

**Nevada Department of Education
Nevada State Board of Education
October 8, 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	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
Susan Neal
Angela Orr

Board Members Absent Excused

None

Department Staff Present

Dr. Steve Canavero, Interim Superintendent of Public Instruction
Lisa Ford, Interim Deputy Superintendent for the Student Achievement Division
Anna Reynolds, Education Programs Director
Barbara Bidell, Education Programs Professional
Angie Castellanos, Administrative Assistant
Zach Khan, Administrative Assistant

Legal Staff Present

Greg Cloward, Senior Deputy Attorney General

Audience in Attendance

Anna Binder
Deboarh Earl
Ed Gonzalez
Erin Phillips
Jeff Horn
Laura Lindstrom

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

Meeting called to order at 9:01 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. Ed Gonzalez, provided public comment regarding 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 thanked former Member Walker for his service, noting his great leadership and considerate perspective. She then announced the new board member, Susan Neil. Member Neil introduced herself, sharing her background, which included growing up in South Dakota, having a degree in elementary education and a master's degree in educational technology. She taught for 16 years, worked as a staff development specialist for Elko County, retired after 28 years, and serves on the Elko County School Board. She also mentioned her work with E for E (online courses for Nevada teachers), her service as a professional development strategist for the Nevada Ready 21 grant, and her volunteer work for CASA (Court Appointed Special Advocates) and Nevadaide.

The President also announced that Dr. Victor Wakefield had been selected as the incoming superintendent, with his first day scheduled for October 27th. A heartfelt thank you was extended to the current interim superintendent, Dr. Canavero, for his leadership and guidance in the interim capacity, not once, but twice. Dr. Canavero, in turn, welcomed Member Neil to the "fantastic, curious, inquisitive, thoughtful group" and praised the board's "thorough, rigorous" process for vetting superintendent candidates, noting that the department staff commented on the thoroughness.

Updates from board members followed:

Vice President Hughes updated the board on the Instructional Materials Working Group, which was meeting to continue conversations around upgrading the process in Nevada to ensure all kids have high-quality materials. The group would analyze the current system, look at three states that have had success, and work toward recommendations. He also updated the board on the Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education, noting that the next phase focuses on a subcommittee around metrics to review the school performance framework and associated metrics, as part of the push under Senate Bill 460 (SB 460). Vice President Hughes requested to liaise between that group and the State Board to ensure the board's input is fully represented.

Member Orr thanked the department for hosting family engagement seminars in Las Vegas and Carson City, noting it was important to interface with families. She also updated that the at-risk funding committee would be meeting next Tuesday to continue working on alternative measures for at-risk funding.

5. Interim Superintendent's Report

Interim Superintendent Steve Canavero provided updates. He reported on the cyber incident recovery, stating that from the user/client aspect, there appeared to be limited to no interruption in engaging with the state's systems, and the recovery was largely back to the prior state due to the efforts of the Governor's office for technology and the NDE team. Regarding the federal shutdown, he noted that the state had long been planning a two-week transition in its accounting and payroll software system, which fortuitously coincided with the federal shutdown. Districts and grantees were urged to bill urgently ahead of this transition. He confirmed that grant award notices for programs like Title One and IDEIA were received before October 1st, and the state can still request draws from the federal government, limiting anticipated real disruptions to two or three weeks. Dr. Canavero gave a special commendation to Interim Deputy Superintendent Lisa Ford for her tremendous job filling many different roles in the agency during the transition period.

He pivoted to the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) results, noting that star ratings and the report card were released on September 15th. He reported seeing "across the board gains" in all grade levels, which he had not seen in his time, signaling "this type of momentum". Gains included increases in English language arts, mathematics (grades 3-8), science achievement, ACT achievement, higher graduation rates, and lower chronic absenteeism rates.

