



TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL

October 30, 2019 9: 22 AM

Meeting Locations:

OFFICE	ADDRESS	CITY	MEETING ROOMS
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Rd.	Las Vegas	Board Room#114
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth Street	Carson City	Board Room

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

(Video Conferenced)

MEMBERS PRESENT:

In Las Vegas

- Jim Cooney
- Kathleen Galland-Collins
- Anthony Nunez
- Zhan Okuda-Lim
- Brian Rippet
- Pam Salazar
- Theodore Small
- Meredith Smith

In Carson City

- Theresa White
- Mary Owens
- Mike Walker
- Dee Ann Roberts

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

In Las Vegas

- Kristin Withey – Education Programs Professional
- Felicia Gonzalez – Deputy Superintendent

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT:

In Las Vegas

- David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General

PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE:

In Las Vegas:

- Karen Stanley, SNRPDP

Bill Garrison, CCASA  
Jana Pleggenkuhle, CSSDE – SSD PD  
Chris Day, NSFA  
Brenda Pearson, CCEA  
Vikki Courtney, CCEA

**Carson City:**

Jose Delfin, Carson City School District  
Dr. Sarah Negrete  
Tom Regan  
Sarah Cunningham

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

Chair Salazar called the meeting to order at 9:22 am.

**2) Public Comment #1**

In Elko: none

In Las Vegas: none

In Carson City: Marissa McLish, Professional Growth Systems Project Coordinator in Washoe County School District.

Ms. McLish stated that she was asked to speak by Kristin Withey regarding the areas that need additional clarification regarding the implementation of SLGs in Washoe County. She thanked Kristin for the work that has already been done in this area. She shared the formative assessment process they're district is engaging in regarding SLGs and she identified areas of strength and growing points. Ms. McLish stated that the SLGs will illuminate the good and the not so good at all levels, individual, groups, departments, schools, and district. She provided additional language in a written document, the contents of which are in italics below:

***Positives***

*Appreciate the increased support by NDE. Kristin has been a wonderful addition. There is a renewed collaborative spirit and valuable conversations regarding successes and areas for growth*

*Having SLG Protocols with alignment to evaluations (professional growth)*

*TLC Beliefs, Evaluation System Goals and Purposes*

***Challenges***

*SLG Protocols*

*Leave so much to positive presupposition for Example in the past administrators and teachers will agree on the SLG old language (what if they don't)–“The SLG must be approved by the evaluator”*

*Assessment priorities don't align to the process*

*The higher the psychometric quality of an exam, the broader the scope. If an SLG is to focus on specific standards (mimicking an effective PLC process) then assessments must be timely and aligned to specific standards*

*SLGs are long-term, measurable, academic goals set for students to accomplish by the end of a course.....evaluating student attainment of the goal at the end of the school year”.- the planning for an SLG is extensive consisting of examining student data or needs, selecting standards relevant to current student needs, determining an aligned assessment, getting approval from administration. SLGs must be completed, approved, and scored by evaluation*

time. This only leaves about 18 weeks for implementing the SLG content and at an odd time of year- challenging for secondary teachers who change students at semester.

Topics where we had to build our own clarification:

Attendance-80% of the instructional interval

Students absent during an assessment for SLG-teachers put in good faith effort for students to make up assessment rather than letting them exclude

When an administrator does not approve of the assessment or rigor of the SLG and a teacher is unwilling to change it- SLG is "Ineffective"

Leave cases

Late hires

Expectations for SLG feedback and support from administrators and review teams

Expectation that all students will grow

**Overlooked teaching assignments impacted by the SLG-**

Credit recovery teachers using online programs, not giving instruction

Behavior-based teachers

Pull out teachers/intervention with rotating rosters based on MTSS processes

Severely impacted students with longer term growth trajectories (Picollo WCSD, Stewart and Miller CCSD)

Broader challenges-

Assessment literacy for teachers and Administrators. Backward planning based on an understanding of standards and success criteria is our biggest challenge. Teachers use assessments every day to determine student success, helpful for administrators to see what teachers are deeming as a rigorous assessment, more helpful when administrator or review team is able to redirect teachers with assessments that are not grade level or assessing the intent of the standard.

