



Nevada Department of Education
SB474 (2015) Advisory Task Force on Educator Professional Development
Thursday, May 19, 2016 at 9:00 A.M.

Meeting Locations

NV Department of Education
 700 E. Fifth Street
 Board Room
 Carson City, NV 89701

and

NV Department of Education
 9890 S. Maryland Parkway
 2nd Floor, Board Room
 Las Vegas, NV 89183

DRAFT MINUTES

Call to Order; Pledge of Allegiance, Roll Call

Chair Woodhouse called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Roll was taken as noted and Quorum was reached.

In Attendance

Joyce Woodhouse
 Victor Wakefield
 Sandra Sheldon

Mark Newburn
 Samantha Hager
 Amber Joiner

Absent

Scott Hammond

David Gardner

NDE Staff

Dena Durish
 Kelee Dupuis

Laurie Hamilton

Public Comment #1

Bill Hanlon, retired RPDP Director who has grandchildren that attend NV public schools came to express his opinions as to the choices made by the Governor, State Board of Education, and Boards and Councils such as this one as to how they determine what happens to children’s education system. He was particularly concerned that NV has dropped to 50th in national education ratings, which he attributed to reduction in funding for professional development and schools, class size increases, specialized funding, and children being held accountable for success when we are not providing them or their teachers the required tools.

Approval of a Flexible Agenda (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Member Newburn moved to approve a flexible agenda.

Member Wakefield seconded the motion.

Chair Woodhouse called for the vote and the motion carried unanimously.

Approval of January 27, 2016 and March 23, 2016 Meeting Minutes

(Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Member Newburn made a motion to accept the minutes of the meeting on January 27, 2016.

Member Wakefield seconded the motion.

Chair Woodhouse called for the vote and the motion carried unanimously.

Member Newburn moved to adopt the minutes of the meeting on March 23, 2016.

Member Wakefield seconded the motion.

Chair Woodhouse called for the vote and the motion carried unanimously.

Nevada Department of Education Updates (Information/Discussion)

NDE Staff Update

Dena Durish provided the following updates and the NDE executive and division staffing.

- Roger Rahming, Deputy Superintendent Business and Support Services, replaced Mindy Martini, who has taken a position with the Legislative Counsel Bureau.
- Brett Barley has been hired as the new Deputy Superintendent Student Achievement.
- Jana Wilcox-Lavin is the new Superintendent in Residence for the Achievement School District.
- Kelee Dupuis has joined the Office of Educator Development and Support as an Educator Programs Professional. Kelee will facilitate the work of the Great Teaching and Leading Fund and the SB474 Professional Development Advisory Task Force. She will also play an instrumental role in facilitating other educational leadership programs such as the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, Milken Educator Awards, and CCSSO's Teacher of the Year.

SB474 Advisory Task Force on Professional Development

Samantha Hager, Teacher, Red Rock Elementary has been appointed as a member of the Task Force by the NV State Education Association. This was her first meeting. She introduced herself and other members then introduced themselves.

Legislative Implementation Update

Dena shared the link to NDE 2015 [Legislative Quarterly Update](#) website addition and reminded the members they can access bill updates and sign up for email notifications on the Legislative Implementation Report.

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

Dena provided an update on NDE's implementation work in response to the passage of the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Under Dr. Canavero's leadership, NDE is forming work groups to support the integration of ESSA with the existing 2015 NV Education Reform Initiatives to develop a state education plan. 2016-2017 is a transition year to evaluate and prepare a plan that includes the six key areas of Accountability, Assessment, English Language Learners, Teacher-Leader Quality, School Improvement Support, and the Federal Funding Streams. The plan is due to be completed during the 2017-2018 school year. http://www.doe.nv.gov/Boards_Commissions_Councils/ESSA_Adv_Group/ESSA_Advisory_Group/

Great Teaching and Leading Fund (GTLF)

During the second year of funding, the State Board of Education is to determine priorities for the grant funding awards, and the SBE decided on: State Science Standards, Teacher and Administrator Leadership and Recruitment/Retention/Preparation. NEPF training was not selected as a GTLF funding priority for the 2016-2017 year. SBE Board Members Ortiz and Wakefield are working with Kelee Dupuis to establish update the application, process, and timelines based on lessons learned and feedback from the first round. The application timeline has been challenging to determine due to competing priorities and external factors, but should be released soon.

