liaisons to answer questions for local school boards? Member Collins stated it is up to the individual district and the NEPF liaison regarding what their role is within that district. She clarified that the item is on the agenda at the request of NDE asking TLC, as NEPF experts, to suggest

some guiding questions. Member White suggests if guidance is needed from TLC then it is welcomed, but without inquiry to superintendents feels “her toes are a little stepped on.” Member Cooney agrees with Member White and feels they do not need to get involved in this as TLC. Member Metcalf wants to know if the local boards have to report these data to anyone or is it merely internally. Member Collins discussed the section in AB320 that gives the department authority to review the manner in which the statewide performance evaluation system is carried out. Member White agrees with Member Collins last comment. There is nothing in legislation that prescribes for any school board the manner in which they monitor that. Believes it is up to local control. Member Collins responded that she believes that the questions are not mandated but are guiding questions that come from the department on what districts may choose to discuss. Member Metcalf thinks they are getting in the middle of something they have not been directed to do. The Board is responsible for reviewing, implication not a stipulation, about getting information from local school boards. He is inclined to say unless the board directed them to provide some recommendations how that might be done it would be wise to back away from this one. Deputy Attorney General David Gardner mentioned a section of law he believes is pertinent to this. NRS 391.465 is what the NEPF was based on and why TLC is involved. Member Smith wondered if it would help to pre-face the guiding questions with a statement that says they don’t have to be used but merely a suggestion of what could be helpful. Member Collins stated they could change the wording from “will” to “may” and those would be suggestions the State Board can decide to use or not use. Member Cooney likes changing the word to may. Deputy Attorney General Gardner stated the TLC could decide on making this recommendation and then the Department could bring it in for their review. Chair Salazar stated the first question is does TLC want to make a recommendation to the Department. If the vote is in favor of making a recommendation, then the Council can discuss the details.

#### **Motion**

Chair Salazar would like to entertain a motion for TLC’s willingness to make a recommendation to the Nevada Department of Education with regards to guiding questions for local school boards per AB320.

Member Small made a motion to have TLC make a recommendation to provide guidance to the Nevada Department of Education to regarding the local school board requirements outlined in AB320.

Member Smith seconded the motion

Members voted, the outcome was unclear, a roll call vote was taken. The results are below:

Member Cooney votes no-Member Collins votes yes, Member Roberts votes no, Member White votes no, Chair Salazar votes yes, Member Small votes yes, Member Marshner votes yes, Member Rippet votes no, Member Smith votes yes.

Yea-5, Nay-4

**Motion passed.**

Chair Salazar opened the discussion on the guiding questions. Members discussed how NEPF implementation positively impacts the district wide goals of the board, vision of the board or how it would be useful to a board member. Chair Salazar stated the intent of the second question is around improving teacher practice and student results. She commented regarding section 1.22 of AB320, which discusses the manner in which schools and school districts carry out the evaluation. She believes the guidance should be related to that manner. Member Collins stated NRS and NAC cover everything else. Chair Salazar stated maybe it should just be question #1, the responsibility is to ensure compliance with the NAC and NRS.

#### **Motion**

Member Collins recommends that the TLC provide guidance to the Department of Education only on question 1 that is listed on the supporting documents. The other three questions will be removed.

Member Small seconded the motion.

Member voted with Members White and Cooney opposed.

**Motion passed.**

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

*(Information/Discussion)* Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair; Dr. Sarah Negrete, Director, Northeastern RPDP; Kirsten Gleissner, Director, Northwestern RPDP; Dr. Chelli Smith, Director, Southern RPDP. Members will receive an overview and updates of regional training activities that occurred since the previous meeting. Possible Actions include approval of regional activities or recommendations for improvements.

Kirsten Gleissner gave a brief summary of NEPF projects since June. Extra administrator funds were awarded, so arrangements were made to provide professional learning focused on supervision for administrators regionally. These opportunities were well attended. To kick off the school year, new teacher training was provided during August focusing on the NEPF, approximately 150 teachers attended from across the rural districts. Coming up for administrators is individualized coaching and mentoring options to support the observation and analysis of teaching, coaching and feedback. Leading for Impact is being offered again. At the moment information is being collected to see if that is wanted.

Learning focused supervision will be offered in two of the districts. NEPF is the focus on the trainings. NEPF is included in all of the content trainings of when it is appropriate to connect the content with the standards and the training is continued on an ongoing basis. A PowerPoint has been developed to be used for guiding trainings for newest members of OLEP.

