

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATEWIDE COUNCIL FOR THE
COORDINATION OF THE REGIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS
FEBRUARY 15, 2017
10:00 A.M.**

Meeting Locations:

The meeting will be video conferenced from both locations.

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	9890 S. Maryland Pkwy	Las Vegas	Board Room (2 nd Floor)
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St	Carson City	Board Room

MINUTES

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

Meeting called to order at 10:05 Am

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call:

Members:

Las Vegas:

Lou DeSalvio
Debbie Brockett
Erin Grossman
Rod Broadnax
Jeff Zander
Brent Husson
Dr Wendi Hawk

Carson:

Dr. Sandra Sheldon
Nicolette Smith
Aaron Grossman

NDE Staff:

Chantel Wakefield
Kelee Dupuis
Dena Durish

Public:

Las Vegas:

Chelli Smith
Sarah Negrete

Carson:

Kirsten Gleissner

2. Public Comment #1

There was no public comment.

3. Introduction of New Member – Brent Husson, Nevada Succeeds (Superintendent Appointee)

Chair Zander presented Brent Husson from Nevada Succeeds.

4. Flexible Agenda Approval

Motion

- Member Hawk motioned for a flexible agenda

- Member Sheldon seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion passed at 10:08 AM**

5. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes for May 13, 2016

Motion

- Member DeSalvio moved to approve the May minutes
- Member Broadnax seconded the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion carried at 10:08 AM**

6. Nevada Department of Education Updates

Dena Durish introduced Chantel Wakefield and Kelee Dupuis as new Council staff. Dena gave a brief overview of the history of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) to the Council. She stated that the ESSA Advisory work began in May of 2016 and NDE put together several workgroups. These workgroups gave their recommendations to the main ESSA advisory group. All of the work finished on January 3rd. Dena asked the Council to review the New Nevada ESSA plan online and give their input. NDE is submitting the plan to the US Department of Education in April. She stated that the most important pieces of the report are the appendices at the end that show the recommendations from the workgroups and the ESSA Advisory group's response. Deputy Durish personally staffed the teaching and leading workgroup. Some of the items discussed in that particular workgroup are: the elimination of "Highly qualified" as a status for teachers- now NDE uses inexperienced versus experienced, looking into redoing the Nevada Data Report Card, and how NDE calculates a school's star rating. Chair Zander and Member Smith were both on workgroups as well.

Dena Durish shared the Great Teacher and Leading Fund (GTLF) external evaluation and notified the Council that FY16 GTLF awardee final reports are on the Department of Education website.

7. SB474 Advisory Task Force on Professional Development Final Report

Kelee Dupuis stated that the Task Force submitted its final report on seven areas of study: the cost of professional development, federal funding available for the professional development; the effectiveness of the delivery of professional development is delivered, the standards and quality of professional development; the effectiveness of the programs for professional development, professional development for paraprofessionals and other educational personnel; and the structure for the delivery of professional development. Kelee also listed the meeting dates and members of the Task Force.

The first category that the Task Force gave recommendations for is Professional Development Standards. The recommendations in this category are: 1) Direct the State Board of Education (SBE) to adopt a specific set of standards for use by all districts and RPDP's, 2) Direct the State Board of Education to align proposed standards and student performance outcomes to program evaluations, and 3) update NRS to reflect the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) definition of PD.

The second category is budget recommendations. The recommendations under this area are: 1) GTLF appropriations should continue, 2) adequate initial funding should be appropriated when new statewide initiatives are enacted (strategic determinations should be made regarding continued funding for ongoing implementation with fidelity), and 3) Nevada Department of Education (NDE) work with districts to clearly define PD expenditure categories and develop business rules for reporting costs associated with providing PD (resulting in annual reports to NDE regarding the use of state and federal funds for PD).

The third category of recommendations is Statute/Regulatory/Policy. The recommendations in this category are: 1) Districts and RPDP's align all PD with NDE priorities and goals, districts submit to the SBE an annual PD report, 2) CCSD participate in a pilot program utilizing established school site- level

budget tracking business rules and a standard budget reporting template, 3) NDE and the Commission on Professional School Standards (COPS) collaborate to modernize the process for approving renewal credit PD course work, 4) COPS/SBE should only approve teacher and administrator preparation programs which include alignment to the NEPF, 5) districts, schools, and RPDP's should utilize NEPF data to drive PD, 6) Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) and NDE should continue to monitor NEPF implementation, and 7) NEPF training should focus on school-based administrators and principal supervisors. Member Sheldon commented that the Task Force was concerned about NEPF implementation across the system.

