

TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 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
Amy Miller
Stephanie Keuhey
Pam Goynes-Brown
Danica Hays
Annie Hicks
Darcy McInnis
Susan Neal
Drew Schaar
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)

Tina Statucki, 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

Senior Deputy Attorney General (DAG), Greg Ott

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

Chair Pam Salazar called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m., followed by roll call and the Pledge of Allegiance. Chair Salazar noted that several membership updates had occurred since the last TLC meeting in May. Felicia Gonzalez stepped down due to her new role as Deputy Superintendent in the Clark County School District (CCSD). Juanita Ortiz and Elizabeth Cadigan, both public school teacher members, concluded their terms but are eligible for reappointment. Louis Markouzis, an administrator member, completed his final term, and Pam Teel, the superintendent representative, retired from her position in Lincoln County. Jeana Blackman-Taylor, the parent member, concluded her first term and is also eligible for reappointment.

Chair Salazar welcomed several new members to the Council. Amy Miller joined as an administrator member, replacing Mr. Markouzis. Ms. Miller has served in CCSD since 2003, including more than 18 years as a site administrator and the last seven years as Principal at Ann Lynch Elementary. She currently serves as the Nevada State Representative for the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and as President of the Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees (CCASPE). Stephanie Keuhey was appointed as the new superintendent member, replacing Ms. Teel. Ms. Keuhey is the Superintendent of Mineral County School District and brings over 23 years of experience in public education. Tammy Malich was appointed by the CCSD Interim Superintendent to replace Ms. Gonzalez, contributing expertise in educational policy and leadership.

Chair Salazar also noted that Andrew Tiscareno, a teacher from the Carson City School District, will conclude his term at the end of October and is not eligible for reappointment. Drew Schaar will also conclude his term at the end of October but remains eligible for reappointment.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

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

3. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF THE MAY 15, 2025, MEETING MINUTES (*Information/ Discussion/ Possible Action*)

Chair Salazar provided members with time to review the draft minutes from the meeting on May 15, 2025.

Member Susan Neal moved to approve the minutes as presented, and Member Richard Varner seconded the motion. With all members in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

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

Ms. Kathy Hoyt, Assistant Director for the Nevada Department of Education Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement, provided updates on the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF). She reported that the NEPF Liaison Newsletter had been shared with districts and NEPF liaisons on May 21, 2025. The annual NEPF Implementation and Monitoring for Continuous Improvement (MCI) Survey links had been distributed to NEPF liaisons on April 1, 2025, with a completion deadline of July 15, 2025. Additionally, the NEPF district ratings spreadsheet template and guidance had been shared on May 1, 2025, and returned to the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) by July 15, 2025. NDE had collected rating data from all

districts and had nearly completed the annual MCI interviews with district liaisons, with only two districts remaining.

Ms. Hoyt noted that progress had continued on development of an electronic NEPF data collection tool, which had the potential to serve as a statewide system. She stated that updates would be provided to the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) as the project advanced.

She also shared information regarding the NEPF Redesign Field Study for teachers and administrators for the 2025–2026 school year, which had been offered to all districts through an open invitation. The initiative had been recommended by the TLC and approved by the State Board of Education (SBE). Participating districts were divided into two cohorts. The Year 2 Cohort included the Clark County School District (CCSD), which had expanded the number of participating schools that year, as well as several schools from the State Public Charter School Authority—including Beacon Academy—and full-district participation from Elko, Lincoln, and Lyon County School Districts. The Year 1 Cohort included Churchill County School District, one school from Douglas County School District, Esmeralda County School District, Storey County School District, and one school from Washoe County School District. The department had conducted introductory meetings with school leaders from participating sites and had provided sample documents and guidance to support implementation. Ms. Hoyt highlighted that the Year 2 Cohort had provided valuable feedback at the conclusion of its first year, which informed ongoing implementation efforts. Virtual office hours were offered biweekly on Thursdays as an open forum for school site leaders to share questions, exchange ideas, and receive feedback from district partners statewide. These sessions also supported the department’s efforts related to legislative implementation and continuous improvement. The Year 2 Field Study was underway, and progress updates were to be shared with the TLC throughout the year.

5. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE 2024-2025 NEVADA EDUCATOR PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK (NEPF) SUMMATIVE EVALUATION RATINGS AND MONITORING FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT SURVEY RESULTS (*Information/ Discussion*)

Kathy Hoyt reminded the Council that NRS 391.485 required an annual review of the statewide performance evaluation system and the manner in which schools carried out evaluations pursuant to that system. She presented a PowerPoint summarizing NEPF summative ratings for several educator groups statewide (see meeting materials). The data included totals for each licensed position, as well as percentages for each rating category—from ineffective to highly effective—and identified those who were exempt under statute. Approximately 19,250 teachers were included in the dataset, with slightly more than 1,200 educators exempt.

Ms. Hoyt explained that the department was required to include summative ratings adjusted for class size, in accordance with NRS 388.890 and NRS 391.465, which applied only to teachers and teacher-librarians. The adjusted data reflected those rated effective or highly effective whose scores had been modified due to class size. As reported in the prior year, the class size adjustment affected approximately 2 to 2.5 percent of eligible positions statewide.

Ms. Hoyt then shared an overview of the NEPF Ratings by Standard (2025), which she planned to present to both the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) and the State Board of Education (SBE). The data identified district-level and statewide averages, highlighting the highest and lowest scoring

standards for instructional practice, instructional leadership, and professional responsibilities. The department had also conducted interviews with individual districts during the Monitoring for Continuous Improvement (MCI) process to help align findings with professional development planning and to offer recommendations for strengthening instruction and leadership practices. Ms. Hoyt noted a discrepancy in the data shared with members, clarifying that the highest and lowest standards for teachers and administrators had been inadvertently reversed in the materials.

For teachers, Instructional Practice Standard 2 represented the highest-rated area, while Standard 4 was the lowest-rated professional responsibility standard. For administrators, Instructional Leadership Standard 3 was the highest-rated and Standard 4 was the lowest-rated standard. She extended an apology for the error. The Council focused its review on school administrators and teachers rather than every occupational group. For school administrators, Ms. Hoyt emphasized that Standard 3, which measured an administrator's ability to create and sustain productive relationships, remained the strongest area. This standard reflected efforts to build respectful learning environments, establish effective communication systems, and create welcoming campuses. The lowest-rated standard for administrators was Standard 4, which addressed the creation and sustainability of structural systems, including curriculum, instruction, assessment, and resource allocation. For teachers, Instructional Practice Standard 4, which focused on metacognitive strategies, continued to be the lowest-rated area, a trend consistent for at least the past five years. This standard reflected students' ability to understand what they were learning, how they were learning it, and how they could assess and reflect on their progress. The highest-rated instructional practice standard remained Standard 2, which emphasized designing learning tasks with high cognitive demand to meet academic rigor and support diverse learners.

Regarding Professional Responsibilities, the highest-rated standard for administrators was Standard 3, which focused on fulfilling professional obligations, while the lowest-rated was Standard 1, related to management of human capital. For teachers, the lowest-rated professional standard was Standard 2, concerning self-reflection and professional growth, suggesting a continued need to promote self-assessment and mentorship opportunities statewide. The highest-rated professional practice standard for teachers was Standard 5, which reflected student perception. Ms. Hoyt noted this as a positive outcome, as it demonstrated that students generally felt their teachers were invested in their success and fostered welcoming learning environments. The final column in the report showed the percentage change in summative ratings compared to the previous year.

