

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

May 03, 2013

Best Western Airport Plaza Hotel
1981 Terminal Way
Reno, Nevada

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pamela Salazar, Chair
Barbara Surritte-Barker, Vice Chair
Christine Cheney, Member (arrived at 10:53 a.m.)
Theresa Crowley, Member
Rorie Fitzpatrick, Member
Kathleen Galland-Collins, Member
Amy Henderson, Member
Bob McCord, Member
Theo McCormick, Member
Dale Norton, Member
Mary Peterson, Member (arrived at 8:55 a.m.)
Theo Small, Member
Bonnie Townsend, Member

COUNCIL MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Sharla Hales, Member

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

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

INVITED GUEST:

Lynn Holdheide, Consultant, AIR

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

Dave Brancamp, NWRPDP
Kristin Campbell, NWRPDP
Kirsten Odegard, NWRPDP
Yvette Deighton, NWRPDP
Jose Delfin, Carson City SD
Dana Galvin, Washoe Education Assoc.

Pati Falk, Washoe County SD
Alyson Kendrick, Washoe County SD
Sue Moulden-Horton, NDE
Patrick MacKelvie, True North Logic
Lisa Noonan, Douglas County SD
Tami Berg, NV PTA
Bob Dolezal, White Pine County SD

Call to Order; Roll Call; Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Salazar called the meeting to order at 8:44 A.M., with attendance reflected above. It was determined a quorum was present.

Chair Salazar led the pledge of allegiance.

Public Comment.

Chair Salazar opened the floor for public comment. There was no comment.

Approval of a Flexible Agenda.

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

Approval of Minutes for the February 22, 2013 Teachers and Leaders Council Meeting.

MOTION: Member McCord moved to approve the minutes from the February 22, 2013 TLC meeting. Member Norton seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Meeting Overview: Orientation to the meeting through the lens of the systems context defined in the Policy Parameters and Implementation Guidelines.

Member Fitzpatrick presented a power point which helped stage the discussion around the implementation of the framework. Members discussed material used at the recent Mega Conference in Las Vegas. The Nevada Educator Performance Framework received a lot of stakeholder input and was influenced by work across the country as well. Nevada's focus on instruction and instructional leadership is different from how most other states have approached the issue. Lynn Holdheide stated whenever she talks about what Nevada has done, people are very interested. Nevada is looking at the instructional shift in Common Core and

what that will mean. Teachers from around the country who are focused on instruction are in your corner. Other states are asking themselves why they didn't take this approach. Ms. Holdheide noted that validating is the battle now, but the narrow focus on instruction is getting Nevada attention for the right things.

Member Fitzpatrick agreed and added if we don't change what goes on in the classroom, we will never change the output. When it comes to instruction and instructional leadership, there are about three decades of solid research and the TLC has embraced that. A number of decision drivers shaped our work. These drivers go hand-in-hand with our guiding beliefs and system goals. At the last meeting we unveiled the system context of 4 systems driving the framework. We standardized the performance expectations for teachers and administrators in terms of evaluating what they know and what they are able to do. We have these expectations for students and we should have them for educators. A large portion of today's meeting will focus on the third quadrant regarding how we collect the data to inform decision making.

Members discussed the theory of action. High quality professional development for teachers and administrators is important. We need to make sure we support administrators so they can effectively evaluate teachers. Member Small questioned whether administrators were part of this big picture as the term instructional practice looked exclusive. Member Fitzpatrick stated the issue would be agendaized and revisited with the goals at the next meeting.

Members discussed the issue of statewide uniformity and elements of local flexibility. There will be a statewide model, or districts can apply to use an alternative data tool. At a minimum, districts will need to show a crosswalk, evidence of validity and reliability, and demonstrate sufficient training of evaluators and educators. Members discussed the concerned feedback they were receiving from teachers about how this will impact their districts. The validation study will uncover issues which will then need to be addressed and revalidated.

Members discussed weighting the measures at the different levels and for different groups. Some are attached to students in a teacher's classroom, while others look at whole school aggregate data. It is not a perfect system, but it is what we can do now with what we have. It will change over time. A cycle of systemic improvement is essential in this system.

Presentation and discussion of information associated with standardized performance expectations for educators.

Chair Salazar discussed the literature review currently being developed for administrators. The review was developed to establish that the standards have a very clear knowledge base and correlates the research that supports our standards. This is all grounded in a substantial body of literature and we are focusing on what is the most important. Members discussed how the review would support legal defensibility and provide information for districts as they plan professional development.