Chair Zander asked what guidance was given on how districts will track PD, and Member Sheldon stated that the Task Force discussed adding a code to the budget codes that deal with PD. Chair Zander thanked Sandra for representing the RPDP committee on the Task Force.

Member Smith asked about the recommendation around capturing the impact of PD on students and student learning and if there is a recommendation around specific measures and tools. Dr. Sheldon stated that there was not a specific measure recommendation. This led to the Council's discussion of surveys that teachers fill out at the end of RPDP trainings, and whether or not those accurately measure impact.

8. RPDP Annual Reports

Dena Durish stated that each RPDP is required by statute to provide a comprehensive report of what was done in that year. Each RPDP Director gave an overview of their report.

Sarah Negrete, NNRPDP, stated that they serve Eureka, Elko, White Pine, Lander, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties. They serve 1,073 teachers and 37 administrators. Distribution of work type is a required reporting piece. They have preparation at 32%, travel at 19%, professional conversation (coaching) at 23%, instructional training at 19%, and classroom observation at 7%. A total of 613 unduplicated educators were reached during 15-16 year, and 2,951 duplicated educators were reached that year as well. Overall 54% of the staff in their region participated in NNRPDP services. She showed an example of a standard survey that is used upon completion of an RPDP survey. Participants scored their training a 4 and above in all categories, and these scores have remained steady across the years. They track and show student achievement using specific outcomes that are related to each training. For example on NVACs-Science, the outcome was to increase awareness and understanding of the NVACCS. It was a blended learning opportunity for K-5 teachers. Teachers that had little to no understanding at the beginning went to fare and solid understanding and awareness. NVACCS has three dimensions and they are: science and engineering practices, crosscutting concepts, and disciplinary core ideas. The teachers understanding of the three areas went up to 100% after completing the training. In the understanding of strategies to support science learning for all students, the educators went from No, slight, and fair to Fair and Solid.

Chelli Smith, SNRPDP, uses the Guskey model-a five tier approach that includes: participant reactions, organizational support and change, participant learning, participant use of knowledge and skills, and student learning outcomes. To accumulate data, SNRPD uses multiple sources: detailed contact logs, activity evaluations, pre and post test scores (PD that is 45 hours or more), qualitative artifacts and testimonials, and post-observation classroom visits. They are reinstituting a follow up around the end of April. 29,412 teacher and administrators are impacted by SNRPDP trainers. 17,196 of the participants went through PD and 43% are unduplicated. Their trainers provided PD for 6,871 administrators. Most trainings they offer last 2 days or greater. Educators can take a minimum of 140 hours through the RPDP to receive a PGP certificate. Educators take a pretest and posttest with each class, and there is a large normalized gain. Educators have to sign a letter saying SNRPDP trainers can come and observe their classroom. Chelli provided the following summary: Sustained PD that focuses on content teachers results in greater student achievement gains, content training that is supported at the school/region/district leads to greater student achievement gains, and teachers who reflect on their practice while undergoing sustained PD show stronger change toward research-based methods, which in turn results in greater student achievement.

Kiersten Gleissner, NWRPDP, serves Carson, Churchill, Douglas, Lyon, Storey, and Washoe Counties. Their focus areas are NV content standards in literacy, math, and science; in addition to NEPF, Prek through third grade support, teacher leader development, a NBPTS cohort, family engagement, and integration of computer education and technology.

The logic model helps them align their work and unify their focus, and is used to guide case studies. There were a total of 2527 unduplicated educators reached, 6,228 duplicated educators were reached during the 15-16 year. Elementary is the largest group that was served and administrators are the fewest group. Overall 48% of educators in the region participated in programs provided by the NWRPDP. The percentage of the type of services provided is training /in-service at 70%, consulting/collaboration is 16%, observed/coaching is 10%, and parent/family engagement is 4%. The percentage for their focus of services is parent/family engagement at 4%, other at 11%, NVACS social studies at 1%, NVACS science at 11%, NVACS math at 18%, NVACS literacy and English at 19%, NEPF at 24%, Leadership at 1%, Computer education and tech at 5%, assessment at 1%, and Prek-third grade at 5%. Educator satisfaction with their classes is between 4.3-4.6 on a five scaled score.

9. Long-Range Planning/Council Work Group Item:9

Area A: Dena showed the Council its duties and responsibilities. She referenced a conversation around standards that occurred in April 2015, as well as discussing how RPDPs already use Learning Forward's seven standards for professional development. In addition, per Kelee's presentation there was a recommendation to add two additional standards. If legislation or this Council picks up the standards then Area A would be revisited. The Council's role only includes the governing bodies of the training programs.

