

**NEVADA TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC) MEETING
April 16, 2012**

**Hyatt Place Reno
1790 East Plumb Lane,
Reno, NV 89523**

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

April 16, 2012

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pamela Salazar, Chair
Barbara Surritte-Barker, Vice Chair
Linda Archambault, Member
Christine Cheney, Member
Theresa Crowley, Member
Kathleen Galland-Collins, Member
Sharla Hales, Member
Robert McCord, Member
Theo McCormick, Member
Heath Morrison, Member (arrived at 10:45 a.m.)
Dale Norton, Member
Mary Peterson, Member
Theodore Small, Member
Kimberly Tate, Member

MEMBERS PRESENT BY PHONE:

Rorie Fitzpatrick, Member (present by phone until 12:00 p.m.)

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT:

Shane Chesney, Senior Deputy Attorney General

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

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

GUESTS PRESENT:

Sujie Shin Senior Manager, Assessment and Standards Development at WestEd
Lynn Holdheide Consultant, Vanderbilt University

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

Pam Hicks Clark County Association of School Administrators

Judy Osgood	Office of the Governor
Kristen McNeill	Washoe County School District
Pepper Sturm	Legislative Counsel Bureau
Nicole Rourke	Clark County School District
Shane McCloud	Students First
Tami Berg	Nevada Parent Teachers Association
Shari Ory	A6

CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Salazar called the meeting to order at 8:40 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 McCord motioned for a flexible agenda. Member Cheney seconded. The motion carried without objection.

APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 8, 2012 AND FEBRUARY 17, 2012 MINUTES

The Council reviewed the February 8, 2012 minutes. *Member Tate motioned to approve the February 8, 2012 minutes as presented. Member Peterson seconded. The motion carried without objection.*

The Council reviewed the February 17, 2012 minutes. *Member Collins motioned to approve the February 17, 2012 minutes as presented. Member Cheney seconded. The motion carried without objection.*

REVIEW OF PROPOSED RECOMMENDED TIMELINE FOR 2012 TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL DELIVERABLES INCLUDING ANTICIPATED PRESENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION ON JUNE 1, 2012 AND DECEMBER 6-7, 2012

Members discussed the potential for making legislative changes to the current statute, AB 222. Judy Osgood, Office of the Governor, provided it was anticipated if clarification was needed on the statute itself, then modifications should be considered and proposed by the Council. Pepper Sturm, Legislative Counsel Bureau, commented the May Legislative Committee on Education (LCE) meeting would be a good time to start the process for any proposed changes to legislation. The LCE will have a June meeting, but may not have a July meeting. In August they will take action on the recommendations, so

plan on submitting something in writing regarding proposed changes to statute in that June period. Members queried whether the proposed changes would need to be agendaized to the LCE before they could take action. Mr. Sturm provided his office would need to consult with their counsel, but usually a general recommendation was enough ground work and could be distributed prior to the meeting. Chair Salazar stated she would provide the LCE with a set of general recommendations at the May 10, 2012 meeting, followed by more specific written recommendation at the June meeting.

Members discussed the upcoming Joint Task Force meeting of the Models and Indicators/Measures task forces and questioned counsel relative to the presence of a quorum of TLC members participating in the Joint Task Force meeting. Shane Chesney, Senior Deputy Attorney General stated he would review open meeting law procedures relative to joint task force meetings and report back to Chair Salazar and Member Fitzpatrick. Members questioned how they should communicate with the Joint Task Force and it was confirmed there should be no direct communication between the task forces. All communication should be conducted through staff to ensure the Council and its task forces did not engage in serial communications. Member Fitzpatrick clarified for the record that none of the email communication occurred between members, all were sent through staff.

Members reviewed and discussed the proposed deliverables timeline. Member Hales questioned whether the Council would actually be adopting standards and indicators today. Members determined they would only review and discuss standards and indicators at the April 16, 2012 meeting.

Member Barker motioned to approve the timeline with the suggest revision to the April 16, 2012 date, indicating the Council would be looking and reviewing standards and indicators, but not adopting them today. Member Archambault seconded. The motion carried without objection.

UPDATE FROM THE COMMUNICATIONS TASK FORCE: REVIEW THE COMMUNICATIONS TASK FORCE'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SHARING INFORMATION WITH INTERESTED STAKEHOLDERS REGARDING THE WORK OF THE TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL AND EFFORTS TO DEVELOP A STATEWIDE UNIFORM PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR TEACHERS AND SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Material presented by the Communications Task Force to the TLC can be viewed at:

http://nde.doe.nv.gov/Teachers_LeadersCouncil_Resources.html

April 16, 2012 Meeting: Communications Task Force Information.