Member Fitzpatrick discussed the handouts Dr. Margaret Heritage provided for the Mega Conference. These handouts provided learning activities which helped participants internalize the information. They are examples of what the standards look like in practice. Dr. Heritage was very complimentary of the work of the TLC, in particular the teachers on the TLC.

Break from 9:56 a.m. to 10:09 a.m.

Presentation and discussion of information associated with applying the performance assessment process to educators.

Ms. Holdheide led the discussion on the Teacher and Administrator Professional Responsibilities rubrics, beginning with the Teachers Professional Responsibilities Indicators and Standards. The team at AIR developed the performance levels by paying close attention to Dr. Heritage's high-leverage instructional standards. Members reviewed the systemic portion of the structure and the differences between the 4 levels generally. Level 4 has more leadership; level 3 is doing a good job, but has not stepped up to school-level leadership; level 2 is doing what they need to do but no more; and level 1 is not stepping up to the plate at all.

Standard one: Commitment to the School Community

Chair Salazar noted that Dr. Heritage highlighted key words which distinguish between the performance levels and this information may be helpful to reference as we are reviewing the indicators.

Members discussed Indicator 1 and felt it was not clear. It is an "either you are or you are not" element and what happens if a teacher shows up to a meeting once but does not participate. We can develop through the evidence what meets the standard and what does not. Training will be needed. Ms. Holdheide noted that through validation we will see where teachers are falling, and if that is in fact where we intended them to fall. Members discussed the use of the term "does not" and stated Dr. Heritage used the phrase "no or almost no" in some areas and the need to keep language consistent. This will be reviewed in all level 1 categories.

Members had no changes for indicator 2 or 3.

Evidence:

Members discussed the use of the term "mandatory." Overall, members liked the use of this term. As an educator, it clearly states what to expect when I talk to my administrator. The point of having mandatory items is to force those conversations between teachers and administrators. Right now too often those conversations are not happening and that needs to change. If these items and conversations are not mandatory, then we have changed nothing.

Members also discussed how to know things actually happen. How do you document and measure collaboration? We can look at work logs, observations of the team, and the PLC as a whole. The key is to keep looking back at the broader scope of evidence used. If we make the

focus too narrow we end up with what we have now. It was discussed that much of the information can be gathered by simply having a dialogue occur between the teacher and the administrator. The same is true for the student perception component.

Standard 2: Self-Reflection and Professional Growth

Members discussed the use of “multiple” mentoring relationships. Perhaps “maintains complex mentoring relationships” would be more accurate. We don’t want a situation where someone is mentoring 5 good people. Members also discussed the phrase “coaching and mentoring” which would cover the situation when some may need help on a particular skill, but not a mentor across the board. Member Cheney noted that taking on pre-service teacher education should be part of this area. As teacher accountability grows, teachers will be less likely to take on student teachers. This should be a function of level 4 and level 3 teachers and they should be rewarded for taking on this responsibility. It was also noted that indicator 2 should include advanced graduate education as well professional learning and could be highlighted in the examples. Members discussed the need of “mentee” at a level 4. Who would mentor a level 4 teacher? Members decided to strike “mentee” at level 4.

Evidence:

The key information here will always be obtained through dialogue. This is true with professional growth plan dialogue, as well as dialogue with a mentor.

Standard 3: Professional Obligations

Correction Indicator 1: “The teacher models and advocates for fair, equitable, and appropriate treatment of all students and families”

Members discussed indicator 2 which pertains to beliefs, values, and actions. All of our professions have ethical standards. The term “integrity” will stay, but we can define that as the ethical standards of the profession. This definition will carry through all 4 levels. The distinction between level 4 and 3 was also discussed. At a level 3 shouldn’t teachers take action? “Teacher finds and uses appropriate resources to address issues of equality.” An example would be to refer to the person who has access to this information. A level 4 teacher will go outside to find the resources; a level 3 teacher will refer to another.

Evidence:

Teachers can serve on task forces and be involved in school and district level policy. Teacher notes, as well as teacher and evaluator dialogue, can be used as evidence. This includes family and community feedback as well.

Standard 4: Family Engagement

Members questioned the phrase “using available tools.” It was noted that this was the language adopted by the Board, so this is what we need to work with. Members also discussed the length of the language in the levels as some thought they were too long. Ms. Holdheide provided some background on this issue. When the Advisory Council on Family Engagement came in, they gave us a lot of indicators they wanted included. These levels include all the things they advised because we want a comprehensive look at parent engagement. Members specifically questioned how to respond to all the different language needs. Chair Salazar indicated the key was “available” tools. We might not have communication tools to be responsive in all cases.

