

**NEVADA EDUCATOR
PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK
(NEPF)
EVALUATION SYSTEM**

**2025-26
TEACHER – LIBRARIAN
PROTOCOLS**



NEVADA
Department of
Education

Table of Contents

Introduction to the Nevada Educator Performance Framework	3
TLC Beliefs	3
Evaluation System Goals	3
Main Purposes of the Evaluation Framework	4
The NEPF for Teacher-Librarians	4
The Evaluation Cycle	5
Step 1: Educator Self-Assessment	7
Step 2: Pre-Evaluation Conference, Goal Setting, and Plan Development	8
Step 3: Plan Implementation - Observations, Conferences, and Review of Evidence	11
Step 4: Mid-Cycle Goals Review	14
Step 5: Summative Evaluation and Post-Evaluation Conference.....	15
Appendix A – Glossary	18
Appendix B – Teacher-Librarian Framework.....	22
Appendix C – Key Words in the Performance Descriptors	26
Appendix D – Goal Setting and Planning Guide	29

Table of Figures

Figure 1: Evaluation Cycle	5
Figure 2: Typical Evaluation Cycle	5
Figure 3: Required Evaluation Components and Timeline (NRS 391.675)	6
Figure 4: Differentiated Observation Cycle (NRS 391.675-391.730).....	12
Figure 5: NEPF Scoring Ranges	17
Figure 6: Teacher-Librarian Category Weights	22
Figure 7: Student Learning Goal Scoring Rubric	32
Figure 8: Library Program Goal Scoring Rubric	35

Introduction to the Nevada Educator Performance Framework

The passage of AB 222 during the 2011 Legislative Session created the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) and outlined the expectations of a statewide performance evaluation system for teachers and school administrators. The first order of business at the October 2011 TLC meeting was to determine guiding beliefs and goals for this evaluation system, now known as the Nevada Educator Performance Framework. The identified beliefs and goals are outlined below.

TLC Beliefs

To promote educator effectiveness and ensure all students attain essential skills to graduate high school ready for college and career success:

- All educators* (see definition in the Glossary) can improve through effective, targeted professional development, as identified through the evaluation process and connected to district improvement plans and goals designed to inform and transform practice;
- An effective evaluation system must include clear expectations for both professional practice and student growth as well as fair, meaningful, and timely feedback;
- A consistent and supportive teacher and administrator evaluation system includes opportunities for self-reflection and continuous, measurable feedback to improve performance of students, teachers, administrators, and the system;
- The evaluation system must be part of a larger professional growth system that consistently evolves and improves to support the teachers and administrators that it serves.

Evaluation System Goals

The Nevada Educator Performance Framework Goals:

- Goal 1: Foster student learning and growth.
- Goal 2: Improve educators' effective instructional practices.
- Goal 3: Inform human capital decisions based on a professional growth system.
- Goal 4: Engage stakeholders in the continuous improvement and monitoring of a professional growth system.

The system based on these guiding beliefs and goals, the foundation on which the NEPF was created, should ensure that educators:

- Positively impact the achievement of students in Nevada;
- Grow professionally through targeted, sustained professional development and other supports;
- Monitor student growth, identify and develop quality instructional practices, and share effective educational methods with colleagues;
- Reflect upon practice and take ownership for their professional growth; and
- Participate in constructive dialogue and obtain specific, supportive feedback from evaluators.

Main Purposes of the Evaluation Framework

The overall purpose of Nevada’s Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) is to identify effective instruction and leadership, and to establish criteria to determine:

- The professional development needs of educators (goals 1, 2, 3, and 4);
- Information on which to base human capital decisions including rewards and consequences (goal 3); and
- Whether educators are:
 - Using data to inform decision making (goals 1, 2, and 4),
 - Helping students meet achievement targets and performance expectations (goals 1 and 4),
 - Effectively engaging families (goals 1 and 2), and
 - Collaborating effectively (goals 1, 2, and 3).

The NEPF for Teacher-Librarians

The 2017 Legislative session revised NRS 391.675 to state, “...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...”

The Department of Education formed a workgroup of teacher-librarians and administrators to develop Standards and Indicators based on a book written by Patricia Owen and published by the American Association of School Librarians¹. The recommendations of this workgroup were accepted by the TLC and State Board of Education.

Please see the Nevada Department of Education’s [Nevada Educator Performance Framework \(NEPF\)](#) webpage for current tools, protocols, and resources.

¹ Owen, P. (2012). A 21st century approach to school librarian evaluation. American Association of School Libraries.

The Evaluation Cycle

The following guidelines are designed to help educators and their evaluators implement the Nevada Educator Performance Framework. The evaluation cycle is a year-long process with multiple components (Figure 1). While the typical evaluation cycle is presented in Figure 2, it is important to note that the evaluation cycle is differentiated for educators based on the level of experience and/or previous evaluation ratings (Figure 3).

Figure 1: Evaluation Cycle



At the beginning of the school year, the educator receives a complete set of materials that includes the **Teacher-Librarian Instructional Practice Standards** and the **Teacher-Librarian Professional Responsibilities Standards** rubrics with Standards, Indicators, Performance Level, and evidence sources, as well as access to the current year **NEPF Protocols** outlining the evaluation process. The educator and evaluator meet to establish expectations and consider goals. They discuss the evaluation process together (including observations/visits, review of evidence, etc.) and review the NEPF Rubrics that describe the Standards and Indicators. The purpose of this review is to develop and deepen shared understanding of the Standards and Indicators in practice. The rubric review is also an opportunity to identify specific areas of focus for the upcoming school year.

Figure 2: Typical Evaluation Cycle

Step	Timeline
Step 1: Educator Self-Assessment	Late Summer/Early Fall
Step 2: Pre-Evaluation Conference, Goal Setting, and Plan Development	Early Fall
Step 3: Plan Implementation - Observations, Conferences, and Evidence Review	Throughout School Year
Step 4: Mid-Cycle Goals Review (Educator Assistance Plan if applicable)	Mid-year
Step 5: Summative Evaluation and Post-Evaluation Conference	Late Spring/Summer

Figure 3: Required Evaluation Components and Timeline ([NRS 391.675](#))

Evaluation Component	Probationary educators in the first year of their initial or additional probationary period OR All educators whose previous year rating was ineffective or developing	Probationary educators whose immediately preceding year rating was effective or highly effective	Probationary educators whose rating for two consecutive years were effective or highly effective OR Post-probationary educators whose previous year rating was effective or highly effective	Post-probationary educators with a rating of highly effective for the two immediately preceding years
Self-Assessment	Prior to pre-evaluation conference	Prior to pre-evaluation conference	Prior to pre-evaluation conference	Prior to pre-evaluation conference
Pre-Evaluation Conference	Prior to first observation/ evidence review	Prior to first observation/ evidence review	Prior to first observation/ evidence review and recommended within 50 days of the start of instruction	Prior to first observation/ evidence review and recommended within 50 days of the start of instruction
Plan Implementation: Observation Cycle(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-observation conference (s) • Observation(s) • Post-observation conference (s) and evidence review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st scheduled observation cycle must occur within 40 days after the first day of instruction • 2nd scheduled observation cycle must occur after 40 days but within 80 days after the first day of instruction • 3rd scheduled observation cycle must occur after 80 days but within 120 days after the first day of instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st scheduled observation cycle must occur after 40 days but within 80 days after the first day of instruction • 2nd scheduled observation cycle must occur after 80 days but within 120 days after the first day of instruction of the school year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One scheduled observation cycle must occur within 120 days after the first day of instruction of that school year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One scheduled observation cycle must occur within 120 days after the first day of instruction of that school year
Mid-Cycle Goal/s Review	Approximately halfway through the school year	Approximately halfway through the school year	Approximately halfway through the school year	Approximately halfway through the school year
The Summative Evaluation and Conference	Performance rating is based on evidence reviewed throughout the school year. The Summative Evaluation rating determines the baseline for the annual cycle in the subsequent school year.	Performance rating is based on evidence reviewed throughout the school year. The Summative Evaluation rating determines the baseline for the annual cycle in the subsequent school year.	Performance rating is based on evidence reviewed throughout the school year. The Summative Evaluation rating determines the baseline for the annual cycle in the subsequent school year.	No Summative Evaluation Use Summative Evaluation Exemption Verification Tool