For the legislative implementation update, he highlighted the department's use of guidance memorandums (10 posted) to enhance communication and provide channels for collaboration with stakeholders. He noted the development of the District Performance Framework, where the "metrics subcommittee for accountability design" was actively recruiting members, including Vice President Hughes, and was scheduled to meet monthly from November through July. He also mentioned the deeply collaborative early literacy work, including the science of reading and the STEM literacy pilot, to ensure a statewide and integrated approach. He announced the start of the "winter of regulations", with workshops beginning October 20th, and formal hearings for State Board regulations to follow in late winter/early spring. Finally, he mentioned the upcoming quarterly Q2 legislative implementation update.

Member Ford requested to express her interest in being involved in the metrics subcommittee for accountability design. Superintendent Canavero clarified that Vice President Hughes served as the State Board representative, but all were welcome to attend and utilize Vice President Hughes as an avenue to weigh in.

6. Consent Agenda (*For Possible Action*)

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

- a. Possible Approval of Dual Credit Request: Clark County School District (CCSD), in partnership with Nevada State University (NSU), the University of Nevada-Las Vegas (UNLV), and the University of Nevada-Reno (UNR)
- b. Possible Approval of Class Size Reduction Variances and Justifications, 4th Quarter FY2025
- c. Possible Approval of Private School License Renewal

Vice President Hughes requested clarification and changes regarding the Class Size Reduction Variance report. Vice President Hughes requested that in future reports, the department include a more direct year-over-year comparison of trends, specifically looking at the data granularly by district, to better inform the board's understanding. Interim Deputy Superintendent Lisa Ford and Deputy Superintendent Peterson confirmed that they could discuss incorporating the requested district-level year-over-year comparison into the report, while also retaining state-level comparisons.

Member Hudson moved to approve the consent agenda. Member Hughes seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action on Approval of Textbook (*Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action*)

Anna Reynolds, Director of the Office of Career Readiness, Adult Learning, and Education Options, presented the recommendation for instructional materials to support Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs statewide. The textbooks were aligned with course objectives and content standards for various subject areas and programs, including Biomedical Science, Accounting and Finance, Health Science, Industrial Maintenance, Culinary Arts, and Principles of Business and Marketing.

The adoption process, which begins at the district level with a review committee, was described. The committee composition is specific, requiring licensed teachers, a district administrator/curriculum specialist, and a parent. The materials for review, submitted by the Clark County School District, followed the specified processes and were confirmed by the department to be aligned to CTE standards.

Member Braxton requested to know how many curricula each appointee was assigned to review. Director Reynolds clarified that the district provides a list of reviewers for each textbook on the forms. Member Lan requested clarification on how stakeholders were involved in the curriculum selection and review process. Director Reynolds displayed an example form, showing that the review committee (teacher, administrator, parent) and community members at community events were allowed to provide input. Vice President Hughes requested clarification on why the committee members' names were known for CTE review but not for core content areas. Interim Deputy Superintendent Lisa Ford clarified that the CTE review is governed by NAC, which requires the district to demonstrate who participated to assure compliance, whereas the core content review runs through a separate purchasing process. Vice President Hughes then commented that the working group was looking at the inconsistency between the CTE and core content review processes and also examining how to ensure the full suite of publisher tools, including supplemental and electronic materials, are evaluated.

Member Hudson moved to approve the instructional materials listed on item seven. Member Dawson Owens seconded the motion. The motion passed.

8. Information, Discussion, and Possible Action on the Development of a Board Policy Agenda for Legislative Engagement (*Information, Discussion, and for Possible Action*)

President Dockweiler opened discussion on developing a policy agenda to guide the board's engagement with the Legislature for the 2027 session. She suggested establishing a subcommittee, assigning members, and defining the charge and timeframe. Board members expressed strong consensus for the idea: Member Braxton cited the importance of establishing relevance and representation and addressing community confusion about the board's role. Member Else mentioned that this represents a strategic opportunity for the State Board to exercise its influence and enter into cooperative partnerships with school districts, the Department, and the legislative body for the purpose of advancing substantive educational improvements. Member Hudson noted it would align advocacy efforts, strengthen relationships with lawmakers, and protect the board's ability to make informed, student-centered decisions. Member Dawson Owens agreed, noting that other state boards do this, often including budgetary asks that translate into legislation. Member Ford voiced inquiries regarding the methodological approach and the specific deliverables, subsequently recommending the implementation of a regularized reporting schedule and the maintenance of transparent, collaborative relationships with stakeholders and elected officials to mitigate the risk of unforeseen developments. Vice President Hughes recommended the subcommittee coordinate with NDE to ensure greater influence and clarify what the board is solving for, while maintaining flexibility. Member Orr echoed the need for laser focus on goals, suggesting the committee's first meeting occur after the new superintendent is in place.

