

TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2025
2:00 PM

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Rd.	Las Vegas	Boardroom
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Silver Ore Conference Room
Department of Education	Virtual/ YouTube	n/a	n/a

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Pam Salazar
Pam Teel
Jeana Blackman-Taylor
Elizabeth Cadigan
Felicia Gonzales
Pam Goynes-Brown
Annie Hicks
Darcy McInnis
Sue Moulden
Susan Neal
Juanita Ortiz
Andrew Tiscareno

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (NDE) STAFF PRESENT

Kathryn Hoyt, Education Programs Professional; Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement (EDLiFE)

Jackie Nygard, Education Programs Professional; Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement (EDLiFE)

Rick Derry, Administrative Assistant; Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement (EDLiFE)

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General (DAG)

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Pam Salazar called the meeting to order following roll call and the Pledge of Allegiance. Chair Salazar expressed gratitude towards member Susan Neal's reappointment. The Governor's office has not yet appointed a member for the Board of Trustees position previously held by Linda Gilkerson.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

There was no public comment in Carson City and no public comment in Las Vegas.

3. **INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 20, 2024, MEETING MINUTES** (*Information/ Discussion/ Possible Action*)

Members of the Council reviewed the November 20, 2024, meeting minutes. **Chair Salazar entertained a motion to approve the minutes.** Member Blackman-Taylor asked about the discussion regarding input from stakeholder groups following the presentation of the STIP during the last meeting. **Member Jeana Blackman-Taylor motioned to approve, with a note to add a reference to stakeholder input on the STIP. Vice Chair Teel seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

4. **INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING OPEN MEETING LAW TRAINING** (*Information/Discussion*)

Members received training on Nevada Open Meeting Law to ensure they understood the legal expectations and requirements of members of the Council. The training was given by Deputy Attorney General (DAG) David Gardner (see meeting materials).

5. **INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE ELECTION OF COUNCIL CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR PURSUANT TO NRS 391.455** (*Information/ Discussion/Possible Action*)

Deputy Attorney General David Gardener facilitated elections for Council Chair and Vice Chair. **Member Pam Teel nominated Pam Salazar as chair, with no other nominations put forward. All members of the Council voted to approve Chair Salazar. Pam Teel nominated Sue Moulden as vice chair. All members of the Council voted to approve Vice Chair Moulden.**

6. **INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING NEVADA EDUCATOR PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK (NEPF) UPDATES** (*Information/ Discussion*)

Kathy Hoyt provided the Council with updates on the NEPF. The Winter Liaison Newsletter was shared with district NEPF Liaisons and posted to the NDE update on December 10, 2024. NEPF Liaisons met on November 25, 2024, following the previous TLC meeting. Attendance was optional and focused on sharing instruction for the NEPF Field Study Winter Participant Survey.

Field Study Workgroups met for their 3rd session during the week of February 11. Members reviewed Winter Field Study Participant Survey data, shared feedback on NEPF implementation in their buildings, and provided feedback on the summative evaluation process currently taking place. Workgroups will meet the week of May 5 to share final feedback on field study implementation. The field study participant survey was shared with participating LEAs, with approximately 85 schools, from December 2 to December 20. There were 256 total responses: 209 teachers, 46 administrators, and 1 principal supervisor. The survey included multiple questions regarding the implementation of field study materials and included opportunities to add additional comments. To ensure confidentiality, the single principal supervisor's response was not included in the review. Ms. Hoyt reviewed the data and opened the floor for questions or comments. Member Pam Teel shared feedback on the data presented. Ms. Hoyt presented the administrator survey results. She stated that principal supervisors and building administrators were typically initiating the NEPF summative evaluation process at this point in the school year. She added that NDE has had lengthy discussions with workgroup members regarding the feedback received during the field study. Many participants expressed concern with inter-rater reliability and subjectivity in summative scoring. The desire to further simplify the summative evaluation process, administrator and teacher time constraints, and educator best practices were common topics.

As a topic of discussion, NDE solicited feedback on a Differentiated Evaluation Cycle for the NEPF with potential field study participants during the 2025-26 school year. The NEPF protocols currently set requirements for NEPF implementation that includes the rubrics, self-assessment, goal setting, observation cycles, evidence collection, evaluation frequency, and class size adjustment on summative evaluations. The Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) and NEPF protocols do not state that educators must be evaluated on all standards and indicators within each evaluation cycle. After receiving mixed feedback from the Field Study workgroups, NDE proposed an evaluation cycle that be differentiated for certain educator groups. Educators who were probationary or designated as developing or ineffective on their previous year's evaluation would continue to be observed and responsible for providing evidence for all standards and indicators. Post probationary educators rated effective based on their previous year's summative evaluation would be observed and responsible for providing evidence for 1 IPS/IL standard and 1 PR standard they identify as areas for growth and 1 IPS/IL standard and 1 PR standard their supervisor identified as areas for growth, as well as for any standards where an indicator was scored a 2 or lower. Potentially, their evaluation would be based on a minimum of 4 standards (as opposed to 10). Ms. Hoyt opened the floor for questions or comments.

