

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)
APRIL 26, 2017
9:00 A.M.**

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Meeting called to order at 9:19AM

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call:

Members Present:

Las Vegas:

- Kathleen Galland-Collins
- Dale Norton
- Pam Salazar
- Theo Small
- Dottie Smith
- Anthony Nunez

Carson:

- Barbara Barker
- Jim Cooney
- Susan Lacey

Public:

Las Vegas:

- Karen Stanley
- Kim Mangino
- Bill Garis
- Ken Basinger
- Kathy Mead
- Kristin Barnson
- Mark Schumm
- Chad Gregorius

Carson

- Cristal Cisneros
- Marina McHatton (NDE staff)

Staff:

- Dena Durish
- Gregg Ott
- Eboni Caridine
- Raven Cole

Chair Salazar asked new member, Jim Cooney, to introduce himself. Member Cooney stated that he was an agriculture education instructor in Elko County for 31 years. He retired 12 years ago. He has worked for the Nevada Department of Agriculture and has experience in the legislative sessions advocating for career and technical education. He was recently voted onto the Elko County School Board and now he is happy to be part of the Teachers and Leaders Council.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

No public comment

2. FLEXIBLE AGENDA APPROVAL

Motion

- Member Norton motioned for approval of a flexible agenda.
- Member Nunez seconded the motion.
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 9:20 AM**

3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 22 & MARCH 15, 2017

The Council was asked to take a few minutes to review the February 22nd meeting minutes for errors or concerns.

Motion

- Member Small motioned to approve the February 22nd meeting minutes.
- Member Norton seconded the motion.
- All in Favor
- **Motion carried at 9:23AM**

The Council was asked to take a few minutes to review the March 15th meeting minutes for errors or concerns.

Motion

- Member Nunez motioned to approve the March 15th Meeting Minutes
- Member Small seconded the motion.
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 9:26AM**

4. NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—UPDATES

Kathleen Galland-Collins, NDE Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Educator Development & Support

- Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) Implementation Updates
Schoolwide aggregate scores were released to districts. The Department fielded several questions on how the scores were calculated. All questions were answered as quickly as possible. The NEPF survey is being developed and focus groups are planned again for this year monitor for quality, reliability, validity fairness, consistency, and objectivity per NRS 391.460.
- TLC Member update
Welcome to Jim Cooney to the Council from Elko. Some Council members have received emails from Nikki Haag of the Governor's Office with paperwork that needs to be completed and returned to her to remain on the Council. The Council was concerned for their Parent Representative, Amy Henderson, whom is scheduled to be on the Council until 2018. Member Collins has not been able to reach her via phone or email, and requested that if anyone knows her personally, to ask her to make contact with the Council. In the attempts to make contact with Amy Henderson, she was asked to submit a resignation letter to the Council if she no longer wants to participate. That letter has not been received
- Application for use of alternate teacher evaluation system
Clark County applied on behalf of a Lomie Heard Elementary School – they are becoming a Marzano Academy. Member Collins and Staff Member Caridine spent hours reviewing the application and comparing the strategies of the Marzano elements to the NEPF standards. The preliminary report was shared with Clark County School District personnel, Dr. Marzano, and Paul

Wright. It was determined that, “after an intensive review of CCSDs application for use of an alternate teacher evaluation tool for Lomie Heard Elementary School, it was determined that the Marzano System of Evaluation elements have many of the same expectations of teacher and student behavior, but the scale for measuring those behaviors are not equivalent to those of the NEPF. During the meeting Dr. Marzano suggested that the NEPF be kept as the evaluation tool, but the Marzano elements be used for educator professional growth purposes. CCSD withdrew their application for use of an alternate system and were advised that if they planned on using alternate tools than those prescribed by the State Board, then they need to send the Department a copy of those tools for Department approval. Future meeting dates
5 people responded to the Doodle Pool. The dates came up with by the Council are 8/2/17, 9/27/17, 10/4/17, 11/29/17, 1/10/18, 3/14/18, and 5/23/18. A complete list will be sent out to Council members as well as posted to the website. If, for some reason, there is not enough on future agendas to meet as frequently as scheduled, Chair Salazar will be willing to reschedule if necessary.

Council members asked clarifying questions regarding the NEPF survey and focus groups.

5. DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCHOOL COUNSELOR STATEWIDE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM

Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair; Marina McHatton, Education Programs Professional, Office of Career Readiness, Adult Learning, and Education Options; Rebecca Gunderson, President of Nevada School Counselor’s Association.

