

**Nevada Department of Education
Nevada State Board of Education
July 29, 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	<u>Virtual</u>

Summary Minutes of the Board Meeting

Board Members Present

Dr. Katherine Dockweiler, President
Tim Hughes, Vice President
Dr. Tricia Braxton, Member
Annette Dawson Owens, Member
Frankie Alvarado, Member
Amy Carvalho, 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
Tate Else, Member
Dr. Victor Wakefield, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Board Members Absent Excused

Tamara Hudson, Clerk

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance, and Land Acknowledgement – 00:00:08

President Dockweiler called the meeting to order at **9:01AM**

2. Public Comment #1 – 00:01:23

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

- **Carson City:** No public comment was present
- **Las Vegas:**
 - **Anna Marie Binder** provided public comment regarding Agenda Item 10, Developmental Delay Eligibility, and Agenda Item 9, the Teacher Apprenticeship College Pathway (TACP). Ms. Binder stated there is no evidence that extending Developmental Delay eligibility through age nine negatively impacts student outcomes and encouraged the Board to consider available research and stakeholder feedback. She also requested that the Career Pathways Oversight Committee conduct a comprehensive review of Nevada's Teacher Apprenticeship College Pathway, including implementation,

financial impacts, and the effect on Career and Technical Education funding and workforce priorities.

- **Written Submission:**

- Board staff read into the record a written public comment submitted by Craig Statucky regarding Agenda Item 6, the Career Pathways Oversight Committee report. Mr. Statucky encouraged the Board to request a more comprehensive analysis of Nevada's Teacher Academy College Pathway, including comparisons to the existing Teaching and Training Career and Technical Education pathway, student retention data, and the financial impact of implementing the program on Career and Technical Education funding and other workforce pathways. (Attachment A)
- Board staff also read into the record a written public comment submitted by Catherine Nielsen, Executive Director of the Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities. Ms. Nielsen summarized findings from a statewide survey regarding Developmental Delay eligibility, highlighting concerns related to service interruptions, inconsistent implementation across districts, and challenges families experience during the transition process. She encouraged the Board to consider the survey findings when evaluating Nevada's special education policies. The accompanying data report was distributed to Board members. (Attachment B)

3. Approval of Flexible Agenda (*For Possible Action*) – 00:10:32

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: Member Braxton moved to approve the use of a flexible agenda.

Second: Member Dawson Owens seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

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

4. President's Report – 00:11:01

President Dockweiler welcomed members and attendees to the beginning of the new school year, expressing appreciation for Nevada's educators, students, families, and school communities. She encouraged continued collaboration to support student success and invited Board members to provide updates and announcements.

President Dockweiler invites members to share additional reports:

- **Member Braxton** recognized Nevada's educators, administrators, school staff, students, and families as they prepared for the new school year. She shared enthusiasm for project-based learning initiatives she recently observed while visiting schools and wished all school communities a successful academic year.
- **Member Dawson Owens** expressed appreciation for community organizations, business partners, and volunteers supporting back-to-school events across Nevada.

She recognized the collaborative efforts to ensure students begin the school year with the resources they need.

- **President Dockweiler, Vice President Hughes, and Superintendent Wakefield** recognized **Member Tate Else** for his three years of service on the Nevada State Board of Education. They commended his leadership, practical insight, and unwavering commitment to students and public education throughout Nevada.

5. Superintendent's Report – 00:19:19

Superintendent Wakefield Reported on the Nevada Department of Education's (NDE) ongoing strategic planning process. Dr. Wakefield explained that the Department's priorities and sub-strategies were developed following an extensive statewide listening tour conducted in the spring and planning sessions held throughout the summer. Dr. Wakefield emphasized that he is focusing NDE on the specific strategies, plans, and indicators required to achieve measurable progress and assured the Board that their ambitious, aligned goals would be incorporated directly into the state's Strategic Improvement Plan (STIP).

6. Informational Updates (*For Information Only*) – 00:34:00

President Dockweiler introduced the informational updates, explaining that the items were provided for informational purposes to satisfy reporting requirements while keeping the Board and public informed regarding operational activities, compliance reporting, and ongoing educational initiatives. No formal action was required.

