

**NEVADA TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)
MEETING MINUTES**

August 20, 2012

Hyatt Place
4520 Paradise Road; Meeting Place 9
Las Vegas, Nevada

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pamela Salazar, Chair
Barbara Surritte-Barker, Vice Chair
Linda Archambault, Member
Christine Cheney, Member
Kathleen Galland-Collins, Member
Theresa Crowley, Member – left the meeting at 11:45 A.M.
Rorie Fitzpatrick, Member
Sharla Hales, Member
Robert McCord, Member
Theo McCormick, Member
Dale Norton, Member
Theodore Small, Member
Kimberly Tate, Member – arrived at 9:45 A.M.

COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mary Peterson, Member – excused
Theodore Small, Member – excused

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

Laurie Thake, Administrative Assistant
Leslie James, Title IIA Education Program Professional
Russ Keglovits, Assessment, Program Accountability, and Curriculum
Krishanu Sengupta, Director of Teacher Licensure

LEGAL COUNSEL:

Shane Chesney, Senior Deputy Attorney General

INVITED GUESTS:

Sujie Shin	Senior Manager, Assessment and Standards Development at WestEd
Lynn Holdheide	Consultant, American Institutes for Research (AIR)
Judy Osgood	Nevada Governor's Office

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

Pam Hicks	CCASAPE
Kristen McNeill	Washoe County School District

Barbara Gnatovich	Sierra Nevada College
Nicole Rourke	Clark County School District
Jane Newton	League of Women Voters

CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Salazar called the meeting to order at 8:45 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 Cheney moved for a flexible agenda. Member Galland-Collins seconded. The motion passed.

REVIEW OF THE MOTIONS PASSED DURING THE INDICATORS/MEASURES AND MODELS JOINT TASK FORCE MEETING ON 7/24/2012 AND THE TLC MEETING ON 7/25/2012 AND A DRAFT OF THE SYSTEMS GUIDELINES WHITE PAPER AS OF 8/20/2012

Ms. Holdheide reviewed the motions and actions taken at the last TLC meeting:

- 1) Approval of the difference in “teacher groups” based on school job description and evaluation;
- 2) Implementation of timeline, related to student growth data, and the impact of when different scores are recorded;
- 3) The phase-in of the system might be differentiated by groups of teachers;
- 4) Determine if different assessments are either available or not available to measure student growth;
- 5) The creation of the Technical Advisory Group for pilot validation;
- 6) Adoption of the draft work schedule; and
- 7) Recommendations as to summits and webinars for communication outreach in the fall.

The TLC reviewed the most recent updates to the *White Paper* and the following amendments were proposed:

- Amendments to effectiveness categories to keep the language in line with the statutory language: Highly effective through ineffective.

- Additions to the Glossary to clarify the intent: High leverage principles, or main objective of effective teachers and administrators, as identified by the Nevada Teachers and Leaders Council based on a robust body of research.
 - Add and define: Indicator and Professional Responsibility.
- Include the guiding beliefs for a new educator evaluation system.
- The evaluation process will lead to continually improving student achievement for all learners.
- Amendments to the evaluation system must include student, teacher, administrator, performance; as well as achievement measured over time using multiple measures, multiple times, and over multiple years (language to be consistent with NRS).

There was discussion on sub-population groups and gaps in performance. Members agreed every teacher can improve. There will be more clarity as to what is meant by the reduction in subpopulation gaps ;we want to raise the lower group and not lower the higher group. There was discussion regarding clarification in the wording of subpopulations, but no action was taken at this time.

It was stated the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) is to be comprised of nationally recognized group of experts and there are individuals in Nevada that would fit this description. Chair Salazar stated that since Nevada is part of the Southwest Regional Comprehensive Center , Nevada has access to experts with knowledge of Nevada. Member Fitzpatrick responded there are individuals in Nevada who are nationally recognized experts and stated she was unsure if local district personnel would want to be a part of the TAG which would reject or approve other school districts' systems. This may be an area where the TLC may want to have national experts making those decisions.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE DIFFERENT GROUPS OF “TEACHERS” (AS DEFINED BY NRS 391.311) TO BE IDENTIFIED FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Chair Salazar led the discussion regarding the Teacher Evaluation Framework and how different groups impact the components of the teacher framework itself.

Ms. Holdheide reviewed the three groups: teachers in tested grades; teachers in non-tested grades; and “other licensed personnel” to include librarians, school psychologists, speech/language specialists, etc. – those individuals who have a stake in instruction, but are not directly involved with instruction. The basic bones of the evaluation process and the measures are the same; just adjusted based on the type of educator you are. Ms. Holdheide stated teacher grouping is commonly based on several components: 1) individual value added; 2) teaching and learning framework; 3) observation rubric; 4) school community/professional responsibility; and 5) school wide value added. Members discussed that as the instruments are validated over time, the percentages and weighting will change. It was agreed there is the need to build confidence in the system before a weight can accurately be placed.