Task Force Chair Barker presented the work to date of the Communications Task Force for Council approval. The purpose of the Communication Task Force is to communicate the work of the Council to our stakeholders. Members reviewed the power points presented and discussed the need to have presentations of varied lengths to present a consistent message from the TLC. Presentation lengths of at 15 minute, 30 minute, and 1 hour were recommended. Chair Barker emphasized power points would be ever evolving documents; as changes to the *White Paper* would necessitate changes to the power points.

Members discussed the idea of creating a 5-6 minute informational video on the TLC with the assistance of the Washoe County School District (WCSD). TLC Chair Salazar will present general information about

the TLC on the video, which will look similar to Washoe Bell Schedule, and will include background video of teachers, administrators, and the Council. If approved, it is anticipated the video will be up and running at the end of the month. Members discussed placing the video on the new website hosted by the Governors' Office.

Members reviewed the feedback forms designed by the task force and discussed each form in detail. Members suggested changes to the response options provided which would lessen the neutrality of responses and provide respondents with an opportunity to provide more detailed comments and feedback. It is important to emphasize during the presentations that the TLC both wants and needs input from its stakeholders. It was recommended the feedback forms be handed out at the beginning of the presentation to provide ample opportunity for input. The feedback forms are currently being collected by Task Force Chair Barker.

The format of the new website was discussed at length by the Members. Judy Osgood, Office of the Governor, stated she had been working with the Information Technology (IT) department relative to the requirements of the new page. There had been some indecision as to whether the new TLC site would be created now or during the overhaul of the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) website; however, it was ultimately decided the urgency of the TLC's work necessitated completion of the new website now. Members discussed how the website would be accessed and the information it would contain. It was determined a web link would be created which could be placed on other websites to direct interested person to the TLC website. The new website will contain the video, webinar information, and possibly an interactive blog. Information from the current NDE website will be selectively used on the new site, with the new site containing a link to the NDE. The NDE site will be maintained as the archival location for all of the information presented to the TLC. The connection between the new website and the NDE website will need to be as seamless as possible.

Member Cheney motioned to approve the Communications Task Force work with the changes discussed. Member Peterson seconded. TLC Chair Salazar summarized the two main changes: First, the task force will adopt standardized power point formats for 15, 30 and 1 hour presentations. Once those are created, they are not to be changed or modified by the presenter; and second, there will be a new TLC website hosed from the Governor's office webpage. The motion carried without objection.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED RECOMMEND KEY TERMINOLOGY ON TERMS SUCH AS "PERFORMANCE INDICATORS", "PRINCIPLES", "CATEGORIES", AND ANY OTHER TERMS THAT EMERGE DURING THE DISCUSSION THAT WOULD BE BENEFICIAL TO DEFINE IN ORDER TO ENHANCE THE CLARITY OF THE NV TLC TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK/MODEL AND NV TLC ADMINISTATOR EVALUATION FRAMEWORK/MODEL

Chair Salazar stated this item would essentially be blended with a discussion with the next agenda item. She requested Sujie Shin, Senior Assessment Manager, Assessment and Standards Development Services at WestEd, to provide some background information regarding terminology and the work completed to date. Ms. Shin provided that based upon clarification of Open Meeting Law requirements, communication directly between Indicators/Measures and Models task forces would not be possible. The task forces reached a point where they were working on parallel tracks and further work would need to be based on and need input from the other group. The decision was made to halt those

conversations and bring the matter back to the TLC to update everyone on where we stand, have a full group discussion, and then provide further instruction to the task forces. As of the last TLC meeting, the framework/model reflected two spheres; Educational Practice on the left and Student Outcomes on the right. The Educational Practice sphere contained 2 domains; Instructional Practice and Professional Responsibilities. The Student Outcomes sphere contained 2 domains; Student Achievement and Student Engagement. Ms. Shin then transitioned to the next agenda item.

UPDATE FROM THE MODELS TASK FORCE: REVIEW OF MODELS TASK FORCE'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE OVERALL STRUCTURE OF THE NV TLC TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK/MODEL INCLUDING THE RELATIVE WEIGHTING OF THE DOMAINS AND CATEGORIES FOR ASSESSING TEACHER PERFORMANCE; AND AN UPDATE FROM THE INDICATORS/MEASURES TASK FORCE INCLUDING REVIEW OF INDICATORS/MEASURES TASK FORCE'S RECOMMENDATIONS RELATIVE TO THE NV TLC TEACHERS EVALUATION FRAMEWORK/MODEL, INCLUDING POSSIBLE CATEGORIES, STANDARDS, INDICATORS, AND MEASURES TO INCLUDE IN EVALUATING TEACHERS, AS WELL AS STRUCTURES FOR ASSESSING TEACHERS WITHIN THAT FRAMEWORK/MODEL

Ms. Shin presented the work of the Models Task Force in seven motions, and the supporting rationale, to the TLC.

