

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)
MARCH 15, 2017
9:00 A.M.**

DRAFT MINUTES

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

Meeting called to order at 10:19 AM.

Roll Call:

Member:

Las Vegas:

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

Carson:

- Barbara Barker
- Susan Lacey

Staff:

- Chantel Wakefield
- Eboni Caridine
- Gregg Ott

Public:

Las Vegas:

- Cristal Cisneros
- Yvette Deighton
- Nancy Kuhles
- Roberta Johnson
- Jose Devein
- Chris Dan
- Rubin Merillo
- Kirsten Gleissner

2. **Public Comment #1**

No public comment in the North. No public comment in the south.

3. **Flexible Agenda Approval**

Motion

- Member Small moved for a flexible agenda
- Member Norton seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 10:22 AM**

4. **Approval of Meeting Minutes for January 25 & February 22, 2017**

The January 25th meeting resulted in an error in meeting minutes regarding the scoring range for elementary schools. 2.0 is the figure that was recorded, however the correct range is to 1.99. Pg. 5 of January's minutes was referenced to clarify that 1.99 was the intent.

Questions were as follows:

Member Norton asked who did the motion and was told Member Janison had completed them. Member Collins asked everyone if they are in agreement with 14%. Chair Salazar acknowledged that she knew 1.99 was the correct figure, but did not rephrase the statement to match the intent of the motion.

Motion

- Member Small moved to approve the January 25th minutes with the modification of 2.0 to 1.99
- Member Nunez seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 10:26 AM**

5. Nevada Department of Education—updates

Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) Implementation Updates

- An NEPF liaison meeting was held to discuss score cuts. The summative evaluation tool has been distributed. Score ranges have been marked as tentative in the revised version until they receive State Board approval. Several updates from other groups will be heard later on in the council meeting.

TLC Member update

- Four members are terming out within the next couple of year: Barbara Barker, Pamela Salazar, Dale Norton, and Theodore Small. Some members are due for TLC renewal/reappointments - Gabe Gonzales and Anthony Nunez. Replacement selections for Jason Sanderson and Amy Henderson are awaiting Jason and Amy's resignation letters. Dottie Smith's appointment ends June 30, 2017. The council will now work on attaining a full panel.
- Staffing Note: Chantel will be transferring offices.

6. NEPF Student Performance: Calculating Schoolwide Aggregate Scores

Member Collins gave a review of TLC recommendations. Cuts will be based on scale score and school level. Schools must have at least two assessment results for cuts to apply.

Council reviewed recommended score cuts that were decided at the last meeting. End of course exams for middle schools were not included.

725 schools were included in the analysis. Thirty-six schools were excluded due to school configuration. Forty-one of the remaining schools did not meet the "at least two assessments" recommendation. 648 schools earned statewide aggregate ratings.

The observations were as follows: Approximately 13% of schools earned a 1 or 2; 87% earned 3 or 4. Four districts had a total of nine schools that earned a level 1 with six of those schools in Clark County. Nine districts had zero schools that earned a level 4. Nine districts had zero schools that earned a level 1 or 2. Member Collins reviewed the distribution of schoolwide aggregate scores by school level graphic charts.

Questions were as follows:

Chair Salazar noted that the results presented were the same data as what they had anticipated. Member Collins added that the 2.0 error without correction would have added 113 schools to level two.

Member Small asked if the board will ask what happens to the schools that have less than two assessments.

Member Collins stated slide two is exactly what the state board would see. If the school doesn't have a sufficient number of records, then the scale would go from 100% to 90%, and the evaluation rating would be based on 90% instead of 100%.

Small asked if they keep track of private schools and they do not. Do they or the Department track the public charters that are under NEPF. Member Collins answered that they do not.

