

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)
FEBRUARY 27, 2019
9:00 A.M.**

Meeting Locations:

All meetings will be video conferenced from all locations.

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Public Education Foundation	4350 S. Maryland Pkwy	Las Vegas	Barrick Board Room
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Board Room

APPROVED MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Las Vegas:

Kathleen Galland-Collins
Kim Metcalf
Pam Salazar
Theo Small
Zhan Okuda-Lim
Anthony Nunez
Meredith Smith

Carson City:

Mary Owens
DeeAnn Roberts
Teri White
Brian Rippet
Michele Sanchez-Boyce

Staff:

Kristin Withey – Education Programs Professional
David Gardner – Deputy Attorney General
Sylvia Figueroa – Administrative Assistant

Public:

Las Vegas:

Jana Pleggenkuhle
Dolly Rowan
Sandi Herrera
Bryan Callahan
Karen Stanley

Carson City:

Alexander Marks
Charles Lednicky
Kirsten Gleissner
Natha Anderson

Dawn Huckaby
Ruben Murillo
Jose Delfin
Chris Daly

1) Call to Order; Roll Call: Pledge of Allegiance Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair
Call to order at 9:10 AM

2) Public Comment #1

Carson City:

- Ruben Murillo, President of the Nevada State Education Association. Commented on a decision made at the previous TLC Meeting. Suggested that his organization would be pushing for less than TLC's tentative recommendation of 20% weight for student learning goals. He stated that he feels the weight should be determined at the local level. He closed by stating that he expected TLC to support his request as he represents the voice of Nevada's educators.
- Natha Anderson, President of the Washoe Education Association. Stated that the WEA supports a lower weight for the SLG. She believes that the benefit of the SLG is the conversation and professional learning communities it supports. When appropriate time and training is provided, students can be much stronger learners. She suggested that experimentation with instructional practices and lesson design that lead to improved outcomes is best supported when the SLG is weighted at 10%. She asked TLC to support reducing the weight during the legislative session.
- Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association. Identified that CCEA had spoken with Governor Sisolak about the use of student data in teacher evaluation. His response was that he feels it is incredibly difficult to accurately measure teacher effectiveness alongside the numerous variables that contribute to student classroom achievement and that it is unfair for teachers to be represented by factors outside of their control.

Las Vegas:

- Jana Pleggenkuhle, Special Education Committee Chair, Clark County Educators Association. Provided input on the recommendations to be taken to the state board. She stated that special educators feel that the current NEPF is not fair or equitable for all and that they are not able to be effectively evaluated, even by evaluators who have been trained. She recommended that the term ALL be clarified on the rubrics to account for individual student factors, citing NEA policy from 2017 that recognized there are variables that impact student outcome beyond teachers control. She recommended that the NEPF define the term 'all' by placing an asterisk each time it is used in the rubrics. The definition of all should be defined as being based on individual students' learning challenges such as cognitive and or developmental abilities, second language, attendance, behavior, etc.
- Dolly Rowan, self-contained special education teacher, Clark County School District, and Special Education Committee Member, CCEA. Stated that while the TLC and the law underscore the import of recognizing differences, actual implementation does not. She provided a personal anecdote as an example of this inequity. She calls for the definition of 'all' in the rubrics so that every teacher can equitably be evaluated based on the individual needs of the students in a teacher's classroom.

3) Approval of Meeting Minutes for January 9, 2019 (Information/Discussion/Possible Action) Dr. Pamela

Salazar, Chair

Member White motioned to approve the minutes from the January 9, 2019 Teachers and Leaders Council meeting. Member Nunez seconded the motion. All members were in favor. The motion passed at 9:27 AM

4) Nevada Department of Education—updates (*Information/Discussion*) Kathleen Galland-Collins, NDE Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Educator Development & Support

