

**NEVADA TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL MEETING  
December 6-7, 2011**

**Hyatt Place Las Vegas  
4520 Paradise Road  
Las Vegas, NV 89169**

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**

**December 6, 2011**

**COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Pamela Salazar, Chair  
Barbara Surritte-Barker, Vice Chair  
Linda Archambault, Member  
Christine Cheney, Member  
Kathleen Galland-Collins, Member  
Theresa Crowley, Member  
Rorie Fitzpatrick, Member  
Sharla Hales, Member  
Robert McCord, Member  
Theo McCormick, Member  
Heath Morrison, Member  
Dale Norton, Member  
Theodore Small, Member  
Kimberly Tate, Member

**COUNCIL MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

Mary Peterson, Member

**DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:**

Leslie James, Title IIA Education Programs Professional  
Laurie Thake, Assistant to the Council

**GUESTS PRESENT:**

Carol Crothers, Director, Nevada Department of Education  
Richard Alexander, Douglas County School District  
Caroline McIntosh, Superintendent, Lyon County School District  
Lynn Holdheide, Vanderbilt University, National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality  
Jennifer Varrato, Regional Implementation Coordinator, Voyager

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:**

Jerry Barbee	Director of Teacher Licensing, Nevada Department of Education
Richard Vineyard	Assistant Director, Nevada Department of Education
Craig Stevens	Nevada State Education Association
Pam Hicks	Clark County School Administrators Association
Kristen McNeill	Washoe County School District
Pepper Sturm	Legislative Counsel Bureau – Research
Richard Stokes	Superintendent, Carson City School District
Susan Keema	Assistant Superintendent, Carson City School District
Dr. Steven Pradere	Carson City School District
Dr. William Rob Roberts	Superintendent, Nye County School District
Lea Crusey	Students First
Abby Parker	Students First
Nicole Rourke	Clark County School District
Joyce Haldeman	Clark County School District
Marsha Irvin	Black Caucus Education Chair

**CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Pamela Salazar, Chair

Chair Salazar called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m., with attendance as reflected above.

Chair Salazar provided a brief review of the key points discussed during the October 25, 2011 meeting, including the Council's established goals: 1) Ensure student learning and growth, 2) Improve teacher and leader capacity and instructional practice, and 3) Develop a performance accountability framework.

**APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 25, 2011 MEETING MINUTES**

Pamela Salazar, Chair

*Member McCord motioned for approval of the October meeting minutes. Member Norton seconded. Member Fitzpatrick requested a change to page 9, second to the last paragraph, to more accurately reflect the need to learn what the current district practices were and how those practices might fit into the Council's current work. Minor revisions without a change to context were also recommended. **The motion carried and the minutes were approved with the discussed changes.***

**APPROVAL OF A FLEXIBLE AGENDA**

Chair Salazar requested a motion from the Council for a flexible agenda. *Member Norton motioned for flexible agenda. The motion carried without objection.*

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Salazar opened the floor for public comment. There was no public comment.

## **OVERVIEW OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT (ESEA) WAIVER APPLICATION PROCESS**

Rorie Fitzpatrick, Interim Deputy Superintendent, Nevada Department of Education, and Dr. Stanley Rabinowitz, Director, Assessment & Standards Development Services at WestEd.

Member Fitzpatrick provided an overview of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) waiver application process. The ESEA waiver provides new requirements with absolutes. The three key principles noted and discussed were:

- 1) College and Career readiness standards.  
Nevada has chosen to adopt common core state standards and participation in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, both of which satisfy requirements of the waiver. Meaningful college and career readiness is the goal.
- 2) School recognition, accountability, and support.
  - 2(a) This section provides flexibility in dealing with different populations. Acknowledges systemic issues in schools and differences in student sub-populations are different issues which need different solutions.
  - 2(b) Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) reports are still required, but are more flexible on how progress is determined. All students must reach mastery, but will no longer require 100% attainment by 2013-14.
  - 2(c-e) Identify at least three subsets of schools: **Reward schools**, which have the highest performance and highest growth; **Priority schools**, which have low growth and low achievement (lowest 5%); **Focus schools**, which show gaps in growth between student populations.
- 3) Effective instruction and leadership.  
This principle requires the State to self-select a category of completion. The categories are: A) No guidelines; B) Some guidelines; and C) Fully integrated system. Member Fitzpatrick indicated Nevada was currently in category B. Nevada has a statute which requires specific deliverables, but we are still working to attain a fully integration system.