SB474 Professional Development Advisory Task Force – Roles/Responsibilities *(Information/Discussion/Possible Action)*

SEE SUPPORT DOCUMENT ITEM #6

Dena Durish stated that Task Force members requested this item to be added to today's agenda to refocus the roles and responsibilities of the Task Force. In looking at PD standards, the focus of today's meeting only addresses one area, and reminded the group that others areas should be addressed in future meetings, such as cost and availability, federal funding, effectiveness of delivery, standards and quality, effectiveness of professional development programs overall, and paraprofessionals. Dena asked Task Force members to provide input to NDE staff about the direction they want this work to go in terms numbers of meetings required, creating the final report, what the format and content of the final product should be. The Task Force final report is due by December 31, 2016.

Member Questions/Comments/Discussion

Task Force Roles / Responsibilities

- Member Wakefield: What should this task force accomplish? We are giving a report to the legislature so that what can happen – what is end result.
- Dena Durish: This study was looped into the into SB474 bill. There are specific categories outlined in the bill that the task force must consider, but Task Force can focus on which issues it feels are important as a result of the study and within the scope of the bill.
- Member Wakefield: What is the difference between the Task Force which is in essence doing an efficiency study and the SAGE Commission?
- Dena Durish: The Task Force study is a subset of the issues that are the focus of the SAGE Commission, since budget is only one area of SB474 and SAGE doesn't focus at all on other PD areas.

Task Force Study Content / Focus

- Member Wakefield: How will the Task Force be able to analyze professional development dollars when many of the funds are allocated in district's departments, funding, and budgets? How can we follow Part (a) of the bill?
- Chair Woodhouse: When this issue came up in the legislature there were two major concerns. One was item (g) structure for professional development delivery and the other was standards for professional development. Her understanding is that there are no professional development standards, except as they fall under the individual curriculum areas. Until standards and a delivery method are in place, or at least being discussed, the true cost is difficult to study. There are so many issues in the bill and for possible Task Force consideration that it is not likely that all of it can be included by the December 31 deadline.
- Dena Durish: Sometimes a finding of a study uncovers that the item being studied doesn't have an answer or solution. As an example, if professional development cost is chosen as a study focus, the finding could possibly be that due to multiple funding streams there isn't a way to accurately determine the cost. The finding could end up that there isn't a statewide mechanism to tease apart all funding, so a system needs to be put into place.
- Member Newburn: His take away is being able to answer the question "What should professional development in Nevada look like?" What does professional development look like now? What are other states doing? We need to get to where we can answer that question.
- Member Hager: One of the changes the Clark County School District (CCSD) made to teacher contracts was to take away the four (4) professional development days and add seven (7) hours at every site in Clark County. They now have an hour a week of some form of professional development at 357 schools. There is a lot of choice. If we are going to move toward more site-based discretion, it might be interesting to study what is going on at some of these schools in a qualitative way to get a handle on how effective professional development is that is happening at the sites,
- Dena Durish: There may not have to be a deliverable specifically from each of the items (a) through (g) but the bill requires that the report must have findings and recommendations regarding budgets and possible recommended changes in any of the areas.
- Member Wakefield: How are we moving forward to producing a product, other than just approving minutes? Will there be a draft of the big take-aways from the first few meetings?
- Chair Woodhouse: Recommended that at each subsequent meeting there be an agenda follow up discussion item to solidify the major topic points covered in the previous meeting. She agreed that the budget discussions from the March 23rd meeting be added to the agenda for the upcoming meeting.

Learning Forward – Standards for Professional Learning *(Information/Discussion/Possible Action)*

(Presented Before Item #7)

SEE SUPPORT DOCUMENT ITEM #8

Dena Durish gave a brief overview of Learning Forward organization and shared that much of their work contributed to the new professional development requirements in ESSA and provided brief context of differences to prior NCLB requirements.

