

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**Seventy-Eighth Session
May 5, 2015**

The Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Becky Harris at 3:32 p.m. on Tuesday, May 5, 2015, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Becky Harris, Chair
Senator Scott Hammond, Vice Chair
Senator Don Gustavson
Senator Joyce Woodhouse
Senator Moises (Mo) Denis
Senator Tick Segerblom

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Mark A. Lipparelli

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Michael Roberson, Senatorial District No. 20
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Assembly District No. 14

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Todd Butterworth, Policy Analyst
Risa Lang, Counsel
Betty Kaminski, Committee Manager
Beth Ann Reykers, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Constance J. Brooks, Ph.D., Vice Chancellor, Nevada System of Higher Education
Dena Durish, Director of Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement, Department of Education
Pamela Salazar, Ed.D., Chair, Teachers and Leaders Council
Nicole Rourke, Clark County School District
Andre Long, Assistant Chief Student Achievement Officer, Clark County School District
Anthony Nuñez, Principal, J.E. Manch Elementary School
Grant Hanevold, Principal, Sunrise Mountain High School
Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District
Dawn Huckaby, Chief Human Resources Officer, Washoe County School District
Gina Leonhard, Principal, Shaw Middle School
Jeanine Clancy, Med, BSN, RN, NCSN, School Nurse, Clark County School District
Mike McLamore, Nevada State Education Association
Jessica Ferrato, Nevada Association of School Boards
Mary Pierczynski, Ed.D., Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Lonnie Shields, Nevada Association of School Administrators
Vikki Courtney, President, Clark County Education Association
Stephen Augspurger, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees
John Eppolito, Nevadans Against Common Core
Theodore Small, Vice President, Clark County Education Association
Samantha Hager, Lead Consulting Teacher, Peer Assistance and Review, Clark County School District
David Bechtel, Principal, Basic High School
Danielle Brown, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Teacher Education, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Andrew Diss, Students First
Seth Rau, Nevada Succeeds
Michael Vannozzi, Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance
Erik Smith
Justin Harrison, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce
Mike Paul, Peer Assistance and Review Coordinator, Washoe County School District

Senate Committee on Education
May 5, 2015
Page 3

Patrick Gavin, Director, State Public Charter School Authority
Craig Stevens, Clark County School District

Chair Harris:

I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 226.

ASSEMBLY BILL 226 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions for the payment of certain undergraduate fees and expenses of certain dependent children. (BDR 34-1010)

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton (Assembly District No. 14):

Assembly Bill 226 originated over a decade ago when this body decided Nevada would take care of the children of a police or firefighter lost in the line of duty by ensuring they could receive a tuition-free college education in Nevada. We always wanted to extend this benefit to other state employees, but never had the opportunity to do so.

After the death of the teacher at Sparks Middle School, it was time to bring the issue forward so children of any public employee killed while performing his or her assigned duty will be entitled to a tuition-free college education in Nevada. In response to concerns raised by the Assembly Committee on Education, Assembly Bill 226 was amended to include the definition of a public employee.

Senator Hammond:

The definition included in section 1, subsection 4, paragraph (g) of A.B. 226 seems overly broad. Are we contemplating extending this benefit to any person who may work temporarily or as a contractor as a public employee? This bill seeks to include teachers and I agree with that intent.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

When I spoke with the Legal Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB), I expressed my intent was to ensure teachers were included in the definition of eligible recipients. The definition in the bill was provided by LCB to ensure the children of teachers killed in the line of duty were included. The original language of A.B. 226 stated "state employee." It was brought to my attention that schoolteachers are not state employees. The LCB revised the language substituting the term public employee with the specific intent to include teachers.

If a parent goes to work and something terrible happens, I believe it is appropriate to offer their children a college education.

I offered this analogy to the Assembly. A highway patrol officer and a dispatcher are standing next to one another in a dispatch center. Someone comes through the door, shoots and kills both of them. It is the same perpetrator with the same gun shooting one bullet after another. Under existing law, the highway patrol officer's family would be treated one way and the dispatcher's family would be treated another way. The intent of A.B. 226 is to treat both employees and their surviving families equitably.

Through the passage of A.B. 226, children of any parent lost while at work for the State or local community should be provided an opportunity for a college education in Nevada. It seems the least we can do.

Senator Gustavson:

This definition seems overly broad. There are many public employees. Legislators can be considered public employees. I think this bill is too broad. I can see including certain law enforcement employees, but I am not sure we are ready to include all public employees.

Senator Woodhouse:

The definition of public employees includes teachers. The LCB is using the same definition for public employees as used by the Public Employees' Retirement System. Years ago, we implemented this program for the surviving children of police and firefighters. In the past couple of years with the deaths of the teachers at Valley High School and Sparks Middle School, the expansion of this program is necessary and appropriate.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

I conducted some research on deaths that had occurred in the State. In the last 3 years, we have lost six State employees, all police or fire personnel. Sometimes the perfect cannot be the enemy of the good. If we try to restrict the definition too much, there is the possibility we could exclude the people we really want to encapsulate.

I understand this is a policy committee, but for your information, there is a line item in the Governor's recommended budget this year that addresses the financial issues of this policy. It sets aside funding for the cost of tuition to the

Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) for the children of our fallen police and firefighters. There are a number of nonprofit organizations and foundations who assist the children of fallen police and firefighters with books, lab fees and ancillary costs of going to college. They have been doing this work for years.

Senator Denis:

Will the NSHE staff be included? Even though the definition included in A.B. 226 is broader, I do not see a huge impact. If someone is performing a public service and he or she loses their life, this is something that can help their family because that person will not be there to help their children. This is a wonderful opportunity. I hope there will never be huge numbers of public employees whose families need this benefit.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

It is my impression if the NSHE employees are classified as public employees; they will be covered.

If something were to happen to one of our colleagues, I want his or her children to have this benefit available.

Chair Harris:

How much money is set aside in the Governor's recommended budget to ensure we are providing the appropriate funding for children who may need this opportunity?

Assemblywoman Carlton:

The appropriations for this legislative cycle include a \$20,000 line item for each year of the biennium. There is a rollover balance, but I do not have that figure. I will provide it to the Committee. There was money left over from the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) summer meeting that will be brought forward.

We recently lost two Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) officers. The action by the IFC ensured there would be funding available for their children to attend college in Nevada, tuition-free. The IFC has the ability to allocate additional resources through a work program request by the NSHE should there be a budget shortfall.

Chair Harris:

How much money is spent each year for the program? Have we had the opportunity to help the children of fallen police and firefighters in the past?

Assemblywoman Carlton:

The Legislature passed legislation to assist the children of fallen police and firefighters over 10 years ago. In all of these years, the NSHE has not come to the Legislature for funding; the NSHE absorbed the cost and used other resources from nonprofit groups and foundations to assist these children attend college. This summer the NSHE approached the IFC for the first time to request funding to implement the legislation. As a result, State General Fund dollars were appropriated for implementation of this measure. It is a new line in the budget.

