

**NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
SB474 (2015) ADVISORY TASK FORCE ON  
Educator Professional Development  
Monday, August 29, 2016-9AM**

**Meeting Locations:**

All meetings will be video conferenced from both locations.

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	9890 S. Maryland Pkwy	Las, Vegas	Board Room (2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor)
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St	Carson City	Board Room

**PUBLIC NOTICE**

*The public is hereby noticed that the SB474 (2015) Advisory Task Force on Educator Professional Development reserves the right to take agenda items out of posted order. Items may be pulled or removed from the agenda at any time and items may be combined for consideration. A time for public comment is provided at the beginning and at the conclusion of the meeting. A time limit of three minutes may be imposed by the Task Force Chair for public comments, in order to afford all members of the public who wish to comment with an opportunity to do so within the timeframe available to the Task Force. The Chair reserves the right to call on individuals from the audience or to allow for testimony at any time.*

*This public notice has been posted at the offices of the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) in Carson City and Las Vegas, the 17 Nevada County School District Superintendents' Offices, the 17 County Public Libraries, and the Nevada State Library and Archives. Notice of this meeting was posted on the Internet through the Nevada Department of Education website at [www.nde.doe.nv.gov](http://www.nde.doe.nv.gov). The support materials to this agenda are available next to the meeting date referenced above, at no charge on the NDE website at: [http://www.doe.nv.gov/Boards\\_Commissions\\_Councils/Adv\\_Task\\_Force\\_Ed\\_Pro/Meeting\\_Materials/](http://www.doe.nv.gov/Boards_Commissions_Councils/Adv_Task_Force_Ed_Pro/Meeting_Materials/).*

*The public may also contact the Department of Education Office at 9890 South Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89183; Chantel Wakefield, [cwakefield@doe.nv.gov](mailto:cwakefield@doe.nv.gov).*

*Reasonable efforts will be made for members of the public who have disabilities and require special accommodations or assistance at the meeting. Please call the Council assistant, Chantel Wakefield, at (702) 668-4308, at least five business days in advance so that arrangements can be made*

**Minutes**

**1. Call to Order; Roll Call: Pledge of Allegiance**

Co-Chairs Senators Woodhouse called the meeting to order at 9:13 AM.

Roll Call

- Victor Wakefield
- Co-Chair Scott Hammond
- Co-Chair Joyce Woodhouse
- Assembly Woman Amber Joyner
- Samantha Hager
- Sandra Sheldon
- Mark Newburn

NDE Staff

- Kelee Dupuis
- Dena Durish
- Chantel Wakefield

They all did the pledge of Allegiance.

**2. Public Comment #1**

There was no public comment.

**3. Approval of a Flexible Agenda**

Motion

- Victor Wakefield moved for a flexible agenda.
- Mark Newburn seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.
- The motion was approved at 9:15 AM.

#### 4. Approval of May 19, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Dena apologized to the Council for them not being completed and explained the transition in staff. Kelee introduced Chantel Wakefield as their new AA 2.

#### 5. Nevada Department of Education Updates

- 2016-2017 Great Teaching and Leading Fund Award Update
  - Kelee explained how they had over 10 million dollars requested in GTL funds in FY 17. They narrowed it down to 4.8 million. She thanked the review team and Dena Durish.
  - Dena will be providing the finalized report to the State Board of Education. She explained that they FY 16 applicants were giving their final financial report today and that several of them did not use all of their funds. She explained that \$650,000.00 was not used from FY 16 and that the unused funds would go into the Great Teaching and Learning fund.
- 2015 Legislative Session Initiatives External Evaluations
  - Dena explained that Great Teaching and Leading was one of the initiatives that was included in the external evaluation along with the Social Workers initiative, Read by three, and five others. She explained the RFP process and that ACS Ventures had won it. She described what ACS has done so far and what they will be doing in the future. By December 2016 ACS will deliver the final report to NDE.
    - Wakefield and Dena discussed which funds are going through the external evaluation process and which are not.
      - Social Workers grant funds, Great Teaching and Leading, Read by 3, Zoom Schools, Underperforming and Turn Around Schools, NV ready 21, and Victory.
      - If it is not in those seven then it is not included in the external evaluation process.
    - Co-Chair Woodhouse asked why Breakfast by the Bell is not included.
    - Dena explained that she is unsure why some of the bills are not included on the list with the seven and she will ask about it.
      - Co-Chair Hammond stated that some of the seven bills were requested by the committee attached to it to have external evaluations.
    - Co-Chair Woodhouse thinks that the funds went through the Department of AG working with First Lady Sandoval.
    - Member Sheldon confirmed that it is under the Department of AG.
    - Member Wakefield asked about the Opportunity Scholarships and Harbor Master.
    - Dena stated that neither of those go directly to school district which is probably why they were not included in the external evaluations.
- Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in Service to Nevada Priorities
  - Dena explained how ESSA requires a large amount of stakeholder input. The ESSA waiver is now void. This is now a transition year. She stated the stakeholder meetings with the six accountability workgroups are meeting individually and had a dialogue with the main advisory group last week. Dena explained what the Teaching and Leading workgroup are working on and that they will meet again in September.

