

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

November 14, 2012  
Hyatt Place Reno  
1790 East Plumb Lane  
Reno, Nevada

**COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Pamela Salazar, Chair  
Barbara Surritte-Barker, Vice Chair  
Christine Cheney, Member  
Kathleen Galland-Collins, Member  
Theresa Crowley, Member – arrived at 8:50 A.M.  
Rorie Fitzpatrick, Member  
Sharla Hales, Member – arrived at 9:00 A.M.  
Robert McCord, Member  
Theo McCormick, Member  
Dale Norton, Member  
Mary Peterson, Member  
Theo Small, Member  
Bonnie Townsend, Member

**COUNCIL MEMBER ABSENT:**

Amy Henderson, Member – excused

**DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:**

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

**LEGAL COUNSEL:**

Carrie Parker, Deputy Attorney General

**INVITED GUESTS:**

Sujie Shin, Sr. Assessment Manager, Assessment and Standards Development Services at  
WestEd  
Lynn Holdheide, Consultant, AIR  
Margaret Heritage, Senior Researcher for CRESST  
Barbara Jones, Researcher for CRESST

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:**

Jesse Wells, Clark County School District/CCASA  
Keith Walz, ECSD

Todd Butterworth, Legislative Counsel Bureau  
Dave Brancamp, NWRPDP  
Dawn Huckaby, Washoe County School District  
Salwa Zaki, Washoe County School District  
Pati Falk, Washoe County School District  
Nicole Rourke, Clark County School District  
Lynn Warne, Nevada State Education Association

### **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**

Jesse Wells, a principal at White Middle School in the Clark County School District, directed his comments to the draft White Paper and expressed that the student engagement should be included under instructional practice. Concern was also expressed regarding the achievement gap data at the school level. Mr. Wells stated that he feels that aligning the systems is a good idea. Mr. Wells expressed additional concern with the timeline for the observations which are currently set for the 16<sup>th</sup> week of school (mid-December) and the 24<sup>th</sup> week of school (mid-February) and feels that these dates are too early and suggested maybe using number of days instead of the weeks of school.

### **APPROVAL OF A FLEXIBLE AGENDA**

**MOTION:** Member Peterson moved to approve a flexible agenda, seconded by Member Small. The motion passed unanimously.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE SEPTEMBER 18, 2012 AND OCTOBER 15, 2012 TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL MEETINGS**

Chair Salazar tabled the October 15, 2012 meeting minutes until the next meeting, as they were not ready for approval.

**MOTION:** Member Norton moved to approve the September 18, 2012 TLC meeting minutes as submitted, seconded by Member Crowley. The motion passed unanimously.

### **REVIEW OUTCOMES FROM NOVEMBER 2, 2012 MEETING INCLUDING MOTIONS PASSED ON WEIGHTING FOR NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK**

Chair Salazar reviewed the following motions made at the November 2, 2012 TLC meeting:

Motion 1: Adopt a weighting of 35% for instructional practice and 15% for professional responsibilities with reevaluation of that ratio in the future after validation of these weights have been examined. Motion made by Member Barker and seconded by Member Norton. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion 2: Remove the indicator of student engagement from the student outcomes domain. Motion made by Member McCord and seconded by Member Norton. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion 3: For 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. Motion was made by Member Fitzpatrick and seconded by member Collins. The motion passed with 8-yes votes and 1-no vote.

Motion 4: For those teachers who teach grades and subjects assessed through the Statewide Assessment System, their student outcomes scores come from a combination of individual scores and school-wide aggregate scores. Motion was made by Member Peterson and seconded by Member Barker. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion 5: For Group 1 teachers, 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. Motion made by Member Small and seconded by Member Peterson. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion 6: Student engagement indicator be moved into professional responsibilities domain. Motion made by Member Small and seconded by Member Barker. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion 7: For Instructional Practice and Professional Responsibilities, the indicators in each of these domains will be treated equally. Motion made by Member Small and seconded by Member Barker. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion 8: Allow exceptions to the system to accommodate exceptional school circumstances based on student body size and/or student population characteristics. Motion made by Member McCord and seconded by Member Collins. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion 9: In principle, and to be explored through pilot and validation efforts, allow for differential consequences for different classifications of teachers (e.g., novice teachers,

teachers assigned out of field). Motion made by Member McCord and seconded by Member Collins. The motion passed unanimously.

