TEACHERS AND LEADERS COUNCIL (TLC)
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 2026
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	Boardroom
Department of Education	Virtual/YouTube	N/A	N/A

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE
Pam Salazar
Sue Moulden
Amy Benham
Amy Miller
Susan Neal
Daniel Schantol
Daniel Tillman
Stephanie Keuhey
Tammy Malich
Pam Goynes-Brown
Vickie Kriedel
Richard Varner
Annie Hicks

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (NDE) STAFF PRESENT
Kathyrn Hoyt, Assistant Director; Office of Educator Development, Licensure, and Family Engagement (EDLiFE)

Elysa Arroyo, 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
Christena Georgas-Burns, Deputy Attorney General (DAG)

1. **CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
   Meeting was called to order at 2:07 PM by Chair Pam Salazar. Chair Salazar led the Pledge of Allegiance Roll call was taken and quorum was established. Chari Salazar submitted a list of council members terms who are expiring 30 June, 2026. Chair Salazar noted that the Council is still waiting for one parent member appointment that the Nevada PTA has submitted nominees for.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT #1**
   There were no public comments in Carson City or Las Vegas.

3. **INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 18, 2026, MEETING MINUTES** *(Information/ Discussion/ Possible Action*)
Members of the Council reviewed the February 18, 2026, meeting minutes. **Chair Salazar entertained a motion to approve the minutes. Member Tammy Malich motioned to approve. Member Daniel Tillman seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

4. **2:19 PM WORKSHOP TO SOLICIT COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO NEPF EVALUATION REVIEW (Possible Action)**
Kathryn Hoyt, NDE, proposed regulation language via public workshop regarding language to comply with amended NRS 391.465, pursuant to SB460 Sec.49.5, establishing a process of review for school associate superintendents or administrators who supervise schools of at least 3 percent of all evaluations of licensed personnel conducted within the schools they oversee.

Ms. Hoyt, on behalf of NDE, reviewed the proposed language which establishes a mandatory review process for administrator evaluations, requires review of at least 3% of licensed personnel evaluations overseen by supervising administrators, and implementation clarity for random selection procedures to meet the 3% sample requirement, timelines for completing evaluation reviews, and corrective action requirements for improperly conducted evaluations. The regulation also addresses documentation submission procedures, allowing flexibility for districts to submit final reports by May 15 of the following school year due to logistical constraints. Implementation is scheduled for the 2027–2028 school year with training pathways for administrator certification and principal supervisors to be developed prior to implementation.

Council members discussed the timeline for completion of evaluation reviews. During this period, administrators will continue conducting evaluations. Council requested additional guidance or guardrails ensuring equitable and representative random sampling and consideration that samples should not disproportionately represent one administrator. They also discussed the lack of statutory specificity regarding corrective action plans, a need for clearer guidance on coaching, remediation and follow-up procedures, and expressed concern about repeat findings of improper evaluations across consecutive years. Council members emphasized that educators should be notified if their evaluation is found to be improperly conducted, processes should address how evaluations will be corrected or redone when errors occur and ensuring fairness to educators affected by improper evaluations. NDE confirmed principal supervisors and supervising administrators will receive evaluator training. Training will occur during the 2026–2027 school year.

5. **2:53 PM INFORMATION, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING NEVADA EDUCATOR PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK (NEPF) UPDATES (Information/Discussion)**
Chair Salazar turned this item over to Ms. Arroyo for discussion. Members received an update on actions relevant to the NEPF, including implementation of items required by Senate Bill (SB) 460 and the NEPF Redesign Field Study for 2026-2027.

NDE continues collecting district liaison feedback to support SB460 implementation frameworks, Educational Growth Goals (EGGs), administrator certification pathways, and districts are contributing insight to the 2026–2027 NEPF Redesign Field Study. Workgroups reconvened March 4, 2026, and April 1, 2026, where RPDP presented an initial draft of the administrator certification course. Feedback continues to be gathered regarding Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs), post-probationary requirements, EGGs, and administrator certification and evaluation review requirements.

Interviews conducted across multiple districts revealed generally positive responses from school leaders. Redesign is viewed as simpler, more manageable, supportive of meaningful professional conversations,

and less compliance-driven and more growth-focused. Easier navigation and clearer expectations which support holistic evaluation of teaching has increased usability. Greater focus on coaching, reflection, and instructional improvement, while shifting away from checklist evaluations toward authentic professional learning. Implementation concerns were loss of scoring nuance without indicator-level scores, reduced specificity when identifying targeted strengths or needs, a strong need for systemwide training, evaluator calibration, and ongoing collaboration among leaders.

After no further discussion or questions, TLC previously voted (Feb. 18 meeting) to maintain an open invitation for district participation in the 2026–2027 field study. **Council elected not to revisit or revote. Recommendation will be forwarded to the State Board of Education for final direction.**

6. **INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING EXPENDITURE OF COUNCIL FUNDS** (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)
Elysa Arroyo, NDE, presented an update on the Teachers and Leaders Council budget and opportunities for professional learning. It was reported that the Council has remaining funds available for Fiscal Year 2026 of $4,287.79. The funds must be obligated by June 30, 2026.

