Nevada Department of Education
Nevada State Board of Education
June 26, 2026
9:00 AM

Office	Address	City	Meeting
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo	Las Vegas	Room 114
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Board Room
Department of Education	Virtual/Livestream	Virtual	YouTube Link

Summary Minutes of the Board Meeting

Board Members Present
Dr. Katherine Dockweiler, President
Tim Hughes, Vice President
Tamara Hudson, Clerk
Tate Else, Member
Danielle Ford, Member *(arrived shortly after roll call and was noted present by the President)*
Jade Jow, Member
Angela Orr, Member
Susan Neal, Member
Dr. Victor Wakefield, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Board Members Absent Excused
Dr. Tricia Braxton, Member
Amy Carvalho, Member
Annette Dawson Owens, Member

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

   President Dockweiler called the meeting to order at **9:04 a.m.**

   Immediately following the call to order, due to technical difficulties affecting communication between locations, the meeting was temporarily paused while Department staff worked to restore reliable audio. During this time, **President Dockweiler** coordinated with staff and board members to verify that all participants could hear one another and discussed potential options for continuing the meeting, including restarting the meeting platform if necessary.

   After determining that audio issues persisted**, President Dockweiler** recessed the meeting and announced that the meeting would be restarted once technical issues had been sufficiently resolved.

   Meeting Reconvened: President Dockweiler reconvened the meeting at **9:26 a.m.** and again called the meeting to order. She directed **Zachary Khan**, Board Secretary, to conduct roll call.

2. **Public Comment #1**

The first period of public comment was opened by President Dockweiler.

- **Carson City:** No public comment was present
- **Las Vegas:**
    - **Vicki Cridel**, a third-grade teacher with the Clark County School District, provided public comment regarding Agenda Item 8, Read by Grade 3, and Agenda Item 7, Developmental Delay Age Criteria. **Ms. Cridel** shared her perspective as an educator with 24 years of classroom experience working with struggling readers. She emphasized the importance of investing in evidence-based literacy interventions, including literacy coaches, tutors, and individualized reading plans, rather than relying solely on grade retention. She also expressed support for extending the Developmental Delay eligibility age to nine years old, stating that doing so would provide continued educational supports for students who continue to demonstrate developmental needs beyond age six. **President Dockweiler** thanked **Ms. Cridel** for her comments and service to Nevada's students.
- **Written Submission:**
    - Board staff read into the record a written public comment submitted by **Anamarie Binder** regarding Agenda Item 7, Consideration of Developmental Delay Age Criteria. **Ms. Binder** expressed support for extending Developmental Delay eligibility to age nine, citing stakeholder feedback, educational benefits, and the importance of prioritizing student needs while addressing implementation challenges through policy development.
- **Virtual Callers:**
    - No public comment was present

3. Approval of Flexible Agenda

President Dockweiler requested a motion to approve the use of a flexible agenda, allowing agenda items to be taken out of order if necessary.

Motion: Vice President Hughes moved to approve the use of a flexible agenda.

Second: Member Ford seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

Action Taken: The Board approved the use of a flexible agenda.

4. President's Report

President Dockweiler welcomed **Jade Jow** as the Nevada State Board of Education's new Student Member and invited Jade to introduce themself to the Board.

Jade Jow shared that they are an incoming senior at Canyon Springs High School Law Academy and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to serve as the Student Member on the State Board of Education.

President Dockweiler welcomed **Member Jow** on behalf of the Board, emphasized the importance of the student voice in Board discussions and decision-making, and encouraged **Member Jow** to actively participate in all agenda items.

President Dockweiler then invited Board members to provide any updates or announcements. No Board member updates were provided.

The President concluded her report and turned the meeting over to **Superintendent Wakefield** for the Superintendent's Report.

5. Superintendent's Report

Superintendent Wakefield provided updates on the Department's current priorities, including implementation of the Department's strategic priorities through the State Improvement Plan (STIP), fiscal year-end activities, budget development for the 2027 Legislative Session, leadership transitions within the Department, efforts to streamline reporting requirements under Senate Bill 460, and development of the proposed District Performance Framework.

