NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FUNDING
September 28, 2023
9:00 AM

Office	Address	City	Room
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Rd.	Las Vegas	Board Room
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Board Room
Department of Education	Virtual	Virtual	Livestream Livestream with Captions

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE COMMISSION MEETING

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT
Guy Hobbs, Chair
Joyce Woodhouse
Punam Mathur
Dr. David Jensen
Dusty Casey
Kyle Rodriguez
Jason Goudie
Mark Mathers
Paul Johnson
Nancy Brune

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT
Megan Peterson, Deputy Superintendent
Jeremy Aguero, Applied Analysis

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT
David Gardner, Chief Deputy Attorney General

1. Call to Order, Roll Call

Meeting called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chair Hobbs. Quorum was established. Chair Hobbs noted for the record that they are joined by Chief Deputy Attorney General David Gardner.

2. Public Comment #1

There was one written public comment from Penney Cotterman regarding agenda item 4. *(See "PublicComment1_ Penney_Kotterman_AP_College_Board_Study.pdf" for details)*

3. Nevada Department of Education (NDE) Update *(Information, Discussion, and Possible Action)*

Megan Peterson stated since we last met with you, we have been working on three key areas. This includes procuring the two contracts that we potentially were discussing during our last meeting regarding updates to the $2 billion investment 10-year plan. They are in their final stages of approval, and we anticipate that that will be completed, hopefully, by this Friday or Monday. Secondly during our off time, we had worked with a working group that was created to inventory and identify areas of information in relation to Assembly Bill 400, which includes requirements to report quarterly for school districts and charter schools on certain achievement metrics that as a result of the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan are hoping to identify in areas of improvement for students. This included meeting internally with department staff to identify what existing accountability framework still work, as well as then external work with the school districts, as well as receiving information from Silver State Governance regarding possible solutions for currently available reports that may also have that information and Chair member Paul Johnson will be digging into this a little bit more later in our meeting today. Lastly, we sat down and we're looking at the different requirements and components for the recommendations that are to be made by the Commission on School Funding and identified additionally the due dates. We identified, as I mentioned, the various recommendations that are required to be submitted. Proposed draft timelines for introducing the materials, making recommendations, and then submitting to the required parties, including the Governor, the legislative counsel bureau. There will be an interim finance committee requirement in the future, which we did not currently identify and the interim finance committee, and so there are color coding options available on this timeline. The oranges color represents materials and the timeline in which they were introduced which includes review from today and our last meeting, the recommendation for the final recommendations from the committee to the department and then the dates by which those recommendations need to be submitted to the respective parties. We will look forward to additional conversation at the end of the meeting today and take recommendations for what the commission would like to see at the next meeting and we will update accordingly.

Chair Hobbs asked if the timeline could also be emailed directly to each member of the commission. I think this is an extremely important reference document for all of us as far as organizing the priority of tasks that we have, which are certainly not few.

Megan Peterson stated they will certainly do that. *(See "3. CSF_RecommendedTimeline.pdf")*

4. Senate Bill 98 (SB 98) from the 82nd Legislative Session, Interim Study Overview *(Information and Discussion)*

Beau Bennett stated at last meeting, we introduced the accountability matrix for the quarterly review that is required by the Commission under AB400 and SB98. This time, we're going to discuss an added duty to the Commission. He gave a presentation on an interim study required by SB98, to include small district funding, teacher pipeline, teacher and support personnel compensation, law changes to sales and property tax structures, interim study due date.

David Jensen stated they just had a school board meeting on Tuesday night where we talked about Senate Bill 231 and as I mentioned to some, our Humboldt County School District's the first district taking this to Interim Finance Commission on, on October 11th, but the conversation centered around SB231 and this lines with point three teacher and support personnel compensation, we're missing administration and Senate Bill 231 very clearly excludes administration from consideration in there for the intent and the purpose that we recognize, but as we engage the conversation with the Board of Trustees in Humboldt County, our teacher vacancy rate is right now is 5%. My administrative vacancy rate is 11%. We're also up against a difficulty in hiring administrators to cover our schools, which is essential to support our teachers and our classified staff members. As we look at this, even though this, this talks about teacher and support personnel compensation as a side consideration and area of focus, I think we also need to include our administration that pipeline flows right through our classified and certified to administration. All of it interconnects and I often become a little concerned when we leave out one group of individuals in either a study or a compensation matrix, and I just share that from a superintendent perspective that's struggling to find administration to support my schools.

Chair Hobbs stated he appreciated his point and think they might have to do a review of the language from SB98 and 400, in a lot of places that allowed the commission to go further than what was actually specifically prescribed within the statute. I would hope that this would be one of those areas and we would be able to take a more holistic look at the overall staffing needs.

Paul Johnson stated one of the things that is near and dear to my heart is the school construction piece, improvements of facilities. I just think one thing that I think is important to note that for many of the smaller school districts that don't have the capacity to raise sufficient funds to secure a loan, that debt alone is not going to solve that problem. There has to be some sort of matching contribution either from the state or from other -- from some other source that may not have to be repaid. I don't know how that vehicle takes place, but if in our instance with align in order to fund a $65 million school, we had to tape together, this last session we were taking a look at ways to figure out how to finance that five different sources of funds in order to do that which still required a significant matching of almost half in order for us to do that because the revenue that we're able to generate locally doesn't secure a great amount in debt. Hopefully that can be a component as well.

Dusty Casey asked, under the achievement metrics in there, are we somehow capturing dual enrollment programs. Because I see it talks about AP programs, specifically IB programs, but I don't see where it captures the college and career readiness piece specifically related to dual enrollment, which has become a huge component in our state and a lot of schools don't offer AP programs, but they concentrate on dual enrollment.

Beau Bennett stated he does not see any of the metrics that would cover dual enrollment. I do believe in the legislative letter intent, there is a review of the dual enrollment, but there is no matrix present for that with, with the note that any other metrics prescribed by the commission can be added. That can be included, although it doesn't appear to be included right now.

Dusty Casey stated he thinks that's something they need to include because again, first of all, schools are required if they're able to, to offer that program and a lot of students are opting now for dual enrollment in place of AP. I do think that's something that we need to track along with these other metrics.

Chair Hobbs stated with respect to the comments about including administration as well as the dual enrollment issue that was just raised, he doesn't know that we need to take a specific action as a commission to also include those onto the list of items that we wish to measure and track. He asked if there's anybody on the commission that feels that those shouldn't be added to the list. If that's not the case, I believe they should be added to the list.

David Jensen stated as part of the last commission meeting he took this to the Nevada Association of School Superintendents and received some feedback that he will share. I'm making some notation of what we've heard today to align those under the NAS recommendations and once we get to that, we can embed those as potential areas for other metrics as defined.

Chair Hobbs stated he thinks it's important that they do that because they need to start with a complete and comprehensive list of all of the different points of measurement and, clearly, there's deliverables for us that are set out in statute, but there we do have the latitude to add additional areas of inquiry and study to try to improve upon the final product. Over the next meeting or two, we identify additional areas of data collection and research, unless there's people on the commission that feel otherwise, we should go ahead and just simply get those added to the list. He asked Dr. Jensen to send forward the wording that he thinks would be appropriate in that area to NDE. *(See "4. SB98 Interim Study CSF 9.28.pdf" for details)*

