

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)  
SEPTEMBER 27, 2017  
9:00 A.M.**

**MINUTES DRAFT**

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

Meeting called to order at 9:09 AM

Pledge of allegiance

**Roll Call:**

**Members Present:**

**Las Vegas:**

- Barbara Barker
- Veronica Frenkel
- Jim Cooney
- Kathleen Galland-Collins
- Gabe Gonzalez
- Terri Janison
- Teri White
- Pam Salazar
- Theo Small
- Anthony Nunez
- Brian Rippet
- Michele Sanchez-Boyce

**Staff:**

- Eboni Caridine
- Raven Cole
- Greg Ott

**Public:**

**Las Vegas:**

- Zane Gray
- Kim Mangino
- Lisa Guzman
- Bill Garis
- Lisa Ramirez
- Karen Stanley
- Meredith Smith

**Carson:**

- Cristal Cisneros
- Chris Daily
- Jose Delfin
- Kirsten Gleissner

**2. Public Comment #1**

There was no public comment in the north or south.

**3. Flexible Agenda Approval** (*Discussion/For Possible Action*) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair  
**Motion**

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

4. **Approval of Meeting Minutes for June 14, 2017** (*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*)

Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

**Motion**

- Member Small moved for approval of the June 14, 2017 meeting minutes
- Member Cooney seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 9:21 AM**

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

Kathleen Galland-Collins, NDE Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Educator Development & Support

- Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) Implementation Updates
  - AB 320 & AB 7  
The assembly bills have been reviewed, and a list of work that needs to be done has been compiled. AB320 requires the Council to develop criteria for assessments for measuring SLGs. The project plan includes the development of business rules for SLGs. The Council will decide whether or not to move those SLGs forward to the State Board meeting on October 12, 2017.  
2016-17 NEPF data that has been collected is in the process of being analyzed. More information on the data will be provided at the October 25, 2017 meeting.  
SB497 requires the TLC to assign a person to that Task Force, which will be voted on later in today's meeting. The purpose of the Task Force is to review ideas regarding administrator expectations and evaluations.
  - TLC project plan  
The Council will also be developing the Principal Supervisor Standards and Indicators. The Standards have already been adopted; the Council is now in the process of contracting with Matt Clifford of AIR to develop the performance levels and the rubric indicators. There will be updates at the next meeting on the final product at the January 10, 2018 meeting.
  - 16-17 Aggregate ratings reporting-process and tentative timeline  
The 2016-2017 Aggregate ratings reporting-process and tentative timeline was discussed.
- NEPF Focus Group and Survey Preliminary Results  
Today, the Council will conduct a preliminary review of NEPF Survey and Focus Group Data. Some of the key points from the survey and focus groups for administrators are: the RPDP and district-led trainings; RPDP trainings were found to have the most impact on practice; about 27% attended all five sessions of Inter-Rater Reliability Training, with 57% of the most recent IRR training being two or more years ago; a majority report practices to calibrate NEPF observations, such as "learning walks." Regarding the cycle for administrators, data revealed misperception that all questions on pre or post observation tools are required to be asked and answered, even though it is written on the tool that they are not.  
Classroom observation conferences are about four to ten hours per educator. Completing documentation takes about four to ten hours per educator. Conferences that are valuable for new teachers are not as valuable for veteran teachers. Administrators requested additional guidance regarding SLGs. There is a misperception that all SLGs have to be Math or ELA; but the goal(s) set should be based on the standards being taught. The confusion may lie in administrators not realizing that the College and Career Ready Standards are a part of the Nevada Content Standards. Historically, and particularly, the old ESCA felt that their content was not valued because it was not tested. Member Small is concerned with a language-art connected standard to the content potentially not valuing the specified education standard (i.e. music). The professionals that he hears from think it is important for children to have a certain music standard level for them and their practice – just as there are standards for language. Chair Salazar clarified that it is not an absence of the discipline standard. Member Cooney asked how the Council can clarify the flexibility available for the districts. Chair Salazar answered that it is a matter of clear communication during implementation and maintaining that communication after. That is also why training and Professional Development (PD) opportunities are so important. Much of the miscommunication and misinterpretation comes at the point of the State passing what it has developed down to the district level.

