

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)
MAY 17, 2017
9:00 A.M.**

MEETING MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Meeting called to order at 9:10AM

Roll Call:

Members:

Las Vegas:

- Kathleen Galland-Collins
- Kim Metcalf
- Pam Salazar
- Anthony Nunez
- Margaret Marshner-Coyne

Carson:

- Barbara Barker
- Veronica Frenkel
- Jim Cooney
- Dale Norton
- Theo Small
- Dottie Smith

Public:

Las Vegas:

- Kim Mangino
- Catherine Unger
- Mary Anne Jones
- Bill Garis

Carson:

- Nancy Kuhles
- Dr. Kimberly Smerkers-Bass
- Cristal Cisneros
- Jose Delfin
- Susan Kaiser
- Robert Munson
- Dawn Miller
- Don Speth
- Juan Palacios
- Natha Anderson
- Kirsten Gleissener

Staff:

- Dena Durish
- Eboni Caridine
- Raven Cole

- Gregg Ott
Pledge of Allegiance

2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

No public comment in north or south.

3. FLEXIBLE AGENDA APPROVAL

Motion

- Member Nunez motioned for a flexible agenda
- Member Frenkel seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried 9:14AM**

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR APRIL 26, 2017

This agenda item has been postponed to the next TLC meeting on 6/14/17.

5. NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—UPDATES

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

- Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) Implementation Updates
Member Collins and Staff Member Caridine are working on the NEPF survey.
- TLC Member update
Member Collins was able to make contact with the President of Nevada PTA. They are aware of the status of Amy Henderson and are looking for a replacement Parent Representative for the TLC. Chair Salazar emphasized the importance of all the districts participating in distributing the survey for the highest response rate possible as it is critical data for the TLC.

6. DEVELOPMENT OF THE SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGIST'S STATEWIDE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM

Nancy Kuhles, Speech-Language Pathologist; NSHA/NV Coalition co-Chair; SLP OLEP Committee co-Lead; and Catherine Unger, Speech-Language Pathologist, Clark County School District Coordinator for Speech and Language Therapy Services, presented the updated standards and indicators for Speech Language Pathologists (SLP) and are seeking approval to move the framework forward to State Board for adoption. The American Speech-Language and hearing Association (ASHA) has reviewed their rubrics and supports the implementation as a performance evaluation system for Nevada's school-based Speech-Language Pathologists. Nevada Speech-Language and Hearing Association (NSHA) and the SLP workgroup recommend that these rubrics be used to evaluate SLPs with a caseload. The SLP's caseload must be manageable. In the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 388.150, it states a caseload of 50 for pupils with speech and language impairments receiving speech and language therapy services. Larger caseloads may impact student outcomes and service delivery options, limiting the SLPs ability to provide the full continuum of services, integration of the curriculum, opportunity for collaboration with teachers and other professionals, and consultations with parents, teachers and other professionals. ASHA and NSHA strongly recommend that the SLP evaluators have experience and expertise in the professional area of the individual being evaluated. The evaluator that does not hold the certificate of clinical competence in speech-language pathology should become familiar with the roles and responsibilities of the school-based SLP. The SLP performance evaluation rubrics align with ASHAs national standards and practices, nationally recognized practice guidance standards, federal regulations, and where applicable the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF). In Standard 1, they are measuring the SLPs knowledge and skills in SLP