5. Scope of Contracts *(Information, Discussion, and Possible Action)*

Chair Hobbs stated this was a discussion on scope of contracts from outside subject matter experts to assist the commission in meeting the deliverables. Obviously, we do need a complete list of all of the deliverables that were required to have as well as those that we believe would, would add to the quality of the work product that we're doing and associated timelines, due dates, and all of those sorts of things. I've been thinking about this quite a bit since the last meeting. This naturally divides into two or three areas, and I would certainly invite Megan as we talk about scopes of services and procurement issues for the state. I certainly don't want to speak out of line with regards to the requirements for procurement or any of those types of things, but in my mind, item number one was to engage outside subject matter experts to help. I'm thinking about the report that we filed last year that report was based on information that was available at that point in time, and we did file that report. It includes some extremely important numbers in it, like the funding targets over the ensuing 10 years. The comparison of the funding targets between APA and NCES and what Nevada is currently spending. Our next agenda item, we will actually be hearing that today. That was item number one, because we needed to have that done before we could update the rest of the prior report. Item number two and doing that work product would be to also engage in a process of updating the funding and revenue options that we identified in that report. Now, clearly, if the targets change, some of the computations that we went through the last time will also change, and I think it would be naive to believe that that's a trivial matter. The mathematics and work that needs to be done, particularly when you're dealing with something as complex as property tax. I'm hoping that the next piece of this that we can get moving on, and I think Megan made reference to it in her part of the discussion, would be to enable the update of all of the funding options that we identified the last time. Now, if we have the updated targets and the update of all of the different funding scenarios that we developed last time, we will have essentially updated the prior report, which was not a simple thing to compile and, in my mind, that speaks to identifying the quantity of dollars that we believe are needed to achieve certain goals, and it's fundamentally important to everything that we're doing. In the item after the next item, when Paul Johnson walks us through the work of the working group, this is probably the centerpiece of our work during this go around, and that's identifying reporting mechanisms that would lead us to a system of reporting that would help us gauge improvements in performance, return on investment, and other related types of things that would improve the confidence, I think, on the part of legislators and others that the additional investment of funds over time is a worthwhile thing and is paying dividends in one of the most important areas in our state, and that's the education of our youth. That's a third area where we will need subject matter expert support, and as I've read through the list of all of the things that we're being asked to do, some tend to group as very similar types of things and some are quite different than those, and I'm not saying this is articulately as I would like to be saying it, but for example, it was mentioned just a little bit ago about classification and compensation for educators. That's probably its own nuanced area of study separates and apart from putting together different pieces of data and reporting mechanisms that would shed a light more on things like ROI and performance. I have a feeling that we'll probably be subdividing this very important area into two or three or even more areas of individual concentration, and I think as we start to go through that with Paul today, hopefully we could be mindful of what kinds of buckets each of those things fit into. We could begin to identify what the deliverables would be to both meet those things that are mandated by the legislation, as well as those things that we feel would better shed light on the value of continued investment in education. That's essentially what I had in mind to talk about, but knowing that the procurement process can sometimes be a lengthy one, the more that we can move on elements of what we need to do as quickly as possible by identifying those deliverables and working with NDE to get that process started. I'm hoping that we're already started on the second item that I mentioned today, which, which is the part that would enable us to update all of the different funding scenarios that we put together last time. We would essentially be in a position before the end of this year of having an updated report that we previously filed that that's certainly my hope and the rest of our efforts can then remain focused on all of those things that remain on our list of must do tasks and things that we feel would enhance the chances of gaining additional funding.

Mark Mathers stated he thinks they talked about a concept a year or two ago, and since we're talking about the scope of work for the consultant, I'd like to raise this to the commission in 2022, both gubernatorial candidates expressed a pledge of no new taxes and I took both of them seriously when they said that, and I feel like well I would propose or make a motion to include a no taxes scenario to the work, that the consultant would do. In other words, if we took those statements at face value, I'd like to consider a scenario where we look at, well, how would we fund K through 12 education if there aren't any new taxes, and the only way that I can think of doing that is a reallocation of state and other local government tax resources, and so to me, whether this is a scenario B, C, D, E, or F in the study, I feel like, there are a large segment of the population that would not support taxes. We had the two gubernatorial candidates express that they wouldn't support any increased taxes. How much would we need to reallocate from other governments and what would that look like to fund education more adequately is, is really the kind of the question I'd like to explore and if it's not enough, then I think we need to call it out to say, we've looked at reallocating tax resources and it only gets us this far or maybe it is adequate based on different scenario as a consultant would look at to fund an extra $1 billion a year or $2 billion a year for K through 12. We've taken a couple of shots at providing ideas for tax increases or changes to the tax structure here and we've done our best work and I'm proud of the work, Chairman Hobbs, that you've done in that area, but I think for the next report, I'd really like a consultant to look at that scenario and quantify what that could look like and again, if there are shortfalls, so be it, but I just think I would like to see that and explore that further. That would be an additional element to the scope of work for consultant that I'd like to see.

Chair Hobbs stated everything would be on the table. We identified alternative revenue sources that are traditional funding sources for education in the state. I think we're still on solid foundation to do that and I'm saying that more from the standpoint of we were asked to, we were asked to identify methods of funding over a 10-year period and I recognize that where the candidates may have had a no tax pledge and I don't remember many candidates ever coming in with, I really like taxes pledge. I suppose I don't want to delve into the artfulness of politics around campaigns, but I would think that since we're looking at a 10-year period, the notion of looking at traditional and historic ways of funding education where we believe there is capacity probably should remain in the forefront, but in the case where we might continue to have difficulty getting the legislature to look at modifying sales tax or property tax or those kinds of things, we do need to have options. I wholeheartedly agree with you and what we're essentially talking about here is directed local or redirected funding from funding that already exists, so essentially that's going to come from local governments and possibly other state agencies. I'm not saying anything in opposition to what you were saying, Mark. I think that ought to be included. I don't think that we should abandon the funding scenarios that we've developed today though and I know that's not what you're suggesting. You were suggesting something in addition to that.

Paul Johnson stated related to this on the sufficiency piece, we may need a refresh of the APA information because that was rooted in a 2006 study and post COVID, I think education has changed dramatically, especially with the educational needs to support students in a, in a manner other than just academically. I would be interested to see how that may have affected the staffing allocations that they have on their tables and the sufficiency targets that were rooted in that study.

Chair Hobbs stated he agrees with what he’s saying and thinks they're going to get an update today that includes for APA numbers inflated forward. For comparative purposes that at some point we should maybe contact APA again and ask them to opine on whether or not we're still in the, for lack of better words, in the ballpark with what we're using as the APA comparable.

Paul Johnson stated a lot of things have changed. Education has changed. The students have changed. It seems intuitive to me that along that line, some of the staffing and things that we have to do and the burdens that we have on education as we provide services to students, not just instructional services, but services to meet the whole child probably have changed slightly. I don't know how dramatically that would be, but that certainly would impact the sufficiency, the adequacy piece and the optimal piece.

Jason Goudie stated member Johnson mentioned that it was 2006. I know that they did in somewhere around 2018 because I was here and I know that updated parts of it. Is it that the staffing models? Because I agree if it's back in 2006, I think even 2018, we need a little bit of a refresher. I just want to clarify that there are some pieces that I do believe they did refresh because I know they did. I was part of the study that they talked about going through and understanding the needs of districts and built it that way as well. Is that consistent with what you have?

Paul Johnson stated it's been refreshed a few times, but it was rooted in 2006 and a lot of the staffing tables and charts and everything else were there, and in 2018, I don't know that it had changed drastically from that period of time, but post COVID, I think it has changed significantly. Although the numbers and information may have been updated to adjust a more recent effect financially on those tables, I think we need to know whether or not the tables have changed as well.

Chair Hobbs thinks that segue ways into the next item because we're going to be hearing about updated values for NCES, APA and what Nevada currently spends, perhaps as an extension of the work that applied analysis has been doing on that. We can maybe reach out to APA. Hopefully, it would be something as simple as an opinion letter, as opposed to a complete redo of all of the modeling and that sort of thing, and if it is that simple, that would be a very easy thing to do. *(See "5. AA-Quantifying the potential Funding Need_ADA.pdf" for details)*

6. Update and discussion on the 10-year plan to meet optimal funding after a $2B investment

Jeremy Aguero stated it strikes him as important as we pick up the newspaper and we read about K through 12 education and we read about the arguments that we may have with the conversations that are in front of us today, that just how much progress has been made by this commission in this state over the last several years. Here we are talking about a revised funding formula that allows money to actually stay with K through 12 education, senator Woodhouse, I don't think anyone back then ever would have imagined that we'd have a fully funded K through 12 education funds as a rainy-day fund specific to education. Since that time, we've also had an unprecedented level of funding toward K through 12 education, and now we're having a conversation about education advocacy with a framework that I think commending both the school districts, the state superintendent, as well as the Governor and his staff in terms of preparing what I would argue to be one of the most aggressive and comprehensive accountability frameworks anywhere in the United States today, pretty remarkable place to be in just five or six years from where we started and having these types of conversations. As we go forward and we talk about where we're funding today, it just strikes me as, as just taking a moment to express thanks to all the folks that made that happen, not the least of which are the people that I am talking to here today that are charged with the oversight and execution of so many of the important elements of what makes it work today, whether that's on the front lines of our school systems or our school districts, or generally in terms of that oversight. I just wanted to express that gratitude, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for that.