The Council discussed the need for the Council to support and endorse the work happening on the waiver. Different definitions and characteristics of the provisions remained an issue. Member McCord stated a common vocabulary of clearly understood definitions would be helpful. Chair Salazar stated some of the terms were already defined, however, some of the values from the ESEA waiver needed to be defined by the Council.

***Member McCord motioned for Chair Salazar to construct an appropriate letter of support for the ESEA waiver and the Council's affirmation to do the work specified in principal three of the waiver. Member Hales seconded. There was no public comment. The motion carried without objection.***

Member Fitzpatrick provided background information on the Accountability Redesign Group and the Core Support Group, stating they were created to provide more efficient alignment of the waiver process. The Accountability Redesign Group provides an overarching view on how to shape the work of the waiver application, while the Core Support Group takes these general concepts and narrows them to fit the specific details of the application itself.

The Council discussed the work of the redesign and core support groups relative to family and stakeholder engagement, as well as the alignment of indicators. The Council noted the unparalleled collaboration between the school districts and the desire to go beyond the basic requirements of the waiver itself to ensure everyone was working on one common goal “*the definition of accountability in the State of Nevada.*”

Member Fitzpatrick turned the presentation over to Dr. Rabinowitz, who facilitated a discussion on the importance of alignment when developing an accountability system. It is important to develop an aligned system which makes sense and can be communicated effectively. One of the most difficult issues in developing an aligned system is the selection and application of indicators. Will indicators apply equally across all categories or will they apply to some categories but not others?

Additionally, Dr. Rabinowitz noted the difficult questions centered on the “other 69%” of teachers in non-tested subjects and grades. Should you make the 31% of tested subjects the driver of the 69%, or should there be a different accountability model for those groups. Dr. Rabinowitz stated there were really only 3 options for the other 69%. You can: 1) Have the 31% drive 69%, whatever the 31% does will equally apply to the 69%; 2) You can try to make 69% like 31%. Build or find CRT’s for those areas; or 3) Recognize the 69% is different than the 31%. Possibly a different performance measure than CRT’s could be more useful.

The Council discussed the issues of outcome versus process, local control, and qualitative versus quantitative measures. Dr. Rabinowitz stated the Council could build core indicators and use variance indicators and options to work with different issues. This type of structure can reinforce continuous improvement.

Dr. Rabinowitz also stressed the importance of looking ahead when designing an accountability system, with the key points in time being at years 1, 3, 5, and 10. In year 1, think about how the system will be working in year 3. What will it look like in year 5 when the system is no longer hypothetical and you have a base of research to evaluate the system? Are there unintended consequences? Are the indicators working? Is there really an argument about growth and status? In year 10, are you worrying about the same things you are today? Build a system that is very oriented to the future.

The item closed and the meeting broke for lunch. Chair Salazar stated the meeting would resume at 1:00pm.

### **Overview of the Nevada Growth Model**

Carol Crothers, Director, Nevada Department of Education, Office of Assessment, Program Accountability, and Curriculum

Ms. Crothers stated students enter and remain in the education system at different levels, with growth measures providing information for all students regardless of where they started. Primary questions we want to answer with the growth model are: How fast is a student growing compared to others? How much did they grow this year? Is the student achieving enough academic progress, at least one year of academic growth from last year?