7. Development of the School Psychologist Statewide Performance Evaluation System

Katie Dockweiler presented an updated draft of the Nevada Association of School Psychologists' "School Psychologist Statewide Standards-Based Evaluation Rubric." They are seeking approval that the evaluation meets the Council's requirements so that the framework may move on for State Board adoption. Last month, they presented the framework and have made one slight change. They split item 9, Diversity in Development and Learning into three indicators as opposed to the two previously presented. Three indicators allow the rubric to better address a system level and a school-based level. They also created mandatory and confirmatory pieces of evidence. Dockweiler added that the association completed the

documents to the best of their ability with the information they have, and would continue to make adjustments based on the recommendations made following the pilot study being held next year. Dockweiler proceeded to ask if the council had questions. The questions were as follows: Member Collins asked if the entire evaluation is based on the first three standards. Dockweiler answered that the Mandatory Standards are standards 1, 2, and 10; making 3 through 9 optional, dependent on how the district chooses to implement them. Member Collins asked if the purpose was to gain either feedback or a score. Dockweiler indicated that the goal is feedback. To clarify, Member Collins asked if 1 through 3 are required and 4 through 10 are for feedback only, not a score. Dockweiler confirmed, but explained that a score could be given, however it is dependent on how the administrator chooses to handle it. It would not go toward the summative evaluation. Member Collins acknowledged some description in the notes provided and suggested creating questions around the notes in the pilot study. Dockweiler confirmed that as the anticipated plan. Member Collins asked if there were any other evidence sources Dockweiler would like to present such as the academic or behavioral intervention plan. Dockweiler answered that in Clark County, the evaluation is completed through feedback from site-based principal or AP, submission of three reports or pieces of evidence that can be a written behavior plan or different artifacts worked on throughout the year, as well as direct observation by the psychologist's supervisor. Member Collins acknowledged that from Standard 2 it looks like the School Psychologist Pre/Post Conference is the mandatory piece because it is harder to observe. Dockweiler confirmed and added that many elements are hard to observe concretely. Member Collins concludes that the presentation makes sense and is also broad enough to meet various standards across the state. Chair Salazar noted that Dockweiler had done a very extensive and thorough review as it is comprehensive and in alignment with the intent of the NEPF. Member Gonzalez asked is the pilot study for accountability. Member Collins answered that because this isn't the legal evaluation, it is necessary to do the pilot study first. It allows the association to get feedback before it is up for legal review, and therefore would act as a secondary piece to the legal piece. Member Collins asked if the anonymous survey of staff feedback listed within the presentation is a survey the staff can build themselves. Dockweiler confirmed.

Motion

- Member Norton motioned for approval to move proposal forward as a pilot study and to State Board
- Member Barker seconded the motion
- All in favor

Motion carried at 10:49 AM

8. Development of the School Speech Language Pathologist (SLP) Statewide Performance Evaluation System

Nancy Kuhles is a speech language pathologist and also serves as the co-lead of the work group to develop the statewide performance system for Speech Language Pathologists. Ms. Catherine Unger is her co-lead. Kuhles began by explaining the SLP as a workgroup comprised of school-based practitioners from Northern and Southern Nevada in both rural and urban communities. The workgroup represents practitioners who work with students at all levels from pre-school to secondary school. The SLP evaluation framework is in alignment with the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association's (ASHA's) "Performance Assessment of Contributions and Effectiveness of Speech-Language Pathologists" (PACE), as well as with existing OLEP frameworks. It is also in alignment with ASHA National Standards and Practices, Nationally recognized Practice Guidance Standards set by Inter-Professional Education Collaborative (IPEC), Federal Regulations such as ESSA, and where applicable, the NEPF. The SLP evaluation framework is flexible for statewide implementation and it focuses on important aspects of a speech-language pathologist's (SLP's) work and their unique work environment. She continued, with a list of reflections of the SLP framework. Those reflections were as follows: the value and contribution the SLP makes to individual students, families and school community, student centered services, and educationally relevant services and evidence-based practices. Next, she presented an example of their Professional Practice rubric composed of 5 standards. She then presented the Professional Responsibilities Standards. The primary goal of the evaluation framework is to determine if the SLP is meeting professional standards with respect to the SLP's specific roles and responsibilities. The secondary goal is to use the evaluation results to guide professional development to ensure continuous professional growth. The SLP workgroup