Mastery of content, grading, etc. How do we measure success? What do % and grades really mean? This is a component of an effective PLC, a challenge to schools and districts with teachers who are not aligned in grading practices

Both of the above issues lead to Opportunity Gaps for students, consistent with TNTP's Opportunity Myth

"The educator and evaluator review the SLG Scoring Rubric and discuss expectations and learning targets associated with each level 1-4. Expectations must be clear to both the evaluator and educator" ...if the administrator is not strong with standards, assessment, and rigor this is problematic

### **3) Approval of Meeting Minutes for June 13, 2019**

Chair Salazar asked members to review the minutes.

**Member Smith made the motion to approve the June 13 TLC meeting minutes. Member Nunez seconded.**

**Motion passed unanimously at 9:31 AM**

Chair Salazar welcomed the new member Mike Walker. Mike is the new member representing school boards.

### **4) Nevada Department of Education—Updates**

Member Collins shared that at the July 17, 2019 State Board of Education, Deputy Superintendent Felicia Gonzalez presented the TLC recommendations for the domain weights adjusted to comply with SB 475 and updated rubric

language for the educational audiologists and school nurses. The State Board approved the Council's recommendations. The next step will be to hold a public workshop to revise the language in NAC.

Dr. Kristin Withey provided NEPF Implementation & Communications updates. School counselors, nurses, psychologists, social workers, SLPs, and teacher-librarians are in their second year of full implementation. The educational audiologists are in their first full year of implementation with their revised language approved at the June TLC meeting. Principal supervisors are completing an additional pilot year, with more information to be shared by Dr. Salazar later in the agenda.

During the 2019 Monitoring for Continuous Improvement and data collection process, the 2019-2020 lists of NEPF Liaisons was established and will be up on the NEPF website, upon approval at the first NEPF Liaison meeting on Monday, November 4<sup>th</sup> at 10 am. Following this meeting, there will be an updated newsletter shared with these identified representatives of all 17 districts. This newsletter is allowed to be distributed.

Member Collins shared that there are several Council positions up for reappointment, including RPDP representative, teachers, OLEP, and one administrator. It has been reported that all recommending agencies have submitted their recommendations and are now waiting on the appointments from the governor's office.

Dr. Kristin Withey continued with updates for the Teacher-Librarian weights. The Teacher Librarian workgroup met Wednesday, July 24<sup>th</sup> to discuss domain weights in reaction to SB 475's adjusted student learning goal weight. The workgroup decided that the weights will remain in line with the previous decision of equal distribution. The weights for the 2019-2020 Teacher-Librarian NEPF are as follows:

- SLG: 15% (per SB 475)
- Instructional Practice: 42.5%
- Professional Responsibilities: 42.5%

OLEP Reconvening – Dr. Withey reported that based off of group feedback sessions completed early spring 2019, the counselors, nurses, and speech language pathologists have requested to reconvene their workgroups of representatives from across the state to revise their rubrics and level language to align with updated national standards and/or be reflective of the work of the professional within the context of Nevada. These revisions will be presented at the January 2020 TLC meeting, and upon recommendation of the Council, will be taken to the SBE in time for implementation during the 2020-20201 school year.

Member Collins continued with SB 475 Updates:

NEPF Online Tool - Department staff and leadership have been in discussions around SB475's requirement that the department provide for a technology platform. They have been gathering information by exploring options currently in use across the state of Nevada. Impact and Validity Study: staff has completed a formal Request for Information related to the SB 475's mandated impact and validity study. The estimated cost has now been submitted to the Interim Finance Committee as a funding request. Allocations should be determined in December. After that point, a formal Request for Proposals will be released for vendor response.

Member were reminded of the upcoming TLC Meeting on Wednesday, January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2020

Member Collins introduced the new member of their staff Arina Kazemi and asked members to introduce themselves and remember to state their names before they speak on the record.

## **5) Curriculum and Instruction Recommended by TLC and Statewide Training for Teachers and Administrators Pursuant to NRS 391.544**

Dr. Sarah Negrete, NERPDP Director, reported on the professional learning they've provided for this academic year in their region. They have provided NEPF introductions for the new hires in August and September in the 3 districts that requested the training. They have launched and completed 3 full days of training for their teachers who are in the Teacher Academy during which they spent 5 days diving deeply into the NEPF standards and indicators. The NERPDP staff have also started and launched a series of book studies specifically for administrators. The focus is on 3 books and alignment to the NEPF for school administrators and how they can use the knowledge in their every-day work.

