NEVADA TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)
MEETING MINUTES

July 25, 2012
Best Western Airport Plaza
1981 Terminal Way
Reno, Nevada

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pamela Salazar, Chair
Barbara Surritte-Barker, Vice Chair
Christine Cheney, Member
Kathleen Galland-Collins, Member
Theresa Crowley, Member – left the meeting at 11:45 A.M.
Rorie Fitzpatrick, Member
Sharla Hales, Member
Theo McCormick, Member
Theodore Small, Member
Kimberly Tate, Member

COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT:

Linda Archambault, Member – excused
Robert McCord, Member - excused
Dale Norton, Member - excused
Mary Peterson, Member - excused

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

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

LEGAL COUNSEL:

Shane Chesney, Senior Deputy Attorney General

INVITED GUESTS:

Sujie Shin,	Senior Manager, Assessment and Standards Development at WestEd
Lynn Holdheide	Consultant, National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality
Judy Osgood	Nevada Governor's Office

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

Kelley Miner	NV PTA, Vice President of Programs
Linda Hunt	Teacher, Washoe County School District
Jose Delfin	Carson City School District
Natha Anderson	Washoe Education Association and Nevada State Education Association

Kristen McNeil	Washoe County School District
Judy Osgood	Nevada Governor's Office

CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Salazar called the meeting to order at 8:40 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 Tate moved for a flexible agenda. Member Cheney seconded. The motion passed.

REVIEW UPDATES AND DISCUSS RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE STUDENT OUTCOMES DOMAIN OF THE NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AS A RESULT OF THE MODELS AND INDICATORS/MEASURES JOINT TASK FORCES MEETING WHICH TOOK PLACE ON JULY 24, 2012

Chair Salazar stated at the July 24th Joint Task Force meeting the discussion centered on measuring student growth in non-tested grades.

Ms. Shin provided a review of the discussion on the main issues from July 24th Joint Task Force meeting:

- The teacher evaluation diagram:
  - 50% educational practice and 50% student performance for at least the first several years;
  - Educational practice is not yet differentiated and currently is flexible as we define the rubric for the operational practice.
  - There needs to be further discussion with regards to professional responsibility.

- Student performance side to be weighted - Student outcomes 50%:
  - Student growth – 20%;
  - Proficiency/Status – 15%;
  - Contributions to reducing the gap – 10%;
  - Student engagement – 5%.

- There was discussion regarding the development of assessments for different courses with strong curriculums, and for groups of teachers who teach elective courses. Also discussed was the different weighting needed for different groups of teachers. It was stated there is a need to ensure teachers know what categories they are in and how they will be evaluated.

The Joint Task Force also worked on timelines during the July 24th meeting.

Ms. Shin introduced the motions from the Joint Task Force and opened the floor for discussions on the motions.

Joint Task Force Motion 1: The teacher evaluation framework will differentiate "groups" of teachers (as defined by NRS 391.311) within the school based on job description.

It was discussed if growth and status will apply to all as it may make more sense to apply to some groups but not others. Groups will be defined based upon job description per NRS 391.311 – teacher/administrator. There was a discussion to differentiate weighting and measures, as the same numbers won't work for every teacher. This process needs to be fair and equitable for all educators.

Also discussed was the need to differentiate amongst school personnel such as school psychologist, speech/language specialist, etc. to see who will need to be included and excluded from the definition of teacher, and the role/suitability of specialist personnel professional standards applied to the differentiation of evaluation in the statewide evaluation system. NRS 391.311 defines a teacher as "a licensed employee the majority of whose time is devoted to the rendering of direct educational services to pupils of a school district". It was stated that NRS 391.311 was used to ensure that everyone was on the same page with the definition of "teacher" and exactly who is included as a "teacher". It was discussed to establish a task force to define the groups of educators and it was further discussed this may look different in different areas of the state.

Senior Deputy Attorney General Chensey advised that NRS 391.311, section 2 refers to the local board's responsibility and suggested the TLC has the responsibility to develop an evaluation for teachers and the local boards have the responsibility for evaluating librarians, counselors, and other licensed personnel. Member Crowley expressed those individuals do share the responsibility of teaching students for student growth/improvement.

Following a discussion regarding legislative language and legislative intent, Chair Salazar stated the Council will look at groups of teachers.

MOTION: Member McCormick moved to accept the Teacher Evaluation Framework will differentiate "groups" of teachers based on their roles (as defined by NRS 391.311) within the school based on job description. Vice Chair Barker seconded. Following a discussion, Chair Salazar called for the vote; the motion passed.

