

**TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC) MEETING
March 5, 2012**

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

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

March 5, 2012

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

MEMBERS PRESENT BY PHONE:

Theo McCormick, Member

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT:

Ed Irvin, Senior Deputy Attorney General
Robert Whitney, Deputy Attorney General

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

Laurie Thake, Assistant to the Council

GUESTS PRESENT:

Cary Baird	National Governors Association
Tabitha Grossman,	National Governors Association
Judy Osgood	Office of the Governor
Stanley Rabinowitz	Director, Assessment and Standards Development Services at WestEd
Sujie Shin	Senior Manager, Assessment and Standards Development at WestEd
Lynn Holdheide	Consultant, Vanderbilt University

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

Kristen McNeill	Washoe County School District
Pepper Sturm	Legislative Counsel Bureau
Nicole Rourke	Clark County School District
Jose Delfin	Carson City School District
Pat Skorkowsky	Clark County School District

CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Salazar called the meeting to order at 8:39 a.m., with attendance as reflected above.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

APPROVAL OF FLEXIBLE AGENDA

Member Hales motioned for a flexible agenda. Member Cheney seconded. The motion carried without objection.

APPROVAL OF JANUARY 2012 MINUTES

The Council reviewed the revised January 20-21, 2012 minutes. *Member Cheney motioned to accept the January 2012 minutes as presented. Member Archambault seconded. The motion carried without objection.*

PRESENTATION ON DEVELOPMENT OF A STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION PLAN AND OUTREACH APPROACH TO ENGAGE MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC, AND CONSIDERATION AND POSSILBE ADOPTION OF A PLAN AND APPROACH

Communications Task Force Chair Barker introduced the technical assistants recruited with the help of the National Governors Association (NGA); Cary Baird and Tabitha Grossman, as well as Judy Osgood from the Office of the Governor, to facilitate the presentation to the Council.

Cary Baird stated the goal for today was to give the Council an idea of what a good communication plan should look like. When you are planning strategic communications, you need to consider who your target audience is. Keep Council communications in simple and clear language.

Messaging is important in providing clear communications for the Council. Messages should be simple, consistent, compelling, memorable, and should be in the language of the people you are trying to reach. They discussed creating the communication plan around four key ideas:

1. These models will help student learning.
2. Benefit to educators will come out in the process.
3. Notion of how the Council is doing their work.
4. Phased implementation.

Think about working collaboratively with diverse groups of stakeholders. The process is critical for people to have a sense that what the TLC is doing has credibility. Members discussed how the current evaluation process fails to reflect what teachers do in the classroom. It is important for stakeholders to understand this process is a tool to improve the professional development of both individual educators and the profession as whole.

The Members discussed the diverse nature of the council and their ability to access stakeholders within the different entities represented. It was also noted the Members should be aware of what the districts are doing currently so they can use that information to facilitate communication, given the short time frame involved. It will be crucial for the Council to communicate clearly and effectively with all media outlets. To that end, it may be beneficial for the TLC to refashion the language of the *White Paper* to be more clear and concise.

Members discussed the importance of developing an enhanced website to display and cluster information on the Council's work more concisely without losing the need to demonstrate transparency. In communicating their work, they noted the importance of emphasizing the process would be one of continuous improvement; it is not just a one-time shot. It is important to send the message that there will be a mechanism for correcting things overtime. Members also discussed the need to develop a rapid response team for quick and targeted responses, as well as an updated deliverables timeline to keep their work on course.

Vice Chair Barker questioned whether conversations with the public needed to be agendized if only input was being sought. Dr. Irvin stated this was an important Open Meeting Law (OML) question. The problem occurs when the information is brought to the task force and to the council as a whole. You are talking about how to get input, feedback, and involvement from groups; you are not talking about inviting them to these meetings. If they were here, you would not have to do the other forms of communication. So if people at a town hall meeting make a suggestion, your feedback can be "that's a fantastic suggestion, could you come to the next meeting on April 16th and tell the whole council." That way you are going to get effective feedback and comply with the OML and you are not going to have problems. It is in the actual fulfillment of the communication that is the important part. If you take surveys, then bring surveys to the council and present the survey information, then you are doing that in an open meeting and that will not be a problem if it is agendized. That communication can happen so long as the important part, which is how it communicated to the council, complies with the OML.

PRESENTATION INCLUDING A DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE APPROACHES FOR DESIGNING A MODEL THAT ADDRESSES CONSIDERATIONS OF LOCAL FLEXIBILITY AND STATEWIDE UNIFORMITY

Dr. Stanley Rabinowitz facilitated a discussion relative to the state versus local control continuum, as this is one of the most important overriding decisions for the TLC. There is a difference in resources, as well as readiness to take on this process, between the districts. Each point on the continuum will have distinct advantages and disadvantages; none of the options will be pain free and all will require shared responsibility between the state and local districts.

