

TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 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
Sue Moulden
Danica Hays
Annie Hicks
Vicki Kreidel
Amy Miller
Susan Neal
Daniel Schantol
Daniel Tillman
Richard Varner
Stephanie Keuhey
Tammy Malich

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (NDE) STAFF PRESENT

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)

Tasha Fuson, Contractor; Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement (EDLiFE)

Monica Cortez, Contractor; 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 D. Ott, Chief Deputy Attorney General (DAG)

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

Meeting was called to order at 2:05 PM by Chair Pam Salazar. Roll call was taken and quorum was established. Chair Salazar led the Pledge of Allegiance. Chair Salazar introduced new members of the Council, Vicki Kreidel, Daniel Schantol, and Daniel Tillman.

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 NOVEMBER 20, 2024, MEETING MINUTES** (*Information/ Discussion/ Possible Action*)

Members of the Council reviewed the September 24, 2025, meeting minutes. **Chair Salazar entertained a motion to approve the minutes. Member Danica Hays motioned to approve. Member Richard Varner seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

4. **2:16 P.M. WORKSHOP TO SOLICIT COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO NAC 391 REGARDING PROPOSED FRAMEWORK FOR PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLANS** (*Information/ Discussion/ Possible Action*)

Chair Salazar reminded the Council that the purpose of this item was to establish a framework for Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) for post-probationary teachers and administrators in conjunction with the statewide performance evaluation system. The Council considered a regulation to update Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) Chapter 391 to include proposed changes for PIPs in connection with the NEPF, pursuant to the requirements of Senate Bill (SB) 460. The Council considered whether to approve moving this item to a public hearing.

Kathy Hoyt, Assistant Director for the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement (EDLiFE), stated that the intent of the regulation was for NDE, in consultation with the Council, to establish a framework for PIPs for post-probationary teachers and administrators who received an evaluation designating their overall performance as ineffective or minimally ineffective for two consecutive school years, as required by SB 460, sections 38.3 and 38.7. Ms. Hoyt stated that NDE, in consultation with the SB 460 Workgroup, had outlined proposed language to provide clarification on requirements for goal setting, assigning mentors or leadership coaches, professional development requirements, monitoring, and other administrative responsibilities related to PIPs.

Chair Salazar opened the item to public comment. There were no public comments in Carson City. In Las Vegas, Dr. Erik Skramstad of the Clark County School District (CCSD) provided comment regarding agenda item 4. A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A.

Ms. Hoyt provided clarification on Dr. Skramstad's comments regarding the proposed PIP language and the differences between PIPs and Educator Assistance Plans (EAPs). She explained that there were currently two separate systems, with EAPs being part of the existing NEPF guide and protocols. EAPs are documents that could be created at any time to support a licensed employee or educator and are typically used at the mid-cycle point of the year to outline concerns, growth goals, or areas of development identified by the evaluator. Ms. Hoyt explained that EAPs outlined areas of growth and suggestions for improvement, whereas PIPs did not go into effect until an employee received two consecutive evaluations rated as ineffective or minimally ineffective. She further explained that SB 460 established specific requirements for PIPs, including the assignment of a mentor or leadership coach, quarterly reviews, professional development requirements, and goal

setting based on evaluator-identified areas of need. Ms. Hoyt clarified for Chair Salazar that EAPs would not be eliminated if a district chose to continue using that process; however, pursuant to SB 460, PIPs were required after two consecutive years of an ineffective or minimally ineffective rating.

Dr. Malich requested clarification on whether PIPs were required by law. Ms. Hoyt clarified that EAPs were not required and functioned as a support and documentation tool, while PIPs were a statutory requirement established by SB 460. She also clarified the associated timeframes, explaining that an individual could be subject to a PIP for up to two years and could be removed from the plan if sufficient growth was demonstrated and the goals of the plan were met. Ms. Hoyt further discussed probationary status, noting that SB 460, section 52.5, addressed this topic. She explained that EAPs could be used at any time during an employee's career, while PIPs applied to individuals who had received two consecutive ratings of developing or ineffective and placed them back on probationary status to provide additional support for improvement. She noted that if performance did not improve, dismissal could occur.

Member Tillman requested additional clarification regarding timelines, asking whether an individual who received two years of developing or ineffective ratings was then given an additional two years for data collection before a dismissal decision was made. Ms. Hoyt confirmed that this was correct. Under SB 460, an employee was given up to two additional years under a PIP before a decision was made to remove the individual from the plan, extend the PIP for an additional year, or dismiss the employee.

Member Hicks recommended changing the term "supervisor" to "supervising administrator" on page 1 under section 2 to maintain consistency throughout the regulation.

Chair Salazar asked the Council for input on the recommended quarterly monitoring requirements, noting that SB 460 did not specify a monitoring frequency. Dr. Malich stated that quarterly monitoring was insufficient for teachers and administrators not meeting performance expectations and recommended monthly monitoring instead. Member Hays, Vice Chair Moulden, Member Miller, and Member Kreidel concurred with this recommendation.

After no further discussion or questions, **Chair Salazar entertained a motion to move this item, a proposed amendment to NAC Chapter 391.XXX to a public hearing at a future meeting. Member Tillman made a motion to approve with recommendations. Vice Chair Moulden seconded the motion. The motion carried with no objections.**

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

Ms. Hoyt stated that the September NEPF Liaison Newsletter was distributed to district NEPF liaisons and posted on the NDE website on October 9, 2025. District NEPF liaisons met on September 29 and October 27. At the request of the liaisons, these meetings were transitioned to a monthly schedule to provide increased opportunities for statewide collaboration.

