

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

**MEETING MINUTES**

February 22, 2013

Hyatt Place Reno  
1790 E. Plumb Lane  
Reno, Nevada

**COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Pamela Salazar, Chair  
Barbara Surritte-Barker, Vice Chair  
Christine Cheney, Member  
Theresa Crowley, Member  
Rorie Fitzpatrick, Member  
Kathleen Galland-Collins, Member  
Sharla Hales, Member  
Amy Henderson, Member  
Theo McCormick, Member  
Dale Norton, Member  
Mary Peterson, Member  
Theo Small, Member  
Bonnie Townsend, Member

**COUNCIL MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

Robert McCord, Member

**DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:**

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

**LEGAL COUNSEL:**

Shane Chesney, Senior Deputy Attorney General

**Invited Guests:**

Dr. Steven McCafferty, Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education, UNLV  
(via telephone)  
Dr. Sylvia Lazos, Boyd School of Law, UNLV  
(via telephone)

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:**

Sue Dallenbach, CCASPE  
Dave Brancamp, NWRPDP

Ellen Holmes, CCEA  
Georgia Coulombe, NWRPDP  
Amy Weber-Salgo, NWRPDP  
Jose Delfin, Carson City SD  
Alyson Kendrick, Washoe County SD

### **Call to Order; Roll Call; Pledge OF Allegiance**

Chair Salazar called the meeting to order at 8:45 A.M., with attendance reflected above. It was determined a quorum was present.

Chair Salazar led the pledge of allegiance.

### **Public Comment**

Ellen Holmes, Director of Special Learning, CCEA, has worked with CCSD on what implementation is going to mean. They have been looking at the data have three areas of concern they would like the TLC to keep in mind. 1) Timeline concerns about the data portions of the system. Question: Will Nevada have an AYP waiver? The current tight data timelines may not be aligned in best practice when implemented. The reality for CCSD is they have one measure that the data house is built around. All data lead back to only one test. When you drill down to the teacher level, all student outcomes are based on the same test. This is an issue to think about. 2) What is going to happen around other multiple measures? If the state is rolling out student learning outcomes, is there a grade level test or some other formative assessment system? CCSD has only piloted this type of assessment. In other words, what type of formative assessment system will be used? 3) We are concerned about what it would take to fully implement an evaluation system which is linked to professional learning. We are not sure there has been enough consideration given to what it will take to fully link the evaluation system to the professional learning options. Thank you.

### **Approval of a Flexible Agenda**

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

### **Approval of Minutes for the November 28, 2012 Teachers and Leaders Council Meeting.**

**MOTION:** Member Norton moved to approve the minutes from the November 28, 2012 TLC meeting. Member Crowley seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**Update on State Board of Education workshop held December 14, 2012, and public hearing held January 25, 2013 regarding adoption of regulations for the Nevada Educator Performance Framework, the uniform system of performance evaluation and support as required through the passage of Assembly Bill 222 in June, 2011.**

Chair Salazar and Member Fitzpatrick discussed the TLC presentation made to the State Board of Education (SBE) at the public workshop and the public hearing for the proposed regulations for the Nevada Educator Performance Framework. The presentation to the SBE was very detailed and TLC members who were present at the meetings comment on how well the presentations went.

It was noted that at the end of the public workshop, most of the comments were positive. However, there were a couple of areas of concern; primarily English Language Learners (ELL) and Family Engagement strategies. The SBE took action on the regulatory language in the public hearing in January 2013.

Member Fitzpatrick began an overview of the regulatory language for the members and discussed the regulatory process and outcomes, as well as areas where more content and information were needed. It was noted additions were needed under the "Definitions" section for the terms diverse learners, sub-populations, pupil growth, and pupil proficiency.

Members reviewed both the Administrator Evaluation Model and the Teacher Evaluation Model. It was noted that all of the conceptual dialogue was included and was now in official regulatory language. Members discussed the terminology shift from "principle" to "standard", which creates alignment across the law. Members commented this was a significant change in terminology as there had never been teacher standards in Nevada before. Member Fitzpatrick noted that standards had been adopted by reference in the code, but they had never been operationalized. Now they are specifically defined and will be implemented.