The Board received informational updates regarding:

- a. AB462 (2025) Career Pathways Oversight Committee Report
- b. Clark County [NAC 388G.105 Report Relating to Teacher Vacancies](#)

Board Discussion

- **Member Braxton** raised concerns regarding the teacher vacancy data presented in Item 6B, noting that several schools reported more than five vacancies. She questioned whether the vacancies were being filled by long-term substitute teachers, whether permanent candidates were available, and how the reported vacancies related to teacher surplus and class sizes. Member Braxton emphasized the importance of using the data to inform action that ensures students have adequate access to teachers and reiterated her concern regarding class sizes across schools.
- **Member Orr** requested that the written public comment submitted by Craig Statucky regarding the Career Pathways Oversight Committee report be shared with Department staff responsible for the report. She encouraged staff to consider his recommendations and seek additional clarification from him if necessary.
- **Member Dawson Owens** emphasized the importance of continuing to monitor long-term teacher vacancies and reliance on substitute teachers, while acknowledging progress in filling teacher positions. She encouraged accountability among education leaders and elected officials to ensure schools have sufficient staffing and resources and requested a future update after the new school year is underway.

Action Taken: This item was presented for information and discussion only. No formal action was taken.

7. Consent Agenda (*For Possible Action*) - 00:39:43

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 Petition for Revocation of the Nevada Educator License for Alexander Scottt Derringer
- b. Possible Approval of Petition for Revocation of the Nevada Educator License for Max Mika Maafala Maiava
- c. Possible Approval of Petition for Revocation of the Nevada Educator License for Jynnell McClellan
- d. Possible Approval of Petition for Revocation of the Nevada Educator License for Rekwon Smith
- e. Possible Approval of the State Board of Education February 25, 2026, Draft Meeting Minutes
- f. Possible Approval of the State Board of Education March 11, 2026, Draft Meeting Minutes
- g. Possible Approval of the State Board of Education April 18, 2026, Draft Meeting Minutes
- h. Possible Approval of the State Board of Education April 22, 2026, Draft Meeting Minutes
- i. Possible Approval of the State Board of Education May 13, 2026, Draft Meeting Minutes
- j. Possible Approval of the State Board of Education June 24, 2026, Draft Meeting Minutes
- k. Possible Approval of the State Board of Education June 26, 2026, Draft Meeting Minutes

President Dockweiler introduced the Consent Agenda and reminded members that individual items could be removed for separate discussion and consideration.

Board Discussion

- **Member Ford** expressed concerns regarding the format and level of detail included in the Board's draft meeting minutes. She stated that the Board should establish a standardized methodology for preparing meeting minutes that promotes transparency and accessibility for the public. She also recommended incorporating timestamps into future meeting minutes and expressed concern that approving the current draft minutes would establish them as the official record before the Board had agreed upon a preferred format.
- **Member Dawson Owens** supported further discussion regarding the format of Board meeting minutes and suggested that including timestamps would improve accessibility by allowing members of the public to more easily locate portions of the meeting recording.
- **Deputy Attorney General Christina Georgas Burns** advised that Board members could remove individual items from the Consent Agenda for separate consideration while approving the remaining uncontested items. She further clarified that draft meeting minutes are required by statute to be available for public inspection within 30 days of a meeting, even before formal Board approval.
- **Member Braxton** requested that the February 25, March 11, and April 22, 2026 draft meeting minutes be removed from the Consent Agenda, noting that those meeting

minutes were not included in the materials available to the public. Following additional discussion, she agreed to amend her motion to remove all draft meeting minutes, Agenda Items **7E through 7K**, for further review at a future meeting.

- **Member Orr** expressed support for approving the remaining consent agenda items while removing the draft meeting minutes for future consideration. She emphasized the importance of ensuring the public has access to Board meeting minutes while allowing additional discussion regarding the preferred format for future minutes.
- **Superintendent Wakefield** clarified that the draft meeting minutes in question had been included in the June meeting support materials and stated that staff would ensure all applicable meeting minutes were included in future public postings.

President Dockweiler requested a motion to approve the Consent Agenda, excluding Agenda Items **7E through 7K**.

Motion: Member Braxton moved to approve Consent Agenda Items **7A through 7D**, while removing Agenda Items **7E through 7K** for future consideration.

Second: Member Ford seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

Action Taken: Consent Agenda Items **7A through 7D** were approved. Agenda Items **7E through 7K** were removed from the Consent Agenda and deferred for consideration at a future meeting.

8. Commission on School Funding At-Risk Update (*Information and Discussion*) – 00:53:49

The State Board of Education will receive an overview of the Commission's work to date, as well as an update regarding the at-risk study commissioned by the Commission on School Funding.

President Dockweiler introduced Agenda Item 8 and invited Guy Hobbs, Chair of the Commission on School Funding, to provide an update regarding the Commission's ongoing work related to at-risk pupils and the at-risk study commissioned to inform future policy discussions and funding considerations.