Ms. Holdheide stated the frameworks contain standard language, but are adjusted further for areas such as special education. The frameworks provide specific guidance for different groups and subgroups. The rubric does not change, but the focus for the different areas changes.

The TLC reviewed the frameworks and percentages adopted and currently used in Washington D.C., Michigan, and Tennessee.

It was discussed to divide educators to three large groups for initial implementation, with the understanding these groups will be reviewed and expanded over time:

- Group 1: teachers in state tested grades and subjects (as defined by NRS 391.311)
- Group 2: teachers in non-tested grades and subjects (as defined by NRS 391.311)
- Group 3: specialist personnel (as defined by NRS 391.XXX) (e.g., related services, librarians).

MOTION: Member Crowley moved to accept the designation of the three groups of teachers: Group 1: teachers in state tested grades and subjects (as defined by NRS 391.311); Group 2: teachers in non-tested grades and subjects (as defined by NRS 391.311); Group 3: specialist personnel (as defined by NRS 391.XXX) (e.g., related services, librarians, nurses, speech/language specialists , etc.) to proceed with discussions. Member Cheney seconded. The motion passed.

A fifteen minute break was granted.
The meeting reconvened.

MOTION: Member Barker moved the TLC recommend the State Department of Education create an ad hoc committee to identify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for each group and report back to the TLC. Member Galland-Collins seconded. The motion passed.

MOTION: Member Tate moved the TLC recommend the State Department of Education create an ad hoc committee to focus on the specialist personnel group to work with the appropriate associations with respect to their professional standards and report back to the TLC. Member Galland-Collins seconded. The motion passed.

It was clarified the ad hoc committees would also discuss how to measure growth in each of the groups.

Ms. Holdheide stated the TLC identified the following:

- The instructional principles rubric;
- The professional responsibilities rubric; and
- The student growth and student engagement pieces.

Now the TLC needs to determine how those rubrics will be rated and scored. Ms. Holdheide indicated the TLC will need to make decisions with regard to the growth aspects, following the

reports of the ad hoc committees, and also discuss if there will be a correlation between practice and growth.

Ms. Holdheide led the discussion on professional practice standards. Previously, the TLC agreed to use the following four categories: family engagement; self reflection and professional growth; contribution to the school community; and professional obligations. Having reviewed a lot of different rubrics, Ms. Holdheide suggested having one rubric which would state: A teacher's commitment to the school, students, families, and the community; which would align with family engagement, contribution to the school community, self-reflection and professional growth, and professionalism.

Member Tate cautioned to not lose the impact and importance of family engagement on student improvement. She expressed concern the emphasis will be lost if family engagement is lumped into this rubric. Member Tate would like family engagement to be under student achievement; as family engagement has a direct impact on student achievement.

The TLC reviewed the family engagement pieces to include responding to family communication in a timely and positive manner, understand that there is a two-way form of communication, and understand and use multiple modes of communication. For the area of student progress, there is a need to ensure a teacher is providing updates on student progress on a continual basis, handling family concerns with compassion and cultural responsibility, and involving families in the learning environment.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING HOW TO MEASURE THE PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES COMPONENTS OF THE NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO BE TAKEN REGARDING ISSUES IDENTIFIED DURING THE JULY 24, 2012 INDICATORS/MEASURES AND MODELS JOINT TASK FORCE MEETING AND THE JULY 25, 2012 TLC MEETING

Ms. Holdheide reviewed the Nevada Model Rubrics for Measuring Professional Practice handout.

With regards to family engagement, it was discussed this piece should be presented to the Advisory Council on Parental Involvement, which already exists within the Department of Education, for input. It was discussed that parents are not currently involved in the education process and parents need to help determine if their children are on the right track.

Ms. James stated the Advisory Council on Parental Involvement would like to provide input and would like to participate in the process of developing a rubric. The Council would be able to help provide draft language in the family engagement area.

MOTION: Member Tate moved the TLC recommend the Nevada Department of Education request the family engagement piece of the rubric be presented to the Advisory Council on Parental Involvement with a request for review and recommendations on the rubric to be presented at the November 2, 2012 TLC meeting. Member Galland-Collins seconded. The motion passed.

Chair Salazar introduced Krishanu Sengupta as the new Director of Teacher Licensure for the Nevada Department of Education.

A lunch break was granted at 11:45 A.M.
The meeting reconvened at 12:55 P.M.

