

Nevada Department of Education  
Teachers and Leaders Council  
January 9, 2019

Draft Minutes

**Roll Call:**

- Members Present
  - Las Vegas
    - Mary Owens
    - Kathleen Galland-Collins
    - DeeAnn Roberts
    - Pamela Salazar
    - Theo Small
    - Zhan Okuda-Lim
    - Anthony Nunez
    - Brian Rippet
    - Meredith Smith
  - East
    - Jim Cooney
  - Carson City
    - Teri White
- Public Present
  - Las Vegas
    - Lisa Rustand
    - Yvonne Chaves
    - Irma Pumphrey
    - Debbie Brockett
    - Jordana McCudden
    - Flor Mowrey
    - Karen Stanley
    - Melody Thompson
    - Brenda Pearson
    - Alexander Marks
    - Alex Bybee
    - Kenny Belknap
  - Carson City
    - Marissa McClish
    - Nancy Kuhles
    - Kirsten Gleissner

## Public Comment #1

- Carson City:
  - Nancy Kuhles SLP, Co-State Education Advocacy Leader for NV S-L Hearing Association, commented on Agenda Item #10. She stated that the OLEP Pilot had a small number of participants and that using teacher score ranges would not allow for accurate distribution rating. Ms. Kuhles suggested that an OLEP aggregate would be more appropriate to allow for comparison across years. She contended that using teacher evaluation score ranges questions the accuracy and reliability of the OLEP NEPF. Ms. Kuhles stated that there were 11 SLPs who participated in the Pilot, not just the published 5. Collecting these additional data would allow for a larger n from which to calculate accurate cut scores. She indicated that the distance between a level 2 and 3 was intentionally greater and required a considerable increase in educational practice. She recommended that TLC keep with the intent of the pilot and collect the remaining SLP score records, eliminating the need for the use of teacher score ranges.
- Elko: no public comment.
- Las Vegas: no public comment.

## Approval of Meeting Minutes for October 17, 2018 and November 28, 2018

- Oct 17 Minutes: Member Collins stated that Michelle Sanchez-Boyce confirmed that she had voted 'no' on the October 17<sup>th</sup> agenda item of question. Member Collins indicated that NDE had reached out again to Yvonne Chaves regarding her public comment to clarify and NDE staff will add that to the minutes. Chair Salazar asked the Deputy Attorney General (DAG) whether TLC could approve the minutes without these updates. DAG David Gardener confirmed that these minutes could be approved as they stood with the intention to update the public comment made on October 17<sup>th</sup>. **Chair Salazar asked for a motion of approval for both sets of minutes. Member Rippet made a motion to approve the October 17<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes. It was seconded by Member Okuda-Lim. There was no additional discussion and the motion passed unanimously at 9:20 a.m.**
- November 28 Minutes: **Chair Salazar requested motion for approval. Member Okuda-Lim made a motion to approve the November 28<sup>th</sup> Minutes. This was seconded by Member Nunez.** Member Small stated that he would like to ensure that we address a statement made during that meeting requesting that districts provide updates regarding the practice of looking at the scores of where educators are [see Nevada Department of Education (NDE) Updates on page 4 of the November 28<sup>th</sup> Minutes]. Chair Salazar said that this would be addressed during this month's NDE updates. There was no additional discussion. **The motion passed unanimously at 9:23 a.m.**
- Before moving to Agenda Item 4, Chair Salazar welcomed Member Okuda-Lim as the new Policy Representative for the Teachers and Leaders Council. Member Okuda-Lim currently serves as Director of Policy and Analytical Leadership and Resident Fellow at the Leadership Institute of Nevada. His background is in educational policy analysis and is a native of Nevada.

## **TLC Election of Council Chair and Vice Chair Pursuant to NRS 391.455**

- Chair Salazar clarified that the role of Chair is to facilitate TLC meetings, work with NDE to design agendas, prepare for conversation, ensure that there is ongoing communication and regular meetings, and to reach out to other groups for presentations to TLC. It is the expectation that the Chair will present recommendations to the State Board of Education (SBE) alongside NDE representative. The Chair must also present to legislative committees with Legislative Council Bureau (LCB) workshops and hearings as well as to stay abreast of educator effectiveness on a national forefront.
- Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Gardner explained the ground rules of the election. He stated that anyone could make a nomination, including self-election, and that there was no need for a second or additional support. DAG Gardner said that the same process would be used to elect the Vice Chair. Member Small nominated Chair Salazar to continue as Chair. DAG Gardner asked for additional nominations. No other nominations were brought forth. A vote was held for Chair Salazar to remain. **The motion passed unanimously: Chair Salazar will remain in place until her term limit.**
- Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Gardner continued to nominations for Vice Chair. Member Smith nominated Anthony Nunez.
- Member Cooney stated that there was difficulty hearing council members over the teleconference line. Chair Salazar suggested rearranging the room to reduce hearing difficulty.
- DAG Gardner asked for additional nominations. Hearing none, **there was a unanimous vote to confirm Member Nunez as Vice Chair. The TLC Election was complete at 9:31 a.m.**
- Member Small acknowledged Member Marschner-Coyne who has been promoted to an administrative position so was no longer eligible for Vice Chair or TLC membership. Member Small wanted to publicly recognize her leadership and that of Chair Salazar.
- Chair Salazar initiated a reorganization of the room at 9:34 a.m.

## **Nevada Department of Education—Updates**

- Member Collins provided implementation updates from the Nevada Department of Education.
  - NEPF Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG): Member Collins explained that the MAG is comprised of assistant superintendents, Human Resources leaders, and NEPF Liaisons from a broad range of school districts and counties including Humboldt, Nye, Clark, Washoe, and Carson City. Per the authority granted in NRS 391.485, their purpose is to develop procedures and tools for monitoring the NEPF by local school boards with support from the NDE. Member Collins stated that Reino Makkonen and Marie Mancuso from WestEd are helping to develop the monitoring toolkit for districts as well as a rubric for the NDE to monitor that monitoring. Member Collins stated that the goal is to have a draft of these by April so that they can be field tested with PD in the fall. Chair Salazar and Member White are also on the MAG, so will help to provide accurate updates. As it is not a public body, Member Collins will be reporting to NDE and TLC on all actions, decisions, and tools created.