Area B: The Council is to establish a statewide program for teachers and administrators concerning effective parental involvement and family engagement. Dena referenced a PIFE presentation to this Council from March 2014. Since it doesn't look like anything has been done with that, it was suggested that this responsibility be addressed and should be prioritized between now and the end of the year. Chair Zander suggested making this a topic for their next agenda, and to work with coordinators to evaluate what is/ has been going on in this area. Member Husson asked for reports from the RPDP's and PIFE Council at the next meeting. Member Hawk asked if they are just getting updates or collaborating and Dena explained that a state wide program needs to be established. Member Hawk asked if the statewide committee is the Council's responsibility. Dena informed the Council that the PIFE Council sees its role as advising on this priority and the two groups can do a joint subcommittee. Member Hawk then asked if the Council should have an establishment of standards and go from there, and Dena stated that the Council needs to establish a program, since it is not defined. Member Husson stated that the Council needs to understand what a good parental engagement program looks like. Member Sheldon asked if there is a group of people that is looking at family engagement, or is the Council starting it as an additional responsibility. Dena clarified that there is a PIFE council that is statutorily created, and they have several documents and tasks that are outlined; while the RPDP Council is to establish the training program around the work of PIFE. Member Hawk stated that it is already being done in the RPDPs. Dena read the PIFE Council statutory requirements: PIFE looks at best practices, but PIFE will create the standards and the RPDP Council will do the curriculum. This curriculum must be aligned and include teachers, paraprofessionals, disengaged families, capacity building, and the liaison conversation. Member Hawk asked for a report from the RPDP's, showing if they are aligned with the standards, at the next meeting. Chair Zander stated that this Council will focus on strategies and standards.

Part C: Coordinate the dissemination of information to school districts, administrators, and teachers concerning the training programs and services provided by the regional training programs.

Part D: Disseminate information to the regional training program concerning innovative and effective methods to provide PD.

Since both C and D refer to getting an update of what they are doing and the current landscape and how that information is shared with teachers, Chair Zander stated that guidelines can be put in place. It was suggested that RPDPs share their current process with the Council at the next meeting.

Part E: Conduct long-range planning concerning the PD needs of teachers and administrators employed in this state.

Part F: Adopt uniform procedures and criteria for use by the governing body of each RPDP to report the evaluation conducted pursuant to NRS391.552

Part G: Part G reads as: review and recommend any changes to the five year plan prepared by the governing body of each RPDP.

Dena Durish does not believe that the RPDP has done anything with it.

Part H: Review and recommend any necessary revisions to the annual report prepared by the governing body of each RPDP.

Dena Durish stated that it is currently being done.

Part I: Dena Durish stated that it will make sure that there is communication, alignment, and a state wide process of PD. There is not a statewide picture of PD. Chair Zander stated that last spring they had each RPDP show their five year plans. Member Sheldon stated that she has the five year plan from NWRPDP, which is in place, and the Council needs to review them Dena asked if all three of the RPDP's are on the same cycle from 2016-2011. Member Sheldon stated that NWRPDP's five year plans has been run through its board. Chair Zander stated five year plans are updated every spring. Member Sheldon stated that five year plans are based on goals set by the previous Council. There is a vision, mission and the five year goals. Dena asked what the deadlines and requirements are for every year, and Chair Zander inquired when the RPDP's update five year plans. Chelli Smith stated May is a safe bet as they have to be complete on August thirtieth. Chair Zander stated that the Council would do it on the first fall meeting.

Dena Durish stated that the next section is the biannual budget. The only thing that isn't statute is the \$100,000 to the administrative training funds. Dena discussed having Roger talk to the Council about the base budget process again, and she reminded LCB will discuss 2618 in March.

10. 2017 Legislative Session Overview and Considerations

Dena Durish stated the Senate Education Committee meets every Monday and Wednesday at 3:15 or 3:30. The Assembly Education Committee meets Tuesday and Thursdays at 3:15. She asked the Council to go to the legislative tracker to keep track on what is happening. Member DeSalvio informed the group that they can testify as well. Dena informed the Council about AB77 and several other bills for Licensure. Member Hawk asked about the high school graduation requirements in regard to end of course exams and Dena Durish stated that there are recommendations coming out of the ESSA work group along with 12 other recommendations, however ESSA still requires that there is a college and career readiness exam. There was a conversation around the ACT and does it measure standards for college and career readiness.

11. Future Meeting Dates and Agenda Items

Chair Zander would like to do another doodle pole and have the results ASAP. He would also like to have a meeting early April.

12. Public Comment #2

There was no public comment.

13. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 12:47 PM