Additionally, Pam Salazar partnered with the NERPDP to provide a workshop for administrators regarding the use of NEPF data for effective instructional leadership. The training was very well received. Pam has been back for additional sessions to bring new participants up to date and to provide follow up sessions to the whole group.

They have been providing NEPF Instructional Practice Standards training each month to the faculty. Chair Salazar thanked Director Negrete and asked for additional information.

Director Negrete answered that it was the Wendover Middle School in Elko County School District.

Chair Salazar asked if there were any questions from Dr. Negrete.

Sarah Cunningham, Director of the Northwest RPDP, shared that they have provided direct training for approximately 80 teachers in 5 of the 6 school districts served. This training consisted of an overview of the NEPF and the analysis of the 5 Instructional Practice Standards and Indicators. The Northwest RPDP has 5 new trainers that have received about 15 hours of intensive training on the NEPF. All of their staff is prepared to deliver training and incorporate it into their content training throughout the school year. They have also had about 80 administrators (most in their first, second, or third year as administrators) that are receiving support through coaching and mentoring in 5 of their school districts. Their administrative support team is working one on one with the administrators; coming out to the school site, providing support with the NEPF, working through the standards, doing observation analysis, research reviews and at various times of school year. They spend a lot of time in the schools with those administrators. She added the final thing for administrators is they have 2 trainers that are facilitating a second year principle cohort in Washoe County. They are working with those administrators after contract hours and contents around NEPF and then again going into school site and supporting through mentoring and coaching model.

Chair Salazar asked if there are any questions and comments from Sarah Cunningham. There were no questions or comments from the Council

Chair Salazar introduced Karen Stanley, SNRPDP Administrative Consultant, to share information on behalf of Dr. Chelli Smith. Ms. Stanley stated that professional learning sessions are centered around NEPF standards so they always incorporate and connect them with all training that they do. Training is also aligned to the Nevada Professional Developments Standards. The SNRPDP provides an outline of dates and sessions offered, and includes that information in monthly updates to Clark County School District leadership to ensure that the information is shared in their administrator's weekly wire. She then reminded the Council that their sessions are not mandatory. Administrators can register for those classes based on the needs they have at their building. SNRPDP also facilitates book studies. The trainings and book studies are focused on leadership practices and school improvement, building collective teacher advocacy, creating a collaborative culture, formative assessment practices, and assessment capable learners. They also train on SLG processes as well as incorporating the analysis of data to make informed decisions around every aspect of school improvement. SNRPDP continues to provide NEPF Inter-rater reliability training sessions throughout the year to new and veteran administrators. Ms. Stanley went on to state that they also offer sessions based on school needs. They go out to schools, to provide supports as requested, including, but not limited to, learning walks and coaching. In Mineral County, they offer the same type of professional learning sessions. Dr. Salazar has contacted and discussed training opportunities with all of the superintendents in their area. They are continuing to work with Lincoln County administrators and have been there 3 times so far this year. She reiterated what Dr. Negrete mentioned in her testimony regarding the trainings Pam Salazar did in Elko. Pam is continuing to talk with superintendents about the Principal Supervisor Framework field study and training sessions. She shared that their content teams are still embedding the NEPF Instructional Standards in every professional learning session they provide.

Dr. Salazar thanked Karen Stanley and asked if there were any questions.

Member Smith asked, if they offered the whole administrative team training, how many school leadership teams are taking advantage of that?

Karen Stanley stated that they have 5 schools that had reached out to them, but this only came about the last month. So, they're just now getting out to schools.

Dr. Salazar asked if there were any additional questions or comments for SNRPDP. Member Okuda-Lim thanked Karen Stanley for the work that they are doing and for taking the training directly to administrators at their schools. At a recent meeting he had with administrators in Clark County there were several that had expressed concern that time was an issue. Dr. Salazar stated that they're also now offering a session that starts after the school day in an effort to help address the issue of being out of the building. She stated they were trying several approaches to providing supports.

