

NEVADA TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)

MEETING MINUTES

August 20, 2013

Hyatt Place Las Vegas

4520 Paradise Road

Las Vegas, Nevada

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

COUNCIL MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Theresa Crowley, Member
Amy Henderson, Member
Theo McCormick, Member

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

Laurie Thake, Administrative Assistant
Russ Keglovits, Validation Study Project Manager
Leslie James, Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEFP) Project Manager

LEGAL COUNSEL:

Robert Whitney, Senior Deputy Attorney General

INVITED GUESTS:

Dr. Stanley Rabinowitz, Senior Program Director, WestEd
Sujie Shin, Senior Research Associate, WestEd
Carol Hedgspeth, Research Associate, WestEd

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

Pam Hicks, CCASAPE
Jose Delfin, Carson City SD
Pati Falk, Washoe County SD

Kristen McNeill, Washoe County SD
Kristen Gleissner, Washoe County SD
Lou Loftin, NWRPDP
Emily Lin, UNLV
Sylvia Tegano, RPDP
Mark Newburn, SBE
Monte Bay, RPDP
Sarah Negrete, NNRPDP

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.

Pamela Hicks, CCASAPE, Clark County administrators very much wanted to attend today; however, there is a mandatory meeting for all administrators in CCSD today. They would have been here today if they could have been.

Approval of a Flexible Agenda.

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

Introduction of new TLC member and Nevada Department of Education (NDE) Project Management Support.

Chair Salazar started the meeting with an introduction of new members and new roles within the TLC. Welcome Dr. Kim Metcalf, higher education representative with UNLV. Member Metcalf stated that he had most immediately come from Georgia and had served on a committee similar to this. He noted this work can be fascinating and sometimes frustrating, but ultimately rewarding. Member Fitzpatrick publicly thanked Leslie James and Russ Keglövits for their professional work that had helped us get this far. As we transition into Phase 1, Leslie will be assuming the role of Project Manager and will assist Pam in setting the agendas and thinking about plans for training and leadership as we move forward. Russ will be assuming the role of Validation Study Project Manager. WestEd is here today and will assist with the validation study and Russ will help implement the contract to ensure the validation goals are achieved.

Member Fitzpatrick stated she would be transitioning away from the Department of Education in the coming months and will be moving to something different. She said she fully endorses Superintendent

Erquiaga's appointment. She is excited to be moving to something different and appreciates everyone's support. Chair Salazar stated, from the TLC, we know she has so much more to give to education and her sphere will move from Nevada to the country. Much thanks was expressed. Member Fitzpatrick stated this is work she has been very proud of and leaving this work is hard. She thanked everyone.

Members, invited guests, and NDE staff introduced themselves to Member Metcalf.

Presentation on and discussion about the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) Validation Study.

Members provided public disclosures relative to WestEd. Member McCord stated that he is a member of the WestEd board and had been chair of the board and the management committee more times than he could remember. He stated he had been careful to have no involvement with the validation study RFP.

Member Peterson, who is appointed to the TLC as a policy advisor, stated she also works for WestEd. She stated she had no involvement in the RFP development or selection.

Member Fitzpatrick disclosed she was a member of the WestEd board and held a position at the NDE. In anticipation that WestEd might apply for the work, she tasked staff to develop and review proposals. She saw the original proposal but was not privy to who applied. She did not review or see the applications, nor did she review or arrange materials. She was not engaged in the selection of WestEd.

Member McCord also disclosed that he owned a LLC in Nevada and had been approached by one of the RPDPs for technical assistance. While it does not relate to the work with the TLC, the RPDPs are a significant part of this work. They approached him, he did not approach them, and he is providing some technical assistance.

Members began a discussion of implementation Phase 1. The next step is to test the framework to ensure this system is going to advance education for Nevada's kids. Mr. Keglovits, project manager of the validation study will have a presentation. Dr. Rabinowitz, Ms. Shin, and Ms. Hedgspeth from WestEd will discuss how the validation study will move forward.

