Nevada Department of Education
Nevada State Board of Education
July 30, 2025
9:00 AM

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

Summary Minutes of the Board Meeting

Board Members Present
Dr. Katherine Dockweiler, President
Tim Hughes, Vice President
Tamara Hudson, Board Clerk
Tricia Braxton
Annette Dawson Owens
Tate Else
Danielle Ford
Evana Lan
Angela Orr

Board Members Absent Excused
Mike Walker

Department Staff Present
Dr. Steve Canavero, Interim Superintendent of Public Instruction
Lisa Ford, Interim Deputy Superintendent for the Student Achievement Division
Angie Castellanos, Administrative Assistant
Zach Khan, Administrative Assistant

Legal Staff Present
Greg Ott, Chief Deputy Attorney General

Audience in Attendance
Dr. Laura Davidson, Director of Research and Evaluation, Washoe County School District
Candance Marijevic, Government Affairs Liaison, Washoe County
Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association

1. **Call to Order, Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance, and Land Acknowledgement**
   Meeting called to order at 9:15 A.M. by President Dockweiler. Quorum was established. President Dockweiler led the Pledge of Allegiance and provided a land acknowledgement.

2. **Public Comment #1**
   i. Dr. Laura Davidson provided public comment regarding agenda item 9
   ii. Candace Matijevic provided public comment regarding agenda item 16
   iii. Chris Daly provided public comment regarding agenda item 10
   iv. Michael O'Dowd provided public comment regarding agenda item 9
   v. Andrea Schulewitch provided public comment regarding agenda item 16
   vi. Gary Butcher provided public comment regarding agenda item 8

vii. John Hammond provided public comment regarding agenda item 8
viii. Darla Lee provided public comment regarding agenda item 8

3. **Approval of Flexible Agenda**
Member Ford moved to approve a flexible agenda. Member Hudson seconded. Motion passed.

4. **President's Report**
President Dockweiler reported that Vice President Hughes would be reappointed to the Commission for Innovation and Excellence in Education to ensure continuity.

At-Risk Subcommittee
Member Orr reported that the At-Risk Subcommittee met on June 30th and received data linking specific student categories (McKinney-Vento, direct certification for Medicaid) to state assessment performance. The committee determined several categories for at-risk funding and requested modeling of these categories for a comparison to the model of gradual growth. The subcommittee plans to bring suggestions to the full Board at the October meeting.

NRS 388G Subcommittee
Member Braxton reported that the formerly known AB 469 Subcommittee unanimously voted to update its name to the NRS 388G Subcommittee to reflect the current statute, SB 460. The subcommittee passed a motion to formally invite public and stakeholder input through listening sessions and discussed a preliminary timeline for internal review and public workshops.

5. **Interim Superintendent's Report**
   - Nevada Department of Education Updates
     - Request for Proposal Timeline for the State Assessment System (Nevada Alternate Assessment, Grades 3-8 English Language Arts, and Mathematics, Science Grades 5, 8 and 11).

Interim Superintendent Dr. Steve Canavero recognized the work of Interim Deputy Superintendent Lisa Ford. He provided an update on legislative implementation, including the July 10th memorandum outlining the omnibus approach to the first quarter of implementation work. Dr. Canavero also informed the Board of a strategy being considered to postpone the state assessment system procurement for one additional year to allow time for the Nevada School Performance Framework and other SB 460 work to conclude.

6. **Informational Updates** *(Information Only)*
   - Historical Overview of State Board of Education Authority Over Superintendent of Public Instruction Appointments (1861–2011)

This agenda item was for informational purposes only and did not require formal board approval. The item included a historical overview of the State Board of Education's authority over the Superintendent of Public Instruction appointments from 1861-2011.

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 Private School License Renewals and New Private School Licenses
   b. FY25 Q3 CSR Report
   c. FY24 Condition of School Facilities Report
   d. Nevada Pre-Kindergarten Social Emotional Standards, Revised 2025

e. Possible Approval of Washoe County School District Dual Credit Course List
f. Possible Approval of State Board of Education Meeting Minutes, June 25, 2025
g. Possible Approval of "At-Risk" Subcommittee Meeting Minutes, June 30, 2025
h. Possible Approval of AB469 Subcommittee Meeting Minutes, July 9, 2025
i. Possible Approval of State Board of Education Meeting Minutes, July 17, 2025

President Dockweiler asked for any items to be pulled from the consent agenda, and Item e was pulled for a future meeting.