Oversight will be an important factor in local implementation. There will be decisions different stakeholders will not like, no matter what they are. The goal of oversight is to ensure at least sufficient practice, and to show what best practice could look like, in different contexts. Council members reviewed some of the advantages and disadvantages of the different models in the continuum and discussed their meaning.

State review and approval: This means the state is approving the district followed a process. What the district ended up with at the end of the process is not the state's business. As long as you check the right boxes, then the state has to approve the model. The state's role is formal and procedural, but not substantive.

Districts are required to submit a model to the state for review and feedback: State or outside experts provide feedback, but the districts are not required to use the feedback. Honors local control, but acknowledges locals may not have the expertise they need. Districts are required to get feedback, but use of the feedback is purely optional.

State's only role it is to come up with the models: A state distributes the models and the districts use what they want. The state is not endorsing the models; they are just showing what different models are out there.

State board adopts a model: The only role of the state is in evaluating the process; there is no oversight piece.

The discussion emphasized the adoption of a model was not the same as creating a statewide evaluation tool. If you require a classroom observation, then the district can use a tool that has been validated and verified. If the district does not have a tool, then the state may contemplate a sample or example tool which would meet the criteria. The TLC will ultimately decide the proper oversight and support roles in Nevada.

Dr. Sugie Shin facilitated a review of the framework in its current form, with a focus on definitions so the framework would be communicated clearly at all levels. Members discussed how differences in local flexibility would impact different parts of the framework. In order to give direction to the work of the task forces, the members determined they were in majority agreement of the following framework and conceptual statements:

First level: Two Spheres:

Educational Practice:

Focuses on teacher input in the classroom or the school community.

Student Achievement/Engagement:

Focuses on student outcomes.

Second level: Four Domains:

Instructional Practice (teacher input):

Teacher behavior in the classroom that enables every student's learning.

Professional Responsibilities (teacher input):

Everything a teacher does outside of instruction to influence and prepare for learning at the highest level in the classroom and promote effectiveness of the school community.

Student Engagement (student outcome):

The students are motivated and active participants in the learning process.

Student Achievement (student outcome):

Students show appropriate expected growth over time in their subject/content area.

Students show proficiency in their subject area and grade level.

In coming to an agreement on these conceptual statements, it was reaffirmed the TLC intended to focus on student centered instruction. The Council's prior work with Dr. Heritage helped to identify this as the area the TLC felt would make the large changes necessary to elevate Nevada's ranking in national education standards.

REVIEW, RETHINK, DISCUSS, REFINE, MAKE CHANGES TO AND POSSIBLY APPROVE MARCH 5, 2012 VERSION OF THE SYSTEM GUIDELINES WHITE PAPER

The Council discussed the need to be aware of legislative timelines and their relation to the projected costs of the proposed system to both the State and Local Education Authorities; page 13 of the *White Paper*. Pepper Sturm from the Legislative Counsel Bureau stated the Regional Professional Develop Programs (RPDP) and the local districts were building their budgets for the next biennium and those budgets needed to reflect any additional costs for professional development or staffing. Proposed budgets from the districts go to the state budget office in May. RPDP are about the same time as well. The budget division meetings for different parties will begin in July, so the Council will need to estimate the costs to the best of their ability.

Chair Salazar noted the importance of this information as they were trying to build the system out and project costs before implementation. Beyond the need to consider necessary professional development, the second component needing budgetary consideration was technical infrastructure and data; both the technology and personnel needed. She will be making a presentation to the Legislative Committee on Education in May to discuss the activities of the Council.

Member Fitzpatrick recommended updates to the *White Paper* with regard to the terminology associated with the spheres, domains, categories, and state versus local control and uniformity. Dr. Irvin advised someone could make a motion to approve changes to the *White Paper* consistent with the actions taken today and based on the discussion today; then a vote could be done today.

Member Cheney motioned to adopt changes to the White Paper today which were consistent with the Council's work of March 5, 2012. Member Norton seconded. The motion carried without objection.

DEPLOY TASK FORCE WORK

In deploying the task force work, Member Fitzpatrick reminded members it was important to adhere to the Council's commitment in following the spirit and letter of the OML with regard to task force work. In order to have non-Council members participate in the task forces, she proposed having the Council Chair appoint individuals to each of those task forces based upon their expertise. Those members would then be retroactively approved during the April 16, 2012 meeting.

Dr. Irvin stated compliance with the OML would occur when the selection was openly discussed at the time of the meeting. The process as to how the members were selected would be disclosed to the Council and they would approve those appointments, so the public would have the opportunity to know how it happened. I suggest that nominations be open to any form and I also suggest the Council Chair make the decisions in conversation with the Chair of the task force.