Of the many growth models available, Nevada has chosen a well vetted model which has been used in over 20 states. NDE and the districts worked with data for over 2 years, so the model is something we

can we stand behind. The model provides comparable results for students at all levels of academic achievement.

Calculations from the growth model can indicate whether a student is on target. However, the model does not inherently indicate whether the student made at least a one year's growth. The Council discussed some of the positive merits of the model, including the ability to compare students with others in the same academic growth percentile group, and the ability for educators to have conversations about methods that had a positive effect, and the ability to cross-train each other on best practices.

The Council expressed concerns about the relative newness of the model and the reliability of the data over time. The Council discussed the need for a quality control aspect in the model, possibly an independent third party evaluation. Dr. Rabinowitz added that all growth models have some problems; however, he stated this was an area where the Council could include the information as an indicator, but limit the weighting until the validity and value of the studies was determined.

Member McCord stated for the purposes of disclosure that he serves on the board of WestEd, and that WestEd may be contacted in the future to conduct some of the studies.

The Council discussed the concept of proper weighting of indicators and the importance of doing a phased in weighting system so high-stakes decisions were not jeopardized. Members also discussed the importance of educating stakeholders about growth models and what those results mean. Specifically, education on the difference between growth and status models was mentioned. Caution was raised on basing the system solely on growth, as well as the importance of making sure we hold ourselves accountable so students who are far behind do not get left behind.

The members discussed the importance of students graduating from our Nevada Schools College and Career Ready. We want our students prepared for life and need to be honest with stakeholders what needs to be done, not only in school, but at home as well. We need to continuously remind the Legislature about education funding levels. Member Morrison recommended bringing in business leaders for a perspective on where Nevada stands compared to the rest of the country and the rest of the world.

## **Presentations and Discussion on Existing Evaluation Systems in Nevada School Districts Douglas County Presentation**

Rich Alexander, Douglas County School District, Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources

Mr. Alexander introduced himself and stated his district was very appreciative of the tough challenge the Council was taking on. Mr. Alexander gave an overview of Douglas' current evaluation framework, including the domains and three levels of performance evaluated as mandated by statute: satisfactory, unsatisfactory, and area of strength. The entire Douglas County School District presentation can be viewed at:

<http://nde.doe.nv.gov/PDFs/Teachers/DCSDCertifiedPerformanceEvalProcess.pdf>

Mr. Alexander provided strengths as well as weakness for their current framework and rubric.

**Strengths:** Everyone knows what is expected. The system has specificity, which allows us to pinpoint areas of strength and weakness. Student achievement is addressed as part of the evaluation. The suggested improvement plan always focuses on support and professional development.

Weaknesses: System focus is on inputs instead of outputs. Progress is not clearly defined. Parent and student input is not part of the process. No evidence system has improved teaching quality. No evidence that our process is making a difference.

Council members conferred with Mr. Alexander regarding issues of district demographics, focused staff development, principal training, student input, and the importance of a consistent statewide system. The Council thanked Mr. Alexander for his presentation.

Chair Salazar provided all of our school districts are being interviewed on their current practices. Those results will be compiled and presented in an aggregate form. If a district does not make a presentation today or tomorrow, we will still have their information and a sense of what their practice is.

### **Lyon County Presentation**

Caroline McIntosh, Superintendent of Lyon County School District, and Scott Lommori, Director of Testing & Educational Technology

Ms. McIntosh made an introduction for herself and Mr. Lommori and emphasized her district did not work in isolation. They were very grateful for the Council's work and the support of the regional professional development programs (RPDP). Ms. McIntosh continued with an overview of district demographics and stressed the importance of their career and technical education program, stating that 50% of their high school students were involved in that program. The entire Lyon County School District presentation can be viewed at:

<http://nde.doe.nv.gov/PDFs/Teachers/FutureOfTeachingLearningInLCSD.pdf>

Mr. Lommori introduced their use of the *Marzano Teacher Evaluation model* and discussed specific points of the system. Mr. Lommori indicated Lyon County would focus their development, implementation, and training on those aspects which meant the most in the classroom. Ms. McIntosh indicated their system had a 4-year rollout and stressed the importance of thinking ahead towards staging different portions of the rollout. Completing K-12 curriculum alignment with the Common Core Standards (CCS) has been a huge project.

