

TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)
MONDAY, MARCH 31, 2025
1:00 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	Boardroom
Department of Education	Virtual/ YouTube	n/a	n/a

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Chair Pam Salazar
Pamela Teel
Jeana Blackman-Taylor
Pam Goynes-Brown
Darcy McInnis
Sue Moulden
Susan Neal
Juanita Ortiz
Drew Schaar
Andrew Tiscareno
Richard Varner

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (NDE) STAFF IN ATTENDANCE

Kathryn Hoyt, Assistant Director, Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement (EDLiFE)

Tina Statucki, Contractor, Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement (EDLiFE)

Jackie Nygaard, 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 IN ATTENDANCE

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General (DAG)

DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVES

Tasha Fuson, Carson City School District
Erik Skramstad, Clark County School District
Lindsay Bender, Douglas County School District

Jeannie Dwyer, Douglas County School District
Carly Strauss, Douglas County School District
Marissa McClish, Washoe County School District
Briana Wiltsie, Washoe County School District

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

Chair Pam Salazar called the meeting to order followed by the roll call and Pledge of Allegiance.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT #1**

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

3. **INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 26, 2025, MEETING MINUTES** (*Information/ Discussion/ Possible Action*)

Members of the TLC reviewed the February 26, 2025, meeting minutes. **Chair Salazar entertained a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Member Goynes-Brown made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Member Schaar seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carried.**

4. **INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING NEVADA EDUCATOR PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK (NEPF) FIELD STUDY UPDATES**

(*Information/ Discussion/ Possible Action*)

Kathy Hoyt, Assistant Director from the Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement (EDLiFE), provided members with an update on the NEPF Field Study. At the time of the meeting, NEPF Field Study participants, along with all districts statewide, had begun the Summative Evaluation process for administrators, teachers, and other licensed educators. Educators evaluated under the NEPF were also preparing to complete the annual NEPF Monitoring for Continuous Improvement (MCI) Survey, which had been shared with districts during the first week of April. This year's survey included additional items specifically for Field Study participants, allowing them to provide site-specific feedback and respond to open-ended questions regarding the implementation of the Field Study. It was noted that charter schools participating in the Field Study were included in the MCI survey process, which had not typically been done in prior years. Ms. Hoyt also reported that the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) had invited Field Study participants to participate in virtual interviews to share their experiences with the 2024–25 Field Study. A total of 12 interviews were conducted, involving 10 school administrators, one principal supervisor, and one teacher. The open-ended questions used in these interviews were shared with members as part of the meeting materials.

At the February 26, 2025, meeting, the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) sought feedback from the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) on a proposed Differentiated Evaluation Cycle for the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF), with the intent to potentially incorporate it into the Field Study for the 2025–26 school year. Ms. Hoyt explained that while Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) and Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) establish requirements for the evaluation of licensed personnel—including the use of NEPF rubrics, self-assessment, and observation cycles—they do not clearly define the frequency with which all Instructional Practice/Leadership Standards (IPS/ILS) and Professional Responsibilities Standards (PRS) and Indicators must be evaluated. In response to feedback from NEPF Field Study participants and NEPF District Liaisons, the Department adjusted its original proposal for a Differentiated Evaluation Cycle. The revised proposal specified that the differentiated model would not apply to probationary educators, post-probationary educators rated Ineffective or Developing, or post-probationary educators who received a score of 2 or lower on any