Board Discussion

Following the presentation, Board members discussed the Superintendent's report and asked questions regarding the proposed accountability framework, district performance measures, implementation timelines, and opportunities to reduce reporting requirements while maintaining transparency and accountability.

- **Member Ford** expressed concern that the proposed District Performance Framework could ultimately result in increased state oversight of local school districts. She referenced developments involving the Houston Independent School District and the Texas Education Agency, stating her belief that similar governance models could diminish local control. She also encouraged Board members and the public to review the legislative history of Senate Bill 460, noting that the final legislation differed significantly from its original version following negotiations during the legislative session.
- **Superintendent Wakefield** clarified for the record that the Education Service Center is not involved in the development of the District Performance Framework or its performance indicators, explaining that the framework is a responsibility of the Nevada Department of Education.
- **Vice President Hughes** then shared his experience serving on the Accountability Redesign Subcommittee. He noted that the committee includes representatives from a broad range of stakeholder groups, district sizes, and educational perspectives, resulting in thoughtful discussion regarding how proposed performance measures could be applied fairly across Nevada. **Vice President Hughes** further explained that several components of the framework are prescribed by Senate Bill 460, requiring the committee to work within statutory parameters while developing recommendations for the pilot framework.

6. Consent Agenda *(For Possible Action)*

Information concerning the following consent agenda items has been provided to Board members for study prior to the meeting. Unless a Board member has a question concerning a particular item and asks *that* it be withdrawn from the consent list, all items are approved in one action.

a. Possible Approval of Instructional Materials for the Washoe County School District

b. Possible Approval of Dual Credit Courses for the Clark County School District
c. Possible Approval for Private School License Renewals
d. Possible Approval of February 25, 2026 Regulation Hearing Draft Meeting Minutes
e. Possible Approval of March 11, 2026 Draft Meeting Minutes
f. Possible Approval of April 18, 2026 Draft Meeting Minutes
g. Possible Approval of April 22, 2026 Regulation Hearing Draft Meeting Minutes
h. Possible Approval of May 13, 2026 Draft Meeting Minutes

President Dockweiler introduced the Consent Agenda and asked whether any Board member wished to remove an item for separate consideration.

Vice President Hughes requested that Item 6B – Possible Approval of Dual Credit Courses for the Clark County School District be removed from the Consent Agenda pending clarification regarding the assignment of course weights. DAG Ott indicated they had not yet reviewed the concern and recommended postponing consideration of Item 6B until later in the meeting after additional review.

With Item 6B removed, the Board considered the remaining consent agenda items:

- 6A. Possible Approval of Instructional Materials for the Washoe County School District
- 6C. Possible Approval for Private School License Renewals

Items **6D through 6H** (approval of prior meeting minutes) were postponed until later in the meeting to allow Board members additional time to review the posted meeting materials.

Motion: Member Hudson moved to approve Consent Agenda Items **6A** and **6C**.

Second: Member Ford seconded the motion.

Vote: Motion carried unanimously.

Action Taken: Consent Agenda Items **6A** and **6C** were approved. Consideration of **Item 6B** was deferred until later in the meeting, and **Items 6D through 6H** were postponed for consideration at a future Board meeting.

7. **Consideration of Developmental Delay Age Criteria** *(Information, Discussion, and Possible Action)*
   The State Board of Education will receive a presentation regarding the potential extension of the age at which a child exits eligibility under the Developmental Delay disability category. The presentation will include information and data from the Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities regarding stakeholder survey findings, as well as data and analysis from the Clark County School District Task Force related to the potential impact of extending the Developmental Delay age criteria. The Board will discuss the educational, fiscal, and operational implications of extending the exit age to 7, 8, or 9 years old and may take action to provide direction regarding a preferred age for inclusion in future regulatory or policy recommendations.