Motion 1: Rename the "Teacher Evaluation Model" to the "Teacher Evaluation Framework."

Rationale: The Models Task Force believes the name "Model" could imply a single tool or set of metrics to be disseminated to all LEAs and feels "Framework" more accurately represents the current status of the Framework, as well as the intended objectives of the TLC.

Motion 2: Rename the "Student Achievement/Engagement" sphere to "Student Performance."

Rationale: The Models Task Force believes the name "Student Performance" more accurately reflects the data to be collected under this sphere and allows for flexibility in adding additional domains, categories, and measures as may be needed in the future.

Motion 3: Weight the Student Performance domain at 50% of the overall score.

Rationale: In the absence of any research, internal or external, regarding the benefits of weighting student performance data more than 50% of the overall model; the Models Task Force recommends holding it at the legislated weighting until further informed decisions can be made.

Motion 4: Rename the "Student Achievement" domain to "Student Outcomes."

Rationale: The Models Task Force believes the name "Student Outcomes" more accurately reflects the data to be collected under this domain, and additionally does not conflate it with "achievement" as outlined in AB222.

Motion 5: Remove "Student Engagement" from the domain level and instead include it as a category under the Student Outcomes domain.

Rationale: In comparing the level of granularity measured by the Student Engagement domain, it appears to be more in line with a single category within the domain of Student Outcomes, with the categories as currently listed components of a single survey (e.g.: the Tripod survey).

Motion 6: Weight the Instructional Practice domain more heavily than the Professional Responsibilities domain, within the remaining 50%.

Rationale: The Model Task Force believes that the research they are most compelled by (Danielson, Heritage, etc.) points to the teachers' actions and practices in the classroom as being the most measurable and having the greatest impact on student outcomes. Therefore, the Model Task Force would like to ensure that there is a greater weight on these components.

Motion 7: Request the Indicators/Measures Task Force to specifically outline and differentiate the components of the Professional Responsibilities domain.

Rationale: The Models Task Force believes the way the model current stands; the Professional Responsibilities domain remains vague and runs the risk of being subsumed under the categories of the Instructional Practice domain.

Council members had a robust discussion on the seven changes recommended by the task force, with particular emphasis on the 50% student outcomes piece. Pepper Sturm, Legislative Counsel Bureau, clarified for the TLC that per AB222 the 50% must come from data in the longitudinal data system. Concern was also expressed around how all teachers could be measured with the data currently contained in the longitudinal data system. Members discussed the possibility of making legislative changes to AB222 to incorporate more data into the longitudinal system, which would provide for multiple measures for tested and non-tested subjects and grades.

Members discussed the need to place emphasis on instructional practice in the classroom, and as such, the need to weigh Instructional Practice higher than Professional Responsibility in the teacher evaluation framework. Members also considered whether instructional practice could be weighted higher, given that professional responsibility improves instructional practice.

Member Cheney motioned to adopt the revised teacher evaluation framework, including all of the language in the 7 motions, providing it would remain a dynamic framework. Member Morrison seconded. Member Barker expressed concerns over motion 6 relative to weighting and suggested adoption of the revised framework relative to 1-5 and 7; leaving motion 6 for future discussion. ***Members Cheney and Morrison accepted the friendly amendment. The motion to adopt recommended changes 1-5 and 7 carried without objection.***

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATOR STANDARDS

Lynn Holdheide, Consultant from the National Teacher Quality Comprehensive Center, facilitated a discussion regarding the items to be considered non-negotiable by the State, the current work of the districts, and the possible development of rubrics at the State level. This was done with the understanding the TLC was making recommendations to the State Board for their approval. Members

discussed the need to remain focused on improving student learning. As such, the discussion centered on Margaret Heritage's six high-leverage principles:

1. New learning is connected to something already learned;
2. Students are clear on intended learning and performance criteria;
3. Learning tasks have high cognitive demand for diverse learners;
4. Students engage in meaning-making through discourse and other strategies;
5. Students engage in metacognitive activity; and
6. Assessment is integrated into teaching and learning.

As well as the Iowa Core's five principles:

1. Student centered classrooms;
2. Teaching for understanding;
3. Assessment for learning ;
4. Rigorous and relevant instruction; and
5. Teaching for learning differences.

Members discussed overlap between the two sets of principles and how state control versus local flexibility might fit in. Members discussed having the Iowa Core as the overarching principles, with Margaret Heritage's six high-leverage principles as those the districts would be held accountable for. It was determined if the TLC provides key high-leverage principles that are so important to our values to be put into place consistently across the state, then it would make sense that the TLC tell districts what these principles will look like in the classroom and at the different performance levels: highly effective, effective, minimally effective, and ineffective.