#### 6. Professional Development Standards

Members will review standards discussed from previous meeting.

- a. Members will review Learning Forward's Seven Standards for Professional Development (Learning Communities, Leadership, Resources, Data, Learning Designs, Implementation, and Outcomes) and hear information about adoption of these standards in other states

- Kelee stated that at the last meeting members requested that they have a refresher on the standards. She related that the seven standards are meant to be used together and she identified them. It was proposed that the Task Force may want to add cultural competency and equity as well.
  - Co-Chair Hammond inquired as to whether or not a class that is teaching specific content has to incorporate the seven standards in it?
  - Kelee stated that there should ideally be all seven, but realistically not all seven will be highlighted in one professional development class.
- The Task Force discussed how it should not only be taught but achieved. It should be a class with long range elements put in so they can learn it over time. The Task Force discussed how the teachers need support to implement, for example coaches to help reinforce learning. They also discussed giving first year Teachers a mentors to spend a day or a few hours with them to train. The Task Force stated how these are more guidelines to assist teachers with staying past the first year.
- Member Wakefield suggested that they use the proposed standards to be added because they helped him think of what is being suggested. He explained the close reads of the two new standards and how they should be in every class.
- Members Wakefield and Sheldon discussed how every standard does not fit into every class and not including a standard should be a deliberate decision.
- **Motion**
  - Co-Chair Woodhouse motioned to add equity and cultural competency.
  - Member Sheldon seconded the motion.
  - Member Wakefield stated that he would like to discuss his worries of having a long list instead of a short list of standards. He was surprised that the national learning standards did not include equity and cultural competency.
    - They discussed how the training is now long term and how these could be embedded in professional development.
  - Co-Chair Woodhouse asked Dena or Kelee if they know what the history is for the two not being included in the learning forward standards.
    - Kelee explained that Learning Forward stated that it should be implied. Connecticut stated that it should be called out or it may not be adhered to.
    - Co-Chair Woodhouse explained why she believes that the two should be added.
    - Member Wakefield added that as the report is done it should show the Senate the dialogue as to why they are doing this.
  - All were in favor
  - **Motion carried at 10:05 AM.**
- b. Members will continue a discussion from the May 2016 meeting regarding consideration of additional standards (i.e. “Equity” standards based on California example and “Cultural Competency” standards based on Connecticut example.)
  - Kelee discussed the language on how to word the standards. They looked at California for an example standard on equity and Connecticut for an example

standard on cultural competency. They are not the same stems used by Learning Forward. The task force would have to discuss the language for the two new standards.

- Member Wakefield asked if they had adopted the standards but not the language yet.
- Kelee stated that it was requested last time to have another discussion about California's and Connecticut's specific standard language. If the task force is comfortable with the language proposed from CT and CA, respectively, than) they can move on.
- Co-Chair Woodhouse stated that she was comfortable with the language in 6A.

## 7. Review of Professional Development National Landscape

Members will review examples of how other states have developed comprehensive statewide systems of professional development. This may include, but not be limited to the following focus areas:

- State, District, and/or School PD Plans Tied to Identified Priorities
  - Kelee explained what the national landscape was with the professional standards. She shared a spreadsheet with the task force showing policy actions and what happened with any LEA's. She explained that they were just for reference.
  - Newburn asked if it was something that they would pick up during their next work session.
  - The Task Force agreed that it sounded like a good plan. Item 9 is where they would start making those recommendations to add into the final report.
- Staffing Requirements (Coordinators, Councils, etc.)
  - Kelee explained what other states are doing with their staffing requirements. Whether they are creating a Coordinator or a Council. She used Ohio's professional development committee (PDC) as an example. She used Arkansas as an example for coordinators. Co-Chair Hammond asked how the PD Committee is run.
  - Kelee stated that being on the committee is usually built into a job. .
  - Chair, Senator Hammond asked how Arkansas is run.
  - Kelee explained that they have one coordinator per a district.
  - Co-Chair Hammond stated that the position would be funded by the state.
  - Co-Chair Woodhouse said that Washoe and Clark have professional development coordinators.
  - Member Hager stated that Clark is reviewing the growth plans that the teachers are making.
  - Member Wakefield asked if it is the Principal's job to sign off on it.
  - Member Hager said it is.
  - Co-Chair Woodhouse asked Mr. Stevens, from the Clark County School District, to explain what the PD structure is.
  - Co-Chair Hammond asked if the meetings are ad hoc or scheduled.
  - Craig Stevens stated that he was not sure, but he would get that information to them as soon as possible.
  - The Members discussed the need to find out how the smaller districts handle PD and if they need assistance.
  - Craig Stevens explained that the Instruction Unit is in charge of PD. Co-Chair Hammond asked if they approve the courses before or after they are given.
  - Craig Stevens stated that they have people who approve the classes but it would be great to work with the State as well.
  - The Task Force discussed how RPDP's are important to the rurals. When the rural areas request CEU's they are approved through the Department of Education. Members discussed how they need to do more research to see how things are already being done. They would like to see someone else evaluating the courses to make sure that they meet

the standards. RPDP's are using the Learning Forward Standards already. They would like RPDP, CCSD, Washoe County, and the rurals to make a short presentation on this topic at the next meeting. Members would like to give the groups listed above this information and ask for their recommendation as well.

- Craig Stevens stated that some things are changing down the line and they can discuss how they turn this into a service for their educators.
- Member Newburn asked what pieces Nevada is missing compared to other states, or if we already have the pieces, how do we put them together.
- Kelee said that Nevada does not have PD standards. She explained how some other states do.
- The Task Force discussed whether having a committee would be of benefit or not. They asked if the department would need a new person to look at the standards to approve PD. Members discussed how committees in other states are funded by legislature.
- Dena explained that the Commission on Professional Standards is in charge of all things licensure. She explained how the Department of Education makes sure the PD courses meet the requirements. The Task Force discussed how they would like a flow chart of who has what responsibilities and where they flow. . They asked Dena if the Department does not have the resources and/or the authority to look more rigorously into the classes.
- Dena said that they do not have the funds or the authority to look into the classes more rigorously. .
- PD Evaluation/Outcomes Measurement
  - Kelee showed them the professional development rubric from the Connecticut Department of Education. It has been the rubric in Connecticut since 2013. They use a PD committee and have been using the rubric since the committee was assembled. It has been adopted by over 30 states.
  - Member Hager said that our rubric should match our nine standards.
  - Kelee explained that we would have to just add in the last two standards as the rest are already there.
  - Dena asked if it was this work group's job to come up with a rubric or if they should encourage the state board to adopt these standards. They can suggest a temporary committee is formed to create the rubric.
  - Member Wakefield stated that the strongest rubrics include an ROI question.
- Mentor/Coaching/Induction Requirements
  - Kelee explained how Ohio developed mentor standards in 2011. This is not a mandate but a suggestion. Six or seven states use them.
  - Co-Chair Hammond asked how it fits in with the P.A.R. mentor.
  - Kelee explained that some states use these to evaluate the people who facilitate PD and onboarding.
- Tiered Licensure/Renewal Requirements
  - Kelee explained how Ohio's Department of Education connected PD with their licensure renewal.
  - Member Wakefield asked a question about the latest bill passed about renewal.
  - Dena explained that AB234 only applies to licenses issued after July 1, 2015. They need a multicultural class for renewal. The other bill regarding renewal concerns adding a TESL class for renewal if they do not have a TESL license.
  - The Task Force discussed how requiring teachers to take certain classes for renewal would require a change in NRS; which they have the power to recommend.
  - Member Newburn asked who in Ohio is filling out the form.
  - Kelee explained how Ohio mandates a committee to do it.
  - The Task Force discussed working on how to tie in this process since there is already so much going on. They discussed how some of the things that are counting as CEU's are mentoring, tutoring and etc. They need more information and recommendations before

they make a decision regarding this professional development. The Members can ask the presenters at the next meeting for more information on this.