Additionally, the SBE requested an additional standard be added to both the Administrator Evaluation Model and the Teacher Evaluation Model which specifically addressed the issue of cultural competence and the need to address the unique needs of ELL students. Standard 2 (d), added to the Standards and Indicators to Evaluate the Instructional Leadership of School-Level Administrator states, "The school-level administrator operates with a deep belief that all children can achieve regardless of race, perceived ability and socio-economic status. Standard 2 (d), added to the Standards and Indicators to Evaluate the Instructional Practices of Teachers states, "The teacher operates with a deep belief that all children can achieve regardless of race, perceived ability and socio-economic status."

Members noted the TLC had considered the needs of these students by using and expressly emphasizing the phrase "all students." Members expressed the concern that 2(d) in both models should go well beyond just ELL students. It is important not to call out one group to the exclusion of others. It was stated that the regulations had been adopted with this wording. The TLC can come back to the SBE with a change if the standard is not satisfactory as articulated.

Members reviewed the information on page 13. Member Fitzpatrick stated the information shaded in grey is the language we anticipate will come before the SBE in June. Currently, there are dates within the current statute which will not work with the framework. We should have the opportunity to work more with teachers who are new or who have poor performance. The current statute does not

differentiate in this way. Senator Debbie Smith is carrying forward a bill to make some of those changes to the existing statute to accommodate the model from the TLC and adopted by the SBE. It is unknown at this time as to whether the legislature will have any interest in modifying the current performance level labels.

Members discussed the current weighting in professional responsibility for the strategies for family engagement. The TLC acknowledged the standards should be stronger, they should have more weight. Dialogue with the SBE indicated that, absent opportunity for more fully integrated system of measurement, we are hesitant to increase weighting. We need to make sure data collection is valid and reliable. Most districts now use surveys and school based events. There is currently no statewide system to make sure we do not differentially impact teachers and indicators by socio-economic status. Members discussed the difficulty in being consistent across the state because we are so widely varied; it is difficult even within one district. The TLC will continue to have engagement with the Parental Advisory Council to help develop this element. It is an imperative measure and we will have active engagement with that council.

The SBE passed a motion to adopt the regulations as presented, with the addition of the definitions and the addition of standard 2(d) as discussed above. We will make the proofreading changes necessary.

Chair Salazar requested input from Dr. Steven G. McCafferty, Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education, UNLV to discuss issues relative to ELL and the newly adopted evaluation models. Chair Salazar noted the TLC asked Dr. Margret Heritage, CRESST, to look at our literature review and evaluate the degree to which consideration was given to ELL students, as well as how that literature aligns to the training and professional development to implement the high leverage standards.

Dr. McCafferty discussed the issues he has seen with ELL. Areas of interest revolve around cultural background, how teachers help students, and how students help each other. Students come into the classroom with a set of learning strategies, so we need to spend time and effort to evoke new strategies. Members briefly discussed SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) and the importance of working in the Zone of Proximal Development. Members discussed the issue of support and professional development needed in the area of language and linguistics. The real test of our system is in the structures and supports put in place to help teachers be successful. We partner closely with our universities for pre-service and professional development.

Dr. McCafferty and the members briefly discussed the importance of understanding language acquisition and how language works. This can be particularly difficult with writing because there is an emphasis on formality. Members questioned whether linguistics should be part of a licensing endorsement for ELL. Members discussed the difficulty of trying to learn everything as an undergraduate. At that level, there is only so much you can do and understand. It takes work experience and time in the profession to understand the relevance and importance of this type of issue. An ELL endorsement does not mean teachers have those linguistic strategies. It was noted this type of learning could be best accomplished through professional development.

Members noted that while it was important to consider the needs of ELLs, it was important not to forget the needs of other groups. Honors students need to show growth as well. Professional development needs to be tailored to all populations, not just one population. All students need to be challenged. We want to ensure the programs outlined by our universities remain comprehensive. We do not want to restrict the universities in the development of their programs.

