

**NEVADA TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)
INDICATORS/MEASURES AND MODELS
JOINT TASK FORCE**

MEETING MINUTES

July 24, 2012
Best Western Airport Plaza
1981 Terminal Way
Reno, Nevada

JOINT TASK FORCE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pamela Salazar, Chair, Indicators and Measures
Rorie Fitzpatrick, Chair, Models
Lisa Bliss, Member
Christine Cheney, Member
Kathleen Collins, Member
Theresa Crowley, Member (left at 12:00)
Sharla Hales, Member
Mark Martinsen, Member (left at 1:30 P.M.)
Theo McCormick, Member
Ricky Medina, Member
Keith Savage, Member (left at lunch)
Theodore Small, Member
Stacie Vesneske, Member
Lynn Warne, Member
Wayne Workman, Member

JOINT TASK FORCE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Linda Archambault, Member - excused
Linda Johnson, Member
Paul LaMarca, Member
Kristen McNeill, Member
Pat Skorkowsky, Member – excused
Karen Taycher, Member – excused
Keith Walz, Member – excused

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

Karen Johansen, Administrative Assistant
Leslie James, Title IIA Education Programs Professional
Russ Keglovits, Assessment, Program Accountability, and Curriculum
Richard Vineyard, Assistant Director; Assessment, Program Accountability, and Curriculum

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT:

Shane Chesney, Senior Deputy Attorney General (left meeting at 2:00 P.M)

INVITED GUESTS:

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

PUBLIC PRESENT:

Kelley Miner NVPTA, VP of Programs

CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting was called to order at 8:44 A.M., with attendance reflected above. It was determined that a quorum was present.

Chair Salazar led the pledge of allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF A FLEXIBLE AGENDA

MOTION: Member Crowley moved for a flexible agenda. Member Small seconded. The motion passed.

DESCRIBE THE PURPOSE AND DESIRED OUTCOMES OF THIS JOINT TASK FORCE MEETING, AS ARTICULATED IN EACH ITEM OF THIS AGENDA, AND AS PART OF THIS DISCUSSION, TO THE DEGREE NECESSARY TO FACILITATE UNDERSTANDING BY THE TASK FORCE MEMBERS, REVIEW MOTIONS THAT WERE ADOPTED BY THE TLC ON JULY 11, 2012

Chair Fitzpatrick reviewed the *System Guidelines White Paper* and provided an overview of the Draft Work Schedule for Nevada Teacher Evaluation Framework. Members discussed the possibility of summits being offered in northern, southern, and rural eastern Nevada. During the summit, there will be teacher training in the morning, and in the afternoon there will be specific focus sessions. These sessions will discuss concerns, opportunities, etc. in small groups of 12 to 15 individuals. Members discussed possibly meeting on Saturdays, as that day would disrupt fewer teacher schedules. Member Crowley stated that this was an excellent idea and the Task Force should move on this quickly to get the word out and suggested videotaping the summit at some of the locations.

Chair Fitzpatrick discussed the portion of the *White Paper* centered on the 50% of teacher evaluation; student growth, student proficiency, contributions to reduction in subpopulation gaps, and stakeholder engagement. Members discussed that stakeholder engagement needed to be higher than 5%. It was further discussed to add a footnote; the TLC would like student growth to be a larger portion of the score which applied to all students.

With regard to growth in non-tested grades and subjects, the State Board of Education will regulate the measures of student growth, with school districts providing student growth information where statewide assessment data does not exist. Work will begin in August around the framework, with a continued discussion of the *White Paper*.

PRESENTATION INCLUDING A REVIEW OF GROWTH MODELS AS PRESENTED TO THE TLC ON MAY 1 AND MAY 7, 2012

Ms. Shin introduced the growth model and discussed the evolution of status to growth modeling and its use in teacher evaluation. Members reviewed status vs. improvement modeling and discussed benchmarks of proficiency.

Members inquired as to whether there were triggers to show student growth. Ms. Shin responded that fair and equitable does not mean one model and suggested looking at trends. Members discussed that after piloting the system; there may be a need to differentiate the system for special education teachers. Ms. Shin stated the current political tide was for 50-70% growth weighting.

The following are questions for the pilot:

- Are there trends in specific teacher, student, or school group types?
- At what level do we differentiate model weighting?

Ms. Shin stated a comparison between years shows growth. It is a measure of the amount of academic progress made over a period of time, such as a school year, and tracks progress over time.

The following types of growth models were discussed:

- **Simple Growth Model:** Looks at the amount of academic growth made over a period of time.
- **Growth to Proficiency Model:** Sets a target and looks at whether students are on target to meet proficiency after a determined period of time, such as a school year.
- **Projection Model:** Uses student level data to predict academic progress.
 - Student Growth Percentiles measure student progress by comparing one student's progress with the progress of other students with similar scores.
 - Projection: value added is a predicted score added with actual score.