- **Pilot Study for Educational Audiologist:** Member Collins provided an overview of the field tests for principal supervisors and educational audiologists. Dr. Carie Hornby-Daniels has been working on the audiologist framework providing needed clarifying language to the indicator levels. Representatives of that group will bring new language to the May meeting.
- **Pilot Study for Principal Supervisors:** Nevada was invited to present in January at the CCSSO convening about its adoption of the model standards for principal supervisor. Dr. Pam Salazar presented. She said that there are a number of states interested in this work, but most are not yet utilizing the national standards. In this case, Nevada is at the forefront. Principal supervisors have recently been identified as big levers in education and there will be a shift in roles from the past because of the expectations for college and career readiness. At AASA, the leaders from Washington SEL led by Silverman and team presented around the importance of principal supervisors. Dr. Salazar stated that she had not yet spoken to four districts that participated in the pilot about Dr. Silverman’s webinar on the subject, but was intending to attend the superintendents meeting next week in Carson City. This meeting will allow her to reconnect with the pilot study members to see if any were able to attend and to plan upcoming calibration meetings with them. Member Collins added that NDE was able to begin strategizing at the same CCSSO conference how it will systematically roll out support for schools with that principal supervisor role in mind. She cited Maria Sauter’s School Leadership Network that is currently being used to provide supports for principals and their supervisors across the state.
- **First Year of Implementation:** All other OLEP are in first year of implementation. There are several trainings that have been offered at the district level and there is statewide meeting for school counselors this weekend at which there will be NEPF trainings. The tools for OLEP have been updated online to correct noted errors. There should be a revision date in the footer of the most recently updated versions.
- **NEPF Communication:** An NEPF liaison meeting is scheduled for March 1. The NEPF overview (included in the TLC meeting materials) will be shared at the Liaison meeting. This document includes a historic overview of the NEPF starting from 2011 including the impact of legislative changes to NEPF, especially to the domain weights, the status of NEPF-related regulations, the status of the ten frameworks, and the plan for monitoring and improvement.
- **State Board of Education Updates:** TLC recommendations will be pushed to the May SBE meeting as the SBE meeting scheduled for March 12 will focus on the search for superintendent.
- **NEPF Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG):** The MAG met February 8, 2019 to go over the survey questions for NEPF teacher and administrator surveys to be administered by the districts. The group determined what questions were valuable for district monitoring of the NEPF and would inform continuous improvement. The next meeting is scheduled for March 7 and will provide members the time to look at the survey and monitoring guidance documents developed by NDE in collaboration with RELWest and West Comprehensive Center. The goal of this monitoring plan is to shift from a compliance focus towards helping facilitate continuous improvement and using the extant data to manage talent and leverage it appropriately. Member Collins paused to allow MAG members to add updates. Member White confirmed that Member Collins had reported accurately.

Member Smith requested that the dates for the meetings be published.

- **TLC Membership Updates:** The replacement for Member Marschner-Coyne has not yet been officially identified. Member Gonzalez has resigned so the TLC will be accepting nominations for the administrator position from NASA. Chair Salazar and Member Small will term out June 2019. The terms for members Owens, Rippet and Smith also conclude on June 30th, however they are eligible for reappointment. These members can reach out to their associations for re-nomination. Member Collins mentioned that NDE staff will be reaching out to all TLC Members for whom there is no nomination letter on file to ensure accurate record-keeping.
- **Future TLC Meeting Dates:** The meeting materials include a document with possible dates for 2019 and 2020. On the advice of NDE leadership, NDE staff has reserved the board rooms on a consistent day of the month for the TLC, thus setting a precedent. TLC members were presented with the options of either the last Tuesday or Wednesday of every month. Rooms are currently being held and will be released upon decision made by TLC members. The May meeting will be at new southern location on Flamingo and Burnham. The new location will provide easy access and a central location. NDE is expecting to move at the end of March/beginning of April. The boardroom will be downstairs while all NDE offices will be upstairs. There will be a small anteroom attached to the boardroom for members to convene before actual council meetings. Member White commented that some dates fell very close to Thanksgiving and Christmas. Member Metcalf requested the address of the new NDE building. Member Collins provided it: 2080 E. Flamingo Road. Member Rippet requested that the TLC choose dates now. Member Owens suggested meeting on Wednesdays. Chair Salazar reminded the TLC that 4 to 5 meetings should be sufficient, especially since there will be no new pilots next year. Member Collins stated that NDE would continue to hold meeting spaces just in case they are necessary, but that the TLC could vote on the four they'd prefer today. Member Roberts requested a vote between Tuesdays and Wednesdays since her preference is Tuesday. Member Owens motioned to hold TLC meetings the last Wednesday of the month. Seconded by Member Metcalf. The motion passed with 2 nays and 10 yays; the TLC meetings will be the last Wednesday of the month for the next school year. Member Collins suggested they eliminate the dates in November and December. She suggested that the first meeting of the year would be a bulk data review, then there should be several additional over the course of the year, and end with one in the spring. Member Rippet made a motion to hold the last Wednesday of the month in September, January, March, and May. Motion seconded by Member Owens. All members were in favor. The motion passed at 9:54 a.m. Chair Salazar reminded the members that additional meetings can always be added upon request of the council. Member Collins stated that the chair and vice chair will meet with NDE to map out the content planned for those meetings.
- **Questions Posed by TLC Members:** Member Small requested updates on NDE leadership. Member Collins responded that Jason Dietrich was serving as the interim Deputy Superintendent and that he and Member Collins are in regular conversation. Interim Deputy Dietrich then reports directly to the Acting Superintendent of Public Instruction, Jonathan Moore. A recommendation for the Superintendent will be made after the March 12 State Board of Education meeting. Member Collins could not confirm any timeline further. Member Owens posed a question about TLC terms and whether replacements could be reappointed. Member Collins clarified that Member Owens is eligible for reappointment for another three-year term if identified by her state association or recommending board.

