# NEVADA TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL MEETING November 2, 2012

Hyatt Place Las Vegas 4520 Paradise Road Las Vegas, NV 89169

## MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

# **COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Pamela Salazar, Chair
Barbara Surritte-Barker, Vice Chair
Kathleen Galland-Collins, Member
Rorie Fitzpatrick, Member
Sharla Hales, Member
Robert McCord, Member
Dale Norton, Member
Mary Peterson, Member
Theo Small, Member

# **COUNCIL MEMBER EXCUSED:**

Christine Cheney, Member Theresa Crowley, Member Theo McCormick, Member

# **DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:**

Leslie James Title IIA Education Programs Professional

Russ Keglovits Assessment, Program Accountability, and Curriculum

Laurie Thake Administrative Assistant

Richard Vineyard Assistant Director; Assessment, Program Accountability, and Curriculum

**LEGAL COUNSEL:** 

Robert Whitney Deputy Attorney General

**INVITED GUESTS:** 

Dr. Linda Archambault National Principal of the Year; Former TLC Member

Dr. Stanley Rabinowitz Senior Program Director, WestEd

Lynn Holdheide Consultant, American Institutes for Research

Dr. Margaret Heritage Senior Researcher for CRESST

Barbara Jones Researcher for CRESST

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:** 

Dave Erbach CCSD – Mannion Middle School

Pam Hicks CCASAPE

Kristen McNeill WCSD

Robert Mars CCSD – Silverado High School
Jamey Hood CCSD – Garrett Junior High School

Jesse Welsh CCSD – Thurman White

Jeff Hybarger CCSD – Goynes Elementary School

Jill Pendelton CCSD – Clark High School

Mark Newburn Vizics Nicole Rourke CCSD

Jose Delfin Carson City School District

Francine Mayfield SNC

# 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 a quorum was present.

Chair Salazar led the pledge of allegiance.

## **Public Comment.**

Chair Salazar requested public comment and the following comments were provided:

Dave Erbach: Middle school principal in Henderson. Practices are important and we have some issues with the vagueness of the language in parts of the framework. Indicators on Teachers and Administrators side; the language is very important and should be clear to the everyday practitioner. How does the Common Core relate to Group 1 and Group 2 teachers? There may need to be a group between the two. Reading and writing standards are supposed to be happening explicitly. How responsible are science and social studies for the improvement of reading and writing scores? These are all issues which need to be clearly expressed.

Jill Pendleton: Principal at Clark High School. Concerns about the evaluation of Group 2; if half (50%) of the evaluation is based on the aggregate school data, how do you differentiate between highly effective and effective? Also, those teachers and administrators who are committed to working at high needs schools are special people. It is important to acknowledge they may not meet benchmarks, but they are doing very important work.

Bob Mars: Principal at Silverado High School. It is important everyone realize the final product will not be perfect. There were 84 participants in the Las Vegas focus group. Given the reliability of surveys, you want to have 30% of your target population participating. If part of the feedback will be from parent evaluation surveys, the TLC may want to consider having a minimum participation requirement so the results are not skewed. They need to have statistical validity. Focus group participants also had questions relative to the language around scheduled versus non-scheduled classroom visits, how are the two defined and distinguished.

Jamey Hood: Boulder City. Our school has strong parent involvement, between 80-90% at every function and event; however, survey participation is only about 10-20%. We get about the same participation from students as well. We have concerns about the cost of the Tripod program given these

participation numbers. My career with junior high students and teachers at that level are swamped, so we need to look at every subject area as equally as we can. We may need to review the timeline of evaluations to better correlate with timeline of the data release.

Jeff Hybarger: Principal at Goynes Elementary School. Mr. Hybarger discussed research around teacher evaluations. He expressed concern relative to the lack of ideas or research data for elementary schools. He discussed an article which reviewed the similarities in teacher evaluation. There is a fascinating look at the definition of leadership, as it has not been standardized, and the indirect effects of achievement. Growth models are also discussed, in particular the importance of taking into account contextual factors around student growth. States and districts should avoid an overreliance on standardized testing and use multiple measures. He expressed concern about the observation piece in relation to the number of times an administrator can observe a teacher. It is important the schedule remain as flexible as possible.