The self-evaluation tool is not being used well. With the intent of making the tool more user friendly, it was revised and streamlined. 33% of administrators did have an observation conference. Of those surveyed, 33% did not have a conversation after they were observed. Those that had a conference thought the observation was helpful. Overall, the NEPF is fair. 43% plan schoolwide PD based on results. 42% stated that they were unaware of how the information is used. Because this is the survey that was released after the ending of the last school year, he asked if there were plans to re-release the survey during a time that teachers were still on-site. Yes, the survey will be released much earlier this year, as the questions are already developed. There have also been plans made to do random school visits for collection of additional data. Member Small asked if there was a known reason why survey questions were skipped, as that can skew data. The Council currently doesn't know, but that is something that can be analyzed. Chair Salazar requested an in-depth aggregate analysis.

Key points for teachers were most of the trainings they experienced were school-led. Most felt fairly confident in setting and measuring SLGs. Most thought self-assessments were more valuable for new teachers than veteran teachers; but, some did comment that it was beneficial for their own self-reflection. 9% did not have post-observation conferences. Of those that did, 54% agreed it helped them improve their practice. Teachers perceived that 0-3 hours were spent by administrators observing them and giving feedback. They perceived 0-3 hours were spent by teachers on independently preparing documentation for administrators. Most agreed that the NEPF helped them identify areas of strength and growth; but they equally agree and disagree regarding its positive impact on student learning. Most see it as fair. 12% strongly disagree that each administrator follows the same procedures and expectations. 72% were unaware of how the results of the NEPF are used.

Barbara Barker suggested that the Council may need to communicate the expectations better which may mean reviewing what we have posted on the website and other community resources. Member Collins informed the Council of the NEPF "One-Stop-Shop" now available on the NDE website.

OLEP Pilot study tools have been uploaded to the webpage. A google form was sent to liaisons, district HRs, and superintendents to gather participants for the pilot study. The Council is piloting six frameworks: School Counselors, School Nurses, Teacher Librarians, School Speech-Language Pathologists (SLPs), School Psychologists, and Social Workers. There are currently 146 participants in Clark County and 77 in the north. The Council is still recruiting participants. These numbers will be confirmed in a future meeting, but in Clark County, there are 31 School Nurse participants and 2 supervisors. In the north, there are 36 with at least 2 supervisors. For Social Workers, there are 4 in Clark County and 3 in the north. There are 13 School Psychologists participating in Clark County and 6 in northern Nevada. There are 12 SLPs participating in Clark County and 10 in Northern Nevada. There are 58 Teacher Librarians participating in Clark and 7 supervisors. In Northern Nevada there are 8 participants. There are 6 participating School Nurses and 7 participating in the north. The plan is to have some OLEP Pilot Study orientations in late October. There will be one or two in the north and one in Southern Nevada.

Member Small suggested setting percentage goals based on how many there are in the state, as it may be helpful with reaching the goal. He also asked if Council members should be promoting the initiative to recruit participants. If members are going to help promote, it must be done with all necessary information provided within the next few days. Member Collins reminded the Council that they do not have the capacity to run an official pilot study. This particular pilot is a field test for data collection purposes. Member Boyce asked if the person doing the field test has to be the same person doing the in-house evaluation. No, so long as both people are supervisors.

- Update from August 17<sup>th</sup> Regulatory hearing

On August 17, there was a public workshop for the measurement of SLGs. The document being shared in Item 8 today is the same document that was shared at that public workshop. There was no public comment. Today, the Council will review that document and determine whether or not they have the same recommendations as before. If approved by the TLC today, it will move on to LCB.

On the Principal-Supervisor Standards, the Council is in the process of going under contract with **Record Institutes of Research (RIR) or Association for Institutional Research (AIR)**. The goal is to have everything finalized in December, with the roll-out of the tools in January.