- Member Smith asked how often the MAG group meets. Member Collins clarified that their first meeting was December 11, 2018 and that there will be 3-4 meetings total to complete a draft by April.
- Member White and Kirsten Gleissner, participants in the recent MAG meeting, did not have information to add.
- Member Small requested more detail on how the toolkit would be different than the current documents online. Member Collins said that the MAG will be developing a tool to help collect the human talent data. It is not just the protocols, but the data to use for monitoring of the implementation. The MAG is looking at the surveys currently used by NDE to see which questions the members felt were meaningful for districts to use as part of their own surveys and which could be trimmed. The goal is to transition the implementation of the survey to the district with hopes that local education agents will be more likely to get survey feedback from their own members and will be able to utilize this data for implementation and to drive continuous improvement.
- Member Small clarified whether the survey would be a state tool that districts may or must use. Member Collins stated that these questions are yet to be determined. She indicated that she will be talking with Interim Deputy Superintendent Dietrich and Superintendent Canavero about these questions.
- Chair Salazar reminded members that there had been a previous discussion at TLC about the authority for oversight and monitoring of the NEPF. At that time, TLC members had decided that this was the department's work, rather than a responsibility of TLC. This discussion had led to the development of the MAG. NDE appointed Member Collins to complete this work but she has also invited stakeholders to have a voice in its development.
- Field tests:
  - Audiologist: Member Collins has been working with the lead audiologist to make revisions to the language and performance levels in the rubric.
  - Speech-Language Pathologists: Professionals have requested to meet in Las Vegas with concerns around their framework. Possible recommended changes include combining the two separate rubrics into one. Member Collins and the workgroup are currently trying to schedule a date for this meeting.
  - Principal supervisors: Chair Salazar has been leading the principal supervisor field test. There are 4 districts participating: Clark, Washoe, Humboldt, and Nye. Chair Salazar revealed that they have never met as one group, but have all received the same information at individual meetings with her and the group is in constant communication. During each one-on-one meeting, the agenda has included an overview of the standards, framework, implementation cycle, and purpose of the field study. Chair Salazar shared resources from CCSSO, the Wallace foundation, and Vanderbilt University. She indicated that there are three guiding questions driving this pilot study: (1) how well does this framework reflect the work that principal supervisors actually do, how well are the expectations captured, how well do the descriptor notes

and evidence support the standards, and is the framework a tool for growth and development; (2) what should the SLG look like for this group and does it provide an avenue to see the impact of principal supervisors on students, and (3) what support or resources need to be developed to support the successful implementation in addition to the materials already published by Washington SEL. Chair Salazar has completed a crosswalk with current Nevada materials to those already published nationally in regards to the role and standards for the principal supervisors. She states that nationally the focus is shifting towards student outcomes and how to best support school leaders to effect such outcomes. There has been an acknowledgement that principal supervisors are critical to effective principals. The meetings have included a detailed discussion around the role of principal supervisors. Next steps include completing orientation and transitioning through a reorganization of the Clark County School District. Progress checks will be completed January through April with a calibration training in February. A pilot will be completed in April, with findings to be reported to TLC in May.

- Member Rippet posed a question regarding the weight of the SLG for principal supervisors.
- Member Small asked whether there was anything to look at the accuracy of the supervision of OLEPs. Chair Salazar said that there has not been legislation to support the accuracy of the supervision of OLEPs or provide a framework for OLEP supervisors. What was approved by legislature very clearly stated the focus was on the supervisor of the principals, not a global set of supervisors (including those of other educational professionals).
- Chair Salazar asked for questions from the north.
- Member White asked about principal supervisors in the rural counties where the supervision of principals is only one of multiple roles and responsibilities of those who would be evaluated with the NEPF principal supervisor framework. While recognizing the potential for multiple roles and duties, Chair Salazar stated that the recommendation is that the NEPF standards provide guidance and feedback on how that individual supports principals. There has not been discussion around exceptions for those principal supervisors who have additional duties. Member Collins confirmed that other than the superintendent, all principal supervisors must use the NEPF to evaluate their supervisory role and the superintendent may evaluate the satisfactory completion of their additional roles.
- Member White presented an example of an accounting director also completing principal supervision at about 20% of his workload. She wonders whether only 20% of his evaluation should be the NEPF, rather than 100% of the evaluation.
- Member Collins will bring this question to NDE Leadership.
- Member Collins adds a comment that Nevada is getting national attention for the work being completed around their principal supervisor framework as evidenced by discussion at a regional meeting of West Ed and invited

presentation at CCSSO with Chair Salazar and Dr. Clifford. Many states have adopted the standards but have not yet moved to utilize this in a functional rubric. Nevada has already done this.

- Application for Alternate Tools for OLEP. Copies were provided to public in attendance. The alternate tools for OLEP include the same changes approved for teacher and administrator alternate tools. They were built to reduce redundancies of copying and pasting the summary of evidence section. This evidence will still be shared with the individual evaluated. Since the precedent was set that TLC would approve the tools before they are taken to SBE, these additional requests continue this process. Member Collins allowed time for review of the tools.
  - Member White asked whether statewide use of these tools will also be requested like the previous tools had been. Member Collins requested that NASS send a support letter so that the motion for SBE can be for approval of the alternate tools to be used in CCSD and statewide.
  - No further questions.
  - Chair Salazar requested a motion to approve the request for the use of alternative tools for OLEP with changes aligned with those previously approved tools for teachers and administrators. **Member Nunez makes the motion for approval of the alternative tools. Seconded by Member Owens. Member Small requested additional time to look over the tools. Chair Salazar granted a recess of four minutes to review these tools. Chair Salazar initiated a vote. Unanimously passed. Motion carried at 10:12 a.m.**
- Reminder of future TLC meeting dates: Future dates for coming year will be discussed in February. Recommendations to be made to SBE on the NEPF must be finalized at the February meeting to be ready for March meeting.

### NEPF Survey Results

- Member Collins reminded members that they had been charged to review the NEPF survey and Building Administrator data not presented at the last TLC meeting and that NDE would not be completing the presentations in full at the current meeting for the sake of time. Chair Salazar asked for a brief presentation for the members of the public present.
- Kristin Withey, NDE Education Programs Professional, reviewed the NEPF survey results specifically identified as points of interest at previous TLC meetings. Dr. Withey began with a comparative analysis between administrator and teacher perception of time spent on various components required in the completion and use of the NEPF. These include observation, conferencing, and completion of documentation. Additional survey responses were presented in relation to the amount of interrater reliability training completed. Data groupings included categories of 'attended 1 session,' 'attended 2-4 sessions,' 'attended all 5 sessions,' 'none attended,' or 'training not offered.' Questions included types of trainings, perception of positive impact on practices, meaningful implementation of the NEPF, confidence in the student learning goal process, and time spent completing the various components of the NEPF. The last section of the presentation provided a historical comparison of teacher and administrator responses over the two years of survey completion.

