

**Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF)  
2017-2018 Data Review & Teachers and Leaders Council  
Recommendation for NEPF Summative Score Ranges**

**Nevada State Board of Education Meeting**

**November 15, 2018**

**Agenda Item # 15**

# District Monitoring of NEPF

**NRS 391.485 Annual review of statewide performance evaluation system; annual review of manner in which schools carry out evaluations pursuant to system.**

1. The State Board shall annually review the statewide performance evaluation system to ensure accuracy and reliability. Such a review must include, without limitation, an analysis of the:

(a) Number and percentage of teachers and administrators who receive each designation identified in paragraph (a) of subsection 2 of NRS 391.465 in each school, school district, and the State as a whole;

(b) Data used to evaluate pupil growth in each school, school district and the State as a whole, including, without limitation, any observations; and

(c) Effect of the evaluations conducted pursuant to the statewide system of accountability for public schools on the academic performance of pupils enrolled in the school district in each school and school district, and the State as a whole.

2. The board of trustees of **each school district** shall annually review the manner in which schools in the school district carry out the evaluation of teachers and administrators pursuant to the statewide performance evaluation system.

3. The Department may review the manner in which the statewide performance evaluation system is carried out by each school district, including, without limitation, the manner in which the learning goals for pupils are established and evaluated pursuant to NRS 391.480.

# District NEPF Monitoring

- 6 districts have already presented data to their school board
- 5 have set dates on which the school board will review data
- 6 have not yet responded

# Guiding Questions for Districts

- Local School Boards may identify:
  - What evidence is there that district NEPF implementation practices focus on improved instruction/instructional leadership to positively impact student performance?
  - How has the district used the NEPF system results to improve teacher and leader practice?
  - What areas of NEPF implementation does the district need to focus on to potentially see greater improvement in student performance and educator practice?
  - What resources are needed in order to increase coherence of the NEPF system implementation in your district?

# NDE & West Comprehensive Center Project

- Collaborate with stakeholders to generate consensus on roles and responsibilities related to NEPF implementation
- Develop a framework and tools for districts to use to conduct annual NEPF reviews as required in NRS 391.485
- Develop a rubric that will enable the Department to evaluate the district's annual review
- Facilitate professional learning sessions to review data, identify problems of practice and strategies to address them in a continuous improvement cycle

# Historical Review of Domain Weights

School year	Instructional Practice	Professional Responsibilities	Student Performance
2015-2016	80%	20%	0% not measured for 2015-2016 school year
2016-2017	60%	20%	20%: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10% based on school-wide aggregate score from statewide assessment results</li> <li>• 10% based on SLG score</li> </ul>
2017-2018	60%	20%	20% student performance data based on SLG score

# NEPF Teacher Data

# Data Limitations

- Incomplete data from district
  - Possible causes include small N-size or data not reported
- Educators exempt per NRS 391.690
- Data does not include educators who separated from district prior to summative rating



# 2017-2018 NEPF Data Overview-Teachers

- Teachers with summative rating (n = 19,961)
- **Average Teacher NEPF Overall Score = 3.25 of 4 pts. poss.**
- **Average Instructional Practice Score (60%\*) = 3.24**
  - Highest average = Stand. 2 (*cognitive demand/diverse learners*)
  - Lowest average = Stand. 4 (*metacognition*)
- **Average Professional Responsibilities Score (20%\*) = 3.27**
  - Highest average = Stand. 1 (*commit/school community*)
  - Lowest average = Stand. 4 (*family engagement*)
- **Average Student Learning Goal Score (SLG) (20%\*) = 3.30**

\* Weights used for the 2017-2018 school year are different than those that will be used for the 2018-2019 school year


# 2017-2018 Teacher NEPF Data by District

LEA (Schools)	Average Instructional Practice Score	Average Professional Responsibilities Score	Average Student Learning Goal Score	Average Final Score
Carson City (11)	3.31	3.35	3.40	3.34
Churchill (6)	3.01	3.05	3.07	3.03
Clark (349)	3.17	3.19	3.21	3.19
Douglas (14)	3.35	3.42	3.31	3.36
Elko (20)	3.41	3.39	3.15	3.35
Eureka (3)	3.49	3.41	3.66	3.51
Humboldt (10)	3.27	3.37	3.39	3.31
Lander (4)	3.05	3.13	*	2.46
Lincoln (9)	3.28	3.35	3.00	3.24
Lyon (12)	3.43	3.43	3.30	3.40
Mineral (2)	3.13	3.23	*	2.53
Nye (24)	3.24	3.26	*	3.20
Pershing (4)	3.15	3.20	3.10	3.15
Storey (4)	3.52	3.49	3.11	3.27
Washoe (97)	3.40	3.51	3.67	3.47
White Pine (8)	3.28	3.09	3.35	3.21
Grand Total (577)	3.24	3.27	3.30	3.25