## **6) Principal Supervisor Implementation Update**

Chair Salazar provided information regarding the field study of the Principal Supervisor NEPF. There are 11 districts that are participating in the Field Study. Including a couple of districts that are participating where it is the superintendent who is the principal supervisor. Even though they are not evaluated under this NEPF Principle Supervisor Evaluation Framework, they want to use it in order to better support their principals. Chair Salazar shared that in the information and resources shared with the field study participants there are a number of materials that were created last year, using some of the work that Dr Clifford with America Institute of Research (AIR), and Dr. Honig at Washington State University had done in this area of study. The resources included, but were not limited to, links to some of the videos Washington State University has made available through the Center for Educational Leadership Policy, and additional resources provided by AIR and CCSSO. She shared that field study orientation Zoom Meetings were held November 4<sup>th</sup>, November 8<sup>th</sup>, and November 18<sup>th</sup>. Participants could choose to attend any one (or all) of them. She shared that she plans to use Zoom as much as possible to provide them onsite support as they dive into the standards and look at how some of these resources can help them the work in their unique context. Onsite trainings will also be provided.

## **7) Review of NEPF Summative Evaluation Data and Development of Recommendations for the 2019-2020 Scoring Ranges Used to Determine Ratings of Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective.**

Dr. Kristin Withey shared Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) 2018-2019 Data Review presentation. She provided an overview of the NEPF Monitoring per NRS 391.485, reviewed the NEPF scores submitted, and reviewed the current score ranges.

Dr. Salazar asked for clarification about the data for exempt educators. Dr. Withey stated that the numbers of exempt educators was not captured in this data set. Member Owens reminded the Council and public that the weight of the SLG score for this set of data was at 40%. She expects that the distribution of Highly Effective and Effective will change once the weight is at 15%. Member Rippet stated the draft shows very dramatically how teachers and evaluators are not willing to be completely honest in the evaluation when this stakes are so high at 40%. He asked to Council to keep that in mind when score ranges are being determined. He went on to say that if the Council sets them too high, then they're not going to allow for honesty. Council members discussed the need to keep the weights consistent for the next few years in order to be able to have a clear comparison across multiple data sets.

Dr. Kristin Withey continued with the presentation. Member Smith commented about both the School Psychologists and School Counselor data showing that the lowest areas were collaborating and data usage. She stated that a really important component of school special education teams is that they are supposed to collaborate in order to share one another's expertise in service to the student. She wanted to put that on the record because she thought school counselors and school psychologists are experts in the usage of the data. Dr. Withey reviewed the current score ranges for each framework and reminded the group that the official score ranges for Educational Audiologists still needs to be determined. Chair Salazar opened up the floor for discussion and member thoughts regarding whether or not to change score ranges. Member Rippet commented that the changes in the last legislative session and the intent to move toward a system that's not punishing but truly developing and growing, he is less inclined to want to change the score ranges. Council members discussed the potential for the NEPF Impact and Validity Study to inform future decisions regarding score ranges and domain weights. **Member Cooney moved to keep the score ranges the same for the 2019-2020 school year for consistency.**

**Member White seconded that motion**

Chair Salazar clarified that the motion would include Educational Audiologists and the current score ranges for Speech Language Pathologists as shown on the screen. Members Cooney and White agreed.

Chair Salazar called for the vote. **The motion carried unanimously.**

The Council took a brief break. Dr. Salazar resumed the meeting at approximately 10:51 and moved to agenda item number 8.

## **8) NEPF Monitoring For Continuous Improvement: Summary of Results to Date**

Dr. Kristin Withey, Education Programs Professional presented that this past year Nevada Department of Education found authority within NRS 391.485 to monitor the local implementation of the NEPF system. The NDE collaborated with external experts and several of Nevada's education stakeholders in what was called the NEPF Monitoring for Continuous Improvement Advisory Group. TLC members have been provided updates on the groups progress in the development of the NEPF Monitoring for Continuous Improvement Guidance Document and Guidance Memo for LEAs to use during their annual NEPF reviews. All of the information or the requirements for that were found in Guidance Memo 19-03 that was published in May. In association with that, there was a Guidance Document that outlined four (4) distinct tasks to be completed by LEAs. The LEAs worked to administer the teacher and administrator surveys as directed by that Guidance Document. They are then expected to review these data alongside other relevant local information to self-assess the local implementation of the NEPF system. They were expected to engage in an interview with NDE representatives about the local implementation and then share information with their local school boards. Dr. Withey went on to report that 11 districts have already presented their data or have dates set to present data to their school board. 6 districts have not yet reported to the Nevada Department of Education when they have presented information to the school boards. Sixteen districts have already completed their NEPF Monitoring for Continuous Improvement LEA-SEA interview with the final interview scheduled to be completed in November. She shared a summary of the responses to the interview questions. In general the district leadership interviewed expressed appreciation of the visits and the opportunity for extended conversation. NDE staff were able to connect districts with additional resources or ideas to leverage NEPF.