There was concern expressed regarding the student make-up of classrooms and how that may affect a teacher's evaluation. There is definitely a need to show growth, but there could be different levels of growth depending on the student disability.

It was reiterated that student perception (engagement) is not part of Student Outcomes and has been moved to Professional Responsibilities.

**DISCUSS THE ROLE OF "GROUP 3 TEACHERS – SPECIALIST PERSONNEL", AS PREVIOUSLY DEFINED BY THE TLC, IN THE CURRENT NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK. AS DETERMINED RELEVANT THROUGH DIALOGUE DURING THE MEETING, PROPOSE, REVIEW, AND DISCUSS THE TREATMENT OF SUCH PERSONNEL IN THE CURRENT MODEL. IF IT IS DETERMINED THAT GROUP 3 TEACHERS SHOULD BE EVALUATED WITH THE CURRENTLY ADOPTED NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK, THEN CONSIDER AND POSSIBLY ADOPT FINAL WEIGHTINGS FOR INDICATORS AND METHODOLOGIES FOR DETERMINING FINAL SCORES FOR GROUP 3 TEACHERS THROUGH THE NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK, AS RECOMMENDED BY THE AD HOC GROUP ASSEMBLED TO REVIEW THE APPLICATION OF THE NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FOR THESE SPECIALIST PERSONNEL. DISCUSS NEXT STEPS RELATIVE TO FINALIZING THE ADOPTION OF THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS AND THEN POSSIBLY TAKE ACTION**

Leslie James reviewed the handout, "Group 3 Teachers – Specialist Personnel" and the following recommendations from the Group 3 ad hoc technical advisory team (TAT) to the TLC:

1. The TLC should consider a guiding principle belief that certain "specialist personnel" outside of the "traditional teacher role" (that defines Group 1 – tested grades and subjects, and Group 2 – non-tested grades and subjects) who are integral to the support of student growth be **included** in the statewide performance evaluation framework.
2. AB222, Section 6 requires the TLC to make recommendations to the State Board of Education for the establishment of a statewide performance evaluation system for **teachers** and administrators employed school districts.

Therefore in considering inclusion of "specialist personnel" who are integral to the support of student growth in this statewide evaluation framework, the TLC needs to **recommend a change in NRS** to include these personnel, by either:

- a. Expanding the definition of "teacher" in NRS to include "specialist personnel" not in Group 1 or Group 2 for performance evaluation purposes and/or

- b. There needs to be a change in AB222 (391.460) to provide the directive to the TLC to include the consideration of Group 3 “specialist personnel” in this statewide performance evaluation system. The TAT recommends this option.
3. Ensure the TLC recommendation to the State Board of Education to include specialist personnel in the statewide performance evaluation system includes provision of some assurances for evaluation framework flexibility provided certain parameters are met. To provide flexibility an adaptation to roles and responsibilities and local job context (e.g., job descriptions and defined assignments), the evaluation framework would reflect work with, and recommendations from, each specialist personnel stakeholder group in regard to the following aspects of the evaluation framework, and then subsequent implementation piloting.
4. Recommend to the State Board of Education that evaluation frameworks to include “specialist personnel” be developed in X number of years after more foundational work is set for the Group 1 and Group 2 teachers.