He gave a presentation on per pupil funding comparison, national average per pupil funding, national average funding level, APA per pupil funding, and APA funding level.

Chair Hobbs asked if the NCES data is updated now through 2021 or 2022.

Jeremy Aguero stated it's updated to 2021.

Chair Hobbs stated these are incredibly important numbers because again, they form up the targets that will be trying to craft funding scenarios around and obviously subject to a double check on APA and their concurrence with this still being reflective of what their recommendations were previously.

Jeremy Aguero continued his presentation.

Chair Hobbs stated he raises an interesting point that I think we all should just be aware of when we look at this. If we imagine ourselves doing this, the same exercise next year and the year after and continuing to update this, which is what we probably should be doing every year, we will continue to roll 10 years forward and that is also a product of the way the legislation is written, because each time we convene, we're asked to provide funding recommendations for the ensuing 10 years. That continues to move forward, but I think the point that you're raising in terms of measuring progress against the original values may also be of interest, but I think what's important to us and I'd like to have your comment, comments on it because again, this is going to be refreshed every year. As you look at the light blue gaps, hopefully over time we see those getting smaller each time we reproduce it in your set of values.

Jeremy Aguero stated the record is complete. These gaps are materially smaller than the last time you all convened and I think again, credit to many folks in the state, including this group in helping us get there. He continued his presentation.

Dusty Casey asked what the growth rate assumption is we're using in the national average and APA studies to reach those targets out 10 years.

Jeremy Aguero stated we are using an expected rate of normalized growth overall of about 2% per year. From where they are today, just imagining that's where they're going to grow. We can always modify that. In order to get between where we are today and the current national average to sort of catch up to the NCES levels, that's about 4.8% per year necessary for us to catch up. We'll have to do better than what we're expecting and that will have to be additive to that level. To get to the, excuse me, the NCES is 4.5%, to get to the APA level, which is slightly higher, it is about 4.8% growth rate that is necessary to catch up to that by the time we get to that level. So those are the growth rates that we're utilizing for purposes of the analysis that you've looked at today.

Chair Hobbs asked if the assumption that he made for inflation for both NCES and APA were identical.

Jeremy Aguero stated they were, and us locally within the State of Nevada.

Dusty Casey asked if they knew what the last 10 years or so have looked like in the growth rates of the national average. I'm just curious if 2% is a safe assumption that the national average will only grow at that and I know we can only make it an assumption or a calculation, but it seems to me like that's kind of maybe how we got so far behind is we've only slowly grown 1 or 2% while the national average has grown at a much faster pace.

Jeremy Aguero stated he thinks his assessment is right on a number of levels. We can bring back because I don't have the numbers on the top of my head right now. I can bring back or send to the commission as appropriate the last 10-year average. You can kind of get a sense of where we have been, where others have been. The hard part is, is the last 10 years is like looking at a rollercoaster. We've got the great recession, we've got the pandemic, and then we've got this sort of rebound period after both of those, which has made it a little bit difficult to be, to make a meaningful comparison relative to all of that, but we can send it over to you so you can kind of take a look at it and get a sense of where things have been. The only other portion that I would offer is that you're right on another level, and one of the conversations, and this came up a great deal in 2019 is the disconnect between the growth that we have had in absolute spending and the growth that we have had in per capita or per student spending. Oftentimes, we have lauded the number of increases that we've had in K through 12 Education or in a specific revenue source, but it's not until we go back and see the math when it's, when it's sent down to each individual school district when they have for a great deal of the past 10 years, greater than expected growth in, in either expenses or greater than expected growth in enrollment and that number gets diluted substantially relative to that growth rate. Perhaps looking at it both in terms of enrollment growth as well as aggregate amount of spending as well as on an inflation adjusted per pupil level would be helpful in getting an understanding of how all three of those elements come together from a comparative analysis standpoint.

Jason Goudie stated on the slide where he essentially adjusted for the legislatively approved budget, we know that that was a massive increase. I've watched the news and there were a number of other states who put maybe not historic, I don't think anybody had the levels or the percentages that we did, but I think there was a lot of other states that significantly improve their components, and I think that will probably affect the national average, maybe, maybe back to Dusty's point a little bit more in this year than it was. I think that we made headway, and I know that we don't have that data yet and trying to compare this, but I just want to be cautiously optimistic that we've truly gained as much as we really have, and we won't know until 2025 where we get the 2023 numbers or next (inaudible). We'll give a little bit more because I think that, until we see what happened in 2023, because there were a number of places that funded significantly more, you saw what some of the raises were at LA Unified for support. They obviously had to get more money in order to do some of these things. I looked at the fund balances, they have more than we do, but not significantly more. So more of just a comment, because I know that it's not available, but you also do a lot of economic reviews over the nation, and so just wanted to get any feedback on that as well.

Jeremy Aguero stated the answer to his question is he's absolutely right. I think we are ultimately going to be a little light, not hugely light, just because we have big inflation numbers, but I think we may be a little light when the data come out a couple of years from now and we actually see where we are in this next school year. To your comment, if we need to, and we have certainly been looking at it with regard to large urban districts, there has been a disproportionately large increase relative to some of that funding. It's harder for me to see the extent to which that is across all of the school districts in the United States, but your point is dead on accurate and my guess is we're probably a little light in our comparison going in.

Punam Mathur stated the same slide he was referring to the comparison, that shows the implication of the investment just made. From a neighbor's perspective, people that aren't living in this all the time, we always have been told that we're at the bottom of funding, 49th, 50th and so if I look at this chart to the 2025 estimate, based on the numbers today, where would that put us in the overall ranking?

Jeremy Aguero stated they had the exact same conversation last night in their office about needing to inflation adjust everyone up and then create a comparative analysis of all 50 states relative to the change in the rankings. I also asked my team to actually build that into the model as Chairman Hobbs indicated, one of the efforts is to update the report. I would like to see also the model that updates the report to allow the comparative analysis that's done to automatically update. If you do a what if scenario on sales tax or property tax or any other revenue, then we can kind of see how it moves relative to that ranking. We are working on that. We will have it for you, I think in relatively short order, but I want to make sure that I had it right as opposed to try and bring it right now.

Punam Mathur stated if I'm understanding this correctly, looking again at that same chart, the 2025 estimates, $13,368 per people, as compared to a national average of 17,006. Using Nevada as the numerator, and the national average as the denominator, based on this snapshot, we are about 79% of the distance.

Jeremy Aguero stated that is correct.

Punam Mathur stated it'd be interesting to go back to what we submitted to the legislature to see what the percentage was. I think it does underscore the gratitude that we need to express to the lawmakers and the Governor for the leadership and the investment. It moves us some distance, but doesn't get us there and I think that's the message that we've still got to carry forward.

Chair Hobbs stated when you look at the 10-year phase and you look at the far-right value, the delta between what we identified previously, as Jeremy noted, it's much lower now, and it's obviously a function of that.

Punam Mathur stated the point that's been made a couple of times is a really important one, is COVID was illuminating and devastating for every district, because it was for every child, and so I do think that there are lots of different discussions happening all over about how to invest more in the whole child, how to invest more in mental health, how to invest more, and we're not the only ones that are going to be sort of challenging ourselves to do more, and be better to deliver for our babies.

Chair Hobbs stated he thinks something else that's kind of interesting about these values is the gap between APA and the national average is closed a bit, and the decision that we had made, we really used three metrics against Nevada spending, the third one being the numbers that were provided by NAS. We had a lot of discussion about; well, the national average is an optimal funding. APA is probably more optimal than the national average. I mean, logic would suggest that it's a higher value. The fact that they're coming in closer to each other, I think, adds some credibility to this target range that we're looking at as well.

Paul Johnson stated he’s been doing this for a year or two and cannot tell you the sessions of disappointment that we have had in education for years and it all had been over discussions about how much revenue was really in the pot because it was split between state and local revenue and changing the titanic change in just the formula is huge in the way that it is structured. So now there's no more arguing over the money. We know what the money is? It's in one pot. That in itself is a huge change and then to have the investment, because we were told as school districts change the formula first, and then we'll put more money in it and that happened. That builds trust, and I think it is very encouraging for me and in my chair as I move forward and I would agree with Punam, as we tell our story, it would be nice to overlay where we were before the huge investment to see what that data was and now where we are, but I think there's also an expectation that things are going to change, and I think we're going to talk about that pretty soon, too, and we need to identify what those measures of change should be thinking of the end in mind. We can figure out what we're going to measure as we track progress.

