

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATEWIDE COUNCIL FOR THE COORDINATION OF THE
REGIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS

JANUARY 8, 2019

10:00 A.M.

Meeting Locations:

The meeting was video conferenced from both locations

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	9890 S. Maryland Pkwy	Las, Vegas	Board Room (2 nd Floor)
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St	Carson City	Board Room

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

Kathleen Galland-Collins
KellyLynn Charles

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Las Vegas:

Brent Husson
Wendi Hawk
Adam Young
Debbie Brocket

Carson City:

Aaron Grossman
Wayne Workman
Nicolette Smith
Pam Teel

Deputy Attorney General:

David Gardner

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

Las Vegas:

Jerrad Barczyszyn
Chelli Smith
John Hawk

Carson City:

Kirsten Gleissner

1. Call to Order; Roll Call: Pledge of Allegiance

KellyLynn Charles, NDE Education Programs Professional for Office of Educator Development & Support

2. Public Comment #1

Public Comment will be taken during this agenda item regarding any item appearing on the agenda. No action may be taken on a matter discussed under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. The chair of the council will impose a time limit of three minutes. Public Comment #2 will provide an opportunity for public comment on any matter within the Council's jurisdiction, control, or advisory power.

No public comment in Las Vegas or Carson City

3. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes for October 2, 2018 (*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*)

Adam Young; Council Chair

Motion: Member Husson made a motion to approve prior meeting minutes from October 2, 2018

2nd: Member Smith

All in favor

Motion carries

4. Nevada Department of Education Updates (*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*)

KellyLynn Charles, NDE Education Programs Professional for Office of Educator Development & Support

Members will hear updates from NDE regarding items of interest that may impact the work of the Council including, but not limited to:

- Updated Professional Development Standards Regulations (LCB File No. R093-18)
 1. Last legislative cycle regulated that SBE prescribe new requirements for the PD report for the Board of Trustees. Workgroup from around the State is convening to provide input on what it might look like. Followed by a discussion on budget coding. Propose regulation around that budget coding. To begin later this month.

5. FY19 Budget Amendments (*Information/Discussion/Possible Action*)

Kirsten Gleissner, Director, NWRPDP; Chelli Smith, Director, SNRPDP; and Sara Negrete, Director, NNRPDP

One or more of the RPDP Directors may present requested amendments to their 2018-2019 (FY19) budget. The Council will hear requests and justifications before taking possible action on proposed amendments to the FY19 budgets.

Kirsten Gleissner, Director, NWRPDP, requests approval of carryover added to the budget that was approved by the Council in September in the amount of approximately \$18,027 which has been placed in a few different categories: stipends, books for professional development, and to replace a little bit of additional travel money.

Motion: Member Workman moves to approve amendment as presented

2nd: Member Hawk

All in favor

Motion carries

6. Regional Professional Development Program Annual Reports

(Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Kirsten Gleissner, Director, NWRPDP; Chelli Smith, Director, SNRPDP; and Sara Negrete, Director, NNRPDP

Pursuant to NRS391A.190, the Council will review the RPDP's annual reports and incorporate any recommended revisions. Possible actions include providing feedback and approval of Annual Reports.

Sara Negrete, Director, NNRPDP, spoke about agenda item being a standard item on the agenda for the council to review and approve annual reports. Annual reports have been sent to Stakeholders as required by NRS.

- Member Workman reviewed those reports and thanked the professional development regional centers for their great work.

- Member Hawk asked if there would be a better time to put on agenda since Sara Negrete mentioned earlier the timing was off. Sara Negrete stated it is up to whoever sets the agenda to place it on there for August.

Motion: Member Husson made a motion to approve Professional Development Annual Reports

2nd: Member Brockett

All in favor

Motion carries

7. Plan for use of Administrative Funds *pursuant to NRS 391A.130 subsection 9*

(Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Kirsten Gleissner, Director, NWRPDP; Chelli Smith, Director, SNRPDP; and Sara Negrete, Director, NNRPDP

Members will discuss the submitted draft plan for expending the \$100,000 Administrative Funds. Possible actions include providing feedback and approval of the plan to expend RPDP Administrative Funds.