standard or indicator in the prior year's evaluation. These educators would continue to be evaluated on all Standards and Indicators and undergo the full observation cycle. Under the proposed model, post-probationary educators rated Effective in the previous year—who did not receive a score of 2 or lower on any indicator—would be evaluated on a minimum of four Standards. These would include one IPS/ILS and one PRS identified by their administrator as areas for growth, along with one IPS/ILS and one PRS the educator identifies for their own growth. Post-probationary educators rated Highly Effective in the previous year—who also did not receive a score of 2 or lower on any indicator—would be evaluated on a minimum of two Standards, consisting of one IPS/ILS and one PRS they personally identify as growth areas. Ms. Hoyt shared the potential benefits and drawbacks of the Differentiated Evaluation Cycle. One concern noted was the potential shift in focus and accountability from demonstrating best practices across all standards to focusing primarily on selected standards. While educators would still be expected to maintain effective performance across all Standards and Indicators, narrowing the summative evaluation to fewer areas could lead to a lower overall scoring average. She also discussed several logistical considerations that would need to be addressed if the differentiated cycle were to move forward. These included determining how evaluations would be affected in cases of changes in teaching assignment, supervisor or evaluator, school site, or when an administrator has valid concerns that may warrant mid-year adjustments to an educator's evaluation plan. Lastly, Ms. Hoyt noted that implementation of the differentiated cycle might require revisions to existing statutes, including updates related to class-size ratio adjustments due to the reduced number of standards being formally evaluated, and decisions on whether to continue the summative evaluation waiver for Highly Effective educators. She concluded by opening the floor for questions and comments.

In preparation for recommendations for the 2025–26 NEPF Field Study, the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) invited District NEPF Liaisons to share additional perspectives on NEPF implementation. Liaisons provided insights into the implementation of the NEPF at the district level, while district-level Field Study participants offered feedback specific to the Field Study process. Liaisons were also given the opportunity to suggest improvements for the Field Study moving forward.

Tasha Fuson, Chief Academic Officer of the Carson City School District, shared feedback gathered through discussions and interactions with the principals she supervises. Ms. Fuson noted that although previous survey responses from her district had not always been favorable, district leaders expressed a preference for the current evaluation tool. They felt it allowed supervisors to deliver comprehensive, instructional feedback and to support teachers in improving their classroom practices. Ms. Fuson highlighted that the primary challenge with the current evaluation system was the difficulty of evaluating every teacher on the full breadth of the NEPF each year. She stated that her district would like to return to a differentiated growth model that would allow educators and evaluators to concentrate on standards more closely aligned with individual teachers' professional development needs. She also identified inter-rater reliability and the need for consistent, high-quality training for all administrators as ongoing challenges within her district. Chair Salazar then opened the floor for questions and discussion.

Member Goynes-Brown inquired about the type of evidence required when collaborating with grade-level colleagues or participating in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to plan and implement lessons, and how that evidence contributes to an educator's overall performance. Ms. Hoyt explained that for schools not participating in the Field Study, each indicator within the NEPF standards requires both mandatory and confirmatory evidence. A minimum of two pieces of evidence must be collected per indicator to demonstrate that the educator has met performance

expectations. This approach ensures that both educators and evaluators have clear documentation to support evaluation outcomes. In contrast, for schools participating in the NEPF Field Study, the evaluation process uses holistic scoring, which reduces the amount of required evidence. Rather than two pieces per indicator, educators are only required to submit two pieces of evidence per standard—while still including both mandatory and confirmatory types. Chair Salazar added that activities such as PLC participation are categorized under Professional Responsibilities within the NEPF framework.

Eric Skramstad, from the Clark County School District (CCSD), shared his district's experiences with the NEPF Field Study. He reported that approximately 30 CCSD schools were participating in the study, including 20 elementary schools, 10 middle schools, and 10 high schools. Mr. Skramstad noted that his team received consistent feedback from the schools they were able to contact in relation to the key questions outlined in the presentation (see meeting materials). He stated that one aspect that worked well was the perception among principals and supervisors regarding the process of gathering information related to the standards. Because the Field Study removes the individual indicators and instead uses holistic scoring at the standard level, many found the process to be more streamlined. He explained that the consistency of scoring by standard in the Field Study mirrored the level of precision achieved when scoring individual indicators, resulting in only minimal differences—sometimes as small as one-hundredth of a point—when compared to traditional evaluations. Mr. Skramstad, however, noted a concern raised across participating sites: the inability to highlight individual strengths using specific indicators. Under the Field Study model, scoring a “3” at the standard level may obscure areas of notable success that would otherwise be captured through indicator-level scoring. He suggested this supported earlier discussions about the potential value of incorporating a mid-range or half-point scoring option. Mr. Skramstad also shared that a common issue identified across sites was the challenge of submitting evaluation data to NDE. He expressed surprise at the widespread nature of this concern, having initially believed it was unique to his experience. Specifically, educators and evaluators cited difficulties with the electronic tool and its interface with NRS 391.475. He emphasized that when evaluators are required to enter scores for multiple individuals multiple times, the risk of input errors increases significantly, raising concerns about data accuracy.