Mr. Hobbs provided an overview of the Commission's statutory responsibilities, including evaluating Nevada's Pupil-Centered Funding Plan, recommending improvements to the State's education funding formula, and identifying optimal funding levels for public education. He discussed the Commission's ongoing review of at-risk funding, legislative assignments, development of a bill draft request (BDR), and preparation of its upcoming report to the Legislature. Mr. Hobbs also highlighted the Commission's work examining funding methodologies, enrollment count practices, weighted funding categories, and other components of the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan.

Board Discussion

- **Member Ford** inquired whether the Commission's upcoming bill draft request (BDR) would incorporate recommendations related to weighted count funding and investment strategies presented during the update, including recommendations regarding quintile funding and the stacking of weights. Mr. Hobbs confirmed that those recommendations are included in the draft BDR and explained that implementation methodologies will also be addressed.

- **Member Orr** asked whether directing statutorily appropriated funding to the base funding amount, rather than through weighted funding, could accelerate Nevada's progress toward the national average in per-pupil funding. Mr. Hobbs explained that both base and weighted funding are included when calculating per-pupil funding and indicated that shifting funds between those categories would not significantly affect the overall funding target.
- **Deputy Attorney General Christina Georgas Burns** clarified that, pursuant to statute, recommendations regarding at-risk funding calculations are submitted to both the State Board of Education and the Nevada Department of Education.
- **Member Ford** asked for clarification regarding education funding generated through Nevada's room tax and whether those revenues are directed to education. Mr. Hobbs explained that the current Pupil-Centered Funding Plan directs the statewide three percent room tax and other dedicated revenue sources into the State Education Fund, noting that Senate Bill 543 strengthened protections to ensure those revenues are dedicated to education. Member Ford also referenced longstanding public discussion regarding historical education funding and suggested the issue may warrant future review.
- **Deputy Attorney General Christina Georgas Burns** provided an additional clarification that the report ultimately submitted to the State Board is prepared by a third party based on the Commission's recommendations, rather than being submitted directly by the Commission.

Action Taken: This item was presented for information and discussion only. No formal action was taken.

9. Nevada Association of School Superintendents “iNVEST” Initiative Update (Information and Discussion) – 01:57:44

Representatives from the Nevada Association of School Superintendents will provide an update on the iNVEST initiative, including information regarding statewide education funding priorities, implementation activities, and observed impacts on Nevada's public education system. The State Board may discuss the information presented. • AJ Feuling, Superintendent, Carson City School District • Frankie Alvarado, Superintendent, Douglas County School District

President Dockweiler introduced Agenda Item 9 and welcomed A.J. Feuling, Superintendent of Carson City School District and President of the Nevada Association of School Superintendents (NASS), and Superintendent Frankie Alvarado, Superintendent of Douglas County School District, to present the Nevada Association of School Superintendents' **Invest 2027** legislative priorities for the 2027 Legislative Session.

Superintendent Feuling presented an overview of the **Invest 2027** platform, highlighting NASS's legislative priorities related to education funding, declining enrollment, at-risk funding, literacy, educator workforce initiatives, and sustainable investments to support Nevada's public education system.

Board Discussion

- **Member Orr** discussed Priority 3 regarding Read by Grade 3 and early literacy interventions. She noted that many of the intervention strategies discussed are already expected by the public and questioned whether additional implementation timelines,

dedicated resources, or categorical funding would better support consistent statewide early intervention efforts. She also expressed concern that the public may assume these supports are already fully implemented.

- **Superintendent Fueling** responded that districts have developed robust Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) frameworks using existing resources but acknowledged that additional dedicated funding could strengthen early intervention efforts. Speaking from his personal perspective, he shared that his views have evolved over time and that he now sees value in targeted categorical funding when tied to clearly defined educational priorities.
- **President Dockweiler** clarified that the discussion regarding Priority 3 was specific to Nevada's blanket Read by Grade 3 retention policy and distinguished it from the long-standing authority of school principals to make individual student retention decisions on a case-by-case basis. She emphasized that while retention may still be appropriate in certain circumstances, the statutory framework governing those decisions differs from the Read by Grade 3 policy.

President Dockweiler thanked the presenters for providing the update and expressed appreciation for the Nevada Association of School Superintendents' continued collaboration and advocacy on behalf of Nevada's students.

Action Taken: This item was presented for information and discussion only. No formal action was taken.

10. Information, Discussion, and Possible Action: Developmental Delay Eligibility *(Information, Discussion, and Possible Action) – 02:50:20*

The State Board of Education will receive a high-level summary of previous presentations, distilling the key content and data to serve as an informational refresher. Following this review, the Board may then take possible action to determine the next official steps regarding these presentations.

- Julie Bowers, Education Programs Director, Office of Comprehensive Student Supports

President Dockweiler introduced Agenda Item 10, noting that the Board would revisit its discussion regarding Developmental Delay eligibility and receive a review of the information and data previously presented before considering possible next steps.

