

**NEVADA TEACHERS AND LEADERS  
MODELS TASK FORCE MEETING  
April 03, 2012**

**TELECONFERENCE  
Member Call In**

**Public invited to attend at:**

**Nevada Department of Education  
700 E. Fifth Street  
Carson City, NV 89701  
Superintendent’s Conference Room**

**Nevada Department of Education  
9890 S. Maryland Pkwy, Suite 221  
Las Vegas, NV 89183  
Bristlecone Conference Room**

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**

**April 03, 2012**

**TASK FORCE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

*Council Task Force Members*

Rorie Fitzpatrick, Chair  
Linda Archambault, Member  
Kathleen Collins, Member  
Theo McCormick, Member  
Heath Morrison, Member (approx 9:30 am)

*Non-Council Task Force Members*

Sue Daellenbach, Member  
Mark Martinsen, Member  
Kristen McNeill, Member  
Keith Savage, Member  
Karen Taycher, Member  
Staci Vesneske, Member  
Lynn Warne, Member (approx 9:05 am)

**TASK FORCE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

*Non-Council Task Force*

Teri White, Member

**DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:**

Laurie Thake, Assistant to the Task Force

**INVITED PRESENTER:**

Sujie Shin, WestEd

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:**

Pepper Sturm                      Legislative Counsel Bureau  
Pamela Hicks                    Clark County Association of School Administrators  
Sam King                            League of Women Voters Nevada  
Forrest Darby                      Citizen

**CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL**

Chair Fitzpatrick called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. with attendance as reflected above.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

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

**APPROVAL OF A FLEXIBLE AGENDA**

*Member Warne motioned for approval of a flexible agenda. Member Archambault seconded. The motion carried without objection.*

**APPROVAL OF MARCH 5, 2012 TASK FORCE MINUTES**

*Member Collins motioned for approval of the March 5, 2012 meeting minutes. Member McCormick seconded. The motion carried without objection.*

**DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC) REGARDING AGREEMENT ON KEY TERMINOLOGY ON TERMS SUCH AS “SYSTEM” VS “FRAMEWORK”, “CATEGORIES”, AND ANY OTHER TERMS THAT EMERGE DURING THE DISCUSSION THAT THE TASK FORCE AGREES SHOULD BE DEFINED IN ORDER TO MAKE SUCH RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE TLC**

Dr. Shin began the discussion on a key term; whether this form would be called a framework or a model. There had been some concern the term model implied a more stringent tool. Chair Fitzpatrick added the term model seemed to promote the idea there would be one kind of protocol and one tool to be used by everyone. However, the term framework implied an overarching construct by which different types of data would be defined.

Members questioned whether the term used was really important. Chair Fitzpatrick provided some background on the issue of terminology within the TLC. Having one set of terminology became important because when terms were used interchangeably, the Council was unclear on which changes they were making at any given time.

*Member Vesneske motioned to recommend the use of the term “Framework.” Member Warne seconded. The motion carried without objection.*

**CONSIDERATION OF POSSIBLE CATEGORIES, STANDARDS, INDICATORS, AND MEASURES TO INCLUDE IN EVALUATING TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS AND POSSIBLE ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO PRESENT TO THE TLC**

Dr. Shin facilitated an in depth discussion with the Members relative to the naming of the first sphere on the right hand side of the framework; the sphere now called “Student Achievement/Engagement.” It was discussed whether “Student Academic Performance” would more accurately capture the intent; however,

concern was expressed over whether the term academic performance would encompass more than merely assessment data, as different data would be required for the evaluation of non-tested grades and subjects.

Chair Fitzpatrick motioned to label the sphere “Student Academic Achievement.” Member Martinsen seconded. However, through further discussion the label “Student Academic Performance” was suggested. Chair Fitzpatrick withdrew her original motion. ***Member McCormick motioned to label the sphere “Student Performance.” Member Archambault seconded. The motion carried without objection.***

The Members began a discussion on the two different domains under the “Student Performance” sphere; “Student Achievement” and “Student Engagement.” The Members had a robust discussion on the naming of the “Student Achievement” domain. To help facilitate the discussion, Dr. Shin noted student achievement should not be based solely on academic or standardized test scores. Student achievement needed to encompass more by accounting for non-tested grades and subjects. Members also discussed moving student engagement out of the domain level. Chair Fitzpatrick clarified, for open meeting law purposes, the members were having a blended conversation between two agenda items and the flexible agenda allowed them to move back and forth between those two. ***Member Vesneske motioned to change the domain of “Student Achievement” to “Student Outcomes.” Member Archambault seconded. The motion carried without objection.***