Update on Development of the NEPF for school counselors. Marina Mc Hatton with the Department of Education (DOE) began by stating they have completed all six standards and, would like to be able to introduce things they have reworded to ensure that the Performance Levels align with Indicators. Besides those changes, they are ready to present before the State Board of Education (SBE) as they have no changes to their content. Chair Salazar said, looking at this, it appears that they have done a lot of work since they last time they presented before the Council in terms of moving from Indicators to Levels of Performance, using language that parallels the language of other groups in the NEPF, and providing clarity surrounding description notes. Chair Salazar thanked the group for the intensive work they have done in order to bring their presentation forward. The floor was then opened to the rest of the Council for comments, suggestions, and/or potential action. Member Collins brought attention to the evidence pieces of Standard 1. She said she noticed that the group has three items under Mandatory Evidence: Signed Annual Agreement, Direct Observation, and One Additional Item from Confirmatory Evidence Column. The NEPF requires at least two pieces of the evidence and the third is at the discretion of the group. If they are not requiring three, Member Collins suggested adding “or” between “Direct Observation” and “One Additional Item from Confirmatory Evidence.” The way it is stated now, it legally reads as all three elements being required. Member Barker thanked them because she knows at Sparks Middle School the counselors are amazing and they support the community extensively in a variety of ways. That said, she appreciates the group’s role in the school, especially the role they play in developing the culture and climate of a building. She had questions about the family engagement piece. Rebecca Gunderson answered, stating that Member Barker is correct. Counselors do act as the central point of contact between families and administrators. She added that one of the glossary terms that can be seen all throughout their evaluation tool is “stakeholders.” That said, they do not always refer to staff, students, parents, and administrators by their specified role, but just as stakeholders in general as it is all-encompassing. It is a tool that counselors use so when they look at who they serve they are looking at their students, parents, community, local businesses, and anybody else who would make up an effective School Counseling Advisory Council. That also includes the School Board and administration. She knows that at Shaw, in particular, their Advisory Council and Parent Involvement Framework, and their school counseling goals are all intertwined because they make sure their school counseling program is addressing the needs identified by their stakeholders. She thinks the glossary will help define broad terms like Chair Salazar suggested -- especially on Standard 5 in terms of all of the outreach through communication, teamwork and collaboration, both inside and outside of the school -- those places where there are no descriptor notes, is where the rubric can be enhanced so there is clarity around the expectations of the indicators. Member Small asked if the group could review [Standards 4 & 6] again and if they group had any discussion about whether or not certain standards should be weighted differently or are they equal. Marina McHatton stated that As far as weighting is concerned, being that this

is k-12, counseling is different for the different age groups. Many of the duties of a counselor differ from elementary school to middle school to high school. To make it equitable for all grade levels, it would be difficult to add the weighting. Member Collins added that she thinks those are great questions that can be addressed in the pilot study. She thinks that if they ask specific questions of the participants such as whether or not there were specific indicators that should have weighed more heavily for secondary or for elementary they can use that feedback to address Member Small's concerns. Member Nunez brought the attention of the Council to Standard 4, Indicator 3. From a principal's perspective, it is written as a yes or no statement. But when looking at the rationale, the rationale has everything to do with wanting people to use data in order to create action steps. How it plays out in the pilot study might address the issue, but if the group's intent is to give the counselor the opportunity to get and use data to make structural decisions at the site level and then be evaluated on their impact on the structures they create, then the wording may need some precision because the Mandatory Evidence is a results report. Chair Salazar thanked Member Nunez for his input and added that his concern is another example of the significance of clarity so that the intent of an indicator is what is actually used by the supervisor to evaluate. She encourages the group to read through every one of them and think about how it actually plays out when it is operationalized. Member Small encourages them to find flexibility between the school levels that will allow the rubric to be both specific to the different levels of education and also broad enough to be generalized across the state. Chair Salazar looked to the Council for potential action

Motion

- Member Barker motioned to accept the proposal and move it forward to the SBE for their recommendations and to pilot it.
- Member Collins seconded the motion.
- All in favor

Motion carried at 10:00 AM

6. PILOT STUDIES OF THE STATEWIDE EVALUATION FRAMEWORKS FOR THE “OTHER LICENSED EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL (OLEP) GROUPS Eboni Caridine, Education Programs Professional, Office of Educator Development and Support.

Members received an overview of the proposed processes for completing the pilot studies of the Statewide Evaluation Frameworks for School Counselors, School Library Media Specialists, School Nurses, School Psychologists, School Speech Language Pathologists, School Social Workers, and Educational Audiologists.