Chair Hobbs stated he’s really pleased that Jeremy identified some of the areas of progress so far because they're certainly not minor, which you are also reflecting on,. I tend to get caught up in the, okay, this is September of 2023. We have two pieces of legislation and the legislative memorandum, getting us a bunch of tasks that we have to accomplish over the next several months and I tend to look at those with a great deal of excitement, things that I know we have to do, but I think it's nice to have, and very appropriate to spent a couple of moments reflecting on just how amazing the progress has been over the last four or five years with the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. The ability to identify the revenues that are truly education related revenues and not have this sort of end around flow chart that only a few people could really understand. Now at that part of it is very clear and the commitment that was made during the last legislative session by the Governor and the legislature. I would say that that's very encouraging, and we know what the tasks are to keep that kind of progress moving forward, and we'll focus on those over the coming months. We thank you very, very much for getting this turned around as quickly as you did, and we look forward to continuing to work with you on any additional tweaking or updating of this part of it and the rest of the report as well. *(See "6. Commission on School Funding - Target Funding (Sept. 28 2023) v1.pdf" for details)*

7. Working Group Report *(Information, Discussion, and Possible Action)*
Chair Hobbs stated he thinks this is the beginning of a discussion that I hope will enable us to identify all of the different pieces of information that Paul and I talked about this the other day. All of you that are involved with school administration, I started to learn about three years ago, and I needed to (inaudible) at first about all the different reports that you guys were talking about that you file at the state and the district and the school level, not being aware of all of the information contained in all of those reports and even being less aware of what happened to those reports when they were delivered, wherever they were delivered. As I learned, it's a massive amount of information that's being, being provided, which is obviously a workload on a lot of you folks, but I think that what that data tells us, is really, truly the most important thing, not just meeting a deadline of filing a report. I know the part of what Paul has been embarking on with the rest of the working group is identifying data that exists out there, data that would be helpful in putting together a system of reporting that would reflect on true improvements in performance as well as return on investment because that's going to be essential to continue the type of progress that we've seen over the last couple of years. Hopefully all of that helps form up what our deliverables will be for our subject matter experts and getting this part of it moving forward but I'd like to turn it to Paul with a lot of gratitude for being willing to take on the task of being the working group leader to help start to bring this together. This will likely be the focus of most of the rest of our meetings.

Paul Johnson stated he would like to start off by simply thanking the members and the folks from NDE that provided input on this. I know that David did something independent with the superintendents that he can share as well. We had Megan, James, and Beau from NDE and Peter Zutz also from the data assessment side was provided input as well, and when we started off, we really had to kind of go through an orientation and purpose phase to identify what it is that we're doing, where we are at the purpose and scope of the working group, and through the deliberations, we went through and, well, we did brainstorming basically to kind of identify some potential scope and purpose. As we discuss this, there's really two items that we need to take a look at. There's a short term, which we had discussed last time. With the huge investment, the historic investment that we just talked about, there is some sense of urgency that things will change. In the short term, we have to have some sort of deliverables that we're going to have to come up with for this next legislative session, which is probably just going to be on the input side of things, not on the output side of things. The output would be the student outcomes and the things that we want to have affect our students, that is going to happen down the line. Certainly, we can identify how we're spending and why we're spending. I think those things have to be identified and a lot of that work has already been done through NAS because they presented to the legislators if we were given more money. Here's the three priorities that we would spend our money in and that's how we got the, I guess, third leg of triangulating inadequacy as you mentioned, Chairman Hobbs, the NAS recommendations. We certainly can identify progress on those priorities, primarily on one priority, because much of the investment went into teachers, teacher wages and employee wages, additional staff and programs and services and then the more complicated piece is what to measure in dovetailing on what you said, Chairman Hobbs, there is school districts are already doing a lot of stuff. There are district improvement plans. There are school improvement plans. There's a state improvement plan. There's the Nevada School Performance Framework, all of those provide very salient information on what schools are doing and school districts are doing in order to improve certain measures of the academic progress. Some of it is limited in scope because what gets measured gets done in the performance framework; it's very limited in the depth of the things that we measure to provide star ratings or ratings at schools. We don't know how connected those are in a seamless way so that we can track the dollars that go and the ingredients that go into the cake and then the chemical process that takes bake the cake to what the cake tastes like. I wanted to use a different analogy other than plumbing. Hopefully we can have a more dessert-based analogy in this phase of our study than the plumbing study that we had previously. No offense intended Punam. In addition, we have data from SchoolNomics that provides or insight data, it may be called that every school district gets that provides per pupil and total spending by category, and it resembles our chart of accounts, and if, if we could do anything going forward, if there's a way for us to frame everything that we have going forward with the same language and stratification, as we have in our chart of accounts that would make it would make comparison and aggregation of data a lot easier, by the way. We went through that part of the 387-303 reports, we have our comprehensive annual financial reports. They all have different formats. They use different language and that all stuff that all needs to be connected and be more consistent as well. I think probably the most important piece of this, and I talked about a little bit is we need to identify, if you start with that in mind, what are the things that are most important that we should be taking a look at as far as student, academic achievement, and human development and then work backwards from there. If we start saying we want academic achievement, what are those components of academic achievement do we want to measure? And that should be tied to, that should be correlated with those things that directly correlate with success of a student, and not just standardized test scores, but something much broader than that. What about growth? What aspects of growth are we going to take a look at? What are those most important features, and all of those bubbles that we have in the dashboard that NDE has provided, I think that's a great document, a good start. All of that stuff needs to be identified and then from that, we can work backward to figure out the staffing, the resources and all those things that we should be investing in that are all evidence based. Everything that we do, the district improvement plans, the school improvement plans all have to be grounded in evidence before we can say that we are going to do something to change how we are going to impact students. It goes through a vetting period to make sure it's grounded, and it goes through NDE to make sure it's approved. All of that data exists and is available. Synthesizing it into a more connected, means, I think, is something that we probably could look to somebody from the outside coming in who has knowledge and expertise, not just with our data, but with other states, and maybe can draw from other areas that have either gone through something similar or has more information that we can draw from best practices, things that worked or didn't work because we don't want to create something and replicate mistakes that have made in other areas. I know that David had some talk to the NAS folks about some of those measures.

David Jensen stated during their conversation in connection with the work of the subcommittee, he took their four academics, areas of focus to the NAS group and asked the question what should other metrics be considered by the commission include. Before I go through some of those, member Johnson and I then had a subsequent phone conversation, and so I'm going to share the recommendations or some of the suggestions that came from NAS, but we're going to need to be careful and certainly just not blanket adopt those, because one of the things we're going to find is that whatever we do, there's going to have to be the consistency of the data collection across the districts. Otherwise, we're going to struggle to do an apples-to-apples comparison. One of the things we will have to vet is this information number one regularly available across districts and number two, some of the pieces that were recommended, not all districts have the capacity or collecting that data. With that being said, under number one achievement metrics, as member Casey identified and I would be in full support is dual enrollment and some type of measure across dual enrollment, and I believe you see some consistency against some of the other measures that are listed above. From the NAS group in addition, we had percentage of graduates completing service towards their community. Again, I think there's value in that but what would that look like in terms of data collection? Percentage of graduates presenting a portfolio of work to their community, percentage of graduates participate in peer mentoring or other formal leadership activities and then qualitative measures of student achievement, which could include things such as service learning, project based learning, and other drastic barriers. In addition, we had both 9th and 10th grade credit sufficiency components, and then the percentage of six through 21-year-old students eligible for special education that spend 80% or more of their time in the general education population, meaning are they being exposed to grade and standard grade level content standards. Under improvement metrics, we did hear in our public comment this morning that one area that we might want to look at in addition is the AP exam and how we are measuring those outcomes, but in addition, we had the percentage and number of students demonstrating proficiency on teacher created meaningful and holistic assessments. Again, which I think will be a little challenging to measure, but it's something that we can look at. Qualitative measures describing students who work to improve their AGP is required through the NSPF. Then we have the percentage of students meeting their AGP on the English Language Proficiency Assessment through WIDA. Also, I better clarify AGP stands for Adequate Growth Percentile. Under hiring and retaining staff, in addition to the ones that we identified, and again, we do have under there the rate of vacancies and positions for teacher support and administrators. The other ones that (inaudible) recommended is a look at what are our mentoring programs for our teachers and administrators look like? Description of teacher and administrator, professional learning provided through districts and measures related to pay increases and other fiscal investments designed to hire and retain and again, that can tie right into conversations about teacher classified and administration and then something else that I just added, given, given my comments in our earlier compensation, is I know there's a lot of studies that look at compensation comparisons, but that might be interesting as we look at these aspects of how are we doing as a state with this historic investment, where I know every school district is providing increases SB231, but ultimately, what do we look like as we compare ourselves to the national? Then finally under expectation metrics, we had one recommendation around family engagement and how to measure family engagement, which is going to be essential to the success of our students through the district. As I shared what if it pleases the commission, I'll consolidate this information and then push it out through Chair Hobbs so that it is here and then as we look at this again, these are just recommendations. I don't hold that all of these are going to have the value that we as the commission think, but I wanted to bring back what their recommendations were. Because again, we're going to have to, through our outside partners, ask the question, is this information collectible? But there are components of this that I truly think under other metrics as prescribed may add value as we do our work as a commission over these upcoming years.