President Dockweiler opened agenda item 7 and invited the presenters to begin. President Dockweiler recused herself from the item due to her professional role as a school psychologist.

The presentation was delivered by **Julie Bowers** (NDE), **Dr. Meski Renn** (CCSD), and **Katherine Nielsen** (presenting on behalf of the Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities, representing the office of **Ellen Marquez**).

- **Julie Bowers** outlined the operational impacts of expansion, noting that extending the age would require regulation changes, data reconfigurations, and district-level shifts to maintain service continuity. She highlighted that while ages seven and eight follow a 9-to-12-month implementation timeline, age nine would take 12-to-18 months due to complex structural overhauls, including teacher licensing amendments.
- **The Governor's Council (via Katherine Nielsen/Ellen Marquez)** shared survey results from 67 respondents (parents, educators, and advocates). The survey revealed widespread concern that the current age-six transition creates disruptions in critical therapies and academic interventions, with most respondents recommending an extension to age nine.
- **Dr. Meski Renn** presented findings from a CCSD task force. Notably, data from the last four years showed that less than 3% (76 students) who exited the DD category at age six later re-qualified for special education. For those who did re-qualify, the average time elapsed before returning to services was 1.5 years.

Board Member Discussion
The Board engaged in a robust debate regarding the "adult problems" of implementation versus the needs of vulnerable students.

- **Member Ford** strongly advocated for age nine, arguing that even if only 3% of students are impacted, they are the most vulnerable and deserve a longer "developmental runway". She dismissed administrative and licensing hurdles as problems the system's "competent people" should solve with urgency.
- **Member Hudson** supported the extension to age nine, stating that the Board should strive for 100% success rather than being satisfied with 97%. She emphasized that providing the right supports at the right time is necessary for long-term academic success.
- **Member Orr** expressed concern that the age-six cutoff makes it difficult to collect enough data for an informed decision on a child's long-term eligibility. She noted that many students turn six shortly after entering the system, leaving little time for a comprehensive profile to emerge.
- **Member Neil** questioned whether data from other districts mirrored the 3% found in Clark County and noted that certain developmental delays, such as those from prenatal exposure, may not manifest until a child is older.
- **Vice President Hughes** expressed concern regarding the capacity of the department to handle the 18-month overhaul required for age nine. He suggested that a "middle ground" (like age eight) might be implemented more quickly to support students sooner.
- **Member Else** (Practitioner) raised concerns about district liability and teacher licensure, noting that current licenses only cover up to age eight and serving older students could create legal risks for districts.

Action and Results
Two motions were made, but neither reached the **four votes** required for action.

1. **Motion for Age 9:** Moved by Member Ford and seconded by Member Hudson; **failed 2-2**
2. **Motion for Age 8:** Moved by Vice President Hughes and seconded by Member Hudson; **failed 3-1**

Because no consensus was reached, the item was **moved forward to a future meeting**.

8. **Overview of Read by Grade 3 Retention Requirements and State Board Responsibilities** *(Information and Discussion)*
   The Board will receive a presentation on the Read by Grade 3 retention requirements and the Board's statutory responsibilities related to future implementation and decision-making. This item is intended to provide foundational information and context to support future Board actions.

President Dockweiler opened agenda item 8 and invited the presenters to begin.

The presentation was delivered by **Deputy Superintendent Dr. Torrey Palmer**, **Mandy Leytham**, **Lisa Calvary**, **Katie Fink** (Office of Teaching and Learning), and **Mike Pacheco** (Office of Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management). Key components of the presentation included:

- **Statutory Requirements:** An explanation of NRS 392.780, which mandates a uniform examination (currently MAP and I-Ready) to measure proficiency, and NRS 392.785, which outlines "good cause exemptions" for students with disabilities, English learners, or those with intensive remediation histories.
- **The "Simple View of Reading":** A breakdown of how students learn to read by combining word recognition (decoding) and language comprehension.
- **State Comparisons:** Data showing that 14 states currently require retention for students who do not pass a common assessment. Most of these states retain between 2% and 5% of students after good cause exemptions are applied.
- **Assessment Data:** Mike Pacheco presented a crosswalk between I-Ready/MAP scale scores and Smarter Balanced performance levels (Minimal, Partial, Proficient, and Advanced) to help the Board approximate what a "passing score" might look like compared to "proficiency"

Board Member Discussion
Several board members provided feedback and raised questions to clarify how the passing score would impact students and families:

- **President Dockweiler:** She focused on the practical impact of the score, asking what percentile would correspond to the 3–5% retention rate seen in other states. She also requested **projections and estimates** regarding how many Nevada students currently fall under each "good cause" exemption (such as those with IEPs or English Learners) to better understand the "total impact" of any proposed passing score.
- **Member Else:** He sought clarification on the specific percentile ranks used by other states, asking if they typically targeted the **5th percentile or below** for their initial retention cut.
- **Vice President Hughes:** He raised technical concerns about applying a single percentile score to two different assessments (I-Ready and MAP) because they

measure slightly different reading skills. He suggested that the Board might eventually need to advocate for law changes to allow for assessment-specific scores to ensure greater precision.

- **Member Orr:** She emphasized the absolute necessity of clear communication for parents and stakeholders to distinguish between a "passing score" (for promotion) and a "proficiency score" (for state standards). She also questioned the stability of percentile rankings, noting they can shift based on national performance rather than staying fixed like a scale score. Finally, she asked if students who achieve a passing score in 1st or 2nd grade could satisfy the requirement early and requested vendor data on foundational skills to identify students who specifically lack decoding abilities.

The Board is expected to revisit this data in July to recommend a draft passing score, which will then be monitored during a "dry run" in the 2027-28 school year

9. **Approval of Assessment RFP Scope of Work and Evaluation Committee Composition** *(Information, Discussion, and Possible Action)*
   The State Board of Education will review the proposed scope of work and evaluation committee composition for the statewide assessment Request for Proposals (RFP). The Board may take action to approve the scope of work and evaluation committee composition to support final issuance of the RFP.

President Dockweiler opened agenda item 8 and invited the presenters to begin.

The presentation was led by **Peter Zutz** (Administrator of the Office of Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management), with additional input from **Deputy Superintendent Dr. Torrey Palmer**.

- **Scope of Work (SOW):** Zutz outlined additions to the SOW, including requirements for vendors to demonstrate a development process focused on Nevada content standards, proposals for an interim assessment system aligned to state standards, and proof of system capacity and security.
- **Evaluation Criteria:** New criteria included alignment to the Nevada Academic Content Standards (NVACS), validity and reliability demonstrations, and standard-setting processes.
- **Committee Composition:** The evaluation committee was designed to represent the diversity of Nevada’s education system while maintaining high technical and professional expertise.
- **Standards Alignment:** Dr. Palmer introduced supplemental resources from the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and science-specific criteria (NGSS) to provide a more robust framework for evaluating how well a vendor's test aligns with Nevada's academic expectations.

Board Member Discussion
The Board engaged in a detailed critique of the proposed scoring rubric to ensure that the quality of the test content was the primary priority.

- **Member Orr:** Expressed strong concern that the original weighting did not prioritize content enough. She also questioned the "exceeds" criteria in the rubric, arguing that "creativity and innovation" were inappropriate measures for an assessment that should strictly adhere to established standards.

- **Vice President Hughes:** Proposed a significant re-weighting of the rubric to ensure standards alignment was the most critical factor. He advocated for pulling standards alignment into its own category with a higher weight.
- **Member Ford:** Raised questions about the use of "joiner contracts" (piggybacking on another state's contract), expressing concern that they could circumvent competitive bidding. Peter Zutz clarified that while joiner contracts have been used in the past, there would be no joiner contract for this specific RFP.
- **Member Hudson:** Supported the move toward a more content-focused rubric and the removal of confusing "creativity" language.