Ms. James reviewed the 4 Groups of Licensed Personnel:

- 1) Teachers of tested grades and subjects (Group 1) which includes some “specialist personnel” as per licensure certification awarded
- 2) Teachers of non-tested grades and subjects (Group 2) which includes some “specialist personnel” as per licensure certification awarded
- 3) Other “specialist personnel” who are not called out in the current NRS definition of “teacher” but who potentially provide instruction support
- 4) Other Personnel who provide emotional support, non-instructional guidance or medical support (e.g., counselors, nurses) (Should these personnel continue under the district’s uniform evaluation system or be part of a statewide evaluation system?)

Ms. James reviewed the proposed expanded definition of “teacher”. The definition of “teacher” for evaluation purposes could be kept narrow (and evaluation of “specialist personnel” left up to the districts) or it could be expanded to include other “specialist personnel” in the uniform statewide evaluation system as in the following expanded definition of teacher to include specialist personnel provided by the Group 3 TAT:

“Teacher” also means a licensed employee who spends at least 50% of the work year devoted to providing educational services that support students to access and/or process the curriculum to meet the academic standards within the realm of all educational settings. These licensed employees include “specialist personnel” who may meet this definition depending on roles and responsibilities and local job context (e.g., job descriptions and defined assignments) under the following specialist personnel categories:

- “Exceptional Pupils Personnel” – e.g., speech and language specialists, specialist working with vision/hearing impairments, specialists serving in a consultant role to support students with autism

- “Specialized Support Personnel” – e.g., school counselor, school psychologist, reading specialists working as consultants, library/media specialists and
- Teachers on special assignment – e.g., such as implementation specialists, instructional coaches and home bound instructors.

Ms. James stated that the thinking behind this is that students would benefit from having specialist “teacher” personnel be effective and/or helping other teachers be effective in implementing (through consultation/coaching) the 5 high leverage instructional principles in the teacher framework (as per determined suitability) – to meet learning targets that support them in accessing/processing the curriculum to meet the academic standards.

The inclusion and exclusion criteria:

Inclusion: For Group 3 this expanded definition of teacher specifically lists specialist personnel who could be included as per the expanded definition criteria: i.e., a licensed employee who spends at least 50% of the work year devoted to providing educational services that support students to access/process the curriculum to meet the academic standards within the realm of all educational settings.

Exclusion criteria: Specialist personnel who provide contracted services from an outside organization and “other staff” if the decision is to not include this group of specialist personnel who provide emotional support, non-instructional guidance or medical support (e.g., counselors, nurses).

Member Peterson questioned if the TLC has the authority over this group of individuals who are professionally licensed and do not hold a license from the Nevada Department of Education.

Member Fitzpatrick explained that she thought Ms. James was referencing the expanded definition of teacher to include Group 3 “Specialist Personnel” would be licensed by the Nevada Department of Education.

Council members held a robust discussion regarding the definition of “teacher” and how to define “specialist personnel”; who is included and excluded. The Council discussed amending NRS 391.460 to include “specialist personnel” in the evaluation framework. Member Small questioned how these individuals in Group 3 impact student growth.

**MOTION:** Member Hales moved to adopt a guiding belief that the certain “specialist personnel”, outside the traditional teacher role, (that defines Group 1 – tested grades and subjects, and Group 2 – non-tested grades and subjects) who are integral to the support of student growth be included in the statewide performance evaluation framework, seconded by Member McCormick. The motion passed unanimously.

**MOTION:** Member Peterson moved that the TLC recommend to the State Board of Education that evaluation frameworks to include “specialist personnel” be developed within two years of completion of the teacher/administrator validation studies and subsequent validation and implementation, seconded by Member Barker.

There was discussion on the motion; Member Crowley wanted it clarified that the TLC does not want there to be 28 frameworks. There was discussion to add language to the motion to ensure that provisions are included for evaluation framework flexibility.

Upon questioning, it was clarified that only Groups 1 and 2 will be in the first group of validation studies.

Following a discussion, Member Peterson withdrew her motion.

A break was granted at 10:26 A.M.

The meeting reconvened at 10:53 A.M.

Member McCord suggested amending the motion to define “specialist personnel” who are licensed with more than 50% of the specialist’s time spend with student providing educational services.