Ms. Shin stated there were always trade-offs in growth models and the TLC would need to make those decisions. Chair Salazar stated growth is a professionally accepted method of assessing students, with multiple measures, and takes into consideration correlation of data. Ms. Shin stated the growth data shows the strongest correlation with multiple years of data.

Member Hales stated most states do not include "status" and questioned why Nevada has chosen to do things differently regarding growth. Ms. Shin agreed that it is not as common to include "status".

Members discussed issues regarding family engagement. Concern was expressed that not enough emphasis was being placed on family involvement. How to engage families is important and needs to be discussed in depth.

PURPOSE, REVIEW, AND DISCUSS STRUCTURE OF THE STUDENT OUTCOMES DOMAIN OF THE NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK, INCLUDING ISSUES RELATED TO THE WEIGHTING AND APPLICATION OF THE FOUR COMPONENTS THAT MAKE UP THE STUDENT OUTCOMES SCORE FOLLOWING A PRESENTATION ON NON-TESTED GRADES AND SUBJECTS

Members reviewed and discussed student growth, the pros and cons of state and district approaches, and a review of AB 229.

It was noted the US Department of Education's priorities are to increase the numbers of effective and highly effective teachers, as well as the retention and equitable distribution of highly effective teachers.

Members discussed the following issues around student growth:

- Teachers see that growth matters and this makes them feel effective.
- The challenge is measuring contributions to student learning, growth for teacher of non-tested subjects and small teacher caseloads for some student groups.
- How student growth currently is measured in non-tested subjects and grades.
- It was discussed equitable and fair do not need to be the same thing.
- How do you define "teacher" and how do you measure them? Issues of differential and pay structure were discussed. The system values core content teachers in math, writing, reading...is there any merit pay in the core content areas? How do teachers earn merit pay and is it only in the core content areas?
- It was discussed that it is dangerous to value one type of teacher over another.
- Need to ensure that the level is not too high or too low for transition into college, math is not aligned.
- It was discussed for individuals to come together, look at the system, look at school improvement, data and discuss how we did last year and how can we improve on that.

Members discussed identifying teachers by groups. Senior Deputy Attorney General Chesney recommended the Task Force read the definition of teacher from the statute and stated that there is not enough flexibility in the law to do what the TLC wants to do. Members discussed the types of assessments available and how they impact the ability to measure student growth in non-tested subjects.

MOTION: Member McCormick moved the Teacher Evaluation Framework will differentiate "groups" of teachers (as defined by statute) within the school based job description, e.g.: Group 1 = Grades 4-8; ELC/Math teachers; CRT (assessment used); and Group 2 = Grades PK-3; 9-12; ELA/Math teachers; SEA developed pre- and post-tests, grade/subject level status growth, and school level status/growth.

Members discussed gap measures and whether they would be appropriate in another column and if the job descriptions are defined by the Group. Ms. Shin stated she would build a worksheet to fill in job descriptions covered under teacher evaluation framework.

Member Medina seconded. The motion passed.

MOTION: Member Hales moved the Teacher Evaluation Framework differentiate the weighting components within the domain of Educational Practice and/or Student Outcomes of the Teacher Evaluation Framework by identified group of teachers. Member Cheney seconded. The motion passed.

MOTION: Member Vesneske moved the Teacher Evaluation Framework differentiate the implementation timeline of the Teachers Evaluation Framework for those groups of teachers; e.g. Group 1, included in the pilot/validation studies to occur this fall. Member Cheney seconded. The motion passed.

PROPOSE, REVIEW AND DISCUSS THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE FOR THE NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION MODEL, INCLUDING OPTIONS FOR VALIDTION RESEARCH, PILOT STUDIES, AND PHASED IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DIFFERENT COMPONENTS OF THE MODEL

Ms. Shin led a discussion relative to the Draft Work Schedule. It was discussed the legislature needs to be made aware that what we want to do is ahead of what we can do, and the need for more funding to follow this process through to its conclusion.

Members and Ms. Shin discussed various aspects of the timelines and on how the work schedule for Nevada Teacher Evaluation Framework would progress.

MOTION: Member Hales moved to adopt the document as a working timeline to present to the TLC with changes as discussed. Member Warne seconded. The motion passed.

PROPOSE, REVIEW, AND DISCUSS POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING NEXT STEPS, TIMELINES, AND IDENTIFICATION OF COMMUNICATION ISSUES THAT THE TASK FORCES BELIEVE SHOULD BE MADE TO THE COMMUNICATIONS TASK FORCE AND/OR TO THE TLC BASED ON THE DISCUSSIONS, PROPOSALS, AND OUTCOMES OF THE JULY 24 JOINT TASK FORCE MEETING

MOTION: Following discussion, Member Hales moved to endorse and recommend plans to the TLC with respect to the Summits. Member Vesneske seconded. The motion passed.

JOINT TASK FORCE MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no further Task Force Member comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no further public comments.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:29 P.M.

As of this date, no further meetings of the Indicators and Measures/Models Joint Task Force are scheduled. 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>.