Paul Johnson stated that should give you an idea of a set of opinions of the type of data that could be included into a framework that would expand currently what we have, and there's as many people that we have on this commission is probably that many more opinions that we would have for the data that goes in there. If you take a look at the school performance framework, it looks at academic growth and there's a few measures of academic growth. It's a little more generous. I think it’s secondary level this whole framework than at the elementary level. Growth English language proficiency, closing opportunity gaps, student engagement, those are components. It's not deep in a culture and climate, which I think are important. Those are those base level needs that we need to make sure are there before kids can even learn. Family engagement, which was just mentioned. Recruitment and retention, which is another component as well. We are basically going to have to tie together. Every student succeeds at as NRS385.A600, NRS390.105, SP98, SP400, wrap those up in a bow, so all of that information is digestible to folks who are not steeped in on all of this knowledge. I think the dashboard that NDE has for the framework, I think, I think that works that makes sense to me. I don't know if there are other ways to present this type of information or not, but one of the challenges that we've identified in order for us to have data for all of this, that it has to be relevant, valid, reliable, comparable, uniform, has to be gathered in a similar way, reported in similar fashion before we can use it for any comprehensive comparison. That's what we have to identify what it is first and then we're going to have to put into place how we collect that data so that we're all doing it the same way, and I can't begin to tell you how important it is that whatever it is that we do is linked to our part of accounts because that's how every school district compiles its financial data. As we're talking about stuff, we're talking about staff and we're talking about aides, for example, teacher aides, we need to make sure that we're using a common language and putting those in the common chart of accounts because if we don't do that, we are going to have some problems with the different languages and interpreting those types of things and that's one of the things I found when I went through the APA study, went through their staffing tables, they identified things by job description and I had to go through with and map those job descriptions to where they would be placed in our financial statement so that I can do a comparison of the number of employees in each category, and we are thousands and thousands of employees short of that adequacy study based on the ones that have been in place. So that's kind of where we are at this point. This is a huge task that I think would benefit from an outside independent, reputable entity to come in here and help us guide through this process and if the working group is the one that's engaged with that on an operating basis, that seems to make sense to me, but at this point, I think I'd welcome any input from the rest of the folks that have been in discussion of this to see if they would like to add.

Jason Goudie stated as Dr. Jensen and you were speaking and mentioned vacancies, it reminded me of a conversation I just had yesterday. When you think about measuring vacancies, obviously CCSD is going to skew the number in a great way and under NRS388G, which is the reorganization bill, there's significantly more autonomy in the staffing levels or staffing authority for our principals than maybe some other districts and under the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan, we even under our old plan, we used to give them positions, X number of teachers equated to X dollars. We no longer do that. We now give them a per pupil amount of money for which they go through and spend. Other districts may still have class sizes and other components that kind of drive those pieces, what may define it as a true vacancy, CCSD does not and knowing that we have 18,000 licensed personnel that may not, they're not all teachers, but they're all licensed personnel, psychologists, social workers, etc. The way it works for us is that we give the school X amount of dollars. They've got a few required positions, a principal and a couple of other things, but they determine their staffing and they could inadvertently skew what a true vacancy number is. If they know that they can't hire people because we're short in the state, a couple of thousand positions, and so they just staffed to a low level. It may look like there's low vacancies, whereas what we really need to get to an adequate class size would be a much higher number. I don't have an answer, but I just want that as we start going down that analysis, and I know this is a little premature, but I didn't want to forget about it because I just had a conversation yesterday that when we start talking about vacancies we've got to start talking about what that truly means because if we don't, our data based on the way the principles may or may not staff because of the autonomy may skew that on a year to year basis without really have any factual basis as to what vacancy is.

Punam Mathur stated it was a big deal to pass to modernize the formula and there's a lot of cynicism that exists in the world anyway and some of that is the distrust that anything in government never happens the way that the public is told it will happen. One of the commitments that we made that the formula, the promise that the formula makes is money will follow the students, in terms of that short term, immediately go back to the legislature and have confidence in reporting back that to me is one of the things that we need to find a way that's real and meaningful to then say, look money is falling the kid. I don't know what that looks like or what the metrics are or the gauges are, but I do think we've got an obligation to just deliver and confirm that that one fundamental feature of the formula is true. There are so many things to measure and it just can glaze everybody over. I can't help but just remind myself that right now our default is the national rankings. Those dang national rankings that inform and continue to represent the public's belief about how it, how we're doing, and so over the long term, I'd love to create some easy to understand for my neighbor set of gauges that just feels more reliable, feels more relevant, is more useful, and therefore replaces in their minds, the national rankings, or maybe someday, our own work will lead us to reflect top quartile in national ranking, I don't know how that would work, but in the, in the midterm, there's got to be research that says here are the harbingers or the strongest, most valid predictors of student achievements, if we can identify the three or four of those that nationally and over time have demonstrated themselves to be just really unassailable harbingers. That we should peg there, and start to really challenge ourselves to do right along those measures. Because if they're the harbingers, then they're the harbingers and you mentioned, I think the ones that I've heard, third grade literacy, credit sufficiency or deficiency. I don't know what they are, but to get some national experts who could help us make a very strong case to the public to say these are the strongest harbingers or predictors of success. Therefore, those are the gauges that we're putting in and guess what, we are really bad at that right now, but that's okay. Now we know. This is the ambition and the aspiration because it's the thing that will change us over time. I don't know if that's of any use to you at all, but money falls a child in a two year something to make that strong case to elected officials and to the public and then in the short term to midterm, to really anchor tightly around the most reliable national predictors of student achievement.

Nancy Brune stated it goes back to what member Johnson said about sort of figuring out what are the outcomes, that we want to start with, but to your point, member Mathur, there are certain data points that we know are drivers of graduation rates. Has a kid taken algebra in 8th grade or is a kid reading by 3rd grade, and then you can work backwards and figure out, well, to teach algebra in 8th grade, do you have certified teachers in the schools? Like how many, and so tying the measures then or some of the inputs to the driver of the outcome? I do think it should be focused so that schools and NDE don't feel overwhelmed. We talked about probably 30 different indicators, but I think the research would, if we start with the research, there are probably a set of 5 to 10, which are very clear and focused and can give us sort of a roadmap.

Chair Hobbs stated something Jason said got me thinking about all of the different things that we have to address and answer and I think one that rises to the top. Punam, you were referring to it too, that we have the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan and the intent is for the funding to follow the individual student and I think it's important for us to be able to address whether or not that is actually happening because in your comments, Jason, you said that's how you know you're dealing with your individual schools is by passing that along to them, but I think it's going to be important for us to reaffirm to the legislature that it is in fact happening the way it was intended to happen. I think that's one of the things we need to address as well as be able to say affirmatively to them that yes, it is following the student and then the rest of this would fall under the end because of that, here are the benefits that we're now receiving. I think that's an important thing to address near the top of that list and Paul, you were saying something that I need a bit more clarity on as far as getting a subject matter expert to help guide part of this. It sounds like we probably need to have that assistance as we're formulating all of this. I think that's what you were suggesting, and so the actual types of expertise that would be needed to have them be able to help us, is that something that you're working group could also then identify and we could use that as a basis for going out and searching for the consultant that would enable you all to do what you've been asked to do.