Senator Hammond:

There were two LVMPD officers killed in the line of duty during the past year. I believe one officer had one child and the other officer had either four or five children. Does this contemplate a provision whereby there could be a high number of children accessing the program during a period of economic downturn when resources are scarce?

Is there a provision prioritizing which children would receive funding assistance? Police officers and firefighters go to work each day with the knowledge that they may not come home after work. As a teacher, there is a reasonable expectation that I will come home after work. Have you established a method for allocating resources under A.B. 226?

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Under existing law if there is a death of a police officer or firefighter in the line of duty, the county relays the information to the NSHE. The NSHE keeps a list of the children who are eligible for this program. If the child stays in Nevada and opts to access this benefit, the NSHE can project the years of attendance and can plan for the expenditure. Unlike most budget items, this expenditure of funds can be calculated in advance.

This benefit to children of our fallen police and firefighters is augmented by other funding from nonprofit organizations. Some beneficiaries may also qualify for additional financial assistance through scholarships such as the

Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship. Resources to benefit the education of these children will be maximized.

I am not comfortable determining a priority whereby one child of a fallen public employee killed in the line of duty is more worthy than the child of another employee killed in the line of duty. If we make a commitment to these children through A.B. 226, we should fulfill it. This is the least we can do if a child's parent leaves for work one morning and does not come home.

Chair Harris:

Are the children of the LVMPD officers who were killed during the past year eligible for this benefit? Is the funding for their tuition guaranteed should they choose to access it? Will funding for college be determined only if funds are available and a child approaches a NSHE institution and enrolls in college?

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Their children are eligible for this benefit. It is guaranteed. It will be up to each child to decide if he or she wants to go to college in Nevada; the funds will be available. Based upon the names given to the NSHE, we can calculate the amount of funding that may be required for any given year. I do not believe we will need to put the dollars into the fund until a child makes the commitment to attend a NSHE institution. Assembly Bill 226 only proposes to pay the tuition at a NSHE institution.

Chair Harris:

While we can begin to plan for these children's needs because of the devastating event, will the funds not be appropriated until a student is ready for college?

Assemblywoman Carlton:

That is correct. We do not know if a child will avail him or herself of this benefit until he or she registers for college and requests the benefit.

This summer was the first time the NSHE came to the IFC to request funds for implementation of the program. It was not a large amount of money. Requests for funding can be addressed through the Legislature or IFC as the need arises.

Chair Harris:

Once funds have been allocated to this program through the State General Fund, do they stay in the fund or do they roll over and continue to grow on behalf of the child?

Assemblywoman Charlton:

Funds allocated through the IFC are still in the actual budget. When they were appropriated, the line item in the Governor's recommended budget had not been created. We now have a line item in the budget and there is \$20,000 appropriated each year of the biennium. The Governor is recommending \$28,962 for fiscal year 2015, which includes the amount allocated by the IFC this summer.

Chair Harris:

How many children are presently on the list?

Assemblywoman Carlton:

I do not know. I hope there are not too many.

Senator Denis:

If the need changes from the budget allocation, a child would not be denied the benefit. The NSHE would request additional funds from the IFC if we are not in Session and ask for additional money to meet the obligation.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Yes, the NSHE came to the IFC to request additional funds just recently. The NSHE absorbed the costs to a certain point but ultimately requested more funds from the IFC. The process has worked well to date; I think it will work well in the future.

Constance J. Brooks, Ph.D. Vice Chancellor, Nevada System of Higher Education):

The NSHE supports A.B. 226. The balance in this account is \$45,000. The estimated cost of a college education per student is \$30,000. Over the summer, the NSHE requested \$5,288 from the IFC to help fund the two children currently receiving benefits from this program.

Unfortunately, the NSHE projects another two students will be accessing this benefit during 2016 to bring total enrollment to four students.

Chair Harris:

I will now close the hearing on A.B. 226 and open the hearing on A.B. 447.

ASSEMBLY BILL 447: Revises provisions relating to the statewide performance evaluation system. (BDR 34-1120)

Dena Durish (Director of Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement, Department of Education):

Nevada did not have a statewide evaluation system of accountability for its teachers and school administrators prior to the 76th Session of the Legislature. The Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) was established in response to the legislation passed during that Session. The TLC required a statewide system of teacher evaluation, professional development and growth to be established. The TLC made recommendations to the State Board of Education regarding the design and implementation of a statewide evaluation system of teachers and school administrators. Its recommendations were adopted into regulation during the 77th Session Legislative Session.

It was the intent of the legislation passed in 2011 for full implementation of the statewide evaluation system of accountability to occur in the 2015-2016 school year. The 2013 legislation allowed 1 or 2 additional years for the completion of a validation study. After the first year of the validation study during the 2013-2014 school year, the Department of Education (NDE) obtained permission from the IFC to allow a second year of continued study. The request was submitted in consultation with the local school districts.

The Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) is a statewide system consisting of a 4-tiered rating system. The four ratings are: ineffective, minimally effective, effective and highly effective. We are in the middle of the second year of the study, with 142 schools participating. These schools are utilizing the NEPF rating system, but the data is not yet being used to make performance or personnel decisions. All teachers and administrators in the State are still operating under the previous teacher evaluation system, which utilizes a binary rating system of either satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

At the end of this school year and moving into the 2015-2016 school year, there will be full implementation of the NEPF system. This system includes the 4-tiered rating system whereby 50 percent of a teacher and administrator's

rating is comprised of student achievement scores that are based on growth and student achievement scores.

Assembly Bill 447 makes changes to the evaluation system prior to full implementation. Section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (d), subparagraphs (1) and (2) recommends changes based upon what we have learned over the past several years and what is occurring in other states.

The first change recommended by the NDE suggests the 50 percent weight placed on student performance remain, but the composition of the 50 percent shall be modified to include 25 percent to be derived from statewide data and 25 percent to be comprised of local data.

Local data would include end-of-course exams, interim formative assessments and other performance-based outcome measures, as determined by a local school board and approved by the superintendent of public instruction.

Section 2 of A.B. 447 requests a delay in implementation. The original legislation required the TLC to make recommendations and for the State Board of Education to create a statewide evaluation system for teachers, administrators and other licensed personnel. The other licensed personnel group is more dynamic than originally defined. This third group includes school social workers, psychologists, speech pathologists and 13 or 14 other categories. This work is not yet complete; therefore, the NDE is requesting a delay in implementation of any statewide system for other licensed personnel. An additional year is needed to develop the framework.

