

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)
JUNE 14, 2017
9:00 A.M.**

MINUTES

Call to Order; Roll Call: Pledge of Allegiance

Meeting called to order at 9:13 AM

Roll Call:

Member:

Las Vegas:

- Kathleen Galland-Collins
- Gabe Gonzalez
- Dale Norton
- Pam Salazar
- Theo Small
- Dottie Smith
- Anthony Nunez
- Margaret Marshner-Coyne

Carson:

- Jim Cooney
- Susan Lacey

Public:

Las Vegas:

- Kathleen Vokits
- Debra Minagil
- Yvonne Chauey
- Tom Larnerd
- Patricia Cooper
- Trent Day
- Kent Roberts
- John Anzalone
- Lisa O'Keffe
- Dawna Alexander
- Chris Day
- Ian Salzman
- Robert Tarter
- Susan Sernoe
- Lauren Kermofillo
- Susan Urite for Kim Mangino
- Kait Krolic

Carson:

- Yvette Deighton
- Cristal Cisneros
- Kirsten Gleissner
- Jose Delfin
- Sarah Negrete

Staff:

- Dena Durish
- Gregg Ott

- Raven Cole
- Eboni Caridine

Public Comment #1

Public comment in Las Vegas:

Kent Roberts, principal at Green Valley High School, came before the Council representing fellow principals around the district. He was at the meeting to speak in regards to the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF). He stated that the district is now in its third year of NEPF implementation, and while well intentioned, the framework widely misses the mark in terms of improving teacher effectiveness. Their primary issue with the NEPF is the sheer number of indicators – thirty-four – that must be observed and evaluated. While they understand the need to be thorough in conducting observations, many of the indicators seem redundant and poorly worded. He and other principals around the district believe that the NEPF needs to be revisited and streamlined, so that they can effectively and efficiently work with all teachers to improve instruction, and most importantly, improve student achievement. Kent gave several specific examples of issues with the framework. They are as follows: Standard 1 in Instructional Practice is related to the communication of learning outcomes. The entire standard can be summarized by saying, “The teacher clearly communicates the daily objective and links it to previous learning.” Standard 2 is redundant, as Indicator 1 says, “Tasks purposefully employ all students’ cognitive abilities and skills.” Indicator 3 says, “Tasks progressively develop all students’ cognitive abilities and skills.” He explained that the nuances are understood, however there is very little discernible difference when conducting an observation. Indicator 4 spells out an impossible to measure standard. It says, “Teacher operates with a deep belief that all children can achieve regardless of race, perceived ability, and socio-economic status.” They can observe a teacher’s actions, look at discipline data, etc., but there is no way to prove that someone believes something unless they state it directly. Kent also argued that the Professional Standards are hardly better. Standard 1, Indicators 1-3, are nearly duplicates of each other. Standard 2, Indicator 3, is an inappropriate measure for a first year teacher in every respect and probably shouldn’t be used as a measure until a teacher has completed at least 2-3 years of full-time service. Standard 3, Indicators 1 and 2, are also redundant as they reflect the same objective as Standard 4, Indicator 2.

John Anzalone, principal at Sierra Vista High School, addressed the Council on behalf of secondary principals. He had a few concerns. The first he mentioned was the number of indicators. He explained that due to the high amount of indicators, the weight of each one is lessened, making it even more difficult to accurately identify teachers who are struggling. His second concern was that the amount of time required to complete an evaluation is substantially greater than previous iterations of teacher evaluation systems, they spend more time writing evaluations than they do going into classrooms and doing observations. In addition, because they want documents to be professionally done, they end up being “high-priced copy editors.” He said he was quite certain that this was not the Council’s intent. He believes that the real work of improving teaching is being in classrooms frequently and having meaningful conversations with teachers that involve reflection, self-analysis, as well as a review of data and other pieces of information. He has been told by a fellow administrator that the evaluation of a stellar teacher ended up being 20 pages long in order to properly document their efforts. John added that he and principals/administrators like him have no problem doing the work as they are used to long hours and working nights and weekends. But, if they are going to spend large amounts of time away from their families, they want the work to be meaningful and have a real effect on instruction and learning. They currently don’t feel that way with the use of the framework. He believes the tool needs to be revisited and streamlined so that they can return to the task for which they were primarily hired; that of being instructional leaders who can positively impact large numbers of lives by influencing the quality of the instruction provided to their students.

