

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

October 15, 2012
Hyatt Place Las Vegas
4520 Paradise Road, Meeting Place 9
Las Vegas, Nevada

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
Dale Norton, Member
Mary Peterson, Member
Theodore Small, Member

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

Laurie Thake, Administrative Assistant
Russ Keglovits, Consultant
Leslie James, Administrative Staff to the Council
Monie Byers, Parental Involvement Consultant

LEGAL COUNSEL:

Shane Chesney, Senior Deputy Attorney General

INVITED GUESTS:

Sujie Shin, Sr. Assessment Manager, Assessment and Standards Development
Services at WestEd
Linda Archambault

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

Francine Mayfield, Sierra Nevada College
Jesse Wells, Clark County School District
Pam Hicks, Deputy Administrator for CCASAPE
Eve Breier, University of Phoenix
Sue Egloff, Clark County School District
Dave Erbach, Clark County School District
Jamey Hood, Clark County School District
Devin Heintz, Clark County School District

Joy Pearson, Clark County School District
Karen Leggett, Clark County School District
Matthew Lopes, Clark County School District
Dave Brancamp, NWRPDP
Jillyn Pendelton, Clark County School District
Jeff Halsell, Clark County School District
Marle Newburn
Robert Mars, Clark County School District
Keith Walz, ECSD
Kristen McNeill, Washoe County School District
Meg Nigro, Clark County School District
Esther Kassouf, University of Phoenix
Iletha Groom, Clark County School District, EODD
Barbara Clark, Parental Involvement Advisory Council
Jose Delfin, Carson City School District
Lea Casey, Students First

CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Salazar called the meeting to order at 8:36 A.M., with attendance reflected above. It was determined that a quorum was present.

Chair Salazar led the pledge of allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Pam Hicks, Deputy Administrator for CCASAPE, strongly encouraged the Council to listen to the individuals who work in education and in our schools with students every day.

Jesse Wells, a principal at White Middle School in the Clark County School District, commended the Council for their work and expressed concern that there are some things implicitly included in the indicators but explicitly stated items such as classroom management is missing and professional responsibility . Mr. Wells expressed concern with the observations and timelines and being able to meet the requirements. Mr. Wells stated that there are schools that employ a lot of probationary teachers, which requires three evaluations a year for the first three years, for a total of nine evaluations; this places a large time constraint on the administrator of that school. Mr. Wells expressed concern with regards to the teacher effectiveness piece, when there are long-term substitutes in the classroom, included in the administrator evaluation framework.

Jillyn Pendelton, a principal at Clark County High School, stated that she worked on the Race to the Top application and noticed that the Council has stated that students should be taught by great teachers and led by great administrators; which she also believes. But there are challenges for at-risk and inner-city schools and requested that the Council consider some of the issues that teachers and administrators face in these schools; such as high school students who come in underachieving and suggested using assessment tools in high schools which are not limited to another test. Ms. Pendelton stated that assessment for the sake of assessment may not be the best way to go and teachers and administrators need to be incentivized to work in at-risk and inner-city schools. Ms. Pendelton commended the Council for their work and looks forward to the focus groups.

Bob Mars, a principal at Silverado High School, thanked the Council for all of their hard work. Mr. Mars expressed appreciation for including other data other than test scores in the evaluation. Mr. Mars stated that the evaluation cycle includes three evaluations; for a probationary teacher in the Clark County School District this means that there are three observations for each evaluation, three evaluations per year for a period of three years for a total of nine observations for each probationary teacher. Some schools have upwards of fifteen probationary teachers and requested that the Council reconsider how that will work for those teachers and the administrators of those schools.

Dave Erbach, a principal at a middle school in Henderson - Clark County School District, made four points: 1) it is important to make "best practice" a part of the evaluation and receive credit for performing best practices; 2) In the administrator evaluation there is too much focus on what the student is doing, not what the teacher is doing; 3) may need to further explain terminology contained in the framework as there may be an understanding issue for some teachers; and 4) find out what the best teachers do and then train others to do that.