Section 3 of A.B. 447 speaks to the delay of the student achievement piece as a whole. There have been challenges with the implementation of the statewide student testing system. We will be unable to gather a full 2 years of data from the State testing system. The NDE recommends the 4-tiered evaluation system be implemented in the 2015-2016 school year as scheduled, but it would not include the student achievement component.

The NDE has submitted a proposed amendment to A.B. 447 ([Exhibit C](#)). This amendment is the result of research and conversations with stakeholders. Based upon recommendations from the TLC, the NDE recommends a 40 percent weight be placed on student performance with 20 percent of that weight

derived from district-level student assessment data and the other 20 percent derived from statewide assessment data.

The NDE recommends that beginning with the 2015-2016 school year, only district-level data be used at the 20 percent level and continue to be used during the 2016-2017 school year. Statewide data will be added to the district-wide data and used beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, thereby achieving the 40 percent weight.

Section 2 of the proposed amendment proposes full implementation of the statewide system of evaluation for other licensed personnel during the 2016-2017 school year. There has been extensive discussion centered on which positions should be included in this third group. This section authorizes the State Board of Education to determine which position classifications require a statewide system of evaluation. In some states, school nurses are included in the statewide system, but school psychologists are not. Each school district will retain its own system of evaluation for any position not included in the statewide system.

Section 3 of the proposed amendment to A.B. 447 grants the State Board of Education the opportunity to determine what, if any, student achievement measures should be included for a particular classification group. Evaluations based upon student data for school nurses are somewhat different from that of classroom teachers or school-based administrators.

At the request of the TLC, section 3 gives the State Board of Education the task to determine the district-level administrators who should be included in the statewide system of evaluation. Existing law establishes a statewide system of evaluation for school-based administrators. It is the NDE position that those district personnel who supervise principals should be included in the statewide system of evaluation and should include student performance data. Perhaps a central office human resources administrator would not be included in a statewide system. We think the State Board of Education should be empowered to make those decisions.

Senator Hammond:

What is the rationale for using district student performance data a year before State student performance data? Is the intent to review the data districts may

use for student performance? If there is not enough data available at the State level, maybe we should wait at the district level as well.

Ms. Durish:

Teachers receive their final evaluations in April of each year. Because of the challenges we have experienced with the testing vendors this year, the statewide data needed to comprise the 20 percent component proposed in the amendment is not available. The local districts have data available to complete their 20 percent of the evaluation since it is not driven by the statewide student assessment system. A significant portion of the statewide 20 percent evaluation includes a growth model. Two years of data from the State is necessary for an accurate picture of student performance; this results in the 2-year delay in statewide data use.

Senator Hammond:

Are there any concerns regarding the end-of-course exams? Are the districts having difficulty establishing baseline data?

Ms. Durish:

I do not want to speak for the school districts, so I will defer the question to them.

Including these multiple measures in statewide data will allow us to look at trends over 2 or 3 years of growth. Even if there were challenges with this year's end-of-course exams, the intent will be to use next year's real data. The districts can determine their own criteria; it does not have to be an end-of-course exam. There are many different measures being used by school districts in other states. The 20 percent component offers the districts flexibility to determine their methodology for measuring student performance.

Senator Hammond:

If a district can determine what method of assessment will be used to measure student performance, then every school would have to use certain assessments. I am not sure if that takes place now.

Ms. Durish:

That is correct. A local school district could choose to use measures already in place. There is some flexibility. We have certain grades and subjects that are tested and others that are not. That is the power of using district level data.

Music and social studies teachers are not assessed statewide. A school district can determine how student achievement will be defined in a particular subject matter area.

Yesterday, the Senate Committee on Finance approved the NDE funding request on behalf of the local school districts to complete the Smarter Balanced assessment system. This will include a comprehensive, formative assessment with benchmark assessments across all districts.

Section 4 of the proposed amendment, [Exhibit C](#), to A.B. 447 allows the NDE to adopt regulations for the reporting of aggregated, anonymous data for evaluation ratings for teachers, administrators and other personnel. Nevada is out of compliance with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The State has no system in place to report how many teachers under the current system are rated satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

The NDE is working on a federal equity report consisting of aggregated, anonymous data that must be submitted by June 1, 2015. It must include the number of teachers who have received either unsatisfactory or satisfactory evaluations at our low-income and low-minority schools, in comparison to our high-income, high-minority schools. We are not able to comply because we do not have statutory authority to collect that data.

The TLC is proposing a change in the timing of the teacher evaluations in proposed section 5 of A.B. 447. The law defines all first-, second- and third-year teachers and administrators as probationary employees and requires three evaluations per year or nine evaluations in 3 years regardless of a teacher's evaluation rating. Based upon feedback from local schools, the NDE is requesting a change to the required evaluation structure.

If a teacher receives a highly effective or effective rating on all three of his or her first-year evaluations, the teacher would have two evaluations in the second-year. If those evaluations are both highly effective or effective, the third year would require only one evaluation. It changes the timing for probationary evaluations. It does not change the standards reporting or the student achievement component of the evaluation. It simply changes the number of evaluations a probationary teacher or administrator receives.

Senator Hammond:

I support the proposed change to cut back the number of evaluations. I would like to discuss cutting this requirement back even more. It is good to be evaluated. It is good for a teacher to improve through feedback. The evaluation system is a lengthy endeavor. Can you send the Committee a copy of the evaluation tool?

Ms. Durish:

I will email the members of the Committee a copy of the NEPF as recommended by the TLC and approved by the State Board of Education.

Senator Hammond:

I think it is important for the Committee to see the length of the instrument administrators use to evaluate teachers. It is a lengthy process, and if a principal has several probationary teachers, he or she spends a lot of time on the evaluation of teachers. The observation portion of the evaluation is more critical than the evaluation form. I appreciate the willingness of the NDE to address local concerns.

Senator Woodhouse:

During the interim, I visited a number of elementary schools and was told the evaluation process was lengthy. I have served as a principal and assistant principal in the Clark County School District (CCSD) and am aware of the importance the observation component of the evaluation plays before each evaluation document is completed. I support the proposed changes to the evaluation system. It addresses the concerns expressed by school principals.

Pamela Salazar, Ed.D. (Chair, Teachers and Leaders Council):

The TLC has been working on A.B. 447 and has proposed several conceptual amendments, ([Exhibit D](#)) to the bill. Since the establishment of the TLC in 2011, I have served as its chair. The TLC takes this work seriously. The work is about improving education for our students.

Over the last year, the TLC has been involved with the validation study of the NEPF. Both teachers and administrators shared their experiences with the TLC pertaining to the pilot and field studies. They gave us some insights as to how the system is working and its benefits. This system has to benefit improving teacher practice. It must have a positive effect on student performance.

The TLC meets every other month. The teachers who have come before the TLC believe the standards defined in the NEPF are the correct standards. The teachers support the work to improve teacher performance, which translates into improved student learning.