Joint Task Force Motion 2: The Teacher Evaluation Framework may differentiate the weighting of the components within the domain of Educational Practice or Student Outcomes of the teacher evaluation model based on identified groups of teachers.

MOTION: Member Small moved to approve the Teacher Evaluation Framework with a possible differentiation of the weighting of the components within the domain of Educational Practice and/or Student Outcomes of the teacher evaluation model based on identified groups of teachers. Member Hales seconded. The motion passed.

Joint Task Force Motion 3: The teacher evaluation framework may differentiate the implementation timeline of the teacher evaluation model for those groups of teachers.

It was discussed to develop a roll out plan for all groups of teachers and identify a tool to explain to the public the timeline of what is to take place.

Ms. Shin stated the Council may have to begin the process using assessments and measures which will change as the system evolves. Ms. Shin advised the Council to be sure about the system before any high stakes decisions are made.

Member Small stated the school districts are expecting the TLC to develop the frameworks for all groups of teachers and the TLC needs to clearly communicate with the districts what is being done. Member Hales stated she feels the school districts know they will need to dovetail their work into what the TLC is developing.

MOTION: Member Hales moved to approve the Teacher Evaluation Framework that may differentiate the implementation timeline of the teacher evaluation model for the different groups of teachers. Member Crowley seconded. The motion passed.

Joint Task Force Motion 4: The Joint Task Force recommended the TLC adopt the Draft Work Schedule for the evaluation framework as a working timeline with edits to the definition of existing teacher evaluation rubrics and district responsibility of training.

Chair Salazar granted a break.
The meeting reconvened.

Ms. Shin led the review of the Draft Work Schedule. The TLC reviewed and worked through the Draft Work Schedule for Nevada Teacher Evaluation Framework with the Overview of Teacher Evaluation Cycle for reference.

The following items were reviewed along with the work that needs to be completed over the next year. The TLC reviewed the five strands:

- 1st strand – work around the growth models.
    - An external group will be developing the growth model and the TLC needs to provide an outline for those groups and define parameters for the piloting.

- 2nd strand - existing district teacher observation rubrics.
    - There is a need to educate stakeholders on how assessments can be relevant and ensure that part of the communication plan is to inform and educate stakeholders on the work of the TLC.
- 3rd strand – developing a new teacher observation group.
    - Advise districts of their responsibility to ensure qualification/certification demonstration of rubric competence. It is important to look at the context of technical advisory groups.
- 4th strand - professional responsibility.
    - Allow flexibility to collect data, understand that the LEAs are using multiple measures and assessments and recommended a phased-in implementation.
- 5th strand – communications.
    - Need to be able to deliver more detailed communication to families.

The TLC discussed defining and setting the parameters of the validation for this process, as well as data collection and the evaluation of data. This evaluation system is going to take at least three years to be operational for all educators. It was suggested the TLC hold further discussions on reducing the gap to see if a teacher is actually contributing to gap reduction. Member Small recommended allowing school districts to use their current evaluation tool to help expand the score of growth beyond CRTs and expand the data being used.

Members expressed concern about districts using different collection and evaluation methods for data and the need to provide consistency in these areas. It was stated communication to stakeholders is a key imperative in this process. As part of the communication plan, there is a need to educate individuals regarding what assessment can be used to measure student growth, as these measure will consist of more than a CRT test. Members discussed the additional valid ways to measure student growth to evaluate how well a teacher is doing.

Vice Chair Barker stated the Communications Task Force established the need to educate legislators in this entire evaluation process.

There was a recommendation to allow assessment flexibility in the evaluation process. Members expressed concern over allowing too much flexibility. It was suggested to continue with the current assessment system and move forward with identifying avenues in which to measure a student's growth.

Ms. Shin recommended that the TLC spend the summer defining professional responsibility and then define the rubric in the fall.

MOTION: Member Tate moved the TLC recommend to the Nevada Department of Education to create a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to oversee the piloting and validation process of the technical components associated with the Teacher and Administrator Evaluation Frameworks. Member Crowley seconded. The motion passed.

A lunch break was granted at 11:40 A.M.

The meeting reconvened at 12:30 P.M.

Ms. Shin stated the high priority for the next couple of months is building and understanding the five high leverage principles and communicating the timelines. For families, the need is to focus on communicating the timeline and the dissemination of the results.

MOTION: Following discussion regarding the timeline, Member Galland-Collins moved for the TLC to adopt the Draft Work Schedule for the Nevada Teacher Evaluation Framework as a working timeline. Member Tate seconded. The motion passed.

RECEIVE UPDATES AND DISCUSS RECOMMENDATIONS (IF ANY) REGARDING NEXT STEPS, TIMELINES, AND COMMUNICATION NEEDS IDENTIFIED BY THE MODELS AND INDICATORS/MEASURES JOINT TASK FORCE WHICH MET ON JULY 24, 2012

Ms. Fitzpatrick shared the recommendations from the Joint Task Force:

- Hold a series of one day summits to be offered on Saturdays in September, with locations in Reno, Las Vegas and Elko. The morning session would cover the expectations of the framework and the afternoon session would be for conducting smaller focus groups for feedback.
- The Communications Task Force will develop the summits with support from the State Department of Education.
- It was discussed to video tape the summit for individuals to be able to access via the website and to be used for training. It was also discussed to offer a series of webinars, wherein individuals could participate in a live via webinar or download the webinar for later viewing.

Member Hales questioned the possibility of educators receiving continuing education credit for attending the summit.

Vice Chair Barker stated the Communications Task Force discussed holding a summit for legislative bodies and inviting experts in the evaluation system from other states and providing a listening forum and feedback in December in preparation for the 2013 Legislative Session.

Judy Osgood stated it was instructive to hear directly from the legislators as it fills an important gap. It was indicated the work the TLC is doing could necessitate some large statutory changes during the 2013 Legislative Session.

Ms. Osgood stated she spoke with Stavan Corbett, Nevada State Board of Education President, on how to include both the old and new State Board of Education Members in this process. Mr. Corbett stated he is interested in making the transition easier and suggested involving both new and old Board Members in order to inform the new Board Members of this ongoing process. Member Fitzpatrick suggested extending an invitation to new Board members to attend the December TLC meeting as members of the public to listen, learn and

begin to understand this process. Member Fitzpatrick recommended the orientation may want to be centered on the *White Paper*.

Vice Chair Barker expressed concern with the logistics and support for the communication plan to ensure that a quality product is delivered. It was stated the charge of the Communications Task Force is to specify the communications plan/timeframe and then for the TLC to review what resources are available and the areas in which the Department of Education can lend support.

ACTION: It was recommended the *White Paper* be updated and posted to the website on a consistent basis, as this is the main source for communication with TLC members and stakeholders.

Craig Stevens, NSEA, questioned if the Legislature is aware of the amount of professional development which will need to be provided through the Regional Professional Development Programs. Mr. Stevens offered his assistance to the TLC in this area. Chair Salazar responded that she felt the Legislature was aware; the TLC is waiting for Margaret to complete the work on the five high level principles before moving forward with the professional development piece.

MOTION: Member Small moved the TLC adopt the recommendations and forward the recommendations to the Communication Task Force regarding the summits and webinars for communications purposes in the fall of 2012, as well as a legislative summit in December of 2012. Member Galland-Collins seconded. The motion passed.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

The next meeting of the TLC is scheduled for August 20, 2012. It was suggested the following be on the agenda:

- Discussion on professional responsibilities for teachers, to include the parent/family engagement component;
- Discuss the administrator framework and/or professional responsibilities for administrators;
- Update on communications plan;
- Request that Kate Lipor, Educational Council, make a presentation on what is happening nationally on the legalities of the evaluation tools;
- Communications Task Force Update;
- Discussion/update regarding the replacement of Council Members who have resigned; and
- Discussion and possible development of ad hoc task forces to address the issues around:
    - Defining teacher groups and differentiation of model weighting by group.
    - Next steps for teacher evaluation results around:
        - Reporting

- Human capital decisions
- Professional development decisions
- Process around the above

- Discuss reporting and the use of evaluation data.

MEETING SUMMARY AND INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND COMMENTS FROM TASK FORCE MEMBERS

The meeting summary and informational items discussion was tabled.

Member Fitzpatrick thanked the Communications Task Force and the Joint Task Force Members for all of their time, hard work, and dedication in this process.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Stevens expressed concern there were educators and administrators out there who feel unprotected by this process. He expressed concern over how information was disseminated and the importance of the buy in by these educators and administrators.

Chair Salazar adjourned the meeting at 1:47 P.M.

The next meeting of the Teachers and Leaders Council is scheduled for August 20, 2012 at **Hyatt Place Las Vegas, 4520 Paradise Rd., Las Vegas, NV**. For your convenience, minutes and agendas are posted on the Nevada Department of Education's website, under Commissions & Councils, at http://www.doe.nv.gov.