Chair Salazar thanked Dr. McCafferty for taking the time to review the literature to address the needs of Nevada's students.

The members to a break from 10:08am to 10:36am to review the *White Paper*.

### **Discussion and possible adoption of February 2013 version of the *Systems Guidelines White Paper*.**

Members discussed minor content changes to the *White Paper*. Changes included adding Dr. Linda Archambault and Kimberly Tate as former members; adding the regulatory language for 2(d) to both the teacher and administrator evaluation models as discussed in agenda item 5; revisions to the membership of the Communication Task Force and Group 3; adding the percentage breakdown (35%, 10%, 5%) to the Student Outcomes section of both the teacher and administrator models; and adding page numbers and corresponding information to the Table of Contents.

**MOTION:** Member Crowley moved to approve the presented *Systems Guidelines White Paper* as an archival document which records system development, with changes as noted. Vice Chair Barker seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

### **Presentation on *Policy Parameters and Implementation Guidelines*, including reviewing the PowerPoint presentation shared with the State Board of Education on January 25, 2013, and discussion of need for a written guidelines document that further explicates the content of the PowerPoint presentation.**

Member Fitzpatrick shared with the TLC the power point presentation from the January meeting of the SBE. The power point would essentially function as a user's guide for the new performance framework. The table of contents is driven by stakeholder values and will help structure the user's guide.

The guide is broken up into four main areas of focus:

1. Why the Framework is needed;
2. What the Framework measures;
3. How the Framework operates; and
4. How the Framework will improve.

Members discussed “why” the framework was needed. We have a current situation where statewide our students are under performing and our former system was not helping educators improve instruction, and thus our students were not improving. That is the reality. The vision: Students must graduate ready for college, careers, and citizenship success in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. We need a system that will close the gap between vision and reality. To attack this problem, Nevada chose to address instruction, instructional leadership, and to improve instructional support through professional support and learning. Implementation success depends on professional learning and development of both teachers and administrators.

Members discussed the information presented under this section of the power point, as well as its orientation. Members agreed that while it was grounded in the core beliefs of the TLC, some important information need to be either added or emphasized. Members stated it was important for the user’s guide to note the scope of work we have hashed out together, the hard conversations we have had are important to share with others so they understand what we have gone through to come to a consensus. It should clearly state this was a real group effort and was focused on research and best practices. It was also noted that information relative to achievement data such as graduation rates, gap reduction, student growth, and aggregate data would be useful in this section. The decision drivers for the framework should also be added.

Members discussed and revised language in the Theory of Action graphic. The middle of the graphic now reflects “World Class Education”, and “Focus and Sustained” was added to “High Quality Professional Development.” To achieve a more concise feedback loop, the last step was labeled simply “Student Results.”

The members then reviewed the information contained in the “what” section of the power point; the standards and indicators for both the teachers and administrators. It was noted the language was adjusted on the frameworks to make them more professional. Chair Salazar noted the official name of the system was the Nevada Educator Performance Framework, which contained an Administrator Evaluation Model and a Teacher Evaluation Model.

The members reviewed the “how” section next relative to collecting data, weights and measures, and uniformity in the system. Members reordered these slides to reflect a progression from the large scale overview to the small scale detail. Members noted a page relative to the rubrics for both educational practice and student outcomes was needed. The orientation of the section should talk about inputs before we talk about outputs.

It was also decided a page was needed which would “Describe Compensatory and Conjunctive Considerations.” We need some content which discusses the differences between the two. We need to note what the override buttons are. Members also discussed the need to make sure we do not lose the focus on increased student learning.

The final piece of the power point is improvement: both system improvement and teacher and administrator improvement. Members agreed the bulleted headings needed a narrative paragraph under each point.

The members discussed the contact information on the final slide. It was decided the TLC should have just the one website through the NDE. Laurie Thake will contact Judy Osgood relative to the transfer on the video to the NDE site and the closing of the Governor's TLC website.