Step 1: Educator Self-Assessment

The first step of the NEPF Evaluation Cycle is self-assessment and preliminary goal setting. During this process, the educator must analyze data, reflect on performance, and identify a minimum of one student learning goal or library program goal and one professional practice goal. A guiding principle for the NEPF is that evaluation should be done *with* educators, not *to* them. Embracing the self-assessment step of the process empowers the educator being evaluated to shape the conversation by stating what they identify as strengths, the areas on which they want to focus, and what support they need. The educator's self-assessment is more potent when supported by specific evidence and clearly aligns with individual and team goals as well as school and district priorities and initiatives.


Self-Assessment:

Using the **Self-Assessment Tool** OR the in-person, hybrid, or distance learning **Self-Monitoring Tool**, and examining a wide range of evidence (including previous evaluations if applicable), the educator assesses his/her practice based on the levels of performance and identifies areas of strength as well as areas for growth.

Goal Setting:

The educator uses the Goal Setting and Planning Tool to:

- Set proposed goals, including but not necessarily limited to:
 - One Student **Learning Goal** (SLG) or one **Library Program Goal** (LPG), and
 - One Professional Practice Goal (PPG) related to improving the educator's own practice that supports the achievement of the SLG or LPG;
- Develop action steps for each goal; and
- Record evidence to be used.



Step 2: Pre-Evaluation Conference, Goal Setting, and Plan Development

The second step of the evaluation cycle is the pre-evaluation conference between the educator and evaluator. The educator begins by sharing his/her self-assessment and proposed goals with the evaluator. The educator collaborates with the evaluator to refine the goals as needed. During this initial conference, the educator and evaluator must engage in a conversation that incorporates all the components identified below, as appropriate to the context of the educator.

NOTE: Pursuant to NRS 391.695 and NRS 391.715, student performance measures are not to be included in the evaluation of educators in their initial year of probation or for post-probationary or probationary educators at a turnaround school in its first two years of turnaround status. A turnaround school is defined as a school that has been determined to be a turnaround pursuant to NRS 388G.400 only; however, these educators are still required to set a Student Learning Goal and Professional Practice Goal as expected within the NEPF.

Goal Setting and Planning:

The educator presents **Student Learning Goal Setting and Planning Tool** or the **Library Program Goal Setting and Planning Tool** with the proposed Student Learning Goal or Library Program Goal, Professional Practice Goal, action steps, and potential sources of evidence to be used to evaluate his/her work.

- **Student Learning Goal:**

The educator and evaluator discuss the proposed SLG and use the criteria column of the Goal Setting and Planning Tool to review goal requirements, revise (if necessary), review baseline data, and identify and define the following: student population, standards and content, assessments to measure student performance, performance targets and rationale. The educator and evaluator review the SLG Scoring Rubric and discuss expectations and learning targets associated with each level 1 to 4. Expectations must be clear to both the evaluator and educator.

- **Library Program Goal:**

An LPG is also a long-term, measurable goal regarding an improvement to the library program such as ensuring equitable access to library resources. Developing an LPG includes identifying the area of highest need for improvement of library services to assist the school community in attaining identified goals, reviewing student/school academic or library data, professional development needs of school personnel, teacher-librarian or administrator identified areas of support needed, setting long term goal, measuring progress toward the long-term goal along the way, and evaluating attainment of the goal at the end of the school year.

- **Professional Practice Goal:**

The educator uses the **Self-Assessment Tool** or the **Self-Monitoring Tool** and/or previous evaluation to identify and set a professional practice goal. The goal should align with and provide support for the SLG/LPG.

Pre-Evaluation Conference Conversation:

The educator and evaluator review the rubrics and engage in conversation. This conversation must:

- Ensure that the standard identified as the focus for SLG/LPG aligns with an area of high need for the educator's current students/program through review of a needs assessment.
- Clearly identify and agree on the source(s) of growth or achievement used to measure the SLG/LPG.
- Ensure that the source(s) of student growth or achievement clearly measures the standard identified as the focus through the needs assessment and goal-setting process.
- Clarify the points in time when the identified assessment, if applicable, will be administered and/or what "multiple points in time" means for the given educator.
- Identify students to be included in the SLG, if applicable, and provide rationale for any exclusion.
- Discuss how the SLG/LPG 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 educator's ability to perform his or her professional responsibilities and/or instruction. Such variables include, but are not limited to, class size and needs of student groups (e.g. English Learners).
- Answer the question, "Are there any assumptions about specific Indicators that need to be shared because of the school/classroom context?" For example, if several students in the class are limited English speakers or are non-verbal, in what ways will the educator address Instructional Standard 3: Students Engage in Meaning Making through Discourse and Other Strategies?
- Answer the questions, "are there any Indicators for which effective performance will depend on factors beyond the control of the educator? If so, how will those dependencies be accounted for in the evaluation process?"
- Answer the question, "are there any Indicators that previous performance identified as an area for growth, and will need to be a specific focus for part or all of the year?"
- Pursuant to NRS 391.465, there must be, "consideration of whether the classes for which the employee is responsible exceed the applicable recommended ratios of pupils per licensed teacher recommended by the State Board pursuant to NRS 388.890 and, if so, the degree to which the ratios affect: (1) The ability of the employee to carry out his or her professional responsibilities; and (2) The instructional practices of the employee."

Educator Plan:

As a result of the conference, the educator should have a clear understanding of the expectations for performance as aligned to the Instructional Practice Standards and Professional Responsibilities Standards, have clearly defined goals to support both student achievement and the educator's professional growth and improvement, and have a plan of action for moving forward.



Step 3: Plan Implementation - Observations, Conferences, and Review of Evidence

The third step of the evaluation cycle is implementing plan. For the duration of the cycle, the educator pursues the attainment of high-level performance on **all** Standards and Indicators and monitors progress on his/her goals (SLG/LPG and PPG). The evaluator provides feedback for improvement, ensures timely access to planned supports, and reviews evidence on educator performance. A single evidence source can be used to support evidence of performance on multiple Indicators and/or Standards. Additionally, the educator may choose to collect evidence for review throughout the cycle but should not create artifacts specifically for the evidence review. Educators should use documents that occur as part of the everyday practice.

The observation cycle provides a foundation for dialogue, collaboration, and action. The educator and evaluator use the **Pre/Post-Observation Conference Tool**, the NEPF rubrics, and student data to develop a shared understanding of effective practice, guide ongoing reflection, monitor progress toward goals, and determine evidence to review.

Evidence Review:

- The evaluator reviews evidence and other relevant data to demonstrate performance on the NEPF Standards and Indicators using the **Observation/Evidence Review Tool**, aligning observation data to corresponding NEPF Standards and Indicators.
- The evaluator reviews preliminary SLG data to monitor educator progress on the SLG/PPG and to provide guidance and/or supports as needed.

