

**Nevada Department of Education  
Nevada State Board of Education  
January 14, 2026  
9:00 AM**

<b>Office</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Meeting Room</b>
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Rd.	Las Vegas	Room 114
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Board Room
Department of Education	Virtual	Virtual	<a href="#">YouTube Link</a>

**Draft Summary Minutes of the Board Meeting**

**Board Members Present**

Dr. Katherine Dockweiler, President  
Tim Hughes, Vice President  
Tamara Hudson, Board Clerk  
Dr. Tricia Braxton  
Amy Carvalho  
Annette Dawson Owens  
Tate Else  
Danielle Ford  
Evana Lan  
Susan Neal

**Board Members Absent**

Angela Orr

**Department Staff Present**

Dr. Victor Wakefield, Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Christy McGill, Deputy Superintendent of Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement  
Lisa Ford, Interim Deputy Superintendent for the Student Achievement Division  
Angie Castellanos, Administrative Assistant  
Zach Khan, Administrative Assistant  
Andrew Morgan, Education Programs Professional

**Legal Staff Present**

Christina Georges Burns, Deputy Attorney General

**Audience in Attendance**

Anna Binder, Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities

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

Meeting called to order at 9:00 A.M. by President Dockweiler. Quorum was established. President Dockweiler led the Pledge of Allegiance and provided a land acknowledgement.

**Verbatim Transcript**

**President Dockweiler:** Good morning, everyone. It is 9:00 o'clock on Wednesday, January 14<sup>th</sup>, and I would like to call this meeting to order. I'll ask the secretary to please call roll.

**Angie Castellanos:** Good morning. This is Angie Castellanos for the record, and this is roll call president Dockweiler.

**Angie Castellanos:** Madam President you have quorum.

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you Angie. I would like to note for the record that we are also joined by deputy attorney Christina Georges Burns, and we would like to acknowledge the indigenous peoples whose traditional homeland where we are presenting from and where people are joining us from. In what is now the state of Nevada, please join me in standing for the Pledge of Allegiance.

*(The Board recited the Pledge of Allegiance)*

**2. Public Comment #1**

- a. Anna Binder, provided public comment regarding item 10.
- b. Jeff Church, provided public comment regarding item 9.

**Verbatim Transcript**

**President Dockweiler:** Please note for the record that member Dawson Owens has joined us here in Las Vegas. I will now open the first period of public comment under agenda item 2 I'd like to remind everyone that comments should be limited to items on the agenda. Please ensure you fill out a comment card. Turn the microphone on and state your name for the record. Additionally, please note the items characterized as future agenda item requests are not included in this public comment period. I will also limit each speaker to 3 minutes, and time will be monitored by Vice President Hughes. I will begin with any members of the public who have attended to provide or comments in person. Are there any comments in person in Carson City?

**Zach Khan:** Madam President, there are no public comments in Carson City at this time.

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you. Moving to Las Vegas we have Anna Binder speaking about graduation rates.

*(For full public comment read into the record: See appendix)*

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you Ms. Binder seeing no more public comments in person in Las Vegas. I'll ask the secretary. Have we received any written comments online?

**Angie Castellanos:** We have one written comment that was submitted online. From Jeff Church my comment concern agenda item 9 and in general.

*(For full public comment read into the record: See appendix)*

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you Angie. With that we will close agenda item 2 and move on to agenda item 3, approval of flexible agenda.

**3. Approval of Flexible Agenda** (*For Possible Action*)

**Motion was made by Member Braxton and seconded by Member Hudson to approve the flexible agenda. The motion carried unanimously.**

**Verbatim Transcript**

**President Dockweiler:** May I please have a motion to approve the use of a flexible agenda allowing me to take items out of order if necessary.

**Member Braxton:** Member Braxton, for the record I move to approve the flexible agenda.

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you. Is there a second?

**Member Hudson:** Member Hudson second thank you.

**President Dockweiler:** All favor say aye.

**Board Members:** Aye.

**President Dockweiler:** Any opposed? Abstentions all right so moved.

**4. President's Report**

Member Braxton provided an update on the NRS 388G Subcommittee meeting from December 18th. She thanked Michael Stewart, Todd Butterworth, and Kimberly Marsh Granasso from the Guinn Center for presenting a summary of Senate Bill 460. She stated that proposed regulatory language regarding large school districts would be presented for public workshops on January 27th at 1:30 p.m. She also noted that the legislative subcommittee (including Members Ford and Dawson Owens) was scheduled for its first public meeting on Thursday, February 5th at 3:00 p.m.

**Verbatim Transcript**

**President Dockweiler:** Now we will move on to agenda item 4, the president's report and a board member. Updates are there any board members who have updates they'd like to share.

**Member Braxton:** Yes, member Braxton for the record I'd like to give an update on the last meeting of the NRS 388 G subcommittee during our meeting on December 18th we were joined by Michael Stewart, Todd Butterworth, and Kimberly Marsh Guinasso, from the Guinn Center for policy priorities. Present they presented a summary of Senate bill 460 the 2025 legislative session and I want to thank them again for their clarification on specific items and their time the proposed regulatory language was in the committee in the subcommittee and will be presented for public works. On January 27th at 1:30 pm, we're 380G regarding large school districts will be aligned with SB 460, 2025. Regarding organizational of large districts including Clark County, it is anticipated also that the regulatory language will then go to LCB for the R numbers and then presented for a hearing our next 388 G subcommittee meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 4th. Also, with regards to the legislative subcommittee that includes myself, member Ford, and member Dawson Owens, we are scheduled to have our first public meeting on Thursday, February 5<sup>th</sup>, at 3:00 PM and I'm excited about this meeting as the interim legislative discussions have begun.

**President Dockweiler:** Both are welcome and wonderful updates. Thank you so much. Looking forward to hearing the outcomes of those meetings thank you. Any other member updates?

## 5. Superintendent's Report

Superintendent Wakefield presented updates on entry priorities and significant NDE initiatives. He highlighted his three priorities: leading through partnership, setting a shared statewide direction, and strengthening NDE capacity. He reported on school visits in Douglas and Storey Counties and upcoming visits to Clark, Washoe, and Carson City. He announced plans to share an initial draft of NDE-wide priorities in his March update.

He provided an implementation update on SB460, which he described as 204-page bill pillars focused on advancing early literacy, modernizing the workforce, strengthening accountability, and providing district supports. He detailed progress in early literacy, including approved "Science of Reading" professional development courses and a 45-clock hour course offering master's level credits. Regarding accountability, he noted the assembly of a committee to develop recommendations for Nevada's first statewide district performance framework.

Finally, he addressed regulatory updates, noting 53 regulations were in progress. He highlighted the regulation for foster students in residential treatment facilities, noting that following the Board's non-approval in December, another public workshop was scheduled for January 27th to gather more feedback before a March hearing.

### Verbatim Transcript

**President Dockweiler:** All right seeing none we will move on to the Superintendent 's report.

### [Superintendent's Report](#)

**Superintendent Wakefield:** OK. Thank you. I'd like to have the slides projected then I'll get started. All right I'm excited. To share updates regarding my entry priorities significant NDE initiatives and also some regulatory updates pertaining to the authority of the Nevada State Board of education I'm hoping that today's presentation along with the e-mail that Angie sent on Friday with information about these upcoming regulatory workshops will begin too. Meet your interests that you've expressed in my first few meetings of being better informed about the regulatory process in map and everything that makes your makes its way to you at the state board so we can go to the next slide.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** So first I'm going to share an update on the progress I'm making on my entry plan. So next slide. As a reminder, I'm focused on 3 key priorities leading through partnership setting a shared statewide direction and strengthening the capacity of NDE. At our December meeting I spoke about the listening and bright spots. And have had a terrific start including Douglas County and story County School visits in December I visited schools engaged in dialogue with the superintendents and trustees along with administrator's educators and even students about their experience. I'll be spending time in Clark Washoe and Carson City in the coming weeks related to my listening tour. Next slide in order to stay on track to my March first benchmark I'll continue my focus on listening and learning which includes today's. Item that we'll do together around the listening tour with a structured conversation but I'm also going to begin articulating and testing NDE wide priorities. NDE wide priorities in the coming weeks and I plan to use my March update. To share an initial draft of those priorities. So, the slide is attempting to show that I'm you know beginning that transition of taking all the inputs and beginning to articulate the set of guiding priorities. Next slide.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** Now I'm excited to share a few updates on significant work underway at the

Nevada Department of Education. So of course, I am new in trying to enter responsibly but there's big work underway. So, my goal today is to thread the needle there between the 2 and today I'm going to focus on the implementation work underway regarding SB 460 member Braxton you had mentioned that you know you got a fly over from the Guinn center there and so I'll do. Something similar here. Hopefully that is accessible and useful for the board next slide.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** So, SB 460 from the 2025 session you know was a significant piece of legislation that is intended to provide a comprehensive update to K 12 system at 2:00 104 pages long there's a lot contained in the bill. I've really tried though to analyze the key components the appropriations involved. The legislative intent and I would summarize the main pillars of the bill as following advancing early literacy modernizing the educator workforce strengthening accountability at all levels and providing more comprehensive district supports to make sure that we're in this together in strong partners at the state level. As I shared with you while interviewing for this job seeing Nevada advance such a bipartisan large scale omnibus bill was one of the signals to me that education was a priority. For state leaders it was part of what drew me back to the state frankly and to see interest in in this role I'm going to highlight a few of the biggest pieces of implementation underway. This is not meant to be exhaustive. There's many work. There's so much other there's so much work going on across all of our offices and departments, so I don't want to suggest this is comprehensive, but I did try like some of the largest sort of bodies of work to share next slide.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** So, starting with early literacy the ND has worked intentionally and collaboratively on this piece across departments with the RPDG 's with higher education partners and we've developed. A number of things including science of reading professional development guidance we've identified and approved science of reading professional development courses. We've launched science of reading course application for districts we've created a NEPF crosswalk. And we've developed a 45-clock hour course that not only meets statutory requirements and but also offers an opportunity for master's level credits. So, all of these resources and ideas are available on our ND website as well, next slide.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** The accountability work is also well underway. SB 460 included aligned accountability system at the classroom school and district level. This includes creating Nevada 's first statewide district performance framework to do this work we've assembled an All-Star committee that includes district leadership trustee's educator's student boys includes your state board vice president. The committee also represents a good number of members of the Commission on innovation and. Excellence. Given the important overlap of the work between that Commission and this committee, the committee 's working across a very clearly defined scope with 2 main deliverables. To develop recommendations for the new district performance framework and also to refine and refresh the school level performance framework. The next meeting of this committee is next week, and we have an important survey that's live so I've included the QR code here so please take it and share your thoughts on accountability. And share it out with your networks. The survey was also shared in all of our NDE lists and on our social media handles if that's an easier way to promote the survey next slide another important element of SB 460 is the significant appropriation. That were designed to enact key components of the bill. You can see the macro fiscal year appropriations highlighted on the slide over the course of the 2 years of the biennium next slide.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** And within those totals NDE was granted appropriations to build up our department 's capacity and some expertise in order to advance elements of the bill I credit Dr. Canavero for laying some pretty strong groundwork this summer and working with our cabinet to use the resource investments to help. NDE makes evolutions come into more coherent, transparent and focused. So, this is also aligned to my entry priorities about building up state capacity so as a leadership team at NDE we've developed a set of guiding principles that we're using to approach any investments we make or any staffing up we do. The first is we want to make sure that we develop practical tools that help districts strengthen

instruction and the educator workforce. This might be some of the literacy updates I gave before. It also includes some of the user-friendly educator dashboards we're working on. Related to parts of the bill. Secondly, we want to focus on continuous improvement systems not piece meal solutions or punitive accountability measures or compliance. We want to make sure that anything that we report out helps drive improvement across the state. 3rd we want to build durable infrastructure not just place short term fixes. Sometimes you get a specific amount of money in a bill for a specific you know dashboard or piece of infrastructure and we're trying to make sure that it all maps together. So, we don't. So, it can actually. Efficient and sustainable for NDE and then the 4th principle is to evolve our strategy operating model and our core systems at the agency so that we can actually do our work really well and also raise the bar. For state level work across Nevada, I think this is a chance to lead the way for us and level up and give the rest of our state ecosystem the opportunity to do the same. I'm thinking about RPDP 's the new ESC the education service center that we've been learning about. Other organizations that contract and support commissions and councils across all of the work underway. So, we've started to move forward some a small number of positions aligned to these investments. We'll also be taking some contracts to the interim Finance Committee in the coming months with a set of partners that meet the technical and Nevada specific needs. So, I wanted to share this with you, so you have a macro policy view because we have a number of benchmarks that we have to meet in order to advance. Any you know the contracts and the personnel work that we're staffing up with next slide?

**Superintendent Wakefield:** Finally, I'm going to move into upcoming regulatory. Regulation that are under the state board 's authority. You've asked the NDE to continue conducting workshops on your behalf, so we talked about this last meeting we and I worked with leadership here of your board and we're going to keep conducting the workshops on your behalf as NDE. We're going to communicate more actively what is upcoming and we're going to be really clear this is the date for this regulatory workshop that then eventually becomes a hearing that comes in front of the board. So that was our agreement per the direction of your board 's leadership, the department currently has 53 regulations. I'll repeat that. 53 regulation updates in progress. These are spread across the state board the Commission on professional standards and under ND ES authority. I'm going to focus on the state board and NDE's authority here with update so we'll go to the next slide, and this is my final slide the first column includes scheduled regulatory workshops that will occur on January 27th. I'll highlight the second one on this list, for example regarding students in foster care place in residential treatment facilities. This was an item that was not approved at the December state board meeting since at that time the department has worked with stakeholders to further revise the language and use, we plan to use the January 27th workshop to gather. Another round of public feedback and review before submitting the regulation for hearing during the March board meeting. A few highlights from the second and 3rd columns. You'll see that some of the bullets say pending receipt of LCB language as a reminder holding regulatory hearings requires that the proposed regulatory language is reviewed and to the department from LCB. So, since there's not a state board meeting scheduled for February and we have some timely and important regulatory hearings to advance open enrollment is an example of that we're going to be reaching out to you in the coming days to share potential February dates with you to find. A date that would give us quorum to try to advance the February hearing dates. So, with that that concludes my updates again I tried to cover my entry plan. Some of the big work underway at the department and begin to share this regulatory map. I hope it begins to meet. Interests around communication in the department about your role and authority and also keeps you apprised of what we're up to. I'm happy to answer any questions or elaborate on anything I've shared today.

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you Superintendent Wakefield. Love the updates and really appreciate the regulatory map and really laying out what's coming up and what's under the board 's authority what's under NDE's authority and then also as you mentioned what perhaps might be under COPs authority which you didn't specifically talk about but just important to. Acknowledge that there's a lot of different pieces of regulation that the department is helping to facilitate. So, thank you for that. Any questions, comments,

thoughts from board members? Member Braxton.

**Member Braxton:** Member Braxton. For the record I just want to ditto what our president Dockweiler said. And I will also add that just as home means Nevada partnership means transparency and your entry plan is a synced and timely so thank you.

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you member Braxton. Any other questions for Superintendent Wakefield?

**President Dockweiler:** OK seeing none thank you for the updates and we will move on to agenda item 6 informational updates this agenda item as you recall was added to provide key updates on various aspects of Nevada 's education system.

## 6. Informational Updates *(Information Only)*

The State Board of Education reviewed several informational topics intended to satisfy statutory reporting requirements and provide updates on Nevada Department of Education (NDE) initiatives. These items were presented for transparency and do not require formal Board approval.

### **Featured Report: Career and Technical Education (CTE)**

As part of this update, the Board reviewed the following:

- [NRS 388.396 – CTE Grant Effectiveness](#): In accordance with state law, a program professional has evaluated and reported on the effectiveness of Career and Technical Education (CTE) grants. This report ensures that funding is being utilized efficiently to support student readiness for the workforce.

### **Verbatim Transcript**

**President Dockweiler:** These informational updates do not require formal approval from the board, but they do serve as a platform for fulfilling reporting requirements. From districts and charter schools as well as sharing critical developments from the Department of Education. These updates ensure that stakeholders, including district school's educators and the public in general, remain informed about progress in key developments within our education system. Are there any questions from board members about today's information item regarding career and technical education grant effectiveness report. OK seeing none.

## 7. 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 the [Private School License Renewals](#)
- b. Possible Approval of the [State Board of Education Meeting Minutes, December 10, 2025](#)
- c. Possible Approval of the [State Board of Education NRS 388G Subcommittee Meeting Minutes, December 18, 2025](#)

Member Ford requested that Item b (State Board Meeting Minutes, December 10, 2025) be pulled from the Consent Agenda for separate discussion. Regarding Item A (Private School License Renewals), Member Ford noted several typographical errors. Interim Deputy Superintendent Lisa Ford advised the Board that these errors had been previously identified and that the corrected documents were currently posted for the record.

Regarding Item b, Member Ford expressed concern that the December 10 minutes did not accurately reflect the depth of the discussion or her specific remarks. She argued that minutes should provide more than a

summary of voting outcomes and requested that her comments be explicitly included in the written record, particularly when prefaced with the phrase "for the record." She further noted that reliance on video recordings for synthesis is problematic due to inconsistent audio and video quality.

Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Georgas-Burns provided legal clarification, noting that statutes require minute approval within 45 days or by the next scheduled meeting. She clarified that while minutes are not required to be a verbatim transcript, they must include the substance of all matters proposed, discussed, or decided, as well as any specific information a member requests to be included in the record.

