

Teaching and Leading Work Group Recommendations for Discussion

Item	Teaching and Leading Work Group Recommendations	Teachers & Leaders Council and Commission on Professional Standards Recommendations	Superintendent’s Recommendations for Discussion
1	<p>Definition of Inexperienced/Experienced Teachers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Inexperienced” teachers should be defined as those with less than 3 full years of contracted teaching experience in a K-12 public school. • In addition to “inexperienced” teachers being reported, experience levels of teachers at 5-year intervals (i.e. 5-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 26-30, 31+ years) should be reported for each school. 	<p>COPS: Less than 3 years should be considered “inexperienced,” and no reporting of additional intervals of experience.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Move forward the definition of inexperienced. The definition is in line with existing NRS. Consider feasibility of reporting (dashboard) the additional experience intervals.</p> <p>Required Component to ESSA Plan: States are required to define “inexperienced” teachers and report inequitable distribution.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: Yes, increases with additional reporting (e.g. experience intervals).</p> <p>Other Considerations to Explore: See recommendation regarding reporting.</p>
2a	<p>Not Fully Licensed/Out of Field Teachers: Grades/Subjects/Areas of Licensure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nevada should report the number/percentage of teachers at each school who are "teaching out-of-field or are not fully state certified" in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Core Content Areas – Math, Language Arts, Science, Social Studies ○ Elementary ○ Early Childhood ○ Special Education • Possible consideration of other areas to report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Business and Industry ○ Art/Music/PE ○ Foreign Languages ○ Other Licensed Personnel <p>(Note: COPS will need to review/revise NAC licensure requirements for all areas via Public Workshops/Hearings.)</p>	<p>COPS: No Motion/Recommend.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Move forward the recommendation to report within the areas identified under bullet one; consider feasibility (time/money/value) of reporting areas under bullet two.</p> <p>Required Component to ESSA Plan: States are required to define teachers who are “not fully licensed/teaching out of field” and report inequitable distribution.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: Yes, expands if additional reporting is required.</p> <p>Other Considerations to Explore: COPS working to define full state certification – see note.</p>
2b	<p>Not Fully Licensed/Out of Field Teachers: Types of Licensure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nevada should report the number/percentage of teachers at each school who are teaching with the following: 	<p>COPS: All types of licensure should be</p>	<p>Recommendation: Move forward the recommendation that all types of licensure should be reported. This recommendation addresses <i>why</i> a teacher is classified as out-</p>

Item	Teaching and Leading Work Group Recommendations	Teachers & Leaders Council and Commission on Professional Standards Recommendations	Superintendent's Recommendations for Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provisional Licenses ○ Conditional/Alternative Route to Licensure ○ ARC/Option Special Education Program 	reported.	<p>of-field/not fully state certified.</p> <p>Required Component to ESSA Plan: States are required to define teachers who are “not fully licensed/who are teaching out of field” and report inequitable distribution.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: Yes, expands if additional reporting is required.</p> <p>Other Considerations to Explore: The reporting of these data are important to address school level/principal support of teachers – especially those with Conditional and ARC/Options.</p>
2c	<p>Requirements Permitted for Provisional Licensure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The following requirements should continue to be permitted for provisional licensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Basic Skills Proficiency ○ Subject Area Proficiency ○ Pedagogy Proficiency ○ Up to 6 Credits of Coursework ● Provisional licensure should not be permitted if student teaching requirement has not been met. 	COPS: As already passed in NAC Workshop/Hearing, all areas should be permitted for provisional licensure.	<p>Recommendation: All areas should continue to be permitted for provisional licensure, as previously passed by COPS and Leg. Comm. and currently reflected in NAC.</p> <p>Required Component to ESSA Plan: Not required to identify specific provisional licensure components.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: Not as contemplated but yes if reporting is required.</p> <p>Other Considerations to Explore: Proposed changes to NRS under AB77. (Department submitted for 2017 session.)</p>
3	<p>Other Areas of Data Collection/Reporting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The number/percentage of teachers with the following licensure endorsements should be reported by school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TESL/ELAD ○ Reading Specialist ○ National Board Certification ○ Teacher Leadership* ● Numbers/percentages of the following staffing data should be reported by school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teacher Vacancies ○ Teacher Absences ○ Long Term Substitutes 	COPS: All endorsement and staffing areas proposed should be reported.	<p>Recommendation: Move forward the recommendation for all endorsement and staffing data to be reported.</p> <p>Required Component to ESSA Plan: None of these areas of reporting are required per ESSA.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: Yes, and may impact timeline of reporting rollout.</p> <p>Other Considerations to Explore: Development of “business rules” related to staffing data and Teacher Leader endorsement, as noted.</p>

