

**TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)**  
**THURSDAY, MAY 15, 2025**  
**3:00 PM**

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Rd.	Las Vegas	Bighorn Conference Room
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Artemisia Conference Room
Department of Education	Virtual/ <a href="#">YouTube</a>	N/A	N/A

**DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**

**MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE**

Pam Salazar  
Sue Moulden  
Jeana Blackman Taylor  
Annie Hicks  
Darcy McInnis  
Susan Neal  
Drew Schaar  
Pam Teel  
Andrew Tiscareno  
Richard Varner

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (NDE) STAFF PRESENT**

Kathryn Hoyt, Assistant Director, 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 PRESENT**

Greg Ott, Chief Attorney General

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

Chair Pam Salazar called the meeting to order following the roll call and the Pledge of Allegiance. Chair Salazar introduced Richard Varner, a new member representing the Board of Trustees with the Carson City School District. Chair Salazar noted that several other members' terms expire on June 30, 2025: Juanita Ortiz (teacher), Elizabeth Cadigan (teacher), Louis Markouzis (administrator), Jeana Blackman-Taylor (parent), and Pam Teel (superintendent who will be retiring). Chair Salazar confirmed that the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) has requested nominations from the respective organizations responsible for these roles and will provide updates to the Council, including any changes resulting from new legislation affecting membership.

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 MARCH 31, 2025, MEETING MINUTES** (*Information/ Discussion/ Possible Action*)

Members of the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) reviewed the meeting minutes for March 31, 2025.

**Chair Salazar entertained a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Member Blackman-Taylor moved to approve, and Member Hicks seconded. The motion carried with no objections.**

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

Chair Salazar and Kathryn Hoyt provided the Council with updates on three bills currently under consideration during the 2025 legislative session: Assembly Bill (AB) 236, Senate Bill (SB) 78, and Senate Bill (SB) 460.

Ms. Hoyt began with AB 236, which proposes changes to the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) nomination process for teachers and licensed educational personnel. Under the bill, six nominees would be required, with three nominated by the employee organization representing the plurality of teachers in Clark County School District and three nominated by the employee organization representing the plurality of teachers in all other Nevada school districts. AB 236 passed the Assembly on March 18 and the Senate Education Committee on May 12. It now awaits a Senate floor vote, after which it would move to the Governor for consideration if approved. Most exhibits submitted on this bill have been letters of opposition. The TLC has previously voted to oppose the measure due to concerns about fairness and statewide representation, and Chair Salazar submitted a formal letter of opposition on behalf of the Council.

Turning to SB 78, Ms. Hoyt explained that this bill seeks to substantially revise the membership of the TLC and several other education councils. Membership would be reduced from sixteen to nine members, with reductions made in the number of teachers, administrators, and education policy experts. The bill also shifts appointment authority from the Governor's Boards and Commissions Office to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Language requiring geographic representation of Nevada's diverse school districts has been removed. SB 78 passed the Senate, as amended, on April 11 and advanced to the Assembly. An amendment intended to reinstate the geographic representation requirement was introduced but later withdrawn. On May 5, the bill was mentioned in a joint meeting of the Senate Finance Committee and Assembly Ways and Means Committee but was not placed on the agenda. At present, it is not scheduled for any further hearings. Like AB 236,

most exhibits submitted for SB 78 are letters of opposition. The TLC has already voted to oppose the bill, and Chair Salazar has submitted a letter of opposition on the Council's behalf.

The discussion then turned to SB 460, known as the "Educate Act," sponsored by Senator Cannizzaro. This omnibus bill contains multiple sections that, if enacted, would directly impact the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF). The bill is scheduled for a first hearing before the Senate Education Committee on Monday, May 19, at 1:00 p.m. Section 50 revises NRS 391.480 by changing the terminology from "learning goals" to "educational growth" and replacing Department-approved exams with those listed in NRS 390.105. Section 51 amends NRS 391.485 to require annual reporting of teacher growth data to the Nevada Department of Education and establishes a certification program to ensure that only certified administrators conduct evaluations. Section 52 updates observation timelines by requiring the first observation within thirty days, the second between seventy-five and one hundred five days, and the third within the final forty days of the school year. Sections 53 through 55 establish a professional growth incentive program tied to evaluation ratings, limited to Clark County School District. This program would allow teachers and principals to receive salary increases after completing professional development or other specified actions at their own expense, provided they meet multi-year service commitments at either Title I or non-Title I schools. The Council may choose to take a position on a section individually or on the bill as a whole. If a position is taken, it may be submitted in writing or through public testimony, typically provided by the Chair.

Ms. Hoyt reported that when SB 460 was first published, she and Chair Salazar met with NEPF District Liaisons to review its provisions. The liaisons raised concerns about Section 50, particularly the reliance on state assessments for student learning goals. They emphasized that many teachers, such as those in physical education, music, or specialized roles, do not provide direct instruction in state-tested subjects, making such measures inequitable. Chair Salazar reminded the Council that this issue echoes a 2017 proposal in SB 320, which similarly sought to use state assessments as a basis for evaluation. At that time, the TLC opposed the proposal, pointing out that only about forty percent of teachers had applicable state assessment data, leaving the remaining sixty percent to be evaluated by collective schoolwide results. District liaisons reaffirmed their view that the current practice, which allows teacher-designed measures to track classroom-level growth, is a more equitable and accurate method. Council members agreed that SB 460 raises significant concerns, particularly regarding Section 50, but no formal position had been taken yet.

**Chair Salazar entertained a motion to oppose Section 50 of SB 460 regarding the use of state assessments. Member Schaar moved to oppose, and Member Hicks seconded. The motion carried with no objections.**

**Vice Chair Moulden moved that the Council oppose the language change from "Student Learning Goal" to "Educational Growth." Member Teel seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

**Member Schaar moved to oppose Section 51 of SB 460. Member Neal seconded, and the motion passed.**

Members discussed section 52 of SB 460.