- Chair Young stated in last meeting workgroup was organized to meet with RPDP directors and discuss some of the ideas from that meeting and asked if anyone from that group would like to share their thoughts/feedback on that.
- Member Hawk was on that team and had concerns with giving the funds to NASA. This was done in the past but was negatively looked down upon. Had concerns that giving it back to NASA might be creating another issue like previously.
- Member Husson requested more information about the history of that.
- Member Smith stated about two years ago there were conversations around the decision to seek a different organization to provide professional learning. There was conversation by some people on the board that there had been some feedback about the quality of the professional learning. That was part of the reason for choosing to go with a different organization.
- Chelli Smith stated this change was done about 10 years ago and there was some kind of conflict between the then director of SNRPDP and the existing governments under NASA. Conflict about how the money was spent and what was done at the conferences for the prior couple of years. At that time this council did not exist. The council consisted of all the RPDP people coming together and discussing how the money should be spent. At that time a decision was made in concert with legislation that the money would flow into the RPDP coffers thinking the money would be used in a better way. The problem now is that the way the money is being expended or used through the RPDP does not feel like it is meeting the mandate. The difference is that now there would be guidelines on how the money is to be used and what it is used for.
- Member Husson asked why there needs to be that organization doing this rather than the RPDPs expending the funds directly. Chelli Smith stated they have no problem spending the funds but from a conversation from last year, it was questioned on what they were using the money for. They don't have the capacity to do a huge conference for administrators across the state. They are overspent in human capital and monetarily.
- Member Husson would like to know more about what NASS is and asked if that group would add value in accomplishing that which RPDP is trying to accomplish. Chelli Smith stated those two groups were determined to be the best because either Nevada Association of School Superintendents (NASS) would be the ones to touch some changes made at that level or Nevada Association of School Administrators (NASA) because that would be leading from the middle. The RPDP is not equipped to do that for a couple of reasons beside capacity. It is PD by choice and not this group that comes together which is one of the issues.

- Member Husson just to be sure stated that NASS is just superintendents only which NASA is administrators which is the next level down and they have membership that meets regularly anyway. They would then agree to put on this particular programing. Do they understand what is trying to be accomplished so they can do it well or would the RPDPs work with them so as to make sure they know what is being envisioned?
- Sara Negrete stated they are probably not the best people to ask whether NASS or NASA feels they have the capacity to put something like this together with the funds. If the council is to provide the funds to them then she would the Council would have to give them the direction because the RPDPs do not have the human capital capacity to direct or put together a conference of that size when thinking statewide.
- Member Workman, current Vice-President of NASS, stated both those organizations are equipped to put on conferences because they already do. There is a Southern and Northern conference that is put on by NASA each year and paid for from the dues that members pay. Same director for NASS and NASA. In a couple of weeks for NASS there will be a superintendent academy where professional development is being provided to superintendents and their executive cabinets from each of the districts. Disadvantage is not every administrator is a member of NASA nor does every administrator attend one of the two conferences. Need to define who the target audience needs to be and that would help which medium to present the professional development.
- Member Husson asked Member Workman's opinion if he believes the leadership of the two organizations would be interested in working with us to plan something or would they prefer to direct the vision themselves? Member Workman stated he knows Dr. Rob Slaby very well and is confident that he would want to work in conjunction with this body. He believes the intentions are the same. Everyone wants their schools to be successful and for their students to achieve. Believes it would it be possible to join those two things together and have it be effective and meet the goals.
- Member Husson stated in his experience in the business world, when two organizations try to work together it doesn't all work very well. Usually in the first time it does because everyone is excited and trying to do a good job but then time agendas start changing.
- Member Hawk stated \$100,000 will not go very far and does not recall in the last meeting saying we wanted this to specifically be a conference. Saying more along the lines of resources and materials being available online and mentoring type movement. Not sure what is being awarded for NASA and RPDPs. Her concern is using part of the money for a conference is one and done and doesn't believe that was the intent from the last meeting. It was a continual building of a program to build leadership modules that people can go and utilize it and then some type of mentorship behind it. Continually build a systematic system that could be bolstered every year. Believes that was the intent from the last meeting. It makes her uncomfortable due to where we were in the past and using a little bit of funds for the biggest impact.
- Member Husson explained last time he didn't have a clear vision. He wants to see strides in Nevada making systemic change in professional development. Believes it would be beneficial for an initial conference to lay out what the vision would be, but not every year. Why was this chosen as the first step given the amount of money there is and the views of the board of their intent? Chelli Smith stated last time there were many different visions given. Chelli Smith, Sara, and Kirsten tried to put all those vision together to create a vision everyone can agree on to start and from there change to supplemental materials and modules after that. To have a systemic change the bulk of people need to be reached. It's not happening because a lot of people aren't going to outreach for the materials and they are not taking the modules unless there is a need for it. She believes if people have this idea and then the modules or materials are after that then there is more of a reason to reach out.
- Member Brockett, former president of NASA, has a concern with the small number of administrators that attend the NASA conference. If goal is to reach everyone, it