Some areas of the NEPF still need work. The TLC has submitted eight proposed amendments, [Exhibit D](#). The first proposed amendment is identical to the NDE proposed amendment. The second amendment addresses the technology platform. When the TLC designed the NEPF system, it was intended as a paperless system. The NEPF should be using an electronic platform. The TLC continues to recommend funding for a technology platform.

The proposed third conceptual amendment to [A.B 447](#) is slightly different from the amendment proposed by the NDE. The language offered by the TLC mirrors the original language contained in [A.B. 447](#). The TLC recommends delaying the implementation of the NEPF system. As Ms. Durish stated, there has been difficulty designing a statewide evaluation system for librarians, school psychologists, counselors and the myriad of classifications included within the generalized term of other school personnel. They fall into group 3.

The fourth proposed amendment by the TLC suggests a single evaluation for each year a teacher is classified as a probationary teacher. The amendment proposes there remain three observations during each of the 3 probationary years for both teachers and administrators; but only one written, substantive evaluation. A post-probationary teacher will continue to receive two observation components and an annual summative evaluation at the end of each probationary year. The TLC heard extensive testimony from teachers stating the observation component of the evaluation is the most important piece of the process. It also heard testimony from principals stating the evaluation must emphasize multiple teacher observations rather than the written summative evaluation.

Senator Hammond:

Is the observation period followed closely by an informal conversation between the administrator and teacher? Teachers benefit from immediate feedback.

Dr. Salazar:

The observation cycle requires a conference before the observation, the observation and a conference after the observation. These “bookends” of the

observation are required and defined in statute. The TLC recommends reducing the written summative evaluation to once a year. All other provisions remain the unchanged.

Proposed amendments 5–7, [Exhibit D](#), to [A.B. 447](#) align with the recommendations made in the amendment proposed by the NDE.

Proposed amendment 8 to [A.B. 447](#) directs the Regional Professional Development Programs (RPDP) to support the implementation of the NEPF. The TLC received multiple requests from teachers and administrators for the RPDP to provide professional development and support surrounding the implementation of the NEPF. Only the 146 schools that were included in the pilot program are receiving professional development pertaining to the NEPF this year. Next year as we move to full implementation of the NEPF in all schools in the State, additional funding for the RPDP will be necessary.

Senator Hammond:

This Committee heard [S.B. 474](#) earlier this Session. It focused on the improvement of professional development opportunities for teachers in Nevada. [Senate Bill 474](#) included funding for the RPDP. It was the only criticism I had of the bill.

[SENATE BILL 474 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Creates the Great Teaching and Leading Fund.
(BDR 34-1183)

The eighth proposed amendment also recommends additional funding for the RPDP. The RPDP should adopt a mission and a goal. The goal of the RPDP should be the implementation of the NEPF and standards. The other professional development groups could request additional money and pursue a different training objective. Is this focus the intent of amendment 8?

Dr. Salazar:

The recommendation from the TLC is to set aside money for the RPDP to continue to support the implementation of the NEPF and mastery of the Nevada Academic Content Standards.

Senator Hammond:

I will support this amendment to [A.B. 447](#).

The TLC's proposed amendment 3 discusses the complexities associated with developing a statewide evaluation system for other licensed school personnel. The testimony from the NDE discussed the need for school districts to develop additional local methods to assess other school personnel. The NEPF evaluates teachers based on assessments that do not directly correlate with the coursework being taught by the teacher. Unless a teacher is teaching English, mathematics or science, the courses measured by statewide assessments, there is no suitable statewide measure of performance to determine student proficiency and teacher performance.

Do high school teachers who do not teach any of the three core subjects fall within the "other licensed school personnel" category? It is hard for me to think about being evaluated next year as a social studies or Spanish teacher when there is nothing developed to assess the subject matter I teach. Is this something the TLC is contemplating?

Dr. Salazar:

Yes, this issue has been discussed by the TLC on numerous occasions. Those to whom you refer are teachers of grades and subjects not tested. The TLC refers to them as "group 2" teachers. As a physics teacher, I would be considered a group 2 teacher.

As we move forward with the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) assessments and interim assessments, there is a large group of teachers teaching elective subjects who fall in group 2.

A number of states have stopped using statewide assessments as a key percentage of their student outcomes evaluation system because there is not a comparable method to assess both teachers in tested grades and subjects and teachers in grades and subjects not tested.

Many states have moved toward measuring student performance using student learning objectives (SLO), which provide teachers a method to identify a specific goal with regard to the impact they are going to make on the students they have during a particular school year and then measure that impact over time. The difficulty with SLO, as many states have learned, is the amount of professional development required. Teachers need assistance designing meaningful student learning goals. Teachers and principals need help learning to negotiate meaningful student learning goals. Most of the Race to the Top states

base a major proportion of their measurement of student outcomes upon SLO. The goal is for a band teacher using a SLO model to measure the impact on his or her students during a particular school year based upon learning outcomes established in consultation with their principal.

Most states include only a small percentage of the school's total score on the State assessment as a part of a teacher's evaluation—anywhere from 10 percent to 15 percent. Therefore, every teacher in the building receives a percentage of his or her evaluation based upon the whole school, with the balance of the assessment components determined by local district and school data. States are struggling with the issue of measuring teacher impact on students in grades and subjects not tested. It is not only a Nevada discussion, but also a national discussion. It explains the movement to SLOs; recognizing significant training will be required.

Senator Hammond:

Teachers are expressing a great deal of anxiety because they do not know how they will be evaluated in the future.

Is the schedule to implement the evaluation process included in A.B. 447 too ambitious? Should we continue to discuss the components before we begin to use the assessments to determine salaries?

Dr. Salazar:

The TLC recommends complete delay for using any type of student outcome data next year. This is the difference between the proposed amendment by the NDE and the proposed amendment by the TLC. There is not enough time for a school district to put together a system that is fair, even with a 20 percent measure of some types of student outcome. Districts can consider pretest, posttest, interim testing, SLO or another method of measurement. It is unrealistic to expect a district to do so in a single year. This concern is validated by research and the practices of other states; it takes years to implement such a system. Delay is probably a good thing. One state official said, "It is better to spend your money in the classroom and not in the courtroom." Delay is not always a bad thing.

Nicole Rourke (Clark County School District):

The amendment to A.B. 447 proposed by the CCSD includes six of the eight recommendations made by the TLC ([Exhibit E](#)). The CCSD did not include

the two measures that would require a budget allocation. It does not mean we disagree with those amendments. The CCSD has some concern regarding the funding of these two measures.

The CCSD strives to ensure accountability through the evaluation process. We support the NEPF in general. We agree with the proposed implementation delay. We also agree with the differentiation of the student outcome measures: using 20 percent State data, 20 percent local data. The CCSD would like to include district data, but we will have an accurate system to measure teacher performance by next year.

