

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)
JANUARY 25, 2017
9:00 A.M.**

MINUTES

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

Meeting called to order at 9:28 AM.

Roll Call:

Member:

Las Vegas:

- Barbara Barker
- Veronica Frenkel
- Kathleen Galland Collins
- Pam Salazar
- Theo Small
- Anthony Nunez
- Susan Lacey
- Maggie Marshner
- Terri Janison

Carson:

- Dale Norton

Public:

Las Vegas:

- Teri White
- Keith Lewis
- Karen Stanley
- Bill Garis
- Katie Dockweiler
- Craig Stevens
- Shelly Pierson
- Tim Mclvor
- Kim Mangino
- David Bechtler
- Dan Wold
- Rod Broadnax
- Kirsten Gleissner

Carson:

- Richard Stokes
- Cristal Cisneros
- Jose Delfin
- Mary Pierazemshi

Staff:

- Chantel Wakefield
- Dena Durish
- Eboni Caridine
- Gregg Ott

Pledge of Allegiance

2. Public Comment #1

No public comment in Carson

Public comment in Las Vegas:

Kim Mangino, Assistant Superintendent of the Talent and Leadership department with the Clark County School District (CCSD) speaking on item 11: CCSD supports the elimination of student evaluation data in NEPF. States across the country are eliminating this requirement. Only 30% of Nevada teachers teach a tested subject. The majority of teacher's would be measured on the work of their peers. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) now allows states greater flexibility in their plans to measure a teacher's effectiveness. Other states are no longer requiring the use of student data to grade teachers. This makes our state less attractive. It creates greater challenges to recruit teachers in high need areas.

Tim McIvor, past president of the Nevada Association of School Psychologists stated that for the last nine months CCSD, Washoe County, and rural county school psychologists have worked on an evaluation rubric that would raise the standards for school psychologists. He thanked the TLC for granting an evaluation rubric that aligns to national standards. A large amount of content from their evaluation rubric has been taken verbatim from the national standards. They have asked for feedback and received positive reviews for capturing the modern practices of the school psychologist. One of the major challenges they overcame while creating a rubric for school psychologists is that Nevada is listed under critical shortage at the district level as well as the state level. There should be one psychologist to every 500-700 students. In CCSD and Washoe County they have ratios of approximately 1 school psychologist to every 2000-2500 students. Some school psychologists at the high school level have 1 school psychologist to 5000 students. Rural Districts have 1 or a few for all schools. The school psychiatrist's job differs depending on the resources provided. The team found the main areas of practice that all school psychologists have in common. They are the nonnegotiable for a school psychologist's goal and the team has made the areas rigorous and relevant. He asked the Council to keep all this in mind when reviewing the rubric.

3. Flexible Agenda Approval (*Discussion/For Possible Action*) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair
Motion

- Member Collins moved for a flexible agenda
- Member Norton seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 9:30 AM**

4. Election of Council Chair Pursuant to NRS 391.455

Deputy Ott explained that they were there to elect a chair and a vice chair. The Chair and Vice Chair elections are normally done separately. First they will nominate and then go forward with the vote.

Chair Salazar explained the duties of the Chair.

Gregg Ott stated that he would open the nomination for the Chair and they do not need a second.

Member Norton nominated Pam Salazar

Vote:

- All in favor of Pam Salazar as the Chair
- Vote closed at 10:20 AM.

Member Norton nominated Barbara Barker as the Vice Chair

Vote:

- All in favor of Barbara Barker as the Vice Chair
- Vote closed at 10:21 AM.

The Council went back to item seven.

5. Approval of Meeting Minutes for November 30, 2016

Member Collins stated that Member Marshner was not on the attendance list and she has been added.

Motion

- Member Marshner moved to approve as amended

- Member Nunez seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 9:49 AM**

6. Nevada Department of Education—updates

Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) Implementation Updates

Member Collins welcomed Eboni Caridine and the new Education Programs Professional for Educator Evaluation. The summative evaluation tool is in final revision. The biggest change is that evidence is still required but is no longer required to be printed and can be provided to the educator electronically. “Other Licensed Educational Personnel” (OLEP) Evaluation System Development

Member Collins stated that all groups are meeting except for school audiologists. School psychiatrists will present today. School nurses would like to present at the March meeting. Some groups will be ready for February with preliminary standards and indicators. Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) – NV Advisory/Work Groups and Timeline

Member Collins stated that the ESSA plan is on the Department website and open for public comment until March first. Section five starts on page 36 and is a reflection of what the Division of Educator Effectiveness supports. Feedback from work groups was taken into consideration.