   NDE presented potential options for use of the remaining funds, primarily focused on professional learning opportunities for council members. Options included a shared professional learning experience for all members, or individual professional learning aligned with members' roles and professional growth. When council member Miller asked whether funds could be donated directly to a school, NDE clarified the funds are restricted to approved professional learning uses only. Chair Salazar requested clarification regarding required council action.

   NDE confirmed that formal council approval through a motion was necessary to authorize use of the funds before distributing the survey. Chair Salazar explained that professional learning opportunities may vary based on member roles and referenced examples such as Learning Forward opportunities and leadership training aligned with council responsibilities. Member Benham confirmed that members could select individual professional learning options rather than all participating in the same activity. Member Neal asked whether multi-year Learning Forward subscriptions could be purchased? NDE clarified funds may only cover one year, as expenditures must occur within the current fiscal year. After no further discussions or questions, **Chair Salazar entertained a motion for the Council to use the balance of the funds of the 2026 budget for professional development for the council members. Member Miller made a motion for use of 2026 funds, Member Hicks seconded the motion. The motion carried with following steps to be completed.**
   NDE will distribute a survey to council members to determine professional learning selections.
   NDE will coordinate expenditures to ensure funds are obligated prior to June 30, 2026.

7. **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS** *(Information/ Discussion/Possible Action)*
Updates on FY26 fund expenditures, including final spending decisions, initial discussions regarding future FY26 fund expenditures, and review of future meeting dates and times. Continued updates on SB460 implementation, particularly as regulations advance. Membership updates, including members eligible for renewal or replacement. The council requested a future presentation from RPDP explaining principal and superintendent evaluation training, certification processes, and practical implementation examples for council members not working in school buildings.

8. **PUBLIC COMMENT #2**
   Ms. Leann Silvia, Clark County School District (CCSD), provided comment via email. (A complete copy of the statements is available in Appendix A).

9. **ADJOURNMENT**
   With no further objections, the meeting was adjourned at 3:34 PM.

Appendix A: Statements given during public comments

1. Ms. Leann Silvia, Special Education Teacher Clark County School District (CCSD), provided comment.

Dear Members of the Teachers and Leaders Council,
My name is Leann Silvia and I am a special education teacher in the Clark County School District. On behalf of teachers within Nevada, I would like to thank you for your work in developing evaluation standards for our educators and ensuring that we are all being challenged to continuously grow as professionals. While it is essential to have evaluation standards in place, I am writing today to request that you revise how special education teachers are evaluated.
Currently, all educators are evaluated using the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) which consists of five instructional practice standards and five professional practice standards. Focusing on the instructional practice standards, all teachers are evaluated on how well they connect new learning to background knowledge, ensure that all learners have cognitive demand, have students engage in meaning-making through discourse, have students engage in metacognition activities to take charge of their own learning, and how well they make assessment a part of instruction.
While some of these elements are visible in every classroom, others are difficult to observe in some classrooms. As a personal example, I teach primary autism and have several students who are non-verbal. Most of the parents I work with are more concerned about their child's life skills, social skills, and their ability to communicate rather than academics. While my students show tremendous growth in these areas year after year, I struggle to show this excellence on the NEPF framework when I rightfully prioritize other skills over cognitive demand, engaging in discourse, and trying to have my students engage in metacognition activities. For special education teachers, the current NEPF is problematic because it holds us to the same expectations as general education teachers, it assumes that all students are cognitively able to engage in higher-level thinking and discussions, and it ignores or undermines the growth our students make in other areas that are equally, if not more, important than academics.
To fix these issues, I am urging you to revise the standards used to evaluate special education teachers. Just as school psychologists, school counselors, and speech-language pathologists have standards that align with their unique roles, special education teachers should also be evaluated with a framework that is more inclusive and representative of our daily work. Not only would this allow for a more equitable evaluation process, but it will also allow all educators to be recognized for the growth their students make, both academically and socially. Further, this change would make evaluations more meaningful for special education teachers, as our scores would more closely align with the priorities of our students and families. Rather than being evaluated on how well our students engage in discourse or metacognition activities, it would be ideal to instead have an evaluation that reflects the differentiation strategies we all use, the IEP goals and accommodations that we focus our instruction on, and the energy we put towards ensuring that learning is accessible for all of our students.
As the Teachers and Leaders Council, you have the opportunity and responsibility to ensure that all teachers within Nevada are evaluated to fair standards. Again, I urge you to reconsider how special education teachers are currently being evaluated and to strongly suggest that the State Board modify our standards. Most of us choose to teach special education and pour our hearts into doing everything we possibly can for our students. It is only fair that our evaluations reflect our work in the growth our students continuously show.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter. If I can provide any further documentation or information to assist with this revision, I would be happy to do so.

Sincerely,
Leann Silvia