

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
COMMISSION ON INNOVATION AND EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION
August 26, 2025
8:30 AM**

Office	Address	Meeting Room
Southwest Career & Technical Academy	7050 W Shelbourne Ave. Las Vegas, NV 89133	Ballroom
Virtual	Virtual	Virtual Link

Draft Summary Minutes of the Commission Meeting

Commission Members Present

Senator Carrie Buck
Dr. Steve Canavero
Patty Charlton
Teresa Dastrup
Senator Marilyn Dondero-Loop
Rebecca Garcia
Tim Hughes
Sandra Kupfer
Chancellor Matthew McNair
Sean Parker
Nicole Rourke
Senator Dr. Angela Taylor
Joyce Woodhouse
Adam Young
Peter Zierhut

Commission Members Absent Excused

Aaron Frantz
Dr. Mariluz Garcia
Assemblymember Tanya Flanagan
Assemblymember Torres-Fossett
Assemblymember Gregory Koenig
Anthony Nunez
Melinda Riemersma
Maite Salazar

Department Staff Present

Dr. Steve Canavero, Interim Superintendent of Public Instruction
Lisa Ford, Interim Deputy Superintendent for the Student Achievement Division

Audience in Attendance

None

AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Meeting called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Chair Joyce Woodhouse. Quorum was established.

2. Public Comment #1

There were no public comments provided.

3. Welcome (*Information and Discussion*)

Chair Joyce Woodhouse welcomed attendees back for day two of the commission meeting. She reflected that the previous day was a great conversation, thoughtful discussion, and collaboration that set a strong foundation for the work ahead. The focus for day two would be looking ahead, thinking about the sequencing of work, the design of metrics and accountability, and preparing to engage with the Nevada Department of Education and the Center for Assessment. Chair Woodhouse encouraged a robust discussion and for no one to hold back thoughts and concerns.

4. Arc of Learning (*Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action*)

Nathan Driskell, Chief Policy Officer with NCEE welcomed attendees to the first meeting of the metrics subcommittee of the commission, acknowledging the topic's crucial nature for the roadmap's success.

Mr. Driskell outlined the broad objective for the day: being responsive to the challenge posed by Dr. Turner and others, which was holding the requirements of today (current law and the next 12 months) foremost while also operating in a second time horizon and being bold in thinking about the future.

Mr. Driskell detailed the agenda's flow:

1. A facilitated conversation with representatives from last year's measuring what matters subcommittee to reflect on the research they studied, innovations, and Nevada's opportunity to grow in assessment and accountability.
2. Reflections from Dr. Canavero on the current legal frameworks and his department's responsibilities, framing the priorities he is grappling with and how the commission's charge is crucial for advancing work.
3. A discussion led by NCEE colleagues Dr. Tracy Burns (Chief of Research and Global Strategy) and Claire Hollywood (Director of Evaluation, joining online) on global innovations to stress-test assumptions and think more expansively about accountability.
4. Reflecting on a structured process for major deliverables with colleagues at the Center for Assessment. They would discuss how the commission can facilitate work related to the NPF and NDPF (Nevada Department of Education Framework).
5. Janice Case and Mr. Driskell would conclude by reflecting on where to go from here and what additional members may need to be invited to inform the work in future meetings

5. Measuring What Matters: Setting the context (*Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action*)

Chair Joyce Woodhouse stated that the working group on "measuring what matters" did a deep dive on the topic in the past two years, and the work must continue to define the progress made towards goals. She noted the discussion was intended to let commissioners reflect on completed work and articulate a clear vision of where to go. The Chair encouraged everyone to jump into the conversation as they refine the work, noting the commission usually works on a consensus basis.

Janice Case, West Regional Director with NCEE, expressed appreciation for the three ongoing members of the former measuring what matters group who were now part of the metrics subcommittee: Tim Hughes, Adam Young, and Sean Parker.