Mr. Keglovits provided an overview of the RFP process and associated deadlines, which had been previously discussed in detail with the TLC. There were 4 vendors who submitted proposals with very different approaches. These proposals were reviewed by a committee of 6, and Mr. Keglovits affirmed that Members Peterson, McCord, and Fitzpatrick were not involved. WestEd was selected based in large part on the research based questions they submitted. They addressed in a very deep and knowing fashion what was needed in this validation study. They won on the merits and on the cost of the proposal. The first official meeting was last night and things are off to a great start. The terms of the contract run from August 2013 through June 2015. July 2014 will be our first year one final report.

Chair Salazar stated WestEd has really tried to understand what we want to accomplish. We wanted to hone in on a very specific set of standards for teachers and administrators. Thank you to WestEd for being with us today.

Dr. Rabinowitz began WestEd's presentation. He said: To place this work in context, I run assessment and standards development services and we have 70 full time and 70 part time staff. We do national work, important work, and interesting work. It would have been lousy to not get to do this work. This particular project is very personal to me and this work is really important to our team. Ms. Shin has worked with you in the past and Ms. Hedgspeth is new to the team. What we bring is capacity, context, and continuity. I think we can do this work better because we understand Nevada. We have the advantage of seeing what other states have done. It is so important what we are going to do with you over the next few years. We need to build the right system and build a safe system, so it is very important to validate this system.

WestEd is a research based organization. Ms. Shin has put together the best state of our knowledge. She is involved in both national and regional research and will really coordinate this work. We consider our work a partnership with the NDE, the TLC, and the greater Nevada education community. We want this study to matter because Nevada educators will drive the findings.

Ms. Hedgspeth and Mr. Keglovits provided the mission statement for the validation study which contained four very important goals: validity, feasibility, defensibility, and fairness.

Validity: Are we identifying the right educators as effective and are the indicators showing that? We have to grow teachers and administrators. Does the system provide information to promote growth? Validity is contextual. Is what other states are doing valid here? Does it work across the state? Does it work for both Clark and Elko despite the differences in districts and in schools? Does it work for all? It is a fairness issue. There are demographic differences in schools and in teachers that we need to get at and get to our sampling approach. Year one should inform changes to the system that need to be made to move statewide in year two.

Members discussed the concept of reliability. Dr. Rabinowitz stated that reliability is really embedded in both validity and defensibility. The hardest thing we have to do is defensibility. It is dependent upon validity, feasibility and fairness. No one as of yet has satisfied the defensibility issue for high stakes decisions.

Ms. Shin will figure out what different states are doing and will track how they are defending this work. From a policy standpoint, how do you move ahead knowing the questions you still have to answer? We need to be humble but confident at the same time.

Member Fitzpatrick reviewed the background for our system about educator effectiveness.

When RTTT came forward in 2012, Nevada had law that prohibited using student success in teacher evaluations. This sparked an opportunity for true reform. Informed decision making with research at the time resulted in AB 222 in the 2011 legislative session. In December 2012, the first framework

models were submitted to the SBE. The SBE has now adopted regulations surrounding the system as it moves from field test to full implementation. What Nevada has done well is ensure communication between the Council, the Legislature, and the Governor. Recall, Governor Sandoval joined us for that first meeting and he instructed the TLC to tell us what needs to be done to complete this work correctly. Likewise, Assemblywoman, now Senator, Debbie Smith said please let us know what needs to be done, so there was a bipartisan effort from a leadership perspective to make sure the work moved forward. Senator Smith sponsored SB 407, which carried most of the changes recommended by the TLC, so the SBE could fully implement the regulatory changes. The purpose of the system in Nevada is not punitive. We have embraced the concept of learning what we need to learn about education so we can improve teacher effectiveness to drive professional development in the system.

Dr. Rabinowitz stated this is a two year process. Year 1 is a pilot and year 2 is a full dress rehearsal. As we go through this process, what infrastructure do we need to scale up? We are moving forward with new systems, new instruments, and new expectations. The goal is not to be right in year one and year two, the goal is to be ready to do this in year three. It is important not to panic in year one. We want to learn and improve for year 2 and be ready in year 3. Relative to the work of the RPDPs, Chair Salazar stated the whole role of the RPDP to make sure this works. Benchmarks and feedback along the way will be very important to the RPDPs so they can make the appropriate adaptations. We need to make sure there is ongoing formative feedback. We don't want year 2 to look like year 1 with just more people.