Jesse Welsh: Principal at Thurman White Middle School. He expressed a need to add his support to the discussion around language regarding scheduled and unscheduled observations. He discussed the need for classroom management in the evaluation system and said the districts are looking at maximizing classroom instruction at this time. There is a challenge around teacher incentives to share best practices. There needs to be some balance for those doing well.

Pam Hicks – Concerns relative to the tight timeline you are facing. I hope as you move forward you let building level people have a voice.

# Approval of flexible agenda.

Member McCord motioned for a flexible agenda. Member Small seconded. The motion carried without objection.

# Approval of Minutes for the September 18, 2012 Teachers and Leaders Council Meeting.

Chair Salazar tabled the minutes and moved the item to the November 14, 2012 agenda.

# Report out on stakeholder engagement opportunities held across Nevada during fall 2012.

Leslie James led a discussion relative to the teacher listening tour. Major concerns which surfaced during the discussions were:

- Training of evaluators and trust of administrator evaluators. Questions and concerns about peer evaluators; some teachers like this and others do not. Of particular concern to Clark County School District teachers.
- Questions about validity and inter-rater reliability and fail safes for "proving effectiveness to another's satisfaction"

- Questions about "all students" and "fully" in the indicators of the 5 instructional strategies. Is
  doing this for all students realistic? Special education teachers for example may not be able to
  be "highly effective" with all students.
- Fair vs. Stacked class building. There are some interesting trust and culture issues out there.
- Questions about district accountability in this evaluation system
- Issues around growth: Individual student growth such as with absenteeism; "Equity" re:
  assessing growth between tested/non-tested grades and subjects; between groups of
  students who are more challenging than others; and between schools that have more
  challenging students/parents than others.
- Angst was expressed as to how all the pieces will fit together for the differentiated ratings, how and when the pilots would occur, and if teachers would be given notice of pilots.

Questions received will make an excellent "Frequently Asked Questions" (FAQ) page. Such an FAQ will assist the TLC in making sure everyone gets access to all of the information. Teachers are encouraged to speak up so they get the training they need. The overall theme: remind people of the evaluation problems we are trying to correct and give them the vision for the solution so teachers get the support they need.

Members discussed teacher concerns around the 50% student outcomes piece and the importance of guidance and support when the system is rolled out. Member Small stated their presentation was a lively hour and a half which could have gone on another hour and half. Currently there is a large divide between classroom teachers and specialists. This showed the group there may be some culture issues in Clark that may not exist in other counties, so a little more work setting that cultural and relational tone may be necessary.

Members discussed the need to have more informational sessions moving forward, especially in Clark County. The current feedback does not show teachers are excited about the changes which will improve the outcome for students; feedback comments are more focused on how the adults are impacted. Perhaps have more emphasis on what AB 222 requires. It was emphasized the system will only be as effective as the follow through on the evaluations. Ultimately, the teachers biggest fear is nothing will really change.

Dr. Linda Archambault led a discussion relative to the administrators listening tour. Administrators reviewed the *White Paper* and provided feedback on many issues and questions for the TLC, some of which may be useful for a FAQ page. Administrators expressed concern about the ability to give adequate feedback and were concerned about the opportunity to provide feedback prior to the final presentation to the Board. They suggested changes to the *White Paper* be given to the superintendents, with changes made in color, so feedback could be given more quickly. They suggested the TLC recommend to the Board a slower process; with a pilot in 2014-15 and a full roll out in 2015-16.