APPROVAL OF A FLEXIBLE AGENDA

MOTION: Member McCord moved for a flexible agenda, seconded by Member Cheney. The motion passed.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE MAY 21, 2012, JULY 11, 2012, JULY 25, 2012, AND AUGUST 20, 2012 TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL MEETINGS

MOTION: Member McCord moved to approve the May 21, 2012 TLC meeting minutes with an editorial amendment, seconded by Member Collins. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Member McCord moved to approve the July 11, 2012 TLC meeting minutes as submitted, seconded by Member Small. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Member McCord moved to approve the July 25, 2012 TLC meeting minutes as submitted, seconded by Member Cheney. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Member Norton moved to approve the August 20, 2012 TLC meeting minutes as submitted, seconded by Member Collins. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Salazar pointed out that the Council Members did receive a copy of the above referenced minutes prior to today's meeting to review prior to approval.

**REVIEW AND APPROVE UPDATED SYSTEMS GUIDELINES WHITE PAPER;
INCLUDING CLARIFYING ANY QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE MEMBERS, AND IF
NECESSARY, ADOPT ANY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE TLC TO CONSIDER IN
REGARD TO CHANGES**

Member Fitzpatrick noted that there will be no action on this item, only a review of the changes to the White Paper and then in Item 13 the Council can take action on the changes.

Ms. Fitzpatrick stated that the White Paper sets forth preliminary recommendations established by the TLC and it is the goal and charge of the Council to develop and establish teacher and administrator evaluation frameworks. Enhancing educator evaluation presents Nevada with an unprecedented opportunity for systemic reform that can initiate the process of repositioning Nevada at the top of education. Educator evaluation can serve as the foundation to increasing educator effectiveness, retention, and equitable distribution of effective teachers and administrators.

Ms. Fitzpatrick reviewed the amendments to the White Paper for Council review. Ms. Fitzpatrick stated that included is a draft of the administrator evaluation framework and the Council will be discussing the high leverage leadership principles for administrators in correlation with the teacher evaluation framework.

Ms. Fitzpatrick updated that the Nevada Department of Education assembled the Technical advisory Team (TAT) who will be discussing and making recommendations to the Council. Russ Keglovits and Sujie Shin will be facilitating the TAT and at their last meeting worked through Appendix B – the draft work schedule and work scope; the last four pages are now incorporated into the White Paper.

Member McCord expressed that the Council needs to be responsive to public input and the concerns regarding observation timelines and classroom management; and recommended that the Council revisit this area. Member McCord suggested that the Council may want to add a diverse learners piece, as there can be challenging students and there needs to be an incremental rate implemented and appreciates some of the challenges that are faced by teachers and administrators.

It was discussed that the Council has previously discussed this and expressed the same concerns and decided that the framework needs to set a minimum number of evaluations and anything above that would be at the discretion of the school district.

Member Small stated that historically evaluations have not been used to improve practice and the intent is to change that tool and its implementation for teachers and administrators. Member Small suggested that administrators who have “highly effective” teachers maybe only have to perform the evaluation once a year or maybe every other year. Member Small stated that teachers and administrators need to think about their practice and set goals.

Member Collins expressed concern regarding a teacher who has a bad day. There needs to be time in between observations to put new practices into place. Part of the thinking is to ensure this evaluation is meaningful, without making it over burdening to others. This may require extra time and work but we want teachers to receive good feedback in order to make changes that will positively affect student outcomes.

The Council discussed to hold both pre- and post-observation conferences, unannounced observations should be part of the cycle, and that the evaluation comments should be explicit.

Vice Chair Barker expressed concern regarding the public comments expressed this morning and that the roll of the administrator evaluation framework may be different from previous evaluation and there needs to be a balance between the probationary teachers, long-term substitute teachers, and balancing the needs of all of the other staff members.