is currently completing the performance levels 4-1. They are also working to complete their sources of evidence, both the mandatory and confirmatory, their description notes, their national standard alignment and protocols that will include reflective tools, definitions, resources, and reference lists. Information about their rubrics has and will continue to be shared through the Nevada Speech Language and Hearing Association as well as the SLP workgroup co-leads. At that time, she addressed the alignment of the SLP's performance framework with the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) by providing two examples. Example 1 was their SLP Professional Practice Rubric within Standard 2 Indicator 2 which states, "SLP uses a variety of instructional materials and strategies, implements activities that promote progress on student's specific IEP goals." This is aligned with NEPF Instructional Standards 1, 2, 3, and 4. Example 2 is Standard 2 of the SLP Professional Responsibilities Rubric and reads, "SLP collaborates with families and provides opportunities for them to be involved in the student's speech-language pathology services." This is aligned with the NEPF's Professional Responsibilities Standard 4. The floor was opened for questions.

Questions were as follows:

Member Barker asked if the SLP's Professional Responsibilities Standard 1 is in alignment with the NEPF's Commitment to the School Community Standard 1. Kuhles answered that it does. Member Barker suggested broadening the SLP's Standard 1 term "classroom teachers" into a term that references the community. The change will work to get SLPs more involved in the culture and climate of an institution. Kuhles agreed to include more community involved language to the standard. Member Gonzalez asked if there is anything within the presented standards that speaks to any form of student growth. Unger stated that because their services are IEP driven, how students move forward is usually based on their IEP goals and benchmarks. They are always accountable for showing that. Also, SLPs record data daily on the section that drives instruction for the future. It is very specific and IEP and benchmark driven. She stated that parent and teacher input is always included in IEPs as well, so all parties involved give and get input on anything else that's going on with the student. Chair Salazar asked Unger to explain what she sees Standard 5 Indicator 1 meaning in Professional Responsibilities. Unger answered, they take data on students' abilities in any situation. So, if they're evaluating a child, they want to observe them in a classroom and some other situations, and based on that information they make a determination about the student's needs. Grades and written goals are looked at, and services provided are always provided with the intent of meeting those underpinnings of academic goal because without the underpinnings it is difficult for students to achieve their goal(s) in the classroom. Chair Salazar added that it is not required that they present a separate Student Learning Goal (SLG). The council has had other OLEP groups that have brought forth their standards addressing the idea of impact of the professional on the students. Chair Salazar suggested that as Kuhles and Unger build out their system – specifically, program management and Standard 5 – and use the Standard and Indicator discussed to demonstrate that the professional is making an impact on students. Member Marshner noted the student growth piece embedded in Standard 5 is similar to special education teachers because special education teachers draft SLGs and track them with IEPs as they similarly hope to do with the proposed program. She asked what the difference would be between the work of SLPs and special education teachers. Unger answered that without seeing exactly how special education paperwork looks, she would have to just say that SLPs don't give students grades. But as far as data collection, it is always IEP driven. She stated that SLPs administer initial testing and then provide the 3 year evaluation as opposed to special education teachers who administer annual tests for district, state, and federal guidelines. Member Small mentioned that most OLEP groups are evaluated by someone in their profession; he wanted to know if that was true for groups in other areas of the state. He also added that his next question may not be able to be addressed at this time, but he wants to know how the Council can ensure they are academically pushing students who need special services and is there any connection to the IEP that they are not putting high intended goals to ensure they are going to meet those goals as opposed to pushing practice. Member Collins answered the second portion by stating that the group is not quite at that point in their workgroup sessions to decide if they want to approach the idea of an SLG for SLPs. That portion is toward the end of their workgroup timeline, but they do seem to be making a good effort toward embedding it within their standards. Unger answered Member Small's initial question by informing the Council that Clark County is the only county with SLP Coordinators that have direct supervision over SLPs, but they are looking to have principals in other parts of the state take a look at their rubric to ensure it is comprehensible to them and that if there needs to be additional training to