Paul Johnson stated the short answer is yes. This is something that is much larger than a working group. It's going to require somebody, some entity doing this full time on a regular basis, scouring a much larger database than just the state of Nevada. There may actually be folks that are already on contract with the Nevada Department of Education who may be able to work on this, whether it's a WestEd or some other entity that this may be able to be included in the scope of work, if not, it would have to be developed as an additional scope of work. The input side of things where the money's going, I think it relatively easy for school districts to report because we all have a universal, somewhat universal chart of accounts, there are variances. We can identify the money down to the school level by function and the function means, the services provided. We have a chart of accounts that identifies instruction, students support, staff support, general administration, school administration on down the line. We can report that in total and on a per pupil basis. We can do the same thing with the, with the number of staff that we have, the number of teachers in total and the number of teachers on a per student basis. Those comparisons I think are pretty readily available in our financial framework. How we measure vacancies is a little bit different, but I think we need to make sure that we are not just meeting the state and federal minimum standards that are identified in statute, we need to build an optimal platform of measurement, reporting and accountability because that which gets measured gets done, and if we have a narrow focus on the measures that we are producing to grade schools and students and human performance, we are going to pigeonhole our resources to move those benchmarks, and I think that's what has been happening, and that's the danger of having this tremendous funding mechanism. With such shallow measures of results, it's going to produce the same thing that we've had in the past and that's the danger that we have. That's why I was talking about what Punam talked about and Nancy and David as well. We need to identify those predictors or those things that most strongly correlate with student success and human performance, and incorporate those things and figure out how to identify that the money that we have spent invested in our staff and programs and services are directed in order to move progress in that direction. This is probably the most important piece, most comprehensive, most complicated, especially those qualitative measures that identify feelings and how students feel in the culture and climate types of things in the quantitative stuff. I can give you these statistics and data for HR and finances out of my accounting system, I can tell you how much money we spent for instruction, how many staff members we have in any one of our schools and the number of students that stuff is easy. We can identify and we assume that there's a correlation, but we want to make sure that there's a strong correlation and influence.

Punam Mathur stated she guesses he got a really beautiful, maybe it was a backhanded compliment, maybe it's just a full-frontal compliment by the legislature when they said, here's a laundry list of things we'd like you to grapple with relative to accountability. As I look at the list, it is an awesome list and it's not a complete list. From the standpoint of us in this position of trying to manage a behemoth enterprise, less is more, and it's the right stuff. There's a part of me that looks at all our honeydew items, and say let's deliver against every homework assignment that the legislature has given us in all the different bills, and challenge ourselves to maybe even separately say, and here's our recommendation that, that addresses the hard questions that you just raised. Like what are the things that we should watch? What are the determinants of future success and all of that from my standpoint as a member of a Funding Commission, should be all around the KPIs, around the funding, because there's so many other things that, that impact and affect education that aren't within our purview at all. That's the hard part is to say, because board of directors of this mammoth enterprise, what are the gauges that we want to see on the dashboard so that we can look at them as a state quarterly and just look for the green, orange or red as harbinger, as a really easy way to see if we're trending in the right direction or not.

Paul Johnson offered a suggestion on how to wrap this up, because it's so huge. Maybe the first step is to get together with the Nevada Department of Education, I don't know if Megan may already have some ideas on that to identify a vendor who may be able to work on this, either short term to work on the short term deliverables but that we have those success indicators, I guess, to identify what we've done with the money and why, and then to see if there is any other scope of work that we discussed that would work with a contractor that they currently work with, that would be a short term, and then long term, we would have to work on developing in order for somebody to do a study, we have to give them an idea of what it is that we want them to study. There should be some discussion about that, what that would look like as well.

Nancy Brune stated maybe in terms of sequencing, it sounds like maybe the working group should meet again to come up with a scope and then we could sit down with NDE and talk about your first point. We talked through your first point.

Chair Hobbs stated that makes logical sense and again, I don't want to sound naive or redundant about this, but I think one of the first questions I would ask of whoever the greatest minds are in performance and return on investment and educational attainment and all of those other areas of expertise would be given what our objectives are here to produce a system of measurement that could be administratively supported over time that could be updated readily to achieve the goals that we have, forgetting for a moment about the dozens and dozens of things that are listed in statute, but if you were going to have the ultimate reporting mechanism, what would that look like. Because somebody has, someone out there has the best current system of doing that, and then okay, the next question would be, what does it take to produce that report, and there's going to be a long, long list of data that probably is probably forms up the basis of reducing that report. Some of which we probably already have, maybe most of which we already have in some form, and we may find that some of that data we're not going to be able to get, just because of the differences in the matter or something like that, but it would seem to me that that's kind of the way I would start with this and with that consultant and kind of work down from that can we buy the best product on the market, and do we have the resources already in place to do that? Maybe we're short some and need to start tracking that data today, maybe as a side benefit of going through all of the seemingly endless number of reports that you mentioned that are already filed. I don't know that some of those become secondary or superfluous through all of this, but it may help condense a lot of the reporting that's already being done that's supposed to be aimed at the same thing and maybe I'm just saying what you've already said, but it would seem that taking it in that order would make sense and trying to find the party or parties that are best situated to help us work it through that way would be a way to go. Hopefully by our next meeting, we could have some kind of sequencing that can turn into a scope like this and get that process started because, again the realities of going through a procurement process, it may take us 60, 90 days to go through something like that and have somebody here and I don't want us having to wait on that if at all possible.

Paul Johnson stated we're talking about two kinds of different scopes. Short term scope on the inputs, I think that might be something our working group can work on to develop those statistics and they could be framed around the NAS priorities that identified and I'll just read them here. Priority one was to fund districts and schools to hire and retain high quality staff in a competitive labor market. We can identify, we can extract things from what we're doing, the percent wage increases that we provided to staff, the reason why we do that, that should be intuitive, you want to attract more, you pay more. Any vacancy rates that we might have or fill long term subs, reduction of long-term subs, those types of things that will identify that we're getting more, we're grabbing a larger share of the labor market that exists and we could provide research or evidence if we need to, that supports the reasons why we make those decisions. They want to ensure adequate staffing patterns consistent with APA recommendations. You can identify the number of staff that you have hired that may have made progress toward that. I think there are things in each one of those. Their priority too was increase equitable education opportunities by ensuring adequate resources to meet the needs of all students that may tie in with the adequacy measures that Jeremy had just presented earlier and I'm sure there's more measures and then there, the third one was to improve needed supports for students and families, a student and family engagement things that could be in terms of other programs and services and staff that we have hired in order to accomplish those main things. I think there are things that would short term we could put together and have some recommendations of a kind of a menu of options for the next meeting for us to take a look at. If that makes sense, if there's another approach, we can talk about that as well.

Chair Hobbs stated let's keep that in mind as we get to agenda item number nine and future agenda items as well. I think that would be helpful.

Paul Johnson stated he just wants to make sure that he has all of the people who wanted to be participating on the working group. I had Nancy, Jason, Dusty, Kyle, myself and Joyce.

Jason Goudie stated he thinks they just want to check with legal counsel because as you create subgroups that then create a quorum that sometimes causes challenges. I don't know the rules, but I think we'd ask before we get clarification, at least to make sure we don't do anything wrong.

Chair Hobbs stated when we asked the group to get together, we tried to do it in such a way that it wouldn't come into conflict with the open meeting law. I can have a conversation with Megan and the Deputy Attorney General, and if, in fact, it's going to be limited by that, I will certainly let those who additionally volunteered know.

8. Review the Legislative Letter of Intent and discuss what information is needed for the Commission to complete the tasks assigned (*Information, Discussion, and Possible Action*)

Beau Bennett stated these first two slides are just to briefly reintroduce the tasks assigned to the Commission via the Nevada Legislator of Intent. After the brief review, we will stop at each individual item and ask the commission what information, data, additional subject matter expertise, the commission would need in order to meet the tasks assigned. The first topic is NCEI, which requires a review of and recommended changes to the Nevada Cost of Education Index. A cost adjustment factor may be applied to the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan and future biennia. We would just ask what information the commission would want to see in order to respond to this task.