Members discussed whether a 10% sample was rigorous enough to inform work for year two. Dr. Rabinowitz stated the same things going on in our 10% sample are going on in the other 90% as well. If the 90% is waiting to see what happens in the 10% before they do anything, we may not have a successful year 3. If districts are waiting for year 2 to get started, that would be a mistake. The NDE needs to get out that districts should not wait. Ms. Shin added, in year 1 we are focusing on real variation and what happens in districts across Nevada. Fine tuning will be ongoing. You will not have to wait for a year to make changes. Members also expressed concern about those outside the 10%. We need to make sure we communicate to the 90% that teachers and administrators will be trained. It could be a disaster from a communication and buy in standpoint if we do not.

Dr. Rabinowitz provided that at least 2 districts were choosing somewhat different evaluation tools, and staff questioned whether adjustments to instrumentation were needed. The answer is no. Chair Salazar emphasized that we have developed a statewide system. The observation tool used needs to reflect the established standards and indicators. There can be local flexibility in the tools, but the standards themselves are statewide.

Member Fitzpatrick provided clarification on implementation and consequences in the 2014-2015 school year. In June, we were directed under law to work with the vendor to create a report no later than August 2014. Recall that the directive is such that the law directs the IFC in August 2014 to make a decision as to implementation for the system in the 2014-2015 school year. If the validation study reveals that the work ready for prime time with consequences, then consequences will occur. If the

evaluation study shows there is still a sufficient amount of work to be refined, then we have a second year of field testing, with no consequences. Agreements with the USDOE now offer some flexibility to states, without negatively impacting our waiver, and we will seek this opportunity in case the validation study needs a second year. Mr. Keglovits provided that in talks with the USDOE, there is a little difference between ratings and consequences. We will have ratings in year two, but on consequences we have some flexibility.

The question we are often asked is why should people participate? The answer is that this will happen with or without your participation, so take the opportunity to have your input heard. We really want the system to work so we need people to participate actively. We are looking to collaborate. Educators are the beneficiaries and they need to have input into the system. Being part of the sample will at least provide minor professional development. You will not be called out or be embarrassed for participating. There will be no individual results coming out of year one, for the school or the teacher or district. This is a system-wide pilot.

Members discussed with Dr. Rabinowitz whether a FOIA request could be used to obtain the information. Personnel documents are protected under the law, but perhaps for school wide data maybe not. Dr. Rabinowitz provided that the data is not being analyzed at the school level, so there would be no data to request. Member McCord stated the TLC should be ready for a FOIA request. Policy development needs to be thought through. Data will be in our first year report, and the NDE and TLC will need to decide whether to make that report public. Dr. Rabinowitz emphasized it was not likely that any one teacher would be involved in all 19 indicators. It would be impossible to get a rating for one teacher across the entire system. Member Metcalf added that in other states, those data have been released. Teacher data has been redacted, but not the school data. Member Fitzpatrick stated that we should set this issue aside for the moment as the NDE had been working with the AG's office to work out these types of eventualities.

Members discussed whether there would be dual system evaluations in year one. Member Fitzpatrick stated that SB 407 requires individuals participating in the sample to also be evaluated with the existing system, as districts cannot make decisions on tenure, etc., with a system in pilot. Member McCord stated that if someone did something grievous, then participation in the sample should not insulate them from appropriate personnel action.

Dr. Rabinowitz provided that these were the year 1 research questions we seek to answer:

- Do the instruments work the way they are supposed to?
- Are they being implemented with fidelity?
- Are the ratings they produce appropriate, valid, and reliable?
- How much burden is it to use them?, and
- What have we learned from all of these questions to inform a statewide implementation?

Members reviewed the questions and specifically addressed question 3. If the first year is all about fidelity of implementation, then why do we have this question? If we are looking at ratings, don't you

have to look at the distribution? If we are to determine whether they are appropriate and valid, don't you have to look at them in terms of student achievement data? Dr. Rabinowitz clarified that these questions were at the instrument level, and not at the system level.

Members discussed how individuals participating in the study would be trained. The TLC had previously discussed the categories of individuals who would require training: evaluators, teachers who will be evaluated, and administrators who will be evaluated. The legislature authorized over a million dollars for each year of the biennium to the RPDs to conduct training relative to the NEPF. There are funds through the RPDs and at the district level to train. In agenda item 7, we will talk more about training. The validation study is about the system, it is not a feedback loop for administrators, schools or principals.

