



TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)

APRIL 28, 2021

9:00 A.M.

Meeting Location

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC) met via videoconference. In accordance with Governor Sisolak's [State of Emergency Directive 006](#), Section 1, there was no physical location designated for this meeting. The meeting was livestreamed on the [Nevada Department of Education Website](#).

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

MEMBERS PRESENT via videoconference

Pam Salazar, Chair
Mary Owens
Andrew Tiscareno
Dee Ann Roberts
Sarah Negrete
Pamela Teel
Elizabeth Campbell
Sue Moulden
Darcy McInnes
Danica Hays

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (NDE) STAFF PRESENT via videoconference

Kathleen Galland-Collins, Assistant Director; Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement
Tina Statucki, Education Programs Professional; Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement
Arina Kazemi, Administrative Assistant; Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement

SENIOR DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL via videoconference

David Gardner

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

The Livestream feed allowed public viewing throughout the meeting.

1: CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting of the Council was called to order at 9:06 A.M. by Chair Salazar. Quorum was established. Chair Salazar led the Pledge of Allegiance. Chair Salazar reminded members of virtual meeting norms and requested that members use the hand-raising feature if wishing to speak. Chair Salazar welcomed Tina Statucki and asked her to introduce herself.

Chair Salazar moved to Agenda Item #2.

2: PUBLIC COMMENT #1

Ms. Galland-Collins shared Tina Statucki's contact information on the screen for public comment. Additional time was provided for the public to submit comments via email due to delay on Livestream. Ms. Statucki and Ms. Galland-Collins checked their emails to see if there was any public comment submitted, but none was submitted.

Chair Salazar moved to Agenda Item #3.

3: APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 24, 2021

Chair Salazar gave members time to review the minutes. Member Campbell suggested that a few edits be made prior to approval.

Member Teel made a motion to approve the minutes with the suggested edits for the February 24, 2021 meeting. Member Campbell seconded. Motion passed with no discussion.

Chair Salazar moved to Agenda Item #4.

4: OPEN MEETING LAW TRAINING (*Information/Discussion*)

Senior Deputy Attorney General David Gardner provided members training on Nevada Open Meeting Law to ensure that they understood the legal expectations and requirements of members of the Council. The information presented was shared in the meeting materials (see [TLC Support Materials](#)). Chair Salazar asked Members if they had any questions regarding Open Meeting Law and the TLC.

Member Hays asked about time recommendations for public comment and other considerations. Senior Deputy Attorney General Gardner answered the Supreme Court had a couple of decisions on this but have not given recommendations for the time. Senior Deputy Attorney General Gardner said that 3 minutes is typically what has been considered reasonable.

Chair Salazar asked if Senate Bill (SB) 76 passes, which changes the "Teachers and Leaders Council" to the "Teachers and Leaders Advisory Council" and moves it under the Nevada NDE of Education, would TLC still be considered a Public Body and therefore subject to Open Meeting Law. Senior Deputy Attorney General Gardner answered that one of the reasons to put TLC under NDE is that it would be an advisory group for the Superintendent and would not be subject to Open Meeting Law.

Member Negrete asked Senior Deputy Attorney General Gardner to specify which Bill he referred to during the Open Meeting Law training. He clarified that it was Assembly Bill (AB) 253.

Chair Salazar asked if there were any more questions regarding Open Meeting Law. No more questions were asked.

Senior Deputy Attorney General Gardner stated that upon further reading of SB 76, he believed that TLC will still be subject to Open Meeting Law and would still be considered a public body as some members will continue to be appointed by the Governor.

Chair Salazar welcomed Member Danica Hays and asked her to introduce herself to TLC members.

Chair Salazar moved to Agenda Item #5.

5: NEPF IMPLEMENTATION UPDATES (*Information/Discussion*)

Tina Statucki, Nevada Department of Education, shared updates on actions relevant to the implementation of the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF). The March NEPF Newsletter was sent to the NEPF Liaisons on March 12, 2021, and they were posted to NDE Update for March 22, 2021. NEPF Liaisons have been provided the links for the 2020-2021 Administrator and Teacher NEPF Implementation Surveys and the NEPF Data Collection Excel spreadsheet. Data is due to NDE by July 16, 2021. Chair Salazar asked if there were any questions regarding NEPF implementation.