The task force then moved to the discussion of the “Student Engagement” domain. Members discussed whether student engagement would be better suited as a category under “Student Outcomes”, with student surveys such as Tripod as its measure. ***Member Vesneske motioned to remove “Student Engagement” at the domain level and place it as a category under “Student Outcomes.” Member Daellenbach seconded. The motion carried without objection.***

## **DISCUSSION OF WHAT THE POSSIBLE WEIGHTS MIGHT BE FOR INCLUSION OF ANY INDICATORS AND MEASURES RESULTING FROM THE CONVERSATION IN ITEM 6 ABOVE, AND POSSIBLE ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO PRESENT TO THE TLC**

Chair Fitzpatrick started the discussion with an overview of the Student Performance sphere and the Student Outcomes domain. AB222 requires at least 50% of a teachers or administrators evaluation come from this sphere and domain. Members discussed whether there was any data to show that more than 50% was advantageous. Dr. Shin stated the data from the assessment models was too new to give any definitive answer. The Members determined it was too premature to use more than 50% at this time. Adoption of 50% would abide by the AB 222 minimum and the percentage could be revisited as the data became more reliable.

***Member McCormick motioned for the student performance sphere and student outcome domain to count for 50% of a teacher’s evaluation. Member Collins seconded. The motion carried without objection.***

Chair Fitzpatrick noted the task force had no discussion to date regarding the remaining 50% of the framework under Educational Practice and asked Dr. Shin about its status of this sphere. Dr. Shin provided the Indicators/Measures Task Force was working on that sphere. Chair Fitzpatrick clarified, for purposed of the open meeting law, that there were rules about the exchange of information from one task force to another. Because of the issues around serial communications, there is a prohibition about discussing the other task force’s work within the construct of these task force agendas. Given that, she

suggested that she didn't know that there was sufficient information to talk about weighting of the Educational Practice sphere.

Dr. Shin provided it would be helpful to have a discussion around the concepts of Instructional Practice and Professional Responsibilities, such as whether or not this task force might recommend weighting those domains equally under the Educational Practice sphere. The Members discussed the advantages of weighting the Instructional Practice sphere more heavily than the Professional Responsibilities, but could not determine a specific ratio, indicating that they believed more specific information was need on the Professional Responsibilities domain.

*Chair Fitzpatrick motioned for the TLC, in light of recommendations by the Indicators/Measures Task Force, to define with more specificity the categories and measures under the domain of Professional Responsibilities. Member Warne seconded. The motion carried without objection.*

*Member Martinsen motioned to recommend more weight be placed on the Instructional Practice domain, with no specific ratio at this time. Member McCormick seconded. The motion carried without objection.*

## **FUTURE AGENDA**

Chair Fitzpatrick facilitated a discussion around agenda items for the next meeting. She noted the interest in further conversation about the notion of "shared attribution" for assessment scores for teachers of non-tested subjects and grades. Additionally, to facilitate a more interactive dialogue between the Models and Indicators/Measures Task Forces, she stated the next task force meeting would be a joint meeting between the two task forces. This meeting is scheduled for May 1, 2012.

It was noted that the next meeting of the TLC was scheduled for April 16, 2012 at Hyatt Place Reno.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Fitzpatrick opened the floor to public comment. The following comments were made: Pam Hicks queried, given the very weighty and complex recommendations that going forward to the TLC, do you foresee any changes in the timeline presented in the *White Paper* given the amount of discussion that will be need as a result of your recommendations to the Council? Chair Fitzpatrick stated the Council Chair has proposed an agenda item that specifically speaks to the proposed timeline and deliverables. The TLC will have a weighty discussion about the deliverables and the timeline and adopt any recommendation on how to progress with the timing.

Sam King stated she appreciated all of the work of this TLC and the focused discussion on teaching and learning. She noted some legal questions would need to be looked at in reference to the timeline, in equity, and in adequacy as this moves forward.

The meeting adjourned at 10:59 a.m.

The next meeting of the Teachers and Leaders Models Task Force is scheduled as part of a Joint Task Force meeting including the Models Task Force and the Indicators/Measures Task on **May 1st, 2012 at the Best Western Airport Plaza, 1891 Terminal Way, Reno, NV**. 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>.