Superintendent Wakefield expressed a commitment to improving the minute-taking process. He suggested a "two-part" approach to ensure specific omissions are captured while still adhering to the 45-day approval window. DAG Georgas-Burns recommended that the Board approve the minutes subject to the addition of

Member Ford's comments as reflected in the video recording, noting that the Board could agendaize a formal amendment at a later date if the subsequent revisions were found to be inaccurate.

**Member Ford moved to approve the consent agenda as presented, with the specific modification that her comments from the December 10th meeting be added to the minutes at a later date and seconded by Member Braxton.**

#### **Verbatim Transcript**

**President Dockweiler:** I trust that our board members have had ample opportunity to review the consent agenda and the support materials. As a reminder board members are asked to review all materials and request clarification in writing. And any board member can pull an item for discussion, or we can approve them all with a single motion, discussion or would any members like to pull an item for discussion? Or may have a motion to approve the consent agenda. Member Ford.

**Member Ford:** Thank you I would like to motion to only approve item C of the consent agenda. The other 2 items I believe it has some incorrect information and typos in it and also, I would like to review. The state board minutes again before they're put back on the agenda.

**President Dockweiler:** All right so for agenda or an item, a could you please flag and we can have the department maybe provide some additional information or context about some of the information that may be incomplete.

**Member Ford:** Yeah, I was on like I kind of figured it might get pulled because it's kind of glaringly inaccurate and it's just where it is at. I mean it looks like it appears to be a template that was used for a previous school and then modified for this one that we're supposed to approve because in the second page it references a different school and has an incorrect, date range. Yeah, it says so essentially it says. November 30th, 2025, and this is saying strong generation. Unless the materials that you sent us are different.

**Interim Deputy Superintendent Lisa Ford:** Lisa Ford for the record we did catch those typos thanks to one of the members giving us feedback during a review session. Made the corrections and the corrected documents are posted.

**Member Ford:** Oh OK. Thank you very much for bringing that to our attention. Good. Know OK and then then that's fine. Additionally, I would like to pull the minutes then. To not be approved at this time as I don't think they accurately reflect a lot of the conversation that was had on December 10th and I can review that separately and. Or we could do it right now if you want.

**President Dockweiler:** Yeah, if there's specific pieces, you'd like to flag that would. Be great.

**Member Ford:** Yeah so, I think I actually would like to put something on an agenda, and I'll wait till the end of the meeting to review our process for recording the minutes. Because most of the information in this one and some previous ones just they just don't reflect anything that happened during the meeting, and you know. I'll give you an example. Where are those ones? Second. So, if you look at page 4 of 12 the item 9 information discussion possible action regarding appointment to the Board of Education service center the only thing that this item references is what the item was about. And the voting process it didn't allude to any of the information, and I explicitly stated that some of my comments on there were made to be part of the record. Additionally, I just think that we should put some more information in all of our items going forward about what is said to make it look more like minutes and not just how the voting happened. Otherwise, I'm not sure why we're even here putting things on the record so. At a bare minimum I would like to pull this so that I can send an accurate reflection of my comments for that item and ideally, I would like to pull it for a discussion of the board to consider. What we think is appropriate framework to record the meetings going forward?

**President Dockweiler:** Yeah, we can definitely pull item B I'm going to look to DAG Georges Burns to provide us some overview of what the legal requirements are for meeting minutes if I may.

**DAG Christena Georgas-Burns:** Thank you, Christina Georgas Burns for the record. So, we do need to approve minutes within 45 days after the meeting has occurred or the next meeting, which would be this meeting, whichever occurs later. This last meeting was on December 10<sup>th</sup>. The 45 days would probably be longer or later. Unless good cause is shown. So, I think its best practice would be to try and get. To get this stuff resolved by the 45 days, but and it could probably be a separate conversation to discuss how to keep minutes going forward, but. Any issues with the December 10th meeting minutes could be ideally resolved within those 45 days. And I give me a moment. I can calculate the 45 days. So that would be by January 24th.

**Member Ford:** That's interesting because there's been many times on the CCSD board where we pulled minutes, and they sometimes went several months ahead to approve them in the in the past so. Somebody's doing something wrong here.

**Vice President Hughes:** This is member Hughes. Can I ask one quick question? I appreciate you flagging this member Ford because it's something I've never thought about. I know that historically for the past 5 years that I've been on the board this has always been sort of the way that the minutes were taken. So, I guess my question is just for my own learning. I always thought that was because the public record is also recording of the meeting which is also posted for public consumption and so because we had the verbatim. Line by line recording that was always my assumption of why it was more of like a high-level synthesis in the actual notes. But is there specific guidelines for members for the point of like wanting to make sure the full content is there. I'm assuming that the minutes don't need to be word for word because we have the recording but is that the case. Or like what's of depth that the written note should be versus the having the recording also as public record.

**DAG Christena Georgas-Burns:** First before I answer your question, I did want to highlight that it does have the law does make a caveat that unless good causes shown, so I can't speak to the specifics of previous minutes, but. There are instances where you may see minutes that have not been approved for several months, depending on what the circumstances of those minutes would be. In terms of the minutes and the compared to the audio or video recording. Both are required if there is a virtual and I'll have to look into the exact details as I'm looking but the requirements for the written minutes. Are that the date and the time and the place of the meeting. The names of the members, the substance of all matter, proposed, discussed or

decided on the substance of remarks made by any member of the general public. And any other information that a member of the body requests to be included or reflected in the minutes so. Member Ford, if she had made that request, then those should have been in the Minutes and that can be added. But yes, there's not. It does not have to be a verbatim written account of the meeting. Those recordings can serve as the additional public record with more detail.

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you. Member Ford. How does that impact your desire to pull item B? Still are you comfortable leaving that in knowing that there's the video recording as well.

**Member Ford:** No, I'm not comfortable. The video recording isn't even high quality enough to do an accurate transcription from, and I would think that that would only suffice if that was being made and put as a reference back-up to the meeting in the minutes. And I do. I had training about this year and years ago so I very specifically when I say I want the record to reflect or for the record I expect that it would be in the minutes. So, I would like that pulled and I don't know what the process would be to vote on at a later time, but I could. I mean I really, I shouldn't have to. And also, no member of this board should have to do that. It should be somebody with an NDE that's doing that, the clerk's job is only to supposed to be look at documents that on behalf of the entire board but not be a secretary or notetaker. So, I think somebody needs to go back to that point and summarize the portion that I wanted on the record and anything else that was put on the record. We have AI now that can do that pretty easily, so I think that's an acceptable ask for me thank you.

**President Dockweiler:** All right. Yeah, we can definitely still pull that if that would be the desire and revisit meeting minutes under agenda item 12. And then also I know Superintendent Wakefield wanted to jump in please.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** Yeah, Superintendent Wakefield for the record, I'll say for the record too because I like this conversation and it actually reminds me of being on the board and kind of always wondering you know. When comments and discussions became something highlighted in the meeting recording versus when they weren't. So, it's all. I think it's very timely, I'm curious if we could kind of do a two parter here, where we could add the specific omission that you believe is so important from the last meeting? And then approve them with so that we can just keep it clearer in. Within the 45-day window and maybe ask if there's anything else that feels similar from any board member and then add this to the ongoing agenda so that way we can actually improve process. I will say that I'm committed to process improvement. I've been trying to do that with the leadership I hadn't heard this one till today right. And so, I'm happy to take this on and put this into our next leadership meeting. But I was just curious if that could suffice. I might need help from the DAG here as well because you know is there a motion where we could say we approve this as is and commit to putting the verbatim transcript of that section into the public meeting record if that would suffice for this need. I just want to. I want to make sure that we're all able to improve as we are ongoing but also not trip up something you know or hold back something that sounds like it's sort of part of a consistent need for staying in compliance with the 45-day window. I just don't know if we're able to make modifications to a document and then approve it without seeing that modification in the document first. That was at least from my experience. You can't do that.

**Member Braxton:** Member Braxton for the record so question for you because this does bring up a good point about the video recordings how they're recorded and transcripts and so forth. Is it possible then to for item 7 then approve A and C items and then leave item B for review and then address that before or by January 24th?

**President Dockweiler:** So, member Braxton, yes, I mean that is possible. And again, I'll look to the DAG because I believe we would have to call a special board meeting to hold that vote.

Member Ford: We could even have a virtual meeting for that vote, and it could be a quorum of the voting members if we want to make it simple. And I'm happy to do that. Quick and painless as possible.

**DAG Christena Georgas-Burns:** Let me look into that a little bit more. I also want to explore. What the good because shown aspect of the statute requires, because this may be an instance where there is good because to push out the requirement of the 45 days or the approval at the at the meeting, whatever occurs later so. Let me have a little bit of time. In the meantime, I think if we're, if you choose not to approve the Minutes, then we can. There is still time before the 24th to be able to properly notice a special meeting, if necessary to hold it. If that good cause is not met by this scenario.

**President Dockweiler:** OK that would suffice thank you. All right so I would love that additional research DAG. So please proceed with that we will move on to agenda item 8 for time's sake, or do you want to and once we have that information, we'll circle back to you, but we'll keep the meeting going.

*(Discussion of Item 7 continues later in the meeting)*

**President Dockweiler:** Before we move on to item 11, we're going to circle back to agenda item 7 and the consent agenda. So, I'll turn it over to the DAG who has had some time to do some research and then I believe present us with what she's found and then some potential. Pass forward for us to consider.

**DAG Christena Georgas-Burns:** Thank you, Christina Georgas Burns, after reviewing the statutes to ensure the 14 day or the 45-day requirement is met. I would recommend moving to approve the December 10th meeting minutes subject to an addition to the Minutes of the specific with the specific comments request. Tested to be included on the record and then any additional revisions needed as reflected to the video recording. So, this will allow us to meet that 45-day requirement. There is an option if after because I know there were concerns about. Approving of something that you haven't seen yet, if there are concerns that the additions are not an accurate reflection of the meeting minutes, then the board can agenda-ize an amendment to those meeting minutes, at a later date. But this will allow for that 45-day requirement to be met, and then there still is that window of opportunity to amend if needed.

**President Dockweiler:** All right. Thank you, DAG. Member Ford, since this was the item that you had wanted to pull for discussion, I will toss it back to you to get your feedback on how you'd like to proceed.

**Member Ford:** That's fine. I just want to ensure that the minutes are going to be the minutes and that the comments will be in those minutes and not like in additional document. So, I don't want someone in the future to be able to pull the minutes and go oh, I have the minutes. But then there's some like appendix that happens to have my comments somewhere. Yeah. So, will it be in the actual minutes? DAG, I turn to you. But it's my understanding that the minutes as they are would be edited, so there would still only be one document of minutes.

**DAG Christena Georgas-Burns:** Correct. It wouldn't be an attachment with the additions. It would be a revision of the actual minutes.

**Member Ford:** OK. And I'm good with that. OK. So, you want me to like, draft it up and send it? Any comments towards or somebody going to go and review that portion and write them out?

**President Dockweiler:** That's a good question. I recommend working with NDE to make sure that your comments are accurately reflected to how you recall them and the video captures them and anybody else. Also make sure that that is true for all of us and with that, if you'd like to make a motion. I will gladly accept one.

**Member Ford:** Yes, I will move to approve the consent agenda as presented item 9. With the modification of my comments from the December 10th meeting being added to the Minutes at a later date. Thank you.

**Member Braxton:** I think that was item 7, not 9 correct agenda.

**Member Ford:** Item 7. Thank you.

**President Dockweiler:** Good catch. Can I please get a second?

**Member Braxton:** I'll second.

**President Dockweiler:** All in favor say aye.

**Board Members:** Aye.

**President Dockweiler:** Opposed abstentions. All right, so moved. Now we will jump ahead again to number 11 on the agenda public comment 2.

- 8. Information and Discussion on the Superintendent's Listening Tour Survey** (*Information and Discussion*)  
Superintendent Wakefield presented the data from the Board's survey responses (10 total responses). He noted the scoring was directional, meant to surface alignment and tension.

Key Findings by Question:

- Strong Academic Foundations: Most responses were "adequate," with common themes of "scaling up" and "inconsistency" in access across districts.
- College/Career Success: Similarly scored as "adequate." Members highlighted "pockets of excellence" (e.g., CTE programs) that are not yet at scale and concerns that students do not always feel "ready" for their next steps.
- Excellent Educators: Responses were slightly lower. Themes included "unsustainable workloads" and "administrative pressures," though there was a note of "improvement" in teacher retention compared to a decade ago.
- Engaged Families: Scores were consistent with the educator question. Themes included "variation" based on individual schools and a "disconnect" between institutional intent and family experience.
- Aligned Systems: This received the lowest scores, including "weak" ratings. Themes included "incoherence" and a sense that data dashboards are not yet "driving improvement."

**Board Discussion:**

Member Ford stated that she supports the Superintendent but has strong feelings about the current system. She argued that students do not like learning because it is not interesting and that the Board should have a true "visioning discussion." She expressed concern about spending millions on national curriculum companies when expert educators could create flexible approaches. She stated that the system focuses too much on memorization rather than testing the ability to figure things out.

Member Dawson Owens stated that she felt the board was focusing on the right things through SB 460. She expressed concern that 80% of respondents felt college/career success was "adequate," indicating a large group of students is being missed.

Vice President Hughes argued that the system had "lost focus" on content standards. He stated that when standards are understood deeply, they do not call for memorization, and the current translation into daily instruction is a misalignment. He urged clarity on the roles of various entities (State, District, School) to ensure everyone is "rowing in the same direction."

Member Braxton used an "elephant analogy" to describe different entities touching parts of the system without seeing the whole. She called for systematic alignment and suggested a retreat involving different leadership entities to engage in "design thinking."

Member Carvalho emphasized the importance of advocating for public education and the "value proposition" of what children are learning. She questioned what "equity" specifically meant in this context, whether geographical, socioeconomic, or between large and small districts. She also noted the "enrollment cliff" and how funding based on student numbers could lead to cuts that impact education quality.

Member Hudson agreed that policy and practice in classrooms were misaligned, noting that teachers are often asked to provide mental health services for which they are not trained.

Student Member Lan stated that from a student's perspective, they only feel "individual local impacts" and may not understand the state-level misalignments. She asked how systemic alignment would change circumstances for individual students without making "experience gaps" larger.

### **Verbatim Transcript**

**President Dockweiler:** So, with that I will introduce Superintendent Wakefield for his presentation on agenda item 8.

### **[Listening and Bright Spots Tour Presentation](#)**

**Superintendent Wakefield:** OK. This is Superintendent Wakefield. This is why you all are so wise to approve a flexible agenda because we can make these sorts of adjustments in real time. I am really excited about this conversation, and I want to start by sharing my intention for the conversation today. So, to me the perspective energy and concerns of the state board are a major input to my commitment to listening and learning. And they will shape the priorities that we set at NDE. Today we're going to have a bit of a sense making conversation using data that you all provided as one input. This is going to help us hopefully surface where we have alignment also where we have tension within the board and further questions to resolve. The data that we're going to look at together represents ten responses which is terrific from a board response perspective but that's also not a ton of people right. So, we're going to treat it as directional not definitive. We're not going to run really tight quant analysis on ten responses. But I believe it's very useful to play back the data trends per your submissions in terms in order to surface perspectives find areas of alignment intention and then to have discussion that hopefully is rich and robust. For each question. So, when I move into the presentation for each of the questions that you responded to, I plan to share what I saw. So, kind of just the facts in the responses and trends how this data compares to some of the other inputs. I've been getting in my listening conversation so I might say hey that's really consistent with what I've heard from students, or from trustees, etcetera. And then after I run through the brief slide presentation we'll move into a structure dialogue and space to just hear reactions and layer in more perspectives from the board. My hope is to share briefly and then really just be a listener to make sure that you all have the space to discuss and build.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** I also want to say thank you. This was really exciting to me that at the December meeting you all said yes to wanting to have a conversation about this as a board. So, thanks for

that and then thank you for promptly providing data. So, we had a survey for the public just so that you all know the same guiding questions were used but there was also a bit of a difference in this approach to actually ask you to provide. That quantitative that one to five and that was intentional because I wanted to make sure that in my experience when you can offer a really concrete starting point like for example you know we heard, the board was really aligned in this question or misaligned in this question. It just helps you all to have that discussion. My job in today's conversation is not to persuade anybody here to have any sort of conclusions. My job is just to help make meaning of the inputs together so there's not kind of a vote on this item. It's not a final position that anybody has to you know speak or forever hold your peace, but my hope is to leave this discussion item with a strong sense of the state board's perspective on those six guiding questions that we all answered here. To move into the presentation, I'm going to run through it, I'm hoping that's about 10 minutes. And then it's going to be open space for discussion. I also need this to work for you all so if you're realizing like hey it'd be much better for a different approach for you to speak after each slide, I'd be willing to be interrupted and try something, I want this to work for the board. This is my plan. But you know truly your experience in this discussion and getting collectively what we need out of it is important. So, I am open to if we need to make any modifications to my plan here for this item.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** All right so let's get started. We'll go to the first slide just reminds folks of the survey's purpose and then list the 6 guiding questions that are related to the responses that were shared and these again are the same guiding questions. That I shared in the publicly facing listening and bright spots to her document that was part of my December Superintendent update if that's helpful for anybody that is following along in the public and then now, I'm going to go through each of the 6 question trends. Next slide.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** All right so as you'll see I've put the question hopefully very clearly at the top of the slide. This is exactly what this data is in response to this first question theme was about strong academic foundations for moving through this. I'm not going to read the questions verbatim. But I do want to make sure that you all know that each slide shares clearly which data which question the data is in response to and you can see and I'll speak on this in the first one and then I'll probably just breeze through it for the next. 5. But there's a pie chart. The pie chart shows for the 10 respondents what percentage of the 10 so this one is luckily easy to do because it's just 10. So, you can think 10% is one right. And you can just see very clearly. What you all selected if you selected weak or not working well it would be blue? There's no blue in this question if you selected very strong or exemplary you'd. Purple you'd see purple. There's no purple in this question right. So, all of these responses from the board were kind of in the middle 7 that were adequate one that was strong and then 2 that were limited or inconsistent. I'll also speak to the fact that the first 2 questions. Had the highest quantitative if you will. So, this one and the next one were the 2 that scored highest of your 5.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** Next slide the other thing I've done to prepare to for my presentation is I read through all of the raw data. Multiple times to make sure that I pulled out what felt like the loudest and clearest trends you might be sitting here saying hey I felt strongly about something that I don't see reflected. And that is because it wasn't something that came up at least 3 times or 4 times right across the 10 responses. But that's also why we're doing this in a dialogue. So that way when we get to the discussion you can lay that on the record you can speak to that. So, in this case you can see the trends. Here I'm not going to read the bullets because we have all the access. To them through the slide but I will share a couple of the strongest. Phrases or words that came up so many times scaling up. The idea that we have some strong practices for high quality instruction but they're not at scale. I mean to scale them up and out. Inconsistency that word came up multiple times where there's uneven access and inconsistent access learning gaps came up multiple times as well meaning that. There might be some sort of gaps by subgroups of students related to access to these strong academic foundations. I'm going to phone a friend and ask Angie if you would read the respondent quotes. That way I don't just talk talk talk talk here through this whole thing. So, if you

can read the quote and then I will move to the next slide.