Ms. Case explained the purpose was to bring the small group conversations to the whole group to ensure everyone understood the history and road already traveled. Ms. Case posed the first question to the gentlemen: What were the key questions the subcommittee was tasked with, especially around the intentional idea of "what matters"?

Superintendent Adam Young spoke from his perspective about grappling with things that need to be communicated but are not part of the current public narrative. He noted overwhelming consensus that the MSPF (School Performance Framework), while thoughtfully crafted, is often viewed by educators as damaging to morale and not overly informative to the general public. He said a star rating simplifies complexities down to something that is perceived as easily understood but actually isn't. Superintendent Young explained that current metrics don't tell the entire story, especially post-COVID, where schools focus on mental health, well-being, nutrition, and holistic factors that are precursors to academic achievement. He sought what "tells a more full story".

Sean Parker agreed and noted the core question: Amidst a changing environment, what matters, and what matters is what you measure? He said they looked at systems globally (Estonia, Singapore) and nationally. He asked what Nevadans want, noting that the K-12/K-16 system generally is viewed as not preparing young people for the workforce of today or tomorrow. He cited the former Chair, Tina Quigley, who heard from employers that the number one reason they weren't relocating a business to Nevada was education (and healthcare). The commission adopted the Nevada Portrait of a Learner. The goal became to create a measurement system that takes the Portrait of a Learner (durable skills and competencies) into account. He stated experts agreed their system wasn't measuring *all* that matters, though reading is important. Consensus exists that young people need critical thinking, communication, and well-being skills. The group developed a framework recommending a more holistic approach. He emphasized the need to build a new system and pilot a new measurement system while keeping the current one in place.

Tim Hughes added that the group grappled with dilemmas: balancing short-term requirements with long-term goals, the limitations of assessment tools for measuring durable skills, and making the new system accessible to stakeholders while clarifying that they are expanding the bar, not lowering it.

Ms. Case asked for one key insight or "aha" moment that shaped their thinking.

Sean Parker shared an "aha" moment from a field trip to White Pine County, where he saw the power of creating a collective understanding with families and students around the skills in their local portrait model. He observed students advocating for the skills they wanted to develop, demonstrating that moving from the theoretical idea to implementation was possible. This led to increased student engagement. He noted that metacognition (how students think they're doing/own advocacy of learning) is the number one factor for student achievement, and this is a vehicle for it.

Adam Young built on this, recalling that the existing Acing Accountability Framework allowed districts choice in an area to report, which in White Pine and Elko County, included reporting on long-term choice-based learning. He noted this was a process-oriented metric that measures learning conditions and engagement. He cited the example of 100 students on campus for various activities on a random Friday, emphasizing this is a story not currently reported, highlighting the importance of attending to the right things to communicate.

Superintendent Young also highlighted White Pine's portfolio assessment model, where students self-select evidence to present to a committee. This gives students ownership and helps the ultimate consumer—the child—find value in assessment. He stated his belief that current standardized assessment results do not accurately reflect literacy in Nevada because kids are not invested in the process, which is an "us problem" to figure out.

Tim Hughes added that an important question is the lack of a clear articulation of what is important at the state, district, and school levels, and who should have autonomy and flexibility where. He noted that if every district had its own portfolio model, it would be difficult to confidently roll up data across the state for consistency. He said this choice point has implications for the types of systems implemented and how much variation is comfortable for equity across the state.

Commissioner Dondero-Loop thanked the speakers and began a series of questions to Superintendent Young:

1. Are all schools doing the White Pine Portrait of a Learner? Mr. Young replied that they have their own unique tweak on the Nevada portrait called the Portrait of a Leader (for every stakeholder, not just students). He confirmed it is being done in White Pine, noting the challenge in scaling such a charge in a small district of 1,300 students.
2. How does the district deal with transfers (students moving in who are new to the system)? Mr. Young responded that it takes time; it's an embedded way of living and doing school that is constantly being co-created. He provided the example of 8th graders who go through a nine-week career exploration module where they gather evidence for their portfolio based on the White Pine Portrait's four domains, eight competencies, learning progressions, and durable skills credentials. The approach is asset-based, not expecting a home run on all eight competencies, but focusing on those that speak to the student.
3. How do we ensure teachers understand that this new work is not one more thing? Mr. Young responded that as a leader, he talks about a clear and compelling vision of education, contrasting being empowered to build locally with an imposed set of criteria. The fact that his team built, created, and owned the vision to "collaboratively grow leaders who are going to change the world" makes it feel like a completely different thing, not an add-on. He noted that three-quarters of his staff were voluntarily on campus for professional learning prior to the school start because the vision ignites passion.

Tim Hughes added that there's an opportunity on the teacher front to embed durable skills into content standards, as a subset of them are already "baked into the standards" but are not called out explicitly. Blending the two would make it feel less like an add-on.

Commissioner Dondero-Loop agreed that the message to teachers is important and thanked the leaders who enjoy what they do.

Ms. Case asked a final question to the subcommittee: What is your biggest hope for the work of the metrics subcommittee?

Sean Parker expressed his hope that the committee can "chew gum and walk at the same time"—creating a system that builds validity and trust while hitting all statutorily required metrics in SB460. He hopes to test, pilot, and develop a system that sets Nevada up to be a global leader, making Nevadans much more ready for the future compared to others.

Tim Hughes added that his hope is for the committee to have actual micro proof points and pilots because the system should be built to support what's happening on the ground in classrooms and schools.

6. Linking Statewide Accountability Efforts *(Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action)*

Dr. Steve Canavero, Superintendent of Public Instruction, explained that under SB460, the Department has a year (until August 15th of next year) to issue a preliminary rating for the District Performance Framework (DPF), which is a first in Nevada's history.

He noted that the DPF development was put aside after the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) transition because the School Performance Framework (SPF) took all the bandwidth.

When the responsibility came to the Department to establish a DPF, it was intuitive to seek help from the Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education (CIEE), given its work developing metrics. He stated the commission's leadership welcomed the DPF work, stating it fits with their direction, allowing them to "chew gum and walk at the same time" and support the state in the next 12 months while informing the commission's larger compass.

Dr. Canavero cautioned against the DPF taking up all the commission's time and energy. He suggested a framework could have a lane for the state and a lane for the district for their priorities to be expressed and would likely need supports in identifying future-ready metrics. He reiterated the belief that both things could be done simultaneously.

Dr. Canavero mentioned that two legislatively mandated time-on-assessment studies have shown that the state's assessment accounts for a very narrow window of the total number of assessments delivered, which is acceptable because districts should have an opinion about what they're measuring.

The Department of Education, with assistance from the Commission and its Metrics Subcommittee, will develop a district performance framework by August 15th of next year. Action Item: The Metrics Subcommittee will contemplate the types of questions they need to grapple with and identify other individuals who should be involved in the discussion.

7. Transforming Systems and Metrics for Impact *(Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action)*

Dr. Tracy Burns, Chief Research Officer, and Claire Hollywood, Director of Evaluation, from the National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE), presented on "Transforming Systems and Metrics for Impact." Their session highlighted how educational systems worldwide are overhauling their metrics to drive meaningful change, specifically addressing strategies for managing tensions and stress testing assumptions to ensure rigor and sustainability.

Dr. Burns noted that their prepared slides connected surprisingly well with the previous day's discussions, signaling the timeliness of their topic. The NCEE's overview first touched on global systems, acknowledging that assessment and accountability is a "hot topic" globally, full of intense activity. Ms. Hollywood was slated to follow up by focusing on the NCEE's work with U.S. systems, emphasizing not just the technical aspects but the critical implementation and human elements of managing systemic change. The majority of the session was then dedicated to small group activities, providing an initial, iterative forum for attendees to "push, exchange, and talk together" on these topics, setting the stage for a subsequent presentation.

Dr. Burns proceeded with a detailed overview of global priorities, categorizing system transformations into the "who, why, what, when, and how" of reimagining assessment and accountability, based on an NCEE brief.