Observation and Conference Process:

- For scheduled observations only, the educator and evaluator use the **Pre/Post Observation Conference Tool** to discuss the upcoming observation. **NOTE:** The questions on the tool are a guide, and all questions are not required for every observation.
- The evaluator conducts the observation. Using the **Observation/Evidence Review Tool** the evaluator records evidence observed during the scheduled or unscheduled observation and identifies corresponding Standards and Indicators. Observations are **NOT** scored.
- The educator and evaluator use the **Pre/Post-Observation Conference Tool** to discuss the observation, provide feedback, and identify professional learning needs.

Observation Cycle: The observation cycle consists of a pre-observation conference with the educator and the evaluator, an observation based on the Standards, and a post-observation conference. The pre- and post-observation conferences include guiding questions and potential evidence review, as requested by the evaluator.

Figure 4: Differentiated Observation Cycle ([NRS 391.675](#))

Personnel	Evaluation Frequency	Scheduled Observation Cycles Required per Evaluation
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Probationary educators in year one of their initial or additional probationary period OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Educators whose previous year rating was ineffective or developing	1 time per year	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 3 scheduled observation cycles (minimum)• Supervising administrator must conduct 2 of the 3 required observations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Probationary educators whose immediately preceding year rating was effective or highly effective	1 time per year	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2 scheduled observation cycles (minimum)• Supervising administrator must conduct 1 of the 2 required observations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Probationary educators whose rating for two consecutive years were effective or highly effective OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Post-probationary educators whose previous year rating was effective or highly effective	1 time per year	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1 scheduled observation cycle (minimum)• Supervising administrator must conduct the 1 required observation
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Post-probationary educators with rating of highly effective for the two immediately preceding years	No summative evaluation for 1 year	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1 scheduled observation cycle (minimum)• Supervising administrator must conduct the 1 required observation

Pre-Observation Conferences: Each scheduled observation is preceded by a pre-observation conference. This provides the educator an opportunity to discuss needs and evidence for the strategies used. It is also recommended that the educator being evaluated leads these discussions and provides the rationale for the basis of his/her instructional practices. It is essential that both the educator and evaluator participate in professional learning experiences that ensure they are adequately prepared for participating in this type of discussion (available through RPDP and Canvas).

Observations: “Scheduled” (announced) observations are those observations for which prior notice is given AND a pre-observation conference has been held. The minimum number of scheduled observations that must be conducted by the supervising administrator is differentiated according to experience and performance as outlined in the Differentiated Evaluation Cycle (Refer to Figures 3 and 4 above). For educators, each scheduled classroom observation, as one component of the educator evaluation, needs to be conducted for a minimum of twenty minutes. Observations may be conducted by other authorized personnel.

“Unscheduled” observations follow the same procedure as scheduled observations, apart from the requirements for a Pre-Observation Conference and the minimum twenty-minute duration for educators. Unscheduled observations may be conducted throughout the year at the discretion of the evaluator, with no minimum or maximum. Best practices suggest more frequent observations paired with brief reflective conferences support greater improvement of instruction.

Frequent observations provide invaluable insight into the educator’s performance. These offer critical opportunities for evaluators to observe, review evidence, and analyze the educator’s practice. Observations should be both scheduled and unscheduled. The evaluator uses the **Observation/Evidence Review Tool** to document the reviewing of evidence for both types of observations. Observations should **NOT** be scored as ratings should only be assigned after multiple observations are conducted to assess levels of performance.

Post-Observation Conferences: Following all observations, the post-observation conference should be a joint discussion between the educator and evaluator. This is a time during which the evaluator provides explicit feedback on performance and identifies and discusses professional learning needs. Post-observation conferences for scheduled and unscheduled observations within an observation cycle can be combined into a single meeting, regardless of the length of time between the observations, but it is recommended that a post-observation conference should be conducted no later than a week after the observation to provide the educator with timely, constructive feedback.

Based on observations and evidence, if an educator’s performance is likely to be rated ineffective or developing, the evaluator uses the **Educator Assistance Plan Tool** to develop and implement an assistance plan pursuant to NRS 391.695 and/or 391.715. These recommendations should be provided as early as possible in the evaluation cycle to allow the educator sufficient time to access resources, receive support, and demonstrate improvement. Ideally, this should occur no later than the first 80 days of the evaluation cycle, barring extenuating circumstances.



Step 4: Mid-Cycle Goals Review

The fourth step, the Mid-Cycle Goals Review, is the time when the educator and evaluator formally meet to review identified evidence. The conference should be held mid-year to discuss educator progress and performance on all NEPF Standards and Indicators and progress toward attaining goals. This step is used to prompt reflection, promote dialogue between the educator and evaluator, and plan changes to practice. If appropriate, the educator and evaluator may choose to revise the SLG/LPG and/or PPG at this time. If the evaluator and educator agree that an adjustment should be made to the goal/s at this time, then a follow-up conference should be scheduled to review data again and re-evaluate the progress.

In addition, if there are patterns of evidence demonstrating performance that is potentially leading to a final rating of *ineffective* or *developing*, this is a critical time for the evaluator to discuss this evidence so there are no “surprises” during the summative evaluation. More importantly, if an educator is having difficulty, this allows the evaluator to provide the educator with the assistance required to address areas of concern (NRS 391.695 & 391.715). Evaluators use the **Educator Assistance Plan Tool** to provide recommendations for improvements in the performance of the educator and to describe the actions that will be taken to assist the educator [NRS 391.695 1(e)].

Mid-Cycle Conference: The educator and evaluator develop a shared understanding of progress made toward each goal and the educator’s performance on the Standards and Indicators. The evaluator will identify mid-course adjustments if needed.



Step 5: Summative Evaluation and Post-Evaluation Conference

The final step is the summative evaluation, which completes a full evaluation cycle. In this step, the evaluator reviews and analyzes the **Observation/Evidence Review Tool** data, gathers additional evidence and insights from the educator (if necessary), and identifies performance levels on the NEPF Indicators to determine Standard scores and the overall rating. Thoughtful summative evaluation identifies trends and patterns in performance and offers feedback for improvement. It also provides the educator with valuable information that strengthens self-reflection and analysis skills.

Scoring:

- The evaluator reviews the tools and relevant evidence reviewed throughout the cycle for the purpose of determining performance levels for each of the Indicators.
- Educational Practice Category Score
 - The evaluator uses the data from the **Observation/Evidence Review Tool** documented throughout the cycle to identify the performance levels for each Indicator following the **Instructional Practice Standards** and **Professional Responsibilities Standards** and inputs them into the **Summative Evaluation Tool**. Performance levels selected may range from 1-4 (whole numbers only).
 - The Indicator performance levels are then used to calculate the score for each Standard. This is done by averaging all performance levels for each Standard.
 - Overall scores for Instructional Practice domain and Professional Responsibilities domain are calculated by averaging the scores for each Standard.
 - The Educational Practice Category score (unadjusted) is then determined by adding the weighted Instructional Practice and Professional Responsibilities domain scores (see Figure 6).
 - Post-probationary teacher-librarians who provide direct, regular instruction and who are designated as effective or highly effective are awarded an additional weight (adjusted score) in certain Standards and Indicators equivalent to the percentage by

which the ratio of pupils for which the teacher is responsible exceeds the recommended ratio of pupils per licensed teacher (K-3 = 15:1; 4-12 = 25:1). The adjusted score is not to exceed the maximum score that would otherwise be possible for a teacher rated as highly effective (4). The Standards and Indicators that are eligible for the additional weight are:

- The manner in which the teacher employs the cognitive abilities and skills of all pupils, Instructional Practice Standard 2 Indicator 1 (IPS 2.1),
 - The manner in which the teacher provides an opportunity for extended discourse (IPS 3.1),
 - The manner in which the teacher structures a classroom environment (IPS 3.4), and
 - The manner in which the teacher engages with the families of pupils, Professional Responsibilities Standard 4 (PRS 4).
- Student Performance Category Score
 - The educator shares the data gathered throughout the SLG/LPG process. The evaluator reviews the data and uses the SLG/LPG Scoring Rubric to determine an SLG/LPG score of 1 to 4 based on the progress made toward previously set targets.
 - This number is then weighted and becomes the Student Performance Domain score of the Summative Evaluation.
 - NOTE: Pursuant to NRS 391.695 and NRS 391.715, student performance measures are not to be included in the evaluation of educators in their initial year of probation.
 - The overall Summative Evaluation score is determined by adding the Educational Practice Category score and the Student Performance Category score (see Figure 6 for the category weights).