School Selection Strategy:

Dr. Rabinowitz discussed selection methods. We could have put every school in the hat and just picked. We could have also just asked for volunteers. There are real disadvantages to the two. In a completely random selection, some schools would be selected which are not ready to, and do not want to, participate. Even with a school that wants to participate, it may not be appropriate for a 10% sample. If you use just volunteers, you may not get a full range of districts in the state. We wanted to make sure anyone can do this system, so we decided to meet in the middle. Members discussed issues relative to the sample of students. Ms. Shin stated we want to make sure the results are not skewed. We want to make sure the system works for everyone. Members asked if every teacher in a volunteering school participate. Dr. Rabinowitz provided that there will be teachers selected from within those schools. To address the issue of cherry picking teachers to skew results, Dr. Rabinowitz suggested perhaps getting surveys from all teachers in the schools. If the schools are cherry picking, that should help reveal that. Chair Salazar stated that we have all of the demographic slots filled. We had to go back and work to fill some of the smaller demographics. Letters will be going to the district superintendent's and they will be provided with guidelines. However, the superintendents will make the choices on participation.

Questions from TLC members:

Question for the parking lot: Will we be collecting samples of what is out there? The districts will have a lot of materials, observations, and policies. If we can collect that data it may help us. Chair Salazar provided that a component of AB222 was information sharing. I do not think we have the infrastructure for that yet, but absolutely, this has always been about growth and development and that happens when we share information with each other.

Question relative to adding one more burden to administrators: There are already new initiatives going on in schools. Perhaps part of the letter to superintendents should ask what their commitment to this study is; how many initiatives are they already working on.

The Council took a break from 10:41 a.m. to 11:04 a.m.

Strategic Stratified Sample:

Ms. Hedgspeth stated that WestEd will be looking at whether the NEPF is valid, feasible, and defensible. We are looking at the processes and we are looking to see that the framework measures what it is supposed to. We are looking at student performance and outcome measures, as well as technology and training around these measures. We will look at professional feedback and materials, so we can make sure those implementing the framework are as informed as they can be. We will be looking at documentation and guidelines around the framework, as well as your data systems that support the framework. Chair Salazar stated the RPDPs need to have the opportunity to do training. We need to be able to develop the materials to provide training. The first semester we will build capacity, knowledge, and expertise with educators; the second semester we will evaluate those practices and techniques.

WestEd will tie all information back to the research questions and will keep these feedback loops open.

Question 1: Validity. Do the instruments measure what they purport to measure. Do they do it consistently? As some of these measures are already in use, we will be able to answer this question by doing a comparison.

Member Peterson questioned whether this made an assumption on training; that each principal had reached a level of mastery. Dr. Rabinowitz clarified that is more an issue of, for those who did receive training, did it work.

Question 2: Fidelity. Are the instruments being implemented with fidelity? That will be an ongoing conversation. Is there appropriate and sufficient training around each component of the framework? Do the instruments supporting the intent of the framework?

Dr. Rabinowitz asked a question relative to infrastructure. Where would you say infrastructure is now compared to where it needs to be? Mr. Keglovits provided that it is difficult to describe at the NDE. We have so much data, but all of it is purposeful and intended for specific purposes and causes. We have information about teachers and we have information about students, but we do not know which teachers have which students. This is a big piece we need to put into place.

Question 3: Are the ratings appropriate, valid, reliable, and defensible? How are we looking at instruments and their ratings? One of the things we want to look at for each instrument is the content and construct validity. Do the measures inside the instrument work together and do they work well?

Construct validity: What is being measured by this instrument, and is it measuring it appropriately? Does the instrument measure what it purports to measure, both internally and externally? Are the results between the 4 evaluation levels distinct? Are the results reflective of academic factors? If they are, then we need to address those issues. The instrument should measure only what it is supposed to measure. It should not be measuring non-academic factors. Ms. Shin clarified that we do want to keep to those things we decided to measure. We want to measure the instructional standards. We want to focus on what is going on in the classroom. Members discussed the obligation as an educator was to

prove you have done everything you can to the best of your ability. Even with kids that have disenfranchisement issues; when they receive great instruction they improve.

