

**NEVADA TEACHERS AND LEADERS
INDICATORS/MEASURES TASK FORCE MEETING
March 21, 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

March 21, 2012

TASK FORCE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Council Task Force Members

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

Non-Council Task Force Members

- Lisa Bliss, Member
- Carol Crothers, Member
- Paul LaMarca, Member (joined approximately 2:37 p.m.)
- Kristen McNeill, Member (joined approximately 2:37 p.m.)
- Ricky Medina, Member (joined approximately 2:37 p.m.)

TASK FORCE MEMBERS ABSENT:

- Jeremy Hauser, Member

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

- Laurie Thake, Assistant to the Task Force

INVITED PRESENTER:

- Sujie Shin, Senior Assessment Manager, WestEd

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC PRESENT:

- Pepper Sturm Legislative Counsel Bureau
- Pam Hicks Clark County Association of School Administrators

CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL

Chair Salazar called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m., with attendance as reflected above.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

APPROVAL OF A FLEXIBLE AGENDA

Member Crowley motioned for approval of a flexible agenda. Member Hales seconded. The motion carried by roll call vote without objection.

UPDATE ON THE WORK OF THE MODELS TASK FORCE

Dr. Shin indicated there would not be a specific Models Task Force update today as the task force cancelled their March 19, 2012 meeting. Additionally, Chair Salazar stated they discussed the Open Meeting Law (OML) and communication between task forces with the Attorney General's office. As a result, she stated the task forces must first present their work to the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) as a whole before they shared work with the other task forces. We want to make sure the public is aware of the work each task force is doing. We want to stay in alignment with the OML and will continue discussions with the Attorney General's office on this issue.

Chair Salazar stated Dr. Shin was a technical assistant to both task forces and could provide general information as to the agenda topics. Dr. Shin discussed the different focus in the work of the task forces; stating while indicators/measures would focus on the categories and standards across each domain, the models task force would be looking at the structure of the framework itself and how that framework will fit into existing State and local district systems. With new task force members present during this meeting, Chair Salazar reviewed the charge of the indicators/measures task force. Dr. Shin stated as the task force worked through its agenda she would indicate when they may have veered into the work of the models task force.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL 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 TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL

This item was tabled and not discussed during the task force meeting.

CONSIDERATION OF POSSIBLE CATEGORIES, STANDARDS, INDICATORS, AND MEASURES TO INCLUDE IN EVALUATION TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS AND POSSIBLE ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO PRESENT TO THE TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL

Dr. Shin led a discussion on the framework/model as identified by the TLC as important to the development of effective teachers in Nevada. The framework/model includes two spheres with two domains per sphere. There is no implied weighting to the framework/model at this time.

Members discussed at length the Student Achievement/Engagement sphere and its relation to AB222. It was noted that AB222 required at least 50% of the evaluation to be based upon student achievement, however, the determination as to what would be used specifically to measure that achievement had not been established by the TLC. Some members questioned the placement of the student engagement piece and whether it would be better placed under Instructional Practice domain. Chair Salazar clarified the TLC intended the student engagement piece as an outcome measure and not as part of the instructional input piece. The intent of the TLC was to include student perception as a part of a student achievement measure; although how that input would be obtained from students had not been determined. The issue will require further clarification from the TLC.

Chair Salazar opened the floor to public comment on the issue of student achievement. Pepper Sturm of the Legislative Counsel Bureau provided AB222 specifies that 50% relates to measures collected by the same longitudinal data system, which is referenced on page 3 of the bill. AB222 states that 50% will include information about the student academic achievement rate, rate of attendance, rate of graduation of pupils overtime throughout the state, and have capacity to perform a variety of longitudinal analysis on the results of individual pupils on assessments. There may be an implication that whatever is collected by that system goes into that 50%, so the bill may be defining some of those measures you are talking about.

Chair Salazar stated those concerns were some of the reason the TLC had not concretely defined the 50% as of yet and noted further discussion was needed. It is important to meet the requirements of AB222, but the Council may still want to retain the philosophy that student achievement is more than just test scores. Whatever the TLC ultimately decides to recommend to the State Board will serve the students of Nevada and meet the expectations of AB222.