Julie Bowers, Education Programs Director, presented an overview of the Department's review of Developmental Delay eligibility under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Ms. Bowers explained that while federal law permits states to establish Developmental Delay eligibility through age nine, Nevada currently establishes eligibility through age six in the Nevada Administrative Code. She reviewed stakeholder feedback, statewide survey results, prior Board discussions, public comment, and data collected from special education administrators, educators, and advocacy organizations. Ms. Bowers also summarized survey findings indicating broad professional support for extending the Developmental Delay eligibility age and introduced additional data intended to provide greater clarity regarding implementation and data collection.

Catherine Fusillier, IDEA Part B Data Manager, presented additional information regarding the Clark County School District data previously shared with the Board and provided clarification regarding the Department's data collection and reporting.

Board Discussion

- **Member Dawson Owens** expressed support for extending the Developmental Delay eligibility age to eight, citing the information presented by practitioners, stakeholder feedback, survey data, and experiences shared by families. She emphasized the importance of continuing to monitor implementation and remaining open to future consideration of additional changes as more data becomes available.
- **Member Braxton** referenced the survey results presented by Department staff and sought clarification regarding the terminology used to describe eligibility ages. She noted that survey responses indicated the greatest support for extending eligibility to age eight and requested consistency in how age ranges were communicated to ensure a clear understanding of the proposed eligibility change.
- **Member Orr** stated that practitioners participating in the statewide survey understood the terminology used to describe Developmental Delay eligibility ages and expressed confidence that respondents accurately understood the survey questions.
- **Member Ford** expressed support for extending the Developmental Delay eligibility age to **age nine**, provided districts were afforded sufficient time to implement the change. She agreed to amend her original motion to include an implementation period before compliance requirements would take effect.
- **Deputy Attorney General Christina Georgas Burns** recommended revising the motion to clarify that the Developmental Delay eligibility age would be extended to age nine while providing districts with an implementation period before new requirements became effective.
- **Director Bowers** clarified that, under the Department's proposed implementation timeline, districts would not be held accountable for compliance with revised regulations until the **2029–2030 school year**, allowing adequate time for implementation and staff training. She also noted that any changes would need to be implemented consistently across all districts.
- **President Dockweiler** sought clarification regarding whether any anticipated federal changes to IDEA would affect the Developmental Delay eligibility category. **Director Bowers** responded that the Department was not aware of any pending federal changes that would impact the eligibility category.
- **Member Dawson Owens** expressed support for extending the Developmental Delay eligibility age to **age eight**, citing practitioner feedback, stakeholder input, survey results, and family perspectives. She emphasized the importance of continuing to monitor implementation and remaining open to future consideration of extending eligibility to age nine as additional information becomes available.
- **Member Braxton** referenced the survey results presented by Department staff and requested clarification regarding the terminology used to describe eligibility ages. She noted that the survey reflected the greatest level of support for extending eligibility to age eight and emphasized the importance of using consistent language when describing proposed eligibility changes.
- **Member Orr** stated that practitioners participating in the statewide survey understood the terminology used to describe Developmental Delay eligibility ages and expressed confidence that respondents accurately understood the survey questions.

President Dockweiler requested a motion.

Motion: Member Ford moved to extend the Developmental Delay eligibility age to **age nine**, with an implementation period for districts before compliance requirements would take effect.

Second: Member Braxton seconded the motion.

Vote Taken/Action: Motion failed, 2–3. Members **Ford** and **Braxton** voted in favor. Vice President **Hughes** and Members **Dawson Owens** and **Orr** voted in opposition. There were no abstentions.

Following additional discussion, President Dockweiler requested another motion.

Motion: Vice President Hughes moved to extend the Developmental Delay eligibility age to **age eight**.

Second: Member Neal seconded the motion.

Vote Taken/Action: Motion passed, 4–1. Members **Dawson Owens, Hughes, Orr, and Braxton** voted in favor. **Member Ford** voted in opposition. There were no abstentions.

11. State Board of Education Goals and Performance Metrics (*Information, Discussion, and Possible Action*) - 03:53:04

The Board will review and discuss proposed strategic goals and associated performance metrics. The Board may provide feedback, consider revisions, and take possible action to adopt the proposed goals and performance metrics.

- Tim Hughes, Vice President, NV State Board of Education

Vice President Hughes presented proposed State Board of Education goals and performance metrics developed from prior Board discussions. The proposed goals focused on increasing third-grade English language arts proficiency, expanding access to state-funded pre-kindergarten, and improving eighth-grade mathematics proficiency. Vice President Hughes explained that the proposed percentages were intended as sample benchmarks to facilitate discussion and that the Board's role was to establish statewide goals while implementation strategies would be developed in partnership with the Nevada Department of Education.