- Member Small asked to confirm his interpretation of the data. He gave an example stating that as he interpreted the graph, 80% of those who had not attended any training felt they could meaningfully identify NEPF performance levels for their teachers. Dr. Withey confirmed his analysis was correct.
- Member Smith asked a question on Slide 13 Question 5. Dr. Withey responded that the survey format was a drop down response selection so it limited responses to the predetermined options and did not include 'did not complete' choice. Member Smith posed a follow-up question asking for an explanation of 'online self-check.' Dr. Withey explained that RPDP provides online videos for practice observations and ratings allowing users to then compare their ratings to those of the experts from CREST. Member Smith suggests an 'I didn't do any of this' option. Dr. Withey suggested that this was great feedback to pass along to the Monitoring Advisory Group.
- Chair Salazar suggests that it will be important to consider which of the survey questions are most pertinent to monitoring implementation and is cognizant of the length of the survey.
- Member Smith asked whether there was a requirement in the state of Nevada that licensed administrators attend an interrater reliability training or complete coursework around such. Member Collins stated that there was not currently a requirement that administrators receive content around interrater reliability training. Chair Salazar stated that the administrator program does include a course on evaluation that focuses more on conferencing, rather than calibrating scores for interrater reliability. She stated that the course emphasizes the importance of ensuring that all administrators demonstrate interrater reliability within schools and districts, but is not broader than that discussion.
- Member White suggested that it is important to show number of respondents on the data presentation. She said that it is also important to separate the information, noting that there is a difference between interrater reliability within a school, district, or across the state.
- Member Okuda-Lim identified that the order of the question related to the number of trainings completed may have primed the respondents. He suggested relocating that question to the end of the survey to avoid this priming or overconfident response on subsequent questions. Member Okuda-Lim also informed TLC that after a brief search through licensure legislation, he was unable to find interrater reliability training as an administrator requirement. Member Collins confirmed that she could not remember its inclusion in NRS.
- There were no additional comments.

### **2017-2018 Building Administrator NEPF Data Overview**

- Kristin Withey, NDE Education Programs Professional, presented NEPF data collected from Building Administrators during the 2017-2018 school year. The slides presented the averages of scores for the professional practice domain, instructional leadership domain, student learning goal, and summative evaluations. Data were also presented on the highest and lowest average scoring strands within the domains. Additional slides revealed the distribution of administrator effectiveness ratings by district.

- Member Smith asked for clarification about the effectiveness rating data from Nye County. Dr. Withey explained that data were suppressed based on having 10 or fewer administrators however it appears that there were errors in the data for Nye and Washoe counties.
- Member Smith asked whether there was data that could be reported from human resources departments within the districts about high numbers of administrators in the developing category, especially for Douglas County. Members believe there may have been some typos or errors in the data as a result in change of staff at the NDE during the collection and analysis of data for the 2017-2018 school year.
- Chair Salazar reminds TLC members that there are many rural or small counties for whom small differences in count may have large impacts on percentage and that visualization of data grouped by district can be misleading when counts of administrators vary so greatly between districts.
- Member White stated that the error may just have been that the number in parenthesis is the number of schools, not the number of administrators as stated, and so that data on the slide for which errors were discussed may actually be correct.
- Member Collins stated that this discussion highlighted the importance of asking district superintendents to verify their district data in any presentations to be shared with the public (e.g. during TLC or SBE).
- No additional questions. A brief recess was provided. Council resumed at 10:55 a.m.

### **Public Education Foundation (PEF) Presentation**

- Member Okuda-Lim, Director of Policy and Analytical Leadership for the Public Education Foundation (PEF) and Resident Fellow for the Leadership Institute of Nevada, introduced the work of the PEF NEPF Task Force. This force was convened in August 2018 and is comprised of Teach Plus Nevada fellows, alumni of the PEF leadership academies, and staff of the organization. The purpose of the task force was to bring together teachers and administrators, or those being evaluated and completing the evaluations, to develop recommendations informed by research and experience for policy makers to improve the NEPF. To do so, the task force collaborated with CCSD, conducted interviews, and examined national seminal research on teacher evaluation. Member Okuda-Lim acknowledged other task force members and then introduced the two presenters, Debbie Brockett, a current administrator in CCSD and alumna of the PEF teacher-leader academy, and Jordana McCudden, CCSD instructional coach, alumna of the PEF teacher-leader academy, and Policy Fellow for Teach Plus Nevada. Together they presented six key recommendations to improve the NEPF, benefit educator practice, and improve student achievement in the state of Nevada.
  1. Reduce the weight of SLG. Ms. Brockett said that she believes there needs to be more conversation and training around the SLG before it can be weighted at 40%. Such a high number dilutes the picture of what teachers do in and outside of the classroom every day and does not provide a holistic view of the teacher.
  2. Greater distance between 'developing' rating and dismissal. Ms. Brockett stated that in her experience, the document is currently seen as a tool for dismissal wherein teachers perform the minimum to avoid receiving a 'developing' or 'ineffective' rating. In



addition, as it is currently implemented, the ratings are provided to teachers at the end of the year. This leads to teachers glancing that they are in neither of the categories that places them on a track for dismissal and then putting the document away. If there were greater distance between the use of the NEPF and human resource decisions or if there was a way to more clearly link the NEPF to professional development in the specific domain or indicator on which a teacher needs to develop, the tool could be seen as one to drive continuous professional growth. Such separation and link to professional development would add validity to the NEPF in that when 80% of teachers are effective or highly effective, it is because of the effort they had to put in to making that growth and can have confidence that they actually are effective teachers.

3. Streamline the NEPF tool. To align with the conception of the NEPF as a tool for professional growth, a digital tool could automatically link to specific PD aligned with areas for development. The NEPF ratings would not be referred to only one time at the end of the year, but instead whatever rating provided would link to specific PD for growth. We know that a highly effective teacher is what truly changes achievement, so it would be beneficial to link back to the NEPF every time we meet, show teachers where they are, and provide a link to additional ways to grow throughout the year. When we do see a link to PD, it builds validity of the effectiveness data. She stated that she doesn't want to see the number of ineffective grow, but increase the validity and reliability of the data. Forms need to provide continued conversation towards growth, rather than a summative evaluation score.
  4. Appoint a leader in each district responsible for the NEPF. Ms. McCudden called for point person in each district that is responsible for the local implementation of the NEPF. She stated that the indicators are nuanced and may overlap. Because of this, there is a lot of opportunity for different interpretations. So having a 'point person' to provide specific teaching on what those indicators look like in practice rather than having multiple interpretations would build more value and trust for the tool.
  5. Offer PD aligned specifically to NEPF. Teachers begin the school year with a focus on which standard they need to work on, but do not have a way to find PD that is specific to each standard. If there were PD courses that specifically identified standards and indicators, then teachers would know that they were attending professional development in their focus areas. Teachers want to improve their practice, but feel that they would see better student outcomes if they could clearly find those professional development courses that would align with specific standards and/or indicators.
  6. Require norming of evaluators and peer observers. The NEPF is a nuanced document, so teachers would feel more trust in evaluation if they knew that no matter who was performing them, everyone was able to successfully identify standards and indicators evident in their teaching. Ms. McCudden identified the need for courses and regular norming opportunities that support interrater reliability or calibration for observers and evaluators across schools, districts, and the state.
- Member Okuda-Lim provided a recapitulation of the key ideas informing the six recommendations. He shared the importance of bolstering educator's trust with the NEPF so

that they will use the system to change their practice, refocusing an emphasis on coaching and developing educators, and providing an accurate appraisal of performance.