**MOTION:** Member Small made an amendment to the first motion to add the following language following “specialist personnel” that also means a licensed employee who spends at least 50% of the work year devoted to providing educational services that support student to access and/or process the curriculum to meet the academic standards within the realm of all educational settings, seconded by Member Hales. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Holdheide reiterated that the first process to include specialist personnel will be to broaden and expand the definition of licensed specialist personnel and propose legislative changes to the State Board of Education.

It was discussed that the proposed amendments would be to NRS 391.460 (which was amended by AB222).

Following discussion on how to draft this language, the TLC directed Ms. James and Ms. Holdheide to draft language for the TLC to review and address the concerns in items 2, 3, and 4 in the TAT’s recommendations.

(Member Hales left the meeting at 11:15 A.M.)

**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 OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE CHANGE. AFTER SUCH DISCUSSION, ADOPT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE CHANGES TO SHARE WITH LEGISLATOR(S) AND/OR THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE**

Member Fitzpatrick reviewed the following proposed recommendations for changes to NRS in the 2012 Legislative Session and with the results of the TLC:

- Definitions
  - Teacher – this definition remains unresolved;
  - Administrator – confine to site level administrator (principles, assistant/vice principals/deans of students) which will include the evaluation of a school and there maybe a need to redefine the role of the administrator within the building
  - Paraprofessionals were removed from the uniform performance evaluation system requirement

Student Achievement Data – will now require districts to adopt policies that comply with the regulations established by the State Board of Education and anticipates the possible use of State and/or local data including CRTs, common assessments, and student learning objectives. Regulations may also need to be adopted to address the requisite criteria.

Observation Process – the pre-observation conference and post-observation conference timelines, to be determined today, based on recommendations from the 11/9/12 Classroom Observations Task Force meeting. The evaluation processes determined by combination of probationary status and designation rating (e.g., highly effective, effective, minimally effective or level 1, 2, 3, 4 if labels are changed)

Contents of Teacher Evaluation – the evaluation of a teacher must include the following requirements, as established in the regulations adopted by the State Board of Education: performance on High Leverage Instructional Principles and performance on Professional Responsibilities.

Contents of Teacher Evaluation – the evaluation of a teacher must include a description of the supports that will be provided to assist the teacher in improving instructional practice and/or professional responsibilities based on the teacher’s evaluation data.

Contents of Administrator Evaluation – the evaluation of an administrator must include the following requirements, as established in the regulations adopted by the State Board of Education: performance by High Leverage Instructional Leadership Principles and performance on Professional Responsibilities.

Timelines for Implementation – On or before July 31, 2013, the State Board of Education shall...adopt regulations establishing a statewide performance evaluation system. Each school district shall, not later than the 2013-2014 school year, participate in validation efforts in compliance with regulations adopted by the State Board of Education. Each school district shall, not later than the 2014-2015 school year, implement a performance evaluation policy...that complies with...system established by State Board of Education...

Rating labels: The current NRS state that the labels should be highly effective, effective, minimally effective and ineffective. It was discussed at the last meeting to use a rating system that does not have judgment implied, such as levels of 1, 2, 3, and 4. It was agreed to use a validation process to set labels for different classification of teachers and allow for differentiated criteria for the different classification of teachers.

Ms. Shin cautioned the TLC against using averages and means and encouraged thinking about different systematic labels and staying away from using a numerical rating/category. Ms. Holdheide added that nationally, groups are staying away from a numerical rating system, as it leads to judgments.

Council members held an in-depth discussion regarding the rating system and labels. The following concerns were expressed:

- Questioned if the ratings of educators would be released to the public. as the consequences would be bad.
- Suggested that the ratings be the same for student proficiency.
- Labels could lead to parents requesting for their students to be removed from a classroom with a teacher with a poor rating.
- Labels and how labels are perceived by educators and the public.
- Want to motivate teachers; not demoralize.

Ms. Holdheide suggested using more developmental wording.