Late Hires: Educators hired late in the school year should still participate in the observation cycle; however, a summative evaluation may not be recommended depending on their hire date. Those hired during the first semester should complete the full observation cycle and receive a summative evaluation. Educators hired after the start of the second semester should be observed within their first 40 days, again within the next 40 days (totaling 80 days when feasible), and, if applicable, a third time within the following 40 days (for a total of 120 days).

Evaluation Conference: During the final evaluation conference, the educator and evaluator review the evidence on which the final rating was determined and discuss the scores and feedback given within the **Summative Evaluation Tool**.

The final scoring ranges used to determine the final rating for educators were recommended by the TLC and approved by the State Board of Education for the 2021-22 school year and beyond.

Figure 5: NEPF Scoring Ranges

Overall Score Range	Final Rating
3.6 - 4.0	Highly Effective
2.8 - 3.59	Effective
1.91 - 2.79	Developing
1.0 - 1.9	Ineffective

Educators must:

- Demonstrate an SLG rubric score of 2, 3, or 4 to be eligible to receive an Effective summative rating.
- Demonstrate an SLG rubric score of 3 or 4 to be eligible to receive a Highly Effective summative rating.

For educators who receive a Highly Effective rating for two consecutive years, the final summative evaluation requirement is waived the following year; however, educators who meet this criterion are expected to participate in the evaluation cycle. Evaluators complete the **Summative Evaluation Exemption Verification Tool**. During the subsequent school year, educators who met this criterion will once again participate in the evaluation cycle and receive a summative evaluation (three-year cycle: 2 years of earning a Highly Effective summative rating + one year of a summative evaluation waiver).

NOTE: NRS 391.725 describes the statement that must be included on the evaluation of a probationary teacher, building administrator, or another licensed educational employee if he or she is to receive a rating of 'Ineffective.' The statement reads as follows:

“Please be advised that, pursuant to Nevada law, your contract may not be renewed for the next school year. If you receive an ‘ineffective’ evaluation and are reemployed for a second or third year of your probationary period, you may request that your next evaluation be conducted by another administrator. You may also request, to the administrator who conducted the evaluation, reasonable assistance in improving your performance based upon the recommendations reported in the evaluation for which you request assistance, and upon such request, a reasonable effort will be made to assist you in improving your performance.”²

² NRS: CHAPTER 391 - PERSONNEL. (n.d.). Retrieved July, 2018, from <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/NRS/NRS-391.html>

Appendix A – Glossary

Administrators – Per NRS 391.650, an administrator is any employee who holds a license as an administrator and who is employed in that capacity by a school district. NAC 391.569 further clarifies that, and administrator means a person employed by a school district who provides primarily administrative services at the school level and who does not provide primarily direct instructional services to pupils, regardless of whether such a person is licensed as a teacher or administrator, including, without limitation, a principal and vice principal.

All Students – For the purpose of the NEPF, ‘all students’ refers to the diversity found in all classrooms: various levels of learning, working pace, experience, and backgrounds (e.g., language, culture, SES). A teacher must demonstrate that all students are being well served by instruction. While not always directly observable, the teacher must demonstrate through other evidence sources that he or she has made every possible effort to reach the all-student status. The student learning goal allows for a targeted student population within an educator’s caseload. Within the SLG, ‘all students’ refers to that targeted population.

Data – Information, including classroom observations, student achievement scores, and artifacts, gathered during the evaluation process for determining educator performance.

Defensible – Having grounds to deem a conclusion or judgment valid and reliable based on various measures and assessments.

Diverse Learners – Those students who, because of gender, ethnic background, socioeconomic status, learning styles, disabilities, or limited English proficiency, may have academic needs that require varied instructional strategies to help them learn.

Domain – Primary area of focus for evaluation. For example, in the Teacher Evaluation the three domains are Instructional Practice, Professional Responsibilities, and Student Performance. NEPF Domains are made up of standards.

Educator – The individual upon whom an evaluation is performed.

Educator Assistance Plan Tool - Tool used by the educator and evaluator to develop and implement an assistance plan as necessary pursuant to NRS 391.695 (teachers) & 391.715 (administrators) as part of the Mid Cycle Review, but it may be completed earlier if appropriate.

Evaluation Cycle – Consists of the goal-setting and self-assessment processes and a number of supervisory observation cycles with feedback provided to educators with feedback throughout the process. The number of observation cycles within an evaluation cycle is differentiated based on educator status. See Figure 3.

Evaluator – The individual in an evaluation system that collects educator data, analyzes the data, and collaborates with educators to provide feedback and support, and to make judgments regarding performance.

Evidence – Data gathered through the evaluation cycle to support educators’ progress on NEPF indicators, standards, and domains. Includes supervisor observation and progress towards meeting the Student Learning Goal.

Feedback – Information and/or recommendations given to an educator about performance which is based on evaluation results. Feedback is intended to provide insight to the educator so that professional learning can be targeted and improvements in performance can be achieved.

Framework – The system by which the measures are combined to evaluate the effectiveness of educators and make overall performance decisions. For example, the NEPF is a framework.

Indicator – Specific activity or process demonstrated by the educator being evaluated which provides evidence of the NEPF standard or professional practice being measured. Indicators are the building block of NEPF standards.

Instructional Practice Standards – Five high-leverage instructional practices intended to reflect the practice of effective teaching in the classroom.

Level – The position or rank of an educator’s performance for each indicator, as determined using the rubric, observations, and evidence.

Library Program Goal - A long-term, measurable goal regarding an improvement to the library program such as ensuring equitable access to library resources. Developing a LPG includes identifying the area of highest need for improvement of library services to assist the school community in attaining identified goals, reviewing student/school academic or library data, professional development needs of school personnel, teacher-librarian or administrator identified areas of support needed, setting long term goal, measuring progress toward the long term goal along the way, and evaluating attainment of the goal at the end of the school year.

Goal Setting and Planning Tool – Tool used to set either a Student Learning or Library Program Goal (LPG) and Professional Practice Goal (PPG) as described in the NEPF protocols. Teacher-librarians and their evaluators have a choice between setting a SLG or LPG depending upon the needs of the school and/or program. An LPG is also long-term, measurable goal regarding an improvement to the library program such as provision of equitable access to library resources.

Measure – An instrument or basis for comparison used to assess educator or student performance. Examples of measures could be published assessments or a specific classroom observation rubric.

NEPF Protocols – The NDE guidance document to support the implementation of the Nevada Educator Performance Framework. It is updated annually.