support them with supporting documents then there will be provision of the support and documentation necessary. Though it would be lovely for all people to be supervised by a person who has a skill-base to do exactly what the service provider is doing, it is possibly not realistic in some of the outlying districts simply based on staffing. But, there is no reason why there wouldn't be a support person to any principal as the Nevada Speech-Language and Hearing Association as an institution would be. As far as ethical issues with the IEP, it would be very disappointing for anyone to adjust an IEP and their code of ethics would not allow it. If anybody is violating their code of ethics it would be dealt with within the Association. Member Collins stated that she and Staff Member Caridine have been working with each of the workgroups throughout the process and asked that an additional statement goes with the protocols on what is best practice for that particular workgroup and how the protocols are modified or implemented for their workgroup along with their standards. Professional development is not currently a budget line item but if it is a recommendation from the TLC to the school district that professional development be provided somehow, it can be made. But at this point, it is not a requirement of the district to provide professional development. Kuhles asked when talking about professional development, are they talking about the opportunity to educate their evaluators. Member Collins answered yes. She reiterated that Clark County is the only district that has direct supervisors for SLPs. Chair Salazar noted that the same question arose from a State Board of Education member. Professional Development of supervisors will be a critical piece and professional development is an important recommendation. Unger stated that even a recommendation is a step forward. Member Small suggested that the SLPs ethical code be added to their standards. Unger pointed out that they are added in their description, but that will be made clear in the future.

9. Development of the School Nurse Statewide Performance Evaluation System

Kathleen Vokits will be presenting the School Nurse Statewide Performance Evaluation. The definition of school nursing changed in February of 2017. School nurses have DOE licensure requirements, and the requirements are that the nurse holds a bachelor's degree (in any field) and holds nursing certification from a list of possible baccalaureate institutions. There are associate degree nurses in different roles throughout the state that are not included in this rubric. In rural areas, there is a clause that states if there are less than 5,000 students in a district and there are no baccalaureate nurses available, then an associate degree nurse can work as a school nurse in that district; however, that nurse would have 5 years to become baccalaureate prepared. There are also associate degree nurses in Clark County and Washoe County working at schools, but they are not working as school nurses, they work as procedure nurses. The NRS states that they must be under the direction and supervision of a chief nurse who is a registered nurse. There are some districts that are not able to meet that standard; however, it is a statewide goal for nurses to be evaluated by nurses. The chief nurse has rules when it comes to completing NRS statutes as it pertains to nurses. The Framework of the 21st Century is their national framework. It is a pictorial description of how school nurses work and all the different areas of expertise they hold. The framework is centered on students primarily along with parents in the community, as they are the basis of this framework. Their standards of practice are throughout and their rubric is based on those standards. They split their rubric into two pieces, Standards of Practice and Standards of Professional Performance, to emulate the NEPF's. Their five Standards of Practice are the same as NASN Standards 1-6. Their Standards of Practice are as follows: Assessment, Diagnosis, Outcomes Identification/ Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation. Their five Standards of Professional Performance are the same as NASN Standards 7-17. Their five Standards of Professional Performance are as follows: Communication/Collaboration, Education/Professional Practice Evaluation, Environmental Health/Resource Utilization/Program Management, Evidence-Based Practice and Research/Quality of Practice, and Ethics/Leadership. They have 4 completed indicators and are still working on the evidence required for each indicator. They have had workshops in Clark County where they presented the standards to the nurses without explaining them in great detail due to lack of time. The nurses were asked to turn in mandatory evidence and confirmatory evidence. She said the result was "interesting to say the least," because the nurses didn't know what they were. Their last slide addressed their timeline of completion starting with publication of the ANA/NASN School of Nurse Standards due in April of 2017, and ends in the 2018-2019 school year with the implementation of the school nurse rubric statewide. Questions were as follows:

Chair Salazar began with a compliment on how thorough the nurses' presentation was and how much progress they've made. She said she agreed with their plan to make changes to their rubric following the release of new standards. She insisted that the description notes are what are going to make the difference. The description notes become the "key for comparable implementation" and consistency is a necessity. Member Collins thanked Kathleen for including the pertinent NRS and NAC in the description as it is very helpful. Kathleen stated that the nurses are firm believers in student outcomes. Although the outcomes are not always quantitative, throughout their entire rubric it is embedded that a student outcome is expected each time they interact with the students. Member Barker asked if where the accountability is for Standard 1 of the NEPF to cross walk to the nurses' standard. Kathleen answered that it is difficult to look at one standard and say that it matches the NEPF for that standard because every NEPF standard had multiple NASN standards within it, so it is say that any one specific NASN standard matches with one specific NEPF standard. Chair Salazar recommended that the nurses go back and review their rubric and the standards as they come out so that they may look at making sure that that piece is embedded. Although there may not be specific alignment they can show the same commitment to school community. Member Barker agreed and added that she is looking for the collaborative piece. She said she likes that in indicator 3 of standard one it is highlighted that the nurse plays an active role in cultivating a safe learning center, school, and community. She just wants to see a crosswalk between the two documents. She concluded by thanking Kathleen for their work. Kathleen stated that she can make that much clearer for the Council.