Question 4: Are the processes feasible and relative lo-burden? Can they be scaled up? To what degree is this sustainable? We are looking at school district capacity and support. Can we grow and build it? How can we implement data systems and infrastructure to support? We will look at current professional development offerings to see how they can be bolstered in the future to meet the goals of the framework. We want to know more about how communication happens between entities. Is our message being lost?

Question 5: Can we provide any research based refinements to further meet NEPF goals? Are there any system design issues? Are there things that are glaringly ineffective? This needs to be ongoing and in a meaningful way. Members questioned whether this was outside the scope of the validation study. Ms. Shin provided that it was at this phase. The next phases of the refinement process may be where we look at that.

Chair Salazar called on Assemblywoman Dondero-Loop for public testimony. Assemblywoman Dondero-Loop stated: I am in awe of the work that has been done, so thank you all for doing that. I could not agree more that we have this lapse in communication and time, so I thank you for recognizing that. I, for one, know we depend on you to keep us up on to date on work that is happening in the interim. One thing I can say for sure is that sometimes educators hear things differently than those not in the field. As educators, we are always looking for the positive and sometimes we forget to distinguish what is ineffective; what did not work. What do we need to adjust, and what do we need to just throw out. Essentially, teachers are rule followers and they want to do what is right. It is really valuable to have expertise helping you.

Chair Salazar emphasized that because this is an iterative process we have to provide feedback and follow up. WestEd's work will provide feedback as to that type of professional development that is needed.

Dr. Rabinowitz stated that 5 research questions with 18 sub-bullets had been presented. Unfortunately, we do not have the time or the resources to complete all 18 as deeply as we would want. Some sub-bullets will be deep observations and some will be a survey. We will need a hierarchy of the 18 sub-bullets. It was stressed that successful validation studies are about fewer questions with deeper understanding. Superficial review does not move a system to a highly effective system.

The Council took a break for lunch from 11:53 a.m. to 12:47 p.m.

Chair Salazar requested a brief shift to the next agenda item, number 7. After completing agenda item 7, the council then moved back to this agenda item.

Ms. Hedgspeth provided more details relative to the validation study. Sample size: It is estimated that there are 23,000 teachers and 1000 administrators in Nevada, so we will have a 10% sample size of 2300 participants; 2200 teachers and 100 administrators. They will be part of the sample we will select from.

Members inquired about the quantity of observations and surveys to be completed. Ms. Shin stated we have yet to determine exactly how many observations will need to be done. It will depend on who we select, what questions we ask, and how many observations can be worked into a cycle.

Based on what WestEd is charged with, there must be at least 6 school districts, to include Washoe and Clark. The strata we are interested in looking at may include what is happening based on the type of school; elementary, middle, high school; school size; large vs. small. We may look at indications of socio-economic standards; percentages of free and reduced lunch, as well as special education and ELL classification. Members suggested WestEd also consider the teacher type, the school transient rate, the number of probationary teachers at a school, whether high needs schools are receiving their fair share of highly effective teachers, and the difficulty of showing growth among high achieving students.

Ms. Shin clarified that this is a framework about how to collect a representative sample. At the end of year one, we will be looking at correlations. Ms. Hedgspeth added if we go back to what Dr. Rabinowitz described earlier, we are looking at the key demographics to make sure the framework can be fully implemented. Some of these suggestions may be part of the frame we look at.

Member McCord suggested a work session in the spring or summer of 2014 to invite those members who have participated in the rollout to provide their insight. This goes back to studying the culture and could provide valuable learning. The participants will have an active voice. It will help our thinking and inform the TLC, as well as help the legislators understand how the study has gone.

Bringing us back to the research question: The kinds of things we need to be able to answer our research questions:

- Baseline educator effectiveness data. What kinds of information have been used so we can make some comparisons.
- Past and current process in collecting teacher/administrator practice data. We want to know what it looked like before so we can see if changes have made meaningful differences.
- Training materials, process for and use of education practice rubrics, and all of the training materials.
- What kind of communication strategies are in place.

Chair Salazar stated that districts were already asking what type of communication is available for them, so we should be seeing that come out soon. It was confirmed that the training materials will be all open source so districts can build upon them. The standards are the same for all schools in Nevada, so changes will need to be cross-walked to make sure those standards are not changed if districts make changes to their observation tool.