- Member Wakefield asked to add probationary teachers to the list of questions they will ask the school districts.
- Co-Chair Hammond added that the probationary teachers receive additional mentoring and PD.

#### **8. Review of PD Advisory Task Force Report Template** (*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*)

Kelee talked about how it is a brief description of what the task force has discovered so far. She explained that areas A-C are what the RPDP's are doing and what was reported to the task force on March 23. In area D LEA's were asked to report what their budget was. Item E is that \$18,000.00 is spent per a teacher per a year and Charters spent \$33,000.00 on professional development.

- Member Wakefield asked the language to be changed in regards to what was spent.
- Kelee talked about the Guinn report from the March meeting. She stated what their recommendations were. She explained what the Task Force has learned about standards.
- Member Newburn asked why the Guinn center recommended that they set aside certain percentages.
- Member Wakefield stated that section one leaves too much open for interpretation and would like to know how much of a percentage the district's budget is spent on teachers.
- Member Sheldon stated that all of the districts have different funds and that should be taken into consideration.
- Co-Chair Woodhouse would like information on what Victory and Zoom schools are spending on PD.
- Dena advised the task force to make sure that the questions are very clear.
- They will discuss this matter more thoroughly in the October meeting.

#### **9. 2016 Task Force Work Session and Long-Range Planning**

The Task Force discussed how to report on PD, what they already have in place, the effect these changes will have, the finances, whether standards are done through NAC or NRS, and how do they develop a rubric and who does it.

- Member Newburn asked if they had any idea on where they want to go with the report and the recommendations.
- The Task Force discussed asking the districts if they want a coordinator or a committee. The language from SB474 was discussed and the fact that they are to make recommendations to the three areas outlined in it.
- Member Wakefield questioned what they should ask from the districts about how much they pay for PD.
- Co-Chair Hammond asked Dena what questions they should ask to get the information from the Districts.
- Dena asked Member Wakefield exactly what area he would like information about; like substitutes, books, and pay.
- Co-Chair Hammond said they should ask the sites how much they spend in all areas on PD.
- Member Wakefield suggested that they come up with a list of the most likely PD expenditures that a district has.
- The Task Force decided to ask Charter schools the questions as well. They decided to ask how the schools how they are using their coaches. Zoom schools will be questioned how they spend their PD funding as well. The Members are going to ask the districts to ask the building principals what areas they are spending PD money on that are beneficial to their schools. It was discussed how the rurals spend differently than Clark County. They discussed that they want to see how Title 1 and 2 funds are spent on PD. The Members discussed the budgets further and decided that professional development if done at the school site should meet the needs of the teachers at

that school. They discussed the new student learning goals, teacher evaluations, and how that would play into professional development.

- Member Wakefield asked if they get to suggest an actual dollar amount.
- Member Sheldon stated that professional development dollars are not currently delegated separately to districts.
- The Task Force discussed suggesting a new percentage of what districts use to fund PD. The only issue with doing that is categorical. They discussed adding additional days for PD outside of the school year. Curriculum coaches were recommended for use on site. The Members discussed new teachers and looking at their growth based on PD. They can't look at the data without the information to back it up. The Task Force stated that some teachers need it more than others and they want to know that the money is allocated correctly. They want to make sure that they can account for new teachers leaving one school and moving to another.

#### **10. Future Meeting Schedule and Future Agenda Items** *(Information/Discussion/Possible Action)*

- The Task Force will meet again September 28, October 21, November 15, and the last meeting will be December 16. They will be added to the calendar online.
- Budgets will be discussed at the October 21 meeting and the district reports will be discussed at the September 28 meeting. The joint meeting with the Nevada Board will be on October 21 and is only a couple of hours long.
- The Task Force is writing the report and the December meeting is where the last revisions and editing will be completed. They need a final rough draft by the November meeting.
- For the September 28 meeting they are going to receive reports from RPDP.
- They will write a report from the committee, to go directly to the Governor, concerning the budget PD Standards, and legislation they are recommending for professional development.

#### **11. Additional Task Force Member Comments**

There were none.

#### **12. Public Comment #2**

There was no public comment.

#### **13. Adjournment**

**Meeting adjourned at 12:53 PM.**