In regards to members, the Council is almost full. The Governor's Office has a list of potential Parent Representatives; the Council is just waiting on an appointment. Dottie will be moving, so hopefully there will another appointee named by the next meeting. At that time the TLC will be full. Member Small asked if districts are allowed to adopt the rubric presented in the pilot study instead of the NEPF rubric. Member Collins answered that they are allowed to adopt the proposed rubric as the rubric for their district, but she is not sure if they are allowed to not do an evaluation. That would be dependent on NRS. That concerns Member Small because he doesn't want to inflict double the work. It would be helpful if there is flexibility to afford the districts to choose to do one or the other. Member White clarified for the Council that NRS requires evaluation of all licensed personnel. Her district found a way around that mandate by instituting a 3-tier model. Tier 3 is an Action/Research Model. All pilot study participants are in that model, and have to meet certain goals and criteria. That group does not have to do two evaluations. Member White was asked if Action/Research would constitute National Board Certification. It did under the model in her district.

There was an NEPF liaison webinar at the end of August. There are one or more liaisons for all districts that are appointed by that district's superintendent. They are in place to meet a communication plan and are charged with sharing information about the NEPF with teachers and administrators. Some questions the Council received regarding the NEPF were in relation to AB320 and the timeline regarding that. If a teacher has 2 years of highly effective evaluations, then the 3<sup>rd</sup> year, the summative evaluation is not mandatory. It is the Department's opinion that two previous years can be counted, but it is ultimately a district decision. If a district does decide to carry out that practice, they must do so consistently across all teachers and administrators, as well as have policies in place to determine what is to be done if a teacher moves positions, or there is some other practical situation that would change the procedure. That does not affect the necessity for teachers to set SLGs. Confusion around things of this nature have prompted Member Collins and NDE Staff Eboni Caridine to create a "Myths vs. Facts" page that will be placed on the NDE website to help clarify some common miscommunications. Member Salazar suggested getting that page posted by the next meeting and consistently expanding on that list.

**6. Appointment of TLC Member to SB 497 Advisory Task Force on School Leader Management**  
(Information/Discussion/Possible Action) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

SB497 reads as follows: the advisory taskforce on school leader management consists of 2 SBE members, 2 members of Legislation, 2 members from the Assembly, 1 member who is a school administrator, 1 member who is a licensed teacher, 1 member who is a superintendent of schools, 1 member who is a dean of a college, 1 member who is a parent, 1 member who is appointed by the TLC, and 1 member who represents the business community. The advisory taskforce shall study the statewide performance evaluation (NEPF) adopted by SBE, systems of school leader preparation as approved by SBE, the qualifications for licensure of administrators proscribed by the Commission of Professional Standards, the recruitment of administrators, PD for administrators and teachers as provided by school districts, regional training programs, or any other entity, the compensation for administrators as pursuant to Chapter 288, and the taskforce may make recommendations concerning a matter relating to the study to ensure all areas of the study are aligned statewide so that school leaders are adequately prepared to ensure the college and career readiness of all students; including, without limitation, recommendations concerning budgets, proposed legislation, proposed regulations and policies.

**Motion**

- Member Small moved to nominate Anthony Nunez as the TLC SB 497 Taskforce appointee
- Member Nunez accepted the nomination
- Member Gonzalez seconded the motion
- There were no other nominations
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 10:24 AM. Member Nunez is the SB 497Task Force appointee**

**7. Student Performance Domain: Recommendations Regarding the "Business Rules" (Criteria and Conditions) Under Which Student Performance Data May Be Used As Part of an Educator's Evaluation** (Information/Discussion/Possible Action) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair; Eboni Caridine, NDE Education Programs Professional, Office of Educator Development & Support

Members will review and make decisions regarding business rules on the use of student growth measures of other states to provide direction for measuring Student Learning Goals in the NEPF. Topics being

reviewed include, but are not limited to: Student Attendance/Mobility, and Student Characteristics. Possible action may include recommendations for Business Rules to the State Board of Education for possible adoption.

Most states that have business rules on the use of student growth measures use state test scores in their SLGs. Some of the states that will be reviewed today are slanted because their SLGs/SLOs/SGLs include State test scores. The TLC is required to indicate whether or not there are conditions that districts need to consider when discussing student mobility, student attendance, and student characteristics, and what those conditions should be during a 5 month SLG period. If there are concerns on behalf of the Council around teacher attendance, the topic can be brought to the next legislative session; “student categories and pupils” are the focus of this task. Members of the Council are told to ask themselves if there is a belief, in terms of impact of teachers on students, that at some point, the teacher can no longer be held accountable for the attribution of that student’s learning because that student did not attend class. The specific language giving the TLC this authority is AB-320 Section 1.1 Number 5. “Regarding SLGs SBE may establish regulation and the manner to which to include student categories and pupils in the evaluation.” Nothing was found in AB320 regarding teachers, it is specifically about student categories and pupils.