Member Braxton moved that the State Board of Education develop a subcommittee to develop a policy agenda to guide its engagement with the legislature. Member Ford seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The following members volunteered to serve on the subcommittee: Member Braxton, Member Ford, and Member Dawson Owens.

President Dockweiler moved for Member Ford, Member Braxton, and Member Dawson Owens to serve as the State Board Legislative Agenda Policy Subcommittee. Member Ford seconded the

motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The board then considered the charge of the subcommittee, which included: being laser-focused on content and defining what is being solved for; establishing a regular meeting calendar (with a recommendation to begin after the special session in December); determining the level of engagement; defining the scope of deliverables and outcomes; coordinating with other entities/stakeholder groups; and maintaining flexibility.

Member Dawson Owens moved to approve the role and scope of the State Board Legislative Policy Subcommittee to be as was just presented by board president Dockweiler. Member Hudson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

9. Information and Discussion on WestEd Board of Directors Update (*Information and Discussion*)

President Dockweiler noted that the Nevada representative typically included the state superintendent, and given the upcoming transition, she proposed pushing the discussion to the November meeting to include the next superintendent.

Member Braxton moved to table agenda item nine, "Information and Discussion on WestEd Board of Directors Update," until the November meeting. Member Hudson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

10. Public Comment #2

- i. Erin Phillips, CEO of Power to Parent
- ii. Anna Binder, Community Member
- iii. Linda Linstrom, Community Member
- iv. Samuel Huber, Community Member
- v. Tanya Atterbury, Community Member
- vi. Michelle Mullman, Community Member
- vii. Dana Rodriguez, Community Member
- viii. Deborah Earl, Community Member
- ix. Joanne Smith, Community Member

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

The board was invited to suggest topics for future agendas.

- Member Else requested that once Superintendent Wakefield starts, the board hold another workshop/training day to discuss roles, responsibilities, and goals.
- Member Dawson Owens requested more information (formally or informally) about the district and state responsibilities regarding social media policy and legal ramifications for the board and educators.
- President Dockweiler requested that the board revisit the exit age for developmental delay for students receiving special education supports, including a follow-up presentation of additional data.

12. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 10:33 A.M.

Appendix A: Statements given during public comments

1. Ed Gonzalez, Community Member, provided public comment regarding item 8 during public comment period #1.
2. Erin Phillips, CEO, Power to Parent, provided public comment during public comment #2.
3. Anna Binder, Community Member, provided public comment during public comment period #2.
4. Laura Lindstrom, Community Member, provided public comment during public comment period #2.
5. Samuel Hauber, Community Member, provided public comment during public comment period #2.
6. Tanya Atterbery, Community Member, provided public comment during public comment period #2.
7. Michelle Mohlman, Community Member, provided public comment during public comment period #2.
8. Dana Rodrigues, Community Member, provided public comment during public comment period #2.
9. Deborah Earl, Community Member, provided public comment during public comment period #2.
10. Joanne Smith, Community Member, provided public comment during public comment period #2.