and related areas as well as the implementation of services in an ethical manner. The indicators address the SLPs ability to work across student ability levels, serve a range of disorders as appropriate for the setting, complete and provide in-services, demonstrate competence in oral and written communication, and have good behavior management skills and foster positive interactions with students. In Standard 2, the group addressed cultural responsiveness by measuring SLPs ability to provide culturally and educationally appropriate services and/or specifically designed instruction that are effective, engage students, and reflect evidence-based practices. In Standard 3, the group is measuring the provision of services that meet federal and state regulations and partnerships with team members to determine knowledgeability. The Indicators go into addressing the preparation for MDT and IEP, explaining its content, how Speech-Language goals relate to student success, and they write measurable goals and benchmarks to the student present level of performance. In Standard 4, they are measuring SLPs ability to evaluate students experiencing a variety of communication disorders. Indicators address a SLP's use of assessment tools related to suspected disability, age level, and cultural background. It requires the SLP to conduct observations in multiple settings and interview team members familiar with student. Lastly, Standard 5 addresses SLP use of appropriate and dynamic service delivery methods consistent with the wide variety of individual student needs and skills. The Indicators ensure the development of activities that promote progress on student's specific IEP, and that each student understands the purpose of therapy/activity.

Nancy Kuhles presented the five Professional Responsibilities Standards. The rubric also includes performance levels, sources of evidence, both mandatory and/or confirmatory, description notes, and shows alignment with national standards and where applicable, the NEPF. The SLP Performance Evaluation Rubrics align with ASHA's national standards and practices, nationally recognized practice standards, Inter-Professional Education Collaboration (IPEC), federal regulations or the new Nevada law under ESSA, and where applicable the NEPF. The group concluded their presentation and asked that their framework be considered for approval so that it may move forward for State adoption. Chair Salazar asked if Council members had questions.

Questions were as follows:

The group was complimented on their work. Member Nunez suggested that in Standard 1, Indicator 4 of the Professional Practice Standards, the group replace the word "good" with "consistent" to eliminate the subjectivity and add specificity. The group agreed to the correction. Chair Salazar clarified for the Council that the action today is for the Council to make a recommendation to move this forward to a pilot study. Member Small asked what happens when the group exceeds their caseload; he asked if supervision by someone that is familiar with SLP work is applicable across districts, and how does the group hold contract workers to their standards? Nancy answered that the caseload is allowed to be increased by 10%. Regina Goings of the Clark County School District (CCSD) – the largest school district – does a phenomenal job of staying within the range and providing supports. It is harder to do in other districts as they expand. Adjustments are made when necessary. Tele-practice is one way to build capacity, as it eliminates the travel time. Two counties currently use that option. Another option is entrance and exit criteria for the students to ensure that resources aren't being used on students that need other services instead of Speech-Language therapy. To answer their second question, the group would love to see a provision of professional development for evaluators. ASHA and NSHA are very supportive of that. In regards to recruitment and retention, many districts hire contracted SLPs to fill vacancies. They will not be bound by the rubrics, but they will be held accountable for meeting national standards with which the rubrics are aligned. The group would like to see more of the state's universities to support a graduate program, as a Master's degree is necessary to become professional staff.

Motion

- Member Small motioned to recommend that the SLP Standards be moved on for piloting. Member Barker asked who is currently evaluating SLPs. Currently CCSD is the only district where SLPs evaluate other SLPs. In other districts it is the Principal or Special Education Director or someone else designated in that administrative role. There are seven supervisors in CCSD that supervise over four hundred people.
- Member Metcalf seconded the motion

Member Marshner asked about Standard 3 in Professional Practice Rubric. She wondered if it would support the SLPs to work with healthcare professionals. Catherine Unger answered that they do work very close with students' healthcare professionals and working with a nurse is a requirement.

- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 9:55AM**

7. DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCHOOL NURSE STATEWIDE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM

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.

This agenda item was postponed to the next TLC meeting on 6/14/17.

8. DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRINCIPAL SUPERVISOR STATEWIDE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM

Chair Salazar shared information regarding the Principal Supervisor standards reminding the members that statute requires the Council to develop the NEPF for Principal Supervisors. As a part of that, last year the TLC adopted the national standards for Principal Supervisors. Chair Salazar gave a brief history of the development of the national standards. They adopted four standards. Standard 1 is about the dedication of Principal Supervisor time. Standard 2 is about supporting and helping individual principals grow. Standard 3 is about building the kind of educational environment to serve all students. Standard 4 is about district alignment and support for district vision. Those four standards describe Professional Practice of the Principal Supervisors. The next set of four standards describes Professional Responsibilities. Standard one is about the NEPF in regards to supervision. Standard 2 is about reflection on their own practices as a Principal Supervisor. Standard 3 is about community engagement and provision of supports for that. Lastly, Standard 4 is about coherence around structures, systems and policies that support the district. Those now reflect the best alignment they could determine to the administrators standards knowing that Principal Supervisors will be supporting administrators.

Questions were as follows: Member Frenkel asked if the Principal Superintendent is the Board member, how will that affect the way the Principal Supervisor who is a Superintendent will be evaluated? Chair Salazar answered that there will be an amendment this year to address that very concern. If the superintendent is the single supervisor of principals in a district he/she would first be responsive to the Board of Trustees and whatever that contract requires them to do. They will continue to move this forward with GTL and AIR. Member Small asked if in the process Chair Salazar could bring in Principal Supervisors to get feedback. Chair Salazar answered yes, that after the work is done by Dr. Clifford which is to translate the standards adopted by the Council into the rubric, the Council will then start looking at descriptor notes and samples of evidence. After that they will bring in a group to give feedback and help clarify what that looks like. Member Norton offered to volunteer Associate Superintendents and Directors who are Principal Supervisors to participate. Chair Salazar thinks that having input from a representative group is going to make a big difference. Member Collins added that the quicker we move on this the better as this is scheduled to go into pilot this year. Chair Salazar agreed

9. 2017 LEGISLATIVE SESSION CONSIDERATIONS

- a. Updates on Bills that may have an impact on the NEPF
 - i. AB 7

The minimal information presented before the Council is all that is known as far as updates on AB7 from the previous week. It is scheduled to be heard by Senate Finance as of May 4th; however no members of the Council have seen or heard anything more on this bill. The key piece around AB7 is to address ESSA. Knowing that, it hoped that a hearing comes soon so that it can move forward as it captures everything that the ESSA plan defines. Member Metcalf asked if it doesn't pass, what implications are there of that for the work of the Council. Member Collins answered that the changes made by the Council is clarifying of

the language and clarification on evaluation cycles. If it didn't pass, it wouldn't be extremely detrimental to the Council.

- ii. AB 312 no longer has anything to do with TLC because it no longer contains information about the evaluation system. It is now about class size which the Council has no purview over.