It is permissive, not required; so Member White is nervous about setting criteria at this time. The decision should be left up to teachers to determine what impact they have had on a student for the amount of time they taught that student, and whether or not to include that data on their evaluation. She is concerned about business rules that make this document and the work behind it cumbersome. Member Gonzalez stated that if this topic were looked at in terms of how schools were being evaluated for performance and the accountability of schools as a whole, the Council could say the same students counted for NSPF could be counted for NEPF to keep things simple. From previous conversations, it should be left up to the districts. As a teacher, Member Barker would want an opportunity to work with a student that’s chronic, and then talk about that with her administrator. Member Cooney asked whose responsibility it is and what action will be taken if a teacher doesn’t think a student should be included in their evaluation. Is a supervisor able to override that? Chair Salazar clarified that there is a rubric that has to be used by supervisors with regard to determining what the weight will be. The supervisor does have the opportunity to say that either all or nearly all students have to be included. If a large number of students are excluded due to their absenteeism, then whether or not the teacher was impactful must be determined at that time. Member Collins referenced page 23 of the Protocols. Member Nunez brought to the Council’s attention that attendance is not stated in the rubric; so, making a recommendation around this business rule is going to create many conversations around attendance when it should be around impact. He is concerned with giving principals, administrators, and principal supervisors the wrong impression by giving them an allotted amount of students who “don’t count;” it is about whether or not an impact was made. It is going to be very difficult to make a business rule recommendation. He thinks the mid-cycle review is the time this should be taken care of. Member Frenkel stated that if the Council should make a rule, it should be in alignment with the NEPF/NSPF. She was inclined to say that this could lead to much more difficulty if rules are made, but if they are, clarity must be made through consistency. At that time, the Council has to think about whom the business rules will impact and potential consequences of the rules. Member Boyce said this discussion takes on the issue of the impact of socio-cultural issues in schooling. It can’t be denied that they’re there or that it is equitable across every classroom across districts. She hears on a daily basis about the difficulties of teachers working with Title 1 schools and how they feel it is not equitable because of all the things that affect their students, such as transient populations. While she does recognize the value of making that distinction, she also understands the statistical nightmare of trying to make it equitable. Chair Salazar asked with regards to the area of student attendance, does the TLC believe that a business rule is necessary. Member Gonzalez believes that *if* a policy is necessary, “less is more.” A possible option is to allow teachers and school leaders to evaluate the classroom environment and approve it with their district if they were to develop a policy that is specific for them. Member Nunez commented that business rules are already in the protocols. He believes that messages can be sent to explain that this is not a new policy/procedure it is an opportunity to re-emphasize. He also doesn’t think the Council will be able to come up with a good number of days a student could be absent to make the rule concrete.

### **Motion**

- Member Rippet moved for the Council to adopt a business rule for student attendance to be one of the categories of pupils referenced in AB-320
- Member Boyce seconded the motion
- Floor opened for discussion. Because the Council is not required to create a rule, and it is already in the protocol, Member Janison doesn’t understand why it is necessary to be included. She has

concerns with unnecessarily complicating the process. Member Barker finds the adoption necessary especially for Title 1 schools. If attendance is not identified on its own, its significance is minimized. Member Nunez doesn't believe creating a business rule will provide any more specificity than is already included in the Protocol as written. Chair Salazar and Member White agreed. Member White suggested adding an asterisk and text to the currently used form stating that attendance must be considered in determining all or nearly all. Member Frenkel suggested that if the Council doesn't create a business rule, then there should be questions on NEPF surveys addressing the effect absenteeism has on SLGs, dialogue, observations, etc. Member Barker believes the asterisk idea is a good one. Member Collins informed the Council of the option to make a change to the Protocol document. A comment could be added with the rubric referring back to the classroom content information and the asterisk can be added there if the Council so chooses and adding that to the Protocol. Member White's vote is against the motion on the floor, however if the Council was to use the language from Rhode Island and add to the Protocol itself that, "chronic absenteeism shall be considered in determining the rating of an SLO," then she would be comfortable voting in favor of that.