Member Crowley motioned to delegate authority to Council Chair Salazar, in conjunction with the Task Force Chairs, to recommended membership for the different task forces. Member Cheney seconded. Motion carried without objection.

Chair Salazar queried as to what types of task force communication, outside the agendized meeting, fit within the OML. Dr. Irvin responded that communication was appropriate for less than quorum. Be very careful of serial communications. If you talk to one person, then please be careful not to say that another member said this and another member said that. Emails are allowable as are telephone conversations and one on one conversation; as long as it is not a quorum. I suggest to you that emails are more dangerous because you can send emails "reply to all." The council is subject to the public records act and somebody could come and request your

emails related to this public body. Creating email to do business for the TLC should be avoided as much as possible.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Chair Salazar opened the floor for future agenda items. Members determined the System Guidelines *White Paper* and updates from the task forces on their work would be ongoing agenda items. The Council also expressed an interest in extending an invitation to the new Superintendent of Public Instruction to share his/her vision with the Council.

The Council also discussed the Bill Draft Request timelines and the need to complete research relative to the proposed fiscal impacts on the Department and local districts as required by AB222.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

The meeting adjourned at 4:09 p.m.

*The next meeting of the Teachers and Leaders Council is scheduled for **April 16, 2012 at Hyatt Place Reno, 1790 East Plumb Lane, Reno, NV 89502.** For your convenience, minutes and agendas are posted on the Nevada Department of Education's website, under Commissions & Councils, at <http://www.doe.nv.gov>.*

**NEVADA TEACHERS AND LEADERS
COMMUNICATIONS TASK FORCE MEETING
March 5, 2012**

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

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

March 5, 2012

TASK FORCE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Barbara Surritte-Barker, Chair
Robert McCord, Member
Dale Norton, Member
Mary Peterson, Member
Kimberly Tate, Member

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

Rorie Fitzpatrick, Interim Deputy Superintendent, Nevada Department of Education
Laurie Thake, Assistant to the Task Force

CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL

Chair Barker called the meeting to order at 4:12 p.m., with attendance as reflected above.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Barker opened the floor to public comment. No public comment was provided.

SCHEDULE MEETING DATES FOR COMMUNICATIONS TASK FORCE WORK

Chair Barker opened the floor for the discussion of future meeting dates. Members discussed upcoming speaking engagements and the need to have an additional meeting soon. Chair Barker discussed developing feedback questions for stakeholders. The questions will incorporate different components of the *White Paper* and inquire as to what different groups think about the document in general, and what they consider the document might be missing.

Task force members determined March 12, 2012 would be enough time to come up with the necessary feedback questions and set the meeting time from 3:00-5:00 p.m. During that meeting the members will begin to stage the next steps for the task force. An additional meeting was scheduled for April 3, 2012 from 3:00-5:00 p.m.

FUTURE AGENDA

Task force members discussed the need to work on a communication plan during the next meeting; including the identification of key audiences and opportunities to share information. Members also stated they would discuss potential communication strategies such as website development, surveys, the development of a frequently asked questions document (FAQ), and different modalities for feedback responses.

Member McCord indicated he would develop a power point presentation to distribute to members at the next meeting, which would be derived from the Council *White Paper*, and could be used in presentations to stakeholder groups. Members also discussed the need to designate a spokesperson to facilitate consistent and accurate messaging for the Council.

Members discussed the value in creating a briefing for the Governor, the Legislative Committee on Education (LCE), and the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB). Interim Deputy Fitzpatrick noted the LCE had tentatively scheduled this topic for discussion during the May 15, 2012 meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Barker opened the floor to public comment. No public comment was provided.

The meeting adjourned at 4:36 p.m.

The next meeting of the Teachers and Leaders Communications Task Force is scheduled for **March 12, 2012 at Nevada Department of Education, 700 E. 5th Street, Carson City, Nevada, 89706, Silver Ore Conference Room; and by teleconference.** For your convenience, minutes and agendas are posted on the Nevada Department of Education's website, under Commissions & Councils, at <http://www.doe.nv.gov>.

**NEVADA TEACHERS AND LEADERS
INDICATORS/MEASURES TASK FORCE MEETING
March 5, 2012**

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

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

March 5, 2012

TASK FORCE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pamela Salazar, Chair
Christine Cheney, Member
Theresa Crowley, Member
Sharla Hales, Member
Theodore Small, Member

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

Laurie Thake, Assistant to the Task Force

INVITED PRESENTER:

Sujie Shin, Senior Assessment Manager, WestEd

CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL

Chair Salazar called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m., with attendance as reflected above.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Salazar opened the floor to public comment. No public comment was provided.

SCHEDULE MEETING DATES FOR INDICATORS/MEASURES TASK FORCE WORK

Chair Salazar opened the floor for the discussion of future meeting dates. Members discussed classroom schedule times and possible dates for the next few meetings.