Carly Strauss from Douglas County School District shared that her district's experiences aligned with the feedback being discussed. While Ms. Strauss does not serve in an evaluator role, she has led professional development on educator evaluations since the NEPF was initially implemented. She emphasized her focus on instruction, stating that she believes instructional improvement should be the central focus for teachers. Ms. Strauss identified several areas for improvement, including inconsistency in scoring across different sites and varying expectations regarding the types and quantity of evidence required—differences that often depend on the individual administrator. She noted that the evaluation process is time-consuming and highlighted the challenge of training new teachers, many of whom enter the profession with limited instructional experience. She also raised concerns about the ongoing high turnover of both teachers and administrators, which complicates consistent implementation of the evaluation system. Chair Salazar responded by acknowledging the feedback and suggesting that administrator calibration sessions—similar to the inter-rater reliability training conducted during the initial rollout of the NEPF—could be revisited. She recommended the use of live training sessions and reminded attendees that resources for inter-rater reliability training are available on the RPDP website and accessible to all districts.

Ms. Hoyt spoke on behalf of Lyon County School District, which was unable to attend the meeting. As one of the districts participating in the NEPF Field Study, Lyon County shared that one aspect

that worked well was the observation and feedback process. They appreciated not having to collect and submit paper-based evidence for each individual indicator, noting that referencing standards instead simplified the process.

For areas of improvement, Lyon County reported that the Field Study model did not save time compared to the traditional evaluation process. One of the primary challenges was that, by consolidating all indicators under a single standard-level score, it became more difficult to provide specific, targeted feedback in the way the previous model allowed. They expressed concern that this lack of specificity limited the usefulness of the evaluation. Their recommendation was not to continue modifying the model, as they felt the original design was well-intentioned, but the changes implemented so far had not resulted in meaningful improvements.

Marissa McClish from the Washoe County School District noted that their district did not participate in the Field Study but expressed interest in reviewing the resulting data and learning from the experiences of other districts.

Chair Salazar entertained a motion to recommend that the NEPF Field Study be expanded in the 2025–26 school year without requiring mandatory participation by any district or school. Member Goynes-Brown made the motion, and Member Teel seconded it. Chair Salazar then requested that Mr. Derry conduct a roll call vote to determine whether members were in favor of the motion.

Chair Salazar voted in favor of recommending that the NEPF Field Study be expanded next year without mandatory participation by districts or schools.

Member Teel voted in favor of recommending that the NEPF Field Study be expanded next year without mandatory participation by districts or schools.

Member Gonzales voted in favor of recommending that the NEPF Field Study be expanded next year without mandatory participation by districts or schools.

Member Goynes-Brown voted in favor of recommending that the NEPF Field Study be expanded next year without mandatory participation by districts or schools.

Member McInnis voted in favor of recommending that the NEPF Field Study be expanded next year without mandatory participation by districts or schools.

Member Moulden voted not in favor of recommending that the NEPF Field Study be expanded next year without mandatory participation by districts or schools.

Member Ortiz Voted in favor of recommending that the NEPF Field Study be expanded next year without mandatory participation by districts or schools.

Member Schaar voted in favor of recommending that the NEPF Field Study be expanded next year without mandatory participation by districts or schools.

Member Varner voted in favor of recommending that the NEPF Field Study be expanded next year without mandatory participation by districts or schools.

Member Neal voted in favor of recommending that the NEPF Field Study be expanded next year without mandatory participation by districts or schools.