Member Crowley questioned how to adjust the data for students who are taught by a long-term substitute teacher all year and how that information correlates to the teacher evaluation. Member Norton echoed those comments for the administrator of that same school, as some small rural schools lose individuals and there is no one to come into the classroom and take over, except for the substitute teacher. It was discussed that the Council needs to think about contingency plans in this area.

Chair Salazar reiterated that an evaluation will never be based on a single year's data and there will be stabilization of using data over time. There will be challenges that can be dealt with over time and the Council needs to decide what that model looks like and to use the data.

Member Small questioned if there can be flexibility for new administrators. We have discussed to differentiate for teachers who are new to teaching, but we haven't discussed this for administrators who are new to being an administrator.

Ms. Fitzpatrick announced that Member Kimberly Tate has resigned from the Council.

UPDATE ON TIMELINE, LOCATIONS, AND AGENDA FOR OCTOBER SUMMITS TO REVIEW THE NV TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION FRAMEWORKS WITH TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS IN NEVADA

Leslie James stated that the main objective of the Summits is to listen and obtain feedback/concerns of administrators and teachers. The Summits have been scheduled by region and some of the questions have already been asked and will be addressed in future communications. At these Summits, educators will be provided with the history of the evaluation process and a draft of the new evaluation framework system. Some of the questions centered on the five high leverage principles, logistics, gap analysis, etc. Ms. James stated that one summit has been held at the Washoe County Teacher Association, with another scheduled at Wooster High School next week, one scheduled in Clark County for October 30th and one in eastern Nevada – which is not yet scheduled.

Linda Archambault will be hosting the administrator summits scheduled as follows:

- October 24 at Bonanza High School;
- October 25 in Nye County;
- October 29 in Washoe County; and
- October 30 in Elko.

Ms. Archambault stated that each District Superintendent has been asked to ensure representation from each school, as most administrators are not aware of either evaluation framework. Ms. Archambault stated that she will report back to the Council at the November 2nd meeting regarding the feedback and concerns expressed at the Summits.

It was discussed that the main focus of these Summits is to receive feedback from teachers and administrators in an effort to move forward for a successful evaluation process.

Within a discussion, Member Fitzpatrick reported that the Department is working on developing a list of the required reports to the Legislature to include who is to author the report and the due date for the reports.

UPDATE FROM THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN REGARD TO THE DEVELOPMENT AND MEASUREMENT OF THE FAMILY ENGAGEMENT INDICATOR WITHIN THE PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES RUBRIC

Barbara Clark, Chair of the Parental Involvement Advisory Council, made a powerpoint presentation and stated that the research shows there are positive effects on students when there is family engagement; family engagement is a partnership and shared responsibility towards student success. Ms. Clark stated that she and Ms. Byers attended a meeting of the national working group on family engagement in which they reviewed Nevada's model and Nevada is on the cusp of becoming a national model. Ms. Clark stated that research has been ongoing for 30 plus years on standards for family engagement and parental involvement linked to the success of children. The research shows that all six factors are required for effective family engagement. In 2001, the Nevada Legislature adopted AB 201 which mandated parental involvement policies. AB 224 mandated that licensed teachers must complete three (3) hours of coursework on family engagement.

Monie Byers recommended that the rubric and indicators correlate with the six standards for family engagement which are nationally established. The Standards define family engagement, alignment equals effectiveness, with the goal to be a data driven state.

Ms. Clark offered that within professional responsibility there is a link of family engagement to student achievement and in making parents partners. The indicators are based on the six standards. There is a need to value and recognize family engagement as indicators within their own groups and provide parents with the tools for a partnership. The family engagement component is the missing piece to student achievement.

A break was granted at 10:36 A.M.
The meeting reconvened at 11:00 A.M.