Board Discussion

- **Member Braxton** expressed support for the SMART goal format and asked whether the Board's goals could also identify the strategies that would be used to achieve each target. She suggested aligning each goal with the Superintendent's strategic priorities so the Board's goals clearly reflected how progress would be achieved.
- **Vice President Hughes, Member Orr, and Superintendent Wakefield** explained that the proposed goals were intended to establish the Board's desired outcomes, while the implementation strategies would be developed through the Department's strategic planning process and incorporated into the Statewide Plan for the Improvement of Pupils (STIP).
- **Member Dawson Owens** expressed support for the proposed goals and emphasized the importance of ensuring the targets, particularly the proposed increase in access to state-funded pre-kindergarten, remained ambitious while also being realistic and attainable. She stated she looked forward to future discussions regarding implementation strategies.

- **Member Ford** stated that the Board should focus on how it could support achievement of the goals through its policymaking and legislative roles rather than assuming responsibility for outcomes beyond its direct authority. She emphasized the importance of ensuring the goals supported districts rather than creating unintended consequences and questioned the inclusion of the proposed "miscellaneous" goal related to postsecondary outcomes, asking how success would be measured.
- **President Dockweiler** acknowledged that some proposed goals, such as pre-kindergarten expansion, extended beyond the Board's direct authority but stated they reflected important statewide priorities that could guide future legislative and policy discussions. Vice President Hughes also noted that future assessment changes could require adjustments to the Board's performance metrics over time.

Vote 1

Motion: Member Ford moved to amend the original goal category from **Career and Technical Education (CTE) Expansion** to **Pathway Expansion** and direct staff to bring the **Pathway Expansion** goal and associated performance metrics, along with the **Streamlined Coherence** goal, back to a future Board meeting for further discussion and refinement.

Second: Member Braxton.

Vote Taken/Action: **Motion passed unanimously** by voice vote. There were no votes in opposition and no abstentions. The Board approved renaming the goal category to **Pathway Expansion** and directed staff to return the **Pathway Expansion** and **Streamlined Coherence** goals and associated performance metrics for future Board consideration.

Vote 2

Motion: Member Dawson Owens moved to approve the **Streamlined Coherence** goal as presented.

Second: Vice President Hughes.

Vote Taken/Action: **Motion passed unanimously** by voice vote. There were no votes in opposition and no abstentions. The Board approved the **Streamlined Coherence** goal as presented.

12. Legislative Subcommittee Briefing Document Regarding the Authority, Priorities, and Goals of the State Board of Education (*Information, Discussion, and Possible Action*) – (second recording – 01:20:27)

The State Board of Education will receive a presentation from the Legislative Subcommittee regarding its proposed briefing document intended to summarize the authority, priorities, and goals of the State Board of Education. The Board may discuss the content and purpose of the document, provide feedback, consider revisions, and take action regarding its adoption, approval, or future use in legislative and stakeholder engagement activities

- Dr. Tricia Braxton, Chair, State Board Legislative Subcommittee
- Amelia Thibault, Legislative Liaison, Nevada Department of Education

Member Braxton, Chair of the Legislative Subcommittee, introduced the agenda item and provided an overview of the subcommittee's work since its formation, including the development of a legislative briefing document intended to serve as a public-facing resource for legislators, stakeholders, future boards, and the public.

Amelia Thibault, Legislative Liaison for the Nevada Department of Education, presented the draft briefing document, which outlined the State Board's constitutional and statutory authority, strategic priorities, alignment with the Nevada Department of Education's priorities, governance structure, and opportunities for legislative engagement.

Amelia Thibault: Explained that the legislative briefing document was designed as a foundational resource to communicate the Board's authority, priorities, and role to legislators, stakeholders, and the public. She recommended allowing sufficient time to develop a comprehensive legislative engagement strategy and analysis tool before the start of the 2027 Legislative Session, noting that legislative priorities often evolve through amendments during session.

President Dockweiler: Asked whether the priorities outlined by the Legislative Subcommittee were intended to be completed sequentially or whether work on the legislative engagement strategy and legislative analysis tool could occur simultaneously. She emphasized the importance of having the engagement strategy ready before the start of the legislative session.

Member Braxton: Clarified that the priorities were not intended to be completed in a strict sequence and stated that the Board's immediate focus should be approving the foundational briefing document with minor edits. She explained that the engagement strategy and legislative analysis tool could then be developed concurrently at future meetings, with particular attention given to aligning legislative requests with the Board's adopted priorities.