Member Small stated that no matter what the label, the teacher will know where they are and where they need to improve compared to their peers. Member Small recommended allowing for flexibility for first year administrators.

Member Barker stated that it is not about the label; it is about the relationship between the teacher and the administrator - for the administrator to have a conversation with the teacher regarding this is where you are and this is where you need to be and this is how we are going to get you there.

The TLC made a recommendation that there is contemplation of changing the labels and this should be considered during validation process.

The TLC recommended analyzing legislative requirements which compel administrators to spend time on things other than supervising and supporting instruction and to reduce the burden.

Member Fitzpatrick reviewed the Classroom Observation Task Force recommendations with the following amendments to the White Paper:

- announced vs unannounced observations;
- effective;
- post-probationary;
- authorized personnel;
- observers vs evaluators;
- remove the wording “standard” in the cycle;
- An effective teacher only has to have one observation per year;
- Modify the observation timeline to days as opposed to weeks; and
- An educator will be evaluated on three years of growth and the assessment data from the previous year is based on the legislative calendar established for assessments and the timeframe to get assessment results back. It was further discussed that assessments cannot be too early, as then there is less instructional time.

Pati Falk, as a member of the public, expressed concern regarding the student outcomes and when the assessment data is included in the evaluation; as it is not used until the next year’s evaluation.

It was discussed that possibly changes could be made to the evaluation, based on assessments, as soon as the assessment results are received.

**MOTION:** Member McCord moved to adopt the proposed legislative amendments as discussed to include the slides and amendments to the White Paper for the observation process, the recommendation that the legislature look at creating a system for district level administrators to have functionally uniform evaluation system created, and to have the

Legislature contemplate the changing of the labeling, have the Legislature consider areas in which administrator burden could be eliminated to focus on supporting on instruction, and suggesting allowing for differentiation between veteran and new teachers/administrators; seconded by Member Small. The motion passed unanimously.

A lunch break was granted at 12:25 P.M.  
(Member Crowley left the meeting at 12:25 P.M.)

The meeting reconvened at 1:16 P.M.

**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 PERFORMANCES LEVELS AND THEN POSSIBLY TAKE ACTION**

Margaret Heritage and Barbara Jones handed out the “Literature Review for the Five High-Leverage Instructional Principles” and stated it is approximately 85% complete and includes the appendix and a synopsis of the studies. Electronic copies will be sent to Chair Salazar and Member Fitzpatrick for distribution and posting to website when complete.

Ms. Heritage reviewed Principle 2 – Learning Tasks have High Cognitive Demand for Diverse Learners; along with the three Indicators: 1) Tasks purposefully employ all students’ cognitive abilities and skills, 2) Tasks place appropriate demands on each student, and 3) Tasks progressively develop all students’ cognitive abilities and skills; and four Performance Levels for learning tasks for cognitive learning for diverse learners. This is an effort to get teachers to teach students at the level they can learn.

Member Barker stated as she has been sharing these principles, the overall reaction is that everyone loves the principles, but concern has been expressed over the word “*all*” in order to obtain Level 4 as it may be an unattainable goal.

Ms. Heritage and Ms. Jones reviewed each Indicator and Performance Levels with regard to Principle 2 and 3. For each performance level, Level 4 states “all” students; Level 3 states “most” students; Level 2 states “some” students; and Level 1 states “no” students.

(Member Crowley joined the meeting via telephone.)

It was discussed that it is important for teachers to realize that they need to build upon skills that students currently possess in an effort to reach the ultimate goal; the indicators and levels outlined in this process build upon skills and focus on certain points.

There was discussion regarding teachers nationally posting to a website through crowd sourcing with great examples of performance levels 3 and 4 for teachers to review, learn, and apply in their own classrooms.

(Member Hales returned to the meeting at 2:20 P.M.)

Ms. Jones stated that, as a part of this process, there needs to be professional development to teach teachers how to change their teaching and build on the skills that both the teacher and students already have. The Instructional Practice can be used as a road map to show the path and growth of a teacher.