Dr. Shin continued her discussion on the framework/model domains, categories, and measures. It was noted the categories provided were from Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) primarily because they already encompassed specific standards which would assist the task force in their work. She stated over the next few meetings the task force would need to narrow down and edit the categories and standards to more directly envision what was important to education in Nevada in order for the task force to make their recommendation to the TLC.

Members discussed the large number of categories and measures provided in respect to how difficult it would be to use all of these measures in making high stakes decisions at the district level. Chair Salazar clarified the TLC brainstormed on the categories to include everything which needed to be considered as part of an evaluation system so the work could be charged to this task force. The TLC had no expectation all of the measures would be used, only that the best would be recommended to the Council by our task force. Dr. Shin agreed and emphasized potential measures were crafted in a very open way to make sure everything was thought about. As the task force moved forward, this area will become more specific and simpler.

At this point, Member LaMarca and Member McNeill signed off the meeting due to poor communication quality from their call in location.

Dr. Shin facilitated a discussion on the standards under the category “Student Centered Classroom” (SCC) and she explained the purpose of the workbook titled “Instructional Pedagogy” was to assist in more clearly defining what the TLC had considered important to evaluate for teacher effectiveness in Nevada. The task force generally agreed on the premise that “less is more” when crafting the standards. The desire is to keep the evaluation system clearly expressed and as straight-forward as possible.

As the task force continued to work through SCC category, members questioned if the TLC would design rubrics or surveys to be used by the districts. Chair Salazar provided the portion of state versus local control had not determined by the TLC and was at this point under the scope of the Models Task Force. Member Bliss commented that while the larger districts were very much in favor of local control, too much local control was inherently more difficult for the rural districts to facilitate and requested that be considered as the work moved forward.

The task force discussed how the remaining portion of the workbook was structured so the members could complete work individually to return to the task force for review at their next meeting. Dr. Shin agreed to compile those responses for review at the next task force meeting.

IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Chair Salazar stated the next agenda would continue the discussion around the domain of Instructional Practice, as well the possible categories under that domain. The task force will also begin a discussion on the Professional Responsibility domain, as well as look at all of the categories under the entire Educational Practice sphere. When that is completed, we will have a discussion about potential measures.

Chair Salazar noted the need for more clarification from the Attorney General’s office on how they would be able to meet with the Models Task Force and share that information back to the TLC.

Dr. Shin stated the task force members would be provided with updated workbooks in Excel format in which they could provide their recommendations for changes. Task Force member were asked to provide their responses prior to April 3, 2012.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Salazar opened the floor to public comment. Pam Hicks, Deputy Executive Director of the Clark County Association of School Administrators stated she had an opportunity to share the *White Paper* with the representative council of her association and noted her members queried as to how updates of the *White Paper* would be adopted and how members of the public would be informed of the newest version. Chair Salazar responded the *White Paper* itself was a standing item on the TLC agenda so it can be reviewed at each meeting. Recommended changes come from the task forces to the TLC as a whole for any action on proposed changes. Any changes to the *White Paper* are formally adopted and placed on the TLC Resource and Information Library link.

Ms. Hicks noted the Council acknowledged the important work the districts had completed and their desire not to hamper that progress. She stated the administrators she spoke with were waiting with baited breath about the pending decisions of the Council. She acknowledged the difficulty of the decisions which needed to be made, but implored the group to make some those major decisions as quickly as possible and communicate them to stakeholder groups and to the public. Chair Salazar thanked Ms. Hicks for her comments and stated they all felt a strong sense of urgency in the work of the Council.

The meeting adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

The next meeting of the Teachers and Leaders Indicators/Measures Task Force is scheduled for **April 9, 2012 at NDE, 700 E. 5th Street, Carson City, Nevada, 89706, Superintendent's Conference Room; and at NDE 9890 S. Maryland Pkwy, Suite 221, Las Vegas, NV 89183, Bristlecone Conference Room.** For your convenience, minutes and agendas are posted on the Nevada Department of Education's website, under Commissions & Councils, at <http://www.doe.nv.gov>.