Member Collins shared that an example of something that they were able to suggest is the idea of looking at the highest and lowest indicator scores in the self assessments and the summative evaluations to inform the design and implementation of professional learning. She went on to share that she and Kristin also shared that RPDP content trainings embed the NEPF Standards, and suggested that districts may want to leverage those trainings as a way to continue to improve tier 1 instruction aligned to the NEPF standards. Dr. Kristin Withey continued by highlighting some best practices that are employed by districts and shared that 12 of 17 districts are using tech tools to implement the NEPF. Six districts gave feedback requesting that the system allow the option to focus on one standard per year in order to give targeted feedback. The data showed that some districts are mandating that all educators use the same assessment with which to measure their SLG progress. Some have also added objective percentages to their SLG scoring rubric. Dr. Withey went on to share that in at least one case a district built a professional learning system where if an administrator attends training, their score on the NEPF is moved up.

Member White asked a question about the professional development learning system where an administrator attends training and score is moved up. She asked Dr. Withey to talk a little more about that, because it's already an indicator that we measure and it seems problematic to her. Dr. Whitey answered that one district cited that they reward their administrators for attending professional learning opportunities such as RPDP training etc. Dr. Withey shared that several districts requested additional guidance around SLGS and what to do for English learners and students with special needs. Many cited that there were no areas to reflect on classroom management, blatant conduct errors, or the ethics of teaching. One district mentioned that Level 1 is so low that if the teacher reaches one student, they automatically receive level 2 e.g. Standard 3, Indicator 3: teacher uses no/almost no..." so the level language did not allow for Ineffective. She shared that additional guidance was requested around if somebody is on FML(Family Medical Leave), how can one have an SLG over which they are actually having an impact or how do they apply this to varied roles e.g. math, P.E., band? Other districts mentioned that it was difficult to review the NEPF data in conjunction with ACT, Aspect or NSPF data because systems can't talk to one another. Additional feedback asked for increased local control / autonomy. Districts stated that they would make sure all the "boxes" are checked, but will continue to use only those pieces that they deem important. They were not adverse to professional standards, but would like local control over implementation.

Dr. Salazar: Thanked Dr. Withey and member Collins for very comprehensive report. Then she asked Member Collins if she wanted to provide any additional comments. Member Collins let TLC members know that she and Dr. Withey took this opportunity when they were meeting with district personnel to share information about RPDs and the State Leadership Network. They talked about the tools, protocols, and the resources that are in development. Member Walker stated that he was part of one of these groups for Lyon County. He stated it was actually a really great discussion. They were able to share not just the hiccups they were having within their schools, but were able to problem solve with Member Collins and Dr. Withey. He thought the process was very well implemented. Dr. Salazar thanked Member Walker.

Member Nunez asked for clarification about question 4 in which feedback stated there was a lack of alignment between NEPF and NSPF. Dr. Withey answered that some districts stated that the school star ratings did not necessarily match the scores of the administrators or teachers. There are 2 star schools in which all teachers are rated as Highly Effective.

Member Nunez stated that of all the comments, he found that the most interesting and he offered a wondering; His experience in working in under performing schools, and as one who has always been challenged to ensure rapid improvement, it is understandable that schools in that situation would emphasize solutions oriented to or directed towards tier 2 or tier 3 instruction, instead of tier one instruction. He went on to say that Tier 1 instruction does have an impact on NSPF. However, Tier 1 solutions are usually long term. That may be what is being reflected in that situation. Member Collins thanked member Nunez for comment and stated that they were working on some resources internally that Dr. Whitey was going to show as part of another agenda item. The resources should help that tier 1 conversation. Especially around providing supports for EL students and for special education teachers.. Member White asked about the process the Department was taking to address the districts that had not yet shared their NEPF data with their school boards. Member Collins responded that additional contact will be made via email or phone with follow up with NDE leadership if necessary.