Ms. Hoyt then presented the Teacher Score Distribution (2025) slide, which illustrated statewide teacher ratings by category: ineffective, developing, effective, and highly effective. The majority of teachers were rated effective. The Teacher SLG Distribution (2025) slide displayed the distribution of Student Learning Goal (SLG) ratings, which accounted for 15 percent of a teacher's total evaluation. Teachers were required to achieve an SLG score of 3 or 4 to be rated effective or highly effective. Most teachers received a score of 3, aligning with an effective rating. The Teacher Trend Data (2025) slide summarized five years of statewide teacher evaluation trends from the 2019–2020 through 2024–2025 school years. The color-coded bar graph showed exempt teachers (purple), highly effective (blue), effective (green), developing (yellow), and ineffective (red). The majority of Nevada teachers consistently fell within the effective range, though there was a slight decline in the percentage of effective teachers in 2024–2025, which Ms. Hoyt attributed to stronger implementation fidelity rather than a negative trend. The Administrator Score Distribution slide indicated that most administrators also fell within the effective category, with approximately 70 percent earning a score of 3 on their Student Learning Goals. Similarly, the Administrator Trend

Data (2025) slide showed that administrators, like teachers, had remained largely effective over the past five years, with a slight decrease from the prior year.

Vice Chair Moulden observed an increase in administrators rated as developing and asked whether the rise correlated with a higher number of new administrators compared to prior years. Ms. Hoyt shared that this information would have to be confirmed by individual districts.

In the Data Limitations section, Ms. Hoyt explained that data did not include any subgroup smaller than ten individuals to protect personally identifiable information. Districts with fewer than ten employees in a category were not required to report results, as doing so could compromise confidentiality. Additionally, educators who separated from their district before receiving a summative rating were excluded.

Ms. Hoyt then presented the NEPF Monitoring for Continuous Improvement (MCI) slide, noting that annual survey data collection concluded on July 15 each year. The department received 7,252 survey responses, one of the highest totals in the past five years. Participation included 584 administrators (48 percent, up 7 percent from the previous year) and approximately 6,000 teachers (31 percent, up 4 percent), along with additional licensed educational personnel. Increased participation strengthened the reliability and representativeness of the data.

Ms. Hoyt then reviewed the MCI Survey–Feedback (2025) and MCI Survey–Growth slides, which compared administrators’ and teachers’ perceptions of fairness, the impact of feedback on instructional and leadership practice, and the influence on student learning. The MCI Survey–Impact on Time (2025) slide summarized agreement levels regarding the NEPF evaluation cycle. Ms. Hoyt concluded by noting that survey data were limited to participants and that local control of distribution contributed to variation in response rates across districts. All districts submitted data, though smaller ones often had fewer respondents. She stated that this information would be presented to the State Board of Education in November.

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

Chair Salazar reminded the Council that the presented legislation had already passed and emphasized that the focus of discussion should now be on implementation and the Teachers and Leaders Council’s (TLC) role moving forward.

Assembly Bill (AB) 236, Section 2 revised the appointment process for teachers and other licensed educational personnel. For each vacancy, three nominees were now required to be solicited from both the Clark County Education Association (CCEA) and the Nevada State Education Association (NSEA), rather than from a single association.

Senate Bill (SB) 460 addressed accountability, support, and improved evaluation practices, with phased implementation from July 1, 2025, through July 1, 2027. Ms. Hoyt had included the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) and NEPF guidance memo as supporting material for the Council’s review.

Under Sections 38.3 and 38.7, Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) were required after two consecutive years of ineffective or minimally effective (developing) ratings. Each PIP was required to include measurable goals, professional development, an assigned mentor or coach, and a quarterly

review process. The TLC would consult on new regulations for the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) related to this process.

Under Sections 38.4 and 38.8, post-probationary educators and administrators could be returned to probationary status for two school years if they were consistently ineffective or failed to demonstrate adequate progress on a PIP. Section 52.5 established that if a post-probationary employee, now deemed probationary, received ineffective evaluations for two consecutive years during the new probationary period, the district board of trustees or charter school governing body could issue written notice during the second or third probationary year that the employee would not be reemployed. Alternatively, the superintendent or charter executive director could recommend dismissal to the board of trustees, following Notice and Hearing procedures (NRS 391.824 and 391.826).