(Member Crowley was disconnected from the telephone.)

Ms. Heritage cautioned that a teacher cannot expect to move up on the scale of all principles, but can work on a couple of the principles at a time; but also need to be aware of ALL of the principles and indicators, but build upon and focus on certain points at all times.

Member Cheney stated that children have different ways to show that they have learned.

Principle 3 – Students Engage in Meaning-Making through Discourse and other Strategies.  
Indicator 1 – Teacher provides opportunities for extended, productive discourse between the teacher and student(s) and among students; Indicator 2 – Teacher provides opportunities for all students to create and interpret multiple representations; Indicator 3 – Teacher assists all students to use existing knowledge and prior experience to make connections and recognize relationships; Indicator 4 - Teacher structures the classroom environment to enable collaboration, participation, and a positive affective experience for all students.

It was discussed that Principle 3 includes problem solving and multi level tasks and Indicator 4 embeds classroom management.

Ms. Heritage requested that Council Members provide feedback on the principles and indicators no later than November 19, 2012.

A break was granted at 3:09 P.M.

The meeting reconvened at 3:22 P.M.

**REVIEW AND DISCUSS THE MEASUREMENT, REPORTING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS OF ALL OF THE INDICATORS UNDER EACH OF THE FIVE HIGH LEVERAGE PRINCIPLES WITHIN THE INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE DOMAIN OF THE NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK. DISCUSS NEXT STEPS RELATIVE TO FINALIZING THE IMPLEMENTATION, MEASUREMENT, AND REPORTING OF INDICATORS AND THEN POSSIBLY TAKE ACTION**

Chair Salazar asked Ms. Heritage if she had any specific recommendations with regards to professional development and what the TLC should be thinking about moving forward in the implementation stage and validation studies and then into full implementation.

Ms. Heritage stated that we know that we need to build teaching/learning opportunities at the schools and build capacity within the system. Ms. Heritage recommended that the TLC roll out and focus on one principle at a time and then for the Regional Professional Development Centers to train teachers on each principle and link to the common core. Ms. Heritage suggested starting with Principle 1 and build from there. Ms. Heritage suggested that statewide video trainings have been very successful in Arkansas; and suggested looking at a variety of ways/strategies to provide the training.

Ms. Jones recommended starting with Principle 1 and then the training connects out to the other principles.

This issue will be further discussed by the Council at a future meeting.

**DISCUSS THE ROLE OF “GROUP 3 TEACHERS – SPECIALIST PERSONNEL”, AS PREVIOUSLY DEFINED BY THE TLC, IN THE CURRENT NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK. AS DETERMINED RELEVANT THROUGH DIALOGUE DURING THE MEETING, PROPOSE, REVIEW, AND DISCUSS THE TREATMENT OF SUCH PERSONNEL IN THE CURRENT MODEL. IF IT IS DETERMINED THAT GROUP 3 TEACHERS SHOULD BE EVALUATED WITH THE CURRENTLY ADOPTED NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK, THEN CONSIDER AND POSSIBLY ADOPT FINAL WEIGHTINGS FOR INDICATORS AND METHODOLOGIES FOR DETERMINING FINAL SCORES FOR GROUP 3 TEACHERS THROUGH THE NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK, AS RECOMMENDED BY THE AD HOC GROUP ASSEMBLED TO REVIEW THE APPLICATION OF THE NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FOR THESE SPECIALIST PERSONNEL. DISCUSS NEXT STEPS RELATIVE TO FINALIZING THE ADOPTION OF THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS AND THEN POSSIBLY TAKE ACTION**

Chair Salazar returned to this item for further clarification. Ms. Holdheide reviewed suggested language for a motion for Group 3 – specialist personnel.