## **9) Discussion about the Development of Additional Business Rules for the Student Learning Goal.**

Dr. Withey shared the collection of materials gathered from districts and the current NEPF Protocols regarding SLGs. One of the documents reviewed was a SLG rubric that prescribed specific percentages to each performance level.

Dr. Salazar shared a brief history of the process TLC undertook when developing the NEPF SLG rubric. The Council reviewed rubrics from Rhode Island and several other states that included specific percentages. Since then Rhode Island has changed to a rubric that looks more like the NEPF SLG rubric. They changed because of so much gaming of the system. They found the people started to manipulate numbers in order to show the preferred percentages. This is why TLC went with a SLG rubric modeled after what Pennsylvania had done.

Dr. Withey shared additional information and feedback from districts. Including, but not limited to, the request for additional guidance regarding how to implement SLG with teachers who start mid-year, what to do when there is a disagreement between the educator and evaluator on the SLG etc. Dr. Salazar thanked Dr. Withey and turned to Member Collins regarding the example of when there is not agreement between the administrator and the teacher. Member Collins answered in the situation like that much of what should be done is up to district leadership and/ or the collective bargaining agreement. She went on to express that it doesn't necessarily prevent TLC from offering additional guidance. The Council would just have to be very aware of limitations. Chair Salazar stated that the guiding principle from the NEPF is that evaluation should be done with the educators and not to them. The whole system operates from that belief that we're all in this together trying to figure out how we can better serve students.

Dr. Salazar asked for other thoughts or comments and suggested the Council ask the Department to create an SLG workgroup discuss the SLG Protocols and provide feedback to the TLC regarding additional SLG business rules.

The Council discussed the criteria for assessment used to measure progress on the SLG and how that came about. Member Okuda Lim responded that according to his quick internet search it appears as if additional requirements regarding the measurement of SLGs came about as a result of AB320 during the 2017 session.

Dr. Salazar thanked the group and asked for any other comments on business rules around the SLG the Council wants the workgroup to consider.

Member White declared understanding the conversation 3 years ago regarding percentages within the rubric. However in some discussions with administrators and her executive team who evaluates principals. They found that the guidance from another district that they looked at helped them make decision to create a little bit more consistent inter-rater reliability because it gave them a framework for deciding between 2,3and 4.

Dr. Salazar asked for a motion to form a SLG workgroup led by the Department

**Member Rippet moved to approve the formation of an NDE workgroup to provide feedback to TLC regarding SLG business rules.**

**Member Okuda-Lim seconded the motion. Chair Salazar called for the vote.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General, asked Chair Salazar to clarify if this was a TLC subcommittee or a NDE workgroup. Chair Salazar confirmed that this will be a NDE workgroup that may include a few TLC members. The workgroup will bring suggestions to the Council at the next meeting.

## **10) Discussion Around SB 475, Consideration of Class Size and Perhaps Additional Business Rules**

Dr. Withey shared materials that included a copy of SB475 and various sections of the Nevada Revised Statutes, including, but not limited to, NRS 388.890, pertaining to class size requirements. She explained the purpose of the agenda item is to foster a discussion around SB475's 'Consideration of Class Size' and the possible changes to NEPF Protocols based on requirement. Chair Salazar explained that the question before the Council is regarding what criteria or changes to the NEPF should be considered in related to class size and impact on the educator's ability to carry out his/her professional responsibilities. She asked if this was something the council members wanted to determine at this meeting, or if the SLG workgroup should be tasked with providing recommendations at the next TLC meeting. Council members discussed the topic and expressed the need to make sure the workgroup understood that the consideration of class size is in relation to how class size may impact an educator's ability to carry out his or her professional responsibilities and instructional practices. Chair Salazar also stated that the Council should review what other states are doing regarding this topic. The Council members agreed to have the workgroup bring back recommendations regarding the consideration of class size.

## **11) Impact and validity Study: Review of Desired Research Questions to be Explored**

Dr. Withey shared the Potential Research Questions document that was developed based on previous discussion during the TLC meeting. She compiled the questions after looking at some national studies that have looked at impact and validity of teacher evaluation systems. The questions in the document include those discussed at previous TLC meetings and samples from the studies researched. The Council discussed the requirements outlined in SB475 and the steps the Department has taken so far to contract with a vendor to complete the NEPF Impact and Validity study. Council members discussed the list of proposed questions and gave input regarding the expectations of the NEPF impact and validity study.

