

## TLC Agenda Item #10

### NEPF Work Group on the Consideration of Class Size and Additional SLG Clarification: Final SLG Recommendations

Recommendation	Section and Adaptation	Rationale
<p>Clarify the expectation around “multiple measures” to evaluate the SLG</p>	<p><b>Protocols</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Old Language: Page 20; Step 1: Identify the assessment that will be used to measure student progress towards the SLG.</li> <li>● <b>New Language: Page 20; Step 1: Identify the assessment(s) that will be used to measure student progress towards the SLG, and the points in time when the identified assessment will be administered.</b></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Page 22; Rubric Descriptors: from in time show evidence of high growth and high impact for all or nearly all students. From points in time show clear evidence of growth and impact for most students. From points in time show clear evidence of growth and impact for some students.</li> <li>● <b>New Language: Page 22; Rubric Descriptors: At least one source of growth or achievement from multiple points in time show evidence of high growth and high impact for all or nearly all students. At least one source of growth or achievement from multiple points in time show clear evidence of growth and impact for most students. At least one source of growth or achievement from multiple points in time show clear evidence of growth and impact for some students.</b></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Old Language: Page 23; Choosing Quality Assessments: Choosing high-quality learning in the course.</li> <li>● <b>New Language: Page 23; Choosing Quality Assessments: Choosing high-quality learning in the course. In order for assessment data to facilitate collaborative inquiry and conversations between educators and evaluators, assessment data from multiple points in time should be available. For clarification, it is not required to have more than one type of assessment to measure the SLG. It is necessary to have assessment data available from multiple points in time to facilitate conversations around the educators’ impact on student learning.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Goal Setting and Planning Tool:</b>            Page 4: Includes at least one source of student growth or achievement to demonstrate growth and impact on all students identified in SLG  <b>Page 4: Includes at least one source of student growth or achievement administered over multiple points in time to demonstrate growth and impact on all students identified in SLG</b></p>	<p>It is the belief of the workgroup members that the original intent of the TLC was to ensure measures over time, rather than the use of multiple measures at the same time. In addition, educational researchers Gast and Ledford have established that there must be multiple data points to see a trend in student outcomes.</p> <p>The work group chose not to set a minimum frequency to allow for flexibility in relation to contextual variables (e.g. semester-long courses versus year-long) in line with The TLC’s original intent.</p>

Recommendation	Section and Adaptation	Rationale
Remove assessment priority levels	<p><b>Protocols</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 23: Completely remove the 4th bullet point (Monitoring includes alignment, instrument security, reliability, validity, comparability, feasibility and scoring) through Figure 7</li> <li><b>Page 23: Completely remove the 4th bullet point (Monitoring includes alignment, instrument security, reliability, validity, comparability, feasibility and scoring) through Figure 7</b> <b>Add a statement: Additionally, steps should be taken between educators and evaluators to collaboratively monitor the use of each source of student growth and achievement and calibrate the scoring thereof.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>NOTE:</b> <a href="#">Link to LCB website for R138-17</a> will require revision</p>	<p>It is the belief of the workgroup members that this section places priority on published or high-stakes assessments above alignment with standards of highest needs for their students. This has led educators to determine assessments first rather than referring to their needs assessment and content standards. A focus on test performance has not had an impact on practice and student outcomes. Instead the work group wants to focus the emphasis on alignment to foundational standards/areas of student needs to affect educator development and improved student outcomes.</p>
Clarify student definition in the SLG scoring rubric	<p><b>Protocols</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Old Language Page 22: After ‘all or nearly all,’ ‘most,’ ‘some’ for each score level, add:</li> <li><b>New Language Page 22: After ‘all or nearly all,’ ‘most,’ ‘some’ for each score level, add: students on which the SLG was set.</b></li> </ul>	<p>It is the belief of the work group that the rubric, with included recommendations around ‘multiple sources’ and ‘students,’ continues to allow for flexibility related to local control and bargaining, and adaptations for each educator, as was the original intent of the TLC, but clarifies several issues that have impacted statewide implementation.</p>
Clarify the priority focus (i.e. standards) for SLGs	<p><b>Protocols (Pages 19, 20, or 21)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add a statement that indicates: <b>Content area relevancy is priority. There must be a conversation between the educator and the evaluator to establish and reach agreement on the final student learning target and measure of student achievement and growth related to that SLG.</b></li> </ul>	<p>While there has been much interpretation around the appropriate SLG focus (e.g. overarching skills versus content-specific learning), the work group believes that it is not in the purview of TLC/SBE to mandate that educators MUST use a focus on one type of Nevada-approved standard. The work group does, however, wish to express that educators must be involved in and agree on the import of the standard identified as the focus for their individual Student Learning Goal.</p>