Motion: Vice President Hughes moved to approve the RFP scope of work and evaluation committee composition with specific modifications to the rubric:

1. **Rubric Re-weighting:** The scoring was adjusted to **Project Management (20%)**, **Functional Requirements (20%)**, **Cost (20%)**, and **Standards Alignment (40%)**.
2. **Enhanced Standards Indicators:** The new Standards Alignment section would incorporate the specific indicators Dr. Palmer presented.
3. **Refined Scoring Language:** The terms "creativity and innovation" were struck from the "exceeds" criteria.

Second: Member Ford

Vote: Passed unanimously.

10. **Presentation on Data Related to the State Board of Education Goals and Potential Metrics for Measuring Progress** *(Information, Discussion, and Possible Action)*
The Board will receive a presentation on data and performance aligned to the Board's goals. The presentation will include available statewide data, trend information, and potential indicators for measuring progress toward the Board's priorities. The Board may discuss and take action to identify and select metrics that will be used to monitor progress and inform future goal-setting and strategic planning efforts.

Vice President Tim Hughes facilitated a collaborative overview of the five priority areas previously established by the Board: Third Grade Literacy, Pre-K Expansion, Eighth Grade Math, CTE Expansion, and Streamlining/Coherence. The purpose of this discussion was to review historical data trends and determine the specific types of metrics—such as proficiency, growth, or access—the Board should use to set formal numerical targets in the future.

Goal 1: Third Grade Literacy
The Board discussed whether to prioritize overall proficiency levels, individual growth targets, or gap closure for specific subgroups.

- **Discussion:**
  - **President Dockweiler** and **Member Ford** expressed a strong preference for growth-based metrics, arguing that tracking individual student progress is more meaningful than a static proficiency score.
  - **Member Orr** advocated for **proficiency** as the primary goal, noting that while growth is the path, proficiency is the ultimate standard the Board has the most influence over through curriculum and assessment alignment.

    - **Member Jow** warned against a test culture, observing that students often learn subjects temporarily just to pass a Friday exam. She urged the Board to consider metrics for student engagement, confidence, and relationships.
    - **Member Neil** shared teacher feedback describing a "burned out" student body, citing a classroom that spent 22.5 hours on standardized testing in a single nine-week period.

Goal 2: Pre-K Expansion
The Board examined how to increase enrollment and ensure quality, acknowledging that they have more influence through advocacy than direct funding authority.

- **Discussion:**
    - **Member Else** cautioned against a "robbing Peter to pay Paul" scenario where K-12 funds are reallocated to Pre-K. He also emphasized that rural districts need flexibility in defining "high-quality" seats, noting that his district's two-hour programs are highly effective despite not meeting some full-day definitions.
    - **Member Orr** questioned how the state tracks outcomes for Pre-K students. Superintendent Wakefield clarified that Infinite Campus only recently (within the last two years) gained the capability to track the progression of students from Pre-K into public schools.
    - **Member Ford** suggested the Board take an advocacy role for programs like Head Start and investigate subsidizing private daycare providers that meet state standards to reach families regardless of income.

Goal 3: Eighth Grade Math
The discussion centered on addressing the "cliff" in math performance that typically occurs during the middle school years.

- **Discussion:**
    - **Member Orr** noted that math proficiency often "goes off a cliff" between 6th and 8th grade. She suggested the Board's focus should be on the entire middle school trajectory rather than just the final 8th-grade outcome.
    - **President Dockweiler** suggested a broader goal of increasing math proficiency across grades K through 8 to address the pipeline.
    - **Member Ford** recommended focusing on summer programs and tutoring that are accessible to all students to prevent learning loss.

Goal 4: CTE Expansion and Pathways
Board members debated expanding this goal to include a wider variety of student interests and post-secondary pathways.