- Discussion:
  - Chair Salazar stated that these recommendations reaffirm the approach towards and central beliefs involved in the development of the NEPF and provide support for possible recommendations identified by TLC. She listed alignment with previous recommendations identified by TLC including reduced SLG weighting, the use of a streamlined technology platform, and separation of 'developing' from dismissal. She stated that the technology platform would have reduced the need for application of alternate tools because it would have streamlined the process, provided an easy way to share information with teacher, and would link to training developed by CRESST specific to each strand. Chair Salazar suggested that these recommendations be brought forth to the new legislative session specifically requesting additional funding for the technology platform to implement the system seamlessly statewide so that it can be operationally functional. Chair Salazar discussed the district liaison and shared that Member Collins currently has NEPF liaisons, but this may not have been as effective as possible. She suggested that the conversation around a strong liaison should be brought back to the MAG. Chair Salazar reinforced the importance of PD and stated that RPDP does provide alignment to NEPF in all PD. She recommended that TLC continue to support for this work. Chair Salazar shared that there are offerings for IRR trainings provided by RPDP (developed by CRESST), but there is no current requirement to attend or refresh. Chair Salazar reiterated that it seemed like PEF has identified some of the formal recommendations that have already been made to SBE and legislators, so is very appreciative of the NEPF Task Force support.
  - Member Okuda-Lim adds recognition that these ideas have been discussed and collected over the past several years by working with professionals in the field, especially as components of alumni from leadership programs' capstone presentations as well as the Teach Plus system. He offers opportunity for continued collaboration.
  - Member Rippet directed a question to Ms. Brockett about her comment that the SLG should be reduced to 20% but could be working towards a return to 40%. He asked specifically why we would want to return to the higher weight if it is felt that 40% is diluting the rest of the classroom and professional behaviors. Ms. Brockett responded that there are currently no reliable materials that allow teachers to engage with the SLG or that prove that the SLG is powerful enough to represent 40% of their evaluation. She reiterated that such a high percentage takes away from the rest of what teachers do every day. She feels that the SLG is an important factor, but does not need to make up such a large portion of the evaluation. Member Okuda-Lim added that the task force has discussed how there may be a possible future in which 40% might be a viable option, but that would involve thorough conversation and understanding of what comprises a high quality SLG. Member Rippet followed up with a question asking whether 1/5 of the evaluation (the recommended 20%) is still too much considering the lack of clarity

around the SLG; why 20% versus a lower percent? Member Okuda-Lim responds that the task force discussed the percent in relation to the more recent provision of clarity around the SLG. There has been a gradual shift, revealed by teacher and administrator survey data, towards valuing the SLG as part of the educator performance framework since the goal of education is to impact students. Reducing the weight to 20% would account for its import, but not dilute that of the other work completed daily.

- Member Small appreciated the recommendations and requested to address several concerns across all six. He began with a focus on the distance between developing and dismissal. He questioned Principal Brockett about familiarity with the educator assistance plan that already exists as part of the NEPF and whether it is in practice. Ms. Brockett provided her opinion from a principal perspective. She focused on why evaluators are scared to give twos, stating that if a teacher received a two for three evaluation cycles and then wanted to become an administrator, there would be a stigma attached. She suggested that administrators tend to give threes if a teacher is showing growth for fear of the impact a two might have on teachers' careers and professional confidence. Member Small followed with feedback related to the appointment of a district NEPF leader and provision of professional development, with a question around who is in charge. He focused on the idea of building trustworthiness and stated that he believed mistrust is about the practice of what happens in schools, not the policy makers. Member Small indicated that if we are going to build trust with the system, that has to be built through practice of what is happening in schools; it is not up to TLC. Member Small's next comment provided feedback around the idea of norming (recommendation 6). He stated that he is of the mindset that the NEPF should be flexible so that it can be used across a broad range of contexts. Member Small provided examples of variability between a one-room school house and class for students with severe disabilities. He asked the PEF taskforce to address his concern with their idea of 'norming.' Ms. McCudden responded from the perspective of a peer observer across grade level settings. She stated that good teaching identified in the NEPF does not matter the level in which an observation is being completed. It may look different, but each indicator and standard can easily be applied to any classroom. Norming observers ensures that they know what to look for. The PEF is not recommending norming teachers to include specific behaviors or practices. Ms. Brockett spoke to Member Small's concern about an NEPF point person for every district. She stated that teacher quality in a classroom is essential for student achievement. Ms. Brockett said that there is currently a barrier to building that teacher capacity as administrators must take time to identify who to ask about the implementation of the NEPF each year. She stated that if there were a person who focused entirely on NEPF and who could provide common or required trainings, then they could make sure that every administrator attended the same training thus eliminating the barriers and ensure successful implementation.
- Member Rippet provided a comment in regards to norming. He stated that the punishment portion is counter to trust. Until we eliminate any connection to elimination, we can't have trust. Says that norming is not as necessary as developing

the understanding that what a given evaluator indicates as rated lowest should be the focus of improvement plans.

- Member Smith commented on Recommendation 2. She indicated that it is a critical piece related to the SBE and Mr. Newburn's concerns. The PEF recommendation gets to a question about the state systems as a whole that Member Smith has had. Member Smith said that she doesn't know how we get to a place where there is no penalty for a developing rating. There is penalty at the district level because of how teachers are hired and fired, but not at the state level. Member Collins clarified that there is a potential penalty currently at the state level. Member Smith asked for PEF's recommendation for new teachers, referencing research that suggests a first year teacher can't be expected to be highly effective yet Nevada's current rating system doesn't allow for that reality. Member Okuda-Lim stated that the task force has not decided on specific recommendations, e.g. statutory language. Instead, their conversation has focused on looking at other state frameworks. They have spoken with a representative from New Mexico Public Education Department. The way their statutes and regulations are written provide that teachers who are identified as ineffective still track to a path for removal. For a teacher considered developing, they are not automatically tracked onto dismissal path. Instead, developing teachers get put on an educator development plan with the expectation that the teacher improve over the next few years. If the teacher refuses to follow the plan, then they may be dismissed. He explained that this is the definition of 'greater distance;' that new developing teachers should not be on track for dismissal and not have it in statute that they may be considered for dismissal.
- Chair Salazar says that this speaks to the legislative language on which they were going to vote at the last meeting in which developing is clumped with ineffective. One of the first recommendations is to address the language that continues to uphold a bifurcated system.
- Member Owens affirmed that she also believes the 40% SLG weight was a mistake since there are so many factors that should be part of the evaluations. She added that she feels that she has nowhere to turn for professional development and loves the recommendation of aligned PD. Member Owens asked whether they had discussion around building trust by requiring that principals attend training on how to use the NEPF. To support the idea, she referenced the teacher and administrator survey data presented earlier showing that some administrators are not attending and that teachers are aware of this fact. Member Okuda-Lim said that each of these recommendations was meant to build trust as a holistic package, rather than any one specifically doing so. The taskforce believes that all recommendations must be done in concert in order to successfully improve the trust level.
- Chair Salazar asked for closing remarks or questions before moving to next agenda items. None stated.