**MOTION:** Following discussion, Member McCord moved that the TLC recommend to the Board of Education that NRS 391.460 be modified for the inclusion of specialist personnel as part of a statewide performance evaluation system provided that certain parameters are met and include provision of some assurances for evaluation framework flexibility to account for roles and responsibilities and local job context (e.g., job descriptions and job assignments). Specialist personnel would consist of those who serve as licensed employees and who spend at least 50% of the work year devoted to providing educational services that support students

to access and/or process the curriculum to meet the academic standards within the realm of all education settings. A differentiated timeline would be applied so that results of Group 1 and Group 2 field studies, implementation, and evaluation and recommendations of each specialist personnel stakeholder group can be considered in the development of Group 3 specialist personnel evaluation frameworks within a 5 year period, seconded by Member Townsend. The motion passed unanimously.

**ACTION:** Following discussion regarding issues that may arise around Group 3 teachers who are not licensed by the Department of Education but are included and entered into a contract with the school district; Member McCord recommended that the TLC move forward with the motion and then bring this issue back at a future meeting for further discussion and possibly a reconsideration of the wording.

**PROPOSE, REVIEW AND DISCUSS THE POTENTIAL FINAL WEIGHTINGS FOR INDICATORS AND METHODOLOGIES FOR DETERMINING FINAL SCORES FOR GROUP 3 TEACHERS THROUGH THE NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AS RECOMMENDED BY THE AD HOC GROUP ASSEMBLED TO REVIEW THE APPLICATION OF THE NEVADA TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FOR GROUP 1 (TEACHERS IN STATE TESTED GRADES AND SUBJECTS) AND GROUP 2 (TEACHERS IN NON-TESTED GRADES AND SUBJECTS); DISCUSS NEXT STEPS RELATIVE TO FINALIZING THE ADOPTION OF THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS AND THEN POSSIBLY TAKE ACTION**

Ms. Shin stated that she has been working with the Technical Advisory Team (TAT) to determine, define and make recommendations for Groups 1 and 2 and recommend student outcome final weightings for indicators for determining final scores.

Russ Keglovits reviewed that the TAT consisted of thirteen individuals from around the state.

Ms. Shin reviewed the recommendations for Group 1 teachers for grades 4-8 in ELA and/or math with 20 students per year for a valid number and include classroom level scores in proficiency and status; and Group 2 would only use school aggregate scores. Group 2 teachers would be for grades K-3 and 9-12 in any subject and would include any number of students; and in grades 4-8, all other subjects-not ELA or math; would include less than 20 students per year. The student outcomes weightings would be 50% with 35% for growth, 5% for status proficiency, and 10% for reducing the gap. The emphasis would be on components that the teacher has control over while deemphasizing the proficiency status which is more related to prior student achievement.

There was discussion to use the school performance framework in place of school level aggregate score; there would be a growth score every year.

Member Hales expressed concern and stated that she is not comfortable with this weighting and feels that some teachers will be left out of this due to the number of students requirement, due to student transiency.

Chair Salazar stated that the research from other states is showing that “going slow” in this process is best to ensure that this process drives better instruction and practice.

Ms. Holdheide recommended putting more effort into Group 2 which covers a larger amount of teachers.

Member Peterson questioned if the weighting is equally weighted and will this have an unanticipated consequence and drive ELA and math teachers out of the classroom. Member Peterson raised the question about whether this is a fairness issue.

Chair Salazar stated that the TLC may need to look at flexibility for teachers who rate high in Instructional Practice while rating low in the school level assessment score.

It was discussed that the focus needs to be on professional development and teachers want to be evaluated on what they do in their classroom.

**ACTION:** Chair Salazar stated that due to the time limit of the agenda, this meeting needs to be adjourned, and this item will be further discussed with possible action at the next TLC meeting on November 28, 2012.

### **COUNCIL MEMBER COMMENTS**

There were no further Council Member comments.

### **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Chair Salazar stated that at the November 28, 2012 meeting the TLC will need to discuss the validation studies and finalize the administrator framework.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.

### **MEETING ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Salazar adjourned the meeting at 4:32 P.M.