Member Hughes asked a clarifying question about the social-emotional standards for pre-K (Item D) and its alignment with the "Portrait of a Learner" initiative. NDE staff confirmed that the portrait was a part of the development process for the social-emotional standards.

Member Orr suggested that in the future, the board should always pull standards from the consent agenda to have a robust discussion.

Member Hughes moved to approve the consent agenda, and Member Hudson seconded the motion. The motion passed with all in favor.

8. **Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action for the State Superintendent Search** *(Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action)*

The board discussed and took action on matters related to the State Superintendent search.

a. Review and discussion of cumulative rubric scores:
The board reviewed the candidate score matrix to select a slate of candidates to interview. The top-ranked candidates were 11, 16, 8, 18, and 7.

Member Ford stated that she would oppose the motion, arguing that some candidates who ranked high did not have a background that aligned with public education and that she would have preferred a leader with recent classroom experience.

Member Dawson Owens moved to move forward with the top six candidates, and Member Hughes seconded the motion. The motion passed with five members in favor, one opposed (Member Ford), and one abstention (Member Braxton), making the top six candidates the final slate for the interview phase.

c. Finalization of the performance task and scoring rubric:
The board discussed three draft performance tasks. There was general agreement to eliminate task one as it was redundant with the vision statements candidates had already submitted. The board expressed the most interest in performance task three, which focuses on systems-level initiative design for student outcomes. The board decided to move forward with performance task three with two additional bullet points: one for budgetary considerations and one to address diverse student backgrounds.

Member Braxton moved to move forward with performance task three with the additions discussed. Member Hudson seconded the motion. The motion passed.

b. Finalization of interview questions and scoring rubric:
The board reviewed a draft of seven questions. Member Lan suggested including a question about intergenerational collaboration and supporting student voice. Member Ford advocated for including

questions about the Portrait of a Learner initiative. Member Braxton suggested having 10 questions instead of seven, with additions on topics such as accountability and educator recruitment and retention.

After discussion, a motion was made to move forward with the recommendations discussed and to give President Dockweiler and Vice President Hughes the ability to work with the department to finalize the questions. Member Braxton seconded the motion. The motion passed.

The board also discussed and voted on the rubric for the interview questions and the rubric for the performance task.

Member Ford moved to include language about the Portrait of a Learner initiative in the rubric. The motion did not pass.

Member Hughes then moved to approve the rubric as it was shown in the document. The motion passed, with Member Ford opposed.

A separate motion was made to approve the performance task rubric with the two added bullet points and to give President Dockweiler and Vice President Hughes autonomy to finalize it with Deputy Ford. The motion passed.

d. Confirmation of the interview schedule:

The board discussed interview dates and times, with President Dockweiler proposing August 28th and 29th. The board debated interviewing three candidates each day or four on the first day and two on the second. There was a general agreement that the full board discussion would happen on the second day after all candidates were interviewed.

Member Dawson Owens moved to interview four candidates on August 28 and two on August 29, with a full board public discussion on the second day. Member Braxton seconded the motion. The motion passed with all in favor.

e. Determination of whether interviews will be conducted in person, virtually, or in a hybrid format:

The board discussed whether the interviews would be in-person, virtual, or a hybrid format. President Dockweiler clarified that travel reimbursements would not be provided to candidates.

Member Hughes moved to have in-person interviews but to allow candidates to express a preference for a specific day. The motion was seconded.

The motion passed, with Member Ford opposing it because she believed there should be a virtual option.

f. Finalization of instructions to be sent to candidates:

The board discussed the instructions for candidates regarding the interview process.

The motion to give President Dockweiler and Vice President Hughes the autonomy to adjust the document to reflect the board's discussions passed.

g. Discussion and approval of the structure and format for the interviews:

The board discussed the run of show for the interviews, including the order of the performance task and questions and the time allotted for follow-up questions.

Member Dawson Owens moved to conduct the performance task presentation before the interview questions. The motion passed unanimously.

The board also decided to move all follow-up questions to the end of the interview session, with a maximum of four questions per candidate and a total time limit of 15-16 minutes. The motion to approve this format passed unanimously.

h. Authorization for staff to notify selected finalists:
The board needed to authorize NDE staff to notify selected candidates and release a press announcement to the public.