The Council reviewed and discussed the recommended six standards from the Parental Involvement Advisory Council:

1. Welcoming all families into the school community. The teacher values, respects, and welcomes families and sees them as assets in supporting student learning. The teacher demonstrates a positive educational environment and treats families in respectful and culturally sensitive ways and welcomes their active engagement in the classroom because he or she believes that all families want the best for their student and that family engagement will help students reach their achievement goals, regardless of parents' socioeconomic background or education level. The teachers' interactions are supportive, courteous, and respectful with students, families, staff, community members, and other professionals.
2. Communicating effectively. Written and spoken interactions between families and the teacher are respectful and pleasant. Starting in the beginning of the year, families receive positive, consistent information and affirmation from teachers on the importance of their engagement. Families receive regular, personal invitations to visit the classroom and engage in their student's education. There is a system for regular two-way meaningful home/classroom communication in place. The teacher communicates with families in a manner and format that is accessible and easy to understand for all literacy levels. Information for families is provided in a variety of formats, including phone calls, e-mails, written and translated web blasts, and home visits or meetings in community forums. The teacher considers the language needs of families.
3. Supporting student success. The teacher uses data to show families how their student's are doing. Families can access weekly, personalized student performance and/or assessment data and can use the information to describe how their child is doing related to the student's individual goals and to the class average for that grade-level. The teacher helps families support student learning at home by providing opportunities for families to strengthen their knowledge and skills to do so effectively. Families receive information and specific strategies and ideas, throughout the school year, on how they can support learning at home and create an environment conducive to learning. This information is individualized to their student's specific needs and provides actionable details about what their student needs to do to make progress toward his or her academic goals.
4. Speaking up for every child. Teachers help families ask the right questions about their student's progress and placement. Teachers work with families to access and take advantage of resources, programs and learning opportunities that support their student's success and help families to advocate for their student. Teachers identify student's who would benefit from alternative courses and programs such as GT, AP, IEPs, multi-tiered systems of support, parent portal systems, etc., and provide assistance and help and empower families to navigate

these systems. Teachers empower and encourage families' advocacy for their students to resolve problems/conflicts in the classroom or in the school.

5. Sharing power. The teacher collaborates with the families to establish an equal voice in all decisions that affect their student. Teacher identifies ways in which he/she can inform, include and consult families in decisions that affect their student. Encourage families to become active participants in the school or district to attend decision-making meetings such as parent organizations, school improvement, etc. Identify and connect families from different cultural backgrounds that represent the overall school populations, to be part of parent leadership council/group at the school.
6. Collaborating with community. Teachers inform and connect families and students to opportunities and services in the school, district and community; make referrals to programs and plan activities that provide expanded learning opportunities. The teacher makes sure community partnership activities strengthen families and link to student learning. Invite community members and organizations into the classroom to share experiences, expertise, and services. Families are invited to these activities to allow access to valuable information.

MOTION: Following discussion, Member Peterson moved to modify the professional obligations with attention paid to speaking up for every child included in the language for the rubric in family engagement, seconded by Member Collins. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Holdheide moved the discussion to the support of student success and the supporting of student success and sharing the power. This will be further discussed in the performance levels.

Ms. Holdheide discussed with regards to welcoming families into the school community; that a teacher needs to know something about the student in order to be able to educate effectively.

It was discussed whether the standard "communicating effectively" needs to be a standalone principle and whether the manner and format is accessible and understandable.

It was discussed with regard to "collaborating with community", how to engage families and whether there is an outreach for problems with how our system is set up as a whole.

It was discussed that the only part that a teacher has control over is the effort they put forth and the lack of control over parental engagement . There is cultural sensitivity.

These will be further discussed later in the agenda with Ms. Heritage.