# 2017-2018 Teacher Distribution of Effectiveness Ratings


LEA (Schools)	# of Teachers	Percent Exempt Per NRS 391.690	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
Carson City (11)	380	8%	0.00%	5.20%	68.33%	26.47%
Churchill (6)	178	0	0.00%	4.20%	81.26%	14.54%
Clark (349)	15342	2%	0.14%	1.00%	88.40%	9.03%
Douglas (14)	281	8%	0.00%	1.42%	85.30%	22.46%
Elko (20)	372	35%	0.00%	0.50%	55.11%	40.46%
Eureka (3)	23	21%	0.00%	0.00%	46.80%	53.20%
Humboldt (10)	188	4%	0.00%	2.79%	69.48%	27.74%
Lander (4)	49	0	0.00%	1.00%	69.92%	4.08%
Lincoln (9)	81	0	0.00%	1.23%	82.26%	21.45%
Lyon (12)	285	18%	0.00%	1.64%	64.37%	30.22%
Mineral (2)	25	0	0.00%	7.69%	80.45%	11.86%
Nye (24)	276	0	0.15%	3.02%	73.85%	10.48%
Pershing (4)	50	0	0.00%	0.00%	71.36%	3.64%
Storey (4)	16	38%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%
Washoe (97)	2342	28%	0.07%	1.39%	61.25%	37.29%
White Pine (8)	73	0	0.66%	3.15%	80.86%	15.33%
<b>STATEWIDE (577)</b>	<b>19961</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0.11%</b>	<b>1.34%</b>	<b>80.11%</b>	<b>16.74%</b>
# of Teachers	-		25	242	17060	2640

# 2017-2018 Summative Teacher Ratings by District



# NEPF Teacher Ratings Data

## 3 Year Trend



# NEPF Administrator Data

# 2017-2018 NEPF Data Overview- Administrators

- Administrators evaluated (n=1089)
- **Average Administrator NEPF Overall Score = 3.23 of 4 pts. Poss.**
- **Average Instructional Leadership Practice Score (60%\*) = 3.33**
  - Highest average = Stand. 2 (*continuous improvement*)
  - Lowest average = Stand. 4 (*structures*)
- **Average Professional Responsibilities Score (20%\*) = 3.29**
  - Highest average = Stand. 3 (*prof. obligations*)
  - Lowest average = Stand. 4 (*family engagement*)
- **Average Student Learning Goal Score (20%\*) = 3.19**

\* Domain weight. Remaining 10% based school wide aggregate score

# 2017-2018 Administrator NEPF Data by District

LEA (Schools)	Administrators Scored	Average Instructional Practice Score	Average Professional Responsibilities Score	Average Student Learning	Average Overall Score
Carson City (11)	22	3.47	3.38	3.74	3.44
Churchill (6)	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed
Clark (349)	822	3.36	3.30	3.22	3.29
Douglas (14)	19	3.26	3.26	3.11	3.23
Elko (20)	24	3.14	3.10	2.50	2.83
Eureka (3)	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed
Humboldt (10)	11	3.28	3.28	2.43	3.11
Lander (4)	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed
Lincoln (9)	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed
Lyon (12)	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed
Mineral (2)	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed
Nye (24)	15	3.17	3.22		
Pershing (4)	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed
Storey (4)	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed
Washoe (97)	145	3.53	3.50	4.00	3.62
White Pine (8)	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed
Statewide Total	1089	3.24	3.25	3.11	3.20




# 2017-2018 Administrator Distribution of Effectiveness Ratings

LEA (Schools)	Number Scored	Percent Exempt Per NRS 391.710	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
Carson City (11)	22	12%	0.00%	0.00%	55.76%	36.36%
Churchill (6)	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed
Clark (349)	822	4%	0.00%	0.67%	79.18%	17.00%
Douglas (14)	19	0%	0.00%	5.26%	78.95%	15.79%
Elko (20)	24	29%	0.00%	3.13%	94.79%	4.17%
Eureka (3)	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed
Humboldt (10)	11	0%	0.00%	10.00%	35.00%	45.45%
Lander (4)	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed
Lincoln (9)	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed
Lyon (12)	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed
Mineral (2)	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed
Nye (24)	15	0%	0.00%	0.00%	45.83%	0.00%
Pershing (4)	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed
Storey (4)	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed
Washoe (97)	145	19%	0.00%	0.00%	0.56%	44.83%
White Pine (8)	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed	suppressed
<b>STATEWIDE</b>	<b>1089</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>1.01%</b>	<b>77.78%</b>	<b>21.21%</b>
# Admin.			0	11	847	231