Member Tiscareno asked about the survey. He noted some confusion on the survey regarding the questions asking about “your most recent evaluation” – whether it should be the 2019-20 or the 2020-21 evaluation. He asked for clarification as to whether NDE was trying to collect data for this year or last year. Chair Salazar stated that the confusion may affect the data that is collected and asked NDE to respond. Ms. Galland-Collins answered that the survey questions can be revised to make the questions clearer. Member Tiscareno asked about the implementation throughout the State regarding the status of being rated highly effective for 2 years and whether it carries into the 3rd year (when the summative evaluation is not required). Are teachers considered highly effective for that 3rd year, are they considered nothing, and would that 3rd year (being considered highly effective) count as the 1st year of the next cycle. Ms. Galland-Collins stated this was a question that NDE will clarify during the next legislative session, but Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) specifies that if a teacher is rated for 2 years as highly effective, then he/she is not required to receive an evaluation in the 3rd year. It was TLC’s intent that the evaluator can determine whether there was a summative rating that year, but it needs to be clarified in statute. Chair Salazar clarified that TLC’s intent was that if an educator were rated as highly effective for 2 years, he/she would still participate in the process of feedback and observation during the 3rd year, but there may or may not be summative evaluation. There would be the expectation that the educator would fall back into the cycle again after the 3rd year. Chair Salazar agreed that the expectations need to be clarified, and Ms. Galland-Collins reiterated that NDE plans to address it in the next legislative session.

Member Owens asked if a teacher gets 2 years highly effective and does not get a summative rating the third year, would he/she start the process over again in the fourth year. Chair Salazar confirmed that was TLC’s intent.

Member Moulden stated that her district has been following the protocol: If a teacher was identified as highly effective for 2 years and was exempted from having that full summative evaluation in the 3rd year, he/she was still required to be observed, pre-conference, post-conference, create an SLG and analyze it, and report back to the supervisor. They filled out the one-page exemption form for that year, and then were evaluated the following year as a regular teacher - not as a probationary teacher. Member Moulden asked if she was correct. Chair Salazar answered yes as that is how the system was intended and how it was written in statute. Ms. Galland-Collins clarified that NRS 391.690 only applies to post-probationary educators. Section number 3 says that if a post-probationary teacher receives an evaluation designating his or her overall performance as highly effective for 2 consecutive school years, the post-probationary teacher must participate in one observation cycle in the school year immediately following that school year. They receive one evaluation in the school year immediately following that school year, so that the 2-year cycle begins again after that 3rd year. Member Moulden asked who was getting the surveys. Ms. Statucki answered that NEPF district liaisons send out the survey links to the teachers and administrators within their districts. The next NEPF liaison meeting was on Monday, May 3, 2021. They would recap what was discussed at the TLC meeting and be reminded about the surveys. Ms. Statucki also clarified that some liaisons sent out the survey links early, prior to having evaluations completed, so

that could have caused some of the confusion on the survey questions. The first couple of questions on the survey specifically ask what the evaluation rating was in the 2019-20 school year and the remaining questions are based on the current school year. Member Moulden asked the due date for the surveys to be completed. Ms. Statucki said the surveys have to be completed by July 16th. Ms. Galland-Collins provided additional context about the surveys for the newer TLC members. The survey has changed over the history of TLC. It began as an NDE survey sent to district superintendents to send to NEPF liaisons to send to teachers and administrators, but there was a lack of responses. With the help of WestEd, NDE developed a workgroup to develop Monitoring for Continuous Improvement Protocols for the NEPF. It included stakeholders from across the State who helped develop the questions that would go into the state-wide NEPF survey. The districts would then be responsible for sending the surveys to their teachers and educators. Districts would review the data and then, in the fall, have a conversation with NDE on how they leverage the NEPF data in their districts to drive professional development, etc., as part of the Monitoring for Continuous Improvement cycle and using data to make informed decisions around educators' needs and perceptions.