Observation/Evidence Review Tool - Tool used by the evaluator to note evidence throughout the observation and review evidence during the post observation conference. The evaluator uses this tool to record feedback provided to the educator, review the evidence presented/observed for alignment with Standards and Indicators, and check progress toward goals.

Performance Criteria – The specific performance thresholds that need to be met for an established goal/standard.

Pre/Post-Observation Conference Tool - Tool used by the teacher and evaluator to discuss an upcoming scheduled observation, or to discuss recent scheduled and/or unscheduled observations. It is intended to guide thinking and conversation. The questions on this form serve as a guide to start conversation and are not required.

Professional Learning – The process by which educators’ competencies and capacities are increased, including but not limited to, professional development sessions, job-embedded support, coaching, observing and/or mentoring, peer reviews, etc.

Professional Responsibilities Standards – Five practices intended to promote collaboration and teamwork, personal growth and leadership, professionalism, and importance of building positive relationships with all stakeholders.

Reliability – The extent to which an assessment or tool is consistent in its measurement. There are several types of reliability:

- **Intra-rater** – the degree to which an assessment yields the same result when administered by the same evaluator on the same educator at different times
- **Inter-rater** – the degree to which an assessment yields the same result when administered by different evaluators on the same educator at the same time
- **Internal consistency** – the degree to which individual components of an assessment consistently measure the same attribute
- **Test / Retest** – the degree to which an assessment of the same educator yields the same result over time

Self-Assessment Tool - Tool used by the educator to reflect on practice and identify strengths and areas for growth/improvement based on supporting evidence.

Self-Monitoring Tool - This tool, an alternative for the Self-Assessment Tool, is intended to assist educators as they engage in self-reflection in preparation for and provision of face-to-face, digital, or blended instruction. It should be used as a space to honor the quality work of the educator and to identify priority areas for growth on which the educator would like to focus for the upcoming year.

Source of Growth or Achievement: the assessment(s) or tool(s) used to measure student progress for the Student Learning Goal. Acceptable sources of student growth or achievement include, but are not limited to, course-embedded, teacher-developed, or published assessments that align with the standard identified as the area of highest student need.

Standard – Clearly defined statements and/or illustrations within NEPF domains that capture what all teachers are expected to know and do. Standards operationalize the categories by providing measurable goals. For example, the Professional Practice Standards. NEPF standards are made up of individual indicators.

Standard Score – The overall point value for each standard. Each score is based on the Indicator levels of performance determined by quality observation data and evidence collected throughout the evaluation cycle.

Student Achievement – The performance of a student on any measure of academics.

Student Learning Goal Setting and Planning Tool - Tool used by educators to set a Student Learning Goal (SLG) and Professional Practice Goal to measure the Student Performance Domain.

Summative Evaluation Exemption Verification Tool – Tool used for educators who received a Highly Effective rating for two consecutive years and are eligible to have the final summative evaluation requirement waived.

Summative Evaluation Tool – Tool used to provide educators with their final summative evaluation scores, evidence-based narrative of the teacher’s strengths and areas for growth according to his/her performance on the Instructional Practice and Professional Responsibilities Standards and Indicators, and final rating.

Teachers – Pursuant to NRS 391.650, teacher means a licensed employee the majority of whose working time is devoted to the rendering of direct educational service to pupils of a school district.

Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) – Sixteen-member council consisting of: The Superintendent of Public Instruction, or his or her designee; the Chancellor of the Nevada System of Higher Education, or his or her designee; four public school teachers; two public school administrators; one superintendent of schools; two school board members; one representative of the regional professional development programs; one parent or legal guardian; one school counselor, psychologist, speech-language pathologist, audiologist or social worker who is licensed; and two persons with expertise in the development of public policy relating to education. The purpose of the TLC is to make recommendations to the State Board concerning the adoption of regulations for establishing a statewide performance evaluation system.

Validity – The extent to which an assessment or tool measures what it intends to measure. There are several types of validity:

- **Content Validity** – Refers to the match between the items of a measurement tool and the entire domain in purports to measure
- **Construct Validity** – Whether a test measures the construct it intends to measure, including the ability to distinguish among types of performance and types of performers.
- **Face Validity** – According to those familiar with the measure, measures with high face validity appear to be measuring what they purport to measure.
- **Predictive Validity** – Refers to whether a measurement tool predicts scores on another measure that it should theoretically predict.

Weight – The relative importance applied to an NEPF domain in determining an educators’ final NEPF rating.


Appendix B – Teacher-Librarian Framework

Teacher-Librarians are defined as teachers that hold a valid teaching license with a school library media specialist endorsement and are working in a school library.

Overview of the Framework

The NEPF for Teacher-Librarians consists of two categories and three domains. The Educational Practice Category consists of the Instructional Practice and Professional Responsibilities Domains. The Student Performance Category is the Student Performance Domain. Each domain is weighted differently as mandated by Nevada Revised Statute or recommended by the TLC and approved by the State Board of Education (See Figure 6 below).

Figure 6: Teacher-Librarian Category Weights



Educational Practice

The Teacher-Librarian Framework assesses teacher-librarians' performance across educational practice two domains: Instructional Practice and Professional Responsibilities. The Instructional Practice Domain identifies and defines the standards for measuring teacher-librarian behavior as he/she delivers instruction in the classroom or library, while also specifically monitoring student behavior. The Professional Responsibilities Domain addresses the standards for what a teacher-librarian does to effectively manage the school library program to the benefit of the school community.

The teacher-librarian domains were determined as a result of a rigorous national review of existing standards, including but not limited to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), American Association for School Librarians standards, and examples from other states. The focus on Instructional Practice was based on guidance from national experts and the reinforcement of research. Narrowing the scope to the assessment of Instructional Practice and Professional Responsibilities Standards broadens the depth and breadth of the system. The Standards are based on a vast body of empirical evidence, as detailed in the Literature Review, demonstrating an immediate and important connection to fostering student success by building students' 21st century skills so they graduate college and career ready.

The performance Indicators for each of the Instructional Practice Standards and the corresponding rubrics were modified slightly from those developed by Dr. Margaret Heritage and her team at the University of California, Los Angeles National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST) for teachers. The rubrics and associated performance levels to assess the Indicators were designed to look at educator and student behavior, with a focus on outcomes versus processes.

Teacher-Librarian Instructional Practice Standards and Indicators

Standard 1: New Learning is Connected to Prior Learning and Experience

- **Indicator 1:** The teacher-librarian independently and/or collaboratively activates **all** students' initial understandings of new concepts and skills.
- **Indicator 2:** The teacher-librarian independently and/or collaboratively makes connections explicit between previous learning and new concepts and skills for **all** students.
- **Indicator 3:** The teacher-librarian independently and/or collaboratively makes clear the purpose and relevance of new learning for **all** students.
- **Indicator 4:** The teacher-librarian independently and/or collaboratively provides **all** students opportunities to build on or challenge initial understandings.

Standard 2: Learning Tasks Have High Cognitive Demand for Diverse Learners

- **Indicator 1:** The teacher-librarian independently and/or collaboratively provides tasks that purposefully employ **all** students' cognitive abilities and skills.
- **Indicator 2:** The teacher-librarian independently and/or collaboratively provides tasks that place appropriate demands on each student.
- **Indicator 3:** The teacher-librarian independently and/or collaboratively provides tasks that progressively develop **all** students' cognitive abilities and skills.

- **Indicator 4:** The teacher-librarian operates with a deep belief that all children can achieve regardless of race, perceived ability and socio-economic status.