Kelee Dupuis, NDE Educator Programs Professional, provided an overview and background of the purpose and goals of the Learning Forward Standards for Effective Professional Learning, which are already being implemented by RPDs, and shared videos providing more detail on each of the 7 Standards and facilitated group discussions about possible recommendations for future NV standards. Members were asked to read the information provided for each of the standards and briefly highlight the key words or essence of what Learning Forward was targeting when developing each of the standards and how each might look in practice.

Member Discussion / Comments / Questions

Standard 1 – Learning Communities

- Member Newburn: Are Learning Forward standards now aligned with ESSA requirements?
- Dena Durish: They are aligned and had significant impact on development of ESSA. This standard aligns particularly well with NEPF outcomes and the work that the Teachers and Leaders Council has been doing.
- Chair Woodhouse: What CCSD is doing in regard to their professional growth plan is key to the job embedded piece as the professional development will be done at the school level based on what the students and teachers need at that school.
- Member Hager: The professional growth plans at schools are also focusing on the student outcome data piece to determine what the impact is on students.

Standard 2 – Leadership

- Member Wakefield: If these standards are put in place, who is held accountable for implementing these standards?
- Dena Durish: Depending on the task force recommendations, all entities would be accountable depending on their level of responsibility throughout the governance structure. This could also be included in the Task Force recommendations that when outside providers are used that they adhere to the Learning Forward standards.

Standard 3 – Resources

- Members Hager, Sheldon, Wakefield, Chair Woodhouse: Discussed ideas about timing and technology issues, professional development as a system, instructional coaches, utilizing human capital in professional development, reaching all staff in their various career stages and performance levels, resources and funding being allocated at the building level based on its student and teacher needs, professional development embedded in everyday activities and occurring at the job site level.
- Kelee Dupuis: Brought up data in regard to the recommendations from Learning Forward as to the level of funding for professional learning. The suggested funding amount per building ranges from 1% to 12% and research worldwide indicates those in the higher ranges should yield the best results, but only when standards are in place.
- Dena Durish: Perhaps the Task Force may want to review how state and federal professional development funds are used by districts to develop a common understanding. She referenced the Guinn Report and the NV Data Book on the subject.
- Kelee Dupuis: Highlighted the funding for school improvement and other reform initiatives coming from multiple sources and for multiple purposes from the coordinating resource section of this standard.

Standard 4 – Data

- Member Wakefield: Mentioned the importance of ensuring that data is being segmented for various sub-group populations that are particularly low performing.
- Chair Woodhouse: Noted the paragraph under “assessment” that applies to the sub-groups of student populations that are targeted to be brought up to higher levels of achievement.

Standard 5 – Learning Design (No Video)

- Kelee Dupuis: Reminded the group that it was mentioned earlier that this resembles how CCSD is moving toward a job embedded learning model.
- Member Sheldon: As active engagement is promoted and our learning designs are developed, it is critical to assess who our trainers are going to be and who will assist and support teachers as they implement this learning. We need to make sure that our instructors know how to engage people within those active learning processes so that they provide a deeper understanding of the concepts being taught.

Standard 6 – Implementation

- Member Hager: One of the important outcomes she would like to see is to determine who is doing work in schools, dig in to what was done, etc. A systemic overview would benefit us greatly.
- Member Sheldon: When we talk about change theory, generally in the first year of implementation it is common to experience a dip in performance. According to change theory research, you have to stick to it and it takes about 3 years to begin to see significant gains. It is not a quick fix.
- Member Wakefield: One of his take-aways is that for implementation to happen a learning community referenced in this standards needs to be at the school.
- Member Sheldon: This is not really a linear process, it is circular. It goes back to learning communities that need to be at all levels. Implementation has to be at building level and is where the vision is completed. It may start at higher level but implementation ends at classroom level.
- Chair Woodhouse: Learning communities at the school level have been very important to Zoom schools that have taken this professional development model. It is critical for kids moving forward.
- Kelee Dupuis: Highlighted sustained implementation and continuous, constructive feedback as part of this standard.