Member Dawson Owens moved to authorize NDE to contact the candidates, schedule interviews, and issue a press release to the public with the names of the six finalists, dates, and times. Member Hughes seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

9. **Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action for the Read by Grade Three Alternative Assessments** *(Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action)*
The board received an overview of the process for approving alternative assessments for the Read by Grade Three program as outlined in SB 460. Interim Superintendent Steve Canavero and Administrator Peter Zutz provided a presentation. They recommended approving i-Ready as an alternative assessment for the 2025-2026 school year and establishing a cut score of the 40th percentile. They noted that i-Ready had already been vetted through a prior state procurement process and that an equivalency study in WCSD showed high correlations between MAP and i-Ready, with proficiency classifications matching over 80% of the time. The NDE stated that districts using i-Ready would be responsible for the financial costs. Member Ford expressed concern that this could create inequity for a large district like CCSD, which she stated would not be able to implement i-Ready for the upcoming school year.

A motion was made to approve i-Ready as the alternative assessment for the 2025-2026 school year with a cut score of the 40th percentile, with permission to be made to Dr. Canavero for approval from the Department of Education. The motion passed.

10. **Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action on the Development of a Board Policy Agenda for Legislative Engagement** *(Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action)*
The board considered whether to develop a policy agenda to guide its engagement with the legislature. Members supported the idea as a way for the board to have a more unified voice and advocate for its priorities with the legislature.

Member Hughes suggested starting with a subcommittee after the new Superintendent is selected. Member Braxton moved for the development of a policy agenda to guide the board's engagement with the legislature. The motion passed unanimously.

11. **Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action for the Development of a New Nevada Assessment** *(Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action)*
The board engaged in an initial discussion to explore the feasibility of the potential development of a Nevada-specific statewide assessment. Member Ford requested to explore alternative models, including teacher-created or hybrid models, rather than traditional vendor-purchased assessments. Members raised questions about the feasibility, cost, and legal implications of creating a new assessment, as well as the problem it would be solving. Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott expressed concern about having presentations from specific vendors, noting it could violate state purchasing rules. The board ultimately

decided to take no action on this item at this time and would potentially revisit it as a future agenda item.

12. **Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action to revisit the Board's Current Vision and Goals for Potential Revision** *(Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action)*

    Board members discussed and determined next steps to revisit and revise the board's current vision and goals. Members discussed the need for the board to establish its own vision, separate from other commissions. Member Orr suggested a separate meeting focused on board training and goal setting after a new Superintendent is seated.

    The board decided to take no action on this item at this time but would explore the possibility of a future conversation.

13. **9:32 a.m. Public Hearing to Solicit Comments Regarding the Possible Adoption of Proposed Regulation LCB File No. R016-25 (Formerly R146-22) Regarding NAC 388.XXX - Career and Technical Education** *(Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action)*

    Public Hearing started at 2:34 pm. Anna Reynolds, Director of Career Readiness, provided an overview of the proposed regulation to update NAC 389.810 to align with current state and federal laws concerning CTE programs. No public comment. The Public Hearing closed at 2:40 pm.

    The motion to approve the regulation passed unanimously.

14. **9:34 a.m. Public Hearing to Solicit Comments Regarding the Possible Adoption of Proposed Regulation LCB File No. R058-24 Regarding NAC 388.XXX - Transition Services for Students with Disabilities** *(Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action)*

    Public Hearing started at 2:41 pm. Director Julie Bowers proposed formally changing the age for transition planning from 16 to 14 to align with federal requirements. No public comment. The Public Hearing closed at 2:45 pm.

    The motion to approve the regulation passed unanimously.

15. **9:36 a.m. Public Hearing to Solicit Comments Regarding the Possible Adoption of Proposed Regulation LCB File No. R017-25 (Formerly R147-22) Regarding NAC 388.XXX - Adult High School Program** *(Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action)*

    LCB File No. R017-25 was pulled from the agenda.

16. **9:38 a.m. Public Hearing to Solicit Comments Regarding the Possible Adoption of Regulation LCB File No. R131-22 Regarding NAC 388.XXX - Residential Treatment for Certain Children** *(Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action)*

    Public Hearing started at 2:45pm. Christy McGill, Deputy Superintendent, presented the regulation, but stated that the department would be taking it back to stakeholders to gain more consensus before bringing it back to the board. Member Hudson withdrew his motion to approve the regulation. Public comments were received by: Andrea Schulewitch, Mara McDade Williams, Joanna Jacob, and Jonathan Norman. Full public comment statements are provided under Appendix A. Public Hearing Closed at 3:01pm

    The board took no action on this item and will await a revised draft.

17. **Public Comment #2**

    None

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

The board was invited to suggest topics for future agendas.

Member Ford requested two items:

1. presentation on different options for a statewide assessment model
2. presentation on the history of Nevada's State Board governance shifts.

19. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 3:03 P.M.

Appendix A: Statements given during public comments

1. Dr. Laura Davidson, Director of Research and Evaluation, Washoe County School District, provided public comment regarding agenda item 9.
2. Candace Matijevic, Government Affairs Liaison, Washoe County, provided public comment regarding agenda item 16.
3. Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association, provided public comment regarding agenda item 10.
4. Michael O'Dowd, Principal, Pinecrest Academy of Nevada, provided public comment regarding agenda item 9.
5. Andrea Schulewitch, Associatie General Counsel, Washoe County School District, provided public comment regarding agenda item 16.
6. Gary Butcher, Member of the Community, provided public comment regarding agenda item 8
7. John Hammond, Member of the Community, provided public comment regarding agenda item 8
8. Darla Lee, Member of the Community, provided public comment regarding agenda item 8
9. Mara McDade Williams, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, provided public comment regarding agenda item 16.
10. Joanna Jacob, Government Affairs Manager, Clark County, provided public comment regarding agenda item 16.
11. Johnathan Norman, Attorney, Children's Attorney Project, provided public comment regarding agenda item 16.

Appendix A, Item 1: DR. LAURA DAVIDSON

I'm here in strong support of approving I ready is an alternative assessment for Rebecca grade 3 with the passage of SB 460 and our S 388157 now allows flexibility if equivalency. The 2 assessments is demonstrated. That's the law and the intent of the law is to reduce testing time for students we've already done the work that makes this allowable not just for Washoe but for all the districts and charter schools in Nevada who are in a similar position to ours who have been. Double testing with map and i-Ready for the sake of compliance. And in spite of evidence indicating they are functionally and statistically equivalent assessments at NDE 's request Washoe analyzed data from over 16,000 kindergarten through 3rd grade students. Double test with map and I ready correlations in all windows exceeded 0.80 which is extremely high. Proficiency classifications matched over 80% of the time and in some cases were as high as 90% the assessments test virtually identical content in the same amount of time and in practical terms had we used I ready last year. Nearly all the same students would have received read by grade 3 letters. Double testing means 3 to 6 hours of lost instruction per student testing fatigue and anxiety by students. And confusion about which score to attend to and that does not even include all the lost staff time spent preparing by staff administering the double testing itself. Washoe chose I ready not on a whim but because we found a better supports instruction with lessons tied to the data results. Provides faster and clearer data and is more engaging for students. It helped us turn the corner on lagging reading scores that we've had under Matt for nearly a decade. The decision today is about doing what is best for students reading development. It's about following the law and letting districts opt for research backed assessments. That accelerate reading development and don't impede it washes ready to make the change dye ready for read by grade 32 day supports are in place. Staff are very eager to move forward. We urge you to approve what the law already allows. Let districts use I ready for read by grade 3 at their own cost now thank you. I'm happy to answer any questions you may have about the equivalency study we submitted for today. And we look forward to your decision.

Appendix A, Item 2: CANDACE MATIJEVIC

[Filled out comment card for item 16 but didn't provide a comment during agenda item]

Appendix A, Item 3: CHRIS DALY

Just some quick comments on item number 10 on today's calendar the development of a board policy agenda.

For legislative engagement very generally speaking I think you should move forward with this. I believe that the state of Nevada. Given the dynamics of being 48th in the nation in funding. We need more aggressive voices. To advocate for public education in this state. And so, I believe that this board should adopt these policies. And be a voice for Nevada students who are struggling just a really quick anecdote about our spring in Carson City I think as you know it's a different deliberative body but the Commission on school funding. Spent 5 years developing a plan for the state of Nevada to reach optimal education funding over the course of 10 years. My organization NSEA. Went to the legislature and asked legislators and. The governor to pass the plan to reach optimal funding instead of passing the plan the legislature and the governor delivered a $2.00 per pupil increase for Nevada students this school year. Obviously, that doesn't deliver what Nevada schools and Nevada students need. And so, I think that this board should be that voice leading the charge to make sure that Nevada students. In Nevada schools on public education in the state have the resources that they need to make sure that every Nevada student gets a high-quality public education. Thank you very much.

Appendix A, Item 4: MICHAEL O'DOWD
Dear Members of the Board,

I am writing on behalf of all Pinecrest Academy of Nevada Principals to express our strong support for Agenda Item 9, which seeks to approve i-Ready as an alternative assessment for RBG3 for the 2025-2026 school year. In our capacity as instructional leaders, and in collaboration with educators across our campuses, we can affirm the reliability and validity of the i-Ready data, which will continue to support Nevada students identified under the Read by Grade 3 law.