Item	Teaching and Leading Work Group Recommendations	Teachers & Leaders Council and Commission on Professional Standards Recommendations	Superintendent's Recommendations for Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teacher Turnover/Retention Rates (Note: NV does not currently have a Teacher Leadership endorsement, but the WG recommends+ that this new area be considered by COPS.) 		
4a	<p>Educator Effectiveness: Statewide Educator Evaluation System for Licensed Personnel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nevada should maintain a statewide system for evaluation for licensed personnel. • Current measures and percentages of state and district-determined measures should be maintained. 	<p>TLC: Yes, statewide evaluation system for licensed personnel should continue. Student performance measures should be continued, but would like to consider modifications to current measures and/or percentages.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Move forward the recommendation for Nevada to maintain a statewide system for evaluation for licensed personnel and maintain current measures and percentages of state and district-determined assessments</p> <p>Required Component to ESSA Plan: States are required to define teachers who are “ineffective” and report inequitable distribution.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: None. Current system in place.</p> <p>Other Considerations to Explore: None.</p>
4b	<p>Educator Effectiveness: Definition of “Ineffective” Teachers and Reporting (Ratings, Standards, Indicators)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nevada should use NEPF ratings to define ineffective/effectiveness. • Ineffective and Minimally Effective NEPF ratings should be combined for purposes of federal reporting of “Ineffective” teachers. • For state reporting, all ratings (including Effective and Highly Effective) should be reported separately. • Standard and Indicator-level scores should be reported to identify areas of strength/professional growth. 	<p>TLC: No Motion/Recommend.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Move forward the recommendation that, for purposes of federal reporting, Nevada’s definition of “Ineffective Teachers” should include both the Ineffective and Minimally Effective NEPF ratings.</p> <p>Additionally, for state reporting purposes, aggregate results of all four ratings should be reported.</p> <p>Standard-level scores should be collected and used for educator preparation and professional development purposes, but Indicator-level scores should not be collected.</p> <p>Required Component to ESSA Plan: States are required to define teachers who are “ineffective” and report inequitable distribution.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: Yes, due to reporting.</p> <p>Other Considerations to Explore:</p>

Item	Teaching and Leading Work Group Recommendations	Teachers & Leaders Council and Commission on Professional Standards Recommendations	Superintendent's Recommendations for Discussion
5	<p>Data Collection/Reporting for School Administrators/Leaders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of the following should be considered for school-based administrator/leader reporting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inexperienced/Years of Experience ○ Effectiveness Ratings ○ Areas of Licensure/Endorsements 	TLC and COPS: No Motion/Recommend.	<p>Recommendation: Move forward the recommendation to not report school administrator data at this time.</p> <p>Required Component to ESSA Plan: ESSA has no reporting requirements for school administrators/leaders.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: Yes, if required to report.</p> <p>Other Considerations to Explore: Consider feasibility and value of additional reporting requirements. Considerable challenges with reporting and protecting individual identity.</p>
6	<p>Title II-A Fund Use: State Activities and Districts/Charters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of Title II-A funds at state and district/charter levels should be targeted and focused, and aligned with identified state and local human capital needs. 	COPS: Title II-A State Activities funds should be utilized to support licensure reform/modernization.	<p>Recommendation: Move forward the recommendation as a collective commitment from all levels of the education system to work on alignment/efficiency. Alignment of federal dollars is consistent with other Work Group recommendations.</p> <p>Required Component to ESSA Plan: Doesn't specifically require the articulation of what federal funds are to support; however, clear alignment of resources for greatest impact should be addressed.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: Neutral</p> <p>Other Considerations to Explore: This recommendation is aligned with the Department's work to create a consolidated application.</p>
7	<p>3% of Title II-A for Statewide "Principal and Other School Leader" Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3% of Nevada's Title II-A allocation should be used for statewide activities related to principal/other school leader development. The funds should be spent on a variety of areas related to leader development, but a portion should definitely focus on NEPF implementation and school turnaround/transformation. 	TLC: All 3% additional should be used for NEPF training.	<p>Recommendation: Move forward with the recommendation that 3% of Title II-A funds be used for statewide principal/other school leader development, with focus being on NEPF implementation and school improvement. Additional 3% at the state level provides greater scale and possible impact than diffusing the dollars across districts.</p> <p>Required Component to ESSA Plan: Under NCLB, states were permitted to use up to 1% of Title II-A funds for program administrative costs and up to an additional 4% for</p>

Item	Teaching and Leading Work Group Recommendations	Teachers & Leaders Council and Commission on Professional Standards Recommendations	Superintendent's Recommendations for Discussion
			<p>statewide activities. (95% required distribution to districts.) ESSA allows states to use up to an additional 3% if spent on “principal and other school leader” development. (92% would be distributed to districts.)</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: Overall neutral.</p> <p>Other Considerations to Explore: “Phasing” of 3% to statewide activities over 1-3 years.</p>