Questions from council members were as follows:

Member Small asked if the summative revision tool goes to districts will they still do training with principals and others on that tool. Member Collins stated that it is not that different and should not require additional training.

Member Small asked if Washoe will need more time to adapt. Member Collins stated that no additional time should be needed to adapt.

Chair Salazar asked about the ratings system not being on the summative. Member Collins explained that there has been a delay in getting the data and they hope to have it by the February meeting.

Chair Salazar stated that if they are not able to move down to that agenda item they could still have the summative without that part. That way districts can see what the summative looks like. Member Collins stated that they can put out the summative form without the cut scores on it.

7. NEPF Student Performance: Calculating Schoolwide Aggregate Scores

Russ Keglovitz reviewed slides 1-21 which was presented at the November TLC meeting. He stated that the questions TLC needs to answer are: How many subject area statewide assessments are needed to rate a school? And will the council recommend the use of proficiency or scale scores of the assessment results to determine schoolwide aggregate ratings.

Question from council members were as follows:

Member Janison asked why not just go with the highest number of schools. What would be the negative of calculating with only one score? Russ Keglovitz stated with the 96.2% of elementary schools many have a rating based on one or two assessments.

Russ Keglovitz stated that if they do not have a sufficient number of records to measure the proficiency indicator in the school rating system, they do not rate the school. The N size for calculating schoolwide aggregate scores is 10. There must be at least 10 records for the assessment given. The Department is also concerned about personal identifiable information (PII).

Member Small stated that he does not want to take out a content area and thinks that they are all important. It is important for data to get to schools. Multiple schools in Clark fit this count. The danger around not having all three tests is that it then becomes punitive. There was a brief discussion regarding the use of pooled averages of all three assessments.

Chair Salazar stated that pooled records refers to ten in each of the content areas.

The Council reviewed scoring options for the schoolwide aggregate score comprised of data from the statewide assessment of students in third through eighth grade. The sample data was shown calculated using mean proficiency and mean scale scores. The Council reviewed data from the 15-16 End of Course Exams (EOC); ELA 1 and ELA 2 where combined for this analysis since they were scored on

the same continuum. Math 1 and 2 are calculated separately. Passing score on EOC are based on achievement levels 2, 3, and 4, which is different from Smarter Balance Assessment.

Russ Keglovitz explained the data in detail to council members. The EOC data analysis is only from high school student scores. Some assessments are taken in middle school but are not included on this chart or the middle school chart.

Russ Keglovitz explained the High school proficiency frequency chart and Scale Score Frequency chart on slide 28.

He showed the score distributions based on both scale and proficiency score. There are 159 High Schools in Nevada. The analysis was conducted on 131 of them. Many of the nontraditional high schools are missing. 104 schools had at least ten records then it drops down to 65% of high schools. The rate of high school inclusion may increase by establishing conditions on how many assessments should be included for analysis.

The decision points are:

- Proficiency or scale score?
- Should the cuts be differentiated by school level or common cuts?
- What should the number of assessment results be in order for a school to receive a rating?
- Where should the cuts for level one through four be?

The Council had a robust discussion on the data and asked clarifying questions as needed. The discussion included using scale score over proficiency. The general consensus was scale score.

Motion:

- Member Small moved to use the scale score not the proficiency scale
- Member Janison second the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 11:12 AM.**
- **Motion**
 - Member Small moved to use different cuts for each of the three levels. High school, middle school, and elementary school.
 - Member Nunez seconded the motion
 - Discussion: Member Janison asked why the difference in elementary and middle. If you look at the middle schools scale score vs the elementary scale score the only difference is 3.033 to 3.67 in elementary and middle is 3.33 to 4. She asked why there is a 3.67 in elementary and not in middle.
 - Russ Keglovitz stated that the difference in total number of score points is an artifact of the mathematics. In elementary and middle school there are three different content areas. In order to define a number of one through four and divide by three you get the different fractions.
 - All in favor
 - **Motion carried at 11:18 AM.**
- The next question is should they use all three assessments, two, or one?
- **Motion**
 - Member Small moved that the schools that are measured have to use all three assessments.
 - Member Frenkel seconded the motion.
 - Russ Keglovitz called attention to high school. Do they require ELA one and two and Math one and two when they say all? It is prudent to consider the decision level by level.
 - The Council reviewed the N size slides. If science is required 35% of high schools will not have an assessment score. ADAM and the Educator Effective Division personnel would do the calculations.
 - The Council discussed the methods of establishing the cut scores; they are the referenced approach and the criterion referenced approach.
- **Amended Motion**
 - Member Small amended his motion. For elementary they will use the same cut scores if they have two or more assessments with an N size of ten to be accounted for the school wide aggregate score.
 - Member Frenkel second the motion

- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 11:44 AM**
- **Motion**
 - Member Small motioned for middle schools to have two or more assessments with an N size of ten to be counted for the school wide aggregate score.
 - Member Frenkel seconded the motion
 - All in favor
 - **Carried at 11:46 AM.**
- **Motion**
 - Member small motioned for high school the assessment of ELA and math one and math two with an N size of ten for the school wide aggregate score as it is listed for 82%.
 - Member Frenkel seconded the motion.
 - Russ Keglovits asked about participation in math two in general. He does not have the counts in front of him, but there is less participation in math two then in one.
 - Chair Salazar asked if the data is different than last year. It was.
 - Member Collins asked if math one and two was a combination. It was not.
 - Russ Keglovits stated that ELA as it presents here is a combined ELA one and combined ELA two. All of the schools had at least ten records in both. With this suggestion his office would go back and rerun ELA 1 and ELA 2 separately.
 - All in favor
 - **Motion carried at 11:52 AM.**

The Council discussed how teachers will be assessed if they do not have the aggregate score. Sixty schools in total will not have the score. The two choices were to completely remove the 10% and only use 90% or to make the SLG's 20% of the overall score.

- **Motion**
 - Member Janison motioned that for the schools that do not have a school wide aggregate score they will shift the scale of the scoring from 100 to 90 and adjust appropriately
 - Member Lacey seconded the motion
 - All in favor
 - **Motion carried at 12:08 PM.**

The Council discussed where to put cuts for the scores. They looked at slide eleven and fifteen for examples. Elementary school was first.

- **Motion**
 - Member Janison moved that, for elementary, level 1 is 1.66 or below, level two is 1.67 to 1.99, level three is 2.00 to 3.0, and level four is 3.01 to 4.0.
 - Member Lacey seconded the motion
 - All in favor
 - **Motion carried at 12:21 PM.**

The Council moved onto middle school.

Chair Salazar gave the Council a breakdown of the math in elementary so they would have an idea.

- Level 1 is under 1.66 and 2% of elementary schools
- Level 2 is 1.67-1.99= 14% of elementary schools
- Level 3 is 2.00-3.0= 70 % of elementary schools
- Level 4 is 3.01-4.0=15 % of elementary schools

The Council discussed whether middle school and high school should keep the same breakdown on percentage. They looked at the cumulative frequency chart for middle school, on the power point.

- **Motion**
 - Member Small moved for middle school level 1 to be up to 1.0, level 2 to be 1.01 to 1.99, level 3 would be 2.0 to 2.99, and level 4 would be 3.0 to 4.0.
 - Member Frenkel asked if level two is 1.99 and level three is 2.00 to 2.99.
 - Chair Salazar asked Russ if they are based on the same rules that they had made.

- Russ Keglovits stated that is correct. It would be best to assume a continuum of values between one and four.
- Member Collins asked if there will ever be less than one. No was the answer.
- Member Marshner seconded the vote.
 - Chair Salazar stated that level 1 is 3%, level 2 is 7%, level 3 is 76%, and level 4 is 13% of middle schools.
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 12:47 PM.**
- **Motion**
 - Member Small moved for high school level 1 to be up to 1.0, level 2 to be 1.01 to 1.99, level 3 to be 2.0 to 2.99, and level 4 to be 3.0 to 4.0.
 - Level one is 4%, level 2 is 11%, level 3 is 73%, and level 4 is 12% of students.
 - Member Marshner seconded the motion.
 - All in favor
 - **Motion carried at 12:50 PM.**

8. **NEPF Summative Evaluation Rating: Recommend Scoring Ranges used to Determine Educator Evaluation Ratings of Highly Effective, Effective, Minimally Effective, and Ineffective**

Chair Salazar stated that they do not have the report to help make rating decisions. The Council will look at the report and make decisions at the February meeting. She asked if any of the Superintendents would like to comment on this item, even though they are not taking any action. The summative evaluation tool may be sent out without the cut scores.

The Council discussed how the short turn around will affect the evaluations. It was determined that the districts would receive the information in time.

The Superintendents gave their opinion and stated that the current score does work. One concern is that teachers have a hard time moving from effective to highly effective.