**Chair Salazar entertained a motion to oppose Section 52 of SB 460. Member Varner moved to oppose, and Vice Chair Moulden seconded. The motion passed.**

Member Hicks stated that she does not believe Sections 53–55 of SB 460 align with the mission of the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC). She recommended that the Council withhold from taking any action or making a motion at this time.

Ms. Hoyt then provided information on Assembly Bill (AB) 584, the Governor’s Education Accountability Bill, which had not been included in the meeting materials. She explained that Sections 47–52 of the bill require the Department, in consultation with TLC, to adopt regulations establishing a framework for performance improvement plans for post-probationary administrators and teachers who receive an overall rating of ineffective or minimally effective for two consecutive years. These plans must include clear, measurable goals related to instructional practices, pupil engagement, and academic outcomes aligned with state standards and directly tied to areas of underperformance identified in evaluations. Educators placed on such plans would be required to participate in targeted professional development, including training on pupil engagement, classroom differentiation, data-driven instruction, formative assessments, classroom management, and behavioral interventions. Each district would be required to assign an experienced mentor or leadership coach to provide regular feedback, conduct classroom observations, and support the development of improved instructional strategies. Plans would be reviewed at least quarterly for accountability and adjustments. During the two-year improvement plan, administrators or teachers could also be placed on probation. While on probation, personnel could not be reassigned to another school, except in cases of low enrollment, program elimination, or districtwide operational needs. Principals placed on probation could also have certain site-based decision-making powers, such as budgeting and hiring, suspended or modified. At the end of the probationary period, individuals would be reevaluated. Possible outcomes include being removed from probation if goals are met, being granted an additional year of probation if some progress is demonstrated, or facing non-renewal or dismissal if inadequate progress is made. Ms. Hoyt further noted that Sections 59 and 60 of AB 584 authorize district school boards where fewer than 85 percent of administrators and teachers are rated highly effective for two consecutive years to create incentive programs. One program provides a one-time incentive payment for educators who receive highly effective ratings for three consecutive years prior to their fourth, eighth, twelfth, or sixteenth anniversary as an administrator or teacher. The incentive amount may not exceed ten percent of the educator’s annual base salary at the time of eligibility.

Member Schaar asked whether there was an appeal process for those assigned to performance improvement plans. Ms. Hoyt responded that no appeal mechanism is outlined in the bill; participation is mandatory for any post-probationary educator rated ineffective or minimally effective for two consecutive years. Member Schaar expressed concern about how this would apply across districts, noting the example of an educator receiving one ineffective rating in one county and a second after transferring to another county. He questioned how districts would share this information and how consistency would be ensured. Ms. Hoyt acknowledged that the bill does not specify how evaluations would transfer between schools or districts, only that two consecutive ratings would trigger the requirement. Member Schaar concluded that while the proposal is well-intentioned, it is incomplete and ambiguous. He cautioned that without a clear process, implementation could lead to grievances, particularly if personnel records are not readily accessible, and that the lack of clarity could create challenges for recruitment and retention. Ms. Hoyt added that the bill requires TLC to be consulted in developing the regulations around performance

improvement plans. If the bill passes, TLC will be asked to provide input on the framework and metrics.

Vice Chair Moulden inquired about the timeline for receiving answers on the bill. Ms. Hoyt explained that AB 584 had just been introduced that morning and had not yet been scheduled for a hearing. She noted that the bill originated from the Governor's Office as part of his education accountability package. Chair Salazar clarified that SB 460 had been pulled from its prior hearing and rescheduled for the following Monday. She emphasized that with only two and a half weeks remaining in the legislative session, TLC must decide quickly whether it wants to take a formal position on either SB 460 or AB 584. Ms. Hoyt reminded the Council that the session is scheduled to conclude on June 2.

Chair Salazar asked members whether TLC should take a stance on AB 584, noting that the bill still has several stages to move through before passage. Member Teel commented that if the bill advances, even with phased implementation, it risks undermining more than a decade of TLC's work to establish a fair and growth-oriented evaluation system. She expressed concern that the proposal would diminish efforts to reassure teachers that evaluations are designed to support professional growth rather than to push educators out of the profession. Chair Salazar then asked whether the Council wished to take a position on both the incentive and performance improvement plan provisions or refrain from taking action altogether. Vice Chair Moulden raised questions about funding, specifically whether there would be a budget allocation from the Governor to support incentive payments and required training. Chair Salazar responded that the bill has two main components impacting the NEPF: incentives for highly effective teachers and administrators, and the establishment of performance improvement plans that could lead to dismissal for those who fail to improve after consecutive ineffective ratings. Member Blackman-Taylor observed that the proposal introduces accountability language in collaboration with TLC, which allows for future Council input in shaping the regulations. While acknowledging that the provisions may appear punitive, she considered them to be a public recognition of the need for accountability in the evaluation system. As her term would be ending, she expressed gratitude to the Council for its support in helping her navigate complex processes and stressed the importance of TLC's continued role in ensuring that educator evaluation remains focused on student outcomes. Member Hicks reiterated that the Council faces limited time and incomplete information, which makes it difficult to determine an appropriate course of action. While the proposal seems to anticipate future consultation with TLC, she advised caution against taking premature action without a clearer understanding of the bill's full implications.

**Member Varner moved that the Council remain neutral on the matter, with the condition that TLC continue to be involved in the process as it progresses. The motion was seconded by Member Hicks and carried unanimously.**

**5. PUBLIC COMMENT #2**

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

**6. ADJOURNMENT**

With no further objections, the meeting was adjourned at 4:40 PM.