Administrators expressed concern over how the evaluation system could be consistently enforced. Would there be some type of entity at the state level that will monitor implementation to ensure everyone is meeting standards? There was concern over funding for the professional development which will be required in the new evaluation system. There was concern over creating competition in the schools whereby "highly effective" teachers do not want to share their strategies with other

teachers. They also expressed concern over the possibility of running good teachers out of "at need" schools and away from teaching English language learners and students with special needs. They suggested piloting the system in at least one rural county. It is important for all teachers to be working for a common goal - the improvement of students. Administrators also expressed general concern over the current lack of an administrator on the TLC.

Member Fitzpatrick stated the current lack of an administrator on the TLC reinforces the importance of administrator input which was included in the work that was done over the summer with the Joint Task Forces, which were well populated by actively involved administrators from all of the districts - urban, suburban and rural.

Member McCord concurred with comments made by the administrators relative to the *White Paper*. I am uncomfortable with the mandatory tone on page 12 relative to the observations sequence. There are issues with at risk schools; how do you handicap at risk schools in this framework? A validation study could address or suggest how to think through these issues.

Member Fitzpatrick agreed with Member McCord, stating when I think back to what we intended relative to classroom observations, the language which resulted may have unintentionally resulted in the view an administrators cannot go into a classroom more often. We need to make sure there is a minimum threshold, but we do not want the requirement so rigid and intense that multiple observations cannot be done.

Member Small added teachers and administrators are looking through their current lenses. We are trying to change the lens teachers and administrators are looking through. The current practice is so flawed that if an administrator walks into a teacher's room, the teacher freaks out. They do not view the process as someone coming in as a colleague to assist them and to help improve their practice. We do not want to change this to something which looks like the current practice since we are trying to get away from that.

Member Hales added the system will need to withstand a legal challenge. The TLC needs to be careful about what is suggested and what is non-negotiable. We do not want to set ourselves up for failure. Perhaps a handful of individuals should take care of the language changes to the *White Paper*, as opposed to the whole group. The document needs to be more carefully wordsmithed.

## **Motion:**

Member Fitzpatrick motioned for a task force to be designed by the Chair to look at the changes to page 11 and 12 language in the *White Paper* relative to the teacher evaluation cycle in time to report back to the TLC during the November 14, 2012 meeting. Vice Chair Barker seconded. The motion carried without objection.

Break 10:30 - 10:41am

Propose, review, and discuss the potential final weightings for indicators in the *Nevada Teacher Evaluation Framework* and associated methodologies (i.e., measures) for determining final scores for teachers in each of the three "Teacher Groups" previously discussed by the TLC. Discuss next steps relative to finalizing the adoption of such recommendations and then possibly take action.

Dr. Rabinowitz led the discussion around the weighting of the Teacher Evaluation Framework. He emphasized the first time through the topics will be just discussion. We are thinking at a high level about process and the drivers behind the system. When the discussion is complete, we will stop for lunch to have the opportunity to think over the decisions to be made. To preserve the coherence of the model, no decisions will be made until you understand all of the decisions necessary.

Dr. Rabinowitz and members discussed the following topics related to the Teacher Evaluation Framework:

- 1. Calculating a final score:
  - a. Weighting within and across domains and indicators (and over time)
  - b. Computing a final score

#### **Decision drivers:**

- 1. Statute and regulation
- 2. Values
- 3. Research
- 4. Cost and resources
- 5. Fairness; both real and perceived
- 6. Technical considerations (e.g. reliability, validity, bias, consequences)
- 7. Practices in other states
- 8. Coherence with other NV programs (e.g. Nevada education performance system)
- 9. 1, 3, 5, 10; what is currently possible and defensible versus the fully desired system (indicators, supports, stakes)
- 10. Value versus Burden

Dr. Rabinowitz stated all the decisions you make this afternoon will play against these drivers and it can be very difficult to keep all 10 drivers in balance. The system may tilt out of balance in the beginning as you work toward a better system. Member Small questioned where communication and professional development fit in. Dr. Rabinowitz stated they come under the category of fairness. Resources and supports are embedded under all drivers.