5) State Board of Education and Legislative Session Recommendations (Information/Discussion/Possible Action) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair; Dr. Kristin Withey, Education Programs Professional, Nevada Department of Education;

- Chair Salazar reminds the members that the recommendations identified today can go before legislators as official TLC recommendations. However, these will not be endorsed by the State Board of Education until their May meeting. TLC members cannot state that these recommendations have been supported by the State Board of Education. At the last meeting, the TLC approved some conceptual recommendations to be taken to the SBE and to the legislative session. Chair Salazar referred members to the meeting material for Agenda Item 5.
- Member Rippet motioned to amend both sets of recommendations by reducing the weight of the student learning goal from 20 to 10%. Member Owens seconds.
 - Discussion was initiated by Member Rippet who stated that there had been a presentation by practitioners and much discussion from members at the previous TLC meeting around the exact weight. Member Rippet said that as a TLC member, he represents a professional organization and other educators, so would have to adjust his weighting recommendation to reflect their voices. He cited Governor Sisolak's written statement to CCEA opining that using student data was inherently unfair in the evaluation of teachers.
 - Member Metcalf asked whether the weighting of the other two categories would have to be redistributed because of the adjustment. Chair Salazar confirmed. Member Metcalf reiterated that the current motion was focused only on the weight of the SLG, and not the other two sections.
 - Member Small stated that Natha Anderson had focused her justification for reduced SLG weight around PLCs. He asked whether TLC would be recommending placing weight on the PLC process as well. Member Small also referred to the NEPF overview meeting material, citing that there have always been TLC conversations about sitting on the same weight for SLG for multiple years. He asked members to ensure that there is enough weight to recognize the impact a highly qualified teacher can have on student outcomes.
 - Member Rippet stated that there is no weight recommendation for PLC, suggesting that PLCs should be a local decision and his recommendation is independent from the view of Washoe County.
 - Member Small adds that the NEPF is a statewide system, so PLC weight should not be locally determined.
 - Member Rippet clarified that the motion is to change the recommendation for SLG to be weighted at 10% and does not reflect the comments related to PLCs; PLCs are not part of the NEPF conversation at the present time.
 - Member Sanchez-Boyce comments in support of the reduction to 10%. She appreciates maintaining accountability for teacher effectiveness in the process but cites that constituents state there are too many extraneous factors that affect student outcomes beyond the impact of teachers.
 - Member Nunez states that his support of the motion would be dependent on where the other ten percent would be factored into the other domains. He stated that if weights change too drastically, it may impact the direction he has been coaching teachers and before he can support the change, he wants to understand the consequences of the adjustment. The 20% would align with a previous precedent set. He gave an example of an unintended consequence of the SLG being weighted at 40% is that what he actually observes teachers doing, or not doing, in the classroom holds much less weight.
 - Member Owens is concerned by the discussion of where the 10% would go. Chair Salazar clarified that the extra weight would go to the educational practice domain, but how it is

distributed within that domain is up for discussion. The TLC will have to make this determination at some point.

