

**Nevada Department of Education
Nevada State Board of Education
“At-Risk” Subcommittee Meeting
August 12, 2025
1:00 PM**

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Rd.	Las Vegas	Las Vegas Board Room
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Silver Ore Conference Room
Department of Education	Virtual/Livestream	Virtual	YouTube Link

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
Angie Castellanos, Administrative Assistant

Legal Staff Present

Greg Ott, Chief Deputy Attorney General

Audience in Attendance

None

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

Meeting called to order at 1:41 P.M. by Chair Orr (noting a delayed start due to IT streaming issues).
Quorum was established. Chair Orr provided a land acknowledgement.

2. Public Comment #1

None

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. Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action Regarding the Analysis and Modeling of Discrete At-Risk Student Indicators in Relation to Current Graduation Score Data *(Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action)*

The Department, along with partners from WestEd and Augenblick, Palaich & Associates (APA), presented preliminary findings and methodology for identifying at-risk students and refining Nevada’s definition of “at-risk.”
“Order of Operations: The order of operations used by the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services (DWSS) for direct certification is first SNAP, then TANF, and finally Medicaid. There are no duplications across these categories.

Key Presentation Points:

- Review of data sources including DWSS direct certification files, validation day enrollment, and assessment results (MAP, SBAC, ACT).
- Explanation of order of operations for identifying students and avoiding duplication across categories (SNAP, TANF, Medicaid).
- Presentation of student counts for IEP, EL, Foster, and Homeless categories.
- Methodology for determining the bottom 20th percentile of assessment scores, including two approaches:
 - Option 1: Based only on the directly certified population (excluding IEP/EL).
 - Option 2: Based on the full statewide assessment file.
- Discussion of restrictive vs. inclusive identification criteria (students at risk in both ELA and Math vs. either subject).
- Consideration of missing assessment data, student mobility, and grade-level anomalies (particularly kindergarten and grades 10–11).
- Recognition that homeless and foster youth may require automatic inclusion due to unique needs.
- Presentation of four possible outcome models, with percentages of students identified as at-risk ranging from ~10% to ~20% of the 120,000 directly certified population.

Discussion Highlights:

- Members emphasized the importance of stability and transparency for funding distribution, expressing concerns with prior reliance on the “Grad Score” model.
- Questions were raised about how to address untested grades (kindergarten, 10th, 11th) and ensure early intervention.
- Experts from WestEd and APA stressed balancing precision with transparency, avoiding overreliance on opaque algorithms, and considering the statistical volatility of identifying only the “tails” of performance distributions.
- Members reiterated the need for a definition and funding mechanism that schools can use consistently to plan programs and services for at-risk students.

No formal action was taken; the Subcommittee will continue to request refinements and further modeling.

5. Public Comment #2

None

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

Members discussed the need for continued review of:

- a. Funding stability and transparency in defining “at-risk.”
- b. Inclusion of early grades (especially kindergarten) in at-risk identification.
- c. Additional modeling options to capture students with partial data or composite performance measures.
- d. Possible policy recommendations for the State Board and Commission on School Funding.

7. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 4:09 P.M.