Appendix A, Item 1: ED GONZALEZ

Thank you, Madam President. Uh members of the State Board of Education, Superintendent Canavero. For the record, my name is Ed Gonzalez. Um I'm speaking on agenda item eight. I think it's important that this board develop a legislative engagement. I think what we've seen the last few legislative sessions is the legislature um taking action on bills without having any discussions with the state board. And there are times where you have actually done the work, done a regulation, watch the legislative commission approve the regulation only to watch the the state legislature undo the work they just approved without having any type of conversation with you. um as you go into the community stuff there's really um not a lot of knowledge of what the state board does um just because they don't understand I guess it's a you know it's a lesson in civics where it's like we should change something different we should rush to the legislature it's like sometimes you're actually looking for clarification of the law which would be more appropriate from regulations and then the question ends up informing people like where would you go for regulation how does that process work so I think it's really important for you guys to develop some sort of legislative um agenda um also too when there's um issues that come toward the legislature that you may want to take action on that you can like any other government body. And then obviously too, I think a little bit of concern I have is that many agencies also have the ability to do a BDR. I know the Commission on School funding recently had a a BDR given to them in statute. Um the state board doesn't have anything like that. Um far as I know, you guys don't really have much of any funding. Um so it makes it really difficult for a board who is partially elected. It's a hybrid board to be able to say here's the concerns that we have from our constituents. um when you don't have access to a lot of those situations and sometimes not even in the conversation. I think to me it's been the most frustrating thing the last few years and only we saw it recently because of some active engagement by some board members which is well what does your regulator think on this issue. what is the state board? What kind of information have you gone to them? That's only recently happened because of a push by people. And so, as you continue having this conversation, I do think it's really important for you to be able to have some agendas, a legislative agenda, because there's issues that you see as you're crafting regulations and looking at issues you've been tasked for that not anybody else has, and you're probably the only people who can truly advocate for that. So, thank you, Madam President, for letting me have the opportunity to speak.

Appendix A, Item 2: ERIN PHILLIPS

Dear Members of the Nevada Department of Education and State Board of Education,
I write as a parent and as the CEO of Power2Parent, Nevada's leading parental rights organization, to urge the State Board to fulfill its duty under Nevada law by revoking the licenses of teachers who engage in or promote violence. I respectfully request that this issue be placed on the agenda for your next meeting for discussion and possible action.

Legal Authority and Obligation

Under Nevada law, the State Board of Education has clear statutory authority to suspend or revoke the license of an educator who engages in immoral, unprofessional, or unfit conduct. Specifically:

- NRS 391.330 authorizes the suspension or revocation of a license for “immoral or unprofessional conduct” or “evident unfitness for service.”
- NRS 391.750 outlines grounds for dismissal of licensed educators, including “gross misconduct,” “immorality,” and “willful neglect or failure to observe and carry out the requirements” of duty.

These provisions empower the Board to protect students, uphold the integrity of Nevada’s education system, and ensure that only those who exemplify professionalism and safety remain in our classrooms.

Timeline of Events

In recent weeks, several Clark County School District (CCSD) teachers have used social media to glorify or promote violence, specifically celebrating the assassination of public figures. Following public outcry, Superintendent Jhone Ebert and CCSD leadership removed these teachers from the classroom pending investigation.

While this was an appropriate first step, CCSD Regulation 4100 clearly prohibits electronic communications by employees that can reasonably be construed as harassing, threatening, or bullying. These posts violated both that policy and the spirit of professionalism required by Nevada law.

Parents across the state are asking for full accountability. Removal from the classroom must not be the final step; it must be followed by the **revocation of licenses** for educators who engage in conduct that promotes or condones violence.

Request to the State Board

Power2Parent respectfully requests that the Board:

1. Add to the next State Board meeting agenda a discussion and possible action item to address the revocation of educator licenses for those who engage in or promote violence.
2. Direct NDE staff to provide a legal briefing on the procedures, standards, and timelines for license revocation under NRS 391.330 and NRS 391.750.
3. Communicate to all Nevada districts that such behavior will not be tolerated and that license-level accountability will be pursued when violations occur.

Conclusion

Nevada families expect educators to model professionalism, respect, and safety for every student. Teachers who glorify violence undermine those values and erode public trust. The Board’s decisive action is both necessary and legally supported.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please confirm receipt of this request and whether it will be included as an agenda item at the next State Board meeting. I am available to provide additional documentation or public testimony as needed.