Chair Salazar moved to Agenda Item #6.

6: 2021 LEGISLATIVE SESSION UPDATES (*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*)

Tina Statucki, Nevada Department of Education, gave updates on proposed bills of the 2021 Nevada Legislative session that are currently moving forward that could impact the TLC or be of interest to the TLC.

Ms. Statucki explained that AB 57 proposes changing the student performance domain weight (Student Learning Goal/SLG) to 0% starting with this school year through the 2022-23 school year. The weight would return to 15% starting with the 2023-24 school year. It was heard by the Assembly Committee on Education and passed as amended. It was heard by the Senate Committee on Education on April 21, 2021 but no action was taken. A couple of items of note were mentioned during the hearing. Emily Ellison, Washoe County School District (WCSD) Chief Human Resources Officer, said removing the timeframe is an option as the Bill is not likely to pass before the end of the school year. Asher Killian of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) stated that Section 3 of the Bill, as written, would require that teacher evaluations be changed retroactively if it passes. This could delay the collection of NEPF data. Chair Salazar asked if there were any questions or comments regarding AB57.

Member Campbell asked if Ms. Statucki knew whether the amendment had been proposed to take out the current school year. Ms. Statucki answered she has not yet seen that amendment. Chair Salazar confirmed that she has not seen it either.

Member Teel stated that everybody knows this Bill is out there and there is confusion whether or not to finish their SLG. She stated that her counsel to Lincoln County is that they need to finish the SLG. She had concerns as they were finally making progress on the SLG and a change would muddle up what they (TLC) were doing - the SLG was moving in the right direction.

Member Owens stated that she just signed her evaluation, which included her SLG, so things seem to be moving forward as usual in the Washoe County School District (who sponsored the Bill). She is interested to see if the Bill changes to delay the start date as it could potentially cause a lot of issues, but she still hopes that it moves forward.

Member Moulden stated that April 30th is the cutoff date for submitting all or the evaluations in the Carson City School District and all of them have included their SLG. If there will be changes, she said it

has to wait until next year as the teachers put in so much time and effort into their SLGs and they should be validated. She hoped that TLC would support that.

Chair Salazar asked Ms. Statucki and Ms. Galland-Collins what the rationale was for not having the SLG in the next school year or the school year after that. Ms. Statucki said that, based on the testimony from WCSD, the primary purpose was that they were trying to take something off teachers' plates because they felt teachers were overworked and stressed this year and thought the SLG process put additional pressure on teachers. Superintendent Ebert wrote a response to the proposed bill explaining that WCSD's process is much more rigorous and intensive than required by the TLC and suggested that WCSD may want to realign their processes with the process required by the NEPF. Superintendent Ebert also reiterated that districts should move forward using the SLG/ (Student Learning Outcome (SLO) process until the Bill passes. Member Owens confirmed that was what she understood it to be as well. Ms. Galland-Collins added some additional context, noting that Washoe County also stated that they wanted to use the next 2 years to focus on closing learning gaps and allow educators to set rigorous goals and to be innovative. Chair Salazar stated that she understood the rationale for this year but did not see or understand how that applied to the next couple of years.

Member Campbell said she would like to give a classroom teacher's perception on AB 57. The basis for the SLG is to set learning goals, to manage instruction and assessment, and to reflect on that and what student's outcomes are. The SLG is really a reporting requirement and does not affect what educators do as professionals, so teachers who are knowledgeable of AB57 see it as something being taken off of their plates during COVID. She asked that the Council consider that when they decide what their stance would be.

Chair Salazar asked if there were more comments regarding AB 57. She asked the Council if they would like to take a stance on AB 57. The Bill has moved out of the Assembly and heard at the Senate Committee, but no action was taken. She asked NDE what the next steps would be. Ms. Galland-Collins answered that the Senate Committee of Education has already had discussion around AB57. It would go to a work session next, but they do not take comments during the work session. Ms. Galland-Collins stated that any position TLC would take would not likely make a difference as they are past the point of public comment. Chair Salazar agreed.

