

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

June 14, 2013

Best Western Airport Plaza
1981 Terminal Way
Reno, Nevada

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pamela Salazar, Chair
Barbara Surritte-Barker, Vice Chair
Christine Cheney, Member (departed at 12:35p.m.)
Rorie Fitzpatrick, Member
Kathleen Galland-Collins, Member
Sharla Hales, Member
Amy Henderson, Member
Robert McCord, Member
Theo McCormick, Member
Dale Norton, Member
Mary Peterson, Member
Bonnie Townsend, Member

COUNCIL MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Theresa Crowley, Member
Theo Small, 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:

Lynn Holdheide, Senior Technical Assistance Consultant, Center on Great Teachers and Leaders

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

Dave Brancamp, NWRPDP
Georgia Coulombe, NWRPDP
Jose Delfin, Carson City SD
Dana Galvin, Washoe Education Assoc.

Pati Falk, Washoe County SD
Kristen McNeill, Washoe County SD
Todd Butterworth, LCB
Kristen Gleissner, Washoe County SD
Nicole Rourke, Clark County SD
Circe Stumbo, CCSSO
Terry Janicki, CCSSO
Lisa Bliss, Churchill County SD
Rich Alexander, Douglas County SD
Tami Berg, NV PTA
Steven Augsperger, Clark School Administrators
Patrick Collins, Clark 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

There was no public comment.

Approval of a Flexible Agenda

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

Approval of Minutes for the May 3, 2013 Teachers and Leaders Council Meeting.

MOTION: Member Norton moved to approve the minutes from the May 3, 2013 TLC meeting. Member McCormick seconded. Member Hales abstained as she was not present at the meeting. The motion passed.

Overview of Nevada Educator Performance Framework rollout: Revisiting the Implementation Plan, particularly regarding Phase I Implementation in the 2013-2014 school year.

Council members revisited discussion from the last meeting in terms of the framework rollout over the next few months. As we move into "Implementation Phase 1" we will need to shift our mental model to this language. The Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) Implementation Plan will help the TLC learn from Phase 1 and help to prepare for Phase 2.

Members reviewed the categories to determine if any needed information was missing. A suggestion was made to add a column to the plan to indicate which entity, or who, would be responsible for performing the task. Members discussed perhaps those assigned to complete the validation study might have some suggestions relative to who might be best to perform these tasks so as to not overburden the RPDPs.

Members discussed district flexibility with data collection and the use of their own systems. Member Fitzpatrick indicated the law requires a statewide system. The SBE has established standards and indicators and the districts cannot shift away from those. However, the SBE also adopted that districts could use alternate evaluation tools that incorporate those state standards. Districts will have the opportunity to come forward with a different data collection protocol, but they will need to demonstrate how those tools will generate data to provide a performance rating against the established standards and indicators. Chair Salazar shared how Lyon County worked with Marzano to have additions made to their observation tool that will cover the required standards and indicators. Evaluations should provide data which will guide the professional development of the educator.

Members discussed the ongoing timeline for the RFP and the vendor review process. We will need to have contracts signed and prepared to go before the Board of Examiners in August. After that, the first step will be to determine the 10% representative sample of educators. The work is continuing with materials development and Dr. Margaret Heritage at the CREEST Center will continue to be a strong supporter in building out all of the modules to support this work. While the RPDPs are fully embracing the work to come, Members noted that there is currently more concern about the continuing stage and not the implementation phase. The process needs to remain very transparent so legislators can see how difficult it is going to be for the RPDPs, and to understand this is not one shot training.

Upcoming opportunities such as the NASA conference and the RPDP August training sessions were mentioned as first opportunities to discuss in detail the roll out of Phase 1. The RPDP Summer Institute will involve deep training of RPDP staff and others (teachers and administrators) who will be part of the sample. August will also see the start of focus group conversations with facilitation guides to determine if the guides developed serve their purpose. We will receive continual feedback on Phase 1 training and will receive ongoing support from Dr. Heritage and the CREEST team. Members also discussed other presentation opportunities, such as the NASB Conference in October, to discuss appropriate staffing ratios for evaluators to teachers, as well as the needs of the professional development piece. This would help inform board members so they can accurately explain these needs to their constituents.

Members also discussed the possibility of establishing a work group to map out and assist in RPDP development over the year. It was also noted there was a need for more clarification and information on what the framework is, and this group could assist as part of the communication piece. Just as with the Common Core State Standards, we need to think about the messaging involved, in particular, to stakeholders. The new standards will be far more difficult. As we raise our expectations for educators, we expect to see lower scores initially.