9. **Development of the School Psychologist Statewide Performance Evaluation System**

Katie Dockweiler is the president of the Statewide School Psychologist association. Tim Mclvor is the past president. He is also the chair of the committee that created the evaluation rubric. Katie Dockweiler stated that over the past year and a half they have worked on creating a rubric that accurately represents School Psychologist standards and is separate and unique to their professional. The framework developed is based on the National Association of School Psychologists best practice model, and has the flexibility for state wide alignment. Tim Mclvor stated that Washoe County's rubric is the second made on National Standards. The National Standards endorse them and use it as an example for the rest of the nation. A lot of the ideas in the proposed framework are based on Washoe's rubric.

Katie Dockweiler stated that their national association has also agreed to vet the framework they developed. Content wise they took a little of the information from the Washoe rubric. They have aligned it with the nurse's structure and framework. The rubric is flexible enough for use in all counties in the state. The impact on students is universal. It aligns with the New Nevada Plan and ESSA. The framework consists of ten practice domains that are standards from the National Association. There are three that permeate all aspects of their service delivery. The first is data based decision making and accountability measures. The second is consultation and collaboration. The third is engaging in legal and ethical practices. There are seven additional standards. She stated that given the disproportionate size in ratio they can sometimes only get to the three main standards. Tim Mclvor stated that the three non-negotiables are the same as Washoe's. The additional seven standards do not fit into all school psychologists' job descriptions. The three non-negotiables contain indicators that describe a large amount of a school psychologist's job.

Questions:

Member Collins stated that when they modified it to make it compliant they took out the section with effective to highly effective.

Member Janison asked what the data looks like. What data are they looking at to help drive their decisions?

Katie Dockweiler stated that when they are doing evaluations on children they look at many different categories. Depending on the category depends on the assessments they give. Member Collins asked if on the scoring sheet, it is required for them to choose one of the additional areas. Katie Dockweiler stated that it goes into the flexibility. It may not go into their rating but it goes in their professional feedback. Tim McIvor stated that they are thinking of providing a video tutorial to show how it can be implemented. Chair Salazar stated that the other piece aligns with how the final summative looks. Member Marshner asked if in each district, it is different who evaluates them. Katie Dockweiler stated that in Clark they have coordinators, in Nye it is different, and in Washoe it is a former school psychologist. Member Janison asked how effective is it if they have a different person administering the evaluation. Katie stated that it goes to the training and mentorship. They will provide a leadership role. Member Collins asked the work group to keep the information in mind when creating the descriptions.

10. Curriculum and Instruction Recommended by TLC and Statewide Training for Teachers and Administrators Pursuant to NRS 391.544

Kiersten Gleissner Director of the Northwest RPDP and Karen Stanley an administrative consultant for the southern RPDP (SNRPDP) introduced themselves. Sarah Negrete from the northeast was not there. The SNRPDP developed the tools they are using. The Northwest training continues with administrators on an as needed basis. They are providing support with learning walks in classrooms. They also work individually with administrators, with small groups, and are mentoring new administrators. For teachers they provide an examination of the NEPF content areas.

Karen Stanley stated that the SNRDP had finished formalizing fifty trainings that will be offered in the spring for administrators. They had a great discussion with Kim Mangino, who is now the assistant superintendent for the Talent and Leadership section and with Lisa on how they measure advocacy as well as fidelity in rolling out the NEPF. They are in the process of redefining their new website. It allows principals to take a look at the standards in a consistent manner. It will be up on Friday. They are doing classroom walks and working with principals. Kirsten Gleissner stated that the north is offering administrative credit. Questions were as follows:

Member Marshner asked what the State credit is.

Kirstin Gleissner stated that it is when they institute workshops and apply to the state to authorize credit that can be applied to recertification.

Member Barker asked if they define all as it applies in the classroom.

Karen Stanley stated that they talk about it all the time. All does not mean all students at the state standards and the same level. It is all students well served by instruction. It is about working with each student at their ability level. In the research by Dr. Heritage teachers must have that conversation with administrators.

Member Barker asked if it would be a good idea to include the language in a document on the website.

Karen Stanley stated that the CRESST information is on the RPDP website.

Member Barker asked if they could put it on the state website.

Member Collins stated that they can do an article on it in the newsletter.

Member Small asked for clarification on when they say training is optional for administrators. Is it optional for all districts?

Karen Stanley stated that it is different from district to district. Sometimes the district will make it a mandatory training.

Member Small asked if it is fair to say that there are administrators who have not received the training on the NEPF.

Karen Stanley stated that for new administrators they may not have received the training. They may have received training from the district. The majority did attend the mandatory training for the student learning goals and the NEPF. Many administrators that do attend are new principals.

Member Janison stated that if they want to bring it as a recommendation that they have mandatory training they will need the data behind it. It is critical to have an estimate.

Karen Stanley stated that they do report numbers in the system. They also have sign in sheets.

Member Janison would like to push for that. It is critical data. It will reflect if large percentages have not received the training.

Member Frenkel asked how they evaluate the success of the training.

Kirsten Gleissner stated that when they rolled this out in terms of the evaluation studies, they can report from the NW they had 100% participation for all six districts in terms of administrators. They were able to serve 100% of teachers in five of their districts. There is a different rubric being used in Washoe County. In terms of following up they are not an evaluative entity. They track who they train and how much they have received.

Chair Salazar stated that there is an external evaluator who does assist the RPDP. Member Barker asked if they get feedback about the effectiveness of the tool. Is there anything they can help clarify?

Karen Stanley stated that clarification for the summative is needed, they get a lot of discussion on it. She has heard responses from the administrators that say they are beginning to connect to the NEPF with the training they received. It has become more fluid.

Kirsten Gleissner has heard a different narrative, that they are overwhelmed in using the materials to write the final evaluation. There has been a great learning curve on how to get observations in, and to have enough data to cover all of the indicators. Conversations have changed across all districts in terms of administrators do get it now.

Chair Salazar stated that is in alignment with what they are seeing across the country. Shorter more scripted observations are more valuable.

Kiersten Gleissner stated that the districts that have made a point to provide additional support at the administrative level are seeing more engaged administrators with the ability to get in for shorter more frequent evaluations.

Member Collins stated that the NEPF focus groups are very positive about RPDP training. Participants spoke highly of the calibration walks, considering them very powerful training.

11. 2017 Legislative Session Considerations

Chair Salazar stated that the council recommends Revising the requirement that Superintendents be evaluated using NEPF. TLC did not intend for NEPF Principal Supervisors to supersede the evaluation contract between the local school board and the superintendent.

Chair Salazar discussed professional development. They would like to continue support for the RPDP's for the PD of teachers and administrators to implement NEPF effectively. Member Collins stated that mandating NEPF training had been discussed, however keep in mind that when it becomes a mandate they may no longer be allowed to use federal funds for that training.

Student outcome measures options are to either remove state assessments or require state assessments. Student outcome weight options are: If they remove state assessments then student outcomes will equal 20%, if they keep state assessments then student outcomes equals 20%, and if they keep state assessments then student outcomes will equal 40%.

Chair Salazar discussed revising the rating scale for novice educators. She only found one state with a different scale for novice educators.

Chair Salazar discussed having all charter schools to use NEPF. Principal Supervisors:

The Council discussed supporting School Administration Management (SAM) model. It was discovered that the districts can already use SAM and it is not under the TLC's purview. They discussed how principals with a large amount of probationary teachers have more work. Professional Development:

The Council will make a statement at the State Board meeting about the importance of principal supervisors being trained by the RPDP on the NEPF Student Outcomes-Measures:

The Council and Superintendents discussed removing state assessments for the teacher evaluations.

They prefer to use SLG's as they believe that it is a better indicator of a student's growth. It will also make Nevada more attractive to teachers.

• Motion

- Member Lacey motioned that they remove state assessments from the NEPF and replace it with SLGS at 20%
- Member Frenkel seconded the motion
 - Chair Salazar stated that instead of 40% for next year, it will be reduced to 20% and it will be SLG's.

- Member Barker offered up Washoe County school district to facilitate the conversation.
- Member Collins stated that as the department representative, the department policy is to stay the course and keep it as is.
- Member Small asked if the Department of Education will speak against the TLC.
- Chair Salazar stated that it has happened before and the TLC still spoke on their point.
- Eight members were in favor
- One member was opposed
- **Motion passed at 3:09 PM.**

12. National Issues and Legal Landscape

Moved to the next session

13. Future Agenda Items

Moved to the next session

14. Public Comment #2

Terri White, the Superintendent of the Douglas County school district, stated that in regard to professional development they use both RPDP and evaluation staff. At every staff meeting they have a NEPF item. All new administrators go through level one which the same as NEPF 101. If they were to survey superintendents most of them value the systems and their teams are ready to evaluate. She has a team of fourth grade teachers who work together. It moves the score and empowers teachers to look at the data and drill it down to a strand that students are weak in. It allows them to develop a strategy through the SLG's.

No public comment in the North.

15. Adjournment

Adjourned at 3:13 PM