Council members conferred with Ms. McIntosh and Mr. Lommori regarding issues of teacher and evaluator feedback, real time targeted professional development, focused staff development, as well as the application of the framework to librarians and other staff members. The Council thanked Ms. McIntosh and Mr. Lommori for their presentation.

### **Evaluating the Performance of Teachers in Non-Tested Grades and Subjects**

Dr. Stanley Rabinowitz, Director, Assessment & Standards Development Services at WestEd and Dr. Lynn Holdheide, Research Associate, National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality

Dr. Holdheide began her presentation by taking look back at the hopes and purposes the Council established during the initial October 25, 2011 meeting and posed a question to the members: *What measures of student growth align with the Council identified hopes and purposes?*

Members provided:

- Informs practice to improve student learning.
- Cohesive reliable system.
- Recruit and retain effective leaders.

- Could the growth model provide the type of student data needed to improve teacher and leader performance?
- Is the technical adequacy of the growth model sufficient for making teacher and leader performance decisions? Can it be used at a high stakes level? Do we feel comfortable doing that?
- What methodology will the Council recommend for growth in non-tested subjects and grades?
- What role will the state play?
- Will the state provide training to ensure fidelity? Will the state require districts to do training?

Dr. Holdheide then asked: *How is growth currently measured in non tested subjects and grades?*

Members provided measures such as: portfolios, projects, performances or recitals; and various tests such as the English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA) and IEP goals and objectives.

Dr. Rabinowitz provided that issues of measures and system fairness were the hardest to deal with. The issue of complexity can often lead to lowest common denominator thinking. People will fall back on, “If I cannot do it right then I am not going to do it at all” or “If I cannot do it for everybody, then I am not going to do it for anybody.” Sufficiency of measurement as opposed to perfection of measurement is a very important factor. Remember, whatever these measures are, they were not designed for teacher evaluation.

Members discussed the possibility of working collaboratively with national groups, the importance of developing strong leadership tools, and the overall excitement around the growth and improvement of the teaching profession.

To focus the group on their values, Dr. Holdheide instructed members to identify 5 key purposes or hopes of the teacher evaluation system. Council members identified their key hopes as the ability to:

- Identify where teachers can grow.
- Target professional development.
- Establish effective communication with parents.
- Work collaboratively.
- Work with gifted students as there is not enough challenge for the top 10%.

What types of measures are required to support what you value? Return to the importance of the 1, 3, 5, and 10 year perspective, otherwise the scope is too big to handle. Recall, there are no perfect systems and measures out there now, so focus on where you want to be in 10 yrs. Think about the process in stages for the purpose of implementation. Implementation failure can destroy the credibility of the new system right away.

Vice Chair Barker provided Council members with materials from the National Governors Association (NGA) Policy Academy on Teacher Effectiveness conference.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Salazar opened the floor for public comment. There was no public comment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Meeting scheduled to reconvene on December 7, 2011 at 8:00 am.

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**

**December 7, 2011**

**COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Pamela Salazar, Chair  
Barbara Surritte-Barker, Vice Chair  
Linda Archambault, Member  
Christine Cheney, Member  
Kathleen Galland-Collins, Member  
Theresa Crowley, Member  
Rorie Fitzpatrick, Member  
Sharla Hales, Member  
Robert McCord, Member  
Theo McCormick, Member  
Heath Morrison, Member  
Dale Norton, Member  
Mary Peterson, Member  
Theodore Small, Member  
Kimberly Tate, Member (arrived approximately 8:30 a.m.)

**DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:**

Leslie James, Title I/II Education Programs Professional  
Laurie Thake, Assistant to the Council

**GUESTS PRESENT:**

Kristen McNeill, Washoe County School District  
Nicole Rourke, Clark County School District  
Richard Stokes, Superintendent Carson City School District  
Susan Keema, Assistant Superintendent, Carson City School District  
Dr. Steven Pradere, Carson City School District  
Lynn Holdheide, Vanderbilt University, National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality  
Jennifer Varrato, Regional Implementation Coordinator, Voyager

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:**

Jerry Barbee	Nevada Department of Education
Craig Stevens	Nevada State Education Association
Pam Hicks	Clark County School Administrators Association

**CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Pamela Salazar, Chair

Chair Salazar called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m., with attendance as reflected above.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Salazar opened the floor for public comment. There was no public comment.

Vice Chair Barker provided additional information on the NGA materials provided the prior day. The members discussed the possibility of Gretchen Weber from NGA providing a short presentation at the next meeting relative to the communication component of the grant.

**Continued Presentations and Discussion on Existing Evaluation Systems in Nevada School Districts****Clark County Presentation**

Dr. Staci Vesneske, County School District Human Resources Division

Dr. Vesneske introduced herself and stated that Nevada was further along than most states in this process and applauded the Council's efforts so far. She noted Clark County started making some transformative changes with Student Incentive Grant (SIG) money they received, with Rancho High School being their pilot transformational model school. She noted the potential for the transformational model to influence the whole conversation for evaluation in the district as a whole. The entire Clark County School District presentation can be viewed at:

<http://nde.doe.nv.gov/PDFs/Teachers/CCSDTeacherPrincipalEvaluationProcessRevision.pdf>

Dr. Vesneske discussed the change in focus on work from the prior year. Last year the committees focused on the evaluation process itself and the internal process changes which needed to occur. Both the CCSD teacher evaluation committee and principal evaluation committee were focused on internal changes. This year, she noted they still have one committee for the principal evaluation process, but now have multiple committees doing focused work on the teacher evaluation process, which is rigorous and achievable. Dr. Vesneske also stated they are watching the work of the Council for the purposes of alignment.

Goals of the principal evaluation process include developing a rubric and observable component for leadership, the use of rolling data sets, and an acknowledged need for some outside assistance in relation to discussions on data.

Goals of the teacher evaluation process, we currently have 5 subcommittees working on two big issues: 1) The observable criteria and rubrics to be used; and 2) The technology to be used. Additionally, there is a committee specifically designed for community outreach and involvement.

Dr. Vesneske stated the next big systemic step was to link the evaluation data to a coherent system of human capital management strategies, including hiring and professional development, differential retention, etc. Members asked for a definition of differential retention. Dr. Vesneske explained that differential retention involved the need to increase retention of our best performers, while either helping or letting go of the worse performing teachers. This is a component our current system does not have.

Council members conferred with Dr. Vesneske regarding issues of performance framework indicators, the use of growth scores and gap scores, and concern of multiple measures over multiple years. Dr. Vesneske reminded the Council that there was no perfect model, but some models were more useful than others. She reinforced that the model chosen does not need to be perfect, it just needs to be as good as we can get it at this time. The Council thanked Dr. Vesneske for her presentation.

### **Washoe County School District Presentation**

Kristen McNeill, Chief Strategies Officer, State & Federal Programs and K-16 Initiatives

Ms. McNeill introduced herself and started her presentation with Washoe County's vision for use of the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grant and SIG money Washoe County had received. The TIF grant funds 9 TIF schools and 8 volunteer schools for a total of 5 years, while the SIG money funds 7 schools, as well as 2 additional title schools sites, for three years. The entire Washoe County School District presentation can be viewed at:

<http://nde.doe.nv.gov/PDFs/Teachers/WCSDPresentation.pdf>

Relative to principal evaluations, Ms. McNeill indicated Washoe had selected the *McREL evaluation* system. Difficulties with their old evaluation system centered on a lack of data used and a lack of information provided to help principals and their schools move forward. Additionally, the old system provided only two evaluation levels, satisfactory and unsatisfactory.