Lunch break: 12:00-1:00pm

After the lunch break, Member Hales questioned whether the council had discussed the weighting in the administrator model. It is important the council ensures that in the end, we set up something we have not done already. Specific teachers need specific help and those are the things we find out during the evaluation. We need to ensure administrators are doing a thorough and complete evaluation on their teachers. Administrators need to know that the evaluations they give will be reviewed. They will no longer be perfunctory. Chair Salazar noted that it may be easier to evaluate this piece when we have some summative evaluation information to look at. Members agreed the entire system will be implemented with the fidelity we designed. Professional development for administrators will need to be thoughtfully considered.

Integration and reliability will be the questions we will need to evaluate. We will be defining the scope of the RFP to the group who will develop and conduct the validation study.

**Discussion of the Nevada Department of Education Biennial Budget for FY 14-15 as related to budget priorities for educator effectiveness to support the rollout of the *Nevada Educator Performance Framework*.**

Member Fitzpatrick provided a brief budget review on areas of impact and direct relationship to TLC and framework rollout.

**Budget 2614: Educational Trust Fund**

Unused gift card funds go to Nevada education. The fund currently contains \$500,000. We would like to use this for training teachers and administrators for both the framework rollout and the Common Core State Standards rollout. We have worked with the NSEA at the state level to plan how to use these funds. There is strong interest in developing interactive web based modules with user guides and assistance to make the most out of the modules. Members indicated the models need to be focused. Perhaps teachers and administrators need separate modules. Members also expressed concern about the follow-up to a module. It was agreed this could only work if it was part of a total system, including oversight and follow-up. Members reached a favorable consensus on the idea of web based modules.

**2612-Educator effectiveness**

The Governor's budget recommends SBE govern Regional Professional Development Programs (RPDPs).

What will movement of the RPDP to the NDE mean? Administration and directors will stay intact. Money will go straight to RPDP and their programs. Money flows through the state and there will be interaction between the RPDPs and the NDE as to what programs should include. RPDP employees will remain employees of their school district; their transferability and seniority will remain intact. The three governing boards would be eliminated and SBE would be the governing board.

Members expressed concern that this plan may develop silos, which would make it more difficult for the colleges of education to develop plans and have feedback on professional development. Higher education and representatives from various stakeholder groups need to have opportunity to collaborate with the RPDPs. This communication was possible in the past and needs to be retained.

Member Fitzpatrick stated the Governor's budget provides almost \$3 million more to RPDPs over the next biennium. This increase in funds is for the express purpose of rolling out the educator performance framework. We do anticipate collaboration across the three programs to continue. There should be places where an RPDP would build a larger knowledge base in one area which could be shared with the others. The end result is to make the process more efficient, have less overlap, and promote more productivity.

Chair Salazar called upon Dave Brancamp, NWRPDP, to provide public testimony. Mr. Brancamp remarked that Chair Salazar worked in the southern RPDP and provided assistance to administrators in all of the districts. He explained that currently, if someone called from another area and needed service help would be given. We are always looking at how we work with each of the districts and what we can do to share resources. There is a lot of collaboration between the districts and we want that to continue. Chair Salazar added that the RPDPs try to fill the need wherever it is. There is strong collaboration and communication across the state which is important and we want to retain that. Having this collaboration is what will strengthen the framework across the state and across the districts.

Member Fitzpatrick shared that the Governor is prioritizing full-day kindergarten programs; adding 45 new full-time kindergarten programs over the next biennium. Also, more funds are included for targeted support for ELL; \$14 million over the biennium. These funds will be distributed through a non-competitive grant program. Districts will need to have a solid plan which is fundable, but will not compete with each other.

### **Discussion of contents of the Scope of Work to be included in a Request for Proposals (RFP) to be issued and to result in the Nevada Department of Education hiring a contractor to implement a 2-year validation plan**

Chair Salazar began the discussion by sharing information she obtained while reviewing other states' plans. The overriding issue which surfaced was to think of your questions now. What do we want to see in terms of achieving our goals? The purpose of the validation plan is to evaluate the efficacy of both the system and the training and the implementation. States like Colorado made some assumptions as to

what would happen during training, but those things did not actually happen. We need to ask some very specific questions about the training itself.