Chair Salazar mentioned that when TLC first contracted with Crest and WestEd for the development of the NEPF, the efficacy of the NEPF was built on 2 foundational requirements. One was that it focuses on enabling teachers to enable student learning. Because it is a growth system, scoring cannot be done after each observation. The second premise was that the standards cannot be pulled apart. It is a framework of instructional standards they are integrated with each other. Member Hicks expressed gratitude to Chair Salazar for sharing the history of the NEPF as well as her concerns about the unintended consequences of only focusing on limited standards, which may affect the intended outcome of having effective teaching happening to improve learning outcomes. Vice Chair Moulden agreed with Chair Salazar and expressed how much she loved the NEPF and believed that if it was implemented with fidelity, and if they build relationships with teachers, it could make an impact for the students. She added that data shows that schools and students are not at the level that they should be and questioned how to get them there if they were short-changed. She believed that they need to keep it as is.

Ms. Hoyt continued by presenting the NEPF Differentiated Evaluation Cycle for highly effective educators. Post probationary educators rated highly effective based on their previous year's summative evaluation would be observed and responsible for providing evidence for 1 IPS/IL standard and 1 PR standard they identified as areas for growth, as well as for any standards where an indicator was scored a 2 or lower. Ms. Hoyt opened the floor for questions or comments.

Chair Salazar reiterated the purpose of keeping a focus on all the standards. Member Teel agreed, adding that when given the necessary guidance and training, then the NEPF can be used to support everyone in the educational process. Vice Chair Moulden asked about how the class size adjustment would be affected. Ms. Hoyt said that it would be one of the logistical items that would need to be worked out if this system were to be implemented.

7. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE 2025 LEGISLATIVE SESSION (Information/ Discussion/ Possible Action)

Ms. Hoyt shared that there was no proposed legislation that directly impacted the NEPF yet; however, except for the 2023 legislative session, there had been bills passed during each session impacting the NEPF since it began, so it is likely that bill/s would be proposed at some point. NDE would keep the TLC apprised of any bills.

Senate Bill 78 (SB78), if passed, would impact the membership of the TLC. The bill proposed various changes, consolidations, and termination to the composition and operation of various boards, commissions, and councils. It would change the membership of the Teachers and Leaders Council, as well as a number of other groups. Membership would be reduced from 16 to 9 members with cuts being made in the number of teacher members (from 4 to 1), administrators (2 to 1), district board trustees (2 to 1), and members with education policy expertise (2 to 1). In addition, Section 49 of SB 78 proposes that appointments to the council would no longer stem from the Governor's Boards and Commissions office. Appointments would be made by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The language requiring nominees to represent the geographical diversity of the school districts in the State had been removed. The bill had been mentioned at multiple subcommittee hearings, but no action had been taken.

Assembly Bill 236 (AB236), if passed, would also impact the membership of TLC. The bill proposed changing the nomination process for both the teacher members and the OLEP member of the TLC. Currently, the Governor appoints a member from a list of three nominees from the Nevada State Education Association (NSEA). If passed, the Governor would appoint a member from a list of 6 nominees, 3 nominees submitted by the employee organization representing the plurality of teachers employed by a large school district (NRS 388G.530 defines a large school district as having more than 100,000 pupils enrolled in its public schools) and three nominees submitted by the employee organization representing the plurality of teachers employed by school districts in this State other than a large school district. The members appointed would have to represent the geographical diversity of the school districts in the State.

Member Gonzales said she believed SB78 had been amended, and that the status of the Council may have changed in the bill. She recommended reaching out to the NDE legislative liaison to confirm.

8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS *(Information/ Discussion/Possible Action)*

The regular session of the Nevada Legislature, the 83rd session, began on February 3, 2025, so there may be additional legislation proposed that could impact TLC or the NEPF by the April 30, 2025, meeting. Ms. Hoyt would keep the Council updated if there were any proposed changes. Last year, TLC had an in-person meeting in April. If the Council wished to do it again, they could convene before preparing recommendations for the State Board of Education (SBE). A survey would be sent out to Council members to determine whether the best location would be Carson City or Las Vegas. There would be a discussion on the first year of Field Study and to determine TLC's recommendation to the State Board for a report at their June meeting.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

There was no public comment in Carson City and no public comment in Las Vegas.

10. ADJOURNMENT

With no further objections, the meeting was adjourned at 3:34 PM.