Member Moulden asked if there was a possibility that they would eliminate the SLG this year but not grant the 2 additional years, allowing anyone who did it this year to change it because of COVID. Ms. Galland-Collins answered that they can still amend the language, but it would have to go back to the Assembly Committee on Education to go through the approval process again. It can be amended and there has been discussion around the timelines. Senior Deputy Attorney General Gardner stated it would not have to go to Committee again. The Senate could change it on the floor and approve it. The floor vote is all that matters, and they can amend it all the way up until the last date.

Member Owens asked the Council to consider supporting AB 57 as it is or if an amendment is added to it. Chair Salazar asked whether TLC could take action on this Bill without public comment. Ms. Galland-Collins said TLC can take a position if they choose to do so, but it would require a motion and a second around what that action would be. Senior Deputy Attorney General Gardner confirmed that the agenda allows the Council to vote to adopt a position on any of the items.

Member Teel stated her concerns on making a recommendation to support the Bill. She believed it is in direct opposition to what the TLC was doing regarding the SLG. They have been working on the

implementation for years and it sets them back. She understood the concern from the teachers, but the direction that TLC was going was to help teachers, not hurt teachers.

Member Owens stated that she sees it as a pause and not going backwards.

Chair Salazar asked Members if they wanted to take a position regarding AB57. If so, it would require a motion and a second.

Member Owens made a motion that the TLC take a position in support of AB57 as written. Member Campbell said she would make a conditional second but with an amendment that it would not include this year.

Chair Salazar asked Member Owens if she would approve of the changes suggested by Member Campbell or whether she preferred to keep her motion as is. Member Owens agreed to change the original motion. Chair Salazar asked if there were any further comments prior to taking the vote.

Member Negrete said she would vote no, not because she was for or against the bill, but because there was a lack of agreement among the committee members themselves and because she wanted input from those she represents before taking a position.

Chair Salazar asked for a roll call vote. Motion did not pass (5-4). Chair Salazar stated that TLC would not be taking a stance on this bill. She added that this was the work that TLC has been pushing forward, and TLC needs to continue to look at how it can help the SLG to be seen as a valuable part of teaching and learning and not be seen as a burden.

Ms. Statucki explained that AB 266 proposes revisions to the statewide performance evaluation system by proposing that a teacher, whose overall ratio of pupils exceeds the applicable recommended ratios of pupils per licensed teacher as prescribed by the State Board of Education (SBE), should receive the score the teacher awarded to himself or herself on the self-evaluation on any criteria that are directly affected by class size. The SBE recommended ratios are 1-15 for grades K-3 and 1-25 for grades 4-12 except for choir, orchestra, and band. Two amendments were added to the bill. In the spirit of compromise, NDE worked with the Bill sponsor and suggested awarding a 1-point bump on PRS 4 and/or 5, not to exceed a score of 4 on any indicator. The Clark County Education Association's (CCEA) amendment was to assign an additional weight applied to instructional practice standards 2.1, 3.1, and 3.4 equivalent to the percentage that exceeds the applicable recommended ratios of pupils on those indicators. The Bill was heard by the Assembly Committee on Education and was passed as amended. It had not yet been heard by the Senate. Chair Salazar asked if there were questions.

Member Moulden asked for further clarification. She stated that being at a high school means there are very few chances to get under 25 kids in the classroom. Ms. Statucki answered that, based on the information provided to the SBE by Data Insight, an estimated 90% of classrooms statewide exceed the recommended ratio for class sizes. The protocols state that administrators should discuss class sizes with a teacher during the evaluation. In the spirit of compromise, NDE suggested a potential bump in Standard 4 of professional responsibilities which deals with parent engagement and/or Standard 5 which deals with the student perception. NDE recognized that teachers who have class sizes above the recommended ratio may find it more difficult to reach out to parents as often as they normally would or to develop as strong of relationships, or at least those perceived by students. The CCEA amendment, however, recommended the class size ratio bump. Ms. Statucki presented an example from a high school. Some high school PE class may have up to 70 students per licensed teacher. If that PE teacher