10. 2017 Legislative Session Considerations

Member Collins gave an overview of the key components of AB 7. Section 66 of page 62 of the introduced bill is proposing changes to NRS 391.465. It regards the criteria for student assessments used to measure progress toward a Student Learning Goal (SLG). Section 67 of page 63 is proposing changes to NRS 391.685. It is completely new language and regards probationary teachers. Section 68 of page 64 is proposing changes to NRS 391.705. It regards probationary teachers Chair Salazar asked how the recommendation came about. Member Collins answered that this recommendation came about because previously in the NRS it was about the evaluation. It was the second evaluation, and she thinks the language last time got deleted, however it is still required by the NRS that one has the option. So they included the language of observation vs. evaluation. Chair Salazar followed up addressing the council saying, in other words, if you recall at the last session, they changed from 3 evaluations to 3 observation cycles. There was another section that kept "evaluation" in the language making the sections contradictory. This is already in statute, however it was necessary to make the language match, having all sections read observation cycles as opposed to evaluation. Member Small stated if it plays out, one could have three different observers in his three cycles, so one wouldn't see the growth of a new teacher because they go before three different observers. Member Small suggested possibly emulating a process he is more familiar with that would allow the administrator to meet with the same observer for two observation cycles and a different observer for the third. This way an observer get to follow-up with new teachers/administrators, and any discrepancy in observation between the two observers could be identified and addressed following the third observation. Member Collins responded that the procedure outlined is potentially problematic because observations are not scored, they are cumulative. So if TLC wants to take a position on this language, it is something that the group can discuss. She also added that she thinks this would be extremely difficult to implement. Member Nunez stated he was thinking about an elementary school with one administrator. The responsibility would fall on the district to organize the application of the statute. He explains that he believes the intent of the process is to facilitate regular and specific feedback. He could see districts having to respond to that to make it harder to give the feedback in a timely manner because then it's about pulling resources together. He concludes that he thinks the council is going to make it harder for administrators to give timely, specific, and regular feedback based on the way the statute is currently worded. Chair Salazar said she wanted to re-address how this came about. The intent in AB7 was not necessarily to clarify all nuances, but to establish some consistency between 3 observation cycles versus 3 evaluations for probationary administrators. She reiterated that this statute has been and still is already in place. Chair Salazar then raised questions of her own surrounding potential misinterpretation. Specifically, she wondered if one might mistake the word observation for every time they have been observed, or will they know the statute regards the formal observation cycle(s). She also found