Standard 3: Students Engage in Meaning-Making Through Discourse and Other Strategies

- **Indicator 1:** The teacher-librarian independently and/or collaboratively provides opportunities for extended, productive discourse between the teacher and student(s) and among students.
- **Indicator 2:** The teacher-librarian independently and/or collaboratively provides opportunities for **all** students to create and interpret multiple representations.
- **Indicator 3:** The teacher-librarian independently and/or collaboratively assists **all** students to use existing knowledge and prior experience to make connections and recognize relationships.
- **Indicator 4:** The teacher-librarian independently and/or collaboratively structures the classroom environment to enable collaboration, participation, and a positive affective experience for **all** students.

Standard 4: Students Engage in Metacognitive Activity to Increase Understanding of and Responsibility for Their Own Learning

- **Indicator 1:** The teacher-librarian and **all** students understand what students are learning, why they are learning it, and how they will know if they have learned it.
- **Indicator 2:** The teacher-librarian independently and/or collaboratively structures opportunities for self-monitored learning for **all** students.
- **Indicator 3:** The teacher-librarian independently and/or collaboratively supports **all** students to take actions based on the students' own self-monitoring processes.

Standard 5: Assessment is Integrated into Instruction

- **Indicator 1:** The teacher-librarian independently and/or collaboratively plans on-going learning opportunities based on evidence of **all** students' current learning status.
- **Indicator 2:** The teacher-librarian independently and/or collaboratively aligns assessment opportunities with learning goals and performance criteria.
- **Indicator 3:** The teacher-librarian independently and/or collaboratively structures opportunities to generate evidence of learning during the lesson of **all** students.
- **Indicator 4:** The teacher-librarian independently and/or collaboratively adapts actions based on evidence generated in the lesson for **all** students.

Teacher-Librarian Professional Responsibilities Standards and Indicators

Standard 1: Collection and Information Access

- **Indicator 1:** Teacher-librarian implements a selection policy in which print and digital learning resources are selected/deselected based on their ability to support instructional goals, curriculum standards, interests, and needs of the students and school community.
- **Indicator 2:** Teacher-librarian uses data to evaluate and develop the collection to ensure it supports curriculum standards, interests, and needs of the students and school community.
- **Indicator 3:** Teacher-librarian maintains a collection of print and digital resources in multiple genres that appeals to differences in age, gender, ethnicity, information needs, and reading and language abilities and information needs.

Standard 2: Library Environment

- **Indicator 1:** Teacher-librarian organizes physical space to enable ease of use.
- **Indicator 2:** Teacher-librarian fosters an environment that promotes reading, learning, and encourages the school community to work independently, collaboratively, and/or virtually.
- **Indicator 3:** Teacher-librarian creates and maintains a welcoming, attractive, and supportive library environment.

Standard 3: Program Planning and Management

- **Indicator 1:** Teacher-librarian schedules and/or facilitates consistent and equitable use of the library for information literacy instruction and/or activities.
- **Indicator 2:** Teacher-librarian advocates for and promotes the library program initiatives and services that support instruction throughout the school community.
- **Indicator 3:** Teacher-librarian develops and implements a plan for the continuous improvement of the library program that includes utilization of available funds to support the learning goals of the school community.
- **Indicator 4:** Teacher-librarian implements and facilitates the use of technology to support instruction throughout the school community.

Standard 4: School Community and Family Engagement

- **Indicator 1:** Teacher-librarian welcomes parents/guardians and students to become more active members of the school community and encourages parents/guardians to come into library/classroom as volunteers or experts and attend school events.
- **Indicator 2:** Teacher-librarian models respect, courtesy, and integrity in his/her interaction with school community.
- **Indicator 3:** Teacher-librarian fosters the success of all students by communicating and collaborating effectively with the school community in ways that enhance student learning.

Standard 5: Professionalism and Growth

- **Indicator 1:** Teacher-librarian pursues aligned professional learning opportunities to support improved instructional practice.
- **Indicator 2:** Teacher-librarian seeks out feedback from the school community and uses a variety of data to self-reflect on his or her practice.
- **Indicator 3:** Teacher-librarian follows policies, regulations, and procedures specific to role and responsibilities.

Student Performance

Like teachers and school administrators, the teacher-librarian evaluation system contains a Student Performance Domain. Teacher-librarians must also set a professional practice goal (PPG); however, unlike those educators, they can choose to set either a Student Learning Goal (SLG) or a Library Program Goal (LPG). The selection of which type of goal is most appropriate is a matter that should be discussed and decided between the teacher-librarian and his/her evaluator. Refer to the Goal Setting and Planning Guide (Appendix D) for more information.

Appendix C – Key Words in the Performance Descriptors

LEVEL 4

All Students: To receive a Performance Level 4, a teacher needs to demonstrate that all the students are being well served by instruction. This is indeed a high bar which teachers may strive for, yet not fully reach. If the evaluator, through direct observation, can judge that all but one or two students are being addressed with respect to the indicator, then the teacher must demonstrate through other evidence sources that he or she has made every possible effort to reach all students.

Fully: The descriptor fully, which is only included for Level 4 performances, conveys that the teacher is enacting the standard to the greatest degree or extent. For example, the teacher must adapt his or her instruction to the greatest extent possible in response to evidence of learning during the lesson (Standard 5: Indicator 4); or all students can fully explain the intended learning (Standard 4: Indicator 1).

Clearly: This descriptor is used for Level 4 teachers and indicates that the teacher has performed to the maximum level possible and has been successful in communicating to students. For example, the teacher explicitly – and in a way that is understandable to students – communicates how the new learning is connected to longer-term goals, for example to the standards, or to the overall goals of the unit, or to how this learning is connected to competencies for college and career (Standard 1: Indicator 3).

Effective/Effectively: The descriptors effective and effectively are included for Level 4 performances only. They signal that the teacher has achieved the instructional goal to the maximum extent possible. For example, in the performance level descriptor “the teacher uses effective strategies to help students see connections and relationships between previous and present learning” (Standard 3: Indicator 3), there should be evidence that the strategies the teacher has used have been completely successful in helping all students to see connections and relationships.

Appropriate: This descriptor is used only in Standard 2: Indicator 2 and is used for the Performance Level 4. If tasks are at an appropriate level of challenge, this means that they have been carefully designed by the teacher to match the students’ individual levels of learning – they are neither too easy, nor too hard and they will serve to advance student learning.

LEVEL 3

Most Students: To receive a Performance Level 3, a teacher needs to demonstrate that most students are being well served by instruction. There should be evidence of the teacher’s intention to address all students’ initial understandings, even though this did not happen in practice. (When a teacher demonstrates that most students are not well served by instruction, the performance is a Level 2)

Adequately/Adequate: The descriptor adequately, which is only included for Level 3 performances conveys that the teacher’s practice is satisfactory but does not reach the level of the greatest extent possible. Similarly, the term adequate is used to indicate that the teacher has performed satisfactorily.

For example, the teacher providing adequate guidance indicates the guidance was satisfactory in accomplishing the teacher's intended purpose (Standard 3: Indicator 1).

Generally: The descriptor generally is used for Level 3 performances and indicates that the teacher has for the most part achieved the instructional goal. For example, "generally engages student thinking" and "generally supports their understanding" indicates that the teacher has been mostly successful in engaging student thinking and supporting their understanding but has not reached the standard indicated by 'effective' – i.e., to the greatest extent possible (Standard 3: Indicator 2). The descriptor generally is also used for Level 2 performances, for example, "student reflection is generally unrelated to learning goals..." (Standard 4: Indicator 2). In this instance, the evidence conveys that while the teacher might have attempted to support student reflection, it is not successfully accomplished.