has a class size of 70 in all 6 classes, the load would be 420 students. That means, with the bump for the percentage over, that score could turn from a 4 to a 12 on an indicator. That bump for Indicators 2.1, 3.1, and 3.4 could change the overall score from a 3.0 to a 3.53. That does not include a bump in the professional responsibilities category. That combined could move a teacher from an effective rating to a highly effective rating. It could potentially move a teacher from minimally effective to effective. A concern is that there would need to be a set date to determine the class size ratio as some schools are very transient. Also, every teacher could have a different bump based on how many students they are over, which would put a great deal of work on a school administrator to have to figure it out. The tools do not currently allow issuing scores above a 4, which is why NDE's amendment set a cap of 4. Professional responsibilities only count for 20%, so the added weight would not drastically affect the overall score. If AB 57 also passes, which removes the SLG as well, those instructional responsibilities are now 80% of the evaluation. If a teacher is given bumps on those 3 indicators, that could drastically affect the overall rating. Chair Salazar asked if there were other questions or comments.

Member Moulden asked if that bump would be an automatic. She stated that a good teacher might deserve the bump but questioned whether a poor teacher would automatically get the bump. Ms. Statucki confirmed that the bump is automatic. If the teacher would normally have gotten 1, he/she would still get a bump based on class-size numbers. A high school teacher, with 25 students per class who teaches 6 classes, would have an overall ratio of 150. The percentage would be based on how many students they have over 150 and it would be dependent on what their score was - 1, 2, 3, or 4.

Member Teel stated this was in direct opposition to all the work the TLC has done for 10-12 years in creating an effective evaluation system that is for growth. It would be giving some people extra point credits. She said she knew that there are some large class sizes, and she did not know how to fix that, but she knew this was not it. This diminishes the system.

Member Campbell asked a two-part question. The first part of the question was to clarify whether AB 266 still proposes that other licensed personnel cannot be counted to determine teacher-student ratio. The second question was if there was any fiscal note on the bill. Ms. Statucki explained that she did not have an answer for the first question as it did not apply to the NEPF. NDE did/will attach a fiscal note to this, as it would require rewriting all of the NEPF tools, protocols, guidance documents, and the delivery of professional development for school administrators in how to calculate the scores accurately. Member Campbell stated that the fiscal note has not been attached yet. Ms. Galland-Collins clarified that NDE is considering adding a fiscal note, but it must go through the process because of the latest amendment and because it requires time to make these changes. As far as the impact on other license educational personnel, she did not believe that part has changed, but NDE was tracking section 4 as it was the part related to the NEPF.

Member Owens asked if there were any other amendments to help teachers that have large class-size, other than adjustments with the math of the NEPF. Ms. Galland-Collins explained that the rest of the Bill seemed to be about transparency and reporting of class-size, which was a recommendation from the Teacher Recruitment and Retention Advisory Task Force, so the rest of the Bill was trying to focus on being transparent, clarifying how to calculate class-size, and the expectations for class-size including other licensed personnel. The concerns of NDE are in section 4 which impact the NEPF. SB 475 (2019) required having conversations around class-size. A stakeholder group helped develop additional guidance to add to the protocols to focus conversations on how class sizes might impact performance on instructional practice and professional standards. Ms. Galland-Collins explained that there are things NDE can do with the tools that do not require Legislative action to help make those conversations happen in a more meaningful way.

Chair Salazar asked Members if TLC wanted to take a stance on this. The Bill had not been heard in the Senate Committee on Education yet, so there was still opportunity for public comment. Member Moulden asked when it would be scheduled to take place. Chair Salazar answered that the implementation of the Bill would start next year, but it was not yet on the agenda for the Senate Committee on Education. Chair Salazar asked again if TLC were interested in taking a stance and, if so, said it would require a motion and explanation of what that stance would be. Chair Salazar reiterated her belief that there are other ways to address class size and adding points just because of the number of students in the classroom does not make sense in the evaluation system.