probably won't be able to be linked directly to the ones that are already to be held. There is one coming up in June in Lake Tahoe. Administrators from all over the state will be attending, but the majority of administrators will not be reached by going to one of those conferences. Any conference that is put on that is voluntary will not reach the masses that maybe the intention behind the conference. Her concern is having attended those conferences for the last 15 years, the mass numbers are not there.

- Sara Negrete stated being cautious of adding one more training type professional opportunity for administrators. In her district, they each have strong plans and visions for where they are headed and have created plans for that. With more grant money, the more it gets spread out. Afraid that they money will just be added to one more thing. In her region, the money could be used to support one of the districts visions. Her district leaders know of the money and have submitted requests for the funds. It is strategic within their district plan and not strategic statewide. That might be where the disconnect is. Money that was divided and being used was strategic by the districts, might not have appeared that way from the state level.
- Kirsten Gleissner, Director NWRPDP, stated from their governing board meeting last fall the preference in the Northwest region is to have more control over those funds to have localized pertinent professional development.
- Member Workman attended that governing board meeting and is open to the concept of brining in outside ideas but fears will not hit the mark if modules are created for administrators to use. Each school district is required to put together its own performance or strategic plan and the funds need to be aligned to those plans. If any of those modules are not hitting those strategic plans then essentially they will not be used. In Lyon County the money is used to provide individual training for the administrators because they are all at different levels. Providing professional development for them doesn't always work.
- Member Hawk has concerns with having a training with NASA that does not necessarily have a link to these modules. One thing with professional development is making sure it is continual. She is not completely onboard with that, but sounds like putting the money back in the hands of the people that make the decisions to making improvement in targeted areas for their districts. It sounds like last year, redistributing the money to the RPDP's to be able to go from there. The concern the board had with that before was the money was just released and the board didn't really know what the plans were. Could it be in a grant type application where the districts have a plan for what the money would be used for and perhaps have a committee to review and delegate the money in coordination with RPDP?
- Member Husson never had an issue with individual spending of the chunks of \$33,000. Believes the intent behind the NRS. As a State a different approach to professional development is taken but is not hearing that now. He is hearing to just keep doing what you are doing and just do more of it. What is being done now is not as effective as it could be. As a system we are not doing a good job at professional development. His opinion is that the money be used to change the mindset. The job is not getting done well in the aggregate. This council and money exists to change that. That is why last time it was suggested to look at something more systemic. What is being advocated for now is not systemic and is not changing anything. Right now it is too granular. If you want to see systems change, you need to start with culture. Cultural change starts with new ideas and not doing the same thing that was done before. As a State he wishes to look at not just professional development.
- Member Workman believes everyone wants the same thing. The way we measure success of schools and students in this state is absurd and it doesn't work. For non-educators to say that there is no change and not doing things differently in schools and districts, they haven't been there and haven't seen what is being done. It is a better idea to have a group get together and come up with some approved professional development avenues. Things are measured differently in this state. If the same measures were used from 10 years ago, you would see improvement. But