Sufficiently: The descriptor sufficiently is included for Level 3 performances and conveys that the teacher has provided enough information or used enough strategies to reach the intended goal of instruction. For example, the strategies the teacher uses to connect new learning goals to longer-term goals accomplish the intended purpose (Standard 1: Indicator 3)

LEVEL 2

Some or Few: A teacher receives a Performance Level of 2 if the majority of students are not being well served by instruction or example (Standard 2: Indicator 2).

Insufficiently: This descriptor is used for Level 2 performances to signal that the teacher has not successfully accomplished the instructional/assessment goal. For example, "performance criteria are insufficiently specified" indicates that the teacher has been unsuccessful in providing the criteria for the intended purpose (Standard 5: Indicator 1).

Inadequately: The descriptor inadequately, which is used for Level 2 performances, conveys that the teacher has not adequately accomplished the instructional/assessment goal. For example, the way the teacher attempts to activate most students' initial understandings is limited and does not result in initial understandings being activated (Standard 1: Indicator 1).

Minimally: This descriptor is reserved for the Performance Level 2 and indicates that the instructional goal has not been met. For example, a teacher might have attempted to guide students to a deeper understanding of a concept, but the attempt was not successful (Standard 3: Indicator 1).

Limited: This descriptor is used only for Level 2 performances, limited refers to a practice that the teacher has tried to enact a specific practice, but the practice is not well developed nor is it successful in meeting intended goals. For example, the teacher "uses limited strategies" indicates that the strategies are not well developed enough to achieve the goal (Standard 3: Indicator 3) and there are "only limited opportunities" for student reflection in the lesson indicates that the opportunities are not successful in meeting the goals (Standard 4: Indicator 2).

Somewhat: This descriptor is included for Level 2 performances. It indicates that while the teacher may have attempted to enact a specific practice, it was not successful in achieving the goal. For example,

the strategies the teacher uses are not successful in furthering the students' understanding (Standard 3: Indicator 3).

LEVEL 1

No, or almost no: A teacher receives a Performance Level 1 when there is no, or almost no, evidence that any student is being served well by the instructional practice. For example, the evaluator finds there is no evidence that the teacher attempts to activate students' initial understandings (Standard 1: Indicator 1) or there is no evidence that the teacher plans any ongoing learning opportunities based on evidence (Standard 5: Indicator 3).

Appendix D – Goal Setting and Planning Guide

Teacher-Librarians

Teacher-Librarians serve as teachers and as library program managers. A teacher-librarian may not see the same groups of students with the same frequency as classroom teachers. In addition to setting a Professional Practice Goal (PPG), teacher-librarians have the choice between setting a Student Learning Goal (SLG) or a Library Program Goal (LPG). The selection of which type of goal is most appropriate is a matter that should be discussed and decided between the teacher-librarian and his/her evaluator.


Student Learning Goal (SLG)

SLGs are an approach to measuring student learning and the impact a teacher has on student learning. The SLG process provides an opportunity for teachers to collaborate with other teachers and with their evaluators to set meaningful academic goals for their students. SLGs are long-term, measurable, academic goals set for students to accomplish by the end of a course. Developing an SLG includes identifying the most important learning content for the year alongside teachers of the same content area (if available), reviewing student academic and social data, setting a long term goal for students, measuring the long term goal along the way, and evaluating student attainment of the goal at the end of the school year. The SLG process empowers teachers to set a goal for their own students and facilitates deep collaboration between teachers and evaluators to ensure that students reach the goal.

- SLGs encourage a collaborative process. The process of developing SLGs involves collaboration among teams of teachers across grade levels or subject areas to identify the “most important” content.
- SLGs reinforce and can help formalize good teaching practice. The SLG process involves interpreting data, setting the goal, using data to assess progress and adjusting instruction based on data collected.
- SLGs acknowledge the value of teacher knowledge and teacher skill. Teachers have input on how student learning is measured.
- SLGs are adaptable. They are not dependent on the availability of standardized assessment scores. They can also be adjusted or revised based on changes in standards, curriculum, student population, and/or student need.

SLG Process

Student Learning Goals are not just about the goal that an educator sets for their students, they also emphasize the process educators use to set and monitor student progress towards the desired goal. The collaboration and analysis required for successful SLG implementation aligns with effective practices more broadly. Educators engage in a collaborative process with their teams and ultimately collaborate with their evaluator to establish long-term, measurable, academic goals for their students. There are three main steps to the SLG process as outlined below:



Step 1: Develop and Approve the SLG

- Review course objectives and standards and identify the most important learning for the year
- Identify the assessments that will be used to measure student progress toward the SLG
- Review and collect baseline data
- Draft the SLG, using the **Goal Setting and Planning Tool**, and set performance targets based on baseline data
- Evaluation of the proposed SLG and approval by the evaluator

The SLG must align with Nevada Academic Content Standards (NVACS) or other approved standards. There must be a conversation between the educator and the evaluator to establish and reach agreement on the final student learning target and the measure of student growth and achievement for the SLG. Student need within the content area must be a part of that conversation. Measures of student growth and achievement used for 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.

When possible, educators should work together (e.g. in grade level or content teams) to review and determine the most important standards and content for students to master. Additionally, educators should work together to analyze student performance trends and select or develop common measures for assessing student content knowledge and skills. The administrator should create teams of teachers to work together to review standards, identify priorities, select common measures and establish goals.

The SLG should be horizontally and vertically aligned, when applicable. To develop horizontally aligned goals, all teachers in the same grade level and/or content area should collaborate to set SLGs and then each teacher should set specific targets based upon his or her own students' baseline knowledge and skills. When developing a vertically aligned SLG, teachers across grade levels and/or departments should communicate and collaborate to ensure that students are progressing as expected.

Setting targets for the SLG can be complex. Educators should use baseline and trend data to help set appropriate SLG targets. Targets should be ambitious and feasible for the students identified. The SLG target may address an educator's caseload, a single class, or a subset of students. 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 students whose growth may have a different end of course target than other students of the identified population.) If a subset of students is used or if tiered targets are set, rationale should be provided.

The main questions the evaluator should ask are:

SLG

- Does the SLG focus on a standard that aligns with an area of high need?
- Does it align with department and/or school goals?
- What data was collected to set the baseline?
- How was the target goal set? Were different student populations accounted for by setting differentiated targets?
- How were students selected to be in the target group and why were they selected?
- What assessment/s will be used to measure student growth and why was it selected?
- How will students' progress be monitored? When will data be collected?
- Is the goal S.M.A.R.T. (Specific and Strategic; Measurable; Action-Oriented and Achievable; Realistic, Relevant and Results-Focused; Timed and Tracked)?

PPG

- Does the PPG support the educator's ability to meet the SLG?
- Does the PPG align with one of the NEPF Standards/ Indicators?
- How will the educator measure progress on meeting the PPG?
- Is the goal S.M.A.R.T. (Specific and Strategic; Measurable; Action-Oriented and Achievable; Realistic, Relevant and Results-Focused; Timed and Tracked)?

There must be a conversation between the educator and the evaluator to establish and reach an agreement on the final student-learning target and the measure of student growth and achievement for the SLG. In addition, the conversation should include a review of the SLG Rubric to ensure there is a shared understanding of how the SLG will be scored. The SLG must be approved by the evaluator.