## **NEPF Data: State Board of Education (SBE) Feedback from November 15, 2018 Meeting**

- Chair Salazar began discussion on recommendations to address the concerns identified by the State Board of Education, especially regarding the distribution of educator effectiveness ratings and low count of teachers within the developing category. Chair Salazar indicated that the SBE will not approve recommended score ranges until their concerns are addressed. She restated Member Newburn's comment that the score range decision does not matter if there is not willingness to identify educators as developing. Member Collins stated that TLC and members of the public have seen the data with which the SBE took issue multiple times and felt that it would be more prudent to spend time on discussion of recommendations. Chair Salazar suggested that the recommendation with which to start may be to recommend updated legislative language that separates developing from ineffective. She introduced a report to be published this week from the collaborative between Great Teachers and Leaders Center and WestEd/REL West that explores 6 states engaged in continuous improvement of their effectiveness frameworks. She noted that Delaware found that there is also lack of trust in the system, an issue relevant to Nevada as identified by PEF. They too found distributions that look similar to Nevada's. She suggested that what is important to note is that Delaware is attempting to reestablish their framework as a tool for continuous professional growth. Chair Salazar stated that a second recommendation may parallel Delaware's to reset the messaging by ensuring that there is nothing in statutory language that makes the NEPF a punitive system rather than one for growth and development. Chair Salazar suggested that the next piece should align with Arizona's focus of professional development (PD). She reminded members that NEPF implementation does not look the same within a school or district or across the state, so suggested that another big piece is how support is provided so that it is more consistent. This joint document between GTL and WestEd/REL West will add strength to our recommendations to SBE since we have modeled ourselves after some of these systems previously.
- Chair Salazar opened the floor for discussion and began by suggesting that the first recommendation should be to untangle developing from ineffective in the language.
- Member Small agreed, but asked whether TLC was getting lists of recommendations from each district, or whether TLC members were supposed to be reaching out to districts to find out about their recommendations. He specifically wanted to know whether those teachers identified as ineffective actually lost their or if they did not, what the practice was at the district level. He suggested that even if the law were to change, there would still be variability from district to district. Member Small wanted to ensure that the recommendations TLC puts forth correspond with what districts identify as areas of need and would be received positively.
- Member White, a rural superintendent and President of NASS, was asked to respond whether there are any specific recommendations from superintendents. Chair Salazar stated that an example of a recommendation from superintendents is the grievance/dismissal process related to developing and the reluctance to utilize the 'developing' category. Member White states that it is a fair point to note that we don't go back to districts to request input. Typically, members report what happens at TLC, rather than requesting input from districts. Member White continues that she doesn't think many teachers in the state identified as 'developing' or

'ineffective' did lose their jobs, but are instead are on plans of assistance. Within her district, those not included in the data reported left the profession by choice. Those that are receiving the supports they need and are on plans of assistance stay because they see a way to grow. Member White suggests that the state can't afford to use the evaluation system as a way to get rid of teachers. Chair Salazar states that this suggestion aligns with a prior recommendation made by TLC. The recommendation focused on collecting the number of individuals who have resigned before they were dismissed using NEPF evidence. Member White notes that data is collected on how many teachers fall into one of four categories, but that there is no data revealing where teachers fall along the spectrum. She suggests that if we looked at that data, TLC might be able to identify those who are barely effective and need additional supports versus those who are fully effective. Member White wondered if the way that we report the data presents an accurate picture of where teachers actually fall. Chair Salazar mentioned that the MET study identified a similar finding. When there is a label for a given range of performance, they are always quite broad with those who fall at one end of the spectrum or the other within that range. It is suggested that we look at the distribution within the ranges themselves. This distribution within the range may be more telling than the actual score range label. If there were a disaggregation of subranges within effective, there may be a more visible 'normal' scale.

- Member Rippet recommended that we carefully consider and have discussion around our recommendation of who is allowed to be developing e.g. transference to a different school cite versus new from out of state or getting a new certification/role and not being allowed to develop at that level. Chair Salazar states that this is a better recommendation for agenda item 11.
- Member White asked if it would be possible to recall the motion Member Small had made at the last meeting but on which TLC could not vote because they lost quorum when she left.
- Member Small commented that there is a stigma around the 'developing' rating. Historically, there has been a mindset in which teachers strive for certain scores to reaffirm that they are 'good' rather than being willing to allow themselves to remain in the developing category while they strive to improve their practice. Member Small agreed with Ms. Brockett's earlier comment that developing may be avoided because it triggers the supervisor having 'to do more'. He stated that he does not know how to quantify or explain that, but that paradigm is being carried over to the new system. That mindset and the fact that there is a lot of work associated with helping a teacher develop and grow, may be a reason for the lack of 'developing'. Member Small commented that streamlining tools as CCSD had done should have a positive effect on the amount of time that can be spent on feedback versus paperwork. Chair Salazar recalled the Delaware conversation about the perception that an educator assistance plan is associated with a punitive track. She directed members to the minutes and motion from the last TLC meeting. Member White requested that they vote on that previous motion to remove developing from NRS 391.725.
- Member Collins comments that there is a typo in the November minutes: it should be 725 rather than NRS 391.275.

- Deputy Attorney General Gardner states that there is mention of developing across NRS 391, so the former motion should not stand, but instead should be broader than NRS 391.725.
- A motion was made to remove developing from NRS 391 in all areas when in conjunction with ineffective is linked to developing to punitive action from Member Small and seconded by Member Rippet.
- Member Okuda-Lim clarified the process for recommending to SBE, NDE, and the legislature. Chair Salazar reminded TLC that if SBE and NDE do not approve the recommendations, that does not preclude TLC from taking them to legislators, however the process is that the recommendations first be brought forth to SBE and NDE to attempt to build agreement.
- Member Collins clarified the language: remove developing from NRS 391 when it is used in conjunction with ineffective rating and would result in punitive repercussions. She indicated that there are instances when developing is used in conjunction with ineffective and does not lead to a punitive action.
- Member White stated that the previous lengthy discussion related to probationary versus post-probationary teachers and that the developing language should not be removed from all areas of NRS 391. She indicated concern and would prefer limiting the motion to NRS 391.725 that only focuses on probationary.
- Member Okuda-Lim clarified the current state of probationary versus post probationary and developing.
- Member Collins stated that she would not be able to support a unilateral application, and would prefer to limit the language to NRS 391.725.
- Member Smith asked for a definition of probationary.
- Chair Salazar asked if we need to adjust the motion to focus on NRS 391.725 and any other areas of language with probationary and developing.
- Member Rippet also cautions that probationary should not be limited to new teachers.
- Member Owens provided an example of a post-probationary teacher with a new endorsement who begins to teach a new subject.
- Member Collins stated that good teaching should be able to be applied across teaching contexts so a teacher new to a role versus the profession should not be allowed to be developing for multiple years without a punitive track. Punitive action is triggered after two consecutive years of developing, so that post-probationary teacher does not need to worry about developing for that first year, but should not be developing for more than that.
- Member Rippet stated that if we want a growth system, then we need to take the punishment out. He indicates that he feels the link to punitive measures could deter a post-probationary teacher from moving into a new subject and exploring professional growth in that manner.
- Member White focused attention on 391.730 and stated that it can take much longer than 2 years to become competent or to move out of developing. She stated that she wonders if there should be differentiation between those who are not working towards improvement and implementing the improvement plan with fidelity and should be on a punitive track versus those who are putting forth the effort and should be kept.