Members also discussed what solid family engagement could look like when you have huge student loads. Parent newsletters, teacher communication logs, and involvement of the school community were discussed.

Evidence:

Family feedback and student feedback as appropriate.

Member Henderson presented 2 different brochures created by the Advisory Council on Family Engagement. These are samples of family engagement based on 6 national standards. Advisory Council Chair Barbara Clark requested member Henderson share them with the TLC. The brochures are still embargoed and should be finalized for release by the fall.

Standard 5: Student Perception

The difficulty with this standard is the TLC does not want language which ties it to a survey, so how do you want to develop the performance levels here. How do we define student perception? What is it we want to know and evaluate? Chair Salazar requested members think about this issue over lunch to discuss further after the break.

Lunch Break 12:11 p.m. to 12:56 p.m.

Ms. Holdheide suggested it might be useful to think through some of the information and look for a correlation with what we already have. Members discussed the option of putting together some materials around this standard and make sure they are included in the validation study. There are emerging questions on gathering student information through surveys and whether they are a robust approach. Perhaps we only need something minimal here as the issue is embedded throughout the work.

Evidence:

No particular survey, but broad statements. Some of these statements can come from the instructional practice information. It can be observable or as part of the dialogue we have with students. This goes to the heart of the issue - student dialogue. We don't respect student input as much as we should and they have important things to say. Respect and listen to students.

Administrator Professional Responsibility Standards and Indicators

Standard 1: Manages Human Capital

Indicator 4: Members expressed concern over 4 levels of compliance. Compliance is either you do or you don't. They suggested the term "leverages" from level 4 be carried into level 3; level 2 would use "complies". Indicator 2: level 4 was changed to use the word "all"; collaborates with all teachers. Members also changed the word "utilize" to "use" throughout the levels. In indicator 1: level 4 members questioned why the phrase "as seen by others" was used. Either you are modeling or not modeling. "Models fair and equitable" is necessary, but there is no need for it to be seen by others. Indicator 3: level 4: how do we make sure administrators are offering leadership opportunities to everyone? What if teachers seek out opportunities, but are denied? It was noted that, in terms of evidence, this will come out in the dialogue between the teachers and administrators.

Standard 2: Self-Reflection and Professional Growth

Members questioned the common understanding of the phrase "shares out". "Shares and applies" is a clearer statement. It was also clarified that professional learning opportunities are different than professional development opportunities. Indicator 1: level 4: Administrator models self-reflection should be changed to "Administrator models high levels of self-reflection, seeks out feedback from multiple sources."

Standard 3: Professional Obligations

Indicator 4: Follow and make sure school follows all rules. This is not about just his/her role as an administrator. Integrity is used differently here. Ms. James suggested the language be changed to mirror the teacher indicator which stated "consistent with ethics of the profession." Level 3: "make sure others in the school are following"; level 4 should have the same language. Level 2 and level 1: should have the same principle, but be lessened by language. Sentence needs to be added to all, but the strength of the language needs to be changed by level.

Standard 4: Family and Community Engagement

Indicator 2: level 4: Evidence. Is this an appropriate place for the word “all?” Is this the appropriate place to address the issue of language tools? Structures and resources should be provided for teachers to do their job, but there is no need to reference the resources by name. Members also indicated the word “attempts” should be changed to “consistently pursues a shared sense of commitment.”

Indicator 3: Connects students and families to community, health, and human services. Members discussed that teachers already have a lot of obligations, and sometimes connecting students to resources is difficult to do. Most teachers don’t have access to these resources unless they develop them. A referral is the obligation of the teacher, but not developing the resources themselves. Members also expressed concern about the family engagement piece and the need to make sure parent representation on panels and in groups mirrors the demographic of the school.

Members discussed how to redefine the role of an administrator so they can address the new responsibilities under the administrator framework. Chair Salazar noted there has been national discussion around school administrator assistants. There is an instructional leadership role, and then an assistant handles everything else. We are watching to see how other states are moving forward. The difficulty comes in obtaining resources. School boards look at numbers all of the time and their first question to any change is how many teachers will that cost us; then the conversation ends. In addition, unions think districts are top heavy already, so districts can’t provide the support to support the administrators. It all comes down to prioritizing the allocation of resources.

Administrator High Leverage Instructional Leadership Standards and Indicators

Chair Salazar noted the team at AIR was still working on the performance level for these. You should see a strong correlation between the teacher standards and administrator standards.

Standard 1: Creating and Sustaining a Focus on Learning

Indicator 2: should be “facilitates”. The levels should reflect whether the administrators are facilitating. Are they making it possible by providing the necessary tools? What kind of support is put in place? Member Galland-Collins noted that protecting academic time is part of this issue and we need to make sure it is addressed.