The types of things to be decided were outlined as:

Student Outcomes 50%: Mandated by AB 222

How do you then split the other 50%: Instructional Practice \_\_\_\_\_% Professional Responsibilities \_\_\_\_\_%

- Instructional practice should be larger than professional responsibility: this has been decided. Today will put numbers on the left hand side.
  - Should each of the principles in each domain be weighted equally?
  - Should the system be compensatory or conjunctive?
- How do you combine them?
  - Combination of weights or weighted after total.

- Come up with today, what is a 1, 2, 3, 4 and how they coincide with the statutory labels.
- What is the distribution likely to be?
  - You can decide what an acceptable distribution is today and then what is an acceptable distribution a few years from now.
- Lastly, will talk through the pilot. What ideally will it look like? What are the resources currently available?

# Lunch 11:47am to 12:45pm

After lunch, Dr. Rabinowitz and the TLC discussed the Instruction Practice and Professional Responsibilities side of the Teacher Evaluation Framework. Beginning with Instructional Practice, Member discussed weighting percentages from 30-40%. Members agreed it was important to place as much weight on instructional practice as possible, while still keeping a balance with professional responsibility. Member Norton reminded members it was important to remember we needed a starting point. The percentage may shift as piloting and validation studies are completed.

The Members moved to a discussion of the weighting for Professional Responsibility. The importance of retaining a focus on the component of Family Engagement was discussed as it was important to the TLC not to lose that component in the mix.

#### Motion:

Vice Chair Barker motioned to adopt a weighting of 35% for Instructional Practice and 15% for Professional Responsibilities, with reevaluation of those weightings in the future after validation of these weights have been examined. Member Norton seconded. The motion carried without objection.

# Student Engagement piece:

Chair Salazar discussed the recent meeting with The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the Education Counsel in Washington, DC. She stated a representative of the United States Department of Education (USED) clearly stated student engagement will not be accepted in the waiver systems as a student achievement outcome. USED stated any states which have student engagement as a component of student outcomes will need to remove it.

Member Fitzpatrick stated the ESEA Waiver is conditional upon our final evaluation framework and set of regulations adopted by the State Board. We will have some challenges if we try to include the student engagement piece in the Student Outcomes domain. Additionally, some teachers have concerns relative to the validity of student survey data.

# Motion:

Member McCord motioned to remove the indicator of Student Engagement from the Student Outcomes domain. Member Norton seconded. Motion carried without objection.

Non-tested grades and subject areas:

Dr. Rabinowitz started this discussion by asking the TLC what they would like the system to be 3 years from now. The following options were discussed:

- 1. There could be a test or measure for every content area and grade.
- 2. Could use the current system with tests in certain grades and content areas.
  - a. School score: weighted average.
- 3. Selectively pick certain grades and content areas to fill holes in testing gaps with a state test.
  - a. Have a State science test in every grade.
  - b. Have a State test in every grade:
- 4. Allow local assessments to be used officially as part of the State endorsed teacher effectiveness system.
  - a. Require some type of alignment study to State standards and a comparability study to other districts which may be using a different test.

Dr. Rabinowitz and Members also discussed a compromise choice which involved a hybrid of State tests in certain areas, with districts supplementing the tests with interim assessments. The formation of district collaboratives would aid the smaller districts with interim assessments. Dr. Rabinowitz also noted a compromise choice would assist with the issue of fairness. The overriding concept is what is fair to evaluate an individual teacher. Is it acceptable for the entire right hand side of the framework to be driven by English Language Arts (ELA), Math, and Science testing? How do you factor in all of the teachers in non-tested grades and subjects?

Members discussed in Year 1, Group 2 teachers will get a school-wide average score as their student outcome score; all teachers in this group will get the same score. The score in future years will be based upon a State feasibility study on the option of having an assessment in all grades and content areas through developing additional state assessments, acquiring commercially available assessments, or allowing locally used/development of assessments which meet the technical requirements of the State. Members discussed a recommendation to the State Board that the regulation sunset in 2 years from the date of adoption to allow for reevaluation.

