

**Nevada Department of Education
Nevada State Board of Education
“At-Risk” Subcommittee Meeting**

**June 30, 2025
9:00 AM**

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Rd.	Las Vegas	Big Horn Conference
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Battle Born Conference
Department of Education	Virtual/Livestream	Virtual	YouTube Link

Draft Summary Minutes of the Board Meeting

Subcommittee Members Present

Angela Orr, Chair
Annette Dawson Owens
Superintendent Andrew Fueling

Subcommittee Members Absent Excused

Mike Walker

Department Staff Present

Dr. Steve Canavero, Interim Superintendent of Public Instruction
Lisa Ford, Interim Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement Office
Megan Peterson, Deputy Superintendent for Student Investment Division
Peter Zutz, Director, Office of Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management
Dr. Gunes Kaplan, Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management
Angie Castellanos, Administrative Assistant

Legal Staff Present

Greg Ott, Chief Deputy Attorney General

Audience in Attendance

Amanda Morgan, Executive Director of Educate Nevada Now

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance, and Land Acknowledgement

Meeting called to order at 9:00 A.M. by Chair Orr. Quorum was established. Chair Orr provided a land acknowledgement.

2. Public Comment #1

- a) Amanda Morgan, Executive Director, Educate Now, provided public comment regarding agenda item
(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)

3. Approval of Flexible Agenda

Chair Orr requested a motion to approve the use of a flexible agenda. Superintendent Andrew Feuling seconded. Motion passed.

4. Review of Requested Data on Potential At-Risk Student Indicators *(Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action)*

Chair Orr introduced the item and welcomed Dr. Steve Canavero, who provided background on the data request. Because the data was not yet de-identified, it was not presented publicly, but the Department’s data team discussed their findings.

Dr. Gunes Kaplan reported that 40.4% of K–12 students in Nevada (187,108 out of 462,915) were directly certified. Category-specific percentages included: Medicaid at 13.1%, SNAP at 26.0%, TANF at 0.1%, Homeless at 1.0%, Foster at 0.22%, and Migrant at 0.0%. Results showed high non-proficiency among directly certified students. For SBAC Math, non-proficiency rates were 73.9% for Medicaid and 82.5% for SNAP. For SBAC ELA, the rates were 64.7% for Medicaid and 74.5% for SNAP. ACT Math non-proficiency rates were even higher—88.2% for Medicaid and 92.6% for SNAP. Among students in grades 10–12, 20.1% of Medicaid students and 31.3% of SNAP students were credit deficient. Each student in the data set is counted in only one direct certification category (there is no duplication between SNAP and Medicaid). A recommendation was made to incorporate a data validation process similar to those used for accountability reporting.

Outstanding data requests include unduplicated counts within the 187,108 direct certified students; counts of how many are also identified as EL or IEP; disaggregation by grade bands (elementary, middle, high); graduation rate correlation; and discipline data such as multi-day suspensions or expulsions, which is currently unavailable at the student level through existing department reporting.

5. Evaluation of Metrics for Defining “At-Risk” Under NRS 387.1211 *(Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action)*

Chair Orr led a discussion on how best to structure the evaluation of “at-risk” definitions under NRS 387.1211. Key topics included: Whether to define “at-risk” based on discrete demographic categories (e.g., direct certification) or academic performance, evaluating proportional funding versus per-pupil allocations, the implications of using fixed percentage thresholds (e.g., quintiles) versus more flexible models, legal interpretations clarified that the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan (PCFP) requires that at-risk funding not be distributed proportionally by district but rather based on individual student eligibility, current statute maintains the requirement for quintile-based identification, which the Commission on School Funding may recommend changes to in future legislative sessions.

The subcommittee agreed that academic performance indicators, especially SBAC, ACT, and MAP scores, could support creating a composite risk index. They also emphasized the importance of using consistent business rules to remove duplications (e.g., students already counted under EL or special education weights).

6. Timeline for Finalizing Definition and Implementation Planning *(Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action)*

The subcommittee briefly touched on the need to develop a timeline and process for refining the at-risk definition. There was no formal action taken, but the need for continued coordination with the Commission on School Funding, district data teams, and Department analysts was noted.

7. Public Comment #2

Public comment was received by the following:

a) Amanda Morgan

(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)

8. Future Agenda Items (*Information and Discussion*)

none

9. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 11:20 A.M.

Appendix A: Statements given during public comments

1. Amanda Morgan, Executive Director of Educate Nevada Now
2. Amanda Morgan, Executive Director of Educate Nevada Now

Appendix A, Item 1: AMANDA MORGAN

Good morning. My name is Amanda Morgan. I'm the executive director of Educate Nevada Now. At-risk is an issue ENN has been very invested in. Wanted to say, I really appreciated the discussion at the last At-Risk Subcommittee meeting. I just had a few thoughts to share as you develop a new definition. Much of this was already mentioned by members and the Department at the last meeting. First, I agreed with the comments regarding getting the definition right, even if that might mean expanding eligibility. There was some concern that the next legislative session, the weight itself would be reduced in an effort to include more students, like per pupil funding. It's important to get it right and set that target for the Legislature, even if that target isn't met right away. And the way to address the potential dilution of funds is by simply giving districts some flexibility. This wouldn't make funds categorical. Weights are still calculated at the state level and distributed to districts. But the districts could have some reasonable flexibility in allocating those funds to schools, just to maintain programs and services as the state grows into fully funding the weight. And this is basically how the weights operated in the first couple years of the PCFP as it was onboarded. And just for reference, it's really common in other states. You can look at New York, Michigan, Illinois, New Jersey, and several other states. Their weights operate under this way. The only other thought: as a baseline, using direct certification identifying poverty and then adding additional factors, we really agreed with that sentiment. And then modeling all this prior to any formal adoption is really important and was also identified at the last meeting. So anyway, thank you so much for your hard work and your time this morning.

Appendix A, Item 2: AMANDA MORGAN

Hi, thank you. Thank you again, Amanda Morgan with Educate Nevada Now. I just wanted to make a couple of comments. I participated in the drafting of SB 460, so I just want to offer myself as a resource for that. Wanted to provide a little context about why the quintile was removed and then put back in. So, the quintile was removed, and then LCB said that because SB 500, which is the appropriations bill, was already, you know, signed and in law, that bill had a specific weight in it for at-risk. So, if the State Board were to add additional students, it would dilute that weight, and that would not, that would conflict with the appropriations bill. So, I just wanted to provide that little bit of context there. And it just sounds like there are kind of two different conversations happening, one around what can be done this session as far as working within that quintile, and then what can be recommended for the future. And I just want to say, you know, kind of being part of the drafting process for SB 460, it's definitely contemplated that the State Board and Commission can recommend moving beyond that quintile in the next legislative session. So, I just wanted to throw that out there. Some of the figures that we had put together for unduplicated direct certification, so removing EL, special education, was around 90,000 students, which I think is a little more manageable than the full direct certification and, for simplicity's sake, you know, might be a way to go. So anyways, just wanted to throw that out there, and I really appreciate the discussion. And certainly, a resource for anyone. Thank you so much.