Task Force members established the next two meetings would occur by teleconference on:

- Wednesday, March 21, 2012 from 2:30-4:30 p.m.

- Monday, April 9, 2012 from 3:30-5:00 p.m.

Department staff will determine physical locations for members of the public to attend the task force meetings.

FUTURE AGENDA

Prior to determining items for the next agenda Chair Salazar and Sujie Shin, WestEd, facilitated a discussion to clarify topics from the Council meeting. Members discussed whether the Council had positively identified the use of the term “system” or “framework”. Chair Salazar stated no terminology had been voted on at this time. Dr. Shin stated it was her understanding the Council was comfortable with looking at a format which at this time contained two spheres; and under each sphere, two domains; with the domains named Instructional Pedagogy/Practice, Professional Responsibilities, Student Engagement, and Student Achievement.

Dr. Shin continued by explaining the document she presented had some *examples* of what the standards and categories *could look like*. Chair Salazar emphasized the work of this task force would be focused on the creation of standards and categories for the domains established by the Council. She agreed many important decisions were still needed in the areas of state vs. local control and where available resources would be focused. As the Council made further determinations; fine tuning of the task force work was anticipated.

Chair Salazar stated she would work with Dr. Shin to determine how to best organize and allocate task force work

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Salazar opened the floor to public comment. No public comment was provided.

The meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m.

The next meeting of the Teachers and Leaders Indicators/Measures Task Force is scheduled for **March 21, 2012 at NDE, 700 E. 5th Street, Carson City, Nevada, 89706, Superintendent’s Conference Room; and at NDE 9890 S. Maryland Pkwy, Suite 221, Las Vegas, NV 89183, Bristlecone Conference Room**. For your convenience, minutes and agendas are posted on the Nevada Department of Education’s website, under Commissions & Councils, at <http://www.doe.nv.gov>.

**NEVADA TEACHERS AND LEADERS
MODELS TASK FORCE MEETING
March 5, 2012**

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

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

March 5, 2012

TASK FORCE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rorie Fitzpatrick, Chair
Theo McCormick, Member
Linda Archambault, Member
Kathleen Galland-Collins, Member

TASK FORCE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Heath Morrison, Member

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

Laurie Thake, Assistant to the Task Force

INVITED GUEST:

Sujie Shin, Senior Assessment Manager, WestEd
Robert Whitney, Nevada Deputy Attorney General
Pam Salazar, Southern Nevada RPDP

CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL

Chair Fitzpatrick called the meeting to order at 4:40 p.m., with attendance as reflected above.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Fitzpatrick opened the floor to public comment. No public comment was provided.

SCHEDULE MEETING DATES FOR MODELS TASK FORCE WORK

Chair Fitzpatrick opened the floor for the discussion of future meeting dates. Members discussed classroom schedule times and possible dates for the next few meetings.

Task Force members established the next three meetings would occur by teleconference on:

- Monday, March 19, 2012 from 3:00-5:00 p.m.
- Tuesday, April 3, 2012 from 9:00-11:00 a.m.
- Monday, April 30, 2012 from 3:00-5:00 p.m.

Members discussed whether physical locations would be available for members of the public to attend the task force meetings. Chair Fitzpatrick noted there would be at least one physical location in Carson City for public attendance. She inquired from Dr. Whitney whether it was acceptable for members of the public to participate by phone. Dr. Whitney stated he knew of other agencies that allowed for public call in. Members discussed whether it was easier for members of the public to call in rather than travel to a physical location, which would in turn net greater public participation. In support, Dr. Salazar noted with the quantity of meetings occurring during the next six weeks, it would be easier for Department staff to facilitate those meetings if public call in was available.

It was decided the Chair would work with the Attorney General's office in Carson City to see if a public call in option would comply with the open meeting law requirements.

FUTURE AGENDA

Chair Fitzpatrick facilitated a discussion around agenda items for the next meeting. Sujie Shin, WestEd, stated she would send out updated information from this discussion, including possible next steps for this task force. Members discussed the need to review the weighting of various categories and measures as soon as possible. Additionally, task force members determined updates from the Indicators/Measures Task Force would need to be a standing agenda item.

The next task force meeting will include a discussion of weights and the inclusion of various categories, standards, indicators, and measures.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Fitzpatrick opened the floor to public comment. No public comment was provided.

The meeting adjourned at 4:51 p.m.

The next meeting of the Teachers and Leaders Models Task Force is scheduled for **March 19, 2012 at NDE, 700 E. 5th Street, Carson City, Nevada, 89706, Silver Ore Conference Room and by Teleconference.** For your convenience, minutes and agendas are posted on the Nevada Department of Education's website, under Commissions & Councils, at <http://www.doe.nv.gov>.