- Member Collins stated that there may be opportunity to add a descriptor to 391.730 to differentiate between developing who is making effort or progress versus those who are putting forth the effort.
- Member White said that those who are not making effort should be ineffective.
- Member Okuda-Lim suggested striking subsection 1 of 391.730.
- Member Nunez stated that there are multiple stakeholder viewpoints, so if we make a recommendation that is too limited, we will have disappointed stakeholders or we could have improved variability for the next few years and then a return to the same bifurcated trend. He reminded TLC members that Nevada already has a measure for the state to take action if a school is not successfully supporting its students in the NSPF. He suggested that we allow districts and supervisors to own the system they have put in to place.
- **Chair Salazar returned to 391.725 to remove developing because that addresses probationary only. She recalled Member Small's original motion at the last meeting with regards to the removal of developing on 391.725. It was seconded by Member Rippet. The motion passed unanimously and was carried at 12:49 pm.**
- Chair Salazar asked for a motion to remove subsection 1 related to developing in NRS 391.730.
- Member White stated that this recommendation reflects her intent. She reiterated that there is still concern about the definition of developing overall.
- **Member Small made a motion to remove developing from 391.730 subsection 1. Seconded by Member Okuda-Lim. Ten votes approve. Member Collins abstained. Vote passes at 12:52 pm.**
- Chair Salazar states that there is a definition of developing in the protocols already. She provided a summary of recommendations thus far: sub-ranges, clarify legislative language, collect data on resignations
- Member Collins stated we will need more recommendations than just those identified already. She suggested that if we were to collect NEPF information at the individual level through OPAL, it would allow for analysis mentioned in TLC (the sub-distribution of 'effective'), but there has been push-back against the collection at an individual level. She said that TLC would need support from TLC to request this level of data collection.
- Member Smith asked if there is a way to make a recommendation that we need to have some access to the data at this level through the OPAL system.
- Member Collins restated that a recommendation be made that the NDE be able to collect NEPF data at the individual level through the OPAL system with the stipulation that all data would be shared in aggregate and de-identified in order to provide more detailed analysis.
- Member White stated that she liked data review at the individual level, but does not want to support the collection of this data at the individual level.
- Member Collins stated that we do not have that data and would need to collect it either from district report or through OPAL. Member White states that districts could report this data with identifiers removed to overcome her issue with the use of the OPAL system.
- Chair Salazar stated that this data could be collected via the OPAL system to avoid making the districts have to do this work.



- Member Collins stated that we do not have the human talent or data system at the state level to receive information sent from districts. Risk of error is much higher if districts send data manually. It would be much more successful if districts could use a portal into the OPAL system. Member Collins will have to talk with data leadership to see if whole-district de-identified data could be uploaded into OPAL. Right now, the data must be linked to the confidential file of the teacher, but this link allows for data analysis related to number of years teaching, prep program, etc. There would be protections in place that no individual identifier would ever be shared.
- Member White stated that there is misperception about educator effectiveness. She stated that the more clarity around the data, we can better explain what is happening around the tool. She identified that there is still work to be done around the separation between student achievement and teacher ratings.
- Chair Salazar stated that a tangible recommendation may be to request that more precise data needs to be collected to better reflect or provide a clearer picture of student achievement and educator effectiveness. The recommendation would not include OPAL specifically, or the method through which this data should be collected.
- Chair Salazar states that another recommendation be made regarding the continued work with the Monitoring Advisory Group and development of the audit toolkit to reflect many of the implementation and liaison concerns presented by SBE.
- Member Collins suggested that an additional recommendation might be to have a digital implementation of the NEPF. She identified that that NDE could draft out language for the third and fourth recommendations to be brought forth to the SBE. Members could move to approve that the NDE draft language for additional recommendations, including an additional discussion around the technology platform.
- Member Small expressed that this was a positive step because even if quorum was lost at the next meeting, there would still be conceptual recommendations to take to SBE.
- Chair Salazar opened for motions to approve the five conceptual recommendations.
- **Member Okuda-Lim suggested a motion in three parts**
  - **that TLC move to approve the three conceptual recommendations.**
  - **authority granted to the NDE to draft language to be potentially approved at the February TLC meeting**
  - **TLC members are authorized to share these conceptual recommendations with additional members of the public and the SBE.**
- **Motion seconded by Member Smith.**
- Chair Salazar opened for additional discussion.
- Member White opposes approving toolkit without having seen it, especially if the motion was to require districts to use the NDE toolkit instead of the system they are currently using.
- Member Collins suggested that the recommendation instead be TLC supports the development of a toolkit with stakeholder input.
- Member Okuda-Lim read NRS 391.485 about the data to be reviewed and by whom.
- Chair Salazar suggested the recommendation be that SBE take the authority granted in NRS 391.485 reviews the local school board reviews of the manner in which the NEPF is carried out

- Member Cooney states that all this information has already been submitted to NDE, so NDE should share that data with SBE.
- Member Collins clarified that NDE does not have the data presented to local school boards, only the dates on which the data was shared.
- Member Okuda-Lim asks for Member Collins to share the conceptual recommendations again.
  - Need more precise collection of data to more accurately represent the distribution of scores
  - the SBE review the local schoolboard monitoring of the NEPF
  - statewide technology platform for implementation of the NEPF aligned with PD offerings
- Member Okuda-Lim amended his motion to incorporate the conceptual recommendations as they currently stand. Member Smith confirmed her second.
- **Chair Salazar called for a vote. Member Cooney opposed. All others in favor. Motion carries at 1:31 pm.**
- Chair Salazar asked TLC if a lunch break is desired. Members agree to take a five minute break.
- Chair Salazar uses flexible agenda to move to the 2019 Legislative Session Recommendations.