PROPOSE, REVIEW, AND DISCUSS THE PERFORMANCE LEVELS TO BE DETERMINED BY EACH INDICATOR UNDER EACH OF THE HIGH LEVERAGE PRINCIPLES WITHIN THE INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE DOMAIN OF THE NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK. DISCUSS NEXT STEPS RELATIVE TO FINALIZING THE ADOPTION OF THOSE PERFORMANCE LEVELS AND THEN POSSIBLY TAKE ACTION.

Ms. Heritage stated that they completed the literature review for all of the five principles. Ms. Heritage stated that they will hand out the literature review for Council Members to take home, review and provide feedback within the next week. Ms. Heritage stated that they continue to work on the final appendix and including key studies.

The principles handout was distributed and it was stated that the performance levels and indicators will be ready for review at the November 2, 2012 meeting.

Ms. Heritage reviewed the performance levels on a scale of 1 to 4- with 4 being the highest. 1 is “not evident”; 2 is “the sum evidence of practice with a long way to go”; 3 is “good enough”; and 4 is “wow – the gold standard”.

Ms. Heritage reviewed Principle 1 – New Learning Connected to Prior Learning with indicators and performance levels, along with mandatory evidence that has been updated from the performance levels.

Principle 4 – Students Increasing Metacognitive Activity to increase understanding of and responsibility for their own learning. There are three indicators and four levels. Level 1 is that all students cannot explain the learning goal; Level 2 is most students can vaguely explain the learning goal; Level 3 most students can generally explain and most students can fully explain two of the three learning goals; and Level 4 is that all students in the class can fully explain the learning goals.

It was discussed that Level 4 is intentionally set high and this is considered the “gold” standard and is the goal that all teachers should be working toward.

Member Small stated that we want Level 4 to be attainable, but also realistic as well.

Ms. Heritage stated that in order to have reliability in this, evaluators need to be trained. The Council may want to define “all” and as what is said is not always understood.

Upon questioning, Ms. Heritage stated that most of the teachers she knows will be at Level 2.

Member McCord stated that the distance between Level 2 and 3 is huge and the distances between the levels is not consistent. Ms. Heritage responded that if most of the teachers get to Level 3 that would be a good teaching force. "Highly effective" teachers will be an elite group of teachers with teachers and leaders moving from teacher-centered instruction to student-centered instruction.

Member Cheney expressed concern about unintended consequences of mentally developmentally disabled students, especially moderate to severe, not being welcomed into classrooms. We need to ensure we are not going to exclude these students. Ms. James responded that maybe this is where the IEP comes in.

A lunch break was granted at 12:01 P.M.
The meeting reconvened at 12:47 P.M.

The Council continued their review and discussion of the Indicators for Principal 4.

Indicator 2: Level 1 is all students engage in no or almost no reflection of their learning status; Level 2 is that most students do not engage in adequate reflection of their learning status; Level 3 is that most students adequately engage in reflection of their learning status; and Level 4 is all student actively engage in reflection on their learning status. The focus is on the goal of learning and students can learn the new routines and structures.

Member Peterson expressed concern with the terms: "frequently", "adequate" and "sufficient" and inquired as to whether these terms can be defined through professional development; as the terms can be very subjective.

It was discussed that in building the profession, Principle 4 is something to strive for and a way to improve the profession but it is also about the culture in the school.

Member McCord asked if there could be a third party in making a judgment call; an objective evaluation may be a good idea. Ms. Heritage felt this is a good idea and suggested a peer and is sure that every school has one or two people that everyone trusts.

Ms. Shin stated that with regards to performance levels for teachers, there needs to be a lot of communication going into resetting expectations and what it means to be a good, strong teacher. An individual who obtains a Level 3 indicates that they are a very

good and strong teacher in the classroom. It was discussed that at the end of the day, there will be very few teachers who obtain a Level 4; there needs to be a trust in the system that they will be supported.

Ms. Shin stated that in the roll out of this evaluation system there will be a learning process and the way that the system is rolled out will affect the buy in with teachers. Ms. Heritage stated that this also applies to administrators on how they are helping their teachers in this process.