By contrast the McREL evaluation levels range from developing to proficient, with clearly established criteria for each step-up. The system is rigorous, but easy to understand and includes a professional growth system. Washoe used to have different evaluations for principals and assistant principals, but now both are now aligned into same evaluation system. Ms. McNeill stated they were still piloting McREL district wide, so they will be looking at feedback from principals at the end of this year.

Council members discussed the impact of school improvement plans, student achievement data, and the rigor of the new system. Ms. McNeill stated they wanted to create a true pilot model, so the student achievement data they add next fall will be a no fault, to give an honest look at how student achievement will impact evaluations. This work is too important to make it high stakes at this point in time.

Relative to teacher evaluations, Ms. McNeill indicated Washoe had selected the *Danielson model*. The past evaluation system did not provide a lot of feedback to teachers. Additionally, most teachers were evaluated as satisfactory, but the district had a 56% graduation rate. In TIF and volunteer schools, we did not start with old rubric; we actually started with second edition of the Danielson model. We are currently piloting this model in 17 schools and would like to fully implement the model in our next school year, so we are in the planning stages of implementation now.

Council members conferred with Ms. McNeill on the criteria for a good assessment system. They discussed issues such as available resources, family and community involvement, and cultural diversity. Also discussed were growth and foundational targets and how those targets integrated into the evaluation. Ms. McNeill stated they were still in the process of developing the specifics.

Council members discussed multiple measures and the positive impact of the Measures of Academic Process (MAP) system Washoe was currently using. Members stated the system impacted all of the standards and helped to direct instruction. Member Crowley stated that the use of MAP can pinpoint

where a student is lacking and helps both teachers and parents know how the student is doing. Also noted was the breakdown of data which helped students chart their own pathways to academic success. MAP data is immediate, so it shows where a student is at any given time. Currently MAP is being used for instruction and parent conference only. Council members noted that a lack of computer resources could be an issue for lower income schools.

Council members conferred with Ms. McNeill on the issue of surveys, in particular the *Tripod* project, and the reliability of that data and/or concerns about signs of survey fatigue. There is currently no evidence of either. They also discussed how the district currently obtains professional support. Ms. McNeill stated Washoe would **be blending federal funds** to pay for consulting teachers and implementation specialists. The Council thanked Ms. McNeill for her presentation.

### **Carson City School District Presentation**

Richard Stokes, Superintendent of Carson City School District; Susan Keema, Associate Superintendent of Educational Services; and Dr. Steven Pradere, Director of Grants and Special Projects

Mr. Stokes introduced himself and provided an overview of his district demographics and discussed some of the challenges. Mr. Stokes noted Carson City has started making some transformative changes with SIG money they received. Teacher and administrator associations have been included in this process, and the professional dialogue created between the schools was amazing. The entire Carson City School District presentation can be viewed at:

<http://nde.doe.nv.gov/PDFs/Teachers/CCSDFrameworkForEffectiveTeaching.pdf>

Mr. Stokes turned the presentation over to Susan Keema, Associate Superintendent of Educational Services; and Dr. Steven Pradere, Director of Grants and Special Projects.

Dr. Pradere began with a discussion of the district's *learner centered approach*. He indicated the district looked at the most successful teachers and asked how they measured their success. Those teachers responded they measured their success by their student's success. However, not all teachers inherently follow this philosophy. Some teachers prefer to measure their success by how well they follow the curriculum. Dr. Pradere stated before they began this system, there was no incentive in their system for teachers to be learner centered. Dr. Pradere briefly discussed ideas concerning curriculum development, assessment, instruction, and the leadership component.

Susan Keema presented information on the *Danielson model* preferred by their district. Ms. Keema noted that other districts were using SIG and TIF grant money to work on other pieces, so they chose to focus their work on curriculum development. Carson City focused their SIG work in year one on 3 specific pieces: the evaluation piece, the student achievement piece, and the persistence piece.