Indicator 1: not a big enough difference between level 4 and level 3. The only difference seems to be how many stakeholders were engaged. Level 4 should be continually reviewing and adapting; level 3 just reviewing and adapting. It was noted that “continually reviewing” does not mean a drastic change every year. Changes need to be reflective of the environment. Things like zoning changes are constant issues. Level 4: Should be “Development and

implementation of a coherent vision.” Indicator 3: “actively engaging all teachers.” Should add “at the same level,” this clarification will help administrators.

Standard 2: Creating and Sustaining a Culture of Continuous Improvement

Indicator 4: This was the standard added by the SBE for teachers and administrators. This will go back to the AIR team for further work.

Indicator 1: level 4 and 3: “Clear and high expectations”. Members expressed concern about “high expectations.” It should read “high, yet achievable expectations.” We want rigor, but it needs to be attainable. Level 3: “Administrators set clear and achievable expectations.” Level 4: “Clear and high, yet achievable expectations.”

We need to make sure both teacher performance and student performance are looked at and monitored. Indicator 2: talk about teacher development; from pre-service through experienced teachers. Administrators do play a big role with pre-service teachers. Member Townsend indicated including pre-service teachers is not unreasonable. It is what we should be doing.

Standard 3: Creating and Sustaining Productive Relationships

Indicator 2: level 4 and level 3. The difference in the level is the word “all.” This parallels what we have for the teachers. Dr. Heritage wanted to make the frameworks as parallel as possible. Indicator 3: level 4: the “all” is missing from this one. Chair Salazar indicated she would highlight and consult Dr. Heritage. Members discussed the notion of a respectful environment. Indicator 1: level 4: should be “mutually respectful” environment.

Standard 4: Creating and Sustaining Structures

Chair Salazar stated Indicator 2 wasn’t correct and changed the column to the correct information. Indicator 3: level 4: should be “Administrator allocates and reallocates human and physical resources effectively, including reorganizing time and learning goals.” Members questioned what the learning goals would be and it was clarified they would be the learning goals of the school. We want to leave broad enough so it will be able capture the needs of different populations with different resources. Members discussed the past focus of “learning goals” as only encompassing only reading and math. Perhaps it should be changed “to support the learning goals and achieve school vision.”

MOTION: Member Cheney moved to adopt the first draft versions the Professional Responsibilities rubric for Teachers and the Professional Responsibilities rubric for

Administrators, as well as the rubric for Administrator Instructional Leadership Standards. Vice Chair Barker seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Salazar thanked members of the public for listening to all of today's dialogue, acknowledged the district superintendents in the audience, and asked if they had any comments. Bob Dolezal, White Pine CSD thanked the TLC for the opportunity to participate. It is nice to see all of the hard and thoughtful work coming out of this group. Chair Salazar noted this was hard work and everyone takes it very seriously. Will take a break and move on to the validation study.

Break 2:52pm to 3:11pm

Presentation and discussion of information associated with sustaining the cycle of continuous improvement for education.

Member Fitzpatrick gave a general overview of the implementation drivers and the work of the National Implementation Research Network which works on implementation science. Paying attention to the implementation drivers is important. When drivers are conscientiously attended to, you can successfully roll out a program in 3 yrs. Without solid attention, it can take as long as 17 years to accomplish the same thing through diffusion. The 6 bullets are the categories for a "to do" list. She instructed members to take a few minutes to read through the worksheet, to then talk as a whole group about questions and comments and then work in small groups for the overarching to do list.

Members asked about the timeline for the RFP and Member Fitzpatrick indicated that, thanks to the efforts of Chair Salazar, Mr. Vineyard, Ms. James, and Mr. Keglovits there was an RFP almost ready to go out. Mr. Vineyard provided a general overview of the RFP timeline and indicated we would be ready to select a vendor by mid-June and have signatures on the contracts by July 9th to get to the Board of Examiners for the August meeting.

The scope of the work for the RFP is five big ideas: are the instruments developed in line with the intent of the framework; validate the instrument; validation of implementation itself (will simulate using previous years data); what kind of recommendations from those; and then any realignment of the system.

Members discussed how RPDP training and professional development would impact the validation study. We need to be careful the validation study does not end up validating the professional development as opposed to the framework itself. Member Fitzpatrick stated that was a valid concern and the validation study had been designed to protect from that problem.