Indicator 3: Level 1 is all students take no or almost no actions; Level 2 is most students actions are infrequently based on their own assessment; Level 3 is most students frequently take actions based largely on their own assessment; and Level 4 is all students routinely take actions based on their own assessment of their learning status. Ms. Heritage stated that you want to see students thinking for themselves and advance learning with independent thinking and with a teacher's support. We need to engage children at the youngest levels.

Member Peterson stated that when we pilot this system and if we do correlation studies, you would want to see a strong correlation between growth and proficiencies.

Principle 5 – Indicator 1: Level 1 is that the teacher does not, or rarely, plans ongoing learning opportunities; Level 2 is that a teacher sometimes plans ongoing learning opportunities; Level 3 is that a teacher frequently plans ongoing learning opportunities; and Level 4 is that the teacher fully aligns assessment opportunities with clearly specified goals.

Indicator 2: Level 1 the teacher does not align assessment opportunities with any learning goals; Level 2 is the teacher inadequately aligns assessment opportunities with specified learning goals; Level 3 is the teacher adequately aligns assessment opportunities; and Level 4 is that the teacher fully aligns assessment opportunities with clearly specified goals.

Indicator 3: Level 1 is the teacher structures no, or almost no, opportunities to generate evidence; Level 2 is the teacher structures limited opportunities to generate evidence of any student learning; Level 3 is teacher structures adequate opportunities to generate evidence; and Level 4 is teacher structures multiple and varied opportunities to generate evidence of all student's learning.

It was discussed that multiple and varied information is important and that there is more than one source of information; ALL is important here, as well. Member Cheney

questioned where a student teacher falls in this continuum? Ms. Heritage stated that many states are indicating that new incoming teachers are not sufficiently trained.

Indicator 4: Level 1 is that the teacher continues with the planned lesson regardless of any evidence; Level 2 is the teacher inadequately adapts her/his actions for most students; Level 3 is the teacher adequately adapts her/his actions for most students in response to evidence; and Level 4 is the teacher competently adapts her/his actions for all students in response to evidence. This provides the teacher a license for flexibility. It was discussed that it is a good thing to show students that mistakes can be made and evaluated and reworked and then re-evaluated. This is an effort to go for a reflective practitioner.

Member Fitzpatrick recommended that the TLC recommend that the State Board of Education direct the Department of Education to develop a guidance document to support implementation of the system.

ACTION: Chair Salazar requested Ms. Heritage to provide additional guidance regarding the professional responsibilities piece and family engagement and maybe remove communications, as there are some areas where these overlap in an effort to build out the rubrics. Ms. Heritage stated that she would like to be able to think about this and report back to the Council at a future meeting.

PROPOSE, REVIEW, AND DISCUSS THE INDICATORS TO BE MEASURED WITHIN THE PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES DOMAIN OF THE NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK. DISCUSS NEXT STEPS RELATIVE TO THE FINALIZING THE ADOPTION OF THOSE INDICATORS AND THEN POSSIBLE TAKE ACTION

Chair Salazar stated that this item has been covered in Items 6 and 7 and will be further discussed at the next meeting.

PROPOSE, REVIEW, AND DISCUSS THE HIGH LEVERAGE LEADERSHIP PRINCIPLES TO BE MEASURED WITHIN THE NEVADA ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION FRAMEWORK TO ORIENT THE TLC AS TO HOW THESE MAP TO ISLLC, NBPTS AND NEW LEADERS/NEW SCHOOLS CURRENT ADMINISTRATOR STANDARDS AND POSSIBLE NEXT STEPS. POSSIBLY TAKE ACTION TO ADOPT THESE PRINCIPLES

Ms. Heritage reviewed the Crosswalk of High Leverage Instructional Leadership Principles and Nationally Recognized Standards handout. The foundation for the development of this crosswalk is this is what we expect teachers to do; and thus

administrators need to do “this” to support teachers. Literature has an effect on leadership and we want it to be clear and to the point and based on instructional practice.