- Member Smith suggests the maintenance of a 20% weight for consistency of implementation for two years. She cites research about the impact an individual teacher can have on student outcomes in support of a 20% weight then expresses frustration that there is not a more scientific way to determine the appropriate weight of student outcomes. Because of this, the TLC will continue to grapple with and discuss the most appropriate weight.
- Member Roberts supports the 10% weight and wants to discuss how to allocate the remaining weight. She recommended placing the majority of the weight on the instructional practice domain. Member Roberts adds that PLC would be covered under professional responsibilities and doesn't want to allocate specific weight to the PLC practice separately.
- Member Rippet references the meeting material that provided an overview of the NEPF. He draws attention to page two with the legislative changes to the domain weights. He notes that while the argument for 20% has focused on maintenance or consistency, the chart reveals that there has never been consistency. In three years, there have been three different percentages. So there is no valid argument for consistency at 20% in particular.
- Chair Salazar asks for members who have not yet spoken to represent their stakeholders.
- Member Metcalf states that there is no empirical evidence to indicate that the instructional practice or professional responsibility domains impact student achievement. This weighting is philosophical, not empirical or scientific. Until we have evidence from our own work that a teacher who scores well on the other domains produces greater student learning, then there is no danger in us determining our own weightings.
- Member White asks if this entire discussion is moot since legislative session has already begun and she is unaware if there are any BDRs saved for this point.
- Chair Salazar shared that there is still opportunity to provide our voices. She states that there is a BDR being held at the present for TLC's recommendations.
- Member Okuda-Lim states that he appreciates the conversation, but asks members to identify the purpose of the evaluation system and consider signals sent if there is change every few years. He questions what might be a way to show educators that this is meant to be a system to help support them to improve their practice, not to be a tool for punishment. He states that it is important to think about the recommendations taken as a whole. If SLG were the only focus, he would be concerned, but reminds members that there are recommendations about distancing developing from dismissal and the design of tools that will increase allotted time for the conversations that drive improvement. When considering the totality of the recommendations, they show that TLC is making an effort to move towards the coaching and development approach versus that of dismissal. Member Okuda-Lim recommends cutting the current weight in the NRS in half to 20%. This weight signals that student learning is critical in what educators should accomplish with their craft. This reduction in combination with the other recommendations should help send the message that we are looking to see educator improvement rather than punishment.
- Member Smith asked for Member Metcalf's guidance since there is no empirically identified weight. What would be his recommendation for the weight of the SLG or what a policy recommendation would look like to address that particular concern? She also comments to Member Rippet that she shares his sentiment around the inaccuracy of the idea of

- consistency, but was trying to make a recommendation based on some past precedent.
- Member Metcalf responded to Member Smith’s request. He said that he has no specific recommendation but states that Nevada has not done any testing to validate the extent to which instructional practice or professional responsibilities are related to some indication of greater students success in school, no matter how that may be measured. Because of this, it could be argued that the recommendation should be for equal weighting across the three areas (33% for each) until there is evidence to show where the key leverage points lie. Given that we don’t know about any of the three, any argument about which should have more or less, or be eliminated, is somewhat arbitrary.
 - Member Boyce reminds the TLC that OLEP are part of the educator umbrella and that these groups do not use student performance data. Not all educators are teachers and not all are being evaluated using SLG scores. There is not consistency across all ten frameworks.
 - Member Owens reminded the board that there are teachers on special assignment that don’t use SLGs either.
 - Member Smith wonders how to make right decision without empirical validity of the tool at all. Either decision is a policy or political decision and affects message we are sending to professionals. Is 10% or 20% any more grounded in research? She feels like either decision is really a policy decision and a political decision in terms of the message being sent to teachers and OLEP. Is 10% really just more to align with governor’s statement or what teachers want to see? In absence of empirical data, are we just making a political statement?
 - Member Small mentions that page 19 of the minutes from last meeting reflects the same conversation. He reminds TLC that 20% was the recommendation at the 2017 Legislative Session as well. There is consistency with 20%. He cites that he is the representative of the 20,000 teachers and other licensed educational professionals in CCSD, however he hasn’t asked them because many of them would have different weight suggestions. He states that consistency is too valuable.
 - Chair Salazar calls for additional comments. She restates the motion: to change the recommendation to be taken to the SBE and legislative session from a 20% SLG to 10%. Chair Salazar calls for a roll-call vote. Member Owens: yes; Member Collins: no; Member Roberts: yes; Member Metcalf no; Member White: no; Chair Salazar: no; Member Small: no; Member Okuda-Lim: no; Member Nunez: no, Member Rippet: yes; Member Sanchez-Boyce: yes; Member Smith: no. **Motion failed:** the recommendation remains for the SLG to be weighted at 20%.
 - Chair Salazar recommends looking at the distribution of the educational practice domain weights.
 - Member Small moves that the TLC returns to the 2017 recommendations of 60% instructional practice and 20% professional responsibilities. Member Metcalf seconds the motion. Chair Salazar calls for discussion. There is none.
 - Chair Salazar calls for a vote. **Motion passes unanimously at 10:47:** The educational practice domain will be comprised of 60% instructional practice, 20% professional responsibilities.
 - Chair Salazar asked that members look at the additional recommendations, reminding the TLC that they had conceptually approved the recommendations 3-7 and then had asked the department to formally draft the language to be voted on at this meeting.
 - Member Collins asked for clarification regarding which statements are currently under