it problematic that an administrator that this statute applies to would present their problem as not liking the way their observation is scored. But they don't receive scores, so it implies that the council is going to change the implementation of the system in order to set it up as being implemented. It is really important that Member Collins addresses the problematic portions even though the initial purpose of the revisions was to edit the language and establish consistency. However maintaining it as it is would cause for unintended consequences in a couple of ways. Member Collins addressed subsection 1 for the NRS 391.685 is about the timeline for the solution. The first observation must be conducted within 40 days, the second within 40-80 days. 391.725 addresses Subsection 2 which is about the qualifications of the observer. If a probationary administrator requests that their next evaluation be conducted by different administrator in accordance with the notice, then the administrator conducting the observation must have a specified list of qualifications identified in that subsection. Chair Salazar clarified that the original intent here is to provide a level of due process prior to their recommended changes. Member Collins referred to the bill and informed the council that the language in sections 67 and 68 conflict with section 69. She suggested the TLC take a position and make recommendations for what they'd like to see happen. Chair Salazar suggested the TLC make a recommendation that they don't agree with the teacher-administrator observation cycle, but do support the amendment to section 69 addressing the level of due process. Member Gonzalez asked if the sections that aren't needed are removed, would all the language left be surrounding evaluation rather than observation. Member Collins answered if 67 and 68 are removed, they would rely on section 69 which still includes evaluation, but the next observation may be conducted by another administrator. Member Nunez reemphasized that if there is language that states an administrator can request observation by a different administrator after every observation, the council is going to place an unnecessary burden on administrators and district officials. Member Small followed up by saying he has seen that. Due to no fault of the teacher, three observation cycles done by three different administrators leads to three inconsistent pieces of information that are not cohesive. By the council saying they should have the same administrator for at least two observation cycles and allowing the choice of requesting a different administrator for the third, they would make a contribution to the consistency piece. Chair Salazar identified her concerns with that as it assumes there is only a single observation during an observation cycle which is not protocol. So she worries that they are saying something that is not within their protocol. Member Nunez identifies his concerns as limited administration in rural areas, again placing the burden on the district, in turn, creating a more difficult process when the intent is to give feedback. Member Collins stated that she thinks the motion might be unnecessary because in NRS 391.690 Section 1, the revisions they are seeking to make surrounding the option of having a different observer for the third observation are already in place for post-probationary teachers/administrators. Chair Salazar clarified that it reads "observation" not "observation cycle." Member Collins confirmed. Chair Salazar stated that that would be an even more significant revision. Chair Salazar also adds that she agrees with Member Nunez that requiring options of different observing administrators would absolutely be burdensome to the district. She made it clear that everything they make suggestions for that day will simply be recommendations on behalf of the TLC. The TLC does not support with 67 and 68 as component of AB7 and they do believe that 391.690 address these in post-probationary educators and should also be reflected for probationary educators. Is that a fair statement?

Motion:

- Member Small moved to support NRS 391.690 and not support language in sections 67 and 68 in.
- Member Nunez seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 12:05PM**

Member Collins continued her presentation with section 69, page 65 stating that its revisions are for the purpose of clarifying and combining language. NRS 391.725 regards probationary teachers and administrators. The written evaluation must include the following statement: "Please be advised that, pursuant to Nevada Law, your contract may not be renewed for the next school year. If you receive a minimally effective or ineffective evaluation and are reemployed for a second or third year of your probationary period, you may request that your next evaluation be conducted by another administrator". If a school had only one administrator at the school, they would need to find another administrator to conduct all the observations required for that probationary teacher if requested. Chair Salazar noted that the key

language in that statute is “if requested,” therefore, this statute is essentially the same as 690, but applies to probationary staff.

Member Nunez thought it important to consider that if someone does request observation from a different administrator at a school with only one principal, it is required that the school works with another principal that may not understand the structures, functions or processes of the school. He wondered if any district will have the capacity to carry out the statute. He questioned how someone external to the building would be able to see the programs or strategies being carried out at the school.

Member Norton agreed that the statute could create problems for rural schools as Member Nunez stated. Member Gonzalez asked when the word evaluation was included in the language, was the intent the summative. Chair Salazar stated that this is part of the clean up because it was already in there in the days when there were three evaluations for probationary. Now that we do not have 3 evaluations in your first year, this piece was modified to say that if you’re second or third year probationary and you were going to receive minimally effective or ineffective evaluation, then you’d have someone else do your evaluation or summative for the whole year. Their goal is to differentiate between evaluation and observation cycle and the intent is not well reflected in the language. They need to make sure that site admins can take quick action and quick course corrections for the betterment of the kids. It is not a good position to put any site admin in. Member Collins stated that a potential way to solve this might be to use the language from NRS 391.690 and modify 391.725 to match what is in 690. Chair Salazar agreed with the suggestion.