The TLC reviewed and discussed the four principles:

1. Create and sustain a focus on learning.
 - a. Focus for all students who walk in the door that they will learn, including families.
2. Create and sustain a culture of continuous improvement
 - a. If you are a 2, there should be an expectation to get assistance to become better.
 - b. If you are a 4, then you need to be a 4+ and sustain a culture of continuous improvement.
3. Create and sustain productive relationships
 - a. Take advice and input from others and create and sustain productive relationships with parents, business leaders, etc. in the service of the learning of the students of that school.
4. Create and sustain structures
 - a. Enable the community to be a part of the school and enable resources to be managed effectively.

Linda Archambault stated that she felt that the four principles are critical and they will be key in the indicators and measures.

Keith Walz stated that he would like to see what the indicators are and how they will be measured.

MOTION: Member Crowley moved to adopt the four principles in an effort to move on to develop indicators with the four high leverage principles, seconded by Vice Chair Barker. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Heritage requested that the Council review the Literature Review and provide feedback, through Ms. Thake, by next Monday.

A break was granted at 2:40 P.M.
The meeting reconvened at 3:02 P.M.

UPDATE ON THE WORK OF THE AD HOC GROUPS REGARDING WHAT IS INFLUENCING DECISIONS TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE TLC AT THE NOVEMBER 14TH MEETING TO IDENTIFY INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION CRITERIA FOR THE THREE GROUPS IDENTIFIED (GROUP 1: TEACHERS IN STATE TESTED

GRADES AND SUBJECTS, GROUP 2: TEACHERS IN NON-STATE TESTED GRADES AND SUBJECTS, AND GROUP 3: SPECIALIST PERSONNEL), DETERMINATION OF APPROPRIATE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT INDICATORS, AND DISTRIBUTION OF EVALUATION CATEGORY WEIGHTINGS

Mr. Keglovits reviewed that at the August 20th TLC meeting the Nevada Department of Education was requested to develop an Ad Hoc Group to look at recommendations for and requirements of the teacher groups. Mr. Keglovits stated that there are three groups made up of individuals from around the state. The Ad Hoc group reviewed the framework, presented by Ms. Shin, component by component. The Ad Hoc group advised that status needs to remain in student outcomes. The Group expressed concern regarding growth. The Group discussed gap measures and felt that gaps will be a school wide measure and attributed to all teachers across the board. There will be challenges in some schools and grades, but there needs to be a school-wide measure.

The Group discussed the membership of Group 1 for grades 4-8 with ELA and mathematics as the subjects with 20 or more students taught and the CRT data would have to be currently available. For Group 2 would be for grades K-3 and 9-12 in all other subjects, not ELA or math, the number of students taught and the assessments to be used has yet to be determined as time progresses and an assessment is developed.

Member Small stated that specialist personnel meet with classroom teachers, and he feels that all teachers should be proficient with what their standards are in their area of licensure. Member Small stated that teachers should be thinking about what the standards are that are commonly assessed and how they incorporate that into their lessons; how the content they teach is tied into what the state assesses.

Ms. Shin asked the Council what flexibility they want to put into the weighting and what defines mathematics or ELA subjects not just ELA teachers will be responsible for ELA scores. Ms. Shin continued the discussion regarding smaller classes and the use of aggregate data for an evaluation score and if a teacher has taught less than two years, they will receive a score, but there will be no human capital decisions made on the score. Ms. Shin also asked the Council to consider what constitutes a “new” teacher and how long they maintain that status.

The Council held discussion regarding what grouping of teachers are included and/or excluded and does it revolve around new or experienced teachers.

Kristen McNeil stated that this has been a great discussion and asked the Council to remember the importance of the other side of the equation as well and how does that

look on the qualitative side of the data. If we don't look at school-wide data, then the other 50% is actually 100% on the qualitative side.