The CCSD does not have consistent measures across its schools. We are in the process of soliciting requests for proposals for a districtwide interim assessment. We will need time to implement it. It will measure student performance. The proposals will be reviewed in relation to the evaluation system.

The CCSD will consider the student learning objectives mentioned previously, but as you have heard, it takes time to train teachers and principals on the use of the assessment instrument. We know jobs are at stake. We want to ensure we get it right.

Andre Long (Assistant Chief Student Achievement Officer, Clark County School District):

I will now read from my written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)).

Anthony Nuñez (Principal, J.E. Manch Elementary School):

I will now read from my written testimony ([Exhibit G](#)).

Grant Hanevold (Principal, Sunrise Mountain High School):

I will now read from my written testimony ([Exhibit H](#)).

Lindsay Anderson (Washoe County School District):

The Washoe County School District (WCSD) has been working to modernize its evaluation system since 2010 and is heavily invested in this work. The District has done pilot work in advance of the rest of the State. We have helped to guide the work of the TLC based on our experiences in this area.

Several WCSD staffers serve on the TLC. We support the amendments proposed by the TLC, particularly the recommendation for the full delay of implementation of the NEPF. We do not support the partial delay of implementation as proposed by the NDE. The WCSD is not prepared to use district-level assessment tools in the next school year. It is May 5, and the next WCSD school year begins August 10. There is not enough time to create an assessment for all teachers that includes the 20 percent district level data as proposed.

The WCSD is one of the districts in the State piloting the SLO program. The pilot program has experienced some successes and some challenges. The amount of professional development necessary to get teachers and administrators vested in the SLO process is enormous.

The TLC identifies the importance of growth in any measurement of student achievement data. If growth is not included, we may inadvertently penalize teachers who teach at low-performing schools because the student achievement data is not high enough. This Session, the Committee and the Legislature have discussed creating incentives for teachers who teach at low-performing schools. If we do not have a robust growth portion included in student performance data, we may inadvertently drive teachers away from low-performing schools. That is not the intent of A.B. 447. The comparison of multiple years of student achievement data is crucially important to the validation of the system.

Dr. Salazar's comments regarding spending money in the classroom and not in the courtroom are wise and appreciated. School districts have genuine concerns with potential litigation related to a teacher evaluation system that has not been validated. The WCSD has worked diligently with its employee associations to gain consensus on the current evaluation system. A change in system will require a great deal of work.

The WCSD began this work before the NEPF was developed. It adopted an evaluation tool that is slightly different from the instrument designed by the NEPF. The WCSD uses Charlotte Danielson's Framework For Teaching, a nationally validated framework used in other places across the Country. The WCSD is heavily vested in this framework. We have been using this 4-tiered evaluation framework since 2012. The amendment offered by the WCSD codifies an existing regulation, *Nevada Administrative Code* 391.579, allowing

school districts to apply to the NDE for permission to use an assessment tool aligned with the NEPF, [Exhibit E](#).

Dawn Huckaby (Chief Human Resources Officer, Washoe County School District):

Since 2012, the WCSD has used a 4-tier evaluation system aligned with the NEPF. The WCSD has worked with its employee associations to accomplish this work. We have developed a true professional growth system. A significant amount of professional development has occurred to support system implementation. As proposed in our amendment, [Exhibit E](#), the WCSD is requesting the flexibility to use its evaluation tool, which has been “crosswalked” to the NEPF objectives and indicators to ensure alignment.

Gina Leonhard (Principal, Shaw Middle School):

The WCSD has worked for years to ensure teachers know the rubric by which their performance in the classroom will be evaluated. We recognize that student performance data will be added to the evaluation system, but we require good, solid data in the area of student growth as a component. Conversations centered on classroom management and how to improve classroom performance are necessary. The WCSD is simply not there yet. The work completed thus far is invaluable. The 4-tier system is common knowledge amongst our teachers. When a common language is spoken, true evaluation can be accomplished and work toward improvement can be completed.

With the new testing, there is no common base to look at student growth. It is unknown whether Nevada’s content standards are aligned correctly. The delay should not be perceived as lack of cooperation, but the desire to accomplish this work correctly. The data and the rubric are important pieces of the process. Students, teachers and staff in the building must know and understand the goal.

Senator Hammond:

Congratulations to Ms. Leonhard, who was named the Nevada Middle School Principal of the Year, today.

Senator Gustavson:

Ms. Leonhard is the principal at Shaw Middle School, which is located within my district. I, too, offer my congratulations on behalf of this Committee and your students. Thank you for the work you do.

Ms. Anderson:

Many student assessments are being conducted in the WCSD as we speak. Teacher evaluations, as required by law, are due in April. Current test scores will not be available to include in the evaluations. This Committee should consider the consequences of the availability of student achievement data in teacher performance evaluations. Will data be 1 year behind? Will we use assessments that are conducted much earlier in a school year? The timing of student test scores and teacher evaluation due dates are problematic for school districts.

Jeanine Clancy, MEd, BSN, RN, NCSN (School Nurse, Clark County School District):

I am the past president of the Nevada State Association of School Nurses. School nurses have collaborated across the State and agree we meet the criteria for other licensed personnel and we support the NEPF.

We believe flexibility is necessary in the development of a statewide rubric for school nurses. We welcome the opportunity to develop a rubric that addresses our unique roles and responsibilities and aligns with our national professional nursing standards as well as our role as educators.

Not only will a statewide rubric ensure students have access to learning in the least restrictive environment, but the practice of school nursing in Nevada will be elevated.

The State Board of Education can provide valuable insight and guidance to the development of a statewide rubric for school nurses.

Mike McLamore (Nevada State Education Association):

The Nevada State Education Association (NSEA) supports the recommendations provided by the NDE and the TLC. I am submitting a letter in support of the TLC recommendations for A.B. 447 ([Exhibit I](#)) and a proposed amendment ([Exhibit J](#)) to A.B. 447.

The NSEA supports the reduction of the scoring ratio and the inclusion of a higher degree of weight on the other aspects of the evaluation tool. The professional practices and professional responsibility strands of the NEPF include 34 indicators. The evaluation tool is exhaustive. Student achievement is more about a student's journey and learning than it is a snapshot in time as captured

by a singular instrument on a particular day. More emphasis should be placed on a teacher's behavior in the classroom than on student performance.

The NSEA supports delay of full implementation of NEPF for all of the reasons previously cited. Nevada is still in preparation mode in terms of the assessment, training and orientation and the part of teacher.

Jessica Ferrato (Nevada Association of School Boards):

The Nevada Association of School Boards (NASB) supports the provisions brought forth by the TLC. We support the delay of full implementation for all the reasons mentioned previously.

The NASB supports Nevada's RPDP. Those RPDP that serve the rural districts are tremendously important to the school districts they serve. The rural school districts do not have the resources the larger districts have.

