



**NEVADA**  
**Department of**  
**Education**

**NEVADA EDUCATOR PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK (NEPF)**  
**Monitoring for Continuous Improvement Survey**  
**Guidance Document**

**2024**

## 2024 Monitoring for Continuous Improvement Survey

Continuous improvement requires specific measurable goals, the flexibility to test evidence-based solutions, time to research and implement strategies, and the collection and use of data (Best & Dunlap, 2014). Assessing educators' performance — and using that data to guide their professional growth and development — can build and sustain a workforce driven by continuous improvement, so that instruction improves and each student is afforded access to highly effective educators (LeFloch et al., 2016).

Nevada law requires that all local education agencies (LEAs) in the state “annually review the manner in which schools carry out the evaluation of teachers and administrators pursuant to the statewide performance evaluation system” known as the Nevada Educator Performance Framework, or NEPF (NRS Chapter 391.485). To support this work, the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) is seeking to promote deep local analysis and use of NEPF results to drive continuous improvement.

This document provides guidance that LEA leaders should use to conduct their annual NEPF reviews and advance local continuous improvement-centered action planning. It includes the minimum required survey questions for LEAs to administer (beginning in spring 2019) to their teachers and administrators regarding local NEPF outcomes, along with links to relevant resources and guidance for LEA leaders to review their available data and assess whether their local NEPF implementation is accomplishing its intended goals.

To support this work, NDE will offer a range of technical assistance options, including but not limited to:

- Quarterly meetings with District NEPF Liaisons to provide guidance for implementation,
- Support with online survey administration and the analysis of results,
- Professional development on data analysis and continuous improvement provided by the Department with external technical assistance partners, and
- Facilitation of focus groups to examine local NEPF implementation issues.

As part of the implementation of this guidance, NDE officials will also conduct annual, separate, structured interviews with leaders from each of Nevada's 17 school districts to explore the local use of NEPF results and survey data for continuous improvement (see page 8), as well as to identify additional supports that NDE can provide to LEAs to advance the goals of NEPF. NEPF results, survey data, and interview feedback will be reported to the Nevada State Board of Education and to the Nevada Teachers and Leaders Council.

For further information or assistance regarding this guidance, please contact:

- Kathleen Galland-Collins ([kgcollins@doe.nv.gov](mailto:kgcollins@doe.nv.gov))
- Kathryn Hoyt ([kathryn.hoyt@doe.nv.gov](mailto:kathryn.hoyt@doe.nv.gov))

## Questions for ALL Educators

Given the NEPF system's core goals of improving instructional practice and informing professional growth, educators' perceptions of how well their evaluation system is functioning can provide valuable insights for the LEA leaders charged with implementing and overseeing the system. A local staff survey that poses the following questions of the NEPF-evaluated **educators** in the LEA is a direct way to gather these perceptions.

1. Which district do you work for? *[drop-down]*
2. How would you characterize the grade span of your school? *[Elementary/ Middle/ High/ Combined]*
3. Which school/s do you work at (optional)? *[Optional question]*
4. How long have you been in your current position? *[Three Years or Less/ Four Years or More]*
5. What is your current position?
  - Administrator *[go to 18]*
  - Audiologist *[go to 6]*
  - School Counselor *[go to 6]*
  - School Nurse *[go to 6]*
  - School Psychologist *[go to 6]*
  - School Social Worker *[go to 6]*
  - Teacher *[go to 6]*
  - Teacher-Librarian *[go to 6]*

## Local Teacher Survey

Answer the following questions based on your own NEPF evaluation cycle experience conducted by your designated supervisor(s): (self-assessment; pre-evaluation conference, goal setting (if applicable), and plan development; plan implementation - observations, review of evidence, and conferences; mid-cycle review; summative evaluation and post-evaluation conference).