Standard 7 – Outcomes

- Member Wakefield: Does this relate to changes in regulations, legislation, or policy changes? He asked for guidance about what “lanes” of the task force should be considered in regard to the above.
- Dena Durish: Perhaps as the work proceeds, the Task Force could revisit some of the other states’ examples of regulations, legislation, policies, etc.

- Member Newburn: Once standards are established, what do we do with them? Do these become the rubric or part of it? How does this flow down and how do the standards get used?
- Dena Durish: This is what should be part of the Task Force recommendations, how they are used for guidance and in what areas – delivery, evaluation, implementation, etc.
- Member Newburn: If these standards are set for professional development, every time a report or evaluation is submitted, then they should be evaluated by these standards. How would these be used to enforce continuity for how we use professional development?
- Member Wakefield: This could also be used to drive budgets and funding allocations.

Overall Learning Forward Standards Discussion

Member Wakefield: Standards are overall very strong and would serve many purposes. But, because they are missing equity as it applies to ESSA alignment and raising English-Language Learners to a higher level of importance, this area should be considered as its own standard. The group should have a strong opinion around what professional learning communities could/should be because there is flux across the state in this area. Learning communities could be based on successful and trending communities by expertise area, site based communities that share a collective accountability for all children at school, and/or based on phases of careers.

- Member Sheldon: Cautions about limiting the definition of learning communities. A learning community could be three teachers who have two or three students in common working on best strategies to work with these students. The research on learning communities is not just centered around professional development, but also on evaluating student data as a community to determine the best direction and strategies to help students grow and succeed.
- Chair Woodhouse and Member Sheldon supported the new categories of learning communities suggested above by Member Wakefield.
- Member Wakefield: It is important to establish guidelines, and suggested organizing/guiding best practice principles to districts, and offering something that doesn't constrict – yet provides guidance.
- Member Hager: One of the other recommendations that should come from the Task Force is to look at student outcomes in regard to the amount of money and time spent on professional development. Putting outcomes at the forefront with teachers is very important.

Professional Learning/Development Standards – National Landscape

(Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

SEE SUPPORT DOCUMENT ITEM #7
(Item #8 Taken Before Item #7)

Dena Durish reviewed the Google Doc for this item and mentioned some possibilities of regulatory and/or statutory language, etc. (see Item #8) that the Task Force could include in their recommendations. She highlighted states that are geographically close to NV and gave examples of some of the concepts and components of other states' programs with various samples for consideration.

Member Discussion /Questions/Comments

- Member Wakefield: Recognized that there are a lot of good examples to look to, but requested a more synthesized version of all this information to capture the key concepts.
- Chair Woodhouse: Would like to use the Learning Forward concepts as the base, noting that a cultural competence outcome standard (CT example) and equity standard are missing.
- Member Newburn: Evaluated the documents in the context of selecting standards. He reviewed the Learning Forward standards and then compared the differences between the states. Once we have the standards, what will we do with them next? He would like examples of what other states do once they adopt standards to be a future meeting topic.
- Chair Woodhouse: Asked if there other major areas not reflected in Learning Forward to consider adding for NV?
- Member Wakefield: Are there also things that we don't think are as important that might be eliminated or sharpened, using work from the other states' as possible examples.
- Member Sheldon: Likes the Learning Forward standards because they provide a framework for professional development with designated outcomes and data, components as to how districts can/should use this framework in professional development, and require a professional development plan be in place on a year or multiple year timeframe. There aren't areas of the Learning Forward standards that can be eliminated without creating a gap somewhere.