Jason Goudie stated they have beaten this topic to death and unfortunately throughout the 18 to 24 months that we've spent discussing this topic, I don't know that there was any true belief that creating one index that could adequately address the intent when you have a district with over 300,000 students in a county with 2 million compared to a district that has 500 students and 2000 people in the county. I understand the legislative intent. I think conceptually we all agree with looking at how that may be utilized, but unless we could figure out a way that, that truly addresses all those concerns. I don't know how we get there. I know this is on the task list, but it says we must review and recommended changes. We could go through it. Unless anybody else has any ideas, I don't know what other information that we could get that we haven't already seen that would change our position.

David Jensen agreed. He stated it might be as simple as asking to bring it back, review it with the commission so that we refresh our mindset on it, and maybe it pops up something that we want to address, or it might be as simple as we recommend no further changes.

Chair Hobbs stated from a procedural standpoint, I think what Dr. Jensen said is probably sensible, that it be placed perhaps on the next agenda for further discussion, at which time, if there's a consensus among the commission, we could take more formal action on at that time. He asked Megan on some of the others, if there's a specific direction, is that something that we need as a commission to act upon item by item.

Mark Mathers stated the only other suggestion I might make, just for consideration by the commission is, I remember when this was first brought up, whatever it was, three or four years ago. It was noted that, I think it was five states, maybe up to seven states who have a similar index and I remember discussing it with a consultant that the state was using about it, and they had noted how controversial it was. I think it was in the state of Colorado and again, I'm struggling like everyone. I think, to come up with what are additional data points we would consider, I might be interested in hearing how those indexes have worked in those five to seven states. Are there lessons there, or do the controversies surrounding these indexes in other states confirm to us that this isn't something we want to do in Nevada and maybe that additional information could be shared with the legislature to better inform them of why the vast majority of states don't do this. It's just a thought and a suggestion trying to think outside the box as to what else we might want to consider and again, I go back to some of the conversations we've all had, which is let's not try to figure this out ourselves necessarily. Let's look at what other states or districts have done and maybe there are things we can learn from them. That would be my only other suggestion or idea, maybe it's something we could ask a consultant again to kind of work on and bring back at some later point.

Chair Hobbs stated they'll be placing this on the next agenda for further discussion to get you the clarity that you need.

Beau Bennett continued the presentation on Online Schools-Baseline Funding, which requires a review of the effect and development of recommendations on providing school districts receiving FY 2020 Baseline Funding with the statewide base per pupil funding amount for their online schools.

Jason Goudie stated he believes essentially what we're looking at is something to the effect of what we're looking at overall for the PCFP as to what changes in the educational performance have happened because of the change in the funding mechanisms. It becomes a subgroup of the online schools. I know that the online schools, I believe, were funded differently and so therefore they received the, so it looks like the 2020 Baseline Funding with the statewide based pupil funding amount. The additional information I think that I would want to see is once we determine kind of what some key academic performance measures are and/or staffing level performance measures that we know the working group and stuff. I think that this just becomes a subset of those to show that here's what it was before this change in funding and here's what it was after, and if we're going to measure the entire plan against it, it seems like we could measure this against it as well.

Beau Bennett pointed out that with the investment that we now have during this last legislative session, there are no districts on the FY 2020 baseline that offer online schools.

Chair Hobbs stated that certainly raises a question or two. He asked why it is on the list.

Megan Peterson stated she thinks that as we were going through session and the numbers were shaking out, it wasn't readily apparent that they would, that we would have any school districts on hold harmless after that made this relevant. I do believe it's probably a legacy item, but it was included.

Chair Hobbs asked if it was right that the review might not be a factor at this point.

Megan Peterson stated that was correct. However, the commission may wish to provide some alternative recommendations based on the request, indicating that we still wanted to do some analysis of online schools and the per pupil amount they're receiving and since we didn't have the information or the information that was requested wasn't entirely relevant. We did some additional analysis in general but it is not required.

Chair Hobbs asked what the likelihood is of this becoming an issue down the line.

Jason Goudie stated this might become an issue or not necessarily an issue, but something to discuss more deeply down the line is that I don't truly believe and obviously we have the largest online school in the state with (inaudible), but we don't truly know yet and we're learning how to truly staff and/or fund an online school and so we kind of run it through the model, but we make a lot of adjustments to it because it is not the same. There are instances where they could have significantly more pupils in a classroom and be just as effective and there are other cases where they cannot, if it's a general lecture type kind of class, social studies things of those nature that don't require a lot of written well, or English, a different one, there's different staffing models. We're not quite there yet. I think that it just may be come as we start to, and I know other districts may be even farther along than we are and having online schools, they may be small and easier to kind of comprehend the differences, but I think that continuing to at least look at how those online schools are funded, may be worth it as we move forward. I think that's the only place that it would come up.

Chair Hobbs stated the review would indicate that it's not a current issue; however, it remains an open item as additional information becomes available sort of approach to it.

Beau Bennett stated the next item is a Grad Score Review and this is a review of the use of the grad score for the funding plan and its effectiveness in identifying at risk pupils.

Chair Hobbs asked Paul if this something that gets covered by the other work that's being done.

Paul Johnson stated yes, he I thinks grad scores are included in the NSPF. I'm not an expert on that. High schools it is.

Chair Hobbs asked if the answer would be that this is something that would likely be reviewed under the assemblage of all of the other data that we're putting together for the performance measurements.

Paul Johnson stated yes, it's a form of student achievement that certainly should be measured and I think it's that along with many other achievement measures should be included in whatever framework we come up with.

Jason Goudie agreed that this is going to be a component of those other pieces, but what I think based off of prior discussions in these meetings, primarily around the 20%. I think a good data point would be to utilize the current definition of the lowest quintile of students and identify those and this certainly could take a while because there's elementary schools that may not graduate yet and compare how those students are identified and actually whether or not they graduated and then compare, as a percentage of those that weren't identified and how many of those didn't graduate, and we'd have to use ranges of grad scores because obviously somebody with a grad score of 150 is going to graduate. They graduate, so I think some sort of analysis to understand whether or not the 20% is truly the right number, because I know there was a lot of concern about that, would be the one piece I would ask, because that may drive how we recommend the weights that then would have to go back up to the state board and down to the legislature to get that changed, but I think that's the one piece of data that wouldn't be included in that that might be worth reviewing in some context.

Paul Johnson stated this is one of those things that could be a component of the outside consultants, recommendation of those correlative things that strongly indicate where we should invest our money because here's, this is a performance indicator. I don't know. I don't value reviewing that outside of incorporating it into a larger achievement matrix makes sense, but that's up for the commission to decide.

Chair Hobbs stated he wants to be sure they're giving Megan and Beau the direction or information that they requested on each of these items. He asked Megan and Beau if this discussion has been helpful in that regard.

Megan Peterson stated it aligns more with the latter conversation in terms of whether or not this is properly identifying students for additional support rather than in terms of the accountability and achievement matrices. Just from the background and remembering the conversations that occurred during session, obviously with the change from FRL to at risk, it was a large change, but I think that they are requesting additional information on whether it's appropriate to identify students in this way to make sure we're achieving outcomes.

Punam Mathur stated this letter of intent, our homework deadline is August 1st of next year, and I think the controversy, it certainly was for our decision to use the Infinite Campus Proprietary Algorithm as the basis, and then further complicated by the fact of the 20%. It's a twofer and so I think what this is a request from those who have concerns about the decision that we made to go with the Infinite Campus Proprietary Info. They can't see it and we had an infinite campus present to us and they said, here are the 73 indicators, but what they want to know, I think this is around the curiosity of how much is each one, like, show us more and to submit something by August 1st, 2024 nothing's going to change. I still think that we made the right decision to go with the grad score. I think we made the right decision at the 20% and time will tell and August 1st, we won't have any new insights on it. I just feel like if we are still feeling like we made the right decision and don't feel the need to reconsider it, then I think we just say that out loud, acknowledge that there may be concerns that other people are expressing and that overtime, will tell. We will know and I think a year or two years from now, we can have a more informed discussion about is 20% the right threshold. Should it be higher? Should it be lower? Is the selection of the Infinite Campus Algorithm Grad Score the right basis, yes or no? I feel like that's at least two years away.