Step 2: Monitor the Progress of the SLG

- Delivery of instruction/instructional leadership
- Adapt instruction/instructional leadership plans based on data collected
- Monitor progress and discuss with team and/or evaluator
- Revise supports and interventions as needed
- Educator and evaluator adjust the SLG at the Mid-Cycle Goal/s Review conference if necessary

The educator evaluates students' progress throughout the course of instruction. This information is part of an ongoing conversation between the educator and evaluator via observation conferences. Progress toward the SLG and the educator performance observed should be closely linked and discussed throughout the evaluation cycle.

The Mid-Cycle Goal/s Review conference is the time when the educator and evaluator formally meet to discuss progress toward the SLG and the educator's performance to date. The evaluator and educator review the evidence (data collected) to determine whether the SLG has been met or is on track to be met. If it becomes clear that the SLG can be improved or is no longer appropriate, adjustments may be considered if:

- Based on new information gathered since the SLG was set, the goal fails to address the most important learning challenges in the classroom and/or school.
- New, more reliable sources of evidence are available.
- The class composition has significantly changed.
- Teaching schedule, assignment, or personal circumstance has significantly changed.

If the evaluator and educator agree that an adjustment should be made to the SLG at this time, then a follow-up conference should be scheduled to review data again and re-evaluate the progress on the SLG. In addition, the evaluator may use the **Educator Assistance Plan** to provide specific resources and directives to the educator if evidence from observations warrants the additional instructional/ instructional leadership guidance.

As a reminder, as part of the review process, the evaluator and educator should also review progress on the Professional Practice Goal (PPG) to determine if it has been met, if it needs to be adjusted, or if any additional support is needed to meet that goal.

Step 3: Evaluate the Attainment of the SLG

- Assess students' progress toward SLG using previously approved assessments
- Analyze results
- Educator and evaluator review the results
- Evaluator reviews SLG attainment and evaluates the level of achievement of the SLG before assigning the score based on the SLG Scoring Rubric (below)
- Educator and evaluator reflect on process and results to improve student learning and educator practice

Near the end of the evaluation cycle, students are assessed and results are then compared to expectations set in the SLG. Based on previously set targets, the Student Learning Goal Scoring Rubric (see below) is used to determine the educator's score from 1-4. This number becomes the raw Student Performance Domain score of the **Summative Evaluation Tool**. The evaluator and educator discuss this information during the Post Evaluation Conference for the purposes of reflection and to inform the improvement of the process for the following school year.

Figure 7: Student Learning Goal Scoring Rubric

SLG Scores	Score Descriptors
High = 4	At least one source of growth or achievement from multiple points in time shows evidence of high growth and high impact for all or nearly all students on which the SLG was set.
Moderate = 3	At least one source of growth or achievement from multiple points in time shows clear evidence of growth and impact for most students on which the SLG was set.
Low = 2	At least one source of growth or achievement from multiple points in time shows clear evidence of growth and impact for some students on which the SLG was set.
Unsatisfactory = 1	The educator has not met the expectation described in the SLG and has demonstrated an insufficient impact on student learning.

NOTE: State law requires that the evaluation of a probationary educator in his or her initial year of employment as a probationary teacher or administrator must NOT include student performance data.

Student Learning Goals – Choosing Quality Assessments

Choosing high-quality assessments is an integral component of the SLG process. A quality assessment provides an indication of the degree to which a teacher has impacted his or her students' learning in the course. 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.

[Nevada Regulations \(R138-17\)](#) require that the assessments must show ALL the following:

- Alignment with content standards/NVACS and curriculum,
- Alignment with the intended level or rigor,
- Psychometric quality of validity and reliability to the highest degree feasible.

If practical, educators should use standardized assessments to measure their SLG. If no assessment matches the identified content standards on which the SLG has been set, the educator may elect to modify an existing assessment or develop a new assessment so long as it is reviewed to ensure validity and reliability.

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. Further, a school or school district may continually monitor the assessments used to measure the Student Learning Goal to ensure that they incorporate the features above.

Library Program Goal (LPG)

A Library Program Goal (LPG) is a long-term, measurable goal that focuses on improvement to the library program, such as ensuring equitable access to library resources. Developing an LPG includes identifying the area of highest need for improvement of library services to assist the school community in attaining identified goals; reviewing student/school academic or library data, professional development needs of school personnel, teacher-librarian or administrator identified areas of support needed; setting long-term goal; measuring progress toward the long-term goal along the way; and evaluating attainment of the goal at the end of the school year. The steps to setting an LPG are the same as for setting a SLG; however, the focus of an LPG is on improving the library program overall rather than on a specific group of students. The positive impact of a well-designed and implemented LPG is school wide and beneficial to all or almost all students, educators, and the school community. The Teacher-Librarian Professional Responsibilities Standards outline the expectations of a teacher-librarian in providing a high-quality library program and may be helpful in guiding the focus of an LPG.

The LPG process empowers Teacher-Librarians to set a goal for his/her library program and facilitates collaboration between Teacher-Librarians and evaluators to ensure the goal is attained.

- LPGs reinforce, and can help formalize, good library program management. The process involves interpreting data, setting the goal, using data to assess progress and adjusting practice based on data collected.
- LPGs acknowledge the value of teacher-librarian knowledge and skill. Teacher-Librarians have input on how progress is measured.
- LPGs are adaptable. A variety of data sources may be used throughout the process, and they can also be adjusted or revised as needed.

LPG Process

The Library Program Goal process is like the Student Learning Goal process. The educator collaboration and analysis required for successful LPG implementation aligns with effective practices more broadly. Educators engage in a collaborative process with their teams and ultimately collaborate with their evaluator to establish long-term, measurable goals to improve the library program and benefit the school community. The three main steps to the LPG process are outlined below:



Step 1: Develop and Approve the LPG

- Review library program data to identify areas of potential growth
- Identify the data sources that will be used to measure progress toward the LPG
- Review and collect baseline data
- Draft the LPG, using the **Goal Setting and Planning Tool**, and set targets based on baseline data
- Evaluation of the proposed LPG and approval by the evaluator

Step 2: Monitor the Progress of the LPG

- Implementation of changes necessary to attain the identified LPG
- Adapt implementation based on data collected
- Monitor progress and discuss with team and/or evaluator
- Revise supports and interventions as needed
- Educator and evaluator adjust the LPG at Mid-Cycle Goal Review if necessary

Step 3: Evaluate the Attainment of the LPG

- Assess teacher-librarian's progress toward LPG using previously approved data sources
- Analyze results
- Educator and evaluator review the results
- Evaluator reviews LPG attainment and evaluates the level of achievement of the LPG before assigning the score based on the LPG Scoring Rubric (below)
- Educator and evaluator reflect on process and results to improve positive impact on the school community and educator practice

Near the end of the evaluation cycle, results are assessed and are then compared to expectations set in the LPG. Based on previously set targets, the Library Program Goal Scoring Rubric (see below) is used to determine the educator's score from 1 to 4. This number becomes the raw Student Performance Domain score of the **Summative Evaluation Tool**. The evaluator and educator discuss this information during the Post Evaluation Conference for the purposes of reflection and to inform the improvement of the process for the following school year.

Figure 8: Library Program Goal Scoring Rubric

SLG Scores	Score Descriptors
High = 4	Multiple sources of data from at least two points in time show evidence of high positive impact from library services on the school community.
Moderate = 3	Multiple sources of data from at least two points in time show evidence of positive impact from library services on the school community.
Low = 2	Multiple sources of data from at least two points in time show evidence of minimal positive impact from library services on the school community.
Unsatisfactory = 1	Teacher-Librarian has not met the expectations described in the LPG and provides little or no evidence of positive impact from library services on the school community.