Member Teel asked if there was a way to take a stance to inform what Section 4 does in regard to the work that the Council has been doing for years, but not necessarily take a stance for or against. Ms. Galland-Collins answered that the Council could choose to take a neutral position and then inform the Senate Committee on Education on what the impact would be. Member Teel stated she was willing to oppose or to stay neutral depending on the political climate and what the best position was for TLC to take if they want to be heard.

Member Teel made a motion for TLC to take a neutral stance and make a statement regarding the impact of section 4 on the NEPF and the work of the TLC. Member Moulden seconded.

Chair Salazar clarified the motion. Ms. Galland-Collins asked for clarification around the motion. Ms. Galland-Collins asked Senior Deputy Attorney General Gardner whether, if the intent is to draft a response, would it need to be included in the motion. Senior Deputy Attorney General Gardner agreed that it should be. Chair Salazar asked Member Teel, as the author of the original motion, whether the motion would include writing a statement that represents the neutral position. Member Teel agreed, but asked whether TLC will draft the response if it moves forward. Ms. Galland-Collins stated that it could be done in a couple different ways. The agenda outlined that possible action could include voting to adopt the position on any of the items as a Council. The motion could ask Chair Salazar to write the response and share it with legislators on behalf of TLC, but TLC could provide input. Senior Deputy Attorney General Gardner said TLC could do that or just vote to give somebody the ability to speak on behalf of TLC.

Member Teel amended her original motion: TLC will stay neutral on AB266 but ask Chair Salazar to speak on its behalf on how the Bill would impact the work of TLC. Chair Salazar asked Member Moulden if she seconded the revised motion. Member Moulden seconded.

Chair Salazar summarized the motion and asked NDE for guidance. Ms. Galland-Collins confirmed that the motion was acceptable as worded and Senior Deputy Attorney General Gardner agreed. Chair Salazar repeated the motion and asked for any further discussion.

Member Negrete stated that the Bill fundamentally changed the work of the TLC, and based on the conversation, believed TLC would want to take a stance in opposition and provide the statement as to why it would be opposed. She was concerned that, should the Bill move forward, there could be other reasons why a teacher would get additional points - it might not just be the class-size. A teacher might have a large number of students with special needs in her class. She stated that it could lead to other areas getting awarded additional points and questioned where it would end as there is never a regular class. Chair Salazar agreed and referred to the previous general discussion on that topic.

Chair Salazar asked the Council what position they were interested in taking - neutral or in opposition. She asked NDE and Deputy Attorney General Gardner for clarification on whether TLC can stay neutral in terms of the Bill but oppose section 4. Senior Deputy Attorney General Gardner stated that if TLC does not agree with any section of the Bill, then their stance would be in opposition. Neutral means there is no preference.

Member Teel moved to amend her motion and change it to opposing the Bill with the considerations of the last motion. Chair Salazar asked Member Moulden if she seconded the revised motion. Member Moulden seconded.

Chair Salazar restated the revised motion and asked for any additional discussion. **Chair Salazar asked for the roll call vote. Motion did not pass (5-5).** Chair Salazar confirmed that TLC would not take a stance for or against AB 266.

Ms. Statucki explained that **SB 76** proposed renaming the “Teachers and Leaders Council of Nevada” to the “Teachers and Leaders Advisory Council of Nevada” and clarified that the purpose of the Council was “to provide non-binding advice and assistance to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Board and NDE in the exercise of their duties.” The Bill was heard by the Senate Committee on Education and passed as amended. The one proposed amendment was changing the appointment of teacher members to 3 teachers nominated by the Nevada State Education Association (NSEA) and 1 nominated by the largest employee organization representing the largest number of teachers in the largest district in the state. Previously, all 4 teacher members were nominated by NSEA. Chair Salazar asked if there were any questions regarding SB 76.