Member Dawson Owens: Agreed that the legislative analysis tool and engagement strategy should be developed together, noting that the analysis tool would help identify legislation that aligns with the Board's priorities and statutory authority.

President Dockweiler sought a motion to approve the Legislative Subcommittee's foundational briefing document, incorporating conforming changes adopted by the Board under Agenda Item 11 regarding the Board's goals and performance metrics.

Motion: Member Braxton moved to approve the foundational legislative briefing document with conforming changes reflecting the Board's actions under Agenda Item 11 regarding goals and performance metrics.

Second: Member Orr.

Vote/Action Taken: Motion passed unanimously by voice vote. There were no votes in opposition or abstentions. The Board approved the foundational legislative briefing document, as amended, and directed that conforming revisions be incorporated.

13. Read by Grade 3 (RBG3): Draft Retention Score Selection (*Information and Discussion*) – (second recording – 01:43:01)

The Board will receive a presentation on Read by Grade 3 (RBG3) student performance outcomes, assessment data, and related indicators to support discussion and consideration of a potential retention cut score.

- Dr. Torrey Palmer, Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement Office of Teaching and Learning
- Lisa Calvert, Education Program Professional, Office of Teaching and Learning
- Katie Fink, Education Program Professional, Office of Teaching and Learning
- Michael Pacheco, Education Programs Supervisor, Office of Assessments, Data, and Accountability Management

Deputy Superintendent Torrey Palmer presented an update on the implementation of Nevada's Read by Grade 3 law and the Board's responsibility to establish a draft passing score for promotion to fourth grade. The presentation reviewed the statutory requirements, implementation timeline, good cause exemptions, and the phased approach for determining passing scores using MAP and i-Ready assessments. Staff emphasized that the 2026–2027 school year would focus on establishing draft passing scores, with the 2027–2028 school year serving as a trial implementation period before any student retention occurs in the 2028–2029 school year. Staff also reviewed literacy development research, including Scarborough's Reading Rope, to provide context for understanding third-grade reading proficiency and discussed how early literacy instruction, intervention, and assessment work together to support student success.

Board Discussion

- **Vice President Hughes** thanked staff for the presentation and asked instructional experts how the proposed passing score aligned with student reading development and the use of i-Ready data. He emphasized the importance of understanding the instructional implications behind the assessment rather than focusing solely on a numerical cut score.
- **Member Neal** asked whether additional data on students retained in kindergarten and first grade could help inform future retention decisions. She also questioned whether substitute and underqualified teachers would receive science of reading training, expressing concern that students should not be disadvantaged because they lacked access to well-prepared literacy instruction.
- **Superintendent Wakefield** responded that the Department's broader goal was ensuring every Nevada student becomes a proficient reader through strong literacy instruction, expanded pre-kindergarten access, high-quality instructional materials, educator preparation, targeted interventions, and appropriate use of retention only when necessary. He emphasized that the discussion should remain focused on improving instruction rather than solely on establishing a passing score. He also asked the Board what additional information would help them feel confident in making a future decision on the passing score.
- **President Dockweiler** acknowledged that the Department was already advancing many of the systemic improvements discussed and clarified that those broader instructional initiatives were outside the Board's statutory authority to vote on. The Board's role would remain focused on its legal responsibility to establish the Read by Grade 3 passing score.

Action Taken

- **No action was taken.** The presentation and discussion were informational only.

14. Overview of Nevada's Anti-Bullying Laws, Policies, and Procedures (*Information and Discussion*) – (second recording – 02:35:19)

An overview of Nevada's legal framework for handling bullying, cyberbullying, and discrimination based on race (DBR). Key topics include updated statewide reporting data, the new initial "Screener" process, investigation timelines, parent/guardian rights, and the multi-tiered appeals process to ensure compliance and promote safe schools.

- LaNesha Battle, Director, Office of Safe and Secure Learning Environments

Lanisha Battle, Director of the Office for Safe and Respectful Learning Environments, presented an overview of Nevada's anti-bullying, cyberbullying, and discrimination based on race statutes, regulations, and reporting procedures. The presentation reviewed statutory definitions, statewide reporting data from SafeVoice and the Nevada Report Card, investigation and appeals processes, and the distinction between bullying and ordinary peer conflict. Staff also discussed the Department's role in supporting school districts, monitoring compliance, and ensuring safe learning environments for students.

Board Discussion:

- Board members discussed the application of Nevada's bullying laws and reporting procedures, including how incidents involving students attending different schools are coordinated. Staff explained that when incidents involve students from different schools, including public and private schools, the Department works with both schools to ensure an appropriate response and student safety.
- **Member Dawson Owens** thanked staff for the presentation and expressed interest in continuing discussions offline regarding educational services available to students during suspensions or expulsions, as well as additional student support topics.
- **President Dockweiler** thanked staff for the informative presentation and noted that future scheduling would provide additional time for discussion.