- iii. AB 320

This bill has been heard in front of the Assembly Committee on Education. It made it out of the Committee with a 14-2 vote, however when it left the Assembly floor it was a partisan vote at 27 yeas and 15 nays. It was heard again at the Senate Committee on Education two weeks ago. The testimony given by members of the Council was excellent but due to number of educators testifying time had run out. Therefore, no action was taken at that meeting. Knowing that if they do not find some sort of compromise between the recommendations of the TLC and what the conceptual amendment is from Superintendent Canavero and the Nevada Department of Education (DOE), then there is the very strong possibility that the bill would then make it out of the Senate and Assembly, but it would be vetoed by the Governor. If that does happen, what is currently in place for the 2017-2018 school year is 40% outcomes, 20% SLGs, and 20% state assessments would move forward. The question before the TLC today is what is their recommendation? Member Small spoke stating that many of the legislators he's spoken to do not agree with the reduction to 20% as they feel it is a rollback. That was his understanding of their feelings about the bill and its amendment. Deputy Superintendent Dena Durish referred the group to NELIS and confirmed Chair Salazar's timeline of this bill being passed as written in the Assembly. Amendments were presented to the Senate Education Committee. They were not voted on, so before they are voted it is hoped that DOE and TLC come to some sort of compromise. The first thing proposed was to leave it up the districts. They could choose to use statewide assessments, all SLGs or a combination of both. In conversation, that has not been supported. On behalf of the Superintendent, they have decided to support the proposed amendment to keep 40% and all of that will be measured by SLGs for all subjects in all grades whether they are tested or not. Another recommendation was to put Stop-Gaps in place. This means if a teacher was rated a 1 in Student Performance, they could not be deemed effective or highly effective. Chair Salazar added that that was the recommendation of the TLC. The amendment then put forward by the speaker is that "student growth" needs to be put into statute, not "student achievement." The proposal is that the Department and/or State Board would adopt regulations to determine what is meant by "student growth." Member Nunez added that if state tests are included in the teacher evaluations it will disproportionately affect teacher evaluations in the schools that need the most support. It will also negatively affect principal capacity to attract and retain the most highly effective talent. He thinks it is a great opportunity to move the NEPF toward what it was intended to do. The most important thing in terms of evaluating teachers with precision is the removal of state testing. Member Small believes that it minimally impacts very few educators in Nevada if they use SBAC results on evaluations. Also, it is frustrating for him for the Department to not sit before the TLC and listen or take the Council's recommendations, because his work is making sure that he is representing 18,000 teachers. His biggest concern is that the Department and/or Board is not really listening to or appreciating the work of the Council. Deputy Superintendent Dena Durish responded that she thinks they have come a long way in those discussions so to say that the Department does not value those conversations is disappointing. The protocols that the Department has established are all based on the recommendations of the TLC. She is disappointed that he feels that way and felt the need to put that on the record, but she will pass it along to the Superintendent. Member Small rebutted that he prefaced by showing appreciation to the Department, but based on the timeline from December to today the two groups are learning and growing together, be he has explained how he feels and the politics are frustrating for him as well. Every member of the Council and the Department wants Nevada to be the fastest improving

state, is evaluation part of that. He thinks his emotions are partly because of the politics of it rather than good policy.

Motion

- Member Metcalf motioned to approve the recommendation of the TLC for the 2018-2019 school year that SLG test scores are weighted at 40%
- Member Nunez seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 11:25 AM**

10. NATIONAL ISSUES AND LEGAL LANDSCAPE

Chair Salazar explained a research article about VAMS has surfaced in relation to not properly evaluating educators. Bloomberg has more research about VAM. There is another article titled, *Don't Grade Teachers with Bad Algorithms*. In Houston, everything that we were concerned about came to pass. They found that high weighting of student outcomes does tend to send good teachers out. They were concerned because it didn't consider their professionalism. Lastly, on the hill, everything is about the changes happening in the DOE.

11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Will continue working with OLEP groups.

Updates on final legislative action and implications of those actions on TLC

12. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

North:

Natha Anderson with the Washoe Education Association came before the Council to ask for help with AB320. She wants the Council to consider how much time SLOs take. They appreciate them because it allows them to take a look at their craft. However, the amount of time it takes for administrators to be leaders at school, takes too much time. Instead of being leaders to teachers in the classroom, principals are being required to be pulled away from that portion of their job to do paperwork. This is their 5th year doing SLOs and they are incredibly powerful. Because of how powerful they are, it takes a lot of time. She is asking that instead of 40% it is set to and maintained at 20%.

Ruben Murillo commented that it would be disappointing for assessments to be weighted at 40%. To go to 40% is not doing anything different than being is being done now. Other states are looking to reduce assessment percentage to 0%. He is confused as to what the goal is. For a staff member from DOE to dress down a member of the Council is highly inappropriate. Members should have the freedom and ability to speak their mind without fear of retribution or dressing down in public. What Dena did earlier is inappropriate and she owes Member Small and the rest of the Council an apology. If we are going to act as professionals, we have to understand that not everybody is going to be on the same page and they should be respected for the positions that they take. We shouldn't act like we're in grade school threatening to tell parents or bosses what was said. There needs to be a modicum of respect and there has to be a respect for the work that you do, otherwise, why do you even exist?

No public comment in the south.

13. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 11:36AM