The Project Timeline is very broad at this point and more bullets will be added soon.

- Starting in August: Detailed sampling and project plan to be fleshed out and finalized by the end of August.

- Data collection will start in the fall and go into spring. We hope to have ongoing briefings to the TLC as to what we are finding. It was clarified that NDE was collecting the data, not WestEd.
- September 2013 to March of 2014: There is a lot of work we will be doing. We have some sub-bullets but we are still developing these.
- April 2014 to June 2014: We will have the data compiled and WestEd will analyze data and have an initial report, which will become final in July 2014. We will study how findings from year 1 will influence year 2.
- Year 2 implementation planning will start August 2014. Discuss timeline points.

Ms. Shin stated that this is a huge task because so much is changing. It was a difficult RFP to respond to because of that. We will focus on very specific points and those results will generate new focus points. We need to stay true to what is important to us.

Member Metcalf questioned, from a pre-service standpoint, would the TLC like higher education to look at how to implement this. Member Fitzpatrick responded that I think it is exactly the right thing to do, start to think about preparation for initial licensure, as well as graduate education. We will never get this right until we understand that higher education gets what K-12 sends you, and K-12 gets what you send back.

Presentation on and discussion about the Leadership Institute sponsored by the Nevada Regional Professional Development Programs August 5, 6, 7 on the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) Teacher Standards featuring Dr. Margaret Heritage.

The Council shifted momentarily from the prior agenda item to this one.

Chair Salazar introduced the August kickoff from RPDPs. She noted that all three directors were here, so I think it is important to hear from them so they can tell us about their thinking around the timeline and where we are going.

Sarah Negrete, NERPDP, Elko, Nevada. I brought along Aaron Hanson, who is our administrator coordinator for this work. We have some broad ideas about how we envision working with teachers and leaders. We are really excited to see some dates today. We talked over lunch about how we can work with this timeline. We are looking for some more direction to ensure we are following the correct track. We attended the training from Pam and Margaret in August and have spent time researching some of the materials they provided, so we are busy preparing ourselves to be prepared to go out in front of others with this.

Bill Hanlon, SRPDP. We too had a southern meeting. How are we going to put this together? All of us in the RPDP will get together, as well as the assistant superintendents and university representatives. We are in the process of making sure we clearly understand the standards so we can get a vision, and come

together to start looking at videos on those. We will have 8 or 9 meetings on those. After observing and discussing the videos, then we will go out to the schools and see how that works in the classroom. Then we will confer with other RPDPs so there is a consistent message and training throughout the state. After we make sure everyone has a clear understanding of the teachers standards, both teachers and administrators, we will move on to the administrator standards. Then finally the evaluator standards to ensure inter-rater reliability. Everyone needs to speak a common language statewide. In terms of where we are; in terms of a 10 story building, we are at sub-level 2. We need to make sure people have a can do attitude to get this done. The fact is with the additional time it will help us get this out and be able to reflect. We have to come to grips with some of the standards. I hate confusing activity with achievement, and do not want to confuse engagement with achievement. We have to make sure engagement is involved in student learning. My concern is the one size fits all on the CCSS, with math and foreign language it makes a difference which order you teach in. There are concerns we have to work out to be in compliance, I want to make sure we have an understanding that one size does not fit all to make sure there is engagement.

Kirsten Gleissner, NWRPDP. Sarah ditto and Bill ditto. I also brought along Lou Loftin, who is one of our trainers in science to help keep it real from the trainer's standpoint. Our focus is how to create inter-rater reliability around the integrity of the standards and support our teachers. We need to build within ourselves so we can support, support, support. We will also be extending a couple of positions to administrator support.

The first broad look at the work of the RPDPs, which will be implemented over the next few months, all started with a kickoff with Dr. Heritage explaining the standards in Washoe. I think there was great discussion. Vice Chair Barker stated I think it was very well received. Our current evaluation tool in Washoe has 72 indicators, everyone wanted to take this home and share it. Everyone loved Dr. Heritage and her message. Chair Salazar stated I think people were in support with the message; what is it that teachers do to help students learn and what is it that administrators do to help teachers help students to learn.

Then we went to Elko. We had a fine training room that seats about 60 and we had some great discussions and one on one conversations. The afternoon sessions were for RPDP and other trainers to talk about what it is CREEST should be doing to help assist with their and how RPDPs roll out training. Ms. Gleissner stated the message was well received and people were appreciative. We had a large audience and lots of participation and prompted some continued instructions. We are trying to incorporate the vocabulary so we can get people to start thinking in those terms.

The final stop was in Las Vegas and we had invited all of the principals, but not all of the administrators as we had in the northeast because we knew we had a venue that was only good for about 400. We had 478 people sign in for a room set for 400, so it was a challenge to deliver this.

Mr. Hanlon stated the presentation with Margaret did not go as well in Las Vegas. We had comments that were not good. There was some sense that some people saw Pam in one way and some saw her in a very different way. Words like condescending and arrogant were used. We know what we have to do

to get people on board to move forward. Pam and Theo are on our team, as well as Karen Stanley and Pam Hicks. The bottom line is that people were introduced to this so now it is about getting out there and having people embrace this because it is about students and what students need to succeed in the K-12 system.

Chair Salazar added that the good thing is that I had 173 emails afterward and most of them were very positive. We have had strong communication from administrators in the south who are very excited. We have gotten some feedback that we would not have wished to see, but we have a lot of positive feedback as well. Member Collins stated that right now I do not think the message is clear. The nightmare is that principals may try to implement standards without training. Then teachers will get frustrated, and then there goes our buy in. We do not want that to happen. I do not think they understand the depth. Chair Salazar concurred and stated there were very different perceptions on what this is and what it is not. We need to say to the superintendents this is what it is.

Member Small added that Clark has an issue that is a cultural piece. The one thing I was amazed by is there was not a culture of safety at which they could ask and answer questions. Dr. Heritage would go around and ask people to share, and they would not. They did not want to answer questions in front of their peers. People would not share out. We need to talk about the culture of administrators. These are the people setting the tone in schools. They need to establish an environment where teachers feel like they can have a safe conversation with their administrators, good bad or ugly. I think that will be key for us. I can help teachers with that, but we really need to change the culture. It is going to be a heavy lift in Clark County.

Member Norton provided that the perception of Nye County was skewed. We had year-long training from Chair Salazar. We were talking about this a year ago. Chair Salazar and Member Fitzpatrick have given great presentations at the NASA meeting. Dr. Heritage was the only new part, so we went away with thinking there was nothing that was new to us. The venue did not help that, and I agree that there were just so many people. There was no intimacy.

The TLC finished with this agenda item and moved back to prior agenda item 6.

Development of aligned model for Group 3 personnel

Leslie James led a discussion on Group 3 teachers. This group was not a part of AB222, but they are now a part of SB407. Next tasks for TLC in terms of Group 3 teachers were discussed.

- SB 407: Requires the NDE, along with districts, to select representative sample for a validation study of the system. We need to implement the evaluation to include them in 2015-2016
 - Back in August the TLC recommended ad hoc groups. Group 3 was one of these and involved a discussion on specialist personnel.
 - Exceptional pupils personnel, all in NRS, etc.

- Specialist teacher personnel to help other teachers be effective through coaching etc.
 - Reviewed TLC motions from last November as they were approved by TLC.
 - In consultation with Lynn, we work through this to see what standards and indications looked like for their particular job description, and where there might be similarities.
 - How will they be evaluated in terms of student outcomes. We need some technical assistance from groups across the country. We need to lay out a viable plan to engage stakeholders and get stakeholder feedback. We need some expertise in this area. We need to put something in place for a validation study a year from now.
- Consideration of guiding beliefs is important.
 - Structure for moving this forward in terms of taskforces.
 - We may need to develop those types of structures and bring back to the next meeting as to how we are going to do that work to engage those specialists. High leverage instructional standards as well as standards of the profession need to be addressed, and how everything can be considered together.

MOTION: Member Fitzpatrick made a motion to request the TLC Chair to prepare a draft structure for implement the requirements of SB 407 relative to Group 3 personnel and present to the Council at the next meeting. Vice Chair Barker seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Update on national legal issues.

Update and Report on national legal issues. A standing agenda item was added in light of the Florida case. Chair Salazar requested Member McCord provide an update, and for Ms. Shin to add anything else which may be important. Member McCord stated there were currently 3 that were important:

The ACLU filed suit against the Rhode Island State Board of Education relative to high stakes testing requirements. They were uncomfortable discussing in public what we discuss every day. This should be testimony to us; this is what happens when you whisper about things instead of talking about them openly.

The NEA suit against the Florida evaluation system; there is no action as of right now. There was a statement by NEA president, and references issues in it we have discussed. "This lawsuit highlights the absurdity of the evaluation that has come about as of the result of SB 736. Teachers in Florida are being evaluated using a formula designed to measure learning gains on Florida exams in math and reading. Most of the teachers, including 7 in the lawsuit, don't teach the subjects in the grades where the test is administered. One of the teachers bringing suit is

being evaluated on test scores not even in her school.” The Florida system was before its time and we have been careful to be slow in the implementation. We want to make sure it is not implemented in an irrational way. Florida is in deep trouble in this area, as is Texas and Louisiana. One of the drawbacks is that some states are becoming uncomfortable with CCSS. Going too fast has been proven not to be very wise.

Dr. Rabinowitz emphasized this is why we always talk about 1, 3, 5, 10. You should never do anything you are uncomfortable with without saying what you are going to do in 3 years. People will live with an imperfect system if they know when it is going to end, and end in something better. We know this system is not ideal, but there is some rational. But in 2 years we will have something else in place, a different more defensible system. We do not want to pretend it is all okay. You want something better and it takes time to get better. Member McCord stated this case will ultimately end up in federal court and it will spread like wildfire once a decision is out.

Ms. Shin added that Florida has a fairly complicated evaluation system. I think in terms of comparing it to Nevada, you have taken a very deliberate approach as to how people will be impacted. Florida did not do that. Member Peterson questioned whether there were any states doing a really good job in combining their teacher evaluation efforts with their CCSS implementation efforts. Ms. Shin provided that D.C. had an evaluation system that involves every member in the building, and was aligned to common core. Their system took at least 3 years of concerted development on instructional development and professional development before it was fully rolled out.

Future meeting and agenda items.

There will be ongoing review at the next meeting, which will be on October 1, 2013 in Las Vegas. We will further discuss validation and implementation, as well as a timeline and plan for how TLC needs to be engaged to move this forward.

We will have a meeting plan for TLC for this year.

The following meeting will be October 31, 2013 in Reno. We will discuss the next segment of the process of the validation study and implementation Phase 1.

Meeting summary.

I hope we go away today with a better understanding of the validation study. How schools will be selected to participate. What the validation study is and what it isn't. We are all ambassadors to encourage schools to participate and be successful.

Public comment #2.

Pam Hicks, CCSD Administrators Association. I want to go back to roll out that occurred on the 7th. We had the representative council meeting on the 8th with people who attended that 7th training. There were a couple of things you need to know:

1. Of these 15 principals many said they would like to bring their administrative team to this meeting and the answer was no. Now, for whatever reason, you ostensibly did a disservice to the administrators. These are the gung ho people.
2. They wanted answers, dates, timelines, to plan a structure. That's what they thought they would get. Even today they didn't get that. There is urgency out there, there is not one building level principal here. It easy for us to sit here and discuss this, but I can tell you those principals; there is such a sense of urgency and we need to get them more. When I give them this timeline, they will be very disappointed. Some of these principals are running cities. I know you can't comment but I can't express the urgency. As we move forward, what are the next steps? School board meetings are set a year in advance. I implore you to get information to these people. When I do my report, there will be 15 unhappy people. There are still no specific plans. After all today there is only one date. Please communicate with the people whose feet are to the fire.

Lou Loftin, NWRPDP. On the validation study, exactly what teachers are we looking at? What grades and subjects? I just never got that information. What groups are we going to be working with this first year? Ms. Shin stated the short answer to that is yes, all of the above. A representative sampling in schools is exactly what we mean. Tested and untested. In terms of TLC, groups 1 and 2, but not group three, not the specialists. Mr. Loftin queried regarding specialists. Chair Salazar provided it is the librarians, counselors; the group Leslie James talked about in her agenda item. Evaluation is for teachers in all classrooms and in all grades. Mr. Loftin queried on the CCSS. Chair Salazar provided the evaluation is on standards in the NEPF. We have a whole host of academic content standards and they all need to be taught.

Meeting adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 3:04 p.m.