The bill also required Principal Supervisors to annually review 3% of licensed educator evaluations within the schools they oversaw. The review process included document audits and interviews with both the evaluator and evaluatee. If any evaluation was determined to have been improperly conducted, all evaluations by that administrator were required to be reviewed. An annual verification and action plan was to be submitted to NDE by May 15, following procedures and guidance developed by the Department in consultation with the TLC.

Sections 49.2(c) and 50 introduced Educational Growth Goals (EGGs), which replaced Student Learning Goals (SLGs) and accounted for 15% of an educator's summative evaluation. The new five-point rating scale was based on the percentage of students meeting their growth goals: 1 = ≤20%; 2 = 21–40%; 3 = 41–60%; 4 = 61–80%; 5 = >80%. This requirement applied to all instructional personnel. For ELA, math, and science teachers, state assessments under NRS 390.105 were required to measure growth. For teachers in other content areas, including career and technical education (CTE), course-embedded, teacher-developed, or other approved assessments aligned with areas of highest student need could be used. Member Schaar asked whether the language applied to CTE teachers and what measures they would align with. Ms. Hoyt confirmed that CTE teachers would be included under the category of “teachers of other subjects” and could continue using course-embedded assessments, provided they identified an area of student need within their curriculum. Vice Chair Moulden asked whether the requirements for English, math, and science teachers also applied to special education teachers. Ms. Hoyt responded that the legislation did not distinguish between special and general education teachers regarding instructional responsibilities. She added that additional clarification would be needed for multi-subject teachers, such as elementary educators, and for science teachers whose state-approved assessments were not administered annually. For special education teachers, the applicable goal would depend on their subject assignments and classroom model—whether inclusion or self-contained. Vice Chair Moulden further asked if the new five-point scale would require a revised evaluation document. Ms. Hoyt replied that it was likely the template would be updated to reflect the 1–5 scale, though the EGG component would continue to represent 15% of the total summative evaluation.

Ms. Hoyt also discussed a significant new requirement established under Section 51.4, which created an Administrator Evaluation Certification Program. This program, aligned with NEPF accountability practices, required all administrators to be certified by the 2027–28 school year. The NDE, in consultation with the TLC, was tasked with developing the certification framework, training materials, and virtual learning modules, with tentative availability by October 2026. Ms. Hoyt shared that the Department planned to collaborate with the Regional Professional Development Programs (RPDPs) to support this initiative and would seek Council feedback to ensure statewide applicability.

Districts would be required to submit annual verification data confirming administrator certification for conducting evaluations.

Additionally, Ms. Hoyt explained that beginning in the 2027–28 school year, changes would take effect regarding observation cycles for first-year probationary teachers. The updated timeline shortened the evaluation window, requiring the first observation to occur within 30 days of the school year’s start, followed by a second observation between 75 and 105 days, and a final observation within the last 40 days of the school year. Each observation required a pre-conference and post-conference. Year two and three cycles would continue to be reduced for teachers rated effective or highly effective, consistent with current practice.

Ms. Hoyt concluded by noting that NDE had hired some contractors for this work and was forming a voluntary workgroup of district liaisons and educational personnel (10 members) to review and refine regulation language, frameworks, and protocols stemming from SB 460. The workgroup was expected to meet monthly from November through June, and findings would be brought back to the TLC for feedback and guidance during upcoming meetings. She concluded her report by expressing enthusiasm for the collaborative work ahead and the opportunity to strengthen educator evaluation and support systems statewide.

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

The next Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) meeting was scheduled for November 19, 2025. The Council agreed to hold the meeting despite its proximity to the holiday season, recognizing the volume of work required for upcoming legislative consultations. Member Schaar thanked the Council for the opportunity to serve and noted his intention to seek reappointment for his expiring term.

8. **PUBLIC COMMENT #2**

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

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

With no objections, the meeting adjourned at 3:29 PM.