Ms. Hoyt further reported that NDE presented its required annual report of statewide performance evaluation data to the State Board of Education (SBE) on November 12, 2025. During the presentation, the SBE inquired about accountability measures related to NEPF implementation. Ms. Hoyt stated that she provided an overview of upcoming legislative implementation related to PIPs and the Administrator Certification Program. She also noted that the SBE expressed support for the

continued development of an electronic tool to collect evaluation ratings and data, which remained a work in progress for NDE.

Ms. Hoyt also provided an update on the progress of the NEPF redesign field study. She stated that the field study was underway during the 2025–26 school year with two cohorts of participants, including a Year 1 cohort and a Year 2 cohort, representing schools across multiple districts. She noted that biweekly office hours were being offered to provide NEPF support for school site leaders. Ms. Hoyt stated that NDE planned to distribute a winter mid-cycle survey to field study participants to gather implementation feedback, with differentiated questions for Year 1 and Year 2 cohort participants. She explained that the purpose of the feedback was to inform potential State Board adoption for the 2026–27 school year.

Ms. Hoyt stated that NDE continued its work to ensure NEPF implementation complied with the requirements of SB 460. She outlined for the Council how SB 460 implementation was being approached and provided updates on progress to date. Ms. Hoyt explained that NDE was working with a contractor team, a statewide workgroup, the Council, and the Regional Professional Development Program (RPDP). She also stated that work had begun on the Evaluator Certification Process in partnership with RPDP, noting that this certification would become a requirement for all school administrators conducting evaluations beginning in the 2027–28 school year.

Vice Chair Moulden inquired about timelines related to administrator certification. Ms. Hoyt responded that the timeline remained tentative, as the team was in the early stages of developing a contract and scope of work with RPDP. She stated that the goal was to have a certification course or platform developed by October 2026 to allow administrators sufficient time for guidance and opportunities to complete the certification.

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

Ms. Statucki, contractor for the NDE EDLiFE Office led the Council in a brief review of the Open Meeting Law (OML).

Ms. Statucki explained that the purpose of the OML was to ensure that government business was conducted openly and that the public could observe how decisions were made. She stated that the OML was grounded in Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Chapter 241, which provides that public bodies exist to aid in the conduct of the people’s business and that their actions must be taken openly. Ms. Statucki explained that the OML applied to all public bodies and subcommittees, including the Council. She stated that a meeting was defined as a quorum of members coming together to deliberate or act and that this definition included informal discussions and email exchanges. She further clarified that only voting members were counted toward a quorum and that vacant seats were excluded from the quorum calculation. Additionally, Ms. Statucki reviewed the requirements necessary to remain compliant with the OML and explained the limited circumstances under which a closed session may occur.

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

Chair Salazar discussed potential agenda items for the next Council meeting, including updates on Senate Bill (SB) 460 and the election of a new Chair and Vice Chair. Ms. Hoyt noted that staff anticipated having draft materials available to share with the Council at the next meeting. She also proposed the possibility of holding a future meeting in person.

8. **PUBLIC COMMENT #2**

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

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further objections, the meeting was adjourned at 3:07 PM.

Appendix A: Statements given during public comments

1. Dr. Erik Skramstad, for Clark County School District (CCSD), provided comment regarding agenda item 4.

Appendix A, Item 4: DR. ERIK SKRAMSTAD

The Clark County School District (CCSD) has significant concerns with the proposed changes to Nevada Administrative Code Chapter 391 in alignment with Senate Bill (SB) 460 regarding Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) implementation, referenced in sections 38.3 and 38.7.

Currently, teachers or administrators who are rated as Developing or Ineffective on their Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) evaluation are issued an Educator Assistance Plan (EAP) by their supervising administrator. The EAP captures specific directives directly tied to each individual indicator on the employee's evaluation mid-way through the evaluation year. These directives are issued by the supervisor to the employee and detail each area of deficiency, the expected change in action/conduct to remediate the deficiency (which may include a training plan, coaching or mentoring, and/or other supports determined by the supervisor and employee), and the anticipated timeline for complying with the directive. The supervisor and employee can then track progress based on the EAP expectations. Without these directives and the EAP, it is not legally defensible for a supervisor to issue a Developing or Ineffective evaluation to an employee evaluated on the NEPF. To the extent possible the PIP process, should mirror the EAP work already being conducted by supervisors who are working with deficient employees evaluated by the NEPF.

Based on the proposed regulations, the PIP process provides protections for a deficient post-probationary teacher or administrator to stay in the classroom or at the school setting for an extended period of time (1-2 more years) before being eligible for dismissal compared to the current process; this additional timeframe does not appear to be required within SB460. These same employees would have also already been issued directives and an EAP by their supervisor to bring the deficiencies to the employee's attention prior to conclusion of the annual evaluation cycle to ensure time is given for the employee to correct their deficiencies.

The proposed language to prescribe bi-monthly mentoring/coaching and supervisor reviews every 45 days or every quarter should also be left to the discretion of the supervising administrator and the communicated timelines already established in the current EAP processes or potential PIP processes.

An example of this current workflow containing observation documentation with directives, an EAP with directives, and the final evaluation with directives has been shared with NDE and can also be shared with TLC leadership at their request for a full understanding of what is already necessary to dismiss/non-renew employment for an Ineffective teacher or administrator. Of note, employees who receive a Developing evaluation rating are not eligible to be dismissed/non-renewed from employment at this time.

Please let me know if the TLC would like to discuss further as I am unable to attend the TLC meeting today due to an overlapping schedule conflict.