- All opposed
- **Motion not carried at 11:11AM**

#### **Motion**

- Member White moved to recommend use of language from Rhode Island and something to the effect of "chronic absenteeism shall be considered in determining the rating of the SLO score," and add that to the Protocol.
- Member Frenkel seconded the motion
- Member Collins stated that it logistically could be added to the mid-cycle goal review as well as the summative conference piece where the rubric is located.
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 11:14 AM**

The Council also determined that the adoption of business rules around student mobility and student characteristics won't be necessary.

Member Collins will confer with Deputy Superintendent Durish and let her know what the TLC non-recommendation is and see if they want to take that to State Board.

#### **8. Recommendations Regarding Criteria for District Determined Assessments used to Measure Student Learning Goals** (*Information/Discussion/For Possible Action*) Dr. Pam Salazar, Chair.

This presentation is required, but the Council has already presented this set of criteria in the presentation at the hearing on August 17, 2017. This is what TLC has already passed and identified as the criteria to consider for the assessments used in the SLG. If the Council makes a motion to confirm, their previous recommendation will go to LCB and be finalized in regulation. It is before the Council now to determine if there are any necessary revisions.

The information can be found on page 23 of the Protocols. There was clarification around priority levels added this year. Priority 1 means assessments should be the first choice of assessment if they are available for that SLG for what is being measured. If they are not available, then move to Priority 2, which is measuring progress toward a student goal picking the assessment or measurement that is feasible and reliable. Priority 3 assessments should only be used if no other option is available or feasible. The process is broken down in the Goal Setting and Planning tool. Member Cooney asked, if a district decides that they want to use a specific assessment tool, do they have to have that approved by the superintendent's office or do they have the choice as to which assessment they want to use. Yes, the State will develop a list of assessments, then districts, schools and educators *may* choose to use alternative assessments. The assessments should be chosen based on their SLG; not the other way around. This allows teachers to show the impact they have had on a student regardless of when the student was enrolled in the class. The Council has to determine whether or not they affirm moving forward with the previous recommendation, and if so, it will go to LCB. If they do not, they have to identify the changes to be made and send the recommendation through the approval process again, starting with SBE.

#### **Motion**

- Member Janison moved to not change the criteria that has already been identified for assessments
  - Member Rippet seconded the motion
- Member Cooney asked if "State approved assessments" complicates things for districts. The way it has been interpreted by districts is that if they can apply a Priority 1 assessment, they do, and if not, they

move on. The permissive language – should vs. shall—worries Member Small, for site-level readers may not interpret the flexibility available. Member Collins suggested adding his concern to the “Myths vs. Facts” page. Member Nunez suggested using punctuation to better clarify the language. Chair Salazar clarified that the Council’s action could be to keep the criteria the same, but the clarification around the criteria will be changed in the Protocol, emphasis in the way it was presented, and those changes will be turned over to NDE.

- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 12:00 PM**

## 9. Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) Presentation

*(Information/Discussion)* Peter Zutz, Administrator, Assessments, Data and Accountability; Katherine Fuselier, Education Programs Professional, Accountability