With 9 members in favor and 1 in opposition, the motion carried.

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

Ms. Hoyt provided the council with updates related to the 83rd Legislative Session, noting that there had been developments since the last meeting in February and emphasizing the importance of keeping the council informed.

Ms. Hoyt first discussed Senate Bill 78 (SB 78), which proposes significant changes to the membership structure of the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC). Under the bill, council membership would be reduced from 16 to 9 members. The proposed reductions include decreasing teacher representation from four members to one, administrator representation from two to one, school board trustee representation from two to one, and members with education policy expertise from two to one. Additionally, appointments to the council would no longer be made through the Governor's Boards and Commissions Office but instead directly by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Ms. Hoyt also noted that the bill removes the requirement for council members to reflect the geographical diversity of Nevada's school districts. She clarified that, as of the meeting date, the bill had not yet been brought to a vote in either legislative chamber.

Ms. Hoyt then reviewed Assembly Bill 236 (AB 236), which also proposes changes to the TLC, specifically to the nomination process for teachers and other licensed educational personnel representatives. The bill proposes that six nominees be submitted in total—three from the employee organization with the plurality of teachers in a large school district (defined in Nevada law as a district with over 100,000 students, i.e., Clark County School District), and three from the employee organization with the plurality of teachers in all other school districts. Currently, the Nevada State Education Association (NSEA) is the nominating body. If passed, the Clark County Education Association (CCEA) would also submit nominees. Ms. Hoyt reported that AB 236 had passed the Assembly and was awaiting action in the Senate before potentially moving to the Governor.

Ms. Hoyt also introduced Senate Bill 253 (SB 253), which proposes new reporting requirements for the Board of Trustees of each school district. The bill would require districts to submit an annual report to the State Board of Education and TLC on the implementation and effectiveness of teacher observations. The report would include recommendations for revising the educator observation and evaluation process, as well as a list of the top 10% of elementary, middle, and high school teachers in each district based on their performance evaluations. She clarified that while this bill does not propose changes to the NEPF itself, it would impact TLC and increase the volume of data required for review. No legislative action had been taken on the bill as of the meeting date.

Finally, Ms. Hoyt discussed Assembly Bill 425 (AB 425), which proposes the removal of the student learning component—Student Learning Goals (SLGs)—from the NEPF summative evaluation process. SLGs currently account for 15 percent of a teacher's or administrator's evaluation. Ms. Hoyt noted that while this bill has been introduced in previous legislative sessions without passing, it

has been reintroduced this session. As of the meeting date, no action had yet been taken. She reiterated that NDE would continue to keep TLC updated on any legislation that could affect NEPF implementation or the council itself.

Ms. Hoyt concluded her legislative update by reminding the council that the 83rd Legislative Session is scheduled to end on June 25, 2025. Chair Salazar highlighted the return of AB 425 and said that she has testified on that bill, on behalf of TLC, for every legislative session. Member Drew Schaar asked whether the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) had taken an official position on any of the bills discussed during the legislative update. In response, Chair Salazar opened the floor for discussion regarding whether TLC should take a formal stance on the proposed legislation.