## **2019 Legislative Session Recommendations**

- Chair Salazar restated all discussed recommendations for the legislative session: separate developing and dismissal, technology platform linked to PD, continued support for the RPDP and a move back to 20% SLG weight. She stated that they have not considered the PEF's recommendation for the liaison. Because it is in place, it could be something used with more fidelity. In addition, PEF recommended inter-rater reliability training, and that has been grouped in to PD in the past. She asks members again to build a conceptual list of recommendations.
- Member Collins asked members to turn to the document posted for Item 11. She stated that the first bullet point has not yet been discussed. She clarified that there are components already in statute for teachers and administrators; there is not the same statute for OLEPs. Asks for the recommendation that they add statute for OLEP that matches that already in statute for teachers and administrators.
- Member Small asked if we are going to make motions individually or as a large chunk.
- Member Collins asked for individual motions.
- **Member Small makes a motion to add statute for OLEP, including principal supervisors. Seconded by Member Owens. No further discussion. Motion passed unanimously.**
- **Member Collins added that we recommend to legislators the same changes in NRS proposed to SBE (remove developing from NRS 395.725 and delete subsection 1 of NRS 395.730). Member Rippet made a motion. Member Okuda-Lim seconded the motion. No further discussion. Chair Salazar called for a vote. The motion passed unanimously.**
- Chair Salazar returned to previous recommendations made during the last session. The first identified is a move to 20% weight for the SLG. She asked for consideration from members of

the council. Member Nunez moved to recommend that the SLG be weighted at 20%. Member Owens seconded.

- Member Collins stated that the NDE feels that no recommendations should be made this legislative session in an attempt to see continuity of the NEPF.
- Member Cooney stated that there would be no impact on the current year, so echoed Member Collins' concern.
- Member Owens suggested that the original 20% wasn't allowed the opportunity to go un-amended either.
- Member Small stated that movement and change is the norm around the country. The concern is that the SLG is merely a snapshot of the daily practice, rather than a holistic measure. The set of standards and indicators should facilitate teacher thought and attention directed towards student outcomes across all areas of instruction daily; the weight of one measure shouldn't usurp all others.
- Chair Salazar references the soon-to-be-published white paper on reporting states reconsideration of their teacher effectiveness systems. She states that those states who weighted SLOs heavily are pulling back and saying it should be more about informing educational practice. So, the national landscape is moving towards less emphasis on a separate category of student outcomes based on standardized or statewide assessments and should be more about an embedded practice model with authentic measures of student growth. While she understood the concern about shifting weights again, she says that TLC was against 40% weight originally, and should align with the national movement. Chair Salazar cited again that variability of student outcomes is impacted by teachers at around 17%, so asked how it should comprise such a high percentage of the evaluation system.
- **Chair Salazar calls for a vote to recommend 20% SLG weight. Member Collins said nay. Motion carries at 2:04pm.**
- Member Okuda-Lim motions that there be a recommendation to support funding for a streamlined digital statewide tool for NEPF implementation. Seconded by Member Nunez. Member Smith clarified the language to include technology. Chair Salazar suggests 'technological platform' so that it is not limited to tech-based tools alone. **Member Okuda-Lim proposes to recommend that the legislature fund an NEPF technology platform for use statewide. Member Nunez continues with his seconded motion. No further discussion. Chair Salazar calls for vote. Member Collins abstains. Motion passes at 2:09 p.m.**
- There is explanation around why Member Collins abstains. As representative of the NDE, she votes along supported NDE recommendations and abstains if specific NDE position is neutral or unknown.
- Chair Salazar suggested that the third recommendation be to continue to support the RPDP to implement the NEPF effectively. Member Collins states that the NDE is continuing to prioritize this initiative. Member Small makes a motion. Member Owens seconds the motion. Member Small asks whether there needs to be an increase in funding since the current data is showing a large percentage of administrators indicating that they did not attend IRR training. Member Small also proposed that there be a certification process wherein the RPDP provide verification

of attendance of PDs ensuring that administrators and above attend the trainings required to do their jobs. Chair Salazar stated that there are two pieces: a) increase the funding to the RPDPs to ensure that everyone has training and b) the expectation that people do indeed participate in the PD. Chair Salazar cautioned that once something is mandated, it changes the funding source. However, there is opportunity with the continued development of the Monitoring Task force to fully define the role of the NEPF Liaison and Principal Supervisor to underscore the importance of PD attendance so that principals can be fully prepared to be instructional leaders.

- Member Owens asks for clarification of how the funding sources would change if mandated. Member Collins explained that if a state mandates an action, then federal funds can't be used to support this ('supplement versus supplant'). There is an issue of not taking PD because it is not mandated, but the issue remains if something is mandated and then not funded.
- Member Smith stated that while funding is always a concern, if there is something that needs to be mandated to ensure that the NEPF is implemented with fidelity, then we should not avoid it. Also asks how you can be a licensed administrator in the state of Nevada and not be required to be educated and trained on the state evaluation tool. Chair Salazar reminds that the original motion is to continue to support RPDP and then can look at the implementation pieces.
- **Member Small and Member Owens continue to support the motion. No additional discussion. Members voted on supporting continued funding of the RPDP. Member Collins abstained. Motion carried at 2:20 pm.**
- Chair Salazar stopped discussion to move on to the next agenda item related to OLEP scores.

### **Other Licensed Educational Personnel (OLEP) Score Range Calculation**

- Dr. Kristin Withey, Education Programs Professional with NDE, presented the Other Licensed Educational Personnel score range calculations. She provided the authority granted through NRS 391.675. Dr. Withey noted concern around using teacher score ranges for OLEP and cited two areas of specifically for SLPs and school nurses. Specifically, there are indicators for which a score of four is not possible so there was concern that the score ranges may not be attainable. Because of these concerns and because TLC's goal is to ensure that the previous recommendation does no harm, the conversation was brought back to members. Dr. Withey provided a reminder of how the original teacher score ranges were established and why it was recommended that these ranges were applied to OLEP. The recommended score ranges were approved at the October TLC meeting. Original discussion around teacher and administrator score ranges was presented at the May 2015 meeting. At that time, they discussed two options: a) identify a specific proportion that could fall into each category i.e. curving, or b) determining a range of scores based off of the pilot distribution. This recommended score ranges were made off of the samples from Washington and Colorado. Slides revealed the application of range lines across the curve of teacher scores from the pilot. Chair Salazar added that it is important to note that TLC used teacher data to develop score ranges for administrators so the precedent of using the teacher score ranges for a group for which there was no distribution data and a different set of standards and indicators was set in 2015. Dr. Withey showed a slide presented at the October TLC meeting of the count of OLEP who submitted their scores to the pilot data set. Member Collins added that the EPP had reached out several times to the OLEP who