Respectfully,
Erin Phillips CEO, Power2Parent

Appendix A, Item 3: ANNA BINDER

Members of the Board,

I am writing today out of deep concern over a coordinated attempt by a small group of individuals to pressure this Board into revoking the licenses of a few Nevada educators. These individuals are not here because they care about improving public education, they are here to weaponize the public comment process to advance a culture war.

Let’s be honest: these are not people who show up when this Board is discussing real issues like funding,

literacy, or inclusion. They only appear when they can feed outrage for sport.

The Nevada Department of Education and local districts already have clear, established procedures for addressing employee concerns or alleged misconduct. Those processes exist to ensure fairness, due process, and accountability, not trial by social media, not mob rule, and not political theater.

This Board should not, under any circumstances, insert itself into personnel matters that are properly handled at the district level. To do so would set a dangerous precedent that undermines every educator's sense of safety and every district's ability to manage its own staff.

Our public education system depends on our willingness to stand firm against that kind of manipulation as this Board has done historically.

Respectfully,
Anna Marie Binder

Appendix A, Item 4: LAURA LINDSTROM

Good morning. I don't know how to address everyone. This is my first time coming forth. um as these most recent issues that have already been expressed that people are coming to talk about has in my experience this is not the first time that educators have acted in improper ways and I don't feel like the Nevada model code of ethics for teachers is being honored especially my experience in CCSD where I received an email from teachers who attacked me and um wanted to address things with my children from eight years ago. Um they a bunch of educators signed a litigious letter um sorry they signed a letter they sent it to CCSD superintendent. This letter was intended to prevent my advocating for my children. There was stuff in this letter that um said that I ask for things outside of my children's IEPs. That is nothing that any parent should not be able to do. So, this conduct most recently to me is nothing new. It feels as though the teachers are protected over the students. I have not seen anything that shows that there was anything done um any recourse for that conduct. Part of what their retaliation was for was because I reported to the school that they were sharing pictures of foster children. And after that I get an email that almost goes tip for tat for everything I had addressed and addressed in a reasonable time with administration. Um, so I don't feel that educators in Nevada are following your model code of ethics. I don't feel like because it is it shows in there that it's the responsibility of everyone to report a teacher who they know, an educator who they know is not following the code of ethics. I don't feel like that is being enforced like anyone is actually making sure that that's being held to. And I have concerns again about what teachers have shared, how they're judging students and how there's just more division. And a lot of this is just impacting children's access and parents advocacy, especially when you're seeing your educators saying things that implies that if you feel this way, you're an awful person. how they felt that things should they were okay with how things were handled. I had a teacher outside of a school tell me, 'Well, what did you expect with the president rounding up ice and taking people there?' I mean, the conduct is just reprehensible and it's not showing anything that that helps parents advocate and helps children access their education. Thank you. I'm sorry.

Appendix A, Item 5: SAMUEL HAUBER

Dear Members of the Nevada State Board of Education,

I am writing to express deep concern regarding reports of teachers who openly celebrated the assassination attempt on Charlie Kirk during his recent visit to Utah Valley University.

While every American enjoys the right to free speech, educators hold a unique position of public trust and responsibility. Advocating or celebrating violence—particularly political violence—undermines the values of respect, safety, and civil discourse that our education system is meant to uphold.

I respectfully urge the Board to investigate this matter and, where verified, to revoke the teaching licenses of any Nevada educators found to have publicly expressed or endorsed violent ideologies. Free speech is guaranteed, but a teaching license is a privilege that carries an expectation of professionalism and moral

conduct.

Taking decisive action will help restore public confidence in Nevada's schools and reaffirm that violence and hate have no place in our classrooms.

Thank you for your attention and for your ongoing commitment to the integrity and safety of our education system.

Sincerely,
Sam Hauber

Appendix A, Item 6: TANYA ATTERBERY

Good morning:

I am submitting this as a public comment regarding a number of issues that are being addressed.