Members discussed and responded positively to the concept of a school wide average, noting it will stop the loss of teachers in areas that are being tested. A school-wide average would help build camaraderie within schools and departments and improve school culture.

Member Hales discussed whether we are talking about all teachers being school-wide, since we do have scores to measure some teachers. Dr. Rabinowitz stated, yes for Group 1 teachers there are scores which could be associated with individual teachers, but we were hesitant to recommend that as an option based on the fairness issue. Member Hales inquired if one of our objectives is to make human capital decisions is it not better to use individual scores when possible.

The members stated they would decide on the Group 2 teacher first and then work on Group 1 teachers who have individual score information.

#### Motion:

Member Fitzpatrick motioned those teachers teaching non-Statewide tested grades and subjects receive scores based on school-wide data, with sunset date no later than 2 years from date of adoption.

Regulations request the State study the feasibility of developing and requiring additional statewide assessments in other grades and subjects, and/or local acquisition of such assessments specific to each grade and content area, subject to state approval against stated technical criteria. Member Galland-Collins seconded. The motion carried with 8 Members in favor; with Member Hales voting in opposition.

# Group 1 teachers:

Members discussed the availability of state test scores and evaluation scores for Group 1 teachers. Members considered the following options for their evaluation score:

- 1. Use only the individual scores obtained by Group 1 teachers;
- 2. Use the school wide score just like Group 2 teachers;
- 3. Use a combination of their individual score and the school-wide score.

Members discussed the positive aspects of Option 3. Individuals would be held accountable for their results, but factoring in school-wide scores would assist in filling the gaps in school test frequency and foster the sense of school collegiality and improve school culture.

#### Motion:

Member Peterson motioned for those teachers who teach grades and subjects that are assessed through the Statewide Assessment System, to have their student outcome scores come from a combination of individual scores and school-wide aggregate scores. Vice Chair Barker seconded. The motion carried without objection.

## **Motion:**

Member Small motioned for Group 1 teachers, that minimally the combination of school-wide and individual teachers' test score data should be no less than 50% for the individual teachers, with a goal of increasing the individuals' test score attributions subject to pilot study validations of reliability and validity. Member Peterson seconded. The motion carried without objection.

## Weighting within domains:

Members discussed the weighting of Principles within each domain. Dr. Rabinowitz noted the default starts at equal weighting. If you would like to move away from equal weighting you should have a justification to support such a move. You want to make sure such a move is supported by research or can be supported by technology.

Members discussed and agreed the 5 principles under the Instructional Practice domain should be equally weighted.

Additionally, Members discussed the Professional Responsibilities domain. The TLC was in agreement the Student Engagement piece, previously removed from Student Outcomes, should be placed under

Professional Responsibility as it is an integral part of student centered instruction. Members also agreed the principles now under the Professional Responsibilities domain should be equally weighted.

# Motion:

Member Small motioned the Student Engagement indicator be moved into the Professional Responsibilities domain. Vice Chair Barker seconded. The motion carried without objection.

## **Motion:**

Member Small motioned that under Instructional Practice and Professional Responsibilities the indicators in each of these domains be treated equally. Vice Chair Barker seconded. The motion carried without objection.

# Compensatory or Conjunctive:

Members discussed what measures would work to weed out unfairness in the evaluation system. They discussed the types of considerations which would override the weighting. Members determined those conditions could be introduced and dealt with under the business rules of the system, agreeing that exceptions should be fair and rare.

#### Motion:

Member McCord motioned to allow exceptions to the system to accommodate exceptional school circumstances based on student body size and/or student population characteristics. Member Galland-Collins seconded. The motion carried without objection.

## Motion:

Member McCord motioned that in principle, and to be explored through pilot and validation efforts, to allow for differential consequences for different classifications of teachers (e.g., novice teachers, teachers assigned out of field). Member Galland-Collins seconded. The motion carried without objection.