- the metric to which we are measuring keeps changing. There are teachers and administrators open to change and have changed. The problem is each student is an individual and are not the same which means we need to be adaptable to different situations. There is not one magic answer to say this is what works in education. If research teams have found some answers then that could be shared with individual districts to use and implement. Superintendents would be very open to that.
- Member Husson, even though not an educator has been doing this work for 12-15 years and is in schools and around educators all the time and does understand what happens in them. There is not one clear answer. The way success is measured is different. Believes some teachers and administrators have a changed mindset. Breaking out of the chains that bind us as state in the way we think about education. A brief history on Michael Fullan: He has done research and has led a team in Ontario, Canada that moved them from looking like what we looked like to one of the finest education systems in the world today. For our educators not to know that is systematic of the problem. Not just Michael Fullan, but there are others that have made great strides and our administrators should know that and know these people and should be bringing those ideas back. Focus on working on something that does work somewhere else and then analyzing what might happen in Nevada if tried here given the differences that exist in our population and culture etc. That's the kind of work that needs to be done in schools and at the district level. Complaint is that the system doesn't encourage that. Teachers are not given the time to think about those kinds of things. Would like this council and the state to start thinking about giving them the time and resources to do that. Administrators should be the ones thinking what's working. Problem is the system is not allowing for visionary thinking. His goal is to get the system thinking like that. He's hoping this money and the group can be the beginning of that. Change the mindset of the system to advance and change.
 - Chair Young mentioned Michael Fullan, Doug Reaves, Mike Schmoker, and any incredible dynamic speakers have books several years out in advance. From a practical level where we are that could have some difficulties. This model would allow school districts to utilize some choice and choose options that are best for their version of their district performance plan and strategic plan. There are differences among school districts in the state even though everyone wants the same end result. The model the State has done the last few years is to have a list of evidence-approved partners the districts are allowed to use and access this grant money from. It allows a little bit of choice and gives districts a vetted menu. Maybe what can be considered is a type of split the baby approach. The practice recently has been dividing the \$33,000 among the three regions. Maybe to combine all the ideas would be to have a menu with all the researchers and presenters and ESSA vetted world renowned people that see that 60,000 foot view. Mike Fullan, Doug Reaves, and Mike Schmoker would all see that picture but there are a lot of other companies that are like that. Maybe this council can look at an intermediate step that would get us there but we are not there yet. RPDP's don't feel comfortable taking on a gigantic state conference. Believes possibly the reason for people not attending the NASA events could be the quality of the presenters. People will come if the presenters are better well known. Supports the statewide vision the council has discussed but as an intermediary step provide parameters to say here is a menu of things to think about because that is where we'd like to push forward to with leadership.
 - Member Husson agrees it is a wonderful idea. The idea that the council would set the guidelines. That is the responsibility of the board and to say this is the vision of what the money is to be spent for and not to say to do professional development in a certain way. There needs to be systemic change and here is a list of people to consider or these are the kinds of things the money should be used for. Want the districts to start thinking more globally and this is the money to help them do that. Encourage more of that kind of thinking and to provide resources for it. Understands that they don't have the money, time or resources. This could potentially be the beginning. Maybe we could seat it with this first \$100,000 and propose to the Senate

- or the Governor to look at this is a piece of what we do but hasn't been done very well as a state. Only \$100,000 is given to them to think what needs to be done at the highest level. They are doing great at the mid-level, but no one is giving any time to the long term vision. That's what makes a lot of the other professional development less effective. Let's look long term and then we can ask for \$500,000.
- Member Brockett appreciates Member Husson's vision on getting the strategic of getting these speakers that can change the philosophy and way of thinking but a breakdown in cost would need to be done. She's attended several of Michael Fullan's talks and he is incredible. If every administrator could start thinking in the way he talks about doing business it would change the district. The concern is the \$100,000 is not going to cover the workshops and the continuation that is needed. What happens too often is administrators go to these conferences and get excited and then return and don't have the time or the resources to help continue that vision. Likes the idea of asking for more. Changes can't be made if the top isn't trained well enough to continue to roll that down. Have never had that opportunity to have that level of training and focus unless it came out of their own pockets. Believes if NASA could get in great speakers good things could happen with that money. It needs to be done now and grow it from there.
 - Member Hawk stated change does not happen from the top. Change must be continually gone back to be able to sustain that change. On the contrary there are statewide goals opposed to the district goals that are being discussed. There are four purposes clearly laid out in the law for what this money is supposed to go to. There are statewide goals that need to be addressed and leadership is part of that. This \$100,000 is laid out in the law: dissemination, development, support, and to supplement. This can be accomplished. Does not think equal distribution across the board is the right way to do it but is open to some type of grant motion that aligns to the state goals for leadership and then addresses each one of the issues. Would like to know what the application process would look like and who would be facilitating that?
 - Member Workman is concerned with a grant process. It is already tedious and less than half of his school districts have grant offices or departments which means superintendents and other district level personnel are writing those grants. Also concerned that not all of the districts would be receiving this money in order to use for professional development for their administrators. Asked Member Hawk if this grant process would mean some districts would not receive some of this funding? Member Hawk stated she was just brainstorming.
 - Pam Teel stated she is in a smaller school district so she would be the grant writer. She is struggling to pull off the grants that are currently due with the timelines and the constraints. They already have ongoing professional development with administrators that is in conjunction with RPDP and is aligned with the district goals and the state goals. She would struggle with having another whole process that should be aligning that.
 - Member Husson stated that understanding a grant process maybe doable in the long term would not be practical for this year or for a couple of years or until there is enough money to make it worthwhile for some of the smaller districts and even then maybe it won't be considering what has just been said. For this year maybe accomplish what is trying to be accomplished by using NASS and NASA together. Doesn't have an interest in who gets the money initially. We would basically tell them how it needs to be spent within reason and they would have to do what is said. Would like to incorporate what Chair Young said is to have some latitude for the districts. Would like to know what is the total number of administrators and how many come to those NASA conferences? About 1,800? Member Brockett stated 250-300 administrators attended the spring conference. Fall conference held in both Southern and Northern Nevada. About 15% of the total. This year should be starting a conversation about having a vision for professional development. Let people know