Member Schaar initiated the conversation by expressing strong concerns about AB 236, stating that the bill posed significant harm to statewide representation by allowing only three nominees from employee organizations outside of Clark County to represent 16 counties. He emphasized that this approach would prioritize a single district's interests and diminish the voices of educators in rural communities. Drawing from his personal experience as a representative from Mineral County, he noted how rare and valuable it is for educators in rural areas to have a seat at the table. He stressed that this bill risks silencing those voices. He further stated that educators enter the profession with a deep commitment to students and that many, especially those in rural communities, are deeply invested in day-to-day classroom instruction. Member Schaar noted that this bill would remove him from the council and argued that it fails to reflect a balanced or inclusive representation of educators across the state. He suggested that a more equitable approach might involve dividing nominations between Clark and Washoe Counties but noted that the bill currently designates only the Clark County Education Association (CCEA) to make those nominations—an approach he reiterated would be detrimental. Chair Salazar thanked Member Schaar for his comments and asked Ms. Hoyt whether she had any additional information about AB 236. Ms. Hoyt responded that she would need to research further to ensure accuracy but clarified that unlike SB 78, AB 236 did not reduce the number of council members. Instead, it altered the nomination process. She explained that the bill would allow three nominees from an employee organization representing educators in Clark County (a "large district" under NRS) and three nominees from an employee organization representing educators in all other school districts. She emphasized that the appointment authority would remain with the Governor. Chair Salazar thanked Ms. Hoyt and asked if there were any further comments. She acknowledged the importance of Member Schaar's question, noting that TLC had previously taken formal stances on legislation when it aligned with the Council's mission and role. She encouraged members to consider whether the Council should adopt a position now, in anticipation of being asked for input. She emphasized the importance of TLC members representing the interests of their respective constituencies. Member Teel revisited SB 78, confirming that the bill had not yet been heard or had any activity. Member Gonzales added that her understanding was that a substantial amendment to SB 78 was expected. She stated that many of the education-related committees originally named in the bill—including TLC—may be removed from the legislation if it moves forward.

Member Teel asked Chair Salazar to provide context for AB 425 and why it has appeared during multiple legislative sessions. She noted that understanding the historical background would help

inform the Council's discussion. Chair Salazar responded by outlining the origins of the Student Learning Goal (SLG) component within the NEPF. She explained that when the NEPF was first implemented during the 2012–2013 school year, student achievement data accounted for 50% of an educator's final evaluation score. Over time, based on recommendations from the council, the weight assigned to student achievement was gradually reduced. In the most recent legislative session, TLC had proposed retaining the SLG component at 20% but ultimately agreed to a 15% weight in order to maintain it as part of the evaluation framework. She clarified that SLGs had evolved from being tied to standardized assessments to being based on teacher-developed measures of student progress. Teachers now identify SLGs in collaboration with their supervising administrator and colleagues, using metrics that are appropriate to their instructional context. Chair Salazar emphasized that TLC has consistently supported including a student achievement component in the NEPF—if it is teacher-driven and not solely based on state-mandated assessments. She drew a connection between SLGs and Professional Practice Goals (PPGs), noting that both are intended to drive professional growth and improved student outcomes. Chair Salazar also referenced Member Schaar's earlier suggestion that TLC consider taking a formal position on this bill. She pointed out that since AB 425 has been introduced in nearly every legislative session since the NEPF's inception, the council may wish to adopt a stance in anticipation of the bill advancing this session. Chair Salazar then opened the floor for additional questions or comments regarding the SLG component. Member Teel agreed with the importance of the SLG, particularly because it supports the principle of measuring growth within the classroom—an area where teachers have meaningful control. She explained that SLGs align with competency-based instructional models currently in use across several districts and allow for more accurate reflections of student progress than standardized assessments. Vice Chair Moulden echoed this sentiment, stating that the SLG is pivotal because it encourages teachers to take ownership of both their professional development and their students' academic growth. She asserted that removing the SLG could reduce teachers' motivation to focus on student improvement and emphasized the need to preserve and advocate for the inclusion of the SLG within the NEPF. Chair Salazar concluded the discussion by opening the floor for any final comments regarding the proposed legislation.

Member Teel made a motion for the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) to formally oppose AB 425, specifically regarding the proposed removal or alteration of the Student Learning Goal (SLG) percentage within the teacher and administrator evaluation components of the NEPF. Vice Chair Moulden seconded the motion.

Chair Salazar opened the floor for discussion on whether the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) should take a formal position opposing the proposed removal or modification of the Student Learning Goal (SLG) component in AB 425. With no further discussion, the Council proceeded to a vote.

Chair Salazar voted in favor of opposing AB 425, specifically regarding the proposed removal or alteration of the Student Learning Goal (SLG) percentage within the teacher and administrator evaluation components of the NEPF.