The NASB echoes the concerns raised by Senator Hammond and others with respect to the statewide evaluation of other licensed personnel. It is unfair for teachers to be evaluated based upon exams they do not give, especially in a high-stakes environment when teachers' livelihoods are at stake.

Like the CCSD and the WCSD, the NASB is concerned with issues surrounding the timing of testing, reporting and evaluation.

Mary Pierczynski, Ed.D. (Nevada Association of School Superintendents):

The Nevada Association of School Superintendents is neutral on A.B. 447. We are supportive of A.B. 447 with the recommendations and amendments offered by the TLC.

Lonnie Shields (Nevada Association of School Administrators):

The Nevada Association of School Administrators supports A.B. 447 with the amendments offered by the TLC.

Vikki Courtney (President, Clark County Education Association):

The Clark County Education Association (CCEA) supports the amendments to A.B. 447 offered by the TLC. We support the proposed changes to the evaluation of probationary teachers to include three observation periods each year culminating in one summative written evaluation.

The CCEA supports reducing student outcomes and having outcomes be shared equally with school district assessments where more educators can demonstrate their impacts on student outcomes, especially since 20 percent or fewer educators have a test connected to their instruction.

We appreciate the delay of full implementation to give districts and the State time to create fair, valid and reliable assessments, which are important to students' growth.

The CCEA represents other licensed professionals and believes those groups should have enough time to work with the State and the TLC to create an evaluation system that matches their individual education professions.

Stephen Augspurger (Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees):

We support A.B. 447 with the amendments brought forward by the TLC. The Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees (CCASAPE) has worked with the TLC since inception. The amendments brought forward are important pieces that will make the NEPF work for teachers and administrators and ultimately benefit children.

John Eppolito (Nevadans Against Common Core):

The NEPF standards are written by the people who write the tests. The purpose of the standards is to test children. The amount of testing that occurs in high-achieving countries far exceeds the testing that occurs in this Country. The SBAC test is an experimental test. We do know it is designed to label two-thirds of the students as not meeting the standards; that is failing two-thirds of the children.

The SBAC is a 10-hour test given to fourth graders. Why are we administering a 10-hour computerized test to a fourth grader? This is torture. This is wrong. Part of the test is graded by people rather than computers. Craigslist sites advertise positions to grade the SBAC tests at \$11.05 per hour. Initially, the SBAC sought persons with college degrees to score the exams, but were unable to fill the positions at the pay rate being offered.

I do not support using any percentage of the student SBAC test scores in the teacher evaluation process.

Chair Harris:

I will now close the hearing on A.B. 447 and open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 332.

SENATE BILL 332: Makes an appropriation to the Clark County School District to carry out a program of peer evaluations of teachers. (BDR S-763)

Senator Michael Roberson (Senatorial District No. 20):

The origins of this bill date back to the 2011 Session, when we passed a trilogy of bills addressing performance evaluations for educational personnel, and for the first time, linked educator evaluations to the academic growth of students. Assembly Bill No. 222 of the 76th Session created the TLC to establish a statewide performance evaluation system, for both teachers and administrators, with at least 50 percent of the evaluation based upon student achievement data.

The second of these three bills, A.B. No. 225 of the 76th Session, provided that a post-probationary teacher or administrator receiving an unsatisfactory evaluation for 2 consecutive school years would return to probationary status.

The last of these three bills, A.B. No. 229 of the 76th Session, made a number of significant policy changes: it streamlined the evaluation process—including expedited dismissal hearings—and expanded the grounds for immediate dismissal; extended the probationary period for new teachers and administrators to 3 years; eliminated seniority as the sole criteria for any needed reductions in workforce; and required school districts to establish programs of performance pay and enhanced compensation for the recruitment and retention of educational personnel.

This legislation was followed up in 2013 with S.B. No. 407 of the 77th Session, which further refined the evaluation statute and, more significantly, added a component of peer evaluation.

The next step is S.B. 332, which provides the necessary funding for the CCSD to conduct peer assistance and review and to support teachers with the information and resources they need to be more effective in the classroom. It appropriates \$1 million in each year of the new biennium and explicitly limits expenditures to their intended purpose.

The CCSD has already begun a pilot project to test a limited rollout of this model. The Peer Assistance and Review program (PAR) is evidence-based and was developed in consultation with Montgomery County, Maryland, which has successfully used this model for 15 years.

The PAR program is a partnership between CCSD and the CCEA, so it has the buy-in that is essential for a new initiative. The program leverages the expertise and excellence of the district's best teachers—referred to as “consulting teachers”—who help their peers in need of support, perhaps because they are new to the profession or are teaching in challenging classrooms.

The PAR program is guided by a ten-member panel, made up of five CCEA teachers and five CCSD administrators. The panel selects the consulting teachers who make a 3-year commitment to help 10-15 of their peers.

Though the program is new in the CCSD, there is significant evidence that it works. As various organizations report data on the relative performance of national educational systems around the world, observers have asked questions about what sets apart the top performers from countries that, like the United States, are struggling.

In response, a great deal of research has been conducted on this topic. There are several reasons for the educational growth and success of other nations, but one reason stands apart: high-performing countries have professionalized the job of teaching. No longer are teachers viewed as mere employees to deliver a standardized product according to some formula; they are professionals with deep subject knowledge who are empowered to customize education according to the needs of each student.

Teachers in high-performing jurisdictions have acquired the expertise necessary to deliver this high-quality education through a system of job-embedded professional development. Teachers are in constant communication with other teachers who observe their classroom work, share productive critiques and collaborate on strategies to improve their craft. This system of peer interaction and accountability, along with other public policy measures, has led to continuous improvement in teaching quality and has made teaching a true profession, much like medicine and law.

It is good that we are asking our teachers to interact in a meaningful way, to work toward mutual improvement and to hold one another accountable as peers, as professionals. The CCSD and CCEA have partnered to lay the groundwork for this paradigm shift in educator development. Senate Bill 332 will ensure this important work is brought to scale.

Theodore Small (Vice President, Clark County Education Association):

We cannot separate the evaluation of teachers from the support and professional development necessary to teachers. The vision of the CCSD and the CCEA is to have great teachers in every classroom, with teachers taking the lead to ensure this vision is achieved.

This is my twenty-first year in the CCSD. Teachers often wonder how to support the teacher next door. We sometimes give that work only to administrators. Part of this program requires teachers to step forward to lead their profession.

The CCEA sought grants from the National Education Association to find collaborative ways to work with the district and research ways the CCSD supports teachers in the classroom. We received a grant and examined the practices of four different schools last year. We discovered great examples of teacher support. As we looked across the CCSD, the only similarity we found was that every school was different. We want to make sure we work collaboratively in schools to improve teaching and ensure teaching professionals who enter the CCSD are supported. This is the reason the CCEA and CCSD worked together to develop this system.