changes are coming, bigger names will be attending. Take idea of changes to legislature. Possibly step one of three or four steps over the next couple of years.

- Member Hawk stated focusing too much on the details as opposed to two different proposals on the table. One proposal is the one presented here and the other proposal is distributing the \$100,000 a different way to RPDP to the districts. Maybe move forward with this idea and then work on the details. Chair Young agrees with that. That vision can be shared with NASA, NASS, and the RPDPs. Dilemma is it all or nothing. Sara Negrete was asked if there are already requests for the funds. There have been requests for the money, but Sara has been stalling. Where do the funds go and who has the power to bring that to pass. Maybe a portion goes to the RPDPs so as to deal with the requests they already have and another portion goes to NASS/NASA as money to get started on the vision.
- Member Husson asked Chair Young and Member Workman would it be overstepping to give NASS/NASA the \$100,000, here's what would like to see happen with it, and here's the plan and if they can continue with that plan. Don't want to feel like dictating to them, but do want them to understand the vision for how the council wants to see the money spent. If they agree, they can be the agent of the money and the council will provide the higher level vision. Member Hawk believes that is a good direction. The requests to RPDP need to address all four components of the law and how it is met should be reported back to the council. Not sure if the money distributed last year met the four components of the law.

Motion (01:19:44)

Member Husson made a motion for the 2019 allocation to disseminate the full \$100,000 to NASS/NASA organizations with the instructions they use the money to initially this year produce a convention or a day-long seminar that would meet these four requirements. We would let them know what those are and they would have to agree to do that with the money and stipulate they come back afterwards and explain how they did that with the money. Additionally direct them to hold the conference with the vision providing professional development.

KellyLynn Charles asked for clarification of the motion. The administrative fund has carryover funds from last year. There is more than the \$100,000. Requests permission from the council for the RPDPs to use what was allotted from last year as carryover to take care of some of the requests that have come in with the assumption the money would be there for those requests. The carryover won't fulfill everything. It will fulfill and reimburse some of the districts that presumed the money would be there and have already spent the money. It will also allow one of the requestor's to potentially be able to send one or two administrators to a conference. Requesting from council to grant the rollover funds that were provided to each region to finish out this year.

Chair Young re-stated the money under discussion would be limited to the \$100,000 that is currently for the 18-19 school year with the carryover from FY18 remaining with the RPDPs to use for their districts request.

The motion is awarding the \$100,000 to NASA and NASS becoming the executer and develops the plans to have an event within the next few months.

2nd: Member Brockett

Member workman asked Chair Young who also sits on the NASA board if this money would be spent at the June conference. Chair Young answered yes because it would be difficult to plan a separate event at this time. Would recommend to the NASA board how much would researcher/presenter cost and then use the remaining funds to pay for travel or per diem or some other type of incentive.

Member Hawk reminded their role is to supervise and oversee the RPDPs. By awarding the funds to an outside entity shows no confidence is shown to RPDPs in executing their role. Has serious concerns with handing the money over to an entity that years ago the money was taken away from. Has confidence in what RPDP is doing and her vote would be for RPDP to hold districts accountable to meeting the four components of this law.