review.

- Chair Salazar clarified to which statements she had been referring. She asks the TLC to confirm that they approve 1-6 and then look at the additional recommendations that were considered, but not voted on. She also asked to entertain any additional recommendations that TLC would like to make to during the legislative session.
- Member Okuda-Lim clarified a point about supporting funding for a streamlined technology platform. His takeaway from the discussion at the last meeting was that the TLC supported moving away from the use of Word documents and Excel spreadsheets to supporting a tech tool that allows for immediate feedback, reduce time spent completing paperwork and increase time to engage in high quality conversation, and would connect educators with aligned professional development opportunities.
- Member Small confirmed that this had been his understanding of their decision. He wanted to add that the TLC's recommendations should be empathetic with special educators and those teachers who enter into other in high needs classrooms. He explained that 'all' may not need to be defined in legislation, but should be part of TLC's discussion. Member Small asks Member Metcalf what the cost would be to set up empirical research study to analyze the standards and indicators to see which are the most impactful to teacher and student success. He suggests that a recommendation should be to add an empirical research study.
- Chair Salazar refers members of the TLC to documents entitled 'The NEPF High Leverage Instruction Standards Descriptors of Performance – Key Words in the Protocol' and 'NEPF Performance Level and Standards Explanation' that are available on RPDP website. These documents were developed by CRESST and WestED to identify that there is a written explanation / definition of 'all.' She suggests that there is misunderstanding around the definition of 'all' and that from the beginning; it was meant to ensure that teachers are doing something for all students, rather than seeing the improved outcomes of all. She acknowledges that there is work to be done to ensure that the word 'all' is fully understood by and clarified for educators.
- Member Smith commented that it is frustrating that there is a state evaluation tool with which there are licensed administrators in the state who are not familiar. She reiterates her sentiment that there should be some connection to the state licensure system to ensure implementation with fidelity. She says it is baffling that there are comments reflecting that evaluations are not being done correctly because the administrator hasn't gone to trainings and that the state allows them to practice as administrators with incomplete/inaccurate knowledge. She says that she knows there is not a policy connection right now, but there must be something done to thread all resources together.
- Member Nunez said that the focus of conversation last time was to ensure that the TLC avoids creating a bifurcated system. He states that this focus should continue as they move forward. Rather than make exceptions for various different groups, the intent of the NEPF should be to allow an evaluation to show that a person exceeded in these areas, but has room for growth in others and that's ok. Training should be continuous. The current conversation needs to refocus on whether there are any additional steps to ensure that the system is not bifurcated, moving away from 'you're being let go or not' and towards permitting a range of scores so that they are usable to drive continuous professional growth.
- Member Okuda-Lim thanked the public for their comment. This leads to a recommendation around norming and professional development to ensure that evaluators are well-trained. He underscored the importance of providing training, norming, and nuance definition for