According to exit interviews from teachers who left the CCSD within 5 years, the No.1 reason teachers left the district was lack of support at the school. We also reviewed existing law, which states districts should be making efforts to ensure teachers are successful. This language is too broad. We discovered in some schools, there are some great things happening to support teachers and in other schools, there are not. We took it upon ourselves as an organization, in collaboration with the CCSD, to ensure there is more than a reasonable effort to ensure every teacher is successful.

We examined over 15 different systems around the Country. We found multiple examples of districts supporting their teachers throughout their careers. We selected Montgomery County, Maryland, as the model for our program for

three reasons: they had 15 years of success; their student population was more diverse than that of the CCSD and 15 years ago, they struggled with attracting and retaining teachers, a top priority for the CCSD.

We developed the CCSD PAR program during the past 18 months. We sent three different teams of CCSD and CCEA personnel as well as members from other stakeholder groups representing business and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) to visit Montgomery County, Maryland. The PAR program was created to support the standards of the NEPF.

Samantha Hager (Lead Consulting Teacher, Peer Assistance and Review, Clark County School District):

Next year the CCSD hopes to hire 2,600 new teachers. We know that the teacher pipeline is small, so teacher retention is key to ensuring the teachers we hire stay in our classrooms.

Every teacher who leaves the CCSD has a story to tell; and right now, the story is: "I came to this district; I came to this State, and I was not supported." We need to change the story.

There is a report from the Alliance for Excellent Education that identifies teacher quality as the most important factor in student learning in the school. Improving teacher quality will make an impact on student learning, especially in high-need schools, which is where implementation of the PAR program will begin next year.

I have been a coach in these schools for the last 3 years. In stepping into this position, I have spent a lot of time talking to principals about their current realities. Many of the CCSD elementary schools have more than 20 brand-new teachers who are supported by other teachers in their schools who might have only been teaching for 2 years. Although they are the most veteran teachers in their buildings, teachers with only 2 years of experience are not prepared to mentor other teachers.

I was at a high school this week where the principal will have upwards of 60 probationary teachers next year. We know teacher support needs to come from outside the building and inside the CCSD. The principals with whom I have spoken are excited about the PAR program. They know that although there is

some support within their building through professional development, resources for teachers and testing coordinators, it is not enough for probationary teachers.

Consulting Teachers (CT) hired through the PAR program will have a group of 12–15 new teachers assigned to them. The CT will specifically assist probationary teachers by supporting their instruction. They will not be overlapping other resources offered by the CCSD. The CT will conduct formal and informal observations throughout the year to help the new teachers with instruction through the lens of the NEPF. The CT will share their findings with the PAR panel. The panel will ultimately make a recommendation to the CCSD superintendent as to whether the teacher has met the standards, needs continued support to meet the standards or has not met the standards despite the support received. The recommendation could include the nonrenewal of a teacher's employment contract.

The PAR program and system of CT will improve support offered by the CCSD to its new teachers.

Senator Hammond:

I support S.B. 332. We need to support new teachers. Teachers do not "hit their stride" until about the fourth year. Will a first-year teacher automatically receive assistance? What happens to a first-year teacher in the CCSD?

Ms. Hager:

Each new teacher in the 22 schools that the PAR program will be supporting will be assigned a CT mentor for the year. They will meet regularly. The CT will conduct multiple formal and informal observations. Evaluation reports will be submitted to the PAR panel. The support will be ongoing and in addition to the administrative evaluations that are ongoing.

The PAR evaluations are not completed for the purpose of evaluation. They occur for observational purposes and are forwarded to the panel. The building principal will also get a copy of the observational report.

Senator Hammond:

Is the intent punitive or supportive?

Ms. Hager:

The intent is to support the new teacher. The goal of the PAR program is to improve teacher instruction and retain teachers.

Chair Harris:

This is a mentoring model more than a supervisory model, is that correct?

Ms. Hager:

Yes, that is correct.

Senator Roberson:

There has been a friendly amendment proposed by the NSEA ([Exhibit K](#)) with some changes. I support the proposed amendment.

Mr. Long:

The three major purposes and goals for PAR in the CCSD is to ensure great teachers in every CCSD classroom, consistent support of quality teaching and the retention of teachers beyond 5 years in hard-to-fill schools. The unique part of this process has been the collaboration with the CCEA, the CCASAP, the RPDP, UNLV and the community. Everyone has the same goal of supporting great teaching in all the CCSD classrooms.

We know that we have to examine the teacher pipeline and support new and struggling teachers. We are not as consistent as we should be. The collaborative process with the key stakeholder groups gets everyone involved and centered on teacher retention and improving instruction in the classroom.

The PAR panel of five teachers and five administrators selected the CT. Eleven CT have been hired. Several more will have to be hired to meet the need in the Turnaround Zone. We would like this program to be implemented districtwide, but we know there is a price tag that comes with that. Hiring the 11 CT cost about \$1 million for 1 year. With the desire to go districtwide and make it a true collaborative process, we understand funding and taking teachers from classroom positions will be obstacles. We believe the PAR program will make a huge impact on teacher retention and teacher quality.

David Bechtel (Principal, Basic High School):

I am the PAR panel cochair with Mr. Small. The PAR structure has five administrators and five teachers on the panel. All of them were chosen

collaboratively, which makes this one of the greatest programs I have seen as a school administrator. The CCEA was working on this program for almost 2 years before the principals became involved. The building principals only had one concern, the potential to lose a great teacher from the building to the PAR program. While the principals acknowledged that PAR is a great program philosophically, nobody wants a great teacher to leave their building. It was scary for many principals. I have been selling the concept of the PAR program to the principals for the last year. This system will make the entire system better. I believe in the potential we have to not only improve the performance of struggling teachers, but also to show the CCSD that teacher support can transform education.

Mr. Small:

The CT are hired on a rotational basis. The teachers who will serve in this capacity will be removed from the classrooms for a 3-year period. After that time, they will return to the classrooms for a minimum of 2 years before they are eligible for CT assignments again.

Danielle Brown, Ph.D. (Assistant Professor of Teacher Education, University of Nevada, Las Vegas):

I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit L](#)).

Andrew Diss (Students First):

Students First supports S.B. 332. We have supported the NEPF since inception. Given that we have experienced significant testing issues over the last couple of weeks, the State Board of Education has determined that Nevada will be freezing performance ratings at the current level for the next school year. As a result, these peer evaluations become even more important. Without having student performance data available to judge the effectiveness of a teacher, we should be giving feedback to educators regarding the delivery of instruction. Master classroom teachers know how to do this better than anyone else.