Tam Larnerd, principal at Spring Valley High School, thanked the Council for the work they've completed over the last three years to develop a system that provides the opportunity to make sure that as tax payers and parents, they are getting a good return on the investment of tax dollars into the classroom. To summarize what his colleagues shared before him, they need a simpler system to maintain teacher accountability. He had Nevada's 2015 Teacher of the Year, Ian Salzman with him, who is now the Assistant Principal at Spring Valley High School. When Mr. Salzman was a teacher, Principal Larnerd would complete a 15 page evaluation for him and Mr. Salzman would smile and sign all 15 pages without looking at any of the work Principal Larnerd spent hours and hours completing. Mr. Salzman was a phenomenal classroom teacher, so Principal Larnerd feels as though it is his job to get out of Mr. Salzman's way to allow him do the work he did in the classroom. They need a system that can hold teachers that are not like Mr. Salzman accountable, and they need something simple and defensible. For example, in the previous system, the CCF8 had one standard that said, "Followed previous directions." That allowed him the opportunity to provide coaching/mentorship directions for teachers that were ineffective, and if they didn't follow them, he could hold them very strictly accountable through the evaluation system. The same applies to classroom management. The foundation of effective teaching is a strong classroom manager. As the system is hopefully simplified, he would like to see a very simple standard that's focused on the elements of strong classroom management that are very objective. Either they are there or they're not. As a group of high school principals, they need a more concise, simple, system to recognize their highly effective teachers without getting in their way, while also holding accountable their least effective teachers to make sure that they either improve or exit the education system.

Member Small asked if the speakers are representing a union. He said that the Council can collect the notes of the speakers, as they have some specific things listed that the Council has some control over. He is interested in ensuring that the system works for the commenters and their colleagues. Member Small also asked the speakers how many RPDP trainings they've been to. If the speakers are willing, he would be happy to stay after the meeting to discuss some of his questions with the principals in attendance

Public Comment in Carson City:

Natha Anderson, president of Washoe Education Association, wanted to echo some of the principal's concerns with the time it takes to complete an observation. As an educator, they'd rather have principals in their classrooms helping them when they are struggling with lessons and when they are struggling with classroom management. She is aware that her concerns are not on the agenda for today, but it would be wonderful if their concerns could be addressed in the future.

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

- Member Norton moved for a flexible agenda
- Member Nunez seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 9:32 AM**

Approval of Meeting Minutes for April 26, 2017 and May 17, 2017 (*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

Motion

- Member Small moved to approve the April 26, 2017 Meeting Minutes
- Member Norton seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 9:35 AM**

Motion

- Member Small moved to approve the May 17, 2017 Meeting Minutes
- Member Marshner seconded the motion

- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 9:40 AM**

Nevada Department of Education—updates (*Information/Discussion*)

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

- Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) Implementation Updates

The survey has gone out. It was sent out the last week of school for Clark County, but many other districts were out prior to that. It will be closed in July.

Focus groups are scheduled in districts that volunteered. Those districts are Washoe, Carson City, Douglas, Lyon, Humboldt, and Clark. 120 teachers and about 20 administrators have responded to focus group surveys. Staff Member Caridine will be conducting focus groups in northern Nevada next week. Simultaneously, Member Collins will be facilitating focus groups here in the Clark County School District (CCSD). That said, Member Collins advised Council members to encourage people to sign up. Feedback does make a difference. Last year after focus groups, there were significant changes made to protocols, the summative evaluation form was shortened, and submitting evidence electronically was made available. This was all possible because of the feedback collected.

Other Licensed Educator Professional (OLEP) tools and protocols are being developed. Several of them have already been started; the Council is just waiting on the final go-ahead on the pilot study from the State Board of Education (SBE)

The NEPF tools and protocols are being revised for the 2017-2018 school year to reflect some of the changes from AB320 and results collected from focus groups, survey data, and the like. The protocols will be restructured again this year because of the addition of the OLEP. The Department is also looking at potentially revising the self-evaluation tool, as anecdotal records have deemed it fairly long and cumbersome.

August 2, 2017 will be the next TLC meeting. There will be a complete list of recommendations the TLC will need to make during the 2017-2018 meetings schedule; so they will be presenting the 2017-2018 plan.

Training on the NEPF, specifically, Student Learning Goal (SLG) protocols are now a priority for the Great Teaching and Leading Fund (GTLF). Applications for GTLF are due June 19, 2017, so an update should be available at the August 2nd meeting.