Ms. Holdheide stated that the Ad Hoc Group for Group 3 just recently met. Ms. James did an excellent job in the membership of this Group. This Group is reviewing the statutory requirements around Group 3 – “specialist personnel”, “other personnel” and the statutory requirement for “teachers”. It was stated that the definition of “teacher” is “a licensed employee who spends a majority of their working time rendering direct educational services”. This group will report at the next meeting.

The Council held a discussion with regard to who to include and exclude in Group 3 and how those specific groups of teachers spend their time with students. The following concerns were expressed:

- Who licenses these individuals?
- Do they spend a majority of their time rendering educational services?
- It could be very difficult to determine special support personnel, district by district.
- May need to be statutory language revision.
- How do the high leverage principles apply to Group 3?
- Do professional responsibilities apply?

Jose Delfin stated that a change in the definition may need to be a statutory language changed.

It was recommended for Group 3 that they not be included in the teacher evaluation framework in its current form and suggested that a different framework be built with a different slant.

Chair Salazar stated that the Council needs to make a decision regarding the following:

- Where does the TLC stand on the definition of “teacher”?
- Where do the high leverage principles fit in this?
- Are these roles treated differently from district to district?

Senior Deputy Attorney General questioned if there is another definition of teacher within NRS 385.3468(k)(3)(I) and (II). A teacher who spends 50% of the work year providing instruction, discipline, or support staff, without limitation to librarians.

The Council then discussed what does “instruction” mean?

Member Crowley stated that there needs to be a clear relevant definition for the evaluation process and the TLC needs to be clear about who we are talking about, otherwise every district will be having the same conversation over and over.

Chair Salazar stated that this issue will be discussed at the next meeting.

PROPOSE, REVIEW AND DISCUSS THE POTENTIAL METHODOLOGIES FOR DETERMINING SUMMATIVE RATINGS FOR THE NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK. DISCUSS NEXT STEPS RELATIVE TO FINALIZING THE ADOPTION OF THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS AND THEN POSSIBLY TAKE ACTION

Chair Salazar stated that this item is tabled until the next meeting.

REVIEW, RETHINK, DISCUSS, REFINE, MAKE CHANGES TO AND POSSIBLY APPROVE AN OCTOBER 15, 2012 VERSION OF THE SYSTEMS GUIDELINES WHITE PAPER

Chair Salazar noted the discussed items and this item will be tabled and discussed at the next meeting. Chair Salazar requested Council Members to send any notes they would like to be included to Ms. Thake and those notes will be discussed at the next meeting.

Chair Salazar stated that a draft of the White Paper will be mailed to Council Members with the changes tracked.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Chair Salazar stated that Dr. Stanley Rabinowitz from WestEd will be at the next TLC meeting to discuss weighting and the agendas. Chair Salazar stated that a discussion regarding professional development will also be on the agenda.

Chair Salazar stated that the homework for Council Members is to review the Literature Review and provide feedback and reference the section by Monday to Ms. Thake. Chair Salazar also requested that Council Members review a segment of Ed Council and read the ten pages in preparation of Stanley's presentation.

MEETING SUMMARY

Chair Salazar tabled this item.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no additional Council Member comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Pam Hicks, Deputy Director of the School Administrators Association, stated that in regards to the White Paper that professional development needed is going to be different from what people think of as professional development. Ms. Hicks also stated that it should be elaborated on how much professional development is going to be needed.

Jose Delfin stated that in reference to Group 3, most school districts already have a separate evaluation for different educators and it depends on what district you are coming from. Mr. Delfin suggested that the Council may want to discuss differentiated learning and staffing as well. Mr. Delfin stated that we are all empowered to learn and as we review this model, the Council might want to think about a teacher's behavior in an educational setting other than in a classroom.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT

Chair Salazar adjourned the meeting at 4:24 P.M.