participated and the low count was all that had been received. Member Small clarified that the data shown was the number of data submitted to NDE, not the entire set who participated in the pilot. Member Collins affirmed that this data had to be submitted and there was only about 20% data submitted. Dr. Withey presented a calculation of the minimum number of four's an OLEP could get in a domain to achieve a highly effective status. She demonstrated the calculation using the teacher summative rating score. Dr. Withey reminded members of all assumptions held during the calculation, including holding a perfect score in other domains, the lowest score as a 3, and some indicators hold more weight in the calculation. She next presented the OLEP scores with only one rubric, labeled as 'unweighted summative evaluation scores.' She stated the number of fours required to get a rating of highly effective. The next slide shows those with multiple rubrics or 'weighted summative evaluation scores.' She explained that the number of fours shown in the table reveal the count required to reach 'highly effective' if the other domains are held at a constant 4. The table also reminded members of the weight of each domain. Dr. Withey focused on the calculation for SLPs specifically since this group had had noted concern. She noted the three indicators for which a score of four was not attainable. The highest attainable score is a 3.63 in the professional responsibilities domain, or 1.87 points with the rubric weighting. The highest possible in professional practice is a 4. To compensate for the limited score range of the professional responsibilities domain, an SLP would need about 1.8 points in the professional practice domain to be ranked 'highly effective' overall. She then calculated the number of fours required in the practice domain; can still have seven threes in that domain to achieve 'highly effective.' Although the maximum score attainable is 3.81, SLPs do have the opportunity to receive quite a few threes and still be rated 'highly effective.' Dr. Withey reminded TLC that the score range decision is just for the 2018-2019 school year until a complete set of data can be acquired on which to run calculations to determine appropriate ranges for all OLEPs as had been done to build the score range recommendations for teachers. With small n sizes from the OLEP pilot, there was not enough data on which to base a different score range recommendation, but one had to be made as they are in their first year of implementation. She opened the floor for questions.

- Member Rippet asked for clarification why this topic was being reintroduced. Chair Salazar stated that 'we weren't that far off.' The precedent of using a score range not normed on the specific group had been set with administrators. Until we are able to collect data for the year on which to calculate OLEP score ranges, then this presentation was meant to show that the recommended score ranges will do no harm. She reminds TLC that the first score ranges for teachers were for developed from scores without an SLG and these score ranges still work even with the different weightings now. She asked the members if we need to make a different recommendation.
- Member Owens asked whether a future goal is to change the rubric so that there are no indicators for which a score is unattainable. Member Collins said that the rubric cannot be changed unless the specific workgroup brings forth the recommendation to make the changes; the goal is that after this year's data has been collected, we will bring that range on which to base score to collect OLEP data during this year of implementation on which the score ranges can be built. This range did not exist for this year because of the small n size.

- Member Rippet asked what the process would be to change the scoring from 1-3 to 2-4, so that SLPs can get a four, but not get a one. This works towards the issue of trust. He said that under system, I cannot get a perfect score. Chair Salazar stated that changing the rubric is not in our purview. Instead, the OLEP workgroup can change the rubric, bring it to TLC and then present it again at the SBE. She asked TLC members to consider if the recommended score ranges should be adjusted based off of the current presentation.
- Member White asked to look at page 12. She stated that SLPs are at a disadvantage. The arbitrary decision is hurtful to that OLEP group by holding them to a different standard. Dr. Withey restated that SLPs need less fours to achieve highly effective than other OLEP groups. Member Collins reminded TLC that this calculation was to reach 'highly effective,' not 'effective.'
- Member Smith had concerned about what the score ranges are based on, even if just trying to get a baseline moving forward. She is not convinced about what the best solution may be. Member Rippet said that it seems as if we are trying to say 'don't worry about it' for not being able to reach the highest score. Member Rippet asked if he could recommend asking SLPs to change their rubric scoring.
- Member Okuda-Lim asked who had developed the rubrics. Member Collins explained that NDE reached out to state associations who formed workgroups. With materials provided by NDE, these workgroups developed their rubrics based off of their own national standards and brought them back to TLC for approval. She recounted the legislative history of the OLEP evaluation and rubric development. Member Okuda-Lim added that he had wondered if we could go back to the workgroups to change their rubrics, but stated that if these are built off of national guidelines, it may not be possible. Member Collins clarified that the level threes were considered the maximum because there was no way to exceed standards. They either completed it by law, or they didn't. She said that changing the rubrics now will not solve the current problem since we are in year one of implementation and need score range recommendation for this year. Member Okuda-Lim stated that moving forward we should calculate score ranges based off of full sets of OLEP data. Member Collins confirmed that is the goal moving forward, but we want to make sure that we are doing no harm for this first year of implementation. Chair Salazar reiterated that we wanted some consistency for the initial year and then can make changes. She reminded TLC that there can be an action to support the currently recommended score ranges for the SBE or can update the recommendation.
- Member Smith cited the public comment from the morning that had requested NDE collect the full set of data from the pilot. She clarified that Member Collins had stated that numerous attempts had been made to do so, with no success. Member Collins stated that they could reach out again, but that it is already January and people will need to use the score ranges for evaluations soon.
- Member White recommended that TLC scale back the score ranges proportionately if the max for SLPs is 3.8. Member Collins offered that the scores could be multiplied within the tool so that the score range could be kept the same.

- Member Owens stated that there are professionals in attendance who have waited all day to hear the discussion, so suggests that we just add a multiplier in so that a level 4 is achievable for all OLEP.
- Member Collins asked whether a multiplier would impact the data received on which they intend to calculate the score ranges for the next year. Member Nunez said that we would need the scores both ways so that we would have the actual score to see the real distribution. Member Collins stated that the tools would need to be adjusted for the raw score and the multiplier tool. Dr. Withey clarified whether the multiplier was going to affect the summative score or just the indicator. She stated that if you multiply the summative, it won't be an accurate representation since some people will not have scored differently on those indicators for which the limit is set at 3. It will increase everyone's scores. Chair Salazar stated that it should be by standard. Those for which a four is not attainable should be multiplied, rather than the overall summative score. Chair Salazar pointed out that there are some indicators that inherently have more weight since there isn't the same number within that standard. She asked the group to make a motion.
- **Member White made a motion to adjust the score range for SLPs by .95 so that 3.8 is the top and all ranges are adjusted for each of the four labels.** Recommendation is that all other OLEP align with the teacher and administrator score ranges. Members checked to ensure that no other SLPs had the reduced score range. Nurses could attain 3.975, so were not included in the motion.
- Yvonne Chaves, school nurse representative, clarified that the concern for nurses is that the standards are so stringent that they are not able to achieve a score of four and the quality of work is not represented by the rubric. She stated that nurses would like to modify their rubric and tool to update. The issue is not the same as the SLPs.
- **Motion was seconded by Member Rippet. Vote passed unanimously.**

#### **Future Agenda Items**

- Chair Salazar confirmed that the future agenda items are to continue to talk about agenda item 11 and then finalize SBE recommendations.

#### **Public Comment #2**

- No public comment in the north.
- No public comment in the east.
- No public comment in the south.

#### **Adjournment**