- TLC Membership

The Governor's Office will be reaching out to NSEA for nominations for the OLEP Representative on TLC. This will be discussed more on the legislative update. Member Collins has already emailed Ruben Murillo to get him thinking about what names he would like to send to the Governor. Member Collins has also been in contact with the Governor's Office regarding the replacement of the Council's Parent Representative. They have been contacting the Nevada PTA to get that name in. Member Collins is also in the process of updating the TLC Membership page. She hopes to have it updated this week. All the term dates will be updated along with membership names and emails.

Member Small was concerned with the number of pages of the summative evaluation, especially if it is not seen as a useful tool to teachers and administrators. He wondered if Member Collins can clarify how much of this is a Clark County issue and how much of it is a Department issue. Member Collins replied that to the best of her knowledge the multiple page issue is because of the design of the online platform CCSD is using. She did clarify that questions will be asked regarding the use of NEPF Tools during the focus group session. The Department would like to get an idea of what's being used and how that may impact the implementation. Member Cooney was concerned that the survey had just went out on the previous Friday, which was the last day of school for many counties up north. He doesn't think the results of a survey sent out at that time of the year will hold much validity. Member Collins explained that there were internal issues that hindered the sending out of surveys.

Development of the School Nurse Statewide Performance Evaluation System

(Information/Discussion/Possible Action) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair; Kathleen Vokits, Nevada State Association of School Nurses (NSASN) President and School Nurse Clark County School District; Bobbie Shanks, NSASN Director, School Nurse Coordinator Elko County School District.

Kathleen Vokits with the Nevada State Association for School Nurses opened by stating that as of last April, when they last presented their framework, they were waiting for the new standards to come out. The standards still have not come out. At this point, approaching deadlines, they decided to use the standards they have in place right now. Kathleen reviewed the School Nurse framework and pointed out the addition of their references and NRS statutes that cover their job description in their indicators. The floor was opened up to the Council for questions. Chair Salazar explained to the Council that the next step is to present the School Nurse framework tomorrow at the SBE meeting to recommend pilot for 2017-2018 school year. Member Small asked if the group has received any indication from their national organization that they're going to be greatly different. Kathleen answered that they were involved in reviewing them before they went into publication. There are some slight differences like standards separated into multiple parts to make them clearer, but as a whole, the standards are very similar except in wording. The group is comfortable using the current standards they have with what they had seen in the draft form.

Member Small asked, when they do come out, can the Council look at them again if there is something the school nurses are interested in changing, and go through the process again with the department. Chair Salazar recommended that there be timelines created in terms of how they think this has to proceed. She said it will also be advantageous for State Board. Kathleen asked, because the law states that they're supposed to have their evaluation start the following the year, does it make a difference that they aren't started. Member Collins answered that it doesn't. The OLEP Plan has all the dates in the timeline; they will just make sure that they revise it and clarify it for the TLC. They will probably compose the timeline as a group to save time. Preparing a timeline will be added to the August 2nd agenda. Member Small inquired about which counties have supervisors in the profession and does the training for supervisors of all OLEPs go to RPDP to seek training. Member Collins answered that it is in statute that they are supposed to be supervised by a chief nurse. There is an exception for small districts. Regarding training, she is still working through channels at the Department to see what funding is available to do trainings for OLEPs. It is not in TLC's or RPDP's purview, but the Office of Educator Development and Support is working to see what funds can be used to provide training. It might be necessary to work with State groups to see what can be done. Member Collins asked if the nurses want all the standards between their two rubrics weighted equally. Kathleen answered yes.

Motion

- Member Norton motioned to move the school nurses' rubrics on to the State Board of Education for approval for pilot for the 2017-2018 school year
- Member Collins seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried 10:08 AM**

Development of the School Social Workers Statewide Performance Evaluation System

(Information/Discussion/Possible Action) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair; Beth Schroeder, Project PEACE School Social Worker, Washoe County School District; Susan Sernoe, Director Wraparound Services Department