Motion

- Member Norton moved to not support Section 69
- Member Nunez seconded
- Discussion:
- Member Small stated that if a teacher is deemed ineffective, they don’t have a second or third year. He said he doesn’t know if this happens in reality. He continues by saying that they don’t currently have training in the system regarding the elimination of biases and this concerns him. He says a situation containing potential biases is the only time he could imagine the statute being used in reality and he would feel better if certification was in place on this. Chair Salazar understands his suggestion agrees there is a lot of training and professional development to do but she doesn’t think this particular statute would solve the problem he has raised.
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 12:17 PM**

11. National Issues and Legal Landscape

In terms of ESSA and ESSA regulations, there is now a lack of requirements in the new ESSA template that has many groups very concerned. Stakeholder input is also no longer required and the only requirement is review by the governor; no approval necessary. All language regarding a large number of requirements has gone away. In terms of the budget, Trump would like to see a 6 million dollar reduction in the U.S Department of Education. That is a 35% reduction in personnel immediately. He has also targeted Title II in terms of money to build capacity. The president would like to cut budgets across various departments in order to fund his budget proposal.

12. Future Agenda Items

Council will look at recommendation in regards to professional development, OLEPs, and their support in general. They will hear from other OLEP groups in terms of their progress. The larger discussion will be around seeing what happens between now and next month at legislature. They will report the outcome of the Board of Education presentation Chair Salazar and Member Collins on the TLCs cut scores. They will also discuss future meeting dates.

13. Public Comment #2

Public Comment North:

Rubin Murillo, President of the Nevada State Education Association (NSEA), would like to touch base on supporting administrators through evaluation process. There is a lot of pressure on administrators to do quality evaluations. Therefore, there is a lot of time spent on evaluations and not helping teachers in the classroom. Whatever the TLC can do to provide services and support for them would be greatly

appreciated. He knows that the pressures the administrators feel trickles down to the teachers and then on to the community.

Chris Daily of the Nevada State Education Association represents 40,000 educators and would like to address AB 212 on teacher evaluations. High-stakes tests used to evaluate teachers has the ability to bring a first-year teacher nearly to tears deeming that the pressure as just too much. Establishing fair and meaningful teacher evaluations continues to be a priority for NSEA. Assembly Bill 212 is a vital step toward fairness in these evaluations. He feels badly for his peers. Teachers are accountable for student's every day. Teaching is a demanding and complex performance. Meeting the demands of the teaching profession requires tremendous will, ability and preparation. It also requires continuous learning, feedback, and support. We must support education professionals by removing testing from their evaluations. A Silverado High School teacher described removing testing from teacher evaluations as bringing back the human element of teaching. To ensure high quality teaching it is necessary to have meaningful and fair format for constructive assistance. Over the last several years this council has worked to put a rigorous framework to measure teachers instructional and leadership practices as well as professional responsibility.

Unfortunately, Nevada has a competing political emphasis on the use of student achievement data including high-stakes test scores and evaluations. While educational practice currently accounts for 80% of the teacher's evaluation, which is scheduled to go down to 60% next year. The No Child Left Behind Act has gotten Nevada and many other states caught in a cycle of over tested students and teachers pushed to teach to tests. With that act now repealed, many states have been moving away from that high-stakes testing and including student achievement data in teacher evaluations. It is time for Nevada to do the same. He doesn't receive testing data until after the school year is over. The results from the previous year aren't very useful for his instruction and certainly shouldn't be used in his evaluation. Educators teaching in regions of lower socioeconomic status have a built-in disadvantage. While teachers control most of what happens in classroom, they have very limited control outside of it. Would like to continue talking about AB 212 and its merits and they appreciate the work of the TLC and hope they can support it.

Jose Delfin is the Associate Superintendent of the Carson City School District. On agenda item 10, lack of form on the educator assistance plan struck him. He has trained his principals that if there is any teacher that needs further assistance, it is their duty to have that plan ready to go so that they may have a framework to propel themselves toward a better way of teaching. He thinks it is a very important document to have and one thing that can lead to conflict is that the timelines are set. He wants to give administrators the leeway to be able to give specific and reasonable timeframes for improvement, which could last a few months. With regard to calling another admin for observation, he's been called in Carson City to help another school district and he sent a different administrator to a different district and they don't have the continuity of having that relationship with that particular teacher asking for another evaluator. He said this is the case because they have to correspond via email, travel across county lines and conduct as many impromptu observations as they can. Therefore he agrees with the discussion of not only the time factory but the continuity with the evaluator from the other district. He concluded with describing the process as "clunky" at best.

No public comment in the South.

14. Adjournment

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 12:36 PM.