The key take-away from the presentation is the realignment with the NSPF. The new NSPF 2.0’s benchmarks are now anchored on the State schools becoming the fastest improving in the nation. The goal is both ambitious and achievable. The department has proposed a 3-phased approach to implementation this year. Phase 1 regards data transparency. On September 15<sup>th</sup>, the NSPF website was posted with student achievement results on State assessments. The second Phase is educating stakeholders about the realigned NSPF 2.0; which is why they are before the Council today. They want districts, schools, and community leaders to understand the updated NSPF so that it can be used for continuous improvement. Phase 3 is the release of the informational Star Ratings. They anticipate its release before the end of 2017. In 2010, the State adopted new standards aligned to higher expectations as to what students should know and be capable of doing. In 2014, new assessments were selected, capable of measuring deeper learning levels and understanding aligned to the higher expectations. Now, in 2017, the new NSPF that honors those higher expectations will be released. While this was being developed, there has been new policy in funding, supporting the new learning expectations. In alignment with the ESSA Plan and State Improvement Plan, Nevada has set out to be the fastest improving state in the nation by narrowing the Department’s focus on elements it can have the greatest impact on. The new NSPF can help to identify some of the schools that are in need of the most support, work with principals and leaders to create strong plans around school improvement, and use the data to determine where educators should be focusing their efforts. A star rating system is a tool for stakeholders to see how their school is performing. It is a State designed accountability system, encouraging continuous improvement and support for lowest performing schools. It will also highlight schools that are successfully educating all students and closing opportunity gaps. Lastly, it will help to realign expectations and achieve the goal of being the fastest improving state in the nation. She explained the fault in the NSPF 1.0 being caused by a testing irregularity in 2015, leading to the need for the NSPF 2.0. Nevada chose to use the ESSA Plan to support work done here, as opposed to directing it. ESSA supports State’s goals to advance equity and uphold critical protections for the State’s most disadvantaged kids. There are five components of the federal law for an accountability system, however States have significant latitude to determine how indicators are measured and weighted.

As a result of collaboration with different workgroups, community values have been integrated in the new NSPF. Those values were as follows: commitment to *all* students, English language proficiency and acquisition, student growth, student engagement, and college and career readiness.

Peter presented the components of the framework. There are five elementary school indicators: academic achievement, growth, English language proficiency, opportunity gaps, and student engagement. There are also maximum points available in each indicator totaling 35 points. There is not much difference between elementary school indicators and middle school indicators. The high school model will be completely revised as it transitions into the 3.0 model next year. They are currently in the regulatory process for changing the language around EOCs that would change them from a graduation requirement to a true end of course final, administered and scored by the districts. Three populations of students were recorded in NSPF 1.0: FRLs, ELLs, and IEPs. All three of those subgroups are specified in the NSPF 2.0, as well as those students identified by race and ethnicity. That is another indication of the State’s focus on student that it has to do a better job with.

Star ratings are a result of a 1-100 index score. Index scores are calculated by combining the points a school earns in the indicators. In collaboration with the Accountability Advisory Group, it was decided that the State should anchor itself around 2017 goals, as opposed to the 2022 long-term goals we expect to have met by that time. The group also requested that the framework be realigned in a couple years if necessary. The task was to establish a point earning opportunity based on the national landscape and State goals. Measures in the system earn points through a point attribution table. There are many more

partitions along the continuum of student performance in the new NSPF's attribution table than there were in the NSPF 1.0. That allows for tracking of smaller levels of performance in a positive or negative direction. The tables are unique for each school level and for each measure in the system. NDE has collaborated with stakeholders to align Point Attribution Tables (PATs) to the State's long term goals and Measures of Interim Progress (MIPs). A school will earn full points if they are meeting the State's Long Term Goals (LTGs). The NV State Plan has goals set for each year from 2016 to 2022. Not every measure in the system has an associated LTG so that schools performing in the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile or greater in those measures will earn full points in those categories. Half of the points in the PAT for each of the measures will be earned by schools that are achieving at the State's 2017 MIP. For a school in Nevada to be a five-star school or approaching that rank, they should be pushing the 2022 LTG achievements. Minimal points are also earned and the lowest given at any level have been established at the 15<sup>th</sup> percentile. The points earned for several measures under an indicator are combined up to the indicator level. Those points earned across the indicators are added to that to get to the index score. Finally, those index scores are then mapped to a star rating. In the development of the NSPF, there have been much stakeholder engagements. One of those engagements consisted of the development of these policy descriptors. The process was essentially an exercise in which the stakeholders on what ranks 1 – 5 mean on a star rating scale. Once a star rating is made available, stakeholders can go back to the PLDs to describe the performance of that school.

Schools can use NSPF for continuous improvement by:

As the NSPF is implemented the State will first help districts understand the index score and the components of their framework. Next, a review of data will determine where in the ranks a school is, and where it would like to be by a certain time. Then, in school improvement plans, teachers and administrators can determine their priorities for making improvement.