Member Tate motioned to accept the five Iowa Core principles as overarching principles supported by Margaret Heritage's six high-leverage principles. Member Crowley seconded. To clarify, Chair Salazar stated the motion was that we capture the five Iowa Core principles and the six instructional practices as identified by Margaret Heritage as our framework for Instructional Practice. The motion carried without objection.

Ms. Holdheide facilitated a discussion on the districts' current work with evaluations. Given the districts are currently building their budgets, a policy statement relative to the districts carrying on with their current teacher evaluation work is needed. There is some general agreement with the frameworks and the six high-leverage principles adopted; however, it is acknowledged the evaluation tools currently used by the districts may not be developed to the level of depth needed. How and where tools need to be strengthened will be easier to determine when the indicators for each of the above-stated principles are established.

Further, the Members discussed the need to adjust the rubrics as necessary; not to merely lengthen the rubrics. For example, if you have a teacher who is struggling, they will need a more in-depth evaluation than a teacher who is not. Member Peterson provided that current criticism of school curriculum is that it is a mile wide and an inch deep. To a large extent, the same can be said about teacher evaluations. What the Council is saying is these are the areas where we want to dig deeper and have a more extensive evaluation because they are our high-leverage principles. Districts can use additional evaluation criteria if they wish, but these are the areas we are honing in on.

To provide additional direction for the districts, the Members discussed position statements for inclusion in the System Guidelines *White Paper* relative to the districts continuing work on evaluations, professional development, and training.

The first position statement is:

- *Initial motion:* Districts be accommodated to use current rubric as long as they are strengthened as needed to be aligned with the frameworks the TLC adopts.
- *Rephrased motion:* District rubrics must be rigorous and aligned to the frameworks of the TLC.

Member Cheney motioned to adopt the initial position statement indicating the districts be accommodated to use current rubric as long as they are strengthened as needed to be aligned with the frameworks the TLC adopt. Member Tate seconded. By friendly amendment the position statement was rephrased to read district rubrics must be rigorous and aligned to the frameworks of the TLC. The motion carried without objection.

The second position statement is:

- *Initial motion:* The TLC adopt a standard model rubric for district opt-in.
- *Rephrased motion:* The TLC will develop opt-in standard model rubrics.

Member Hales motioned to adopt the initial position statement indicating the TLC adopt a standard model rubric for district opt-in. Member Crowley seconded. By friendly amendment the position statement was rephrased to read the TLC will develop opt-in standard model rubrics. The motion carried without objection.

TLC PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY PRINCIPLES

The Indicators/Measures and Models Joint Task Force will work on a review of the principles for Professional Responsibility during their May 1, 2012 meeting. The Joint Task Force will present that work to the TLC during the May 7, 2012 council meeting.

PROVIDE DIRECTIONS FOR POSSIBLE NEXT STEPS FOR THE TASK FORCES

Chair Salazar presented next steps relative to task force work. She indicated the Indicators/Measures Task Force would be looking at professional responsibilities, the Models Task Force would be looking at relative weighting in the model, and the Communication Task Force would continue to recruit individuals to convey the message of the TLC's work. Chair Salazar requested Members review the communications calendar and consider speaking at some of the meetings.

REVIEW, RETHINK, DISCUSS, REFINE, MAKE CHANGES TO AN POSSIBLY APPROVE AN APRIL 16, 2012 VERSION OF THE SYSTEM GUIDELINES WHITE PAPER

Members discussed proposed changes to the System Guidelines *White Paper*, including the two approved mission statements referenced above. Revisions will be made to the *White Paper*, creating an April 16, 2012 version.

RECAP AND DISCUSS KEY DECISIONS REACHED DURING THE COURSE OF THE MEETING AND DEVELOP FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

The TLC approved the Communications Task Force work and approved the Instructional Principles in the Teacher Evaluation Framework. Additionally, the TLC adopted two important position statements for inclusion in the White Paper which convey important information to the districts relative to rigorous evaluation rubrics.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Salazar opened the floor for public comment. Shane McLoud, Students First, provided his organization had three primary goals: elevate the teaching profession, empower parents with more choices and real information to help make those choices, and spend money wisely to keep money on instruction and in schools. A year from now Nevada will be looked at as the model for an amazing statewide teacher and administrator evaluation system. You are focused on accountability, measurement, and student growth; not just test scores. I encourage you to continue to get stakeholder input. I invite you to use us as a resource if needed.

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

*The next meeting of the Teachers and Leaders Council is scheduled for May 7, 2012 at **Hyatt Place Las Vegas, 4520 Paradise Road, Las Vegas, NV 89169**. 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>.*