Member Owens expressed her concern about how that impacted the Council as it was already an advisory council. She also questioned why they would change the nomination to include a teacher from a specific district. Ms. Statucki responded that the amendment sought to ensure that there was equal representation by teachers from the south as NSEA’s recent nominations were primarily from northern districts. Ms. Galland-Collins asked Senior Deputy Attorney General Gardner to confirm whether the Bill changes the work of the TLC. Senior Deputy Attorney General Gardner reported that Section 32 explained that the State Board will no longer have to act on the recommendations of the TLC but instead take them into consideration. There would be minor changes in statute. Chair Salazar asked Ms. Galland-Collins if she wanted to provide some context on why this change was being recommended. Ms. Galland-Collins could not speak to the purpose of the actual changes, but she believed it was an effort to make sure the role of being an advisory council to NDE and the State Board of Education was clear. Member Owens stated that NRS 391.465 said, “the State Board shall, based upon the recommendations of the Teachers and Leaders Council, adopt regulations...” Member Owens said it seemed like it was taking some of the power away from the TLC which she opposed.

Chair Salazar asked if TLC wanted to take a stance regarding SB 76. The Bill made it through the Senate Committee. Ms. Statucki confirmed and said it would be going to the Assembly, so TLC could make a statement at that hearing.

Member Campbell asked who the originator of this Bill was and what was the intent of the originator. Ms. Galland-Collins answered that the Bill included several changes to councils to make them more efficient and effective. It was the intent of this particular section to make sure the recommendation from TLC would go through NDE to the State Board of Education. Ms. Galland-Collins asked for confirmation from Senior Deputy Attorney General Gardner. Senior Deputy Attorney General Gardner stated that under Section 32, TLC would still make recommendations to the State Board. Instead of the

State Board making changes “based upon” the recommendations by TLC, it would make changes “after consideration of” the recommendations by TLC. He stated that it is a minor change in semantics. Chair Salazar stated that TLC has operated under that belief from the beginning, understanding that TLC made recommendations but did not assume that recommendations would automatically be acted upon. Ms. Galland-Collins confirmed. Chair Salazar asked if there were further questions regarding SB 76 or whether TLC wanted to take a stance regarding SB 76. There were none.

Tina Statucki provided updates about SB 120 which proposed that certain principals were employed at will and required certain post-probationary school administrators to apply for reappointment to their administrative positions. While it did not directly affect the TLC, it might have required revising the evaluation tools and protocols. It was heard by the Senate Committee and an amendment was proposed, but it did not pass. Chair Salazar asked if there were any additional questions or comments regarding the legislative updates. There were none.

Chair Salazar moved to Agenda Item #7.

7: FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Chair Salazar asked about future agenda items. Ms. Statucki stated having 2 items to add to the future agenda:

- Legislative updates on the status of AB 57, AB 266, and SB 76
- FY 22 Meeting Calendar

Chair Salazar stated that the next meeting date will be on June 23rd at 9 A.M. Chair Salazar asked if the next meeting would be virtual or face-to-face. Ms. Galland-Collins shared that Ms. Statucki will be physically available at the Carson City office for public comment and she would be at the Las Vegas office, but the members will be able to attend virtually. Chair Salazar recommended finishing the year virtually. Ms. Statucki added that, based on what Senior Deputy Attorney General Gardner said earlier about current legislation that may pass, TLC could continue to have meetings virtually.

Chair Salazar suggested future discussion about the NEPF data collection. Ms. Galland-Collins said AB 57 could significantly delay the data collection and reporting to the Council. Chair Salazar asked if there were any further questions. There were none.

Chair Salazar moved to Agenda Item #8

8: PUBLIC COMMENT #2

Ms. Galland-Collins shared Tina Statucki’s contact information on the screen for public comments. Additional time was provided for the public to submit comments via email due to delay on Livestream. Ms. Statucki and Ms. Galland-Collins checked their emails to see if there was any public comment submitted, but none was submitted.

Chair Salazar moved to Agenda Item #9

9: ADJOURNMENT

Chair Salazar adjourned the meeting at 11:23 A.M.