Going into their second-year, Carson City is focusing their work on instruction and assessment and is currently rolling out pre and post assessments. Ms. Keema noted some factors unique for a SIG school; such as the need to add instructional time to the school day, provide academic instruction after school, and the need to turn homeroom in to a period to work on academic strategies courses.

Council members conferred with the Carson City staff, regarding issues of common assessment for the non-tested subjects, the necessary reorganization of resources, focused staff development, as well as the difficult issue of establishing and maintaining growth targets. They also discussed unintended positive

consequences, such as special education and regular education teachers working more closely together. The Council thanked them for their presentation.

*Member Fitzpatrick motioned for Chair Salazar to write a letter on behalf of the Teachers and Leaders Council to the districts thanking them for giving us their time, information and resources shared. Member Archambault and others seconded. The motion carried without objection.*

The staff for the Council has interviewed most of the districts and put together a general summary which Member Peterson suggested be the Council's starting point for further development of their tasks.

### **Continuation of Evaluating the Performance of Teachers in Non-Tested Grades and Subjects**

Dr. Lynn Holdheide, Research Associate, National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality

Dr. Holdheide reviewed information discussed the prior day, reminding the Council they started discussing purpose and how the phase end of these new evaluations might phase in.

Council members discussed the possibility of using Student Learning Objectives (SLO) as part of the 50% of student achievement. It was noted that some districts already have this culture established, but not all. Training will be needed to make sure all SLO evaluators are knowledgeable. For students who are deemed at risk, there will need to be some level of collaboration between teachers and specialist teachers to develop those goals and objectives. SLOs need to be reflective of what a student's abilities are.

The discussion then returned to the concept of adequate growth begun yesterday. The big question is how do you credit growth back to specific teachers? Think of a co-teaching situation, some systems say a 50/50 split on growth, others say 100% to each teacher. The Council discussed the need to partner with national regional comprehensive centers to assist in adopting standards. Working collaboratively with others will balance the work and save resources.

The Council discussed the need to develop a communication strategy. Many members were already getting lots of questions regarding the Council's work and what was currently happening. Specifically, the area of tested and non-tested subjects needs to be well articulated no matter what evaluation manner is decided upon.

The Council briefly discussed the need to come to some agreement on purpose. Dr. Holdheide noted this is where the going gets tough and there needs to be buy in from stakeholders across the state. Mission statements are useful in helping everyone move in the same direction.

Council members discussed the unfunded legislative mandate relative to the changes required, in particular in year one. Also discussed was the concept of phasing in certain aspects like professional development balanced with the need to move forward in a meaningful way.

Members discussed the preference for beginning with the evaluation process for principals. It is important to establish trust early on, and by beginning with principals, other educators can observe how the process will work before it applies to them. There will be differentiated components in each system, but there will need to be systemic alignment overall for both.

Members also discussed the importance of getting back to the core in the next meeting. Specifically, what are the deliverables? Which measures are non-negotiable? As well as the concept of multiple measures and the difficult decisions they represent.

### **Determine Meeting Schedule for 2011-2012 School Year**

Pamela Salazar, Chair

Chair Salazar provided some topics for the next agenda would be:

1. Core measures.
2. What is in the 50%.
3. Multiple measures.
4. Working groups and expert panels. How do different groups use and address these problems.

The following dates were established for future Council meetings:

- Jan 20–21, 2012 in Reno
- Feb 8, 2012 in Las Vegas
- March 5, 2012 in Las Vegas
- April 16, 2012 in Reno
- May 7, 2012 in Las Vegas
- May 21, 2012 in Reno

Meeting times and venues to be determined.

Member Hales and Member McCord stressed the importance of establishing and voting on key core measures and basic tenants at the beginning of the next meeting. It is important to begin action on the core measures as soon as possible.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Salazar opened the floor for public comment. There was no public comment.

The meeting adjourned at 1:05 pm.