Break from 3:55 to 4:00pm

Propose, review, and discuss the possible Indicators to be measured within the Instructional Leadership domain of the *Nevada Administrator Evaluation Framework*. Discuss next steps relative to the finalizing the adoption of such indicators and then possible take action regarding any next steps that are identified by the TLC.

Chair Salazar presented a handout and spoke about the discussions she had with Dr. Margaret Heritage relative to indicators. However, given the shortness of time remaining in the meeting, there was not sufficient time to delve deeply into the topic. Members agreed there was at least a superficial endorsement of the indicators discussed, and there was a consensus in the TLC that Chair Salazar should continue her work on the indicators with Dr. Heritage.

Propose, review, and discuss next steps for the NV TLC in recommending to the State Board of Education the adoption of regulations that address development and implementation of a multi-year plan including validation and piloting of individual components of as well as the full operational system of the *Nevada Teacher Evaluation Framework*.

Dr. Rabinowitz and Members discussed the pilot and validation studies and a possible best version of both. Components to be considered were:

- Data systems
- Growth
- Teacher observation rubric and instructional practice
- Professional responsibilities piece
- Full evaluation of the framework.

Members discussed that Phase 1 and 2 of the pilot should consist of an evaluation of components. Phase 3 and 4 of the pilot should consist of a validation of the system. Embedded in this is an evaluation of the supports necessary to make the system work.

# **Motion:**

Member McCord motioned for the TLC to recommend the NDE develop an RFP that incorporates the timeline for pilot and validation studies including all items as discussed at the November 2, 2012 meeting. Vice Chair Barker seconded. The motion carried without objection.

Discuss any TLC recommendations to the State Board of Education that would require legislative changes in order for the recommendations to align with Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) including any recommendations associated with the types of student achievement data to be used in the Nevada Teacher Evaluation Framework, the timing for and number of classroom observations of teachers including differentiation by type of teacher (i.e., probationary status and/or effectiveness rating), timelines for adoption of local board policies for implementation of the Nevada Teacher Evaluation Framework and the Nevada Administrative Evaluation Framework in order to allow for piloting and validation studies, and/or any other recommendations for legislative change. After such discussion, possibly adopt recommendations for legislative changes to share with legislator(s) and/or the Governor's Office.

Member Fitzpatrick gave an overview of proposed changes. She stated there were places in the statute where changes were required. There were five sets of changes on the first page, two sets on page two, and there may be other changes as well; this should not be considered a comprehensive list. Member Fitzpatrick added that another category of change may be the designation of the evaluation levels as 1,2,3,4. Members were asked to review the handout prior to the next meeting; the topic will be reagendized for November 14, 2012 meeting.

Review, rethink, discuss, refine, make changes to and possibly approve a November 2, 2012 version of the *Systems Guidelines White Paper*.

It was noted Richard Vineyard would continue to keep the *White Paper* updated. Member Hales requested the next *White Paper* show changes made.

# Future agenda items.

Chair Salazar noted items have been previously discussed and include Professional Responsibilities and indicators for teachers, score card for administrators, professional performance levels, Group 3 specialist personnel, the discussion of proposed statutory changes, unscheduled visits and any other final information to be discussed at the final meeting on November 28, 2012.

# Council member comments.

Member McCord commented on the number of students in Charter Schools in Nevada and the fact the work being done by the TLC would not apply to them. Member Fitzpatrick noted in the original version of the bill, they were included. They were removed during the session.

Member Small stated we really had not discussed the issue of percentages of parent responses. Additionally, if individuals are appointed for the open TLC positions before the next meeting, can Chair Salazar meet with them in advance to bring them up to speed before the meeting? I feel sorry for those needing to catch up on a year's worth of work.

#### Public comments.

Chair Salazar opened the floor to public comments. There was no comment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:34 p.m.