Recommendation	Section and Adaptation	Rationale
Clarify that both tiered targets and/or a focus on subsets of students is allowable	<p><b>Protocols</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Old Language on page 21: “Tiered targets may be necessary to address the needs of all students in the class (e.g. students performing in the lowest or highest third of the may have a end of course target-set lower than students performing at higher levels on the baseline assessment</li> <li>• <b>New Language on page 21: “Tiered targets may be necessary to address the needs of all identified students (e.g. students performing differently on baseline measures of student achievement or growth may have a different end of course target than other students of the identified population Identifying a target student population with a common need is allowable. It is not required to have an SLG set for an entire class or educator caseload. However, it is necessary to provide rationale for the targeted student population. If subgroups are excluded, explain which students, why they are excluded</b></li> </ul>	<p>The work group recommends these changes to ensure that both tiered targets and the identification of smaller target groups is allowable, as originally intended by the TLC. Changes were also recommended to ensure consistency between the Goal Setting and Planning Tool and the Protocols.</p> <p>Allowance of a focus on subsets of students is necessary for those teachers who have multiple classes or widely varying caseloads (e.g. high school teachers, specialists, and special education generalists). Actual implementation has seen for teachers in such circumstances identify a single class or a subset of students with similar needs, rather than focus on the entire caseload</p> <p>Tiered targets are important for the academic diversity within a program and there is a precedent in MAPS and other assessments</p>
Update the Goal Setting and Planning Tool	<p><b>Goal Setting and Planning Tool</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove the Goal Statement description “Possible example: “Based on the data that _____(x%) of my students are currently performing _____(Standard(s)) as measured by _____(assessments), my goal is that by the end of the interval of instruction, _____(x%) of my students will have achieved mastery/growth as measured by _____(assessments)”.</li> <li>• Include a statement that ensures that however it is written, it must be a SMART goal</li> <li>• Align the language of the tool to rest of the above recommendations related to the SLG and protocols</li> </ul>	<p>The original intent of the Goal Statement description was to offer the frame as an example. While unintended, it has been used as a required sentence frame. The work group fears that this limits educator flexibility and may not be in line with several of the other recommendations identified above (e.g. tiered targets).</p>
Update the Professional Practice Goal	<p><b>Goal Setting and Planning Tool</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a section to the PPG table that asks educators to identify the rationale or research base that justifies the identified NEPF indicator as the best target to help students achieve their goals. It will prompt educators to explain how the identified NEPF indicator will that help their students grow and how it will impact their instruction to help students achieve the SLG.</li> </ul>	<p>It is the belief of the work group that it is critical for educators to link the professional practice goal to their student learning goal. An addition such as the one recommended will help highlight that link. Further, they see this addition as an opportunity to build reflective and intentional practice.</p>