Appendix A, Item 5: ANDREA SCHULEWITCH
Please allow this email to serve as Washoe County School District's (WCSD) written comment to alert the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) to an issue with its proposed amendments to the regulations for NRS 432B.60847 (LCB File # R131-22) which is listed as item #16.

In October of 2022, when LCB File # R131-22 was first noticed for hearing for the adoption of regulations, WCSD reached out to the NDE to express concerns about the proposed revisions. WCSD and the NDE had a collaborative meeting and WCSD provided the NDE with suggested redline edits. WCSD wants to thank the NDE for incorporating a number of those suggested edits into this amendment.

However, in reviewing the proposed language in the 2025 version of LCB File # R131-22, WCSD is concerned about the addition of subsection (a) to Section 10, Subsection 5. With the exception of subsection (a), WCSD is fine with the remainder of Subsection 5 which requires that residential facilities invite districts to participate in meetings to review IEPs and service plans and to discuss compliance with state and federal laws related to child's educational rights.

WCSD takes issue with Section 10 (5)(a) which requires that school districts are to (a) "Facilitate the monitoring required by paragraph (c) of subsection 3 of NRS 432B.60847."

Since the legislature drafted NRS 432B. 60847(3)(c) to require school districts to "Monitor the child's progress while the child is admitted to the facility," it appears the NDE is trying to figure out a way to create a regulation to implement the NRS, but the phrase "facilitate the monitoring" is not clear and could create confusion about the role of school districts who are required to be invited to these meetings. This new language is problematic because it isn't clear what facilitation looks like, especially when school districts have no control over such residential facilities. WCSD is concerned that progress reporting and the lack of control that school districts have over the operations of facilities particularly when the school district has not made the placement determination (these determinations are made by the agency and the courts).

As such we recommend that subsection (a) be removed.

Alternatively, WCSD recommends that 5(a) be deleted and 5(b) revised to incorporate the underlying intention in 5(a) by rewriting it to say "…discuss the child's educational progress and the facility's compliance with all applicable federal and state laws prescribing the educational rights of the child." This way, the child's progress is being monitored in compliance with the NRS through these discussions, but it wouldn't create an additional expectation or role for school districts to serve over facilities we do not control.

Appendix A, Item 6: GARY BUTCHER
Get rid of LGTBQ+ in our schools and get back to educating them in the basics reading, writing, math, history and science. Also, transgender in the athletic field, Title 9 needs to be followed and competition kept between only males and females.

Appendix A, Item 7: JOHN HAMMOND
It is time to go in a new direction focused on education, no transgender sports etc, following Presidential and Federal Department of Ed directives, support school choice, and select a new moderate director. Also, please develop and disseminate a form (attached) and recognize the rights of parents to opt their kids out of LGBTQ+ instruction/ indoctrination. (See Mahmoud v Taylor, US Sup Ct).

Appendix A, Item 8: DARLA LEE
Dear Board Members,
In light of your scheduled meeting tomorrow, we urge you to consider a new direction for education in Nevada, one that truly focuses on academics, not social issues. Reinstating the teaching of cursive writing in grammar school would be a good start. Following the Presidential and Federal Department of Education directives concerning no transgender sports is imperative.
We also encourage you to support school choice and recognize the parental right to opt their children out of LGBTQ+ instruction, i.e. indoctrination. Your development of such a form for opting out would be very helpful. Lastly, please select a "moderate" director, not someone radically left or right.

Appendix A, Item 9: MARA MCDADE WILLIAMS
Please consider another stakeholder session to discuss changes. Thank you.

Appendix A, Item 10: JOANNA JACOB
Madame President and members of the board, we want to thank Deputy Superintendent McGill and members of your staff for consideration of the Clar County comments on R-131-22 from our Department of Family Services. We share the goal to ensure greater specific in the purpose regulation and we appreciate the opportunity to continue to work with the department Wo County and legal aid on a revised draft. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely Joanna Jacob.

Appendix A, Item 11: JONATHAN NORMAN
Agenda item 16, LCB file R131-22 Legal Aid Center and Northern Nevada Legal Aid represent over 4,000 foster children. We look forward to working with our child welfare agencies, Nevada Department of Education, and our school district to ensure these regulations work for our clients and the stakeholders to ensure our foster youth stay on track with their education and do not lose credits. Thank you.