**Angie Castellanos:** Nevada has made progress in clarifying standards and expectations for literacy math science and social studies and there are clear bright spots particularly in schools with strong leadership. Aligned curriculum and embedded intervention systems, however, access to high quality instruction is still inconsistent. Across districts and schools, especially for multilingual learners, students with disabilities, and students in high poverty settings.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** And so, since this is the first one, we'll do five times, I tried to pick a quote that truly reflected the most dominant trends. And so, the quotes represent different member responses I made sure they weren't identifiable either as I selected them but that's the spirit of the quote that we pulled for each one. The last thing I'll say on this slide is that the student panel that I conducted in a rural district in December which had student leader's juniors and seniors they really spoke to this idea of inconsistency. Consistency and learning gaps they had been in middle school during COVID so that was really interesting. How that conversation went but 2 out of the 4 students describe just how clearly algebra and geometry. Those were the classes. They talked about. It was so evident that when they got to 9th grade that they hadn't had the same background as other students in their classroom and it was so striking you know they talked about what it was like to catch up what it was like to feel that it was unfair that students that they were alongside of had different access to some of that foundational academics through middle school. Just as for each one of these I want to also share a reflection from some many of the other conversations that I'm doing as well. So that's our pattern. I'll try to go a little bit more quickly now. So, you can see that this is about college career and life success. The question is at the top this I'm scoring was almost identical to the first question and again these first two were a bit higher than the other questions in the survey.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** Next slide. You can see the key trends here listed in the bullets starting with limited real-world learning opportunities all the way down to some progress and bright spots but alongside are persistent challenges when I looked at the raw data again in preparation. Words that were common were the idea of bright spots and pockets of excellence there might be a really great CTE program or dual credit program in this high school or that high school or in this district but it was called a bright spot which means it's not at scale it means it's a specific, thing so pride there but not at scale. There was also a real trend in your responses around readiness meaning that students are showing up for the workforce or college gateway math at the at institutions was referenced meaning that. Students maybe had done everything on paper we'd ask them to do had the diploma had the admissions. But when they showed up for that next step they didn't feel ready. And so that was a trend that came through, Angie, I'll pass it to you for this quote.

**Angie Castellanos:** Overall student preparation for college career and life success is solid but there are notable gaps that limit its effectiveness for all learners. Expanding work-based learning opportunities. Strengthening partnerships with local employers and ensuring more equitable access to CTE pathways would significantly enhance student readiness.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** Every school visit or district visit I've done, a few charter schools, the Carson excuse me, no that's later this month, the Storey County and the Douglas County, bright spot visits they all took me to these incredible programs: welding class or engineering precollege course or auto. And it was incredible at to see these CTE programs in action. And so, to me it really the data trends that you all shared which is that we have some real incredible pockets of excellence to be proud of and we need more students to have access to those right. We'll go to the next slide. Next is about excellent and empowered educators. You can see the distribution of responses here. You can see that there's a little bit more red. These next two questions were a touch lower than the first two in terms of how you all responded to that. Prompt next slide.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** You can see on the left the key trends that include things like unsustainable

workloads. The administrative and classroom pressures teachers are feeling some of the really common words or phrases I saw in the raw data were things like overwhelmed or overextended teachers feeling that way. Questions about preparation. So, there was you know as we've expanded pipelines as we've done more maybe fast tracks to the classroom there and there were some questions shared across this board around did that impact level of preparedness or preparation of some of our new teachers. And then there was a notable point that multiple people talked about improvement that it does feel different. So, this chart I think would have felt more red or more challenging a decade ago. And so, there was a notable, there was a note of progress and improvement. Angie goes ahead.

**Angie Castellanos:** Nevada's educator workforce is showing signs of improvement particularly in teacher retention efforts and availability of professional resources. Recent initiatives aimed at supporting educators and stabilizing the workforce have had a positive impact and many teachers demonstrate strong commitment and resilience in the roles however despite these gains, educators are still being asked to do more than is sustainable. Many teachers manage excess workloads, teach multiple subject areas or class sections and operate with insufficient funding materials or instructional support.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** And I'll just note that at multiple schools I've been at I have met quote new teachers but that have a long history at the school. They might have been paraprofessionals. They might have done their student teaching there, so I do think that that's actually a really cool approach that the state has taken that's helped to. You know lower the number of vacancies so I add that in because it reflects I think some of the trends that you all shared there. Next slide. All right we're on to the question around informed and engaged families. This one was quantitatively. Pretty consistent with the previous question so just below so kind of what goes questions 12 were the highest 3 and 4 were then the next. And I won't talk about 5 yet that was the lowest one but we'll stay with 4.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** Next slide so in terms of trends related to informed and engaged families some of the buzzwords or most prominent trends was variation. Seems like it really depends on you know sort of different levels of access. Multiple members of the board talked about socioeconomic or societal issues. Maybe creating barriers or systemic challenges for families to have as much access to school or understanding as others. It also was very school-dependent. A ton came up. This is a something that is happening school by school. It varies. It's not sort of system level district level, and the 3rd thing was a disconnect between the intention or the efforts and the actual impact or felt or received. Experience of parents or families or communities meaning that there might be an initiative or trend or some somebody talked about a lot of social media or a lot of sorts of press communication but not necessarily having the intended impact at the level of the family. Feeling connected, engaged or understanding how their child is doing.

**Angie Castellanos:** The bright spots of family engagement happen at the individual school level usually directly correlated to the administrator's staff and parent groups this is an area where the state could help districts communicate to and support families and caregivers to support the student. It would require changes. IE less jargon when speaking in the community.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** And then some of the trustee conversations I've had a meeting with local trustees with each of my visits. They were asking how can we better cut through the noise out there and misinformation and different you know things that feel like it's making it hard to really communicate clearly and effectively to families. They also mentioned wanting to understand for example homeschooling trends which have been growing in in the state. So, I think that those trustee conversations I had really reflect some of the themes that you all as the state board have shared. All right one more slide in this format. So this is now about aligned and coherent systems. This was the. Question with some blue so this is where we felt it was weakest as a whole across the 10 responses of the state board next slide.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** In terms of the key trends there's there was a real feeling of incoherence or a lack of streamlined. Also, there was a sense that we have data, there's dashboards even but it's not driving improvements. It's not being utilized in the way that we would hope it could actually help lift all boats or help the actual teachers and school leaders and district leaders. Figure out what to do with that information. And then thirdly funding came up multiple times. Just this idea that the state isn't at the level of funding that is necessary to deliver on the vision of education, Angie.

**Angie Castellanos:** Overall, Nevada 's data funding and accountability systems are adequate but could be better aligned to be more effectively drive continuous improvement and stronger student outcomes statewide. Existing systems provide useful information and structure, and they support basic accountability across schools and districts. However, alignment gaps remain. That limits their impact at the classroom and student level. Data is not always translated into clear actionable support for teachers and funding mechanisms that do not consistently ensure that resources reach the students and schools. With the greatest needs.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** And for this one I'll highlight my conversations with the NASS group the Nevada Association of School Superintendents they added that they feel there's a large reporting burden put on schools. There are so many reports that are being asked for sometimes they feel duplicative, sometimes they feel like you know it's more compliance exercise than actually providing data that's used to help them improve and they also mentioned the way enrollment trends are impacting all the system so funding especially as. Flows per student if enrollment is dropping then they have to make a lot of. System level budgetary choices that are challenging. So those 2 felt a little bit different and complementary to what you all shared here. Just to highlight it. I don't think they're in conflict, but it was really interesting because that's been so loud with that group and wasn't exactly what I heard. And saw in the data. Here all right. And then my last slide for the presentation then we'll move into the dialogue, and I get to be the listener there and I've been talking a lot.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** So, we also asked the question of where do you see NDE adding value today. Where are the greatest opportunities for us to strengthen our service partnership and impact so this one and this one doesn't have a fund quote with it so this is our only slide here but there was a real interest in strengthening the partnerships and service orientation. So, partnerships being clear communication. Being really in more of a service versus a compliance orientation and also to provide more practical supports for districts schools and educators there also was an opportunity around a clarified vision that then flows through standards and curriculum and that helps us all improve schools. So, there was this an eagerness for that a desire to see that more consistently having a clear vision and direction. And then to also align to that set specific measurable focus areas make sure that we're not trying to do everything in the world but we're trying to do a narrow set of things really effectively telling that story being more clear on what we're up to and how we. Doing I'll share then for this one. As you saw in my entry plan, sort of helping the states set a shared direction is one of my key priorities that came up in my interviews that came up from my stakeholder conversations. That continues to come up in my listening tour so I would point to those as a line to. What you all shared here and I mean that makes sense? You all selected me for the role. I talked about that in my interview so I would hope we're kind of aligned right around what you want to see and what I hope to bring. But I will just highlight that the need for that vision and those specific focus areas. Continues to be something that you all hope to see NDE make progress against OK. So that finishes my presentation. I forgot to set my timer, so I don't how I did against my goal of time. I'm sure I went a little bit over because these qualitative insights are so rich. But now I want to move into dialogue I'm going to keep this very loosely facilitated and might ask you know the board leadership to help you know sort of figure out the right flow here. But my questions based upon this data are as follows. Where do you see the strongest alignment between? This data and then where you think we need to go right as a state. What feels unresolved or

intention for you in this data was there something that you know felt contradictory that felt inconsistent with your experience or perspective as I shared earlier there were other comments that felt different, but I tried to be truly? Consistent with what was a trend here and what I reported back so we would welcome those for this discussion if there's something that really your surprise wasn't there please say that so that we can then ask the board. You know is that shared or is that maybe a unique perspective. And then if these themes are real and as prominent as they appear what does it require us to do differently as a board and as a department. We won't have a ton of time for that next step of where we're going but that is where I'm going in my entry plan and that's where I hope to bring the March conversation. So today we'll sit more in the data analysis. And reflections but frankly whatever you all think will serve your board 's needs and interest in having this discussion today I am now here in your service to help you have a dialogue about which what I shared. Thank you very much.

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you Superintendent Wakefield. This is super exciting and thank you to all the board members for contributing their reflections and providing input into the survey I think for structure's sake we'll take them question by question. So, starting with the first one. Where do board members feel the strongest alignment exists toward our desired outcomes? Maybe we'll start there based on the responses from the board. I'll start. So, I feel that there's very strong alignment I do feel that you've heard what we said and translated it into some key themes. Some issues aren't that systems aren't necessarily on track to being aligned but they're inconsistent and how they're aligning and how they're applied. So, I think that we do see that consistently across. The academic pieces. Funding pieces just across the board so. I think that the identification of that was a very strong piece of alignment so I would offer to begin with any other board members like to jump in.

**Member Braxton:** Member Braxton for the record you know I see that there is also this opportunity and I perhaps sound like a broken record at this point but ensuring that our families, our educators, our teachers. Know where they can rely on support. Dr. Canavero gave a wonderful description of different departments that NDE had in a previous meeting and then I've taken the liberty to share with my constituents and people who will give me 5 or 10 minutes. The difference between the Nevada Department of Education, State Board of Education, and NSHE. What that looks like right. And so, part of addressing these issues would be that additional that continued discussion about the roles of the different education. Boards of leadership in our state.

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you member Braxton. I'm looking at my fellow board members member Ford, and the member Dawson Owens.

**Member Ford:** Can you remind me what questions that we're going to cover, this one is what's alignment? What are the other questions and trying to make sure I phrase stuff in?

**Superintendent Wakefield:** Thank you. I actually was going to ask the same thing to President Dockweiler, when you said to go in order of questions did you mean the questions that were presented in the order of the survey or did you mean the 3 that I named at the end of my presentation, thank you.

**President Dockweiler:** Good point of clarification. Thank you, member Ford, for bringing that up. I was referring to the 3 questions that you just read aloud at the end of the presentation.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** That's great, perfect, OK, and that makes great sense. And I've I wrote down everything I heard. I just didn't know you know which lens to look. I'll read them again. And I'll just kind of shorten them too. So, the first ones around agreement or alignment where do you see the strongest alignment between. This data and your sense of where we need to go as a state so that that would be an agreement or alignment would be your buzzword for that. The second one is unresolved or intention for you

in this data what things feel like they don't reflect your perspective. Or they feel like the board has multiple varied perspectives that might not actually all be the same about a question or anything that I shared and then the 3rd one is like kind of the where do we go from here. What is required of us to do differently as a board and a department? So, in short, where we aligned where we misaligned our intention and then where do we go from here. Does that give you a good sense?

**Member Ford:** So, this item let me just preface and give my disclaimers that I think you're doing a wonderful job. I think that you are well intentioned and I support all your work. That doesn't change the fact that I have very strong feelings about the way that the system is set up and that it how it operates and I think there's a lot of different pieces connected that this board itself can't solve and it's going to take a holistic. Community focused people forward approach to say. Many of these things. Are wrong and we need to look at it a different way? Or that's a little bit roundabout. Way I've been saying this the whole time since I've been on this board that this board hasn't done a thorough taking the reins and said let's have a true visioning discussion as far as what schools should be. What would successful education experience? And I think that some of the answers that you would get if we didn't just do quick workshops with a couple questions but really dove into the issues would be things like kids don't like learning anymore because it's not interesting and we know that kids. Students don't feel like school is supporting them in a meaningful way. I put a lot of these comments in my survey, and I was under the impression that all of the answers would be public but I'm seeing that only if you were pulled. But I think that it's not, it's not that we don't want standardized assessment in curriculum and standards of course we do. We want to make sure as was stated earlier that students are getting the same thing when they transfer to a different school. However, we don't need to spend multi millions of dollars, 10s of millions of dollars to national curriculum companies when we have methods that we could be tapping into like our expert educators. To create that in a more flexible fluid approach like other seats are doing so at the end of the day it's the money. I don't know what to tell you and the people that. Are 99% of the time bringing data to us? That usually pushes an agenda that requires the purchase of more curriculum and through edtech companies so I would love to have a thorough discussion about that. But I think I think at the heart of it it's where we're misaligned. Second question is that we're focusing too much on making kids memorize things instead of testing their ability to figure things out and to learn and to pursue their own interest and unique skill sets. There's a lot of people that agree with me it just seems like it is not really in this state if sports was a subject that we taught in schools nobody would grow up to be sports fans if we only let them go on to the next class if they learned. Enough and if they had to. Only be at the same level. As their peers and if they were consistently tested about their knowledge of sports nobody would enjoy it. So, we need to make kids want to be at school and like kind of portrait of a learner stuff but focus more on that. And let educators actually educate students. Experienced educators not just people who you know only have a year training program. That's all for right now.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** Thank you, and one thing I'll do just in the spirit of data fluency, the thing I'd name from your comments that actually felt quite aligned to the trends. Was the educators actually educating that part around feeling I won't pull the slide up to keep us moving but that part around feeling over stretched overextended getting lots of directives. So, I want to make so I think you're added and it's a great thing for me to hear. I think you added perspective. That was unique in some ways that I'm glad you're putting on the record here because as I shared I could. I would. I was committed to doing what's the trend but then that one is a trend that I want to make sure board members don't hear that that was misaligned. I tried to share that but I can share more clearly.