Chelli Smith added that the money was divided evenly between the three RPDPs, \$33,000 to each RPDP. This was done intentionally to make sure the rural support was there. Her concern would be leaving out the rurals. If the dynamics were to change and for example Clark County were to receive 75% of the money and everyone else had to split 25%, that would not give rurals the support they need. Concern is to make sure something is done to protect the rural counties. Member Hawk stated that if this is the direction some sort of designation as to where and how much money is being distributed. Sara Negrete speaking on behalf of the rurals stated splitting the money up three ways, does allow the rurals to have an equitable share. It was her understanding the intention of the item was could the three RPDPs come together and set up a budget for \$100,000 to meet the needs of the regions rather than the strict \$33,000/\$33,000/\$33,000. Chelli Smith said the SNRPDP only took \$15,000 because all they did was a one-day training on student learning goals that was in need to support the NEPF for administrators.

Member Husson added to the motion to address Member Hawk's concern about the RPDPs having a role in this.....

Member Hawk asked for clarification. She thought they said they do not have the capacity to hold a conference, but didn't hear her say she didn't have the capacity to distribute the funds for administrative purposes within the district.

Sara Negrete said they could use the \$100,000 and divide it up and provide services to the regional districts through collaboration with each other so it wasn't so tight with the 33/33/33. They have reimbursed districts from their administrative funds in the past. They cannot put together a conference at this point in time. They don't have the human capacity at this time.

Motion entails giving the money to NASS or NASA.

Member Grossman asked if the money is given to an outside organization how will they be held accountable to evidenced based outcomes. How to provide something that is systematic? If money is given to someone else, how to make sure they are held accountable to stipulations within ESSA? The purpose of the council is to coordinate the RPDPs.

Member Husson stated adding the amendment to the motion is to have the RPDP heads to be part of planning process to convey to NASA and NASS what's in the law and what was discussed here. In the future, this body should develop a written plan with NASS and NASA. Provide them with a document outlining what we expect from them if they agree to take the money. Also must agree to come back at a later time and explain how money was used.

Members voted: Yes-5 (Husson, Smith, Brockett, Young, and Teal) No-3 (Hawk, Grossman, and Workman)

Motion passes.

Chair Young will speak with Dr. Slaby and advise him of this.

8. Future Meeting Dates and Agenda Items (Information/Discussion/ Possible Action)

KellyLynn Charles, NDE Education Programs Professional for Office of Educator Development & Support

Members will discuss the results of the survey regarding the scheduling of future meetings. Possible actions include approval of future meeting months and/or dates.

Doodle poll sent out and results were positive. NRS states council cannot meet less than four times per year. Majority of members chose January, February, March, April, August, September, November, and December. Poll on preference of days was also done. No Mondays, Wednesdays, Fridays, no 2nd Wednesdays, and not 3rd and 4th Tuesday. Available is the 1st, 2nd and 5th Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays. Proposed meeting

dates are as follows: 1st Tuesday of the meeting month, March 5th, May 7th, August 6th, October 1st and December 3rd.

Motion: Member Husson makes a motion to accept those proposed dates and calendar them.

2nd: Member Hawk

All in favor

Motion passes

Items to be included in future meetings: Member Hawk mentioned getting the annual review in the August meeting. Member Husson believes at the next meeting to include in the agenda discussing further the \$100,000 so it can be settled prior to the August meeting when it should be distributed. Member Hawk stated if money is to be distributed to an outside resource they should provide a report on use of that money and how they have met the premise of the law. Chair Young will extend an invitation to Dr. Slaby to attend next meeting and will provide him an outline of plans from the motion.

Chelli Smith stated the money needs to be expended in its entirety by June 30th of this year. Member Workman addressed Chair Young in regards to the money since it has already been given to NASS and not the RPDPs, need to ask them to look at budget and see how much conference would cost and redistribute back to RPDPs to go for professional development

9. Public Comment #2 (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Public comment will be taken during this agenda item on any matter within the Council jurisdiction, control, or advisory power. No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. The Chair will impose a time limit of three minutes.

No public comment in Carson City.

Las Vegas: Chelli Smith shared that one of their employees, Frank Matthews, passed away on December 15th. He was a big part of computer science surge in Nevada. He was a valued member of the RPDP family.

10. Adjournment

Motion: Member Husson moves to adjourn

2nd: Member Brockett

All in favor

Meeting adjourned.