Mark Mathers stated he thinks the use of the Infinite Campus Grad Score is a better measure than FRL, but I think there were concerns about the use of the 20% measure and I think the legislature really is asking the two questions that have been raised is the Infinite Campus Grad Score the right metric or, or methodology, but then secondly is the 20% mark appropriately measuring who is at risk and that's what I heard Megan say that's what the legislature's asking. I for one would like to relook at that with a consultant. It concerns me if a batch of students are being excluded, left behind with no weighted funding to help them, if a consultant were to look at that and say, you know what, actually 25% or 30% is a better cutoff. I would want to know that and I would want to report that back to the legislature. I don't know that we can wait three years to kind of evaluate that we're being asked to evaluate it. I think it's a good question because I think we picked 20%. I don't know how actually 20% was derived at, but I think there were questions about that and we, I think we agreed it's a starting point. Let's go with that, but I think if we're being asked to relook at it, I think that's fair.

Paul Johnson agreed with that and now that I'm looking at it through the lens of funding at risk students, we have 70 to 75 points that are in our database that identify components of at risk and it goes into this Infinite Campus thing and it spits out the enrollment, but as I was going through and trying to tie out the enrollments of the school to identify a cost per pupil, I couldn't identify the at risk students in my school because I don't know how the Infinite Campus Model tracks it. I think that's a flaw in the system. I think we need to be able to identify in by grade level who the at-risk students are and I don't know that I have that. I get a lump sum total for my school district. I get funding, but I don't know what students those are in each school identified at risk, and I think we had a cut off that drastically reduced that population from a couple of 100,000 down to 65,000. I think it merits taking a look at and I know that the students that qualify for free meals is over 100,000. I think it merits looking into it.

Chair Hobbs stated based on all the discussion that he's heard, it sounds like the next step toward addressing this task would be to use the help of a subject matter expert to review the 20% and get concurrence that that is a reasonable level or that there should be alternatives considered, that would be the next step.

Paul Johnson stated he doesn't know what value this has or not, but it would be great for us to be able to identify the students. I don't know if there's a way to audit that. He asked if they did.

Paul Johnson stated they do not.

Jason Goudie stated he doesn't know the details because he's not in their accountability research, but knows that they were able to. What we did is we get the funding from the state in totality, and then our team was able to utilize the data that we have within the system to run the reports to identify those students that fell in the lowest 20% and we did it by, by bandwidth meaning the lowest 20 in elementary, middle and high. Because, based off the experts, if you run it in totality, high schools get no funding. There's elementary school, even good students that are so far away, it naturally lowers their score and we don't know yet on how to get that information to principal so they can see the information they need to be able to identify that the key factors in this person being at risk, it may be homelessness, which may have a different solution than someone being either poverty, which could be tied to that and/or English learner or some of the other factors. I don't know the details, but I do know that we have access at least at the high level to be able to granularly get down to that. I know it's there and I think that having that information provided out because I think that's the most important, that's why I believe so much in this plan is that the granularity as which the districts and the principals can see and provide data. If that's not happening, then we need to figure that out because I think that's key.

Megan Peterson stated the department is currently working on a guidance memorandum and we'll have the information available and we are working on adopting a practice that will make this information available in more real time, but I think the crux of the problem is obviously that we have adopted a statewide percentile cutoff and at the district level that does not directly correlate to a 20th percentile for the district and we are working on some guidance and some information to hopefully go in the next few days that will identify the students that were in the statewide cutoff for each district and charter school so that way they can have that information and cross reference the data that the state uses versus at the district or charter school level. The one thing or I guess there are two things to keep in mind. One is the data will be a year old, the data obviously comes from currently our account day that occurs in October from the prior year because that is technically the most recent information that is available and secondarily, we will not be able to share obviously, the information from other districts with other districts due to personally identifiable information. Districts and charter schools will only have the students at their, for their respective location and obviously, as I mentioned, we are working on making this a practice. That way that data can be shared as soon as it's available and when we began the calculations for the next year's funding.

Beau Bennett stated the next item is English Learner/Dual Language Program and this is a review of the English Learner Weighted Funding to determine if it would be an allowable use of these funds by school districts and charter schools to establish and operate dual language programs or determine the legislative changes necessary to do so.

David Jensen stated he believes the next to follow this one, followed by dual language program weight are tied because before we can talk weight, we have to determine allowable. Going back to the English Language/Dual Language Program, I'm interested in finding out the number of districts that have such programs. We don't in Humboldt. How are they licensing those positions? The number of positions that are there, including support staff and then I would really like to see if there's any longitudinal data on academic success as a result of dual language programming.

Jason Goudie stated he doesn't have the data on this one yet. From my recollection, when you think about the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan and the use of weighted funds, they have to be allocated to zoom or victory services. The alignment between zoom and victory services are very identical from 90% of them and from my recollection, there's a somewhat general statement that has other programs or systems that can positively impact these programs or the students. I think using that language dual language certainly falls under EL allowable, but this seems to me to be more of a legal interpretation that maybe LCB should step in to tell us the legislative intent. We've got a lot of legislative intent sitting here with us, but I believe that it is written broadly enough that this should be an allowable piece but I don't think that we should be making that determination, I think we can recommend that and maybe just recommend that LCB weigh in on that that it does fall within those other programs as allowable.

Chair Hobbs stated summarizing the next steps would be to gather the information that Dr. Jensen requested as well as get some additional legal guidance.

Beau Bennett stated the next item is associated with the last element and it's a Dual Language Program Weight and that would be a determination of the recommended weight that would be required if a new dual language program weight was to be established for the plan.

Chair Hobbs asked if this follows the same disposition as the prior item.

Jason Goudie stated maybe he misunderstood what the last item was, but thought the question was, is utilization of EL weighted funding for a dual language program and allowable expenditure. That's the way I was reading that. So again, concurrence, that's the way we all intended to read that. Then this confuses me as to this sounds like we're trying to establish a different weight, which I don't think is the right way to approach it. I think that if there's funding and this makes sense for a district to utilize EL funds to do this, I think that's how it should be done because I think if we create a separate weight, it's going to dilute the other weights, which would negatively impact those districts that don't offer this program.

Megan Peterson stated they did contemplate and review this at the department while they were working through this and believes the intent of this request is that if through research, it is determined not to be allowable, that then if the commission determines that it is worth investing in as a weight, what would that weight look like. I think it's kind of the if this than that portion of the conversation and the commission could very well make the recommendation not to recommend a weight.

Jason Goudie stated given Ms. Peterson's clarification there, his preference would be that if it is determined that is not an allowable expenditure that there that the lobby amended to show directly that it is rather than going down the separate weight.

Joyce Woodhouse stated that there was a lot of intense lobbying done by folks that are very much into the dual language program, and I think that just kind of got sandwiched in here. It's certainly number one that needs to be done is the previous slide, and then go from there, but it was put in a legislative intent because of the pressure that was there on the legislature regarding dual language.

Nancy Brune stated if she understands what this is asking us to do, and then I understand the weights that we currently have for English Language Learners at risk, I feel like we almost need to step back and have a theoretical conversation about what we are trying to do with the weights because this is not for a sort of profile of a student. If we're going to have a dual language program weight, we do not have second foreign language or AP or CTE and so I think if we go down this road, and I'm not opposed, we just need to then figure out what are we truly trying to do with the weights because this feels very different than the existing weights that we have.

Joyce Woodhouse agreed and stated the other thing that we might want to make sure that the legislature, with the Governor's recommendation in his budget made significant changes in the weights, should probably have a session, an agenda item on the three weights that we have, or the four weights, so that we're all on the same page and anyone that's watching and listening knows how much the weight system has changed. So that as we go forward, we're dealing from the same set of numbers.

Chair Hobbs stated that sounds like a great idea and just wrote that down for the next item for future agenda items. What I was hearing was, and please correct me if I'm wrong, that it might make more sense to get the responses to the prior item before taking action on this one because if it's allowable or disallowable, that makes a significant difference. I think we'll proceed that way.

Beau Bennett stated that was the last element. Just a reminder that is due no later than August 1st, 2024. *(See "8. Letter_of_Intent_CSF_9.28.pdf" for details)*

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

Chair Hobbs stated he would first go over a list that he's been making during the course of the meeting. An agenda item to once again revisit the topic of NCEI and determine how to move forward or if to move forward with that would be an item. As member Woodhouse just suggested, an update on the changes to the funