

**NEVADA TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL MEETING
January 20-21, 2012**

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

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

January 20, 2012

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Pamela Salazar, Chair
- Barbara Surritte-Barker, Vice Chair
- Christine Cheney, Member
- Kathleen Galland-Collins, Member
- Theresa Crowley, Member (arrived approximately 9:00 a.m.)
- Rorie Fitzpatrick, Member
- Sharla Hales, Member
- Robert McCord, Member
- Theo McCormick, Member
- Heath Morrison, Member (arrived approximately 1:30 p.m.)
- Dale Norton, Member
- Mary Peterson, Member
- Theodore Small, Member
- Kimberly Tate, Member

PRESENT BY PHONE:

- Linda Archambault, Member

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT:

- Ed Irvin, Senior Deputy Attorney General

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

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

GUESTS PRESENT:

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| Stanley Rabinowitz | Assessment & Standards Development Services at WestEd |
| Margaret Heritage | Nation Center for Research on Education Standards and Testing |
| Lynn Holdheide | National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality |
| Jennifer Varrato | Administrative Assistance |

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

Jerry Barbee	Director of Teacher Licensing, Nevada Department of Education
Pam Hicks	Clark County Association of School Administrators
Kristen McNeill	Washoe County School District
Judy Osgood	Office of the Governor
Lonnie Shielor	Clark County Association of School Administrators
Tami Berg	Nevada Parent Teachers Association

CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Salazar called the meeting to order at 8:52 a.m., with attendance as reflected above.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Pam Hicks from Clark County Administrators Association made the following comments: Since hearing and reviewing the district presentations on how they are moving forward, it is apparent there are several different directions districts have chosen. She felt this Council should take those directions into account so the good work each district has done will still be relevant. It is critical the communication about the Council's work be open because you have been given the authority by AB222 to move this work forward. I do think there are ancillary groups out there who would be of great assistance in moving forward on the good work you are doing. Thank you very much.

The December action report was handed out and it was agreed that this action report be an informational item until the meeting minutes were complete.

APPROVAL OF A FLEXIBLE AGENDA

Member McCord motioned for approval of a flexible agenda. Member Hales seconded. The motion carried without objection.

CHAIR'S REPORT

Chair Salazar gave an update on the status of the Council, what has been accomplished so far, and where the work seems to be going. AB 222 required the Council to provide recommendations to the State Board by June 1, 2012, which would:

1. Use multiple measures, including student achievement data, in a fair, timely, and rigorous way to promote student learning.
2. Improve the effectiveness of teachers and leaders through professional development, with said development being a part of their evaluation.
3. Provide a mechanism for public input and shared best practices.

The Council has dissected AB222 and received the background knowledge, including research and expertise of industry experts, needed to help build a strong background of understanding of the elements that will go into creating a new type of evaluation system.

The Chair expressed the need to achieve a framework by the end of this meeting that will shape what effectiveness looks like. We need to determine what types of supports we need to ensure effectiveness, determine the timeline of deliverables, determine recommendations for the role of state versus local control in the new system, and develop a communication piece to gain stakeholder input. All of the work we are doing is really about positioning all of Nevada's students at the top of the list in achievement.

A handout titled *Nevada Teacher and Leaders Council: Developing a Statewide Uniform Performance Evaluation System* was provided to help facilitate the Council's work and can be viewed in its entirety at: <http://nde.doe.nv.gov/PDFs/Teachers/Meetings/2012/01-20/Teachers%20and%20Leaders%20Council%20Guiding%20Principles%20Document.pdf>

ANTICIPATED STRUCTURE FOR SUBMISSION OF REQUIRED PLAN TO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Member Fitzpatrick stated that ESEA Waiver principal 3, which very closely aligns with the charge of the Council, required the creation of a uniform statewide performance evaluation framework and an assurance that the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) ensure districts implement that framework with fidelity.

The Council discussed drafting a white paper to make information available to the public so they can see the process and decision points that we are beginning to make along the way, and provide an opportunity for public input.

The Council was provided a handout titled *Teachers and Leaders Council Proposed Development and Implementation Timeline* which can be viewed in its entirety at: <http://nde.doe.nv.gov/PDFs/Teachers/Meetings/2012/01-20/Teachers%20and%20Leaders%20-%20Proposed%20Development%20&%20Implementation%20Timeline.pdf>

Member Fitzpatrick numerically referenced and discussed the timeline:

1: Teacher and Leader Evaluation Framework.

The model for the evaluation framework will need to be done by June 1, 2012. Dr. Rheault has had some conversations with the Governor's office and with Legislative Committee on Education, and it is understood at this point, that we may only have a preliminary set of recommendations by this statutory deadline.

Member McCord asked if that assumption was realized, will there be time to do a pilot. Member Fitzpatrick stated that the above conversations indicate the need for a phased in approach and she believes there is support from important stakeholders that the timeline can be approached with this in mind. The State Board could adopt regulations for a phase-in of this process. The National Association of State Legislatures has been telling legislators, if this whole matter is approached in a non-deliberative way, it may lead to some serious litigation which will cost more in the end than taking the time to build the system properly. The message delivered by the National Governors Association (NGA) is to approach this evaluation with rigor and speed, but use a phase-in approach that includes some piloting.

2) Evaluation Process.

The Council discussed issues of local control and flexibility versus state uniformity. It was agreed that some basic decisions and targets needed to occur right away.

3) *Categories of evidence.*

The discussion moved to the issue of evidence. How will we know if we have gotten the right combination in place? What will constitute the 50% student achievement and what will make up the other 50%. Dr. Rabinowitz acknowledged a great deal of conversation would continue around the percentages, both now and as the process evolved.

Member Archambault noted using only one year of growth data for building the framework was troubling and expressed a need for using at least two years of data. Member Fitzpatrick stated our Nevada Technical Advisory Committee, as well as other experts on student assessment, have stated the use of two-three years of growth adds stability. Dr. Rabinowitz said the strategy is to build reliability by balancing the different mobility rates in various districts.

4) *Specific Indicators.*

What measures will we include and will be defined as negotiable and non-negotiable?

5) *Data Collection.*

Will need to obtain data. In some cases we may have infrastructure in place to obtain, and in other cases the infrastructure remains to be built, this will include informing the State Board of the anticipated costs for implementation.

6) *Training Needs.*

Training that is valid and reliable across a diverse spectrum of individuals.

7) *Professional Development and Support.*

The Council discussed the significant charge of achieving improved instruction and student learning through the professional development of teachers and administrators.

8) *System Evaluation and Support.*

Also discussed was the need for continuous feedback to improve the system itself.

9) *State Education Authority (SEA) and Local Education Authority (LEA) Duties and Associated Cost.*

Stakeholder Involvement and Communication.

Vice Chair Barker provided the information she received at the Policy Conference for NGA, which recommends a high-end communication plan be developed to include the Governor's office and Judy Osgood as our liaison.

Member Peterson commented the use of the developed timeline would target each objective and act as a road map for each meeting.

DISCUSSION OF CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR DEVELOPMENT OF REQUIRED PLAN

Dr. Holdheide began her presentation discussing the importance of developing a framework before moving on in the process. A framework is a bit like a mission statement and would be the basis on which future decisions would be made. She continued by referring to the timeline previously referenced and noted all of those items were interrelated. A change to one may necessitate changes to the others.

Referring back to *Developing a Statewide Uniform Performance Evaluation System* handout, she stated today's work would center around the Council's assumptions, goals, purposes, and state versus local control value statements. This work will be a foundational piece, a build block for issues such as measure and weights to rest upon. The following definitions were agreed upon:

Assumption: The agreed upon norms or values that an evaluation system need to meet. What do we want this system to do?

Goal: The agreed upon goals of the evaluation system. How we will you know if the system is working?

Purpose: What is the system going to be used for and what is it going to do.

Dr. Holdheide provided a handout for reference titled *Teacher and Leaders Council – Nevada*, which can be viewed in its entirety at:

<http://nde.doe.nv.gov/PDFs/Teachers/Meetings/2012/01-20/January%20TL%20C%20Meeting%20-%20Lynn%20Holdheide.pdf>

The Council began their discussion of assumptions by reviewing information from other states (*see pg 12 of above*). The Council discussed the assumptions of Colorado, Rhode Island, Illinois, Maryland, and Ohio, noting the common themes across the states.

The Council discussed what the Nevada assumptions would include. The topics of professional development; the ability to recruit, retain and reward effective teachers; the need for a system that was fair, equitable, and consistent over time; and how to replicate across a state with very diverse districts were discussed.

Also noted was the need to step back and look at the problem and the solution, keeping in mind the creation of an honest and meaningful evaluation to increase student learning, with a goal of creating globally competent students. Dr. Rabinowitz stated every one of the above-listed points should be focused on improving student outcomes. Dr. Heritage added there was a joint responsibility for improving student learning and those outcomes should be at the center of the framework created. She commented, "Remember, the goal is to prepare students for their future, not our past."

The Council also discussed the nature of the relationship between teachers and administrators, and the need to make that relationship more collaborative and collegial. Professional development needed to start with administrators so they are more able to provide feedback and support to their teachers. Member Cheney noted part of the goal was to create schools that were good places to learn and good places to work. They need to be a better place for everyone.

The Council deliberated and created the following preliminary assumptions before taking a break:

1. Recruit / retain / reward effective teachers.
2. Professional Development: Continuous learning.
3. Do no harm. Fair and meaningful evaluations can improve student outcomes.
4. Collaborative and informative for both teachers and leaders which positively impacts school climate and culture.
5. Involve stakeholders, continuous improvement of the system.
6. Alignment between the systems.

The Council returned from break and heard comments from Assemblywoman Debbie Smith.

Assemblywoman Smith thanked everyone for their commitment of time. She expressed her appreciation of the tasks that this Council has before them and how important this Council's work is and the effect this will have on what happens in the classroom. She stated she is committed as a legislator to going forward to try to give the Council the support it needs to implement this work.

The Council discussed whether there should be an affirmative statement that student assessment data can and will be used and that it is right to do so. Dr. Rabinowitz cautioned on the co-mingling of terms. AB 222 states student achievement data must be used; it does not say student assessment data.

The Council determined it was more effective to break into small groups, with each group assigned a specific assumption to evaluate. Prior to doing so, Dr Irvin provided his function was not to make sure the open meeting law was followed, but to assist the Council in following the open meeting law and to make occasional suggestions to support compliance. He stated he would try to assist to make sure the record is appropriate. He stated that breaking into small groups is difficult under the open meeting law. The function of an open meeting is to create minutes. Those minutes are evidence of what happened and what action was taken. Until those minutes are prepared, the audio recording takes the place of the minutes. It is difficult to have a complete audio record when you break into groups. Everything considered by a public body needs to be on the record. Subcommittee groups need an agenda, and open meeting law needs to apply. If a member of the public wanted to be here, they could participate by walking around and listening. In order to address this, then, given the desired to engage in small group work, when small groups report to the large group, discuss the process used and explain thoroughly the discussion had, so it is in the record to support compliance with the spirit of the open meeting law.

The Council broke into groups to discuss each of the assumptions listed. Members reviewed the work of each group and one person from each group made a presentation to the entire Council. The Council discussed at length each of the assumptions and the differences between them and agreed upon the following language:

The following assumptions support an underlying belief that effective teachers and administrators must be developed and supported so that all students master standards and 21st century skills so that students leave high school college and career ready.

- 1. Teachers and leaders will improve thru effective, targeted professional development that inform and transform practice.*
- 2. An evaluation system will include clear expectations for both professional practice and student growth and include fair, meaningful, and accurate feedback.*
- 3. The evaluation process will involve all stakeholders in a collaborative process that informs practice and positively influences the school and community climate.*
- 4. Student growth is measured over time using assessments and other student work.*
- 5. Educator and administrator evaluations are consistent with and supported by the state, district and school-level systems (i.e. human resource policies, licensure, negotiated agreements, professional development, and governance.)*
- 6. An aligned and supportive teacher and leader evaluation system includes continuous & measurable improvement of the system, the individuals within, and the students.*

Member Peterson made a motion for Chair Salazar to word smith the assumptions and present to the Council at the February meeting. Member McCormick seconded. The motion carried without objection.

The Council broke for lunch and returned at 12:45p.m.

Referring back to the document *Developing a Statewide Uniform Performance Evaluation System*, Dr. Holdheide stated the issue of state versus local control would be tabled until tomorrow, and the Council returned to the discussion of the at least 50% student achievement piece required by AB222. The Council stressed the importance of focusing on measures that would be meaningful to teachers. Dr. Irvin noted AB225 also played a role in the discussion as it dealt with probationary and post-probationary teachers and administrators.

The Council reviewed how other states handled the student achievement piece, looking specifically at Colorado, Iowa, Delaware and New York. The Council discussed whether this was the time to set the student achievement percentage at a firm 50%. It was suggested that perhaps 50% might be used during the initial piloting phase, and could be adjusted when validity of the measures could be evaluated. It was emphasized the decision should not be arbitrary and the TLC agreed it would be premature at this point.

Dr. Holdheide stated that the next presenter, Dr. Margaret Heritage, will be giving background information on what different states have created to show student achievement.

Dr. Margaret Heritage, Assistant Director for Professional Development at the National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing (CRESST) at UCLA.

Dr. Heritage began with her perspective on the evaluation process: Less is more. The states who have created long lists of measures are taking on far too much. The goal is to transform the education system to enable student learning. It is important to have quality instruction for all, which is based on specific principles and contingent upon individual student advancement. She noted the United States, like Britain, has an issue with underachieving students. These students bring cultural capital to the classroom, but do not achieve their potential. Teachers need to be responsive to students needs at all times.

Feedback loops:

Feedback is information on the gap between the actual level and the ideal level of performance; an evaluation of the current status with respect to desired goals. This is an ongoing process. If information is not used to alter the gap between the actual and ideal level, then it is not feedback. She noted to achieve feedback; the system needs to be manageable. Less is more.

Desired practice to create learning:

Dr. Heritage stated she hoped Nevada would be bold. The Common Core Standards (CCS) are an opportunity to reset the education button. Begin with what you would like to see in 2014 and how that might grow and develop. There are huge changes ahead. Both teachers and students need to transform for the system to see real change. Think about what an effective teacher in Nevada will look like and sound like, also what an effective learner will look like and sound like. Don't think about status quo, think about the future.

Changes ahead:

There are significant changes looming on the horizon. Access to complex text will be required for all students, which is viewed as a particular challenge because students do not meet current standards. There will be more emphasis placed on reasoning and argumentation, context and language together, and the ability to compare and contrast ideas across texts and subjects. Higher levels of classroom discourse will be required. Dr. Heritage emphasized classrooms will have to look and operate differently to achieve these results.

The Council discussed issues around implementing the CCS. Trying to get everyone to buy into the concept that everyone is teaching reading has been difficult. The Council noted the need to ensure a specific link to the implementation of the common core and what will be required from teachers to ensure the CCS are reached. Everyone will need to assist in reaching these goals.

Dr. Heritage continued that learning to learn skills were as important as the content standards. We do not want to raise a population with learned helplessness; we have that now. The ability to self-regulate ones learning behavior is essential.

Dr. Heritage led a discussion of the principles to evaluate across disciplines, which are:

1. New learning is connected to prior learning and experience.
2. Students are clear about 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.
6. Assessment is integrated into teaching and learning.

Clear performance criteria and constructive classroom discourse will be essential. To achieve this, teachers will need to structure time in the lesson for students to be reflective on their work. Students need time to think and get their thoughts together to deepen their learning.

Dr. Heritage and the Council discussed how to achieve these principles in practice. It was suggested the six principles be placed in a rubric with research questions and given to the districts to pilot. Dr. Heritage emphasized the rubric needed to be lean, mean and impactful. Dr. Rabinowitz proffered tests for an effective rubric and the Council discussed the types of exemplars which could be used in the rubric. The three types of exemplars are: direct observation, an artifact of the exemplar, and indirect artifacts. The Council thanked Dr. Heritage for her presentation.

Member Morrison arrived and explained the reason for his delay in joining the meeting was a result of addressing issues associated with the Washoe Valley fire. He provided an update on the fire, stating he was able to tour the area earlier in the day, and it was an incredible sight. He discussed the very fast movement of the fire at the press conference the night before. He complimented the bravery of bus drivers who went into dangerous areas and situations to get students out, as well as teachers who live in that area and stayed behind to help out. Member Morrison stated the fire was currently about 50% contained, and weather coming in will help with that. Three schools were closed today, two due to smoke damage and one used as a command center.

DISCUSSION ON THEORY OF ACTION

Dr. Rabinowitz stated the goals and purposes could create an incorrect perception unless the council was very clear that they are building a system which, over a series of years, will phase in from pilot to implementation. Each phase will become a more perfect system than the one before. The system will become progressively better every time.

The Council discussed the need to have subcommittees work on the indicators to begin the evaluation system. Chair Salazar proposed the following three subcommittees and stated their proposed tasks. The subcommittees recommended were:

What: What class of indicators do we want?

How and the how much: Which test, what rubric, existing surveys or do we create our own? Then how much do we weight them across the phases and years.

Communication and professional development piece: How do we get information out there?

Members raised concerns on how these groups would work together and how the information obtained would be presented to the group. Chair Salazar stated the subcommittees would present information to the entire Council who would make the decisions regarding the findings and future work of the subcommittees.

Chair Salazar encouraged the members to think about the big ideas tonight, and indicated subcommittees would be developed tomorrow. Some members have interest and expertise in some areas that she would not be aware of. She also encouraged the members to consider the level of work which would need to be accomplished in conjunction with their existing time demands.

The conversation turned to a discussion of state versus local control. In particular, how the Council could determine a system which would work for every district, both large and small. Dr. Irvin stated we actually have guidance in three bills, AB222, AB225 and AB229. What the Council will find is some things can be discussed and negotiated in general terms, but another sections give the districts flexibility to come up with their own policies and procedures. Since there will be contractual issues which will require consultation with groups like the Nevada State Education Association (NSEA), that is the way it is to happen. Every year school districts evaluate policies and procedures. AB 222 created the functions of this council, while AB225 concerns changes to NRS 391.3116. To some extent, the application of these three bills together changed the world. AB225 and AB229 are the effects of evaluation on individual teachers. Your discussion at this time is leading into possible regulations the State Board will eventually make based on the recommendations of this Council. If you submit a white paper to the State Board, included how you are going address these subjects including the ability for implementation of the other issues, the 50% or less category, ELL, application to non-core, non-tested subjects, and school improvement. Chair Salazar stated the state/local continuum discussion would be continued tomorrow.

Dr. Rabinowitz and the members discussed some of the general issues presented by too much local or too much state control. Issues of validity and fidelity of results were discussed, as well as physical and financial constraints of the districts. They also discussed how goals and purposes may change over time based upon refinement of the measures. The focus now should be on what was realistic to accomplish in year one.

Member Fitzpatrick stated the Council was to provide recommendations to the State Board. Perhaps our recommendations include a phased in approach to the evaluation system, and then the State Board may adopt regulations for phase in. Our recommendation can be to have a staged and sequenced implementation with the required feedback, etc. The State Board has the choice to accept the recommendation in its entirety, or to do something entirely different.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

The meeting adjourned at 4:18 pm.

Meeting scheduled to reconvene on January 21, 2012 at 8:00 am.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

January 21, 2012

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pamela Salazar, Chair
Barbara Surritte-Barker, Vice Chair
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

PRESENT BY PHONE:

Linda Archambault, Member

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT:

Ed Irvin, Senior Deputy Attorney General

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

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

GUESTS PRESENT:

Lynn Holdheide National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality
Jennifer Varrato Administrative Assistance

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

Pam Hicks Clark County Association of School Administrators
Jerry Barbee Nevada Department of Education
Kristen McNeill Washoe County School District
Shane McLoud Students First
Barbara Janne NAE
Judy Osgood Office of the Governor
Sean Hill Sierra Nevada Journeys

CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Salazar called the meeting to order at 8:11 a.m., with attendance as reflected above.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Salazar opened the floor for public comment.

RECAP OF YESTERDAY'S MEETING (January 20, 2012)

Chair Salazar recapped the work done on the assumptions and indicated they would revisit that issue today. She also stated they would revisit the issues Dr. Heritage presented as well. They would cover in more what the subcommittees would look like.

Chair Salazar stated today they would discuss state versus local control, review our assumptions, and work on goals and purposes. They would also spend time working on communication and how to gather input from stakeholders, as well as how do ensure consistent messaging about the council's work. As time goes along, we will gain more and more interest as people start to hear about some of the decisions we are beginning to make.

CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR DEVELOPMENT OF REQUIRED PLAN

Dr. Holdheide continued the discussion of conceptual framework. She stated the members spent a great deal of time working on assumptions the prior day and suggested revisiting those assumptions. The Council discussed wording, context, and scope of the assumptions. Revisions were made and the assumptions were restated and reflected as:

Introduction: *The following assumptions support an underlying belief that effective teachers and administrators must be developed and supported so that all students master standards and essential skills so that students graduate college and career ready.*

- 1. Teachers and administrators will improve thru effective, targeted professional development that inform and transform practice.*
- 2. An evaluation system will include clear expectations for both professional practice and student growth and include fair, meaningful, and accurate feedback.*
- 3. The evaluation process will engage stakeholders in a collaborative process that informs practice and positively influences the school and community climate.*
- 4. The evaluation system must include student, teacher, and administrator achievement and performance measured over time using multiple measures, multiple times, and multiple years of assessment and other student work.*
- 5. Educator and administrator evaluations are consistent with and supported by the state, district and school-level systems.*

6. *A consistent and supportive teacher and leader evaluation system includes continuous and measurable feedback to improve performance of students, teachers, administrators, and the system.*
7. *The evaluation system is a part of a larger professional growth system that consistently evolves and improves to support the teachers and leaders it serves.*

Member Peterson made a motion to adopt the assumptions as amended with the caveat to edit and revisit again. Member McCormick seconded. The motion carried without objection.

The Council then reviewed their original goals to see if any revisions were needed.

Original goals:

1. Develop an accountability framework that improves performance of all educators and students.
2. Inform human capital decisions based around a professional growth system.
3. Engage stakeholders in the continuous improvement and monitoring of a professional growth system.

The members discussed whether the terms contained too much jargon, whether the goals were actually measurable, and if they were accurately worded. The Council debated on changes and settled on the following goals:

1. *Develop a performance accountability framework that:*
2. *Ensures student learning and growth*
3. *Improve teacher and administrator capacity and instructional practice*
4. *Informs human capital decisions*
5. *Continually improves thru feedback*

Member McCord made a motion to adopt the goals as amended. Member Cheney seconded. The motion carried without objection.

Dr. Holdheide began a discussion with the Council on purposes. As we have talked about before, purposes may change over time. It maybe in the first year you do not make human capital decisions because the data is not reliable enough. The Council needs to focus in on specific purposes. The members reviewed and discussed some of the general purposes seen across other states. Dr. Holdheide stressed to the Council your purpose helps to drive the type of measures you will need to put in place.

The Council discussed purposes in detail and decided upon the following wording of their purposes and indicated which goal the purpose supported.

1. Identify effective instruction and leadership that will establish criteria to determine:
2. Whether students are meeting achievement expectations. (supports Goal 1)
3. Effective engagement of families. (supports Goal 1&2)
4. Educator's effective collaboration. (supports Goal 1, 2 &3)
5. What professional development is needed. (supports Goal 1, 2 &3)
6. Human capital decisions including rewards and consequences. (supports Goal 3)
7. Educator's use of data to inform decisions making. (supports Goal 1, 2 &4)

Member Hales made a motion to take purposes as they currently stand, with the flexibility to wordsmith for clarification. Vice Chair Barker seconded. The motion carried without objection.

Chair Salazar opened the floor for public comment.

Kristen McNeill commented she appreciated the opportunity to contribute. She referred back to the Council's discussion on assumptions and proposed a change to a stronger statement. State what your beliefs are wrapped around this entire discussion, as far as professional development and the evaluation system for teachers and principals.

Moving to the goals section, she recommended capturing both effective teachers and administrators as effective educators. Member Fitzpatrick asked for a clarification of whether she was talking about goals or purposes. Ms. McNeill stated she was referring to the goals. She stated that she believes if you take a few moments to review, these restated goals capture the high level discussions the TLC has been having with the intent of the legislation as far as lesson planning, classroom management, but it also speaks to the importance of monitoring the system on a regular basis. She said she could not stress enough the importance of having feedback as this system is put together. Thank you.

The Council agreed on the preference for belief over assumption, but expressed a need to be sure the public would understand that the term "educator" addresses both teachers and administrators.

Member McCord proffered he would agree to amend his prior motion to reflex the change from assumption to belief if the second agreed. Member Cheney agreed. The motion carried without objection.

With the above motion carried the former assumptions are now characterized as beliefs and read as follows:

*Introduction: The following **beliefs** support an underlying belief that effective teachers and administrators must be developed and supported so that all students master standards and essential skills so that students graduate college and career ready.*

1. ***Our belief is teachers and administrators will improve thru effective, targeted professional development that inform and transform practice.***
2. ***Our belief is an evaluation system will include clear expectations for both professional practice and student growth and include fair, meaningful, and accurate feedback.***
3. ***Our belief is the evaluation process will engage stakeholders in a collaborative process that informs practice and positively influences the school and community climate.***
4. ***Our belief is the evaluation system must include student, teacher, and administrator achievement and performance measured over time using multiple measures, multiple times, and multiple years of assessment and other student work.***
5. ***Educator and administrator evaluations are consistent with and supported by the state, district and school-level systems.***
6. ***A consistent and supportive teacher and leader evaluation system includes continuous and measurable feedback to improve performance of students, teachers, administrators, and the system.***

7. *The evaluation system is a part of a larger professional growth system that consistently evolves and improves to support the teachers and leaders it serves.*

Chair Salazar opened a discussion of the use of the term “educator” to reference both teachers and administrators. The Council discussed the matter and reached a consensus to use the term educator, with the proviso to define the term on its first use. The members will include a caveat to use the term teacher or administrator only in instances where reference to only one was intended.

Member Peterson made a motion to use the term educator in place of teachers and administrators after first defining in an initial statement. Member Tate seconded. The motion carried without objection.

The Council next began work to define a proposed evaluation framework. Dr. Holdheide stated they were not talking about any specific measures at this point, just how the Council would define the framework. The Council returned to a discussion on whether this would be an appropriate time to set the student achievement portion of the framework at 50% as a preliminary recommendation for the initial implementation phase. Members discussed the issue of alignment in classroom observation versus and student achievement. Dr. Holdheide indicated some places like New Haven had developed a rubric to help account align an imbalance between observation and achievement.

Dr. Irvin noted that historically you could not use student achievement to evaluate teachers, and then Race to the Top (RTTT) came along. RTTT recommended including student achievement in teacher evaluations. AB222 changed that in this state. Our legislators discussed exactly what you are discussing now; that the tests we have now are not designed to be used for teacher evaluation. Legislators questioned where the concept of 50% came from, and the answer to that was the RTTT application.

The Council discussed the need to have the framework support educator interaction with students as well as colleagues. We want to make sure those educators producing excellent results are sharing with others. It was emphasized the Council was working on an evaluation system which will define success and accountability; not just proficiency. No matter what system we come up with, it is important to acknowledge those who exhibit outstanding performance.

The Council also discussed the need to establish confidence and reliability in the newly established system. It was noted the current system was based purely on evaluations and now we are moving away from that. Until we have confidence the new model, the prudent thing to do would be to hold at the 50% student achievement required by statute. Dr. Holdheide reminded the Council that as confidence in the system and measures increased, the percentage could increase as well.

Member McCormick motioned for student achievement at 50% in the initial stages of implementation of evaluation system. Member Galland-Collins seconded.

The Council discussed concerns around articulating to constituents why student achievement would only be 50%. It was noted that 50% was currently at the high end of what states would be implementing, most were below 50%. It will be important to explain to stakeholders that we are replacing an entire evaluation system for educators. Our current tests are valid for the purposes they were created for. We have not yet established their validity for other purposes.

Member Hales indicated she felt the vote was premature at this point. Member Crowley stated it may be better to start from the end. If we can determine the pieces which go into establishing the two major categories, then it will be easier to determine what the final percentage of each major category will be.

Member McCormick withdrew the motion and Member Galland-Collins withdrew the second.

Council members had a lengthy discussion about the structure of the proposed evaluation framework. Members decided upon:

Evaluation Framework

Student Achievement/Performance

Student Assessment

Other Student Outcomes

Student Perception

Educational Practices

Instructional Principles

Family Engagement

Professional Responsibility

Member Cheney motioned to endorse the Evaluation Framework as a working document; a beginning framework for the Council to continue building upon. Member Peterson second. The motion carried without objection.

Dr. Holdheide then opened a discussion on the Council's philosophy around the balance between state and local control in the evaluation process. Council members stated they were to provide recommendations to the State Board, but questioned whether they had any implementation authority. Members also discussed the preference of the districts to have a minimum framework from the State. A common framework for some of the requirements to allow for the sharing of resources, with flexibility enough to cover 17 diverse districts was seen as optimal.

Dr. Holdheide then discussed what other states were doing and re-introduced the three models previously discussed, which are the:

State model: State dictates what is to be done.

Elective state model: State provides strict interpretation in some area, but allows flexibility in others.

District evaluation system with required parameters: State won't necessarily put out a framework, but they will say districts have to use multiple measures, etc.

The Council discussed the possible trade-offs between the models and reviewed how other states were approaching the issue. Specifically, the Council reviewed: Colorado, Georgia, Indiana, Massachusetts, Ohio, Rhode Island, Iowa, Florida, Maryland, Washington, New York, Louisiana, Delaware, and North Carolina. The information can be view in its entirety at:

http://nde.doe.nv.gov/PDFs/Teachers/Meetings/2012/01-20/Models_State_LocalRelationships.pdf

The Council discussed the concept of weighting and range limitations. There needs to be minimal parameters to ensure uniformity. There may be a possibility of districts submitting plans to for vetting and review by the State, but unsure of staffing and capacity at this time. Member McCormick stated there may be some value in bringing current district pilot programs and our process together over the next 1 ½ years to view alignment.

The Council reviewed and discussed the interview information provided by the districts. This information can be viewed in its entirety at:

<http://nde.doe.nv.gov/PDFs/Teachers/Meetings/2012/01-20/TLC%20District%20Interviews%20-%20Summary%20and%20Considerations.pdf>

Council members discussed what type of system they wanted to develop. Members cautioned against self-limiting the possibilities of the system up front, indicating it may be better to develop the system we really want, and then going back to evaluate funding needs. There may be a possibility of sharing resources with other states to get those things we really want for our system.

The Council will develop a framework that defines effective instruction and practice for educators and establishes a minimum set of criteria and expectations related to measures of performance. Including but not limited to:

The use of multiple measures

The training of evaluators

The use of observations

Includes professional development

Establish minimum and maximum weights for specific measures

Self-assessment

Parent/Student feedback

Educators need to receive written feedback

Districts need a reflective process

Member Cheney made a motion to table the conversation at this point to word smith and edit the state versus local control piece, along with some of the criteria identified, and present again at the next meeting. Member Small seconded. The motion carried without objection.

DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMUNICATION PLAN

Dr. Holdheide began the discussion of a communication plan by referring members to *A Practical Guide to Designing Comprehensive Teacher Evaluation Systems*, page 16, which can be viewed in its entirety at: <http://nde.doe.nv.gov/PDFs/Teachers/Meetings/2012/01-20/A%20Practical%20Guide%20to%20Designing%20Comprehensive%20Teacher%20Evaluation%20Systems%20--%20National%20Comprehensive%20Center%20for%20Teacher%20Quality.pdf>

Dr. Holdheide stated the Council needed to establish who the stakeholders were and what their communication expectations are. A plan is needed from the beginning to correlate communications to your targeted audience.

Chair Salazar stated the Council had resources through an NGA grant to provide technical assistance for the implementation of a communication plan. The Chair called on Judy Osgood from the Office of the Governor for public comment.

Ms. Osgood stated the NGA grant funding could be used to hire consultants to assist with a communication plan. We have already been in touch with the staff at NGA and they are very willing and able to offer any kind of technical assistance we need. One of their staff members has already offered to compile a set of what they consider communication best practices which have been utilized by other states. The NGA could offer excellent guidance for this Council so they will know what is needed. An NGA technical assistance team will be in Nevada to meet with the leadership team on February 3, 2012. It would be helpful for some guidance from this Council for that meeting. Thank you.

Member Morrison stated there was a sense of urgency in creating a website so anybody who has questions knows where to go. The communication subcommittee needs to start discussing what we need to do receive input and inform stakeholders on the current work of the Council. Member Morrison offered to make a Washoe County a resource available to the Council; a partnership with k-12 Insight to get targeted feedback.

SUBCOMMITTEE PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

Chair Salazar stated since the Council had previously given her the direction to set up the subcommittees, she wanted to suggest possible people to chair those subcommittees using individual expertise were it would be most valuable. She asked if Vice Chair Barker would be interested in chairing the subcommittee on communication, since she has been involved in the NGA policy academy and the goal of this subcommittee would be to build a communication plan to both convey information to the public and receive information from stakeholders. Vice Chair Barker agreed to serve in that role.

Chair Salazar stated she has an interest in chairing the subcommittee centered on the “What”; the areas around the standards. This subcommittee will look at some of the measures we can use for educator effectiveness, and Standards and measures used to create standards. She thought this subcommittee should look at other states practices also.

Chair Salazar inquired as to whether Member Fitzpatrick would be available to chair the subcommittee centered on the “How”; the ways and weight to use, as well as the indicators and application thereof.

The Council discussed how many members would be on each subcommittee and engaged Dr. Irvin with regard to how the subcommittees might communicate with each other and the Council. Dr. Irvin emphasized the subcommittees could not conduct meetings via email. Staff can email members of the subcommittee and you can have limited communication. You need to establish the number on the committee and cannot have a quorum discussing any matter away from the full committee unless it has been agenzized. To clarify, there are 15 members of this council, 5 of you can meet over dinner and discuss just about anything you want. The problem is when you discuss matters electronically; there is the possibility of it going to a quorum. You need to be careful about that. He then referred to the presentation of George Taylor during the initial Council meeting; stating Dr. Taylor emphasized this is a quorum state and a deliberation state. Deliberation is an action that does not need to have a motion to occur, so if it looks like action, then it probably is.

Chair Salazar stated the main purpose of the subcommittees would be to gather information to present to the entire Council for deliberation and possible action. The Council discussed the possibility of using staff to gather information and the possible burdens that would create. Chair Salazar stated the issue of subcommittees would be tabled until the next meeting so the communication aspect could be more thoroughly explored. The Chair stated goal of the Council was to be transparent and comply with the open meeting law.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Salazar opened the floor for public comment.

Pam Hicks:

Congratulations on the work you did today. This is a very difficult task and you are doing a fine job. This process is gaining momentum, and you have districts in all stages of process. It is important to get something out to the districts so they can begin to frame things because they are interested in what the Council has to say. My second comment is very short and has to do with the term “statewide” in AB 222. The Legislative Committee on Education has a very different view on what statewide means. I think you should look at local versus state and have a definition of what that term means. Thank you.

Shane McLoud:

I am with Students First and we are a nationwide organization who works in over a dozen states on issues like this. Our CEO is Michelle Rhee. The organization is based in Sacramento. I am a former teacher of 14 years for Los Angeles Unified School District. I have worked at charter schools and have been a public school board member and a former union leader. There are teachers very interested in this process and its outcomes and they will be coming to meetings within the next few months to add their voice so, we are happy you are transparent and welcoming to the public, and that the information in your work is going to be very public to the stakeholders. Thank you for starting this work, I am very impressed with the amount diversity and experience at this table. All of the points you are discussing are very critical. Just from the work I have seen, Nevada certainly could be a leader. I wanted to introduce myself and my organization and let you know we are open to being a resource for your work. We are available. Thank you for your transparency and the revolutionary work you are doing.

The meeting adjourned at 1:28 pm.

The next meeting is scheduled for February 8, 2012 in Las Vegas.