Creating an application process for districts and the initial out of the gate monitoring systems will be a heavy lift for the NDE. Members discussed a data systems RFI so vendors can demonstrate technology platforms. The NDE could provide an opportunity for districts to look at possibilities for IT solutions to collect and align data. The state as an entity has no funding for such a system, but can help facilitate information at no cost to the state. By banding together, there is the opportunity to drive down costs. The districts, along with their boards of trustees, could then decide whether they want to enter into a contract for such as system.

Presentation on and discussion about Senate Bills 345, 407, 447, 504, and 522 as related to the actions of the Teachers and Leaders Council and the rollout of the Nevada Educator Performance Framework.

Members reviewed recent legislative changes and their impact on education generally, and the TLC specifically.

SB 345: creates a STEM Council which is charged with being the receiving body for actions in STEM across the state. Similar to the TLC, they will come forward with recommendation for all things STEM to the SBE. The SBE can adopt regulations around recommendations of the STEM Council. There will be some correlation to the teacher and administrator framework in some areas, so there should be some overlap. Some of the work of the TLC will be to help the other bodies, such as new councils, understand the framework so we do not end up with parallel work between councils. The NDE can find ways to liaison and partner with the chair of each council to establish a standing agenda item to discuss cross-council communication and understanding.

SB 504: provides \$50 million in funding for English Language Learners (ELL) with a focus on how those dollars to have the best outcome. Clark and Washoe will undertake "Zoom Schools". These schools will implement a systems approach and will have a comprehensive program for all ELL at no cost; including pre-k, kindergarten, targeted remediation, and before / after / intersession school options. Rural and Charter Schools will focus on pre-k through third grade. Funds will be awarded through a non-competitive grant program and will be proportional to representation and participation. SB 504 also creates an English Mastery Council which will focus on targeted issues such as the role of teacher preparation, what content is needed for teacher education, and the requisite components and competencies teachers need to be able to demonstrate. The focus of this bill is early learning as research demonstrates it has the largest return on investment.

SB 447: provides changes in the RPDPs. The RPDPs will provide training for teachers and administrators. This codifies that expectation. There are a few changes in budget approval process at local and statewide level. Statewide council configuration has changed and has been formalized, including how we drive the resource allocations on various factors.

SB 522: known as the K-12 Education Budget bill appropriates all other funds for education. Provides resources of \$3 million for the biennium to the RPDPs to provide training on the NEPF. The TLC previously discussed what those resources are and how they will be allocated.

SB 407: changes requested to the NEPF timeline. Some of these changes are things that we asked for; all of our recommended changes were codified in statute. This bill also creates a charge for us to continue some of this work. Changes to the timeline include implementation of a Phase 2. Statute previously required full implementation, with consequences, this year. Changes provide a validation in 2013-14 for this school year and mandate the NDE to work with their vendor and come before the IFC in August 2014. We are required to present to the IFC the first year's summative validation report and show the IFC if we are ready to go in 2014-15 with consequences. Likewise, the validation report may demonstrate we are not ready to go in 2014-15 and the IFC will then make a decision to go forward or expand to further implementation of Phase 1. The question before the IFC will be whether the system will be used for high stakes decisions. We may begin to use the decisions in whole or in part. Professional development could be implemented prior to high stakes decisions.

16.5 & 16.7: provide for waiver of the new timeline. This will be an application process and districts will need to demonstrate they are ready to go forward. Chair Salazar called on Kristin McNeill from WCSD. Ms. McNeill stated Washoe was very comfortable moving forward with the qualitative part, but not the quantitative part of the system. Washoe would like to be part of the validation study on the quantitative part and move forward on the qualitative part as the district has already moved away from satisfactory/unsatisfactory ratings and is using the 4-level designation at the district level.

Changes in this bill also demonstrate that evaluation data should be used to drive professional growth and professional support. We have finally moved away from the punitive language embedded in NRS 391. Additionally, for the first time we will be able to create a cadre of peer evaluators to help administrators build the capacity in a meaningful way.

The SBE adopted additional regulations at their meeting yesterday. When SB 407 was passed, the SBE was able to adopt the regulations that align with evaluation and observation cycles. If you recall, public workshops were held in December 2012 with the previous state board, and in January, the presentation was part of a public hearing and the SBE adopted regulations for content which did not conflict in statute.

Members discussed Cook v Bennett, a legal case in Florida, and the need to be ever watchful. In this case, the Florida school board was sued by the teachers' representatives for violation of equal protection under the 14th amendment. The Florida program does have some similarities to our process; however, the difference is that they went too quickly. They did not complete validation studies. We need to make sure our standard of fairness is maintained throughout the process, and the TLC needs to watch potential litigation so we do not make the same mistakes.

The TLC took a break from 10:37 a.m. to 11:06 a.m.

Discussion of the goals and theory of action for the NV Educator Performance Framework, including possible fine-tuning of the goals and/or theory of action.

Lynn Holdheide lead a discussion relative to the TLC's goals and theory of action. Does your theory still make sense? Have you lost your focus? Are you missing anything? Chair Salazar added that as we move

toward implementation Phase 1, our theory of action is how we operationalize what we intend to accomplish. We can take this opportunity to reset where we are and where we are going. This is where our convictions will be tried.

Members discussed whether the theory of action should require a piece about on-boarding people; recruitment and hiring with the right end in mind. If added, there would be a need for an off-boarding piece as well. From a communication perspective it is important to remain focused, but the TLC may want to step out and look at the larger picture at some point. No changes were made relative to personnel at this time.

Members revisited a change to the TLC goals discussed at the last meeting. Action could not be taken at that time because the item was not listed for action. A request was made to add “and leadership” to the second goal as discussed.

1. Learning and growth;
2. Effective instructional “and leadership” practices;
3. Human capital based on professional growth; and
4. Engage stakeholders.

Members briefly reviewed the purpose of adding leadership. It was stated that since the evaluation system was for both teacher and administrators, there is an expectation for the development of high level leadership practices, as well as instructional practices.

MOTION: Member McCord moved to amend TLC goal #2 to include “and leadership”. The goal will read “Effective instructional and leadership practices.” Vice Chair Barker seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Presentation on and discussion of the revised *Professional Responsibilities* standards and indicators for teachers and administrators.

Members reviewed changes to:

Teacher Professional Responsibilities:

Members discussed the work of AIR to make changes to level 1 across the board. In the past, Members felt the language “never” was setting the bar too low, so level 1 was revised to “rarely does”. Members discussed whether to test “rarely does” or move forward with “no or almost no / none or almost none” language to make it consistent with the language in other levels. Members agreed to move forward with the “no or almost no / none or almost none” language.

Members emphasized that the evidence pieces provided throughout the rubrics were not intended to be all-inclusive lists. They also discussed the need to define “ethical standards of the profession” and state what standard that is. It was noted that trying to define integrity is tricky in this type of system and that this issue will have to play itself out in the validation. Following laws is covered under indicator 3, but for indicator 2 we are trying to get at something different. Members agreed that, for the present,

we should go forward with what is listed and see what happens during validation. Members believe it is an important indicator, but we are unsure of how to measure it.

The TLC took a break for lunch from 11:57 a.m. to 12:50 p.m.

At 12:35 p.m. the Council said goodbye to Chis Cheney and thanked her for her service. Chris Cheney thanked the council for their work and that she appreciated the opportunity to participate and have her viewpoints heard.

Indicator 5: Student perception piece:

Ms. Holdheide indicated, as she looked back at the notes for indicator 5, that nothing had been previously developed. The hesitance on this piece has been that we do not want to write it in a way which implies a specific survey tool, and we do not want to put a resource obligation on districts to use a specific survey. Members reviewed the indicators one by one, noting that level 1 will reflect the “no or almost no” or “none or almost none” language.

Members noted that some of the language in this section felt redundant since it was all embedded in Dr. Heritage’s principles. This is a result of having to move student perception from the outcome side of the framework to the input side of the framework. The observation of teachers also has to include input from students. As we try to understand the effectiveness of instruction, we need to have input and evidence from students.

Members discussed indicator 1 and its relationship to building relationships and culture in the classroom, as well as its relation to encouraging learner self-regulation. Students learn to problem solve themselves and to help others as well. Some consistency may be needed in the language of the levels. Members noted they were in agreement that indicator 1 was really about self-regulated learners and student empowerment. Ms. Holdheide’s team can wordsmith to distinguish between levels 3, 2, and 1.

Indicator 2 relates to the learning environment. Does level 4 get at what we are asking for indicator 2? If so, then we need to make sure levels 3, 2, and 1 are in line. Members noted and were in agreement that this piece was about leadership, empowerment, and responsibility. There really are 2 pieces involved: First, is there a safe learning environment, and then second, the levels are based on how empowered the students are to take a role in their education.

Indicator 3: Does level 4 reflect the intent? At level 3, respecting and honoring should still be involved, but the degree of involvement should be different.