Nevada Department of Education (NDE) Staff Member Eboni Caridine led the discussion on the process of piloting that is being proposed. The timeline is anticipated to be for the 2017-2018 school year for the seven OLEP groups. The seven groups are as follows: School Counselors, School Social Workers, School Nurses, School Psychologists, Educational Audiologists, Speech-Language Pathologists, and Teacher-Librarians. An update on tool development informed the Council that rubrics are being finalized, and protocols are being written. The Department is developing a document for each OLEP group that clarifies the purpose of the pilot study, the expectations of participants, it will outline the support that will be provided by NDE during the process, it will also provide protocols surrounding the pilot study in general. Each of the seven OLEP groups will receive a guidance document specific to their pilot study. More information will be provided to the TLC as those documents are being created. If the Council has any comments, concerns, or suggestions in regards to the pilot studies or OLEPs, they were instructed to contact either Member Collins or Staff Member Caridine. Staff Member Caridine added that she and Member Collins will also see to it that each of the teams asks any questions they want included in the guidelines. She will work closely with them to be sure this reflects what the participants want it to reflect. Member Barker went on record stating that she likes the instructional role question for school counselors as well.

7. 2017 LEGISLATIVE SESSION CONSIDERATIONS

There are just over fifty days left in legislative session. The first deadline recently passed this week, and legislative proposals had to move out of one House to go to the other House. The Council is going to review the bills that have a relationship to the TLC either directly or indirectly, the NEPF and its implementation, provide updates of the statuses of bills, and if there are any additional recommendations.

- a. Updates on Bills that may have impact on the NEPF, including but not limited to, bills listed below:
 - i. AB7
Brief overview of AB7 was presented by Deputy Superintendent Dina Durish and Member Collins at a previous meeting. It is a lengthy bill and the amended version did pass. The key pieces with regard to NEPF on this bill are related to the definition of assessment. Changes to AB7 were mostly revisions to the language, not proposal of anything new in terms of their own individual platform as the TLC. This was all about fixing verbiage that needed to be addressed based on 2015 legislation. Member Collins contributed that this contains pieces about requesting another observer. On this document, they have links to the conceptual amendments if members would like to see what those are. This one has been passed out of the Assembly for Senate Finance and should go to the Floor next. This is amendment number 306 to AB7 if members want to see the amended version verses the first version that was presented on the floor. The Council will continue to monitor this, but again this amendment was for the purpose of clarifying the language.
 - ii. AB212 prohibits the use of pupil achievement data to evaluate employees of the school district. The bill has since been withdrawn. The most recent presentation before the TLC was at the Assembly Committee on Education hearing a couple weeks ago.
 - iii. AB312 was sponsored by Assembly Woman Miller. It was with regard to modifying the NEPF across some Indicators. It was about addressing concerns with class size. Due to large class sizes the recommendation from AB312 would be that there would need to be accommodations made for teachers that had large classes. Chair Salazar was asked if she would support the bill on behalf of the TLC. She declined because they would not support any modification, adjustments or changes to the NEPF or its Standards and Indicators as they have agreed to stand by the NEPF and its standards and indicators as they are defined. After a great deal of discussion at the same hearing, there was quite a bit of opposition to the bill. So the bill was amended with a direction for the NDE to make recommendations although unbinding, but recommendations with appropriate class size. The bill moved out of the House as amended. AB320
 - iv. AB320 is the bill that received multiple recommendations from the TLC. Recommendations include student outcomes now being capped at 20% and those student outcomes being based on student learning goals. It was sponsored by Speaker Frierson. It was presented again to the Committee on Education in the Assembly. Chair Salazar presented side-by-side with Speaker Frierson. The Council was encouraged to take a look at the amended version. There were some areas from the conceptual amendment that was passed in the Committee that were not addressed accurately in the language in the amended version. Chair Salazar was able to speak with both Speaker Frierson as well as Karly from LCB. Those will be corrected as technical issues because they were not substantive changes. The recommendations were to address elements such as two years of highly effective would result in someone then not having an evaluation for two years. Another conceptual piece was minimally effective and/or developing. Karly took the recommendation back to the reviewers and it could only be one or the other, so minimally effective went away and developing replaced it. For all of the levels of performance, there is now: highly effective, effective, developing, and ineffective. The main component in this particular bill was the 20% cap and that removal of state assessment data/state tests from evaluations. Chair Salazar spoke with Speaker Frierson that day, and the bill was passed out of the House now moves to the Senate Committee on Education. Deputy Superintendent Dena Durish added that the bill did pass out of the Floor, and it did pass on party lines. The Department is not supporting the bill as written, so there is a little bit of a conflict there between TLC and the Department. She clarified that she wouldn't call it "uncomfortable," however it is "philosophically not in agreement" with the Superintendent and the ESSA plan agreement. Nor is it aligned with what the Governor currently is supporting. There is still work being done on amendments with different legislators and the LCB and Dena will continue updating Chair Salazar. During the hearing, the Council was very fortunate to have researcher Dr. Beardsley out of Arizona State University (ASU) who is recognized across

