

Proposed Revision to the Speech-Language Pathologist NEPF Framework

Teachers and Leaders Council Meeting

January 29, 2020

Agenda Item # 9

NRS 391.675

Evaluations of counselors, librarians and certain other licensed educational personnel. The State Board may provide for evaluations of counselors, librarians and other licensed educational personnel, except for teachers and administrators, and determine the manner in which to measure the performance of such personnel, including, without limitation, whether to use pupil achievement data as part of the evaluation.

Supporting NRS:

- **NRS 391.460:** TLC to make recommendations to State Board concerning statewide performance evaluation system; authorization to establish working groups and task forces.

Speech-Language Pathologist NEPF Framework

- **Two Rubrics**
 - **Professional Practice**
 - Five Standards
 - 18 Indicators
 - **Professional Responsibilities**
 - Five Standards
 - 13 Indicators

Implementation Challenges

- Not capturing the real work of the SLP
- Duplicated language
- Cumbersome
- Redundancies within standards and indicators
- Example of redundancies: Collaboration
 - Three standards
 - Six Indicators

2019 Speech-Language Pathologist Workgroup Members

- **Workgroup Lead:** Nancy Kuhles, Co-Chair, NSHA / NV Coalition
- **Rubric Revision Workgroup**
 - **Clark County School District:** Karen Klopfer, Flor Mowery, Julie Stephens, Maggie Von Slomski-Aellen
 - **Washoe County School District:** Lindsay Culbert, Deanna Larsen, Katie Lopez, Cheri Lunt, Christine Verre
- **Rubric Reviewer Revision Workgroup**
 - Seven rural school districts and three retired administrators
 - Sarah Billings, Roxanne Bruce, Cheryl Clark, Becky Dendauw, Connie Forestrom, Regina Goings, Val Grinsell, Jayne Lundberg, Melony O’Flaherty, McKenzie Rupp, Brigette Saltarelli, Kimberly Smerkers-Bass

2019 Speech-Language Pathologist Revision Timeline

- **Rubric Revision Workgroup**

- Work began July 2019 thru January 2020
- Met face to face to work, and
- Conducted work via internet (email, google docs) or phone calls

- **Rubric Reviewer Revision Workgroup**

- Work began October 2019 thru January 2020
- Conducted work via internet (email, google docs, google drive) or phone calls

Revision Work Process

- **Reviewed Standards & Indicators**
 - Embedded, condensed or combined a Standard and/or Indicator
- **Reviewed Mandatory Evidence, Confirmatory Evidence and/or Performance Levels**
 - Embedded, condensed or combined Mandatory Evidence Sources of Professional Practice, Confirmatory Evidence Sources of Professional Practice and/or Performance Levels
- **Revised Rubric**
 - Resulted in more concise language, and
 - Captured the essence and “real work of the SLP”

Revision Product

- **One Rubric**
 - **Professional Practices**
 - **Four Standards**
 - Professional Responsibilities
 - Evaluation
 - IEP Development, Facilitation, Implementation
 - Therapy
 - **17 Indicators**

Proposed Rubric Sample

SLP Nevada Educator Performance Framework: Speech-Language Pathologist Rubric Professional Practices							
Standard 1 Professional Responsibilities (PP Standard 1, 2, 3; PR 1, 2, 3, 4)							
SLP demonstrates knowledge and skills in speech language pathology and related subject areas (e.g., literacy) and implements services in an ethical manner.							
Indicators				Performance Levels			
What SLPs Need to Demonstrate	Mandatory Evidence Sources of Professional Practice	Confirmatory Evidence Sources of Professional Practice	Description/Notes	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Indicator 1 SLP demonstrates competence in oral and written communication skills. (PP Standard 1, Indicator 1; Standard 3, Indicator 2; PR Standard 1, Indicator 2; Standard 2, Indicator 2)	Mandatory: Two Confirmatory Evidence Sources	Diagnostic reports Assessment analysis and interpretation summarized in various reports SLP can verbally support the reason for test selection Observation of SLP during MDT/IEP and other meetings Review of written reports Written correspondence Direct evaluator observation Parent survey Teacher survey Email correspondence Homework log Notes home Samples of handouts to parents or staff	SLP's oral and written communication is sensitive to the audience using appropriate social-pragmatic skills (e.g., tone of voice, facial expression, body language, word choice, etc.) SLP explains MDT/IEP content clearly, using language parents and other team members understand. SLP responds appropriately to questions and comments from the team members (includes parents/family) (PP Stand 3, indic 2) Whenever professional terminology is used it is explained so that it is comprehensible to all participants SLP is flexible in revising IEP based on team members' data and direct observations SLP responds appropriately and professionally to questions, comments, communication from parents, team members and/or other professionals (PR Standard 1, Indicator 2; PR Standard 2, Indicator 2) Demonstrates active listening; Presents with a professional demeanor;	SLP effectively communicates oral and written information and initiates engagement with team members SLP consistently invites team members to ask questions or provide input regarding student performance and/or goals SLP actively uses a variety of communication modes to clearly communicate with the intended audience SLP is consistently professional, respectful, and responsive when communicating with staff, families and students SLP uses terminology that is easily understood SLP communicates clearly with the IEP team regarding the student's needs and strengths in language/vocabulary that is appropriate for the intended audience SLP is consistently responsive to cultural and linguistic backgrounds when speaking with parents regarding IEP content SLP will seek opportunity to	SLP effectively communicates information to team members in writing and in oral presentations SLP uses terminology that is easily understood SLP uses a variety of communication modes to adequately communicate with the intended audience SLP is consistently professional, respectful and responsive when communicating SLP communicates clearly with the IEP team regarding the student's needs and strengths in language/vocabulary that is appropriate for the intended audience SLP is generally responsive to cultural and linguistic backgrounds when speaking with parents regarding IEP content All IEP members are provided the opportunity to ask questions and add input during the IEP meeting SLP follows up on parent and/or staff question/concerns in a timely manner (PP Stand 3, indic 2)	SLP uses unclear oral or written terminology; however, when asked or prompted, is able to clarify SLP uses limited/minimally effective modes of communication during interactions (PP Stand 1, indic 3) SLP goes over the content of the IEP and responds to concerns if brought up by a member of the IEP team SLP is minimally responsive to cultural and linguistic backgrounds when speaking with parents regarding IEP content Language may be unclear at times due to use of acronyms/professional jargon SLP follows up on parent and/or teacher concerns after several reminders (PP Stand 3, indic 2) SLP acknowledges receipt of information/communication from professionals with insufficient follow through (PR Stand 1, indic 2; PR Stand 2, indic 2)	SLP does not communicate effectively Oral and written terminology is unclear and/or not explained clearly. SLP's communication (verbal and/or written) may be inadequate, insensitive and/or inaccurate for the intended audience (PP Stand 1, indic 3) SLP rarely explains the IEP content and does not offer adequate opportunity for team members to ask questions or make comments SLP is rarely responsive to cultural and linguistic backgrounds when speaking with parents regarding IEP content SLP rarely follows up on parent and/or teacher suggestions or comments (PP Stand 3, indic 2) SLP almost never responds to phone calls/email in a timely manner (PR Stand 1, indic 3; PR Stand 2, indic 2)

Proposed Rubric

- Please refer to Rubric handout

Possible Motion

- Approve the recommended revision of the Speech-Language Pathologist NEPF Framework for adoption beginning with the 2020-2021 school year.