Administrator Professional Responsibilities

Members indicated Level 1 should be changed as discussed above. Also discussed were changes in standard 2, indicator 1. Perhaps one of the pieces for a level 4 is to provide mentorship or help prospective administrators. Members agreed mentoring should be included.

Standard 4, indicator 2: Change reference from “teacher” to “administrator”. Administrator involves family and community members in vision.

Chair Salazar indicated the document would be edited prior to Phase 1 implementation.

Presentation about professional development modules and resources available from the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders and other entities at no cost.

Ms. Holdheide reviewed the approaches other states have taken on the development of professional learning modules. Some states contracted with an agency to develop professional learning modules, while others used modules developed by the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders. Some states, such as Massachusetts, provide heavily scripted materials for evaluator training so any district or vendor can provide the training. The state provides the trainer everything they need. Other states like Virginia, Rhode Island, and Kentucky provide materials, but are less scripted. Chair Salazar noted the TLC asked Dr. Heritage to develop a training facilitation guide so we have consistent interpretation across the state. It is essential that the training looks the same for all participants. Evaluation of our training is included in the RFP scope of work for the validation study.

Ms. Holdheide provided the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders is working on 3 professional learning modules this year which are similar to Massachusetts and designed primarily for use by states. Modules will contain student learning objectives, evaluator training, facilitator notes, handouts, and examples for using evaluation data. Some states want to contextualize for use at the district level, while others are planning to take the modules and make them very state specific. When the modules are complete, they will be available for online access. The permission required to modify or change the modules has not been determined; we need to ensure the modules maintain a research center.

Presentation on and review of the initial drafts of the *Implementation Guidelines for the teacher and administrator evaluation models.*

Chair Salazar provided an overview of the Implementation Guides. We kept the first few pages from the White Paper and continued with general information. We then continued with documentation specific to either teachers or administrators. The guidelines then return to a common piece at the end. Rubrics were not included in this draft because they were not yet finalized. Chair Salazar also reviewed how all the RTTT states rolled out to their stakeholders and used information from those which most closely reflected our visions for improvement, development, and growth. Members reviewed both guides.

MOTION: Vice Chair Barker moved to adopt the guidelines as a draft, which will be continually revised and added to as we move forward. Member Townsend second. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion of stakeholder engagement strategies including possible models for enlisting educators to review and help shape use of open source materials in professional development endeavors.

Terry Janicki, educator in residence at CCSSO, discussed how they were creating and providing technical assistance and coaching in the area of teacher effectiveness. Circe Stumbo, also an educator in residence at CCSSO, noted she had been working on webinars and support for the country, as well as shadowing Mr. Janicki in the western states over the last few months. CCSSO has been working with 29 states with the goal of getting all entities engaged in educator preparation at the state level working and talking together. Our job is to try to show coherence in these reforms and help people see the connections. Ms. Stumbo stated the goal of CCSSO was to support our work by trying to connect state leaders and state teams together.

Members discussed communication and engagement with the CCSSO team. What we have learned is that teachers need to be intimately involved in the implementation process. How you engage individuals on the ground doing the work is crucial. You often end up with wonderful policy that fails in the implementation. Relative to communication to all stakeholders, Ms. Stumbo stated:

1. You need to be careful about messaging. You need a theory of action, and it's great you already have that. Go back to the theory of action often and connect it to the why.
2. Connect your work to other major complex reforms like CCSS. Make sure your whys connect. The best people to communicate the work to teachers and administrator are those that are involved in the work.

CCSSO has been spearheading the INTASC standards and have developed a web-based online book called Lumibook, which has a lot of rich, interactive content. This resource is a good way to get all levels involved in the work and communicating with each other. Mr. Janicki added that nationally, the processes which seem arbitrary are the ones in trouble. The TLC has the right people at the table and has done a thorough and professional job developing its framework.

Future meeting and agenda items.

The next TLC meeting will be held on August 20, 2013 in Las Vegas, with the location to be determined.

- First round of information back from the institutes. Dr. Heritage will have developed the overview module and we will invite her to participate at the meeting.
- Information relative to the RFP award and work on the next level of documents and guides. What does this look like at Phase 2.
- Begin action plan to develop Group 3 framework. Have chair create a taskforce to include some of the stakeholders involved.
- Report on which schools are involved in the validation study.

- Standing agenda item: communication and engagement.
- Standing agenda item: report on progress of ongoing legal cases.

Meeting summary.

Chair Salazar thanked everyone for their hard work and congratulated Member Townsend on her retirement.

Additional Council member comments.

Members discussed to ongoing need for administrative appointments from NASA.

Public comments.

There were no public comments.

Meeting adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.