Action Taken:

- **No action was taken.** The item was presented for information and discussion only. No motion was made and no vote occurred.

15. 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:**
 - **Nevada Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)** Co-Chairs expressed support for extending the developmental delay eligibility category to age 8, stating that the change would provide continuity of services, reduce unnecessary eligibility disruptions, align Nevada with federal guidance and practices in other states, and allow for more developmentally appropriate eligibility determinations. The Council also indicated its willingness to support implementation through collaboration with the Nevada Department of Education. (Attachment C)

- **Anna Marie Binder** encouraged the Board to strengthen its oversight of Nevada's federal IDEA Part B and Part C responsibilities. She recommended that the Board regularly receive public updates regarding IDEA performance, Child Find outcomes, OSEP monitoring findings, corrective action plans, dispute resolution, compliance efforts, and statewide progress to improve transparency and accountability. (Attachment D)

16. Future Agenda Items Requests

President Dockweiler requested that **Consent Agenda Items 7E through 7K** be returned as a future agenda item for Board discussion.

Member Braxton requested future agenda items related to the Legislative Subcommittee's work, including:

- Development of the **State Board legislative engagement strategy**; and
- Development of a **legislative strategy/assessment tool and rubric** to assist the Board in reviewing legislation.

17. Adjournment

President Dockweiler thanked Board members, staff, and the public for their participation throughout the meeting. She announced that the next regularly scheduled meeting of the State Board of Education would be held on Wednesday, September 9, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. **The meeting adjourned at 4:27 p.m.**

ATTACHMENT A

President Dockweiler, Superintendent Wakefield, and Members of the State Board of Education,

Good morning. I am providing public comment on Agenda Item 6A, AB 462 (2025) Career Pathways Oversight Committee Report.

I appreciate the work of the Career Pathways Oversight Committee (CPOC) in providing an overview and initial analysis of the Teacher Academy College Pathway Program (TACPP). However, I believe the analysis is incomplete.

Specifically, the data presented for the Teaching and Training Career and Technical Education (CTE) pathway does not compare TACPP retention rates with those of the Teaching and Training CTE program prior to the implementation of Assembly Bill 428 (2023), which established TACPP.

As I shared with the State Board in September 2023, the initial Teaching and Training CTE cohort in 2017–18 included approximately 1,000 students and grew to more than 4,000 students by 2022–23, with enrollment increasing each year, including throughout the COVID-19 pandemic.

During legislative testimony in 2023, the Clark County Education Association (CCEA) argued that the existing Teaching and Training CTE program had been unsuccessful and advocated for the creation of TACPP. Given the similar implementation timelines—and the fact that TACPP was able to build upon an already established and growing Teaching and Training CTE program—the State Board should request that the CPOC conduct a more comprehensive analysis of Nevada's high school teacher preparation efforts beginning with the program's inception in 2017–18.

Additionally, the CPOC should evaluate the financial impact of offering TACPP as a CTE program. State funding for CTE did not increase with the implementation of TACPP. As a result, requiring schools in the Clark County School District to offer TACPP may have reduced the amount of per-pupil CTE funding available for other high-demand career pathways that are critical to Nevada's workforce and economic growth.

I do not question the importance or quality of preparing high school students for careers in education. However, I do question whether requiring every high school to offer TACPP is the most effective approach to addressing Nevada's teacher pipeline challenges.

Thank you.



Craig Statucki

ATTACHMENT B

Re: Public Comment, Nevada State Board of Education Meeting, July 29, 2026

July 29, 2026

Good Morning President, Board Members, and Superintendent,

My name is Catherine Nielsen, and I serve as the Executive Director of the Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities.

Over the past several months, the Council has been gathering information from families, educators, school professionals, and self-advocates regarding Nevada's requirement that students receiving special education services under the Developmental Delay category transition out of that eligibility at age six.

Following an initial survey that identified recurring concerns, the Council conducted a second statewide survey to determine whether those experiences were shared more broadly. We received 255 responses from across Nevada, including educators, administrators, related service providers, families, and self-advocates.

While individual experiences varied, several consistent themes emerged. Respondents reported concerns about interruptions in services during the reevaluation process, inconsistent implementation of eligibility decisions across districts, confusion for families navigating the transition process, and concerns that some children continue to demonstrate significant developmental needs but no longer qualify under the Developmental Delay category. We also found broad support among both educators and families for examining whether Nevada should extend Developmental Delay eligibility beyond age six.