A core focus was the importance of purpose (the "why"). Burns stressed that the purpose of an assessment dictates its design, use, interaction with culture and technology, and its connection to analytics and reporting. Systems must have a clear vision and engagement strategy for any given measure, as buy-in is essential for any sophisticated work to succeed.

Regarding the content of assessments (the "what"), systems are increasingly focused on weaving together traditional academic measures (like literacy and math) with durable skills. Key examples cited included:

- The OECD PISA 2022 innovative domain on Creative Thinking, which used a digital format to successfully measure this skill, even securing country buy-in.
- The upcoming OECD PISA 2025 domain on Learning in a Digital World, which combines self-regulation (including metacognitive skills) and computational thinking.
- Chile's Comprehensive Learning Diagnosis, a system-level example that integrates interpersonal and durable skills with academic assessments.

The discussion concluded by reiterating the critical need to focus on the people (the "who") and the importance of bringing all stakeholders along throughout the work.

Following the NCEE discussion, the meeting was scheduled to pivot to the Center for Assessment. Their presentation was designed to help the commission develop a structured process for managing major future deliverables related to assessment and accountability, specifically the National Performance Framework (NPF) and the National Diagnostic Performance Framework (NDPF). This segment aimed to outline how the commission could best facilitate this work and how commissioners could actively contribute.

Finally, the co-chairs planned to conclude the agenda by leading a final reflection on next steps and determining what additional experts or members might need to be brought in to inform future meetings.

8. Nevada's Next Generation Accountability Framework (*Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action*)

Dr. Juan D'Brot and Dr. Laura Hamilton from the Center for Assessment provided an overview of their work, emphasizing the promise of transformed assessment and accountability systems to drive impact. The presentation focused on outlining a structured process and set of deliverables for the commission to use in advancing its work related to the National Performance Framework (NPF) and the National Diagnostic Performance Framework (NDPF).

The presentation covered the following key areas:

- **Highlighting the Promise:** The presenters articulated the potential for assessment and accountability systems to become powerful tools for improvement when designed to align with broader educational goals and to capture a more holistic view of student learning and durable skills, echoing the themes from the previous NCE discussion. Their work centers on creating coherent systems that balance technical soundness with fairness, implementation feasibility, and local context.
- **Proposed Process:** The Center for Assessment outlined a structured, multi-front process for the commission to facilitate the development and refinement of the NPF and NDPF. This process was intended to move the commission's visionary goals toward concrete, measurable outcomes.
- **Deliverables and Timeline:** A set of specific major deliverables and an associated timeline were presented, detailing how the commission's efforts could be leveraged to produce tangible results on multiple fronts of assessment and accountability moving forward. This included a strategy for using the commission's structure to inform and guide work related to both frameworks.

The presenters looked forward to a robust discussion with the commissioners regarding the proposed structure, how the work would be executed, and how the commissioners could best contribute to the development of the NPF and NDPF.

9. Synthesis and Next Steps (*Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action*)

Commissioners engaged in a final discussion to synthesize the day's learning and reflect on the path forward, leading toward the finalization of next steps.

Future Measurement System: Commissioner Sean Parker expressed his hope that the Metrics Subcommittee would develop a measurement system that achieves multiple, simultaneous goals. Specifically, this system should:

- Create validity and trust within the educational space.
- Fulfill all statutorily required metrics as outlined in SB460.
- Be future-oriented by testing, piloting, and developing a new system focused on durable skills together with Nevadans.
- The overall dream was for Nevada's measurement system to set the state up as a global leader.

Commissioner Tim Hughes reinforced this direction, expressing his hope for the development of "micro proof points". He suggested this involves having classrooms and schools that are doing this work well to provide concrete examples of the envisioned system in action. He believed that the final system should be built to support what happens on the ground.

10. Public Comment #2

There were no public comments provided.

11. Adjournment

Chair Woodhouse adjourned the meeting at 2:36 PM.