Recommendation	Section and Adaptation	Rationale
Encourage the use of course-embedded assessments over the creation of assessments or activities developed solely for the measurement of an SLG	<p><b>Protocols</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a statement that indicates: <b>Measures of student achievement and growth towards the SLG may be part of course-embedded assessments and grading practices and may occur as part of everyday practice; SLG measures do not have to be mutually exclusive.</b></li> </ul>	It is the belief of the work group that the implementation of the NEPF should be embedded as part of the everyday practice of the educator, as indicated by the statement on page 10 of the Protocols. It is the belief of the workgroup, then, that this precedent applies to all component parts, including the SLG. The work group suggests that this approach has not been the case for all implementation across the state, so wishes to dispel any confusion.
Clarify topics to be discussed during the Pre-Evaluation Conference between educator and evaluator	<p><b>Protocols (Pages 8, 9, and 21)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine and agree upon whether the standard should focus on skills or content knowledge</li> <li>• Ensure that the standard identified as the focus for the Student Learning Goal aligns with an area of high need for the educators current student through review of the needs assessment</li> <li>• Clearly identify and agree on the ‘source of growth or achievement’ used to measure the student learning goal.</li> <li>• Ensure that the ‘source of student growth or achievement’ clearly measures the standard identified as the focus through the needs assessment and goal setting process</li> <li>• Discuss procedures to be utilized if the same ‘source of growth or achievement’ is to be used by multiple teachers to measure their SLG</li> <li>• Clarify the points in time when the identified assessment will be administered and/or what ‘multiple points in time’ means for the given educator</li> <li>• Identify students to be included in the SLG and provide rationale for any exclusion.</li> <li>• Discuss how the SLG scoring rubric will be applied to the given educator and determine how the educator will be scored. The educator-evaluator team must discuss and consider any contextual variables that may impact the educators’ ability to perform his or her professional responsibilities and/or instruction. Such variables include, but are not limited to, class size and the needs of sub-populations such as English Learners.</li> </ul>	It is the belief of the work group that, “a guiding principle for the NEPF is that evaluation should be done with educators, not to them” (NEPF Protocols page 7). To ensure that all educators have a similar experience that aligns with that principle, the work group recommends clearly delineating all topics that should be included in the Pre-Evaluation Conference between educator and evaluator.

Recommendation	Section and Adaptation	Rationale
Review and update all glossary terms to ensure that the definitions clearly align with the usage throughout the Protocols	<b>Protocols (Pages 17 and 18)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Possible language updates include the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All students</li> <li>○ Data</li> <li>○ High Leverage Standards</li> <li>○ Measure</li> <li>○ <b>Source of growth or achievement (added)</b></li> <li>○ Performance Criteria</li> <li>○ Reliability</li> <li>○ Validity</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	It is the belief of the work group that additional opportunities for clarification lie in the glossary and that these terms should be updated to align with the connotation of the words as used throughout the protocols and tools.

**NEPF Work Group on the Consideration of Class Size and Additional SLG Clarification: Class Size Recommendations**

**Recommendation:**

- Ensure that the conversation that occurs between the educator and evaluator during the Pre-Evaluation Conference (see page 8-9 of the protocols) explicitly requires the discussion of how class size will impact the employee’s abilities to carry out his or her professional responsibilities and affect the instructional practices of the employee. This will be embedded as part of the above recommendation to “clarify topics to be discussed during the Pre-Evaluation Conference between educator and evaluator.” An additional paragraph(s) will be added to the section indicating which components, including the effect of class size, must be discussed during that conference along with questions to consider.

**Rationale:**

- The impact and definition of an appropriate class size varies widely across the state. An urban classroom composed of thirty second grade students presents unique variables as does a rural classroom composed of all students falling into the age span of 5-8 year-old students. Because of the unique contexts present across the state, the work group is hesitant to prescribe exactly how each educator-evaluator team should ‘consider class size.’ Instead, they adhere to the precedent established by the TLC for other decisions around the NEPF, allowing contextualized discussions to guide individual implementation. The work group believes that as grievances or concerns related to class size are reported within districts, it may be necessary at a future date to revise the current guidance, but feels that such data is necessary to drive any statewide decision.