The Council is not recommending a specific policy outcome. Rather, we hope these findings will help inform your discussions as you consider whether Nevada's current approach best serves young children with developmental disabilities. We stand ready to work with the Board, the Nevada Department of Education, families, and educators as these conversations continue.

We respectfully encourage the Board to review these findings as you continue evaluating Nevada's special education policies and to consider whether additional guidance, greater consistency, or policy changes could help ensure students receive the supports they need during this critical stage of development. The full report is available on the Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities website for your review at: <https://www.nevadaddcouncil.org/nevada-developmental-delay-age-6-transition-survey-round-2-findings/>

Thank you for your time, your consideration, and your continued commitment to Nevada's students and families. Sincerely and respectfully,

*Catherine Nielsen, Executive Director
Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities*

ATTACHMENT C

June 9, 2026

Nevada State Board of Education

700 E. Fifth Street

Carson City, NV 89701

Re: SEAC Support for Extension of Developmental Delay Eligibility to Age 8

Dear Members of the Nevada State Board of Education,

On behalf of the Nevada Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), we write to express our strong support for extending the Developmental Delay (DD) eligibility category to age 8. This recommendation reflects the council's commitment to ensuring that Nevada's children with developmental delays receive timely, appropriate, and uninterrupted access to the special education services they need.

Under current Nevada policy, the Developmental Delay eligibility category is available to children through age 5. However, research and the practical experience of educators, families, and service providers across our state consistently demonstrate that developmental delays do not resolve simply because a child reaches a particular birthday. Many children who qualify under the DD category in early childhood continue to exhibit significant developmental needs into their early elementary years, yet face the abrupt loss of this eligibility classification and the services associated with it.

Extending the DD eligibility age to 8 would bring Nevada into alignment with federal guidance and the practice of many other states that have recognized the clinical and educational value of maintaining this pathway through the early elementary years. This extension would:

- Allow children additional time to be appropriately evaluated and served under a category that reflects their current developmental profile, rather than forcing a premature categorical determination;
- Reduce unnecessary eligibility gaps and service disruptions for children and families during a critical window of development;
- Support school-based teams in making more thoughtful, accurate, and child-centered eligibility determinations; and
- Honor the intent of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) by preserving continuity of support for children with identified needs.

SEAC recognizes that this change carries implementation considerations, including training for evaluation teams and updated guidance for districts. We are committed to supporting that work and welcome the opportunity to collaborate with the Nevada Department of Education as these changes are developed and communicated to stakeholders.

SEAC supports the Nevada State Board of Education moving forward with extending the Developmental Delay eligibility age to 8.

Thank you for your consideration of this recommendation. SEAC stands ready to provide additional information or testimony as needed.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason Dietrich

Chair, Nevada Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

Melissa Bart-Plange

Vice Chair, Nevada Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

ATTACHMENT D

Madam President and Members of the Board,

The discussion surrounding the Dd age highlighted a much broader concern.

Throughout the conversation, early intervention and the transition from IDEA Part C to Part B were mentioned several times. That prompted me to ask a simple question: Where is the Board's ongoing oversight of these federal IDEA responsibilities?

A few meetings ago, I provided the Board with both Nevada's IDEA Part B and Part C federal reports because I believed they contained important information that should inform your oversight. Those reports raise significant issues regarding Child Find, general supervision, dispute resolution, statewide performance, and federal accountability. Yet, over the years I have attended State Board meetings, I cannot recall substantive public discussions focused on these reports, Nevada's federal determinations, OSEP monitoring findings, or the state's corrective actions.

These are not minor administrative matters they are core responsibilities that directly affect thousands of Nevada children with disabilities and their families.

While councils, commissions, and advisory bodies each play an important role, I do not believe oversight of these issues should remain primarily within those groups. The State Board is ultimately responsible for providing governance and oversight of Nevada's public education system, and these federal findings deserve regular public review.

I respectfully encourage the Board to exercise its oversight authority by requesting routine public updates on Nevada's IDEA Part B and Part C performance, Child Find outcomes, OSEP monitoring findings, corrective action plans, dispute resolution trends, and progress toward compliance. These discussions should become part of the Board's regular governance work so that Board members and the public can better understand where Nevada is succeeding, where improvements are needed, and how progress is being measured.

Today's discussion demonstrated how interconnected early intervention, Child Find, and special education services truly are. I hope it also serves as an opportunity for the Board to strengthen its oversight of these critical federal responsibilities. Transparent accountability should not be buried within councils and commissions; it should be part of this Board's regular public work.

Thank you for your consideration and for your continued service to Nevada's students.

Respectfully,

Anna Marie Binder

702-906-6517