Point 1: I am asking the Board to follow NRS 391.330 and NRS 391.750, which allow for the revocation of teaching licenses for immoral or unprofessional conduct.

- The State Board must uphold Nevada law and revoke licenses for teachers who engage in or promote violence.
- These actions violate both district policy and the public trust placed in educators.
- Nevada families expect teachers to model professionalism, respect, and safety for every student.

point 2: I ask the board to look into the timeline on when the school libraries will become an open-source county system? The CCSD Superintendent Ebert stated this will happen to provide transparency, but no details have been provided yet even with requests.

point 3: I ask the board to look into Repealing Regulation 6150-If the librarians and principals are approving the books in the libraries then they should not be on the closed-door committee when a parent submits a CCf-400 to request removal of sexually explicit books from the libraries.

These have been the issues that have been heated during the local CCSD school board. Please look into these hot button issues and provide guidance to the local board.

Thank you,
Tanya Attebery

Appendix A, Item 7: MICHELLE MOHLMAN

To whom it may concern,

I find it appalling that any student knows a teacher's political stance. Boundaries matter. Knowing that we have teachers who still hold the equivalent of a minor is unacceptable. It should be clearly stated to any employee of our district how they should represent and conduct themselves in front of students and on social media. There is no such thing as being private on an account that has friends or followers. There is no place for teachers who can't stay neutral in the classroom and comprehend that even in public, their position is responsible for CHILDREN! I do not send my children to school to be indoctrinated with others' ideals of lunacy.

I request the following:

- The State Board must uphold Nevada law and revoke licenses for teachers who engage in or promote violence.
- These actions violate both district policy and the public trust placed in educators.
- Nevada families expect teachers to model professionalism, respect, and safety for every student.

Thank you for your time.

Michelle Mohlman

Appendix A, Item 8: DANA RODRIGUES

It has come to my attention that several teachers in our district decided to celebrate and promote violence via celebratory messages online and some in classrooms. I find this abhorrent as teachers are not supposed to act like this. IT IS AGAINST THE LAW!! What are they teaching our precious children?

The State Board must uphold Nevada law and revoke licenses for teachers who engage in or promote violence. These actions violate both district policy and the public trust placed in educators. Nevada families expect teachers to model professionalism, respect, and safety for every student.

These teachers need to go. Apologies will not work in this instance. A precedence needs to be established and a message to be sent that actions like this will not be tolerated in our school district. Thank you for your time and consideration in this most serious matter.

Sincerely,
Dana Rodrigues

Appendix A, Item 9: DEBORAH EARL

Dear Members of the Nevada State Board of Education,
I am writing to express deep concern regarding reports of teachers who openly celebrated the assassination of Charlie Kirk during his recent visit to Utah Valley University.
While every American enjoys the right to free speech, educators hold a unique position of public trust and responsibility. Advocating for or celebrating violence—particularly political violence—undermines the values of respect, safety, and civil discourse that our education system is meant to uphold.
I respectfully urge the Board to investigate this matter and, where verified, to revoke the teaching licenses of any Nevada educators found to have publicly expressed or endorsed violent ideologies. Free speech is guaranteed, but a teaching license is a privilege that carries an expectation of professionalism and moral conduct.
Taking decisive action will help restore public confidence in Nevada's schools and reaffirm that violence and hate have no place in our classrooms.
Thank you for your attention and for your ongoing commitment to the integrity and safety of our education system.

Sincerely,
Deborah Earl
Parent of 5 CCSD children

Appendix A, Item 10: JOANNE SMITH

I am shocked to realize that educators in CCSD boldly glorified and celebrated violence publicly! Where is their humanity?!? Superintendent Ebert was right to remove them from the classroom.

These "educators" must be held accountable for their gross actions through NRS 391.330 and NRS 391.750. They must never be returned to the classroom for their highly offensive and unprofessional conduct. If not, their warped views will be spread further into our society through our innocent children. I was in education for 15 years and never dreamed I'd see such cringe from fellow educators!

Sincerely,
Joanne Smith