She also provided that in the Governor's recommended budget, as closed in subcommittees, there is an appropriation of a few hundred thousand dollars for the state to develop modules and other online support materials to teach teachers and administrators on the framework

content and how it works; teaching the system itself. These tools can be used by RPDPs and others to train those in the field. This will help people understand the nuances of the process.

There is an additional appropriation of \$2.6 million for the RPDPs to access additional consultants and pay for travel for those individuals to go around the state and engage in the training of people in the field.

Chair Salazar stated we have been paying attention to the work from other states and it appears we get a lot stronger validation feedback and it is more instructive if we use a small sample studied very well, e.g., 10% representative sample of the state to make sure deep work gets done. Field test will be limited to 10% statistically representative sample.

Relative to the validation, it was clarified that we are validating the unique components within the model, the standards and indicators themselves to evaluate if they are the right ones. We are also validating the training, and the tools themselves including rubrics and artifact review. Each component needs to be validated, and then when you put all of the components together, you see if you get what you intended to. Members expressed concern that the district superintendents were already planning for next year. The earlier we can identify who is in the pilot population the better so they can plan. Member Fitzpatrick stated we can start informing districts in an informal way in early July after the contract has been signed, although we cannot technically begin until the contract is signed in August. It was also stressed that participation is voluntary, and we are not anticipating mandatory participation will be necessary. We want the support of the superintendents.

Lisa Noonan, Superintendent of Douglas CSD, provided it is her idea that every administrator practices with the system, but with only one teacher. The new system doesn't count yet, so you don't want to overwhelm the administrators. In this way, we can get a sampling of teachers across the career spectrum. Chair Salazar indicated that had been the model in states like Utah and Colorado. Colorado indicated their biggest mistake was letting too many people participate and things got lost in the shuffle. They were unable to engage in the deeper conversations and missed a lot because of that.

With respect to individual districts using their own tool it was clarified that appropriate training would need to be demonstrated before the tool could be used for high stakes decisions. That being said, with the TLC adjustments in SB407 indicating the system cannot be used for high stakes decisions until at least 2014-15, some districts are trying to get an exemption to move forward with implementation and consequences sooner.

Members discussed the use of peer evaluators and the current ban of those evaluators in collective bargaining agreements. To some extent those clauses exist due to the existence of 288 which prohibits them. Chair Salazar indicated the districts in other states were going back to the table with collective bargaining groups. These changes have been taken care of at the district level, not legislated. Members expressed concern that this would result in inconsistent implementation.

Members also discussed how the data would be distributed. It was emphasized that legislators currently believe a statewide longitudinal data system already exists. It was clarified that data from the state is collected at the NDE in a data file. Then assessment files are produced including items such as proficiency, growth, and gap reduction. The districts then use this information to generate the rating. The state does not evaluate teachers and administrators. That is a district function.

Members emphasized that we need to keep this process close. If it gets too big, then it won't be successful. We don't want to damage future impact.

Member Fitzpatrick briefly touched on remaining items e and f. Item (e): the state coordinated a webinar discussion last week to preview for districts what programs could look like. The state department does not have the resources to purchase such a program, but can help facilitate the process if districts would like to come together to purchase a contract for use of the same product. The state could draft an RFI as an information gathering opportunity.

Item (f): lawsuit in FL based on the inappropriate use of test scores. We will post this case online and send it out to members. The decision will be landmark case law.

Future meeting and agenda items.

The next TLC meeting will be June 14, 2013, in Reno, with the specific location to be determined. We will see a draft on professional responsibilities and standards. We will also have updates from the legislative session.

Meeting summary.

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

Additional council member comments.

Relative to InTASC: Member Small stated they had just finished work on InTASC standards and he provided a companion book to those standards. The book was based on a progression. For example, this is how the progression will look for a teacher who is meeting standards. It was noted that Member Small provided a large contribution on standard 10.

Public comments.

Patrick MacKelvie, True North Logic. We work on creating data systems for work like this. It is great that you for allowing individuals to come and see the work you are doing. It is nice to

have visibility into these processes and see it from a granular prospective. Thank you for considering an RFI to the vendor community. We can talk to you in the formal channels to tell you about the work that we do and can have more contact with the council. Thank you very much.

Bob Dolezal stated thank you for doing all of this for education. Thank you for all your work and I think the superintendents are excited about the work you are doing and are looking forward to the finished product.

Lisa Noonan stated this group has an amazing reputation across the state. People are in awe of the hours you have put in and seriousness by which you have attacked this issue. I think we are nervous as the work now shifts our way, but we feel we are in good hands given the work you have done. You serve the children in so many ways, so thank you.

Meeting adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:21 p.m.