Member Teel voted in favor of opposing AB 425, specifically regarding the proposed removal or alteration of the Student Learning Goal (SLG) percentage within the teacher and administrator evaluation components of the NEPF.

Member Taylor voted in favor of opposing AB 425, specifically regarding the proposed removal or alteration of the Student Learning Goal (SLG) percentage within the teacher and administrator evaluation components of the NEPF.

Member Gonzales voted in favor of opposing AB 425, specifically regarding the proposed removal or alteration of the Student Learning Goal (SLG) percentage within the teacher and administrator evaluation components of the NEPF.

Member Goynes-Brown voted in favor of opposing AB 425, specifically regarding the proposed removal or alteration of the Student Learning Goal (SLG) percentage within the teacher and administrator evaluation components of the NEPF.

Member McInnis voted against opposing AB 425, specifically regarding the proposed removal or alteration of the Student Learning Goal (SLG) percentage within the teacher and administrator evaluation components of the NEPF.

Member Moulden voted in favor of opposing AB 425, specifically regarding the proposed removal or alteration of the Student Learning Goal (SLG) percentage within the teacher and administrator evaluation components of the NEPF.

Member Ortiz voted against opposing AB 425, specifically regarding the proposed removal or alteration of the Student Learning Goal (SLG) percentage within the teacher and administrator evaluation components of the NEPF.

Member Schaar voted against opposing AB 425, specifically regarding the proposed removal or alteration of the Student Learning Goal (SLG) percentage within the teacher and administrator evaluation components of the NEPF.

Member Varner voted in favor of opposing AB 425, specifically regarding the proposed removal or alteration of the Student Learning Goal (SLG) percentage within the teacher and administrator evaluation components of the NEPF.

Member Neal voted in favor of opposing AB 425, specifically regarding the proposed removal or alteration of the Student Learning Goal (SLG) percentage within the teacher and administrator evaluation components of the NEPF.

With 8 members in favor and 3 in opposition, the motion carried.

Chair Salazar opened the floor for additional questions or comments about proposed legislation.

Member Schaar made a motion for the TLC to formally oppose SB 78, which proposes changes to the membership structure of the council, as well as AB 236, which proposes changes to the nomination process for TLC members. Member Jeana Blackman-Taylor seconded the motion.

Chair Salazar opened the floor for discussion regarding whether the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) should take a formal position to oppose SB 78, which proposes revisions to the membership structure of the Council, and AB 236, which proposes changes to the nomination process for teacher and other licensed educational personnel members of the TLC. Member Gonzales requested clarification on the specific aspect of AB 236 being opposed. She asked whether the concern was about replacing the Nevada State Education Association (NSEA) with an employee organization from a large district. Member Schaar clarified that the opposition was specifically focused on the language in the bill that, based on the NRS definition of a large school district, results in only one district—Clark County School District—qualifying. He emphasized that this language leads to inequitable representation for the remainder of the state. Member Gonzales asked if Member Schaar would consider amending the motion to clarify that the Council’s opposition is directed at this specific provision of the bill. Chair Salazar stated that the Council’s concern is with the structure requiring three nominees to come from a single large school district and the other three from the rest of the state, rather than having all six nominees be at large. Member Schaar confirmed that this was the intent of the opposition. Chair Salazar asked Member Blackman-Taylor, who had seconded the original motion, if she agreed to the amendment. Member Blackman-Taylor confirmed her support for the revised motion. Chair Salazar again opened the floor for discussion. With no further comments, the council proceeded to a vote.

The motion—to oppose Senate Bill 78 in its proposed revision of TLC membership and to oppose Assembly Bill 236 specifically in relation to the nomination structure that designates three nominees from a large school district instead of having all nominees be at-large—was carried unanimously.