## **12) Presentation of Developed Questions for Stakeholder Feedback**

Dr. Withey shared that the meeting material posted for this agenda item came directly from the educator effectiveness system assessment developed by the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders, the American Institute of Research (AIR), and from West Comprehensive Center (West CC). She stated that the purpose of this agenda item is to get feedback from the Council members to make sure the questions fit the purpose of the questionnaire. Dr. Salazar asked TLC members to take a few moments and read through the list to choose or revise questions that will be asked of stakeholders in order to learn more about implementation and impact of NEPF. Council members

discussed the draft questions. The Department was asked to take their feedback and revise the list to keep the focus on systems level questions that will be asked of NEPF liaisons.

### **13) HLP and ELD Alignment Documents**

Dr. Withey shared two documents that were created with stakeholder input. The purpose of each document is to provide additional guidance and information to support the implementation of the NEPF in classrooms with a high population of English learners or special education students. The first document reviewed was the crosswalk of the NEPF Instructional Practice Standards and Indicators with the English Language Development (ELD) framework. The ELD framework are standards that are intended to articulate a research based approach for instruction of emergent bilingual students who are identified as English learners (EL). The crosswalk will serve as a guide for teachers of EL students and administrators in buildings with high EL populations. The content is designed to support a teacher in advocating and explaining best practices for teaching EL students. It provides a common language for discussion on instruction of EL students. The document is designed to provide support to an administrator who needs to coach and support their teachers to be able to connect EL best practices with the NEPF Instructional Practice Standards. Dr. Withey expressed gratitude to the members of the work group, Maria Cieslak, Michelle Heneghen, Jackie Smith and Tanya Caron. Dr. Withey went on to share the second document, which is a crosswalk of all the NEPF Instructional Practice and Professional Responsibilities Standard and Indicators with the High Leverage Practices (HLP)s for teaching students with special needs. The HLPs were a combined effort of CEEDAR (Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform), and the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) which is the premier professional organization for teachers of students with special needs. The purpose of the NEPF and HLP document is to provide additional information to special education teachers and their supervisors in order to help them make the connections between the NEPF standards and the special education HLPs. The document was developed with special education stakeholders. Dr. Withey expressed gratitude to the work group members, Andrew Morgan from NDE, Jana Pleggenkuhle, Marva Cleven, MaryAnn Demchak, Donald Mark Edmondson, Richard Fuller, Dr. Roberta Kaufman, Paula Kerchenski, Candace Mapp, Dr. Lori Navarete, Jodee Prudente, C. Jean Reynolds-Trudell, Dr. Patti Schultz, Cathy Scott, and Kim Zunino. All of whom are representatives from across the state. The group consisted teachers, coaches, special education facilitators, district special education representatives, administrators, and higher education members. Member Collins let the Council members know that both documents were drafts, and additional time would be needed to review the vignettes to make sure they are aligned with Performance Levels 3 and 4 before they are officially released as guidance.

Members discussed the documents and asked the Department to ensure that the vignettes included examples across grade spans. Member Collins thanked Dr. Withey and reported that the Department has plans to complete similar documents for early childhood educators and to support social emotional learning competencies.

### **14) Future Agenda Items:**

Dr. Salazar stated that the next meeting will include recommendations from the work group regarding class size considerations and SLGs business rules. Additionally, the Council will review the final draft of the system level survey questions and there will be an update on the Principle Supervisor field study.

Member Okuda-Lim suggested a possible future agenda item particularly for January would be to perhaps invite some NEPF liaisons from the districts to share with the TLC the work that they and their colleagues are doing at the district level to get the information out to educators.

### **15) Public Comment:**

No comment in Elko

No comment in Carson City

Public comment in Las Vegas:

Jana Pleggenkuhle, CSSDE – SSD PD first thanked TLC and explained that she was at the TLC meeting 6 months ago and that a lot has occurred since that meeting. She stated that she just wanted to come and say thank you to the Council and especially to Dr. Withey. She stated that she was part of workgroup that worked on the HLP and NEPF crosswalk. She wanted to remind TLC members that her concerns remain regarding the NEPF and what it looks like

for special educators. She also expressed the need to have a special educator on the SLG/Class size work group. She stated that she was willing to share names of educators she thought might be helpful to the process. She expressed concern that the documents would not be widely distributed or read.

## **16) Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 1:18 p.m.