6. What was your status during the 2023-24 school year? *[Probationary/ Post-Probationary]*
7. Were you evaluated with the NEPF during the 2023-24 school year? *[Yes/ No: exempt due to two previous years of 'highly effective' rating (go to 10)/ No: other reason described below (include an open response box (go to 36))]*
8. My evaluation was fair. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree]*
9. My evaluation was focused more on my professional growth rather than on awarding a score or rating. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree]*
10. My NEPF evaluation cycle experience helped me identify my areas of growth as an educator. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree]*
11. My NEPF evaluation cycle experience took a reasonable amount of my time. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree]*
12. My designated evaluator(s) were well-trained in conducting the NEPF evaluation cycle. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree]*

13. The Student Learning Goal (SLG) process was used to drive my planning and instruction throughout the year. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree/Not applicable (did not participate in the SLG process for the 2023-24 school year)]*
14. The feedback I received during my NEPF evaluation cycle experience positively impacted my students' learning. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree/ Did not receive feedback]*
15. The feedback I received during my NEPF evaluation cycle experience positively impacted my instructional practice. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree/ Did not receive feedback]*
16. I had access to the professional development (formal or informal) that was necessary to implement the feedback and/or directives provided during my NEPF evaluation cycle. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree] (go to 36)*

## Local Administrator Survey

Answer the following questions based on your own NEPF evaluation cycle experience conducted by your designated supervisor(s): (self-assessment; pre-evaluation conference, goal setting (if applicable), and plan development; plan implementation - observations, review of evidence, and conferences; mid-cycle review; summative evaluation and post-evaluation conference).

17. What was your status during the 2023-24 school year? *[Probationary/ Post-Probationary]*
18. Were you evaluated by your supervisor(s) using the NEPF during the 2023-24 school year? *[Yes/ No: exempt due to two previous years of "highly effective" rating (go to 21)/ No: other reason described below (include an open response box; go to 25)]*
19. My evaluation was fair. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree]*
20. My evaluation was focused more on my professional growth rather than awarding a score or rating. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree]*
21. NEPF evaluation cycle experience helped me identify areas of growth as an administrator. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree]*
22. The feedback I received during my NEPF evaluation cycle experience positively impacted my instructional leadership practice. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree/ Did not receive feedback]*
23. I had access to the professional development (formal or informal) that was necessary to implement the feedback and/or directives provided during my NEPF evaluation cycle. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree]*
24. The Student Learning Goal (SLG) process was used to drive my instructional leadership practices throughout the year. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree/ Not applicable (did not participate in the SLG process for the 2023-24 school year)]*

Answer the following questions based on your experiences using the NEPF for teacher evaluation during the 2023-24 school year.

25. Do you evaluate teachers using the NEPF? *[Yes/ No (go to 36)]*
26. How many teachers did you evaluate using the NEPF during the 2023-24 school year?
27. On average, the time I spent on the NEPF evaluation cycle for each teacher was reasonable. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree]*
28. NRS 391.465 requires the addition of a class size adjustment on the summative evaluation for all eligible teachers. On average, how much additional time, if any, do you believe it took you to understand the new process, assist your educators to understand the new process, and to physically complete the summative evaluations for the teachers you supervised? *[No additional time/ Minimal additional time (5-10 minutes per teacher)/ Considerable additional time (15-20 minutes per teacher)/ Substantial additional time (25 minutes or more per teacher)]*
29. I have received adequate training in order to provide meaningful professional feedback to all my teachers as part of the NEPF evaluation cycle. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree]*

30. I was able to successfully guide teachers through the Student Learning Goal (SLG) process. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree]*
31. On average, the teachers I evaluated using the NEPF set rigorous SLGs based on data from the previous year. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree]*
32. The implementation of the NEPF is positively impacting student learning at my school(s). *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree]*
33. The implementation of the NEPF evaluation cycle is positively impacting teachers' instructional practice at my school(s). *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree]*
34. At my school(s), the NEPF evaluation cycle guides individual teachers' professional learning. *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree]*
35. At my school(s), NEPF data is used to determine which teachers would be good candidates for teacher leadership roles (e.g., mentors for novice teachers). *[Strongly agree/ Agree/ Disagree/ Strongly disagree]*
36. Please use this opportunity to share any additional comments/suggestions related to the implementation of the NEPF evaluation cycle experience that have not been addressed through the survey or on which you would like to elaborate.