Chair Salazar concluded the discussion by asking if there were any additional comments related to Ms. Hoyt’s legislative session overview. Ms. Hoyt informed the Council of a recent development regarding AB 236, stating that the bill had moved out of committee and was now on the floor for consideration, indicating that it was proceeding toward a full vote. Ms. Hoyt and Ms. Statucki then sought confirmation from Deputy Attorney General Gardner regarding quorum and the validity of the earlier vote to take a position on AB 425. Deputy Attorney General Gardner clarified that while a vote does not require quorum at the moment it is taken, quorum must have been established prior to the vote. Once quorum is established, the majority of those present must vote in favor for a motion to pass. He confirmed that quorum had been established and that the vote to oppose AB 425 was valid and had officially passed.

6. **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS** (*Information/ Discussion*)

Chair Salazar opened the discussion to determine whether the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) should proceed with the scheduled meeting on April 30, 2025. Member Blackman-Taylor asked for confirmation that the additional data referenced earlier by Ms. Statucki would not be available by that date. Chair Salazar confirmed that the data would not be ready. In response, Member Blackman-Taylor stated that she did not believe an April 30th meeting would be necessary. Chair Salazar noted that the current workshop—though not originally part of the meeting calendar—allowed the Council to complete a significant portion of the work that had been planned for the remainder of the year.

Vice Chair Moulden asked how Council members would be kept informed about the progress and status of the legislative bills discussed, in the absence of a formal April meeting. Ms. Hoyt

responded that she would provide updates to the Council via email as new legislative information became available. She also reminded members that they could independently track bill progress using the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) on the Nevada Legislature's website.

Chair Salazar concluded by reiterating that there would be no need to hold the April 30, 2025, meeting and encouraged members to stay informed virtually.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

Mr. Kelly Grondahl, principal of Vegas Verdes Elementary School for Clark County School District (CCSD), provided comment regarding agenda item 6 (*A complete copy of the statements is available in Appendix A*).

8. ADJOURNMENT

With no further objections, the meeting was adjourned at 3:26 PM.

Appendix A: Statements given during public comments

1. Mr. Kelly Grondahl, principal of Vegas Verdes Elementary School for Clark County School District (CCSD), provided comment regarding agenda item 6.
(A complete copy of the statements is available in Appendix A)

Appendix A, Item 1: MR. KELLY GRONDAHL

For the record, Kelly Grondahl, principal of Vegas Verdes Elementary School, Clark County School District. I am not here representing CCSD, I am simply representing an individual principal who has worked on the NEPF field study. I'm glad I actually stayed for the entire event because there were some great conversations and some great questions that were asked. So, I do agree with Pam Salazar or Chair Salazar regarding the NEPF, as a coaching document. We want to rise to the levels of our goals or what they are, and that's admirable it really is. And as a principal who's at the very end of my career and trying to set the example of our future APs who are going to be principals. And identify enough support for those individuals that are upcoming in education professional development, is so vital for helping new teachers and new administration to understand the content and the development for effective monitoring and coaching practices. There is a major shift coming just nationally with regard to experience and knowledge, because we have a significant amount of people that are going to retire in the very near future, myself included. And that gets to the differentiation of the process, you talked about differentiation today. And it's very important for all individuals when we look at schools, especially students, staff support, licensed that there is some sort of availability to increase growth for them by the differentiated approach. We need to identify specific areas where they are struggling in in order to help them achieve and that's your high effective that you're effective you're developing etc. James Clear who wrote the Atomic Habits, had a great conversation or a great statement and it goes like this, you do not rise to the level of your goals, which I mentioned before, you fall to the level of your systems. And I implore the group, the team that we have to create or you have to create systems that it can be successful across the state of Nevada, because we will never get to where we want to be if we don't have solid systems in place. And if that takes place at individual, finding superstars at each level within all of the districts then so be it. We have to find some way or means to make that happen. And then my last question and I, you know just being an administrator being in education, I think questions are so much the driving force of our improvement. And my question is this, I apologize I have to get to I have to get to another place, but what data exists to provide correlation or causation of the current NEPF system, currently in place. I know there was a conversation earlier regarding changes etc. But I think it's important that we look at the data in the 10 years that we've had this and what changes have we been able to implement or gain for student success in those 10 years. Thank you very much for your time and I appreciate all of you.