**Member Dawson Owens:** Member Dawson Owens thank you. Yes, I was thinking we were going through each of the areas and talking about them specifically but back to your question about alignment where we aligned. I know I think we're going to have some difference in alignment. I remember in the survey you asked, are you coming from the charter world perspective? Are you coming from just a set of schools that you're familiar with? Are you coming from the South and the North. So, I think that's very relevant and you

know I've had some different experiences. For me it is the charter world as well as CCSD my reporting. But if I just picked one or the other it would probably look differently. But what I really love about this is when I see. How are we asking how we're doing and I see that we are committed as a board and as a state going forward in positive ways with the access to open enrollment that just occurred? To have strong academic foundations and have the career in college readiness prepared and to prepare teachers I see that I feel like we're focusing on the right things now and with 460 and the accountability and priorities and all the things that we're doing that's what gives me. Lot of. Positive hope and excitement for the collaboration that I'm seeing across the state and I really appreciate the time that you took to have us look at these specifically and. You know and I'm also you know as you mentioned the administrators you know where the where the teachers would lie on these thoughts too for me the college career and life success I feel like that's a huge one 80% of us felt that it was adequate. And you know I think we're missing a large group of our students. So, for me that's a little you know obviously I was. You can tell I was probably you know a little lower than that. But I appreciate the work that's going forward to make the changes. So, thank you.

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you member Dawson Owens and if the proposed approach of taking these items question by question is not most conducive to getting the information that we need we can certainly just speak to whatever. Whatever we need to. All right Vice President Hughes.

**Vice President Hughes:** Yeah, thank you member Hughes. So, I yeah, my thoughts are sort of wrapped up in multiple questions. I'll do the same and kind of. Kind of share synthesis one thing I would share I think on the academic front. So that is the first question. Something you said remembered forward sparked this for me. My perspective is one of our gaps is a system is that we sort of lost focus of the standards and people understanding the standards at the level of depth to know then what do I do with those. Because if you when you know the standards well they don't actually call for memorization right. And so the fact that that is how they're being translated into daily instruction for kids is a misalignment between what their goal is and is. And this is true across many states right when many states switched over to Common Core standards or their version of them they spent of time going in depth and awash in particular was sort of like a national stand out in 2010 of sort of the work they. Were doing around standards and making sure folks really understood what those looked like in action and then people just sort of think like we got this check and let's move on? But that is really like the foundation of the entire. Instructional ecosystem and so we're sort of forgetting about that part and just talking about the technical pieces. So, I do think that is maybe part of part of what we're seeing that I would like us to spend more time on and then the only other thing I was going to share that sort. Inherent in all of these that I feel like maybe is the attention I'm feeling is I think we really need to get clear on like what are the couple of big things we're trying to solve for sort of in the visionary way and then get clear on. Like what is the role of every single entity from the legislative down. Because I think one of the challenges is like we have so many conflicting initiatives and ideas that then we're spinning our wheels wasting a bunch of time because we're not all rowing in the same direction. And I think along with that is like getting clear about like what should the role of the state be versus the role of the district versus the role of individual school. And again, there might be some based on district there but it's like unclear to me like what is the unit of change that we are putting all of our efforts towards. Like I think there's some people it's like it's a systems level top down. We're going to like to legislate our way out of this and that's their approach. And then there's people who are like no schools need to innovate and like just figure things out. And then it's going to be like a bottom up and so because all that's happening at once we're not making very much progress. So, there's something about just like making sure before we talk about the like specifics that we do have a clear shared line vision you know from the governor 's office down and that then we're clear about what each entity the steps they need to take to be able. To move those priorities forward so in all of these questions I think to me that's what feels missing and likely partly why so many things were mixed. Or adequate because it's like there's not cohesion across the board.

**President Dockweiler:** Excellent points vice president Hughes. Member of Ford.

**Member Ford:** I just want to and then member Brett. Picking back on what you just said, I think I loved a lot of the things you said but the problem is that it is the governor 's office down. It's not supposed to be like that. And it only became like that in 2011 through legislation. So that needs to be a different conversation about what's the point in electing a state board that you believe is going to be your voice. It's supposed to be checks and balances to the governor 's office. When essentially everyone is getting their marching orders from the governor from the Superintendent reporting directly to the governor not the state board and the new education service center that we're still waiting to hear about the authority? But that's going to have however was told to us that it sits alongside the state board. And we still don't know. And we're still waiting to hear about what the state board 's authority even is from the new legislative changes so. Therein lies the problem in my opinion. It should not be the governor 's office down. That's the opposite of democracy but that is that is the law and it's how it works. So, there should be a conversation about what do we want to do about it. That's all for now.

**Member Braxton:** Well, I'm going to talk about the elephant in the room and there is a story about having an elephant in a room and many people. Approaching that elephant but with their blinders on and then touching parts of the elephant. Meaning if you have a blinder on and you're touching part of the elephant you may touch the Tusk you may touch the tail you may touch the hoof you may touch the skin, and every part of the elephant will feel different. Your description of the elephant will be different and how you approach that elephant will be different. And I see that that's what's going on currently with our educational leadership in our state. So, what I'm asking. For is alignment in a systematic alignment right where there is a clear mission goal of what we want to see for our state and removing the competition. Within different entities or perceived competition within different entities to address the needs of our students. The elephant. That's our student. And. How we approach supporting our student matters? If we can have? A. A workshop a retreat of sorts where there are different entities represented and we're having these conversations and we're doing some design thinking about what really matters. That I believe will be helpful. We can together as a state board and design our own goals and mission and then the governor 's office as member Ford has mentioned may have another direction. And then our legislators may have another perspective right. But we have our students we have our families. We can have all of our surveys and we know that. The end value the amount of people who you know contribute to the surveys. It's not as many as we would like you know. But I think that there is an opportunity for improvement and some sort of collective approach to identifying our goals.

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you member Braxton and I will connect that back to what member Ford was speaking about earlier member Hudson.

**Member Hudson:** Member Hudson for the record. I will. I agree with everything that everyone is saying but just to put my little 2 cents and I do think that Nevada is moving in the right direction when it comes to the priorities like making sure that we have academic foundations making sure our students are somewhat prep. The. For. The next. Jobs outside with our CTE programs or. The post-secondary pathways when it comes to that I do however feel that it's not consistent across the board kind of going back with Vice President Hughes for saying how our systems we have a vision. But then our systems aren't aligned when it comes to the systems and supports when it comes to the districts and how that information is taking into the schools. Yeah, I just think that part is still in development that we don't think of people that's actually doing the work and how they can actually implement it the way we want to. So those systems is kind of in development and needs revamping.

**Member Carvalho:** Thank you, president Dockweiler. I have a few notes that I have written down. I think kind of piggybacking on what member Ford mentioned about. Who? Gets to say where. You know what the leadership of education in the state looks like. I think it's also important for us to understand and advocate

for the importance of public education. There are a lot of competing entities and priorities there and I think it's important for us for us to understand that and to be able to talk to our constituents about the importance of it for our state. And in addition you know the value of education. In general I know you know coming from higher Ed we talk about the that value proposition of what. Higher Ed looks like but I think it's the same. Throughout the education spectrum when you know when we talk about. What our children are learning and why? And so, I think that's really important for us and I think that there is a lot of alignment there. So, I will. I will say that too. As a very new member of this board as well I I'm not familiar with all of the details but as I was completing the survey I was looking at the department 's website and I see equity coming up. But what does that mean in this in this circumstance. Are we talking about? Large versus small districts. Obviously, that also means equity within our. Our student populations in our families also means socioeconomic status. We've got a such a large range of what our students really look like in Nevada so I I'd like to know more about what that what does equity look like in this setting. And also, I think that there's a large. Other elephant in the room which is. The future of what education looks like when we at least in higher Ed we're talking about it a lot this enrollment Cliff that's going to be coming. What does the future of education look like when our funding is based on number of students in our classrooms? How are we ensuring that students still receive that high quality education that we all strive to provide for them if funding is going to be cut? So, I think that that's something that's very important for us as well. So those are some areas where I think that. This may be in this data is a bit unresolved, but I think that those are some you know some of the bigger issues that I see here. Thank you.

**Member Hudson:** Member Hudson for the record. I will. I agree with everything that everyone is saying... because she said something that made me like a thought process of when she talked about like the enrollment. Like how the funding our students are going to basically decrease the funding for those students would decrease which is also going to impact the classroom. Now I'm looking like that's because we provide them with so many supports. So that one student we're not going to probably have the funding needed. To support that one student because we're not looking at like the mental health aspect of it and that money being taken away from us not knowing that some students need the therapy the psychiatrist. Other outside supports that may be put back onto the teacher that's not really trained. So, when we think about these the misalignment of the data is between the policy and also the practice that's happening in the classrooms which also impacts teachers and what. They are expected to do because no I'm pretty sure many teachers don't have a degree in psychology or like certain things that these students need. But then they have to put on that hat to provide those services for those students as well so that access to that high quality instruction and making sure. We're supporting not only the teacher but those families that also is a misalignment of like how we're approaching that looking into the future as well.

**President Dockweiler:** Yes, number Hudson you bring up a good point about the. Well, the enrollment Cliff and then the services to students but then also potential impacts to staffing and what that might look like as those numbers decrease and the needs in the districts. One theme that kept popping up for me and my personal responses to some of these questions were related to equity. And equity geographically, so supports not only in our more in our larger districts but also equity. Supports for students in our rural districts just flagging that. And are there any other comments and then I want to circle back to Superintendent Wakefield and ensure we're answering the questions that he's looking to get answers to. All right. Any online I'm looking everywhere? OK seeing none. Who's pointing?

**Zach Khan:** Sorry, we have one up here, sorry.

**President Dockweiler:** OK. Thank you, go ahead.

**Member Lan:** Sorry, this is member Lan. For the record, I just wanted to point out that from a student's perspective, all we feel are like individual local impacts, right? Like, students don't know that. The root

cause of maybe their struggles or experiences right now would be these state misalignments that we're talking about, since all we know are the individual experiences that are local. Districts, right? Like, of course, we'll have statements like we have less opportunities compared to this district or this standard was changed. So, my overall idea is I'd just like to see how a systemic alignment would change the circumstances for individual students, since all we know are the impacts that we feel, right? So, I'd just like to see how that might change to be more localized individual experience in different districts without making that. Experience gap even larger. Does that make sense? Thank you.

**President Dockweiler:** Member Lan that makes perfect sense. Thank you so much for highlighting that because that is such an incredible critical piece for us to keep in mind through all these conversations. I am looking at Superintendent Wakefield to see if he had any follow-up questions for any of the board members or to see if we're on track with the information he's hoping to get.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** This is Superintendent Wakefield. This is far above and beyond even what I would have hoped to get. This is a terrific conversation. I do want to make sure there wasn't any final. Desire to share or get in here because it because I'm going to move us to close the close item. I know I should ask yeah.

**Member Braxton:** I mean I love the conversation the dialogue the different perspectives that we bring you know and I just can't help to think about the sociology of this all right. You know how are we going to. Move together from that social that from a sociological perspective I don't come with that expertise, but it would be interesting if we could identify someone who could. OK noted.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** Thank you for. That ad OK so 3 closing thoughts for me. The first one is gratitude for this conversation. I have copious notes. We have you know meeting recordings. We're talking about our note our minutes taking right. So there this is as I shared. One of the most important inputs to my listening tour here because of both because I care deeply about each of you as leaders but also who you represent right on this board like it is truly the policymaking board for the state. With you know great. Partnership with and then she represented for example. So, it's so important that this board is a is one of the most prominent inputs for me and I really look forward to circling back in March with that first articulation of priorities for NDE.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** I will share. I will just share 2 thoughts at the of themes from here. The first one is for member Carvalho. You, I think we live or I'll speak for myself. I swim in the water of education. It doesn't ever like the idea that it wouldn't be the most important thing in the world is just for an idea to me but you I think you make such a good point around the narrative and how we're all saying the same things about the importance of educ. To everything. And so, I just want to highlight that that you know because to me that wasn't a question because all the questions have that implicit in them. But there's something there for me that I really want to share and then member Lan. Your point around how all this all this talk all the policy all the funding. Like it doesn't actually matter if it doesn't impact classrooms and the student experience. To me that is a piercing insight that. Similar to what I just shared about member Carvalho 's comments. You know this is all in that service. And if that's not coming through as it like clearly vividly in how we ask the questions how we do the input but also how we set the priorities then we won't succeed. So, I really value that contribution. So, I wanted to name that and then 2 housekeeping points. If you ever are waiting on so I think this is for you Member Ford it sounded like at some point in your comments you were waiting on a legal interpretation or something about our authority I want to make sure that no one 's ever waiting on that sort? Of thing so if we. We can make sure in future items or you know speaking through the board leadership channels as we talk regularly. I just want to make sure that I understand exactly the question and we're getting the appropriate interpretations from the DAG or from LCB. So just want to make sure that in my role and I know I'm new here but I never want that to be a barrier like we can get those

answers. We might not like the answers we get right but I never want anybody waiting on an answer that when it comes to authority or legal interpretation OK and then finally member Braxton your elephant analogy is sitting with me. We do have an item later that'll point to where we're expanding out our grad rate. Item to include some NSHE data and some DETR workforce data with the same intention to say all of our systems impact the same humans right. And so, I you know I'm not trying to say this solves the issue but from a data perspective one thing we're trying to do today towards that end is that item later. So, I hope that that begins to model brings data brings information together that sort of helps us see all the pieces of the elephant not just our silos as well. So, with that thank you all so much for the item and I'll pass it back to president Dockweiler.

**President Dockweiler:** Perfect thank you board members and thank you Superintendent Wakefield for this item before moving on to agenda item 9 we will take an 8-minute convenience break and reconvene at 10:40. Thank you.

*(Break)*

**9. Information and Discussion Regarding Chronic Absenteeism, Current Rates, Interventions and Multi-Tiered Systems of Support** *(Information and Discussion)*

Director LaNesha Battle presented the statewide landscape, defining chronic absenteeism as missing 10% or more of the school year for any reason. She noted Nevada has the 12th highest rate in the country. She highlighted that while rates rose significantly in 2021-22 following the return to in-person instruction, they are now trending down but remain above pre-COVID levels. She mentioned factors such as chronic health conditions (asthma, diabetes) and mental health disorders.

Rochelle Murillo (WCSD) detailed strategies in Washoe County. She explained that the district uses "attendance officers" and "re-engagement specialists" to conduct home visits and transport students. She emphasized the importance of a "trusted adult" on campus. She noted innovative transportation solutions, such as RTC providing free bus passes to students under 18 and their families for escorting younger children.

Vice President Hughes asked if more precise data existed regarding the exact academic impact of missing school (e.g., "for every 10 days missed, we see X percent decrease in scores"). He also questioned if the system should rethink equating "attendance" with "learning," suggesting more flexible learning environments.

Director Battle and Deputy Superintendent McGill noted that current definitions follow federal requirements but acknowledged the need for innovation, particularly for high school students who may only feel they need to be present for tests.

**Verbatim Transcript**

**President Dockweiler:** All right. Welcome back. We'll resume our meeting. It is 10:43 and we'll start the meeting with agenda item 9. The board will now hear a presentation about chronic absenteeism, current rates, interventions and multi-tiered systems of supports. We have LaNesha Battle, education programs director for the office for a safe and respectful learning environment, the Department of Education presenting this item, along with Dr. Paul Lamarca, Chief Student Services Officer from Washoe County School District and Rochelle Murillo, director of intervention for the Washoe County School District. Presenters, please proceed when you are ready.

[Chronic Absenteeism Presentation](#)

**LaNesha Battle:** Good morning. Chair and honorable members of this stage, the Board of Education, as stated before, I'm LaNesha Battle director of the Office for Safe and Respectful Learning Environment within the educator effectiveness and Family Engagement Division of Nevada Department head. Next slide please. It's just a quick overview of what you hear during our presentation today. We're going to clarify definitions and requirements by examining Nevada's current definition of chronic absenteeism and related back in the NRS requirements, understand the statewide landscape by reviewing current data trends, subgroup patterns and district level variation and identifying where the system is improving and where significant barriers still remain. We'll also connect strategies to impact by hearing from the field with our Washoe County School District Partners who are here with us today. Next slide. We're going to take a look at our current policy landscape regarding chronic absenteeism. Next slide please.

Chronic absenteeism includes all absences, regardless of whether they're excused or unexcused. And this is one of our most #1 misconceptions is that we have families who believe that, oh, if an absence is excused, then it's not contributing to chronic absenteeism. Chronic absenteeism does encompass all absences. Truancy refers to unexcused absences, which tend to be addressed through a focus on compliance. It's often relying on punitive consequences for students and our caregivers. When we focus on chronic absenteeism, we recognize that students miss school for many understandable reasons, such as health issues, homelessness or unreliable transportation, for which a punitive response is not appropriate or helpful. Given this broader focus, addressing chronic absenteeism becomes not just a school or law enforcement issue, but an issue the entire community can work to address, and this is why key partnerships are key. For example, medical providers can address health challenges, transit and housing agencies can help to resolve other barriers to attendance, and volunteers from businesses and our faith-based communities can mentor students and provide support for families. Next slide please.

Nevada uses the federal definition of chronic absenteeism on which is missing 10% or more of the school year for any reason. Chronic absenteeism includes all absences as stated previously, regardless of whether they are excused or unexcused. This slide shows looks at current chronic absenteeism rates by county. Nevada has the 12th highest chronic absenteeism rate in the United States. When we look at the map, our three highest counties of chronic absenteeism are Esmeralda with 42.9%, Lyon County with 38.5% and Lander County with 36.5%. Studies show missing 10% of the year is the tipping point, whereas students' likelihood of reading at grade level or graduating drops significantly. Chronic absenteeism is a strong predictor of academic struggles and disengagement. It's a key metric in Nevada's accountability system. Combating chronic absenteeism requires partnership between schools, districts, families and state agencies. It is the work of everyone. Next slide please.

While Nevada uses the federal definition for chronic absenteeism, some exceptions, excuse me, have been added during the last few legislative sessions. During our 2023 session, there was religious observances were added, and these were absences for accrued religious holidays that are legally protected under NRS 392.130 and shall not be deemed absences for purposes of statewide Accountability, reporting report cards or eligibility for attendance based awards, and the 2021 session mental and behavioral health were considered essential due to a physical, mental, or behavioral health condition when supported by documentation from a qualified professional must not negatively affect a school's accountability under NRS 392.050 and both pathways there to those memos for your reference. Next slide please. Of course, to begin making any decisions, we need to take a look at the data surrounding the issue. Next slide.

This slide displays our chronic absenteeism rates for the last six years by Lea starting at the left origin of the Axis with our statewide rates and moving across the X axis to show each Lea's rates over the six years. We acknowledge this slide is a little difficult to see with all of the tiny bars on this graph, but a couple of things of note. There is no data for the 2019-2020 school year because of COVID and students attending virtually for the final quarter of the year. Almost every Lea saw a rise in the 2021-22 school year, which is the year our students returned to school in person with no option of hybrid or virtual learning. There is an appendix

at the end of the presentation where you will find each Lea's data on separate Slide 4. Ease of use. Next slide.

This slide displays chronic absenteeism rates across ethnic groups starting in 2018-2019 school year to the 2024-2025 school year. You will notice that there was a rise across every racial and or ethnic group in the 2021-22 school year with students returning to in-person instruction, post-pandemic. Next slide. The data displayed across subpopulation looks the same as the previous slide with no group returning to pre-COVID chronic absenteeism rates. However, data is trending down toward pre-COVID numbers for all sub populations. So, we do have, we are making some strides in chronic absenteeism processing. Next slide please.

Here you'll see some factors which contribute to chronic absenteeism, and you can see that there are barriers, negative school experiences, lack of engagement and some misconceptions are the four buckets for this slide. Although chronic health conditions are generally associated with adults, roughly 25% of children and adolescents in the United States are also affected. The top five are dental cavities, asthma, obesity, diabetes and food allergies. The asthma prevalence rate is significantly higher in our student population who identify as African American and the diabetes rate is significantly higher in our students who identify as Native American. According to the CDC, one in six children aged 2 to 8 had a diagnosed mental, behavioral, or developmental disorder. Johns Hopkins produced a large multi-year study that concluded 21.8% of US children aged three to seven have one or more common mental, emotional, and behavioral health condition assessed. Next slide. So, what are we doing about chronic absenteeism in the state of Nevada? Next slide.

As I mentioned earlier, Nevada is ranked 12th highest in chronic absenteeism in the United States. The Nevada Department of Education has joined the 50% challenge through attendance works with the American Enterprise Institute. In July of 2024, Nevada is one of the initial 14 states to join this initiative. The goal is to cut Nevada's chronic absenteeism rate in half by the 2028-2029 school year. In 2023-2024, Nevada's chronic absenteeism rate was 29% and is currently at 26% for the 24-25 school year, which is a 3% decline. So, we do have quite a ways to go, but we are making sure that—next slide.

MDE has also formed an internal working group working to see how we can support chronic absenteeism at the state Education Agency and assess the root causes of chronic absenteeism. The intent for this group was to build a task force in 2026 as a joint effort to lower chronic absenteeism across the state. The task force will give voice to all who are responsible for the chronic absenteeism rates, which is everyone. Also, Nevada was awarded the Stronger Connections grant in early 2025 to provide technical assistance and professional learning to our districts with the highest needs. Currently, the grant is focused on three Leas: Carson City, Douglas and Lyon County school districts. We have partnered with UNR as well to develop a course focused on targeted early intervention with our youngest learners and families to foster engagement as we know, studies show families are most engaged when their students are starting out. So, we keep them on that track, then we can keep our students and families highly engaged in education. Next slide.

NDE recommends a whole student systems approach because chronic absenteeism is a complex issue with no single cause. Implementing a multi-tiered system of support or support, MTSS, helps students struggling with chronic absenteeism by providing a structured framework to identify and address their needs through a whole student system's approach. When patterns start to show in attendance data that can indicate something struggling, that's a warning light in the system and that prompts an MTSS team to take a closer look at and assess what interventions and monitoring may be needed to support our students. Next slide. As you can see, schools who are stronger implementers of MTSS do much better than those who are not when it comes to chronic absenteeism. Higher implementing schools, which are the green line, had a lower peak in chronic absenteeism following the pandemic, and are still doing much better than schools with a lower MTSS implementation, which is the brown line. Higher implementing meaning they support higher on the tiered fidelity inventory, implementing with more fidelity than other schools. Today, we're honored to have

Rochelle Murillo, director of intervention with us today. Unfortunately, Doctor Paul Lamarca could not make our presentation today, but we have Rochelle here, who is going to talk to us about strategies and how they're impacting chronic absenteeism in Washoe County School district. And now I will pass it over to Rochelle.

**Rochelle Murillo:** Good morning. My name is Rochelle Murillo. I'm the director of the intervention department. One of the things that I oversee in Washoe County is attendance. I'm honored here to be here today to talk to you a little bit about what we are doing in Washoe County to address chronic absenteeism, the strategies that we have tried to implement in Washoe County to reduce chronic absenteeism and some of the unique ways in which we are reducing those—that data that you'll be able to see in a minute. So next slide please.

**Rochelle Murillo:** So, in framing the problem, and we wanted to provide you some context into what chronic absenteeism has looked like for us in Washoe County, much like many of our other counties in Nevada, we were significantly impacted by the pandemic. And you'll see on the left-hand side of your screen, those are all of our students. So, pre-pandemic we were around 17% chronically absent. And once the pandemic hit, we saw large increases in chronic absenteeism up to 39%. So, over the years we've seen some varying rates in terms of dropped pretty quickly. In 2022, we went up again in 2023 and now we're trying—trying to see, we are seeing some downward trends, which we're happy about. In 2024, we'll talk to you a little bit about 2025 at the end of the session. You'll see that our elementary school students have been less impacted by chronic absenteeism but still seeing some variations over the years. Middle school is where we see really large increases right at that 6th grade transition. We'll see large increases in chronic absenteeism. We'll see it again in high school. Our high school students are our most chronically absent and our most severely chronically absent students in our district. Next slide please.

**Rochelle Murillo:** OK, in framing the problem we wanted to better understand what does it mean, what does it look like to be chronically absent. What are the implications and what happens when we are able to invite our students back in and they are attending regularly. And what we found was, of course, 180 school days actually equates to 280 minutes of instruction per day. So when we're framing that wording for our families, it helps them to better understand the amount of time, the instructional time that our students are missing when they miss even one day of school. In 2023, we saw that for students that were not chronically absent, they missed an average of 6.8%. For those that were chronically absent, they were missing an average of 32.5 days, which is over a month of school, and that's where we see large gaps in academics when our students are not in school learning. For every student that we move off our chronic absentees, we regain approximately 25 days of an instruction and district wide for every 1% drop of chronic absenteeism, which equates to about 610 students in our county, we're gaining approximately 15,250 days of instruction, which is huge. And so that's what we're really trying to push for is those really big drops in chronic absenteeism. Next slide please.

**Rochelle Murillo:** The way in which we are doing that is through a comprehensive approach. We wanted to better understand what are the barriers and why are students struggling with coming to school, and what are some of the struggles that our families have had? And so we're doing that through a variety of different ways. And Miss Battle talked about the MTSS framework and that is how we are really framing much of our work. So we are working a lot around building capacity with our schools' systems to have teams, attendance teams, looking at data and understanding who is chronically absent and what interventions they can implement at the school site level.

**Rochelle Murillo:** We also have positions such as attendance officers and re-engagement specialists, and those positions work to do home visits and they do a lot of outreach. They do resource work, they mentor students. They transport students when they're having difficulty getting from school—uh, from their home

to their school and for a variety of reasons. And they are really working at facilitating what we are calling the one trusted adult in the school site. So, attendance officers work across multiple schools and they can often mentor students, but they can't be the trusted adult if they're not there all the time because they're at multiple schools. So they are working to facilitate that teacher, that coach, that administrator, whoever it is that a student feels comfortable with and feels like they can trust. They're working at facilitating those relationships so that a student has that one trusted adult on campus every day that they can go to when they need help and support.

**Rochelle Murillo:** We are providing additional professional development to teachers and administrators ongoing so that they understand what is an attendance intervention, what can we do when students are chronically absent, and how can we better support them. How can we meet groups of students' needs, but how can we meet the needs of individual students also? So, we are providing them individualized support when they experience barriers to attendance. We have expanded our athletics activities, in particular in middle school, as you saw in the previous slide, we saw large increases in middle school and chronic absenteeism. And so we're working at engaging our students in things like athletics and activities in clubs, expanding access to those opportunities so that students want to come to school, they enjoy engaging in these activities and they feel part of that school community. Our schools are also working on attendance competitions. They have incentives and they have lunch with your principal for most improved attendance. They recognize grade levels for our most improved attendance. So there's a variety of ways that schools have worked to provide competitions and incentives for students for improved attendance. And then the most important is we need to understand why students are experiencing chronic absenteeism and Miss Battle talked a little bit about that. But we have to have conversations with our families and our students at multiple levels, so we can understand what are the barriers they experience and how can we reduce those barriers or eliminate those barriers for them so they are able to get to school every day. Next slide.

**Rochelle Murillo:** The last way that we really want to talk about is our Community School interdependence. We understand that our families are our most important partners in our community and we've really engaged with our community to better understand how we support attendance for our students. We know that there are things within our community that impact our students, for example, transportation to get to school. And so, we engage them because we understand that when students are not going to school, they're less likely to be prepared for the workforce. They have increases in poverty and accessing social services. And it creates a setting of discontinuity in teaching, as when students return to school, students need to hold side—or teachers need to hold side students so that they can catch them up, but then it's difficult for them to also keep other students that have been in class moving forward and progressing in their class. So that makes it difficult for teachers to figure out how do they support all students based on their attendance levels and their ability to access education. Next slide.

**Rochelle Murillo:** So, one of the community approaches that we look at and we have worked with since 2023, Fall 2023 is strengthening our community. This is a group of leaders, community leaders, families, business owners that have worked with us to identify areas within Washoe County that are barriers or struggles for our families and this task force has met and identified 15 different priorities through their work and their collaboration with the community and our school district and our leadership. And they have identified the top five that they're working on right now are the stabilization and expansion of middle school support. Again, I want to refer to the data; that's when we're really seeing large spikes in chronic absenteeism. So, they are seeking funding to provide support for staff that are located at middle schools to better support students at a middle school level, to provide mentoring to broker resources, to connect with families and to better understand what the needs of all the students are.

**Rochelle Murillo:** Our second priority is stabilization and expansion of our family resource centers. We have five family resource centers in Washoe County. Their primary role there is to work with our families to

assess what their needs are and to provide resources and support and access to basic needs like housing, access to food, medical access to medical care, those kinds of things. So, we're working on expanding and stabilizing the funding because they're grant-supported family resource centers to provide additional resources for families as they need that support. We are working on innovative transportation solutions and one of the things we've been able to do is work with RTC, which is our public transportation system, and they now provide free transportation on public buses to all students under 18. And then we went back to them and said sometimes we have elementary school students that need to be with a family member because they're too young to ride the bus alone. And so, they provided us free bus passes for the families to escort their students if they need to utilize that transportation. So that's an example of one of the things that we've done there. Chronic absenteeism awareness campaign: we're working with PBS to do awareness campaigns around what students miss out on when they are not in school and the expansion of early childhood programming. And you'll see there are some other priorities that they will be working on in the future, but those are some of the things that we've been doing through that Community approach. It's been really helpful for us to hear from the Community family members about what are the needs and what are the struggles and how we address them together. Next slide please.

**Rochelle Murillo:** So, in reflecting on this data, again, we looked at the 2019-2024 data, but finally now we're looking at our 2025. This is to date. Now you'll see that we continue to trend down in most grade levels, so that's great news. Our approach is working for the vast majority of the students that we're working with, but we're still seeing that our high school students are—are continuing to be chronically absent. So, there's a lot of work that we need to do to continue to address the needs of our students in high school. Next slide.

**Rochelle Murillo:** And our continuing efforts, as I talked about before, are going to continue to work on the trusted adult. We're going to continue to provide opportunities for students and adults to connect and provide mentoring for students as they need it to make sure that their academic needs and their social-emotional needs are being met and that they feel like they're welcomed in a part of the community and that they're seen. Strengthening and expanding our community partnerships—recognize that we need to involve business owners, students and families. We all need a voice. We need to come together to address the needs of our students and families. And so, we'll continue to expand those partnerships over time, developing a process and leveraging the process of transitions in the data. You may recall that kindergarten and then the transition between 5th and 6th and 8th and 9th are where we're seeing spikes in chronic absenteeism. So, we really want to provide support to our students so they understand what to know and what to expect when they move through those big transitions. But we also want to provide better information for our families so they also know what to expect and what their role is in each one of those grades and how they continue to partner with us as their students matriculate through the grades and finally, exploring and discussing legislative policy changes affecting kindergarten, grades 11 and 12. For example, kindergarten is not mandated and we see higher rates of chronic absenteeism in elementary school for kindergarten students. Next slide.

**LaNesha Battle:** So, what's ahead and what has been moving forward with chronic absenteeism efforts? So, our strongest progress comes through collaboration with key partners such as DHHS, DPBH, Children's Cabinet, NDE Departments, University partners, communities and schools. Together we align efforts and maximize resources to support student success. And like Ms. Murillo said, just working with those partners and recognizing that chronic absenteeism is the work of the Community and not the work of one entity. We strengthen Nevada's workforce pipeline through a statewide professional learning series and UNR partnership that builds local capacity and evidence-based practices, family engagement and mentorship. So, we're doing things in partnership, making sure that we're doing things with our families, with our schools, with our districts, with our community partners, and not doing things to our students and families. Also, we strengthen long-term impact by leveraging braided funding, combining federal and state resources to

support a future statewide chronic absenteeism campaign, ensuring long-term coordinated impact. So we want to make sure that we have some funding pointed towards chronic absenteeism in the future and how we can combat that. And one of the things, again pointing out one of the points from the Washoe County presentation: exploring legislation and policy changes to help strengthen our efforts in chronic absenteeism and getting the percentage lower than—getting our kids in school every day. Next slide. Thank you so much. That's the end of our presentation and if you have any questions then our contact information is listed there. Thank you and we will take questions if you have any.

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you so much for this presentation and all the information included. I personally really love the emphasis on relationships and partnerships and giving kids a reason to come to school, like providing clubs and all the different after-school activities going back to what Member Ford has mentioned about making school fun again. So, thank you for making that possible for students. Any other comments or questions for our presenters from members of the board? Vice President Hughes?

**Vice President Hughes:** Yeah. Member Hughes. Thanks so much for the presentation and for the rich data. Two things I would love to get your thoughts on and I'll try to make a coherent question and also share some thoughts intermingled. So one of the things that I always struggle with around this is it seems so logical around like if you're in school then you'll have better outcomes. And if you're not, then you're going to miss that. But I do wonder if there's a more compelling case we could be making to families and getting more precise about what is the exact impact. Because I think if I'm a family, like if my student is getting poor instruction, having a bad experience, saying getting more instructional days does not actually seem very appealing. And so—like, to what extent—and again, if that instruction is not good, maybe it doesn't actually matter if the kids are in school or not, and so to me there's something about distilling the data more precisely around like what exact impact does it have on academics or social-emotional well-being, or safety or health. Like just saying your kids will be healthier and happier if they come to school, again, I think parents need something that is like more precise. And so, I guess my first question is like, do we have that data? Have we looked at that? Like do we know clear trends and just like you're missing a bunch of school or we can say like if you miss X number of days we see this X percent decrease in ELA test scores? Or like what level of data do we have, I guess it is my first question.

**LaNesha Battle:** Thank you, LaNesha Battle for the record. We can look further into some of our data for that. That's again why we have this working group that's going so we can examine some data and going into what we're trying to move into with this this year—going into a task force to examine some of that data alongside with our LEA so that it's not just Nevada Department of Ed, but we're working in partnership with our districts and Leas so that we can ensure that we all have an understanding of what this looks like and how it—how it directly affects student achievement, student mental health, student—well, just health and well-being.

**Vice President Hughes:** Got it. Thank you. Yeah, I think that'd be super helpful and the reason I bring that up is I've seen some districts across the country who have, again they'll like share with parents like, oh, did you know, like for every 10 days of school you miss, like, here's the like exact repercussion we see in the data and I've seen in some cases that be more compelling to families than just like it's important to go to school or you're going to learn more like some of those vague kind of things that we put out there. So yeah, I think I think more we could do on that front that would certainly be helpful.

And then I guess my second question is a little bit more abstract, but I like it. It strikes me that we really have framed absenteeism as and attending school is like a binary. It's like a good or a bad thing, and I wonder if we should also be putting equal energy, if the goal is to improve student outcomes, I think we should be asking ourselves the question like, is attendance the only way to do that? And like, should we ask our questions like, how do we make more flexible learning environments? Like if kids can learn the thing somewhere else and are showing proficiency, should we care as much about what that perfect attendance

looks like or not? So, I just—I'm curious like what else is happening other than just like to get attendance up to sort of rethink the entire way we equate attendance with learning, which we all know often is not the case.

**LaNesha Battle:** Again, LaNesha Battle for the record. Thank you so much for that, Member Hughes. I'm glad to hear a lot of what you said. I think we do have to take some innovative looks in how we're educating students. I know for me myself personally, I know that after the pandemic, I think things shifted in how we are educating students because we were able to educate students and they were not in a seat in a classroom every day. So, we're—we are going to have to look at some more innovative ways, especially with our higher—meaning our high school students who, when we look at Washoe County's data, that's where they're seeing the struggle. We're going to have to look at some more innovative ways because we are hearing students who are saying that, well, I know I just need to be there to take the test. I don't need to be there every day. I'm going to pass the test. I'm good. I got it. Then we need to look at how we're engaging them and what we can do innovatively for absenteeism to lower those rates, because maybe they don't need to sit in a class every day to learn. But that has been the practice since the beginning of time of education, so it may be something that needs to evolve, which is probably a much bigger conversation than what I'm allowed to do, but I think it's something that we should take under high consideration.

**Vice President Hughes:** Yeah. Thank you. I appreciate that. Yeah, we're on the same wavelength there is there, just really quick follow-up technical question. I know that there's some federal sort of requirements, guidelines, what does, what flexibility, do we have any flexibility of how we define attendance? Like is it physically in the seat? And that's the only thing because that's federally defined, or do we, policy-wise, have some flexibilities around how we look at attendance?

**LaNesha Battle:** Right now, it's currently the practices that we are doing now are what we are allowed to do. Sorry LaNesha Battle for director. And so that's what we're going back currently now, so.

**Vice President Hughes:** Is this but that's at the state level?

**Deputy Superintendent Christy McGill:** Yeah. This is Christy McGill. Just to clarify, so right now our chronic absenteeism definition does reflect the federal definition. If it's something that we want to take a look at again, there's nothing saying that we can't change that. But you know again right now it's currently reflecting the federal definition, and I don't know all the ties of what we can and can't do, but that's something that interests you, we can definitely get those boundaries.

**President Dockweiler:** Got it. Thanks so much. That is very helpful. So, this is President Dockweiler. I would be very interested in having that information. What's federally required and defined and what, in statute or regulation, we may perhaps be supporting or upholding, that perhaps we no longer need to or could be considering doing a different way. This is making me think back to agenda item 8 and the information that you're collecting. How does the content of this presentation align to our mastery or mastery learning, and Nevada portrait of a learner and seat time and all the topics that we have brought up about shifting and—and rethinking how we deliver education to our students? But yet we're still using these old—old systems. So I don't—that's—that's a longer item, but definitely something important to have on the radar.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** Superintendent Wakefield for the record. What this conversation makes me want to do immediately and then there's also a lot longer conversation, is actually see if some of this theory plays out. So, can we compare schools that are using competency-based methods or portrait aligned learning and see if that is making a difference in terms of attendance and engagement? That's sort of one of the ideas. Another is work-based learning or CTE programs. I know that we've been watching the outcomes data we shared very excitedly that 98% of CTE completers graduated high school. I'm also curious if we could cut

the data on something like chronic absenteeism. The presentation today used MTSS methods and there is an uptick there for schools that use those methods or approach, right, in terms of their improvements around chronic absenteeism. But I wonder if we should I wonder if we could look at some of these other methods, organize our schools by who's in and out, and then see if that actually adds more, because that could be really interesting if they if we're seeing that improves engagement, it goes toward the state, maybe, you know, helping to push that further or if we see it doesn't make a difference on engagement, that'd be good to know, right? Because that's the narrative that it's supposed to help with. Student engagement looks like #4.

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you, Superintendent. Member Ford.

**Member Ford:** I just have a question or something about regarding the trends in chronic absenteeism, and I'm wondering, it looks like they're getting better. So, but how does that correlate to an enrollment data, like our is this the trends just for everybody or do we have the pocket of students who have been chronically absent and then only that pocket is improving and trending up because then it makes me think like, could we essentially if all the kids that were chronically absent and unenrolled then are we like, woohoo, we solved the problem? Not really. Yeah, just curious how we're tracking those two things in relation to each other.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** Yep. Superintendent Wakefield. And then we'll pass it to our data experts here. So, the question would be something like: do the chronic absentee rate trends also correlate with the enrollment trends in a district? Because we wouldn't want to see that chronic absenteeism's looking good, but actually enrollment's down because we just lost those students. Is that so I maybe y'all can all speak to what is available through this data or we can add it to our ever-growing list of the right data cuts to continue to explore.

**Deputy Superintendent Christy McGill:** This is Christy McGill for the record. So, we have not done that correlation between enrollment trends and chronic absenteeism. We can check in to see if that's possible. Washoe, have you done anything?

**Rochelle Murillo:** Not in relation to in the actual enrollment, but we could do those things. Some of the data points that you all are talking about we are looking at. So, we are looking at special populations. So for example, if we looked at our students with special education services, our English learners, our students who are homeless, we're seeing downward trends for all those special populations across in Washoe County, but we're still seeing high rates, especially for our students that are chronically absent or, I'm sorry, our students that are homeless and in foster care, we're still seeing very high rates for those special populations, but in terms of enrollment, we have not done that.

**President Dockweiler:** All right. Thank you. Well, it sounds like that will be added to the list. Any other board members? Member Braxton.

**Member Braxton:** Member Braxton for the record. Thank you for this presentation and director Battle, I have a question for you. Well, not question, but a request: I'd like to see more information regarding suspensions and mental health. How does that contribute to some of the MTSS offered? You know, when I think of suspensions, and I think of some of the items that were mentioned as to why students—there was a page that you had word listed why students were not attending school. There were different columns that included bullying. It included, you know, the myriads of those things. And then you look at the health aspect. You know, to my understanding, when a student is suspended, their instructional hours cease and—and due to certain health issues, the myriad, the spectrum of—of mental health issues, and instructional hours cease. So, what do we have to say about those students? I know we've discussed homeless students and students in foster care, but that list can be longer if we include these other communities.

**LaNesha Battle:** LaNesha Battle for the record. We are delving a little deeper, especially in our suspensions, because as you know we that is something that we are looking at our suspension data and if schools are disproportionately suspending groups of students. So that is something that we are delving into. We do not have the chronic absenteeism data as it relates to that, but that is something that we can add to the ever-growing list that I am going to make.

**Deputy Superintendent Christy McGill:** And just to add to that, Christy McGill. So we did a couple of evaluations and studies actually around this; we had a Trauma Grant that looked at the absenteeism rates of students receiving trauma services, and we did see for those young people that were receiving those services, they were more apt to stay in school, so that gave some again, these were very localized and pilots. And then we're also seeing that we're tracking in what's our data portal. Our behavioral BH works. We are seeing a small correlation, again, of increasing mental health services and being able to keep our children in school, and I was going to let Washoe are you seeing any of are you guys doing anything about tracking or seeing?

**Rochelle Murillo:** Yeah. So, we have looked specifically at suspensions and chronic absenteeism. What we have seen is that and this won't be a surprise to anyone but the more often a student is suspended, the greater their chronic absenteeism rates are, and the more likely that they will eventually drop out of school altogether. So we do see some of those correlations with suspensions and chronic absenteeism and then a final note is that part of the MTSS process is to take a look at suspension as a warning light and to do some targeted screening so that it's not just the just not the externalization of whatever is going on, and to really kind of delve deeper. And that's an MTSS approach to really look at if there's other factors that could be underlying the discipline.

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you. Any other? Member Carvalho.

**Member Carvalho:** Thank you. Thinking about Superintendent Wakefield's presentation earlier in our discussion regarding parent involvement and then hearing about the Family Resource Center that Washoe County described. I'm wondering if all of the counties have a family Resource Center within their districts. Does anybody know that? Because I think that absenteeism is not just a student issue. It's as we've heard, it's very much a family issue and it sounds to me like these this office does a good job of trying to, you know, give some of the services that might be needed because of the underlying issues of absenteeism, so greater supports for families to who support their students to go to school is really what I'm getting at with that question.

**Rochelle Murillo:** Rochelle Murillo for the record. I can address. So, there are family resource centers in every county, but they are typically run by nonprofits. Washoe County is the only family Resource Center that is under the umbrella of a school district. And I will say that all family resource centers are grant-funded and those grant funds are decreasing every year. And so, our ability to keep our family resource centers open and respond to the needs that families are seeking have decreased over time because our grants are decreasing. So one of our primary grants is funds for healthy Nevada tobacco tax and while tobacco use is decreasing, but that also means the revenue that comes in to support family resource centers is also decreasing and some of our federal grants that we access like Title 4B that does family preservation and supporting families who reunify after having their children removed in foster care and been reunified that's some of the support that we do as well, though they're being decreased this upcoming year too, so the funding and the grants are decreasing, but the need is increasing, at least from my perspective in Washoe.

**Deputy Superintendent Christy McGill:** And this is Christy McGill, just to piggyback on that. Washoe County I think is doing a beautiful job of something they call Community Schools. I got the joy of looking at Hug High School where the Family Resource Center is located in the school. This really could be a bright

spot and a model across the state and one of the policies we might want to consider is a joint effort with the Department of Health and Human Services to say this is a successful pilot of putting these family resource centers in schools, and we should see if we can work together to expand this strategy across the state. So just some considerations for your for some upcoming policy.

**LaNesha Battle:** And LaNesha Battle for the record. And the family resource centers are a beautiful part of making that more of a part of the community that it serves because it's kind of centrally located. It's a school. They can they're going to access it. You're taking your families are having whatever issue that they are having and that they may need some assistance with, then you're taking your child to school, the Resource Center is there. You're picking your child up from school, the Resource Center is there. Kind of just helps and it's a great way for that school to become more a part of that community and more stable, I guess you could say.

**President Dockweiler:** All right, Member Ford. And then we'll take any last closing questions for our presenters.

**Member Ford:** I just want to piggyback on that. Thank you for asking me for that question. And to put on the record that I have mentioned in meetings early this year, last year, Community Schools and that is something that you can call it a bright spot here. You can also call it a bright spot in many other states and districts and urban districts that are seeing a lot of success with the Community School model. So, the model is there. Here in Nevada and elsewhere. So, I think that that is worth its own agenda item when we talk about vision and having those conversations, especially with legislators, as that will require some other additional funding and work within the Community. So yes, 100. Thank you.

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you, Member Ford. Any other last questions or comments from board members? All right. Thank you, presenters, for sharing this information with us. We will now move on to agenda item 10.

#### **10. Information and Discussion Regarding the Nevada Graduation Rates** (*Information and Discussion*)

Administrator Peter Zutz and Dr. Gunes Kaplan presented the cohort graduation rate for the class of 2025.

- Statewide Rate: 85.4%, an increase of 3.8 percentage points over 2024.
- Diploma Types: 57.3% earned a standard diploma; 28.5% earned a College and Career Readiness (CCR) diploma; 13.6% earned an Advanced Diploma.
- CTE Students: Achieved a 98.8% graduation rate.

Board Discussion:

Member Hudson asked what practices drive the CCR growth and if these requirements are equitably accessible across rural and urban settings. She also asked how districts support students who are on track to graduate but not "CCR ready." Administrator Zutz stated that a comprehensive programmatic investigation would be needed to answer those specific questions.

Jake Miller (DETR) presented on the Npower system, Nevada's longitudinal data system. He showed career earnings reports by major and industry. He noted a major obstacle is the lack of "occupation codes" from employers, which prevents us knowing specifically what job an individual does within an industry (e.g., whether an education major is actually working as a teacher).

Renee Davis (NSHE) presented the college readiness data dashboard. She noted that graduation cohorts are followed for 200% of the normal time to graduate to see who completes or remains enrolled.

**Verbatim Transcript:**

**President Dockweiler:** The board will receive a presentation about Nevada graduation rates. This item will be presented by Peter Zutz, administrator with the Office of Assessment Data and Accountability Management, and Dr. Gunes Kaplan Education Program Supervisor, Office of Assessment, Data and Accountability. And as soon as you both are ready, please proceed.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** And I'll just make one comment briefly before just so that way we all have our lenses. This is designed to include three unique presentations, but I do hope we start to see them more interconnected. There's our NDE graduation rate presentation, then a brief NSHE announcement presentation, and then a DETR workforce presentation. I hope we see all of these data systems just continue to make progress and to become more interconnected. So, I want to honor the good work that's been done and also recognize that these might feel like three different distinct presentations and our goal long-term is for them to be integrated. So, with that, I'll pass it to director Zutz.

**[Nevada High School Class of 2023: Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates Presentation](#)**

**Peter Zutz:** Thank you so much. Superintendent Wakefield, Nevada State Board of Education, thank you for this invitation. My name is Peter Zutz. I'm the administrator of the Office of Assessment, Data and Accountability Management. I'll be sharing today's presentation on the class of '25 four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate with my colleague Dr. Gunes Kaplan. Next slide. Thank you. This slide shows the five-year trend in graduation rates by percentage and number of students. The statewide graduation rate for the class of 2025 is 85.4%, representing an increase of 3.8 percentage points compared to the class of 2024. The state's overall rate has remained above 80% for the past five consecutive years. Next slide. The slide has a lot of information. It's easy to unpack. What we're seeing here is a graph showing a comparison of the graduation rates for each Nevada school district for the past five years. For your reference, the statewide graduation rates are shown in the left-most columns of the chart. The blue horizontal dash line is the statewide graduation rate for the class of 2025 and is provided as a reference line. On the horizontal axis, we have the school districts. Each entity has five columns representing the last five years' graduation rates. There is also a data table below the graph with the last five years' graduation rates for each district. All data points are the graduation rates, information and data submitted, validated, confirmed and signed off by schools and Nevada school districts. Next please.

This graph shows the graduation rate trends for the three largest Nevada school districts over the last five years. For reference again, the statewide rates are in the left-most column in the graph. Please note on this graph that the vertical scale starts at 65% and not at 0. This was done to make it more visible to be able to discern between the rates more easily. Next, Kaplan.

**Dr. Gunes Kaplan:** Thank you. Gunes Kaplan for the record. This graph displays the race and ethnicity distribution of graduates of the class of 2025. Please note the data displayed here are not graduation rates, but the demographic breakdown of the 2025 graduating class by race and ethnicity. Values you see inside the bars represent the number of graduates in each race and ethnicity and the percentage values above the bars are computed by dividing the number of graduates in each race and ethnicity by the total number of graduates in the state, 34,175. Next slide please. This graph displays the five-year graduation trends for each racial and ethnic population. For your reference, the statewide all-student rates are in the left, most columns in the graph, and the blue horizontal dashed line is the statewide graduation rate and is provided as a reference line also. Please note that the vertical scale starts at 50% to make the graduation rate differences more visible.

**Dr. Gunes Kaplan:** Next slide please. This slide shows the graduation rate differences between the

individual racial ethnic populations and the all-student graduation rate. Now we are looking at a table that displays graduation rates across five years, with each row representing a graduation graduating class. The first column shows the all-students graduation rate. The columns next to it show how each student work compares to that rate measured in percentage points above or below the all-students average. Below this table you'll see some notes. Green numbers indicate student groups that are above the statewide average. Red numbers indicate student groups that are below the statewide average. Red Arrows indicate a widening in the opportunity gap, and green arrows indicate a closing in the opportunity gap. Now I would like to give an example. For students of two or more races, the first year shows a green 2.0, meaning their graduation rate was 2.0 points higher than the all-students rate in that specific year. In the next year, the value changes to -0.1 in red, meaning their rate was slightly lower than the all-students rate in that year. A red upward arrow indicates that the gap widened compared to the previous year. And in the following year, the value improves to a green 0.8, indicating their graduation rate was again above the all-students rate and the green downward arrow shows the gap narrowed compared to the year before.

Next slide please. This graph displays the distribution of graduates in each student group of the class of 2025. Values inside the bars represent the number of graduates in each student group and the percentage values above the bars are computed by dividing the number of graduates in each group by the total number of graduates, 34,175. Next slide please. This chart displays graduation rates for each of our Nevada student groups. For your reference, the statewide all-student rates are on the left, most columns in the graph, and the blue horizontal dash line is the statewide graduation rate and is provided as a reference line. Career technical education, CTE completion students, obtained one of the highest graduation rates of all student groups at 98.8%. And the military-connected students only have the data available for 2023, 2024 and 2025, and the CTE completer data is only available for 2025. And with that, I'm passing it back to administrator Zutz. Next slide please.

**Peter Zutz:** Thank you. OK. Let's round up this presentation by taking a look at the diploma types earned by the class of 2025. Next. The next two slides will show diploma types earned over the last five years. On this slide, the number of students that earned each diploma. Complete information on requirements for each diploma type can be found at the Nevada Department of Education website. So, I wanted to plug that if you want complete information on the requirements for each one of these diplomas, please visit NDE website. The college and Career Readiness Diploma has the same requirements as an advanced diploma but includes additional criteria such as completion of Advanced Placement coursework, dual credit college coursework and International Baccalaureate coursework as well as CCR college and career readiness endorsement requirements. Slide. Thank you. OK.

**Peter Zutz:** As we said, this slide similar to the last, only this slide shows the percent of students that earned each diploma type. Again, in this slide, you can see the predominance of standard diploma followed by college and career readiness diploma, followed by Advanced Diploma. Next slide. Now let's take a look just at the class in 2025. The previous two slides were five years. Let's take a look at the class of 2025. Of the 34,175 students who graduated in 2025, 19,591 or 57.3% earned a standard diploma, followed by the College and Career Readiness diplomas earned by 9746 students, or 28.5% of the graduates. And advanced diplomas were earned by 4665 students, or 13.6% of graduates. Students who received one of the four diploma types are considered graduates. This is the eighth year in a row Nevada awarded more than 30,000 diplomas in a year.

**Peter Zutz:** Next slide. On the next two slides, let's take a look at the type of diplomas broken down by race and ethnicity for the graduating class of 2025. This table may be read vertically and horizontally. Vertically, looking at the column for two or more races of students, that's third column from the right. There were 2371 students who graduated, and you can see that number in the bottom row. 2371 students graduated and 764 of these students earned the college and Career Readiness Diploma, which makes up 32.2% of the two or more-race graduate population. The table may also be read horizontally. Let's take a look at the standard

diploma row, which is the second from the bottom. You can see that this was the diploma most earned by all races and ethnicities, except for Asian students who earned more college and career readiness diplomas than standard diplomas. Next please.

**Peter Zutz:** So, this slide is a graphical representation of what we saw in the previous slide, and it shows the types of percentages of each diploma type earned by each race and ethnicity. The predominance of the standard lymphoma can clearly be seen here by the dark blue at the top of each column, followed by the college and Career Readiness Diploma in Gray and the Advanced Diploma in Yellow. Next slide. We wanted to thank everybody for your time today and please for additional information, visit the Nevada report card or e-mail us here at Adam Info. We are welcome to take any questions you may have at this time. Thank you.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** Superintendent Wakefield for the record. One thing to connect the dots based on earlier conversation today with the board. Can you just share how the diploma rates are calculated from a cohort perspective? There was a question on if a student were to leave the system, do they still get counted, so that would be impacting the graduation rate, or are they removed from it? Can you share brief information about that?

**Peter Zutz:** Thank you so much, Superintendent Lee, for that question. Well, we're honored to have Doctor Kaplan join us today for this conversation, because I think before your current position, for 10 years you ran the adjusted cohort graduation rate. So, I'm going to turn that question over to you, Doctor Kaplan, thank you.

**Dr. Gunes Kaplan:** Thank you, Dr. Gunes Kaplan, for the record. So, we do this work together with the school district's accountability staff. So, what we do is we pull data and ask the districts to review, and then they let us know basically if students are graduates or not. And to consider a student a graduate, they are supposed to receive standard, advanced, CCR or alternative diploma within a certain time frame. It's important. The establishment of the cohort starts when the student enrolls for the first time in a 9th grade in high school. So, then we track the students' high school life till the end of the 12th grade and then that's the major timeline.

**Dr. Gunes Kaplan** So we track the students over the course of four years from the time they start the 9th grade for the first time till they end the four years. And within that time frame, they are supposed to receive a standard, alternative, CCR or Advanced Diploma. Sometimes they may graduate early; they are still included within their cohort, and if they need more time to graduate then they may continue as a fifth-year senior and we also produce a five-year graduation rate including those fifth-year senior students.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** And if they were to transfer school districts, what would happen? And if they were to leave the system altogether, what would happen too?

**Dr. Gunes Kaplan:** Thank you. So, students can be counted as a transfer out if they successfully move from a school to another school, or from a district to another district, or if they move out of the state, as long as their parents alert the district, then they are counted as a transfer out. Another condition is they can also move out of country or if they pass away then they are also considered as a transfer out.

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you. Thank you, director Zutz and Dr. Kaplan. Any technical questions about this data for our presenters? At the end, we'll have a comprehensive discussion, but in essence of time, just want to move things along. If there are any technical questions? Vice President Hughes?

**Vice President Hughes:** Yeah. I just want to make sure I was fully following the last response. So if a

student exits for whatever reason—that they transfer out for whatever reason—they are not included in these numbers? So, the students who decided to homeschool or do whatever—they're not counted in this if at some point during that four years they transfer out of the system? Did I hear you right?

Dr. Gunes Kaplan: Kaplan for the record. That is correct. Home school students are not counted in this process and successful transfer out students—we do not report on that.

**Vice President Hughes:** Got it. Thank you. So that might just be, again, adding to the previous conversation, future data lists. I know districts would have to do some more digging, doing per-student sort of analysis, but I think that would be super helpful of: to what extent are these numbers impacted by students who are totally exiting our K12 system? Versus—you know, because my—my hunch is there's a portion of those students who are disengaged or not doing well. And so those are students who potentially were likely not on track to graduate, and so whether we're having some like false positives with some of the growth or not would be helpful to understand.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** Well, just to make sure we're following the question and we can do the data analysis, and this is Superintendent Wakefield for the record. If there's a transfer to another system, then you're not concerned about that, but is the concern—if they transfer to homeschool, and what proof we have that they're still being successful there? Is that where the question comes from—I shouldn't call it a concern.

**Vice President Hughes:** Yeah, I think it's just—like with declining enrollment not matching necessarily population decline, those kids are going somewhere. So, I think they're probably some students who opt into homeschool. There might be some students going to private school. I don't—like whoever we're not capturing who's not like a transfer to another system. So, I think it probably would mostly be homeschool. I think there's a larger question about like, where are those kids going if they're still in the state, but in so much as we have any sort of information on that, I think probably homeschool or if there's other big places students are going that we would stop tracking that would be helpful to see. Thank you.

**President Dockweiler:** All right, we have Member Ford and then member Hudson.

**Member Ford:** I just wanted to elaborate a little bit on that because I think that's really important and also for us to consider when we're talking about Nevada ratings, because the graduation rates do go into the ratings and we're compared to other States and charter schools and whatnot. But I recognize that if a parent, you know, goes through different state, takes their kid and tells the school that it would then transfer, my understanding of it from hearing from principals over the years is that that doesn't usually happen. And then because Nevada specifically, Clark County is such a transient city, Las Vegas, you know—that it's like happening a lot more in different pockets. And my understanding is that a lot of principals, this is one of their biggest frustrations because they have to spend a lot of time like scouring social media and trying to find a student who went somewhere else. And then trying to connect with that school and get confirmation if it was all transferred so that their individual schools' graduation rates aren't dinged, which then dings the county and the district and Nevada. So my understanding was that that is a really big issue to address and that those transfers aren't just like immediately going through system to system. Well, thank you.

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you, member Hudson.

**Member Hudson:** OK I have like 3 questions. The first question, and I'm only going from experience because my son graduated from CTE, but I wasn't aware that he wasn't prepared for the standard diploma per NSHE. So it was like a clear—I didn't have an understanding as a parent the difference of the two, but good thing he went into the field that he got his diploma in. But anyway, so I was just wondering, have you guys looked at what practices are driving the CCR growth and how are we scaling those? And then my next question—I don't know if you want me to stop in between the questions for you to answer them—oh, and

Tamara Hudson, for the record, I do apologize. Why can't I just keep going with my questions? How would y'all like them?

**Superintendent Wakefield:** Please.

**Member Hudson:** OK. And then my next one would be, are the CCR requirements equitably accessible across like the rural, urban and charter settings just to make sure that all those students do have access and could get those? And then how are the districts—are you looking at how the districts are supporting students who are not on track to graduate? Or they are on track to graduate but not the CCR ready, if that makes sense? That's where my parenting lens came in at.

**Superintendent Wakefield:** And this is Superintendent Wakefield to help just channel the questions appropriately. The team that's presenting today is going to be really good with the quantitative analysis of what the numbers say. I'm hearing in your question a combination of just what are the numbers, but also what is driving them. More programmatic questions, more strategy questions and that is something that I deeply care about. I don't want to put this team on the spot to think that they have to answer some of those pieces. So why don't we see what they know offhand, and then we can write down all the other questions and we can follow up with you from the departments within NDE that would know more what efforts are underway. And it also may be the sort of thing that we have to learn more from districts—hey, what are you doing that's driven the progress or what has happened that we're seeing the decline? That's sort of where my mind goes. So, I just wanted to help connect those dots.

**Peter Zutz:** Peter Zutz for the record, Superintendent Wakefield. Thank you for your insightful comment. Indeed, the nuance of a comprehensive answer to your questions must include all the programmatic offices here in the department and their counterparts in the district to understand what's going on. For example, your second question: are the requirements either course offerings etcetera for completion of a college and career Readiness diploma provided in every single district in every single school across Nevada? I can't answer that. That's a great example of the need for a really robust, comprehensive and collaborative investigation to understand a rather simple question, I would offer. And then your initial question was a bit more complex. Again, we don't have that information here today. We have captured the question. We look forward to bringing that information to the State board once we have it. Thank you.

**President Dockweiler:** No, thank you. Excellent. Thank you, team. All right, seeing no further questions, we will move on to the second component of this agenda item, which will be presented by Jake Miller with the Nevada Department of Employment Training and Rehabilitation.

**Jake Miller:** Hi. Thank you everyone. If I talk from here, can you hear and see me, OK?

**President Dockweiler:** Yes, perfect.

### [DETR Power Point Presentation](#)

**Jake Miller:** Thank you. Yeah, I'm Jake Miller. I'm the NPWR manager at DETR. NPWR is Nevada's statewide longitudinal data system, and I wanted to just really quickly talk about our program today. We want it to be as useful and involved as it can be. And so I'm going to summarize it briefly, go through some examples of the program's capabilities and future goals, and I can reference some of the things that we've talked about today. Next slide. Our three core data partners that contribute to the system are DETR, NDE and NSHE. Essentially what we do is we take data from those three state agencies—individual level data—and we link the data for those individuals together to form single longitudinal records. The big contributors are wage data from DETR, the grad data from NDE and the grad data from NSHE. In addition to those big

ones we do also include adult education participation. We have workforce participation from DETR and then some other stuff from NDE, like CTE participation, assessment scores, things like that. Demographics, lots of demographic stuff.

**Jake Miller:** This is really the only way that the state can view the outcomes of the policies and programs that happen upstream in NDE and NSHE and then see where those individuals end up downstream in the job market. It also allows for an assessment of the current job market. You can see gaps and then you can follow those gaps back and see how that's linked to that individual's experience in the education system. And then the last thing I would say that we provide is we can take those outcomes and they can be reported on for state and federal requirements. So, like one example is something called the Perkins report that examines the CTE performance and that's something that we produce for that office every year. So basically, what we can provide is the raw data. Together, we can turn that raw data into reports and dashboards that we post publicly, and the most advanced work that we can provide is research into, you know, whatever topics that you can pull out of the data. And really quickly, I just wanted to highlight that we've recently produced a few research reports that deal directly with some of the topics we talked about. We have a great one on the enrollment Cliff and another one on teacher retention—those are hosted on NPWR's website, and I'd be happy to share them around if folks wanted to see more about that as well.

**Jake Miller:** Next slide. So, I'm just going to show a few examples of some of the work we're currently doing and kind of show this can be replicated in a number of other ways that NDE might find useful. So this first one here is a performance dashboard for the adult education and Family Literacy Act program. At the top of the graph there you can see it's measuring MSG or measurable skills gain by year and then we're breaking it down by agency, which are the community colleges throughout the State, age range, demographics, gender, race. And this is a good example I think, because a lot of the programs that we manage in the state come from either federal funding or state funding, but that funding usually includes civil rights requirements, things you know you have to prove that the members of the public are being reached equally, and so graphs like this are a really nice way to prove that or identify if that isn't happening. For example, in the bottom right corner, it looks like the race and ethnicity is pretty well balanced, but if you saw a stark drop in one of those categories, you know where you can improve. And then the other thing I wanted to highlight here is this is an example of a way to measure certain programs' return on investment, so to speak, or like a data-driven proof of effectiveness. So if you ever find that a program might need to justify its existence or justify its funding allocation, that can be done with a dashboard like this, and a researcher can even take those MSG items listed on the left there and they could extrapolate that into should you ever need this they could extrapolate it into economic growth or state GDP growth or something like that. So, I wanted to highlight that we have another one of these for CTE and we could produce others as needed.

**Jake Miller:** Next slide please. This next one is the career earnings report, and this is split up by NSHE's instructional program or I guess major. This one I thought was good to highlight because I think it's important for career planning. You can see it's split up by graduating year and you could track over the years: is there a trend up or down in one of these programs to inform you know, maybe where you should focus and you can also decide you know, is the average salary in one of these programs, could it even sustain a future student loan debt that might incur while you're attending? So, I think it's an important thing for people to be aware of. And you can see in our state, there's really only a small number of programs that see significantly increased average wages over there on the left and everything else is pretty homogeneous. And I thought that was really interesting because we're going to see this replicated again in the next slide. Let's look at the next slide.

**Jake Miller:** So, this is average wage by industry. So, this is decoupled from NSHE now and instead we're focusing on just every everyone who's employed in Nevada by industry. And if you slice that graphic on the

right in half and laid it down, it's basically the same shape. So, it's encouraging to kind of see that the data that was put together is reinforced in different ways. But then I just wanted to highlight again this is a good one for career planning as well. You can see which industries are maybe a little bit more, you know, lucrative and then you can compare this to the programs of study, and you can see how they'll sort of both inform an individual's outcome. You know, you could work in the insurance industry, and you may have majored in, like, math, IT, social science, communications well, you have a very different outcome from that same major who might be working in gaming, gambling. On average, those wages vary quite a bit. So, I wanted to highlight that.

**Jake Miller:** Lastly, next slide please. I wanted to mention a few things that we are planning for the future and just highlight some kind of known obstacles with what we can offer. So really quick, at DETR, we know we're going to be including unemployment insurance claim data in our existing data set and that can just be another factor to evaluate outcomes. You know you can explore what populations maybe have more frequent unemployment insurance claims, which NSHE majors have more or less, which demographic groups have more or less, which counties in the state, which industries. So, it's a good measure of outcomes there. You can also find positive indicators like, for example, is a CTE participant less likely to see UI claims in the future? And so, we're targeting September of this year to be able to provide information on that.

**Jake Miller:** A major obstacle that I just wanted to make everybody aware of is something we can't provide is the occupation code. So, in the last two graphs we saw, we can look at industry, but I can't tell you what your job was in that industry. And that's because employers don't report that to DETR. And I think the only way to change that would probably be legislation. But if that were to change, we could be much more specific in terms of outcomes. We can say not just what industry you worked in, but what you actually did in that industry. Were you an accountant? Were you an executive? It would be really informative for everybody. So, I wanted to highlight that.

**Jake Miller:** Then, specifically concerning NDE, we know one of the challenges with NDE data is that I think the department is sort of at the mercy of what data they get from the school districts, and so broadly, the more data that can be collected from the school districts in a homogenized way, the more we can turn that into something useful. So, a few things I think would be important to take a look at are non-graduates. That way we can analyze like really concretely: what are the differences between graduating and not graduating high school? And then, I know we don't collect this now, but I did want to highlight—since we were talking about it—chronic absenteeism. That isn't currently a data point that we collect on individuals, but if it were to be in the future, we could link that directly to NSHE and DETR and I could tell you, you know, empirically: is there an average difference in salary between somebody who was chronically absent in high school and not? Was there a difference in NSHE's population between a chronically absent student and one who wasn't? Or then conversely, like we were talking about, is there no real difference? And then maybe that's a much bigger question, but if we had that data coming into NPWR we'd be able to answer that question. Same with suspensions or MTSS tiers. Basically, whatever can be included and provided to NPWR, we can give you that really long-term outcome of ultimately: how does this really impact someone's career—their job stability? Later on, we plan to include their participation in things like social service programs or the Department of Corrections, stuff like that. So, we'll expand it more, but ideally you want to improve workforce outcomes, and one of the best ways to do that is to tweak things upstream in K through 12 and higher education.

**Jake Miller:** So that's my summary there. I'd be happy to answer any questions. I know that was quick and broad, and I'd also be happy if anybody wants to reach out to me directly, I'd be happy to talk more about our program too, so thank you.

**President Dockweiler:** Thank you, Mr. Miller. You received a bunch of positive affirmations to some of the connections that you mentioned relative to the data collection. So, thank you for the presentation and the information. I believe we have some board members who would like to speak. Vice President Hughes will start us off.

**Vice President Hughes:** Thank you and appreciate the presentation. Super interesting to see all of this. I had a few questions just about Slide 4, just for clarification. That is, the median wages. So, I'm assuming that this is all Nevada employer data. So, are these all Nevada-based organizations or this when you're tracking salaries or this is like people who are like living in Nevada but maybe working for a company that's not based here? Is it sort of all the above or is it just Nevada specific industries?

**Jake Miller:** That's a good question. The employer does not have to be based in Nevada, but the employee does. So basically, it's sort of the same way that your tax information works, your employer reports unemployment insurance data to DETR. That employer could be based anywhere in the country, but if they have employees in Nevada, then they'll report on those employees and that's what we're looking at. So, for example, we have Microsoft in Reno. We get data from them, but it's just their Nevada data. We don't get everything from Microsoft.

**Vice President Hughes:** Got it. OK, that is helpful. And then thinking about that same slide, I think I heard you say this obviously, I'm assuming, known as a state how many people are in each of those codes who are employed by each of those. Can we how far down can we drill that so we can say how many people from Washoe County School district are within each of these or who graduated from one of these systems? Like, can we get to the school level—how far down could we get about sort of looking at pathways of where people are ending up based on their K12 or NSHE experience?

**Jake Miller:** That's a good question too. Thank you. For NDE, I believe the as specific as we can get is county. I don't think we can go I think for certain purposes it might be nice to be able to go down to like the school level, for example. But I think we can get down to county and then for NSHE we can isolate it to the specific institution. So, we can break it down into, you know, UNR or TMCC, that kind of thing.

**Vice President Hughes:** Got it. Cool. Thank you.

**President Dockweiler:** All right, we have Member Braxton and then member Carvalho.

**Member Braxton:** Member Braxton for the record, and perhaps you addressed this already, but I'm curious to know the connection that ties DMV with the DETR and NDE information.

**Jake Miller:** Yes, thank you for bringing that up. I had that as a bullet point and I totally skipped it. Yeah, so this is really important. We've been working with the DMV for the past three years to incorporate their data into our program—not to expose any—there's no real reason to expose DMV data, but we need it in order to link multiple data sets together, and we've had varying levels of success over the years, and I think we're closing in on a high point with that. But I did want to highlight it because NSHE is great because NSHE collects a lot of data for all their participants and it makes it really easy to link their records to NDE and to DETR. So, if you're in higher education, we can say a lot about you. If you do not enter into the higher education system and you go straight from high school into the workforce or not, it's extremely hard to link those individual records because there's really no commonalities. We pretty much only collect the Social and in NDE we don't. And so, it's very difficult to form that connection and what we plan to do—and what I think we're closing in on this year is we plan to take the DMV and just use it as that connection because they have the biggest population of Nevadans in general. And we can take their common data points and link it to NDE and DETR without the need to kind of go through the higher education system. So

we had their participation in the past, we lost it, and I think we're very close to getting it back this year. The challenge is that there's no legislative sort of requirement for them to do so. So, it's just been a long process, but I think close.

**Member Braxton:** Thank you. You know, I think of the tax information that's often placed in FAFSA and then perhaps that information is used through NSHE collecting data on parents and students and so forth. But I know you know, I'm just thinking of FAFSA, where there's a question about parent education attainment. But I don't think that there are ties to the location of where the parents obtained their educational attainment, right? So, you know, if I'm tracking a student or tracking their parents, tracking a family, I want to track to a certain institution that can of course, track to a county, a zip code. And maybe there's some correlation with high schools, right? So back to Member Hughes' question about K through 12 data tracking student success from K12 to employment, what would that look like? Well, it's not always just one-to-one tracking the student, but tracking through the multiple agencies that collect information.

**Jake Miller:** That's right. And I think one of the really long-term sort of things to be hopeful about is our program is somewhat new it's existed in some form for only about 10 years, and so I know this is really looking forward in the future, but once we are one generation into the data, we'll have the parents and the children both in the system and it'll be much easier to form a multi-generational picture. It's just that the data we have now doesn't have to go back that far. The closest that we're getting to it, I think, is we do also want to be able to incorporate DHHS at some point. Now obviously that's a very slim segment of the population focused in really only one area, but they happen to have they make the connection for like household, for example. So, you can have the parents and the children, and the data linked that way. It's limited, but it is at least available now. Short of that, it would have to yeah, I mean it would have to be something that was standardized from the school district itself. But I think that would be challenging.

**Member Braxton:** Sure. Thank you.

**President Dockweiler:** All right, we've got member Carvalho and then we'll move on to our last presentation of this agenda item.

**Member Carvalho:** Thank you. I had first heard what you're saying about perhaps some more information needs to be acquired through legislation, so I think that that's something that may be important for us all to advocate for when it gets closer to the next legislative session. I know that within NSHE we've been very excited about what we can continue to collect in terms of information for our students there and workforce and I think it's very important to have this information. It's interesting to me that I know that, at least in NSHE, we've used Lightcast for some data collection, but it sounds like a lot of that comes from DETR. So that's interesting to me. I did have one specific question: what about military enlistment? Do you collect any information on that?

**Jake Miller:** Good question. Thank you. We don't currently. We have two potential areas that we can collect it from. It's possible we can get it from the DMV, although we're not sure yet. We do have on our board a member, a representative from the Nevada Department of Veteran Services. And so I think if we can form an agreement with them, we will have a part of that picture. Now they'll only have veteran status. They won't necessarily have current enlistment. So, we'll probably be a little bit limited with that.

**Member Carvalho:** Thank you. I think that information would also be useful. So, if there's anything that we can help advocate on for that, I'd be much interested in that. Thank you.

**President Dockweiler:** Great question, member Carvalho. Excellent. Link to that data would be helpful to have. All right. Thank you, Mr. Miller and DETR, for all the work that you're doing.

**President Dockweiler:** All right. Thank you, Mr. Miller and DETR, for all the work that you're doing. We'll now transition to Renee Davis, Associate Vice Chancellor for academic and student affairs with the Nevada System of Higher Education. Thank you for being here with us today.

[NSHE College Readiness Data Dashboard Presentation](#)

**Renee Davis:** Thank you for having me. Good afternoon. Renee Davis, associate vice chancellor for academic and student affairs. Next slide please. So, I'm so glad that I followed Jake because he has explained NPWR and I—so I won't need to spend any time on that. But it is important to note that a lot of the data that we use in our dashboards... does come from NPWR, so it's a combination mainly of NPWR and then our student data warehouse which we maintain internally at the system level. That contains data that's reported in by all of our institutions.

**Renee Davis:** You'll see at the top of this slide regarding the college readiness data dashboard there's a link there, and if you happen to be on a device right now, I would encourage you to click on that and follow along as best you can because you're going to get a better view of the data than what I was able to include in the screenshots. These are publicly available dashboards on our website. Easy to navigate and there's an extensive section on definitions and methodology so it explains where the data comes from, how it's defined, which I think will be very helpful. Next slide please.

**Renee Davis:** So, we're going to start out with the College Continuation tab on the dashboard. On the slides, you'll see that there are 4 colored bars for each year:

- Continuation to NSHE is in the light blue.
- Continuation to "other" is gold (this includes out-of-state institutions or private Nevada institutions).
- Green is continuing to the workforce.
- And orange is continuation unknown.

**Renee Davis:** There's a pretty big population that's unknown. That population could be they moved out of state, so they're not based in Nevada anymore, or it could be that we don't have a good match. That goes back to what Jake brought up regarding the DMV match that helps us be more precise. Next slide please. Moving on, we actually are changing tabs... to the NSHE Capture Rate, which is basically drilling down on the actual NSHE figures. This particular dashboard I love because it has four levels of data that you can delve into.

**Renee Davis:** You'll see there '22-23 is on the far right with the purple bar. Click on that, and it takes us to the next level. Next slide. Now within that '22-23, you'll see there's a breakdown by institution. This is looking at: of the students who continued, what diploma did they earn prior to enrolling at NSHE? It's pretty interesting to see the distribution between the four diploma types: the standard college and career ready, the advanced, the standard, and then also the alternative diploma.

**Renee Davis:** Next slide. If you have clicked on the UNLV column, this is what you would see. It has the same distribution by race and ethnicity and diploma type. And that is level three of four. Next slide. Then you'll see overtime data on a specific race or ethnicity at a specific institution and how that has changed. Next slide. That was a really quick overview of just one of the areas. On the overall College Readiness

**Renee Davis:** Dashboard, you'll see other information such as:

- The ACT score data averages for those who continued.
- Where those ACT scores fit with the national averages.
- Measures of college readiness.

**Renee Davis:** We also have many other dashboards available on our website. There are some basic things where we employ data that comes from IPEDS, which is a federal requirement. We pull that data and build these dashboards on awards conferred and graduation rates. There's one called an Outcome Measure that I think you would all find very interesting because rather than just looking at the first-time full-time cohort of students, it looks at all students at a given institution, and it follows them for 200% of the time it would normally take to graduate and you see what happens. How many graduate, how many stay enrolled? It disaggregates that data by Pell eligibility. That's actually my favorite dashboard.

**Renee Davis:** We have many other dashboards: Completion and Workforce (using NPWR data), a plethora of information on our Dual Enrollment dashboard, and information on Gateway Course Outcomes (the initial math and English courses all students are required to take). I will pause there. Next slide. I just want to recognize that Jose Martinez, our director of institutional research, is the main architect of all of our dashboards. He's supported by Sarah Echo, our SLDS analyst. So, I'm ready for questions if there are any.

**President Dockweiler:** Wonderful. Thank you, Miss Davis. Quick question, where the data ends with the '22-23 school year is there a plan to upload the last two years as well?

**Renee Davis:** Yes. So right now, the folks who collaborate on the SLDS are working on the '23-24 group and that data... I think sometime in February that should be finalized. We are looking at data on that continuation a whole year after high school graduation, so the '24-25 wouldn't be available until about a year or so from now because we'll need all of that year of data from all of the partners before we can actually do the continuation for the '25 class.

## 11. Public Comment #2

President Dockweiler opened the second period of public comment.

Angie Castellanos read a written comment from Erika Nungori, a parent of a student with autism. Ms. Nungori highlighted a disparity in transition support for students with disabilities compared to their peers. She stated that while her son had a 3.4 GPA, his planning focused primarily on high school graduation rather than college-level expectations and application processes. She urged the Board to ensure equitable access to career-ready pathways for students with disabilities.

*(Full public comment was read into the record: See appendix)*

### **Verbatim Transcript:**

**President Dockweiler:** All right. Thank you. We have no public comments in person in Las Vegas. Madam Secretary, have any been submitted online?

**Angie Castellanos:** We have one that was submitted online. This public comment was submitted by Erika Nungori.

**President Dockweiler:** All right. Thank you very much. So that is our only public comment submitted online. So, we will close out public comment #2 and we will move on to agenda item 12, our future agenda item request.

## 12. Future Agenda Items *(Information and Discussion)*

The following topics were suggested for future agendas:

1. President Dockweiler noted that a special meeting would likely be needed in late February for regulatory hearings.
2. Member Carvalho suggested continuing the conversation on community schools and family resource centers.
3. Member Braxton requested a discussion on ceremonial swearing-in for new members, noting her own experience was "ambiguous" compared to other boards. She also requested clarification on board member compensation (\$90 per meeting), noting that elected members had not yet received pay.
4. Member Dawson Owens requested to understand how students navigate career opportunities and navigate the high ratio of students to counselors.
5. Member Orr requested more information regarding future state assessments to ensure the Board is informed before "crunch time."

### **Verbatim Transcript**

**President Dockweiler:** Board members are now invited to suggest topics for future agendas. Board member requests will be reviewed by the board president and Superintendent, who will determine the most appropriate format for addressing the topic, whether as a formal agenda item for discussion or action. As an informational update or as a memo, providing initial context and responses to any questions asked. Based on the information we received earlier from Superintendent Wakefield relative to our regulatory obligations, it looks like the board will need to hold a special meeting for those hearings. Looking at it probably in order to maintain compliance with deadlines mid to late February. So, board members can expect an e-mail from the board secretary. To set up a date that is mutually agreeable to most members so that we have quorum for that meeting. Any other future agenda items that we would like to make request about Member Carvalho and then Member Braxton.

**Member Carvalho:** Thank you. I'd like to suggest continuing a conversation regarding Community Schools and also family resource centers.

**Member Braxton:** All right. Thank you. And this is a member, Braxton. For the record, this is a little light last year. You know, when we had our new Members come on board, those who were elected or appointed, there was no ceremonial swearing in, and other boards do have other boards, meaning CCSD and other districts. Do have a ceremonial swearing in and you know with my experience last year it was ambiguous. So, I'd like for us to address that, what that would look like, especially being that this is our first meeting for the new Year. And also, you know, for those of us who are elected, we have a deadline tomorrow to submit those financial disclosure reports, and we have to indicate how much compensation we've received. We've not received compensation. I haven't had any other board members receive compensation yet. OK. So perhaps that could be addressed somehow in some way. Thank you.

**President Dockweiler:** Yeah, absolutely. And thank you for bringing that to the forefront. Thank you. And definitely not light. It's important those ceremonies are important and also the pay that we're even though it's, you know \$90.00 per meeting, and I think you know still it's something it'll pay for the extra gas that it takes to get here. Thank you for bringing that forward. Any other board members member Dawson Owens.

**Member Dawson Owens:** I don't know if I'm the only one, but I I'm wondering if we might be able to understand as a board more. I'm curious about how a student in our systems understands about the opportunities that are available for them or what's available. I mean it probably differs between our charter schools. Between districts. But if, if I'm a student and I want, you know, to start working or I want, you know, to start on my path to college, or I want to, what careers are out there? What exists in the state of Nevada? How easy is that for a student to navigate? Again, I'm concerned about that high ratio of the counselors meeting with students maybe once twice a year. And I know that every school seems to maybe

be a little different. I don't know if there's a standardized thing. If I, you know, at my school. I know if I go and make an appointment, I can learn more and get. Information I feel like a lot of that burden is on the schools. I'm not sure how the whole thing works honestly, and just the effectiveness and the streamline it because again that is our ultimate goal. I think it is them graduating and having that success and being connected to opportunities within the Community and the businesses and jobs and knowing also what. Available in the north right for jobs and future employment. So that's just an area I'm interested in.

**President Dockweiler:** I'll add one. Few meetings ago we talked about AI and how prepared students may or may not be, and we also talked about durable skills, and I think we had a little bit of a conversation about understanding where those already exist in our current content standards.

**President Dockweiler:** But I don't think we actually name that as a future agenda item. So, I think that could be helpful again in time. Time frame is flexible, but I think that's come up a few times in a few conversations. Great. Thank you. All right, not seeing any additional requests. We'll move on to agenda item 13, which is adjournment.

### 13. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 12:54 P.M.

#### Verbatim Transcript

**President Dockweiler:** So, as a reminder, our next regularly scheduled board meeting will take place on Wednesday, March 11th at 9:00 AM and please expect that special Board meeting sometime in February. Additionally, the NRS388 G Subcommittee meeting will take place on Wednesday, February 4th, and the State Board policy agenda subcommittee meeting will take place on Thursday, February 5th. So, thank you all for your efforts with that. And unless there are any additional questions, this meeting is adjourned 12:54 pm.

**Appendix A: Statements given during public comments**

1. Anna Binder, Community Member, provided public comment regarding item 10 during public comment period #1.
2. Jeff Church, Community Member, provided public comment regarding item 9 during public comment period #1.

**Appendix A, Item 1: ANNA BINDER**

Good morning, Madam President members of the board Superintendent Wakefield. I want to acknowledge today's presentation on graduation rates and the importance of continuing to examine how we define a measure student success in Nevada. Graduation data matters not simply as a reporting requirement but as a reflection of whether our systems are truly serving all students in meaningful ways. That is especially true for students with disabilities whose outcomes are often summarized in ways that flatten complexity and masks structural barriers. While overall graduation rates may show progress, they do not on their own tell us enough about how students with IEPs and 504 plans are navigating diploma pathways accessing coursework or being supported toward post-secondary readiness. These nuances matter because the type of diploma a student earns and the path they are placed on has real and lasting implications for employment, higher education and independence. Our work in the our interest in this work is not limited to CC and our diplomas alone. We are asking for a broader more comprehensive exploration of how all diploma pathways are functioning for special education students particularly access to and completion of the standard diplomas. That includes examining how and when diploma track decisions are made. What supports are available at the point those decisions occur and whether students are being given meaningful opportunities to pursue a standard diploma with appropriate accommodations and instructional support? This is not about or it is about understanding whether our systems are aligned with the values we say we hold? High expectations equity and meaningful outcomes for students as part of this effort. The Nevada governor 's council on developmental disability. Has extended an invitation to the youth Advisory Council to explore whether they may be interested in partnering with this work and we're waiting to hear back from them, and I want to let you guys know that Superintendent Wakefield is already accommodating his schedule for a meeting in this? Regard so I just want to let you guys know that and that work is very important to us. So, thank you for your time and for your continued commitment to ensuring that graduation represents real opportunity, thank you.

**Appendix A, Item 2: JEFF CHURCH**

My comment concern agenda item 9 and in general:

Hello to Dr. Victor Wakefield, LaNesha Battle and all.

Regarding Chronic Absenteeism, may I opine that nothing will change until attendance is mandatory. Allowing kids to be 95% absent and engage is so called "Credit Recovery" is a disservice to all.

Graduation rates are meaningless. Nevada consistently is at the bottom or near bottom in every survey. What are the ACT rates in Nevada and each District? Impossible to find but dead last nationwide. They are approx. 17.2, last (sorry Mississippi 17.7).

WCSD claimed slight improvement in absenteeism but won't tell you that high school absenteeism is UP, not down. WCSD High School Absenteeism, it's 39.2%! from 38.6. Hug HHS rose to 60%. No tickertape parade needed.

Giving Washoe a break, how bad does it have to be for a state take over? I have Mineral County plates on my car from the old days but now:

2024-2025 Mineral At a Glance

Per Pupil Expenditures \$23,212

Graduation Rate 76.7%

Chronic Absenteeism Rate 34.4%

ELA Proficiency High 15.3%

Math Proficiency High <5%

Finally, please support whatever decision our US Supreme Court makes including on the Gender Spots issue. We are a nation of laws.