Data suppressed due to small n-size or data was not reported by district

# 2017-2018 Summative Administrator Ratings by District



Districts with suppressed or missing data removed from graphical representation

# Student Learning Goals (SLG)

# SLG Process – Protocols p. 21

## Step 1: Develop and approve SLG

- Review course objectives and standards to identify most important learning for the year
- Identify assessments that will be used to measure progress toward SLG
- Review and collect baseline data
- Draft SLG and set performance targets based on baseline data
- Evaluation of proposed SLG and approval by the evaluator

## Step 2: Monitor progress toward SLG

- Delivery of instruction/instructional leadership
- Monitor progress/discuss
- Revise supports and interventions as needed
- Make revisions to SLG at Mid-Cycle Goal Review if necessary

## Step 3: Evaluate attainment of SLG


- Assess students' progress/review results
- Evaluator reviews SLG attainment and assigns a score based on the rubric
- Educator and Evaluator reflect on the process and results

# SLG Assessment Selection Criteria Per R138-17 (Adopted 5-16-2018)

- **Assessments used to measure must:**
  - Align with content standards/Nevada Academic Content Standards (NVACS) and curriculum
  - Align with the intended level or rigor
  - Have as high a degree of psychometric validity, and reliability as feasible
  - Monitoring includes alignment, instrument security, reliability, validity, comparability, feasibility and scoring

# SLG Assessment Priority

## Per R138-17 (Approved 5-16-2018)




# SLG Scoring Rubric – Protocols p. 23

SLG Scores	Score Descriptors
High = 4	Multiple sources of growth or achievement data from at least two points in time show evidence of <b>high growth</b> and <b>high impact</b> for <b>all or nearly all</b> students
Moderate = 3	Multiple sources of growth or achievement data from at least two points in time show <b>clear</b> evidence of growth and impact for <b>most</b> students
Low = 2	Multiple sources of growth or achievement data from at least two points in time show <b>clear</b> evidence of growth and impact for <b>some</b> students
Unsatisfactory = 1	The educator <b>has not</b> met the expectation described in the SLG and has demonstrated an <b>insufficient impact</b> on student learning



# 2017-2018 Average SLG by District




\*Districts did not report SLG data





# 2017-2018 Average SLG by 2017-2018 NSPF Star Ratings



# Teachers and Leaders Council Recommendation

# Authority – NRS 391.465

NRS 391.465 “State Board to establish statewide performance evaluation system and prescribe tools to be used by schools to measure performance; school district authorized to apply to use different performance evaluation system and tools; prohibition against evaluating certain administrators using statewide performance evaluation system.

1. The State Board shall, based upon the recommendations of the Teachers and Leaders Council of Nevada submitted pursuant to NRS 391.460, adopt regulations establishing a statewide performance evaluation system which incorporates multiple measures of an employee’s performance. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 3, the State Board shall prescribe the tools to be used by a school district for obtaining such measures.

2. The statewide performance evaluation system must:

(a) Require that an employee’s overall performance is determined to be:

- (1) Highly effective;
- (2) Effective;
- (3) Developing; or
- (4) Ineffective.

**(b) Include the criteria for making each designation identified in paragraph (a)...”**

# Historical Review of Domain Weights

School Year	Instructional Practice	Professional Responsibilities	Student Performance
2015-2016	80%	20%	0% not measured for 2015-2016 school year
2016-2017	60%	20%	20%: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10% based on school-wide aggregate score from statewide assessment results</li> <li>• 10% based on SLG score</li> </ul>
2017-2018	60%	20%	20% student performance data based on SLG score
2018-2019	45%	15%	40% student performance data based on SLG score

# NEPF Score Ranges

Score Ranges 15-16, 16-17, 17-18

Overall Score Range	Final Rating
3.6 – 4.0	Highly Effective
2.8 – 3.59	Effective
1.91 – 2.79	Minimally Effective
1.0 – 1.9	Ineffective

TLC Recommends same Score Ranges for 2018-2019

Overall Score Range	Final Rating
3.6 – 4.0	Highly Effective
2.8 – 3.59	Effective
1.91 – 2.79	Developing
1.0 – 1.9	Ineffective

# TLC's Recommendation for State Board Motion

The Teachers and Leaders Council recommends for 2018-2019 school year the NEPF score ranges remain the same as in previous years to allow for comparability of the distribution of ratings across multiple years.