- Chair Woodhouse: Leaning toward taking 7 Learning Forward Standards and adding an additional to address cultural competency and/or equity.
- Sheldon: Cautioned that adding too many standards could become unwieldy.
- Members Wakefield, Newburn, Chair Woodhouse: Suggested an agenda item be added to a future meeting so comments on the Learning Forward Standards and other possible additions could be shared (teacher's associations, community stakeholders, professional development providers, and higher education institutions)
- NWRPDP Kirsten Gleissner: In response to a question from Member Sheldon, it was shared that the Learning Forward standards were adopted in 2011, and are heavily used for planning. WCSD Department of Professional Learning also uses them as a guiding document.
- Member Newburn: Does adding cultural competencies/equity cause problems for anyone using this system?
- Member Sheldon: Does not have concerns with adding cultural competencies. She cautioned that the Task Force be careful as to how to define cultural competency, as there are many different definitions.
- Member Wakefield: Thinking about another area of impact on organizations with a concern about equity for staff, inquired about whether embedded professional development includes compensated time. He asked the group to talk about the time implications and whether or not this is an area that should be included in the Task Force recommendations.
- Dena Durish: Shared examples of how this is addressed in other states. Led member discussion that concluded with the importance of all ensuring that all professional development be job embedded rather than "one stop." Several questions/logistical concerns arose, but members felt that this area is crucially important and states that districts should strongly consider ways to provide adequate professional development time/compensation.
- Member Sheldon: There is a difference between Professional Growth and Professional Development framework plans. She is concerned that continuity of standards throughout districts is necessary and important.
- Chair Woodhouse: Reminded the members that they are drafting a working document for recommendations and asked for members to confirm if there is a comfort level with allowing stakeholders to share their ideas about the learning standards.
- Dena Durish: Asked for clarification and direction about whether one or both additional standard(s) are being considered (equity, cultural competence).
- Discussion ensued about student cultural competencies that are also being considered for addition to the Social Studies curriculum as a result of a different 2015 legislative requirement. It was confirmed that all standards discussed for consideration should be shared publicly, with others allowed/encouraged to provide feedback at a future meeting.

2016 Task Force Work Session and Long-Range Planning *(Information/Discussion/Possible Action)*

- Members Wakefield and Woodhouse: In response to Member Wakefield's request that a synthesized brief be developed with suggestions from prior budget sessions and today's statewide standards discussion, Chair Woodhouse encouraged everyone to continue to take good notes and go back and review minutes regularly. It was decided that Kelee would work with both members regarding possible draft format and topics to be considered for a brief.
- Chair Woodhouse: Shared an overview of how the process of Legislative studies work.
- Member Sheldon: Pleased with what was accomplished at today's meeting in regard to the standards. As we move forward with a framework for how districts can use these standards, there could be the inclusion of rubrics as to how to implement/evaluate plans for professional development. In addition to the flexibility of the framework, accountability needs to be included. A framework with those two areas included would allow districts to work within it to structure their professional development but also measure effectiveness.
- Member Newburn: Pointed out that there is still a lot to decide regarding "what do we do the standards now" and that the "what" can end up being additional recommendations made for changes.
- Chair Woodhouse: Part (c) of the Task Force roles and responsibility is effectiveness of professional development delivery and programs. So this has to be the next areas considered before recommendations are put together in final form.
- Member Newburn: How do these standards and other possible recommendations align with state board responsibilities? How does this work drive how the state should be funding professional development?

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

- Friday, June 17, 2016
- Added tentative meeting date for either August 29th or 30th (to be included in Doodle Poll)
- Wednesday, September 28, 2016
- Doodle Poll with prospective dates for August, October, November, December meetings to be distributed to members

Possible Agenda Items - Friday, June 17, 2016

- Follow-up/ review of budget discussions and professional development standards from previous two meetings
- Review of Professional Learning/Development Standards from National Landscape; NDE will contact Learning Forward to confirm which states have adopted their standards, or modified versions of their standards.
- Invite stakeholders for comment and input on Learning Forward standards and the possible addition of Cultural Competency and/or XXX as guidelines for professional development in districts, schools, etc. statewide.
- Begin to discuss next steps for the state regarding what happens after standards are established – PD review, evaluation, plans, etc. based on what others have done and what would be best in NV context.

Additional Task Force Member Comments *(Information/Discussion)*

- Member Sheldon is unable to attend the meeting of June 17, 2016.
- Member Joiner is unable to attend any Wednesday meetings due to her teaching schedule.

Public Comment #2

Chelli Smith, SNRPDP Director, provided a follow up to Member Wakefield's question from the prior meeting about "Controlling for Teacher Experiences" not being included this year, and shared that it was not budgeted for. She also pointed out that SB474 specifically includes new requirements related to cultural competency, so they would be good to implement.

Adjournment

Chair Woodhouse adjourned the meeting at 2:49 pm.