the country as one of the leading authorities in terms of the use of state assessment data/test scores in evaluation systems. Chair Salazar shared information regarding research on using student assessment data for teacher evaluations. Chair Salazar shared that Dr. Beardsley pointed out in her testimony to legislators that she is involved right now as a key witness in some 17 lawsuits across the country and these lawsuits are all around this idea of the unfairness or inaccuracy of using state assessment data in evaluation data. Chair Salazar is aware that Dr. Beardsley is going to provide some additional documentation in regards to why states are moving away from this and we will be utilizing this in conversation with our legislators to help them understand why we need to base this decision, not on politics, but on research. Member Small complimented Chair Salazar for the amount of work and professionalism in representing the Council. He thanked Member Marshner, Member Barker, and Member Lacey for taking their time and speaking on this before legislators. Member Barker asked if the council moves forward with AB320 and then they adopt the 20% SLG piece, she wonders where they are including the support for admins as they continue to try to implement the NEPF and now the council is adding the additional responsibility of looking at SLGs and the evaluation of that piece and supporting teachers. She wonders what supports they are trying to legislate or embed in the system so that they are supporting their administrators so they can implement it effectively. Chair Salazar answered that in terms of the scope of TLC authority, they certainly don't have the scope of authority to prescribe or define what kind of training needs to take place. The Council's recommendations are in regards to what the protocol needs to look like and then the Department actually takes those recommendations, builds the protocol, and defines what needs to be followed Chair Salazar stated that when presenting testimony in regards to 320, they don't disagree that NEPF can be a quality evaluation system, but the challenge will always be the implementation. The question then comes up; who is ensuring the implementation is done with fidelity so that the data that is generated can be trusted? That then goes back to who is ensuring the training to ensure that it is implemented in ways that really does represent the intent of the NEPF. That said, it is not under the Council's scope of authority in terms of them prescribing the training, but it does say something about the importance of the training. In 320 we are now going to rely on SLGs to be the sole indicator of student performance, and therefore, student performance in the teacher's evaluation. There is a proposal that SBE add NEPF with SLGs into one of the priorities for next year with the Great Teachers and Leaders funding. If we could support that being one of the priorities at the Great Teachers and Leaders Fund (GLTF), it would open the door for training for teachers and admins in the future. All of the concerns with SLGs are the same we've heard of the last couple years: implementation and implementation with fidelity. Salazar's question based on Member Barker's question would be, does it make sense for the TLC to support that proposal to add SLGs back as one of the priority items within the GLTF priorities that would make money available for next year?

Motion

- Member Barker moved the TLC recommends the SBE to consider SLGs as a key priority in the GTL fund.
- The motion was seconded by Member Lacey

Member Smith stated that she was having a hard time understanding the purpose of the GTL funds and what the broader needs of the state are before she can feel confident that this is the right priority. Dena was asked by Chair Salazar to give the history of the GTL. The first year of the GTL fund was the year of the first significant teacher shortage here. The focus was very much on addressing the shortage. Last year, it was determined that they wanted to use the funds to implement science standards because there were no other funds statewide for that purpose. That was when the determination was to limit to only three areas. With this, given that the fidelity of the NEPF, regardless of the extent to which the bill stays the same, it is still going to go up to 20% for SLGs. If other proposed amendments are occurring, the Council is not proposing anything to get rid of SLOs or SLGs completely anyway. Given that the Council knows the importance of that fidelity in the system, she thinks Member

Smith's question is a fair and valid one. We know that if administrators aren't setting good benchmark SLOs and aren't using reliable measures with their teachers in all areas, then the system in itself is flawed. She appreciates the opportunity to clarify because this is a priority.

- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 11:49AM**

Member Small included another thing from 320 that he doesn't think was mentioned is adding an OLEP to the TLC. So if any other members needed another reason to support 320, it is to have an OLEP member on the Council.

v. SB497

requires the development of an advisory taskforce with regards to school leader management; specifically, about leadership at a number of levels with regards to supporting greater student achievement. Dena was asked to talk about the bill and specific amendments made to it by the Department. She explained that the interim education committee meets when the legislation is out of session. It is a joint committee between the Assembly and Senate. They are not necessarily a decision making body, however at the end of their session they produce a final report. That final report contains a series of recommendations to the districts be it for regulatory, statutory, or policy changes. Those are based on several presentations that they hear throughout their several meetings during the interim. One of the presentations was by Nevada Succeeds. They have been engaged in a project called "What's Next?" It was in response to all of the 2015 legislation. The goal was to focus on strong school leaders and strong teachers to put all of these education investments into play. A big piece of that was saying the state needs strong leaders. The Committee made a recommendation to have a taskforce to study the trajectory of school leaders in our state. The way the bill was originally written did not properly reflect the intent. It was introduced as a study on the educator evaluation system for principals, which was not the intent. NDE proposed amendments help clarify the purpose of the proposed task force, which is to determine the following: if administrators are being prepared, are they being prepared in accordance with the NEPF? If they are requiring certain licenses, is the license in alignment with what the needs of principals in the 21st century are? Does the evaluation system truly measure the things they are looking for in principals? Given the context of the new precinct roles in Clark, are there different roles and licenses that may be pursued? The original committee was very small; maybe 4 legislators and 1 school administrator. Proposed amendments expanded the committee. Dena explained that they felt it was really important to have someone from the principal-prep community on that committee. They kept the legislators piece, but they also said that the legislators (the speaker of each body) minority and minority party would be able to appoint someone and that it didn't have to be a legislator; that way their voice would still be heard. They thought it would be important to have a teacher voice on the panel. There is a family piece, and they want a member of the TLC. The reason Chair Salazar wanted to share the update with the Council is at some point they will be studying the bigger context and if this bill passes, at whatever meeting the Council has scheduled after June, then the Council will have to make a motion to appoint someone. Therefore she would like the Council to be thinking about who they might appoint. It will probably be about a 16 month taskforce. They will probably meet 4-6 times to study the broader picture. They would like to have a very engaged member voice from the TLC sitting as a part of this taskforce. Chair Salazar followed up by sharing with the Council that the bill can be found on NELIS. It is Senate Bill 497 Amendment 513.

8. NATIONAL ISSUES AND LEGAL LANDSCAPE Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

Members will review current legislative and legal issues that could be pertinent to the work of the TLC including, but not limited to, possible legislation as a result of the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

In essence, discussions are all around ESSA, US Dept of Ed and its role under its leadership of Secretary DeVos and any of the ramifications of implementation of ESSA at a number of levels; be it testing, evaluation, or accountability. Those seem to be the hot topics on any given week. Everything has to do with ESSA and plan submittal. Dena shared with the Council an overview of ESSA and NV being one of the early states to submit the ESSA plan. Headlines today in Ed Week were about the process of review of the ESSA plans and the outside agency that's going to be doing that. All eyes are on Secretary DeVos to see how it actually plays out. Dena added that some of the members may have heard this morning that President Trump is supposed to be signing an executive order to review all federal guidance regulations, informal letters, and all other documents on the ESSA website to make sure that the Department up until this point does not inadvertently or out of accordance what the legislation's intent does not interfere with local decisions. Keep an eye on the news for that. The first step of the ESSA review was a DOE checklist. They did get confirmation on Monday that everything was good and the plan has gone on to the next step. She thinks May 22-24th is the tentative timeline for peer review. Chair Salazar informed the Council that Connecticut and New Mexico are the two newest states to stop the use of student assessments in teacher evaluations. It is the opportunity for states to have local control in terms of what they believe is most important for accountability purposes. That is why it can be seen that states are seeking broader measures for accountability at the school level and as a result relaxing some of the expectations of test scores at the educator level. She strongly encouraged members of the Council that are interested in what's going on at the national level to subscribe to a number of free publications. There were no questions, or concerns from the Council.

9. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

The council will be staying on top of what is happening in the legislative session. As well as an update on moving forward the counselor evaluation system and recommendations that ends up going to the SBE. At the next meeting they will talk about principal supervisors and where they are in terms of what that pilot might look like and a framework that parallels the NEPF, utilizing the national standards for principal supervisors the council previously adopted. Other areas that can be considered are first drafts of survey focus group plans to get more information to the TLC with regards to implementation of the NEPF. Member Collins informed the Council that the discussion within the department is instead of presenting the different OLEP groups to State Board one at a time, the plan is to present them all under an agenda item at the June meeting. The Council will hear presentations by the SLPs and maybe a preliminary from school social workers at the next TLC meeting to get them on the State Board agenda. The groups are working hard and feverishly. . Chair Salazar clarified that the next State Board of Education meeting after the TLC's June 14th meeting is July 23rd. They skip August and it is believed they don't have another until September. There were no questions comments or concerns.

10. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

No public comment the north.

No public comment in the south

11. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 11:09AM