- **Discussion:**
    - **Member Orr** inquired about the "post-program placement" metric, which was 65.5% in 2024-25. Deputy McIll explained that this data is gathered via student surveys and includes placement in post-secondary education, military service, or any employment.
    - **Member Ford** requested that the goal be broadened to include the arts, music, and magnet programs, noting that these "unique special interests" are often what keeps a student engaged in school.

Goal 5: Streamlining and Coherence

This process-oriented goal aims to reduce administrative burdens and redundant reporting requirements.

- **Discussion:**
  - **Member Ford** suggested the Board directly ask districts and principals for their solutions, asserting that those on the front lines already know which requirements are redundant.
  - **Member Else** recommended aligning this goal with the NDE reporting analysis project, which has already identified 89 reports for potential elimination.
  - **Vice President Hughes** suggested the Board adopt internal discipline to ensure that new regulations do not inadvertently create new, duplicative data burdens for districts.

Action Taken: There was **no formal action or vote** on this item.

---

6. Consent Agenda ***(For Possible Action)*** At the direction of President Dockweiler, the Board returned to the remaining Consent Agenda items that had been deferred earlier in the meeting.

Agenda Item 6B – Possible Approval of Dual Credit Courses for the Clark County School District

Deputy Attorney General **Greg Ott** provided legal clarification regarding the proposed dual credit course list and advised that the item could be approved with the condition that the Clark County School District remove the course weighting information from the submitted spreadsheet.

Motion: Vice President Hughes moved to approve Agenda Item 6B with the condition that the Clark County School District remove the course weights from the submitted spreadsheet.

Second: Member Orr seconded the motion.

Vote: Motion carried unanimously.

Action Taken: Agenda Item 6B was approved, contingent upon removal of the course weighting information from the submitted spreadsheet.

Agenda Items 6D–6H – Approval of Draft Meeting Minutes

President Dockweiler returned to the remaining consent agenda items related to approval of prior meeting minutes. Following discussion, Board members agreed additional time was needed to review the draft minutes.

Action Taken: Consideration of Agenda Items 6D through 6H was deferred to a future meeting.

---

11. Public Comment #2

The second period of public comment was opened by President Dockweiler.

- **Carson City:**
  - No public comment was present.
- **Las Vegas:**
  - No public comment was present.
- **Written Submission:**
  - Board staff read into the record a written public comment submitted by **Javana Underwood**. Ms. Underwood expressed concerns regarding Nevada's educator licensure examinations, stating that while she supports maintaining rigorous standards for teachers, she believes the current testing requirements do not accurately reflect an individual's ability to effectively teach in the classroom. She shared that the financial cost and repeated testing requirements create barriers for aspiring educators and encouraged the Board to consider alternative methods of evaluating teacher readiness that better measure practical teaching skills while maintaining high standards.
- **Virtual Callers:**
  - No public comment was present.

12. Future Agenda Items Requests

President Dockweiler opened the floor for board members and staff to request items for future meetings or to provide updates on scheduled items.

Superintendent Wakefield provided updates regarding several items that were shifted due to administrative scheduling and member availability:
- **Commission on School Funding:** A two-part update, including a general overview and a specific discussion on the at-risk indicator, was consolidated into the July meeting. This change was made because **Guy Hobbs**, the commission chair, was unable to attend the current session.
- **Legislative Committee Update:** This update was also moved to the July agenda to ensure participation from two board members who were unable to attend the June meeting.

Member Ford made a specific request for data related to Agenda Item 7 (Developmental Delay). She requested that all information and data presented during that item, which had not been included in the original meeting materials, be added to the official materials and emailed directly to all board members.

President Dockweiler also noted that Items D through H from the consent agenda (draft meeting minutes) would be placed on a future agenda to allow members sufficient time for review.

No additional requests were made by the board members.

13. Adjournment

The meeting concluded following the completion of all agenda items and future request discussions.

- **Motion to Adjourn:** Member Else

- **Second:** Member Ford seconded the motion.
- **Action:** The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was officially adjourned.