Karen Stanley from SNRPDP spoke. She stated that administrator training occurred during which the morning session had 132 administrators participating in a leadership series based on leadership standards and focused on the six leadership practices. In the afternoon the focus was the student learning goals which had 157 participants in that training. Training continued through June. SLG training continued throughout August with request for additional training on September 11<sup>th</sup>. All the trainings are located on the SNRPDP website under NEPF administrator tools. The Inter-rater Reliability training is still being offered. RPDP staff have met with the School Administrator Superintendents (SAS) in August and discussed SLGs, and working with CPD. The SAS presented to their zones within the last few weeks regarding SLG expectations and are focused on the college and career readiness anchor standards. RPDP staff reached out to the rural counties advising them of what is being offered. Member Small asked Karen if the associate superintendents have received any training on the NEPF for principal supervisors. Has that been looked at in detail through your training? Karen stated not yet but it is soon to come. Chair Salazar presented an introduction about the field test of the Principal Supervisor Standards.

Sarah Negrete was unable to attend meeting but shared information with Chair Salazar to present. A half day workshop was held with administrators and new teachers for Humboldt County School District. RPDP staff lead several workshops for new teachers to familiarize them with NEPF Instructional Practice Standards. A brief overview of NEPF was provided to new teachers in Lander County School District. Northeast RPDP launched Cohort 5 of the Teacher Academy in which 28 teachers dive deeply into understanding NEPF standards and the qualitative differences of performance levels at the indicator level. RPDP is planning with White Pine County to determine how mentors can assist in new teacher understanding of the NEPF. They have linked the professional responsibilities to two day family partnership classes and integrated NEPF into other content area training that they've provided. Several of the activities and opportunities happen throughout the school year as requested by the region's districts.

### **2019 Legislative Session Considerations** (*Information/Discussion*) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

Items discussed included the addition of Principal Supervisor and Other Licensed Education Personnel (OLEP) in NRS language, funding for more precise monitoring of implementation and impact of NEPF, a different rating system for probationary teachers that are more in the developing stage, and that professional development is a must for complete implementation. Chair Salazar asked council if there are any other areas to consider. She stated that one of the questions to consider is: Is SLG weighted too much at 40% or should it be 20% as recommended at the last legislative session? Member Collins talked about NRS 391.675 regarding the evaluations of counselors, librarians and certain OLEP gave the State Board the authority to ask us to develop the frameworks for OLEP. The rest of the NRS for evaluations is about teachers or administrators, no other mention of OLEPs or principal supervisors. Sections should be added for those two particular groups so that NRS is guiding that work. Member Small discussed funding for training. He spoke with some OLEPs who are concerned about their supervisors, requesting a supervisor who is actually within their profession and what trainings are given to those building leaders that are evaluating OLEP in the building. He believes it is an important conversation to have around how educators are evaluated and who evaluates them. Should the Council consider that to be part of statute or something districts are encouraged to do? Member Small also commented on the survey data that was reviewed earlier regarding Inter-rater Reliability and the unintended consequences of SLGs. He stated that the question is how to legislate the practice of the districts. Member Marshner stated from a teacher's standpoint all the topics are very important and she supports moving forward with looking at them at the next meeting. Chair Salazar stated this agenda item will be at the next meeting.

### **National Issues and Legal Landscape** (*Information/Discussion*)

Chair Salazar reviewed a study by Rand on the Gates Teacher Effectiveness study released on June 21. She stated that the study showed that "you can't do something to people, must be with people." The study also showed systems based on growth and development work over those that are punitive or focused on removing people. National Education Policy Center (NEPC) out of Colorado released a study on state level assessments and teacher evaluation systems after ESSA. States looked at what has been the trend since ESSA. Key findings include: when systems are built around growth and improvement they are more likely to positively impact student learning. 31 states have moved away from student assessment data to Student Learning Goals and are moving to supporting teachers through formative assessments and looking at systems to help teachers improve. As a result it was found that more teachers that are ineffective are leaving the profession. It was detrimental when using state assessments to retaining teachers when recruiting teachers into the profession.

### **Future Agenda Items** (*Information/Discussion*) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

- Deeper analysis of survey data.

- Cut scores due to survey reports finalized.
- Cut scores for OLEPs.
- Review of NRS items that show bifurcation.
- Legislative changes needed.
- NEPF data.

Member Collins formally introduced Stacey “Dallas” Johnston as NDE’s inaugural Teacher Leader in Residence. Dallas comes with many years of experience and will share the work of the NDE with her colleagues in the field.

**Public Comment #2 Pursuant to NRS 391.544**

**Carson City:**

Jose Delfin, Carson City School District Associate Superintendent, would like to know how the NEPF affects him since he has multiple roles and supervises a handful of departments. He stated that he would like guidance from the TLC for people like him that have many roles outside of principal supervision. Member Collins stated that she was not sure if there is talk of expanding NEPF to include those other roles, and suggested that he or someone in similar role volunteer to be part of the field test for the principal supervisor framework. Participation in the field test would allow them to provide recommendations on what may need to change based on experience during the field test. Member Small stated that he appreciates the feedback.

**Elko:**

No public comment.

**Las Vegas:**

No public comment.

Adjournment

**Meeting adjourned at approximately 11:51 AM.**