Seth Rau (Nevada Succeeds):

Nevada Succeeds has been working with the CCEA and the CCSD on the PAR program for over 2 years. It has been a long collaboration. As a representative of the business community, Nevada Succeeds understands teachers can and should lead the push for teacher quality in Nevada. It is important that teachers take ownership of their profession. The PAR program is one way to do that. We support S.B. 332.

Michael Vannozzi (Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance):

The Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance supports S.B. 332. There is a tendency in education to promote everyone to administration when some of the greatest talent is needed in teaching itself. The PAR program is an opportunity for the greatest teachers in our system to stay in the classroom and help their peers improve performance. This program makes sense. It is something a business community would put in place, if the business community were running education. Veteran teachers mentoring new teachers is good policy.

Erik Smith:

I am a nationally board-certified teacher. Eleven years ago, I began my career with the CCSD. In my first 2 years of teaching, I struggled immensely. I lacked support, mentorship and access to individuals who could help me in the immediate needs of my classroom.

Like thousands of my colleagues, I went out on my own to improve my skill set. I paid for the expenses associated with the improvement of my classroom performance.

Fifty percent of CCSD teachers are leaving the profession within 3–5 years of their tenure because there is no support. Teachers struggle with classroom management skills and stress, creating a turnover factory. It is expensive and harms student learning. It takes at least 3 years to become an effective teacher. Research shows that timely feedback of a teacher's performance works. Learners need that; so do teachers. The PAR program gives new teachers timely feedback on their classroom performance. Administrators are too busy writing long evaluations. They are too busy running the school. They do not have the time to provide meaningful feedback that will help a teacher immediately.

Teachers are too busy in their own classrooms. Designating CT addresses this need. It is a proven program with measurable results. I strongly encourage your support of S.B. 332. This is a realistic opportunity for master teachers to help teachers. It crosses the barrier that sometimes exists between an administrator and a teacher.

Justin Harrison (Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce):

The Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce supports S.B. 332.

Mr. Augspurger:

The CCASAPE supports S.B. 332. Mr. Bechtel is the president of the CCASAPE. We have been working on the PAR program for over a year. I look forward to the day when this program evolves, so we can offer the same type of assistance to new administrators and principals.

Ms. Anderson:

The WCSD is neutral on S.B. 332. The WCSD has had a PAR program in place for some time. Dr. Heath Morrison, a former WCSD superintendent, came from Montgomery County, Maryland. He brought many of the best practices to the WCSD.

I hope you will consider including school districts throughout the State instead of limiting it to only the CCSD. Teachers across our State would benefit from this level of support. If we all agree on the policy, it should be available to all of the school districts in the State.

Mike Paul (Peer Assistance and Review Coordinator, Washoe County School District):

The WCSD PAR program began 2 years ago as a small pilot program with just a small group of schools. We funded it through the Teacher Incentive Fund grant program. This year the PAR program is being implemented districtwide. It is a full partnership with the Washoe Education Association. The PAR program is solely based on the improvement of instruction in the classroom. The program is not used as part of the teacher evaluation process.

Our consulting teachers are the value-added piece of the program. They are improving instruction. Our PAR panel is in place and comprised of five administrators and five teachers. The work the PAR panel does in terms of recommendations to support teachers is tremendous. A difference between the PAR program in the WCSD and the proposed PAR program in the CCSD is that the WCSD program includes struggling veteran teachers. All of our first-year teachers are assigned a consulting teacher.

The program is successful. Twenty-seven teachers were identified as unsuccessful. After 1 year, one-third of the teachers served have improved and are now rated effective. Approximately one-third have chosen to leave the profession on their own terms. We have another one-third who are improving,

but not quite where the WCSD wants them to be. They will remain in the PAR program for a second year and continue to work with the CT.

Our CT work very hard. Our administrators feel very supported by the work of the CT and the PAR panel. We are looking forward to keeping the momentum of the program. It is a struggle to find continuous funding, with the caseload of the CT increasing.

Senator Segerblom:

Does the WCSD do any work with permanent teachers who receive an unsatisfactory evaluation?

Mr. Paul:

Yes. We work with all first-year teachers and veteran teachers who receive minimally effective or ineffective evaluations.

As the PAR coordinator, I monitor all teacher evaluations. The WCSD has a computerized platform where all of our evaluations are completed online. I review the reports and can view them in real time.

If a veteran teacher is rated ineffective on an evaluation, he or she is automatically included in the PAR program. If a veteran teacher receives a minimally effective evaluation, the evaluator is given discretion as to whether or not the teacher is referred to the PAR program. If a teacher is rated minimally effective for 2 consecutive years, he or she is enrolled in the PAR program for support. We do not want to leave a teacher behind.

Senator Segerblom:

Do many teachers receive two consecutive minimally effective evaluations?

Mr. Paul:

The WCSD 4-tier evaluation system has only been in place for 3 years. There were a handful of teachers who reverted to probationary status last year. Only a couple more teachers were added to that category this year.

Chair Harris:

I will now close the hearing on S.B. 332.

Patrick Gavin (Director, State Public Charter School Authority):

Arbab Khalid, a senior from the Coral Academy of Science, was selected as one of only seven Nevada students as a semifinalist for the U.S. Presidential Scholars Program.

Craig Stevens (Clark County School District):

This week, we celebrate Teacher Appreciation Week. Across the district, students and administrators in the CCSD are showing their support for teachers. Schools are holding assemblies; students are giving speeches, and even posting on social media pages. The CCSD kicked off Teacher Appreciation Week at Victoria Fertitta Middle School where, among other events, the students put together an amazing tribute to their teachers. Mojave High School students presented their cafeteria workers a cake. Station Casinos provided 18,000 buffet meals to teachers, districtwide. The students at South West Career and Technical Academy treated their teachers to a free salon treatment at their training center, and the culinary students cooked their teachers a very special lunch.

Throughout the CCSD, educators are making a difference.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Senate Committee on Education
May 5, 2015
Page 36

Chair Harris:

There being no further comment or business before the Committee, the meeting is adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Beth Ann Reykers,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Becky Harris, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	6		Attendance Roster
A.B. 447	C	4	Dena Durish/Department of Education	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 447	D	5	Pam Salazar/Teachers and Leaders Council	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 447	E	1	Nicole Rourke/Clark County School District	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 447	F	3	Andre Long/Clark County School District	Written Testimony
A.B. 447	G	1	Anthony Nuñez/J.E. Manch Elementary School	Written Testimony
A.B. 447	H	1	Grant Hanevold/Sunrise Mountain High School	Written Testimony
A.B. 447	I	1	Mike McLamore/Nevada State Education Association	Letter
A.B. 447	J	1	Mike McLamore/Nevada State Education Association	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 332	K	1	Senator Michael Roberson	Proposed Amendment from Nevada State Education Association
S.B. 332	L	1	Danielle Brown/University of Nevada, Las Vegas	Written Testimony