NEPF Liaison Panelist Discussion

District Feedback
2025-26 NEPF Field Study
and Summative Evaluation Process

Carson City School District *not involved in the pilot

What went well: Administrators are focused on providing teachers with quality feedback on their classroom instruction including areas that require improvement.

Areas of improvement: We have not been able to improve our skill at using the current tool.

Challenges faced: The tool is too cumbersome for admins and teachers to collect evidence on all the indicators every year. Inter-rater reliability remains a challenge for our district.

Suggestions to make better: Carson City would like the TLC to consider a differentiated growth model as we had when we used the Danielson evaluation tool.

Clark County School District

What went well: Perceptions were more positive with scoring Standards versus not having Indicators to exemplify pockets of success. Scoring 5 standards is streamlined and produces similar scoring or slightly lower/higher (+/- 0.0x). Feedback and discussion is easier to provide for overarching Standards with the Indicators being areas to specify growth. Cannot identify pockets of success with a '4' on a specific Indicator when the overall Standard is not being rated as '4.'

Areas of improvement: Almost all feedback provided for improvement was centered upon the redundant workflow of the current evaluation processes and the need for an electronic resource (NRS 391.475 circa 2019). Current paper workflow processes are the biggest hindrance in completing the evaluation processes without an electronic evaluation tool.

Challenges faced: Antiquated evaluation processes that split spreadsheet use with printing, signing, scanning, uploading, and re-entering scores for NDE data collection. Streamlining and simplifying the evaluation processes with an electronic resource for timely feedback and completion are much needed.

Suggestions to make better: An electronic resource is needed. The workflow redundancy is unnecessary in this day and age (enter scores on spreadsheet, print, sign, scan, upload, re-enter scores in District apps, to capture data for NDE for every employee evaluation (approx. 19,000).

Douglas County School District *not involved in the pilot

What went well: A heavy focus on instruction, clearly defined standards and indicators, common language, opportunities for coaching around standards, the highly effective rotation of evaluations

Areas of improvement: Scoring across sites and levels need to be more consistent, disproportionate level of highly effective vs. effective

Challenges faced: Time consuming for administrators, collecting evidence for teachers, can be challenging for first year teachers or ARL just starting out, high turnover of teachers and admins

Suggestions to make better: Admins scoring together as training (like original training during initial rollout), tiering system for ARL and first year teachers or maybe targeted standards for years of experience

Lyon County School District

What went well: Observations and feedback, nice not to have "paper" evidence for everything

Areas of improvement: It doesn't save any more time than the old form

Challenges faced: Instead of looking at each individual indicator, they are all lumped into one, it makes it difficult to get specific like we could with the individual indicators

Suggestions to make better: Don't change the model, I understand it was done with good intentions, but the changes haven't made it better.

Washoe County School District

What went well: WCSD was not involved in the pilot program.

Areas of improvement:

Challenges faced:

Suggestions to make better: WCSD is looking forward to seeing data and learning from other districts.