We need to ask questions which establish a continuous cycle to refine the measures. Chair Salazar mentioned "The MET Final Report." This report talked about some of the things states should consider. In some respect, an evaluation of the system never ends. We will always want to make sure we are getting the results you desire.

The validation process will start with the small scale, such as what kind of sample do we need to have and what is the smallest sample we can have and get reliable measures. We need to determine what type of direction we want to give the vendor relative to the small scale testing. After small scale testing, we move to a larger or wider scale test, and then to full implementation.

Chair Salazar noted the current statute requires the framework to be fully implemented in 2013-2014. As we made presentations to the full legislative committees on the need for validation studies, there was a realization more time would be needed. The Governor has endorsed the two-year validation period and some preliminary conversations with legislators look favorable for a change in the timeline.

Additionally, the chosen vendor may be tasked with building out some of the structures for professional learning. We cannot validate without having some training in place. Administrators need to be trained on how to use the instrument before that tool can be used for a teacher evaluation. When you think about it from this perspective, even two years is a very short turnaround time. We have had the opportunity to look at some of the questions other states found were necessary. What do we want to ask to achieve our desired results? After the break we will break into small groups and form questions which will be presented to the TLC for review. These questions will provide the guidelines for developing the Request for Proposal (RFP).

Member Fitzpatrick explained that we are detailing the scope of work for the research design for the RFP for a contract bid. These are the questions we want answered. The vendor will respond with how they will go about answering those for you. Chair Salazar emphasized that even though our language will not be as sophisticated as that of the vendor, our input is important; language can be adjusted later. Arizona skipped this piece and left their council out. We don't want that to happen. We have so much expertise in this group that we do not want to build an RFP without the group's input. We all have a different perspective and all views are important.

Members began their evaluation and discussion of tools and took a break. 2:20pm to 3:05pm.

After breakout discussions, groups brought their questions relative to the teacher evaluations to the TLC for review and discussion. The questions proposed and discussed with the TLC were:

- Overall mechanics: For the pilot study, are we focusing on the tool we created or are we going to let districts use their own tool?

- Will the data be altered based upon the tool that is used? Do the results differ based on the tool used?
- Do evaluators and teachers really understand the complexity and variance in the use of the word “all”? This has been a concern when we make presentations to teachers.
  - Administrators and teachers need to communicate as to whom is in the classroom. Administrators need to know what “engaged” looks like in that classroom (i.e. autistic). Meeting the needs of “all” of the students at “their” level.
- Does our tool provide enough discriminate language (bright line) to determine what defines “all”, “most,” “some”, and “none?”
  - Rigor needs to be high for all kids at their different levels, and the evaluator understands what should be happening and what is happening.
  - Need accurate and precise criteria. Does it discriminate between the levels?
- Do artifacts represent the standard being measured?
  - Do they accurately portray the standard being measured?
  - Are these the right artifacts to evaluate?
- How does the state’s evaluation tool work?
  - What are the technical properties, validity, and reliability of the tool itself?
  - What is the relationship between each standard and student achievement?
    - Do they apply to students equally?
    - Should they be weighted differently?
- Does the tool lead to pre and post conferences with focused interaction to set a goal and a learning plan?
- Are there trigger points which make more of a difference?
- Do you understand the tool? Do you understand student data?
- Can the teacher reflect on their practice and choose something in the framework as a goal?
  - Can the teacher and administrator agree? Does the use of the tool lead to effective pre and post conferences?
- What is the role of LEA implementation of the framework?
- Are the principals going to be given the time to do these evaluations?
  - How do you make sure administrators are doing effective evaluation? What is the LEA doing to monitor system fidelity?
- Does the evaluation result vary depending on the time and quality of professional development given to the evaluators?
- If the system has the desired effect, what impact did professional development, culture, etc. provide?
  - Why was it effective?
- Was professional development targeted based on evaluation results? Did it have the desired effect? Did it help the teacher?
  
- What was the return on investment of the new system? What are the benefits to the students?