Chair Salazar requested Ms. Holdheide discuss the rubric from a conceptual perspective, so if there is a motion it will recommend conceptual ideas and then ask the ad hoc committees to develop the actual rubric for TLC approval. Ms. Holdheide continued the discussion with regard to the rubric - commitment to the school community and if it meets the high level practices and how teachers participate/collaborate in the school. Ms. Holdheide recommended that the TLC work on refining the rubric instead of creating a new rubric, as there is not sufficient time to design a new rubric.

The TLC discussed conceptually the most important elements for school community. The following were discussed and endorsed: support the whole school as a community, involvement in school initiatives, and creating a cultural of community-school spirit. Members suggested rewording to include more high leverage language: collaborate with colleagues to impact all students; support school and district initiatives; and support school culture and community.

Ms. Holdheide led the discussion with regard to self-reflection and professional growth. Members discussed the need for an accountability piece for both teachers and administrators; mentoring included in leadership as part of level; and within professionalism, the importance of teachers to keeping records and making entries in a timely and effective manner.

It was discussed that there are eight standards which need to be defined over the three large categories and should be set up parallel to how Margaret sets up the rubrics for the instructional principles.

MOTION: Vice Chair Barker moved for the TLC to request the Department of Education to engage in association with a group to work on the components of the rubric, already discussed, and create language which supports the direction of the TLC, and return to the TLC with recommendations. Member Norton seconded. The motion passed.

A break was granted at 2:10 P.M.
The meeting reconvened at 2:30 P.M.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY TEAM (TAT) TO THE TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL, AS IDENTIFIED BY THE NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (NDE)

Leslie James made a presentation regarding the Technical Advisory Team.

Ms. James stated that the purpose of the Technical Advisory Team (TAT) will help inform the parameters of the chosen pilots and evaluation studies and/or review data from the evaluation studies and make decisions about what the data means and how to inform the TLC. Currently, there are discussions with groups that helped the NDE put together a Request For Proposal (RFP) for those studies. The TAT could help inform and respond to the data from those studies.

Individuals who would be on the TAT need the following skills: sound statistical understanding, pedagogical understanding, understand how data for the state can be collected at the school and district level, and educator growth.

Member Fitzpatrick stated in addition to the validation studies, there will be a need to analyze growth data using the growth models towards refinement of the tools in the spring 2013.

Member Fitzpatrick stated Senator Denis recommended an Education Effects Summit sometime in December, whereby key policymakers, including legislators and newly elected and appointed State Board of Education Members could come together to learn about the issues and become familiar with the recommendations of the TLC before the start of the 2013 legislative session.

UPDATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE NEXT STEPS, TIMELINES, AND DEVELOPMENT NEEDS FROM THE COMMUNICATIONS TASK FORCE AS A RESULT OF THE MODELS AND INDICATORS/MEASURES JOINT TASK FORCE MEETING WHICH TOOK PLACE ON JULY 24, 2012

Member Fitzpatrick stated this issue was previously addressed at the July 25, 2012 TLC meeting. To recap, there continues to be interest in pursuing a series of webinars, focus groups, and stakeholder meetings in the months of September and October, and moving towards the Educational Summit in December. The focus of the groups would include in-person experiences, discussion, and teaching about draft versions of the model. The morning session would be to inform and teach regarding the framework, and the afternoon session would be for the smaller focus groups in which Council Members would be listening to individuals, but not answering questions at the meeting.

Member Tate stated the reception from the presentations was that many people were not aware of this process. The parents are protective of the teachers and more critical of administrators to ensure that teachers are provided with the appropriate tools in which to teach and stimulate student growth.

Member McCord and Member Small will be making a presentation to Clark County School Board members in October.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMMENTS

Member Fitzpatrick discussed the previous recommendation to remove the timeline from the *White Paper* as it was no longer accurate. Member Fitzpatrick strongly encouraged the TLC to update the timeline so TLC members, stakeholders, and members of the public are clear on the timeline. The timeline should be updated and placed back in the *White Paper*. Member McCord responded and suggested making the timeline a separate link on the website.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

It was suggested the State Department of Education research the meaning of “teacher of record” and make recommendations to the TLC at the next meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Russ Keglovits, Department of Education Consultant, expressed concern from the IT Department and recommended defining “teacher of record” as this will help define data pieces at the state level.

Pam Hicks, Deputy Director of the Clark County School Administrators Association, expressed appreciation for the Council’s work. Ms. Hicks questioned if the administrator’s framework will be completed and presented to the State Board of Education at their December meeting.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMMENTS

Member Fitzpatrick stated the Council has a deliverable of teacher and administrator framework evaluations in December to the Nevada State Board of Education.

Chair Salazar adjourned the meeting at 3:00 P.M.

*The next meeting of the Teachers and Leaders Council is scheduled for **September 18, 2012 at Hyatt Place Reno, 1790 East Plumb Lane, Reno, NV 89502.** 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>.*