**Table: Questions for Potential Comparisons of Teacher/Administrator Perceptions of NEPF Implementation**

Question Topic	Teacher Question/s	Administrator Question(s)
Fairness of evaluation	8	19
Focus on score or growth	9	20
Identifying areas of growth	10	21
Amount of time	11	27, 28
Adequacy of evaluator training	12	29
Student Learning Goal (SLG)	13	24, 30, 31
Positive impact on student learning	14	32
Positive impact on practice	15	22, 33
Access to professional development	16	23, 34

## Guidance for Self-Assessment of Local NEPF System

The LEA leaders charged with implementing and overseeing the local NEPF system implementation should review these teacher and administrator survey results alongside other relevant local information (e.g., NEPF rating distributions, results from the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF), recent professional development or school performance plans, local coaching/mentoring data, etc.) to self-assess whether the local implementation of the evaluation system is functioning effectively in contributing to the LEA talent management system, and/or to consider what adjustments are needed to drive continuous improvement.

The following questions can help guide this review process:

- Did we hear from enough of our educators? Was the survey response rate over 70 percent? If not, whose perspective are we lacking? How can we ensure a higher response rate in the future?
- What's going well? What isn't going well?
  - Did at least 65 percent of our teachers and administrators agree that their evaluations:
    - Were fair and took up a reasonable amount of time?
    - Helped identify areas of growth and targeted professional development options?
    - Improved their practice?
    - Positively impacted student learning?
  - Did the survey results differ between teachers and principals, or by grade span or experience level within each group? In what ways?
  - If our educators do not perceive things as going well, do we know why?
  - How can we learn more about the root cause(s) of these problems, perhaps through focus groups facilitated by an external partner (e.g., NDE)?
  - To what extent are we seeing alignment between school-level results from the NEPF and NSPF systems? Why do we think this is the case?
- Are we making the best use of NEPF data in our LEA? Do leaders have ongoing access to multiyear NEPF data to inform decisions related to hiring, staffing, developing, and supporting educators?
  - Are we using our local NEPF data to:
    - Differentiate professional learning for our educators?
    - Determine which teachers would be good candidates for teacher leadership roles (e.g., mentors for novice teachers)?
- To what extent is our local NEPF system accomplishing its goals?
  - What strengths did we identify?
    - What evidence do we have to support this?
  - What do we need to adjust/refine in our system to increase its effectiveness?
    - What evidence do we have to support this?
  - What are our next action steps?
    - What can we build on? What other (internal/external/NDE) resources are needed?
  - How will we know we are making an impact?



## Sources

- Best, J. & Dunlap, A., (2014). Continuous improvement in schools and districts: Policy considerations. Denver, CO: McREL International. Online at <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED557599.pdf>.
- Center on Great Teachers and Leaders. (2019). Educator effectiveness systems assessment. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
- Cherasaro, T. L., Brodersen, R. M., Yanoski, D. C., Welp, L. C., & Reale, M. L. (2015). The examining evaluator feedback survey (REL 2016–100). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Regional Educational Laboratory Central. Online at <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED561139.pdf>.
- Goe, L., Wylie, C., Bosso, D. & Olson, D. (2017). State of the states’ teacher evaluation and support systems: A perspective from exemplary teachers. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. Online at [https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/RR-17-30\\_Executive\\_Summary.pdf](https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/RR-17-30_Executive_Summary.pdf).
- LeFloch, K., Garcia A., & Barbour, C. (2016). Want to improve low-performing schools? Focus on the adults. Washington, D.C.: Education Policy Center at American Institutes of Research. Online at <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED571848.pdf>.
- Makkonen, R. (2015). Making meaningful use of teacher effectiveness data. San Francisco: WestEd. [https://relwest\\_production.s3.amazonaws.com/resources/193/Teacher\\_Evaluation\\_Infographic-Reino-final\\_508\\_20150529.pdf?1432947237](https://relwest_production.s3.amazonaws.com/resources/193/Teacher_Evaluation_Infographic-Reino-final_508_20150529.pdf?1432947237).

## Additional Related Supports

- NEPF Tools & Protocols:  
[http://www.doe.nv.gov/Educator\\_Development\\_and\\_Support/Nevada\\_Educator\\_Performance\\_Frame\\_work\(NEPF\)/](http://www.doe.nv.gov/Educator_Development_and_Support/Nevada_Educator_Performance_Frame_work(NEPF)/)
- REL West Teacher Effectiveness Data Use (Video) Workshop:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SNWryKzRhWY>