Questions were as follows:

Member Boyce asked how timely reports will be back to schools so that they may plan for the next school year. This year, data without star ratings was provided September 15, 2017, on [nevadareportcard.com](http://nevadareportcard.com). Currently, we anticipate it will be around that same date in 2018. In a month or less, index scores will be provided and at this time, it is being handled in a step-by-step manner. The final results of the NSPF 2.0 analysis will be available by December 2017. Member Gonzalez asked which students count in relation to the conversation had earlier. Peter answered that all students count. If a student falls below a certain threshold, they will not be generating points that tally up to the index score. Peter mentioned that the math EOC will only be used for this year. Member Collins asked the plans for incorporating end of course exams taken by 8<sup>th</sup> graders. They are still moving through the process to finalize regulation, so he cannot answer that question at this time. Per SBE recommendations of September 12, 2017, the EOC will become a true end of course final that is administered and scored by the districts to be a part of that final course grade. SBE also had a rollout plan for how much the EOC results would be of that final course grade. For 2017-2018, that decision is up to the districts. In 2018-2019, it will be a mandatory 10%. In 2019-2020, it will be a mandatory 15%, and in 2020-2021, it will be a mandatory 20% of that final course grade. The EOC as a course final is not part of the NSPF. They are going to continue to administer their high school science assessment as their federally reported high school science assessment; and as such, will be reported in the NSPF. Member Frenkel asked what kind of support will be provided to the districts to help them understand: that the number of stars is less important than taking a look at the indicators, the differences between indicators in the previous NSPF and the current version, and to communicate what is actually occurring in the schools as opposed to how the star rating change might be. Peter answered that he and Katherine being there today is the beginning of that communication plan. His group is charged with engaging with the districts and providing meaningful understanding of all the models so that districts have actionable data. When looking at the indicators and components of elementary, middle, and high school, academic achievement makes the benchmark. In the old NSPF, that benchmark would change from year to year. As far as growth and academic achievement are concerned, Member Small asked if that benchmark changes or stays consistent on a yearly basis. It stays the same. Peter explained if one wants to measure change, the key is to not change the measure.

#### **10. National Issues and Legal Landscape** (*Information/Discussion*) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

Where states are in relation to ESSA is a daily national issue. If interested, Council members were encouraged to follow *Ed Week* ([edweek.org](http://edweek.org)) for updates on current events in education. Teacher evaluations are not on the forefront, because with ESSA, State assessments were removed. As a result, there have been many changes across the country. Having multiple measures and measures that give more precise information are now what need to be looked at.



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

There was a change in meeting dates. The next meeting is October 25, 2017; however the November 29, 2017 meeting has been moved to January 10, 2018. The next meetings after that will be March 14, 2018 and May 23, 2018. These dates can be found on the NDE website. Chair Salazar will report updates from the October 14, 2017 SBE meeting at the October 25, 2017 TLC meeting. RPDP will be at the next meeting.

**12. Public Comment #2**

Chris Daily of the Nevada State Education Association (NSEA) wanted to remind the council and new members that NSEAs position on teacher evaluation is that no student achievement data should be used in those evaluations. He has appreciation for the new NSPF and thinks it's important to remember the frameworks purpose, which is to improve the teaching profession for the purpose of improving student learning. There was a slide within the presentation earlier that asked teachers if, "At their school, the implementation of NEPF standards and protocols positively impacting student learning." The responses were relatively equal as to whether it was or wasn't. The number of teachers that strongly disagreed was almost 17%, the number that disagreed was 39%, 40% agreed, and 4.5% strongly agreed. In this case, over 55% of teachers who responded to this question said that the NEPF standards are not positively impacting student learning. That said, there is work left to do. He knows that in each of the last four legislative sessions the NEPF has been brought up, amended, considered, and that's likely to happen in the 2019 session. We have to move away from over testing. Another concern with the NSPF is that framework over relies on flawed assessment like the SBAC. There is currently movement away from that. NDE is looking at audit results that canned the SBAC almost universally. Hopefully those recommendations will be implemented in the next session.

No public comment in the south.

**13. Adjournment**

**Meeting adjourned at 1:03 PM.**