- It's more than achievement. Is there a reduction in the dropout rate? Does the graduation rate increase? Are students more engaged?
- Do educators understand the research base?
- Do teachers perceive that learning these new standards (inputs) are improving their instruction so that students meet daily learning targets (outputs) more effectively and efficiently?
- Is data being correlated to the correct teacher?

Member Fitzpatrick explained how the RFP process will move forward. We will work to put together the RFP, which will go out to vendors this spring. We have to allow potential vendors to ask clarifying questions about the RFP. They will ask in writing. We will respond in writing. We will select the targeted contractor and then the proposal will move to the Board of Examiners for approval. If there is a budget, then the contract must be approved. The RFP will have a caveat included which states "pending availability of funds." If all goes as planned, we will be ready for approval at Board of Examiners meeting on July 9, 2013. This is the first meeting after funds are approved. We should then be ready for the first phase next year.

### **Discussion of forthcoming presentation to the Senate and Assembly Education Committees, currently scheduled for March 4, 2013**

Member Fitzpatrick lead a discussion relative to the information the TLC would like shared with the committees. Members discussed putting more information into the power point than will be presented during the meeting. Members discussed and agreed on the following:

- Guided by research and national expertise.
- System back ground. This was carefully and thoughtfully deliberated and supported by stakeholder values.
- Was not designed to fire 3-5% of our educators. That may be the outcome, but it is not the intent.
- Provide a statement relative to what the system is about; improve student achievement by improving teacher effectiveness.
  - Improvement takes everyone to a higher level. Everyone can improve. Efficiently deal with those who are not effective.
- Theory of action.
- Goals
  - One of the goals is to inform human capital decisions. It is one meaningful component, but not the only component.
- Show both the administrator and teacher models.
- Provide our guiding beliefs from the white paper. It is the foundation of all of the work.
- Share the foundation of research and framework.
  - Capture some of the literature review from Dr. Margaret Heritage.

- Describe the process for collecting data. Highlight the role and importance of professional development.
- Description of the weighting.
  - Provide only a small percentage of teachers can be directly tied to an assessment test. The percentage may be smaller, e.g., 15-18%
- Describe the complexities and realities of the work.
- Make the case for validation. It is a mandatory component for facilitation.
  - Share some national examples where validation was not done; those states have had to back off their timelines because of lack of validation.
  - Describe at a high level what the validation plan seeks to do.
- Share slides number 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, and 21.
- Share the difference between Group 1 and 2 teachers.
- Share Group 3 teachers.
- Share the tools for collecting data and how we use them.
- Include pie chart to frame up work.
- Provide the system background.

**MOTION:** Member Peterson moved to approve these items as the content which will be presented on behalf the TLC to the Joint Committee on Education. Member Galland-Collins seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Members Peterson, Hales, Galland-Collins, and Small anticipate attending the joint committee meeting.

**Future meeting and agenda items.**

The next meeting is scheduled for March 15, 2013 in Reno, with the location to be determined. Some of the things we will discuss are the policy implementation guidelines, rubrics, the beginning drafts for the literature review for principals, the performance levels for professional responsibilities, and professional development.

**Meeting summary.**

Thank you to everyone for all of your hard work on moving everything forward.

**Additional Council member comments.**

No additional member comments

**Public comments.**

Ellen Holmes, Director of Special Learning, CCEA, stated cultural competence is different from specific competencies for language learners. This should be defined in the framework if the intent is to grow stronger teachers and better learning. In Clark County specifically, there is only one data set the proficiencies are driven from. There are no multiple measures, so there is far heavier weighting on one

measure than may be intended. Policy and implementation; many teachers are not general classroom teacher. Can framework be applied evenly to all teachers? There is a misperception that teachers have access to high quality ongoing professional learning. Access to professional learning is uneven at best and extremely limited in CCSD. Data system credibility issues are a top concern. If current timeline remains, there is not enough time to put validation steps in place. I am in favor of pushing back the timeline, however, because part the components are part of the ESEA Waiver, will we be in compliance if time line is moved. A final suggestion in naming the levels: exemplary practice, proficient practice, adequate practice, and ineffective practice. Thank you.

**Meeting adjournment.**

The meeting adjourned at 4:16 p.m.