Susan Sernoe, Lauren Hermosillo, and Beth Schroeder presented their School Social Worker Evaluation Framework before the Council. Social workers have dual licensure. In order to work for CCSD, you have to be licensed by the Nevada Board of Examiners and the Nevada Department of Education. School social workers' national models and ethical standards are derived from the following: National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics, National Association of Social Workers Guiding Principles for School Social Work, School Social Work Association of America National Model/ Guiding Practices, and School Social Work Association of America Key Constructs. School Social Workers throughout the state of Nevada have different roles and responsibilities based on the school, department, or grant under which they work. There are several hundred social workers around the state. Differences in job responsibilities

are based on their supervisors. For that reason, the group made their framework as general as possible. The group reviewed a few specific responsibilities of Nevada School Social Workers regardless of what department they work under. Most evaluators of social workers in Nevada are not social workers by profession. That said, the evaluation tool was designed specifically to provide clarification of roles, responsibilities, and expectations within the professional standards. The evaluation tool places the responsibility on the individual school social worker to provide data and documentation regarding each indicator; and as such, assists the school social worker in providing best practices in service to schools, students, families, and staff. Their intent was to place the responsibility on the social worker to be able to demonstrate best practices, and that they are reaching the students using their indicators. They broke their evaluation tool down into four general standards: Planning and Preparation, The School Environment, Service Delivery and Resources, and Professional Responsibilities.

The floor was then opened to the Council for questions. Member Collins asked if the group wanted all their standards weighted equally when it goes to State Board. They answered that they do. Chair Salazar asked if they've had a chance to share their evaluation tool with their other colleagues to ensure that it is operational and makes sense to them, despite the fact that it has to be so broad to encompass the work of all social workers. Susan answered that their committee consisted of social workers that are in different roles. They did access their input, but at the time that the committee was started, there were not social workers in Nevada rural counties. Member Collins asked if they would like links to relevant documents embedded in their presentation when it is published. The group answered that they would.

Motion

- Member Small motioned to pass the draft standards for social workers forward to State Board of Education for approval for piloting in the fall
- Member Nunez seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 10:19 AM**

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

(Information/Discussion/Possible Action) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair; Dr. Sarah Negrete, Director, Northeastern RPDP; Kirsten Gleissner, Director, Northwestern RPDP; Dr. Chelli Smith, Director, Southern RPDP.

Sarah Negrete is before the Council to update them on the training The Northeastern RPDP has provided regarding the NEPF. They have begun their calculation and evidence/data collection for the 2016-2017 school year. Of the 1,240 training they calculated and logged, they have about 55% of those including an embedded NEPF component. They have 8 specific trainings over the years that are focused only on the NEPF. In addition, they run a teacher academy each year. This is the end of three years of implementing a Teacher Academy in which principals nominate teacher/leaders to attend. This year, they did a case study on the entire 3 years of Teacher Academy. So far, they have had 133 teachers attend. It is 5 full days of training focused on the NEPF Professional Standards. There are also half days between those full days where they get small groups of teachers in critical focus groups to dive into student work and how that connects to the NEPF. For their region, that reaches about 133 teachers, which is about 10% of the teachers in their region. Next year, they plan to continue it and they have set aside money in their budget to support 48 teachers in the Teacher Academy. Through a survey they conducted this year to all previous participants in the Teacher Academy, they had a 51% response rate and 41% of those teachers indicated they spent over 50% of instructional time working with students, specifically, implementing things that they learned at the Teacher Academy about the NEPF. So there is a strong indication that the teachers are taking what they learned in the classroom and implementing it.

Chair Salazar commented that it was good to hear appreciation for the framework, despite the public comment from earlier because it is good practice.

From the Northwestern RPDP, Kirsten's most recent update is that they provided a five-week training on the NEPF for administrators to use the teacher evaluation rubrics. This was the last week that they were able to provide state credit for this training. They had 12 administrators complete the training with either half or full State credit. Administrators from Carson City and Storey County participated as well and there was very positive feedback with requests for more of the same training in the fall. They hoped to extend it to Lyon County as well, however they didn't have enough staff to oversee the training in all three places. This fall, they hope to extend the training to other places. They are now moving ahead to schedule that for the fall as well as new teacher NEPF training. They are currently in the throes of collecting their data.

Karen Stanley spoke on behalf of Southern Nevada RPDP director Dr. Shelly Smith. In Lincoln County, they have finished their NEPF training sessions. 100% of administrators attend their sessions. They also had 100% attendance amongst administrators in Nye County. They have also worked with charter schools discussing collaborative feedback and inquiry. Within Clark County, they have provided over 20 continuous professional development sessions ranging from reviewing instruction standards singularly as well as a broad overview. They have taken a look at State tools to share how they were streamlined. Rather than having 19 pages to sign, they have two and the evidence will be recorded electronically. They have done much in regards to training of individuals who have signed up through Pathlor. They are also in the process of collecting their data. They have a due date of June 23rd, when they will present their information to their director. That report will be combined, then presented to their governing council and updates on that will be brought before the TLC in the fall. One of the things she has discussed with Dr. Salazar is how they go deeply into those standards for new administrators and then offer additional sessions for those who have worked with NEPF for 3 years. They are applying for the Great Teachers and Leaders (GTL) grant, specifically, regarding the student learning goal. So they look forward to submitting that application. Tomorrow, they offer a summer institute here in Clark County for administrators. Administrators will leave with the tools to support their teachers. In every Content session, they incorporate the NEPF as the strategies to implement the Nevada Academic Content Standards.