- the accurate evaluation of educators in specific lines of work for both administrators currently in the system and those aspiring towards the supervisor position. He suggests that there needs to be a conversation with the leadership from COPS and licensure about to align requirements for administrators to ensure that they understand the system. He underscored the importance of working with both existing and up-and-coming administrators to help to improve the system.
- Member Boyce provided the voice for OLEP in the recommendation discussion. She suggests that the current weight domains do not address the OLEP.
 - Member Collins stated that current recommendation would only apply to teacher librarians; the rest of the OLEP would not be affected because their weights have already been approved. It would be up to the workgroup to recommend their weight shifts.
 - Chair Salazar stated that the recommendations are in alignment with national landscape. She suggests that the next step is to clarify the language from those ‘additional’ recommendations. Chair Salazar proposes that the TLC limit themselves to 4-5 key recommendations for legislators. She summarized the recommendations as being
 - Distance Developing from punitive action
 - Reduce the SLG to 20%
 - She continued that additional recommendations could be to mandate attendance of PD or IRR training, citing the research identified during the last TLC meeting. She asked members to clarify which of the recommendations they wished to move forward.
 - Member Small stated that the majority of the additional recommendations fit under PD and should be discussed with RPDP. The only additional piece he would like to add is around research to examine the empirical validity. He understands that there is fiscal note attached to the technological tool and a finite pot of funding, but says it is imperative for us to fund empirical research as well. He also asks for the authority for the TLC members to independently speak to lawmakers.
 - Chair Salazar cites the document to be published by AIR/GTL on March 21 and suggests that this supports an evidence of impact research undertaking. The number of definitive studies on the impact of these systems is limited, so there is definite rationale to support this request.
 - Member Small asks whether there is a way to include the study from AIR/GTL as part of the BDR hearing to show that this is on the national landscape.
 - Chair Salazar stated that the GTL researcher associated with this work is Courtney Rowland who presented with TLC in 2014. The other researchers are Nevada’s partners Reino Makkonen and Marie Mancuso from RELWest and WestCC. She suggests that they are all familiar with Nevada’s context and would be willing to support a research endeavor.
 - Member Metcalf supports opening the NEPF to research. One way to begin this is to make the data available to restricted agencies. He also mentions that any attempt to do the work without putting it out for bid would be fought against. Nevada has a reputation for often choosing the same researcher partners and finding the same results, so many question the validity and the quality of that research.
 - Member Collins said there would be an RFP.
 - Member Metcalf suggests that some may be done without funding including the basic examination of existing data by a third party entity. The key problem would be acquiring

the data. This review of data wouldn't be an evidence of impact study, but there are a number of questions we have right now that could be answered using extant data.

- Chair Salazar mentions that acquiring more precise data is something that has been brought forward as a recommendation. The NDE is working to see how we can get this expanded data. She cites the MET study that found that there is a large difference between individual scores and performances within rating bands. She confirms that an RFP process is essential to transparency of the work.
- Member Smith asks if an RFP is put out, would there be an opportunity for TLC members or Dean Metcalf to give input on the type of study to be done so that we are ensuring we are requesting proposals that are getting at what we are truly trying to understand.
- Chair Salazar said that part of the recommendation to legislators would be that TLC should work together to define what that impact study should really look like before it gets turned over to NDE to develop the RFP and implement. She summarizes that the first three recommendations include distancing, 20% SLG with associated 60% and 20% weightings of the other pieces, and the tech platform. The fourth would include ongoing support of the RPDP and norming of evaluators but reminds the TLC that mandating PD is not recommended because that removes a funding source for districts. Instead these decisions should be left to be made at the local level. The fifth to be added is something around the evidence of impact research.
- Member Nunez questions whether there is anything they can do to establish effective communication between those providing PD and those working with educators at the district level? Could there be, or is there a need, to mandate some report that must be given to a person at the principal supervisor level or above that would document PD attendance by administrators and list the questions identified through this training. He suggests that there is a need for a communication pipeline between district and PD providers.
- Chair Salazar says there is already a structure for all of this in the form of the NEPF Liaison group. She says that district representatives, RPDP directors, and the NDE sit on this board, they will just need to operationalize this structure and the response by the partners within that.
- Member Collins confirms that the structure is there but the utilization is weak. There are regular meetings, but attendance is not great and feedback is not robust. She suggests that NDE can get some feedback from the Liaisons to improve the structure and implementation of the extant system. However there also needs to be a realization of the value of the Liaison group.
- Chair Salazar replies that there must be PD to ensure successful and effective implementation of an educator effectiveness system.
- Member Small suggests that the TLC must also hear directly from these Liaisons more. He says that the TLC runs the risk of being in a black box, separate from those who are implementing it. He suggests that the TLC needs to hear more from constituents and that Liaisons need to be publicized so that everyone knows who to turn to for questions about the NEPF.
- Chair Salazar asks whether liaisons should be asked to come to TLC meetings to share where they see breakdowns and what they think the TLC should consider.
- Member Collins said that this conversation can be broached with Liaisons during the March 1 meeting.

- Member Nunez wonders if there is anything TLC can put forth to ensure collegial conversation rather than compliance checks. The goal should be to see if there is anything we can do to better support and improve the system.
- Chair Salazar said that this check will be part of the NEPF monitoring. She cites a tool to be published by AIR/GTL with suggestions for LEA leaders to assess their educator effectiveness systems.
- Chair Salazar says that the TLC has identified 5 recommendations, four of which have been approved conceptually (the bifurcated NRS fixes, weighting, technology platform, and continued RPDP support). The TLC needs to vote on the final recommendation to include an evidence of impact study. Chair Salazar explains that having 5 recommendations is the precedent.
- Member Collins clarifies that approved recommendations include 1 about adding OLEP to all NRS, so can't be lumped. Recommendations 2-3 are related to the bifurcation. She also reminded the group that principal supervisors must be included.
- Member Small motions to approve the legislative session recommendations #1-6, including the addition of principal supervisors to #1. He adds that an additional recommendation will be included to request funding for an evidence of impact research study. He ends the motion with the granting of authority to TLC members to reach out to legislators, SBE members, district and higher education representatives, etc. about the 2019 legislative session. Chair Salazar reminds the TLC that these are not yet endorsed by the SBE, so when speaking with legislators, members must preface the recommendations appropriately. The motion was seconded by Member Smith. Member Metcalf proposed an amendment to add validity to the final recommendation so that it is an evidence of impact and validity study. The amendment was approved by Members Small and Smith. There was no additional comment. Chair Salazar calls for the vote. **The motion passes unanimously at 11:45.**

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

- Chair Salazar shares that there was a recent article in EdWeek on the work of CCSSO looking at inclusionary principal leadership and marrying the standards of practice for principals with principal preparation. The Wallace Foundation funded a pilot study with five states to expand the PESL standards with which Nevada's principal supervisor framework is aligned.
- The Center on Great Teachers and Leaders has announced that they will release their educator effectiveness study at the end of March and will host a webinar with representatives from Colorado and Tennessee. Kristin Withey will share the date and link to the webinar with TLC members once it has been posted.
- At the AASA Conference, there was an announcement that the Washington SEL and the Wallace Foundation are releasing a white paper on importance of rethinking role of principal supervisors. Chair Salazar noted that the current focus really is on principals and principal supervisors and suggests that this is in part due to the fact that around 2/3 of state ESSA plans focus on improving these personnel.

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

- The next TLC meeting is scheduled for May after the next SBE meeting where recommendations will be shared.
- There is a BDR being held for NEPF recommendations with the idea that there will be a fiscal note attached.

- Member Sanchez-Boyce thanked Member Small for encouraging the increased transparency of the district NEPF Liaison. She suggested that she would like to hear from those in the field undergoing the process. The actual implementation is quite different than the idealized.
- Member Okuda-Lim seconded the request to hear from Liaisons, the monitoring group, and different stakeholders working on components of the NEPF at the May meeting. This may inform the TLC's next steps. He also acknowledges that having worked with teachers and administrators on the Public Education Foundation's NEPF Task Force, it can be very different to hear from those implementing the frameworks.
- Member Small suggested that since peer assistance and review (PAR) was mentioned, we may want feedback from PAR subset. He cited a study conducted by UNLV around CCSD's 4 years of PAR implementation and mentioned that Washoe uses this process as well.

8) Public Comment #2

Carson City:

- None

Las Vegas:

- Sandy Herrera, Got Core Values. Stated that she frequently works on school culture transformation and hears a lot of feedback that the NEPF can be diminishing. Says that TLC's vision and direction moving towards continuous improvement aligns with that of her organization so she will take that back to their stakeholders to see it as tool for growth and development.
- Jana Pleggenkuhle, Chair of the Special Education Committee for CCEA. Stated that she found the TLC meeting very enlightening and hopes to share the true purpose of the NEPF as a valuable system to support educators and improve student outcomes. She directed members to review a position paper from the Council for Exceptional Children on special education teacher evaluation and shared their associated toolkit published in 2012.

9) Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 11:57 a.m.