Member Collins asked if they are planning on reviewing the Goal Setting and Planning tool that goes through the steps of the SLG. Chair Salazar answered, that they aren't at that level. They are doing it more from a conceptual framework.

Karen clarified that the administrators that they worked with during this training this spring walked away with having planned their observations for the next year using the 10:10:10 Model being 10 observations for each teacher, with 10 minutes, and a 10 minute follow-up conversation. They felt very good having that much planned, knowing that there would be some adjustment along the way.

Member Small expressed how appreciative he is for their work. He asked member Norton if they are communicating with their supervisors and if trainings are still voluntary. He also asked if there are records being kept of who is volunteering. Member Norton answered yes, one of his associate superintendents, Mr. Scherz, is in charge of the NEPF and gets that information sent to him directly. It is voluntary, but as we move forward, they look at what the important components of training are and he can build that into his mandatory administrative meetings. Member Small stated that one of the ironic things from public comment earlier was that principals had more concerns with the teacher evaluation than their own evaluation. It made him wonder if with Member Norton's principals, does he have conversations about their own practice with the NEPF and what that looks like in context of teacher practice and how it happens. He wonders if there is a connection there. "Absolutely," Member Norton answered. They just finished up a book study and they have already established their review dates and times for their administrators, which is also in line with the annual review for teachers. That was to say, that in his county, they are practicing what they promote for teachers the best that they can. This is a process though, that will get better with practice and time.

Chair Salazar thanked the presenting group for their hard work and updates.

2017 Legislative Session Considerations (*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*)

- a. Updates on Bills that may have an impact on the NEPF

In AB320, for the 2018-2019 school year, the weighting for the student learning goal will be 40% and will remain at 40% from that point on unless something changes in legislative session. Deputy Superintendent Dena Durish provided an update on the Legislative session. The Council is aware of some of the changes made to semantics. It is an easier task to check off, but very important nonetheless. Member Collins and Staff Member Eboni Caridine will be working to do the updates on that. The other short task to be completed is the cleaning up of the language of observation vs evaluation for peers. She is not sure if the Council wants the Department to reach out to other districts, but she knows that it is the role of the TLC and State Board that if any districts are adopting peer observations in the next year or two, they may want to ask the districts to share some of the policies they have to be sure that they are in alignment with the regulations that the TLC recommended to the board now that they have passed. The most significant change is the outcomes of Student Performance Measures. It was decided that there needed to be some clarification of the Student Learning Goals. She suggested the Council adds to the agenda some time to formalize the regulation process. In order for the Board to take action, they would need to hear the TLC's recommendations, that language would then need to be posted 15 days prior to the Department holding a workshop, and then the Board would then hold the hearing. At tomorrow's State Board meeting, there are two documents that are Legislative Overview documents. One is public friendly that is a summary of the investments that the Governor and Legislators have continued to make in the commitment to education. More significantly, is the second document, which is a spreadsheet that shows all but two of the bills that were passed late in the session. If that document is electronically viewed, there is a link to the bill with a summary of what it is about beside an NDE Responsibilities column and a Board Responsibilities column. 1.1#3 is about the Department establishing assessments. She is envisioning using Title IIA funds for SLOs/ SLGs with teachers, and also with what types of assessments are in the priority rankings. The Department is committed for the next 12 or 18 months to putting together some focus groups and coming up with Best Practices Assessments. Working with Dave Brancamp and the standards and instructional support side of the Department and coming up with a list of possible assessments The ultimate responsibility though, is that each district school board is responsible for making sure that those learning goals are established with fidelity and rigor and criteria that will ultimately be outlined in regulation. Section 1.2 talks about formalizing regulations, as well as outlines data that needs to be recorded. She, Member Collins, and Staff Member Eboni Caridine will start reaching out on an annual basis to Superintendents and letting them know what they must annually review according to statute. That would then move up to the TLC and State Board review. The Department is continuing to review and monitor SLGs. Next on the list of updates was the nomination of another Council member. Member Collins has already reached out to NSEA who will nominate a member. Getting the process through NSEA and the Governor's office will be done in as timely a manner as possible. She then discussed with the Council post-probationary teachers and administrators who receive a highly effective rating. There was a lot of work done on the language between Dena and other members of the Council; however it still did not meet the intent. Section 4 of the bill states that if someone receives a highly affective rating during 2016-2017 and 2017-2018, then 2018-2019 there would not be a final rating; but that does not absolve the teacher/administrator from going through the observation cycle process. There were a few other things that were in the conceptual amendments that were agreed and voted upon, but did not actually make it into statutory language because there wasn't a mechanism by which to do that. Those are the things around the business rules the Council has always talked about. That will need to be included in the recommendations on the regulation conversation that needs to be had. The other important element to note is the concept of not being able to receive a highly effective rating or effective rating if a one/lowest possible score is received on the SLG. If the second lowest possible score/two is received on the SLG, then a highly effective rating cannot be received. It was really important that they are ensuring educators that receive a highly effective rating are definitely demonstrating pupil growth and that has to be validated by receiving a 3 or 4. AB7 is a large bill. It encompasses a lot of the ESSA work. The biggest piece relevant to the Council is the recording requirement. The Department is starting to give states feedback on the initial ESSA plans. One of the things the TLC recommended was that "ineffective" and "developing" would be considered for educator equity purposes, they would still be considered an ineffective educator. For State reporting there are also 4 levels. For Federal reporting, the bottom two levels will still be reported as such. The floor was then opened for questions. There were no questions in the north or south

National Issues and Legal Landscape (*Information/Discussion*) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

With regards to State ESSA Plans, teacher evaluations prove challenging for reason of defining the word ineffective. States have to describe in their plan what it means to be an ineffective teacher and how they will ensure that poor and minority students aren't being taught disproportionately by ineffective teachers.

A report came out by Linda Darling Hammond about what high quality professional development looks like and what the six attributes are of high quality professional development. The response to President Trump and the budget for education and the conflict of what the report says needs to be done and therefore, Title II money is on the chopping block from the president's budget proposal. All of Title II money would be gone if the budget were approved, but the good news is that several Senators stated that the budget proposal was dead on arrival. That does continue to be a big topic on the hill though. Chair Salazar was involved with a conference call last Friday with some folks on the hill, and the critical piece is support for teachers in terms of moving forward with education. Member Collins added that what has been proposed is instead of cutting the entire 250 million dollars of Title IIA funds, there were minor cuts that have minor effects on the Department. Chair Salazar expressed interest in adding an update on this topic to the August 2nd agenda.

The next update regards New Mexico. The state has been in the news with their evaluation system and the forced stepping down of the state's superintendent. There is quite a bit going on with their State's evaluation and testing systems that parallel much of the work done here. The floor was then opened for questions. There were no questions or comments in the north or south.

Future Agenda Items (*Information/Discussion*) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

The next TLC meeting will be held on August 2nd. Principal supervisor standards are an important topic that will be discussed at the next meeting. Next Friday, Chair Salazar will be meeting with Matt Clifford from GTL/AIR along with a colleague of his with the idea that at the next meeting the Council will be able to have the psychometric crew from GTL finalize the review of the rubric.

There will be a great deal of time spent getting a sense of where the Council is with the surveys, numbers, focus groups, etc. There will be drafts and highlights of what was learned during focus group discussions and the survey will be resent in August, as well for the purpose of ensuring that meaningful data has been collected.

The rest of the time will be taken by the Council to look at AB320 implications and if there are any implications of AB7 around language changes.

Member Collins suggested an update on the OLEP pilot study. Member Small suggested reviewing the SLG criteria that the Council has already approved. He also wanted to publicly recognize Member Lacey's hard work on the Council as she is retiring and suggested an onboarding process for new members. Member Collins stated that there isn't a formal onboarding process but plenty of information is shared with them such as the protocols and the literature review, and she reaches out to provide answers to any questions. It is not done face-to-face due to travel and budget concerns, but there is always constant contact available to new members. Chair Salazar encouraged Council members between now and August 2nd to download the protocol from NDE because Member Collins took a lot of what they developed around the SLG/RPDPs, and it is now a clean description of the process and what it should look like. It reflects the criteria the TLC determined was key for the development of SLGs along with the rubric for evaluating the SLG. Member Collins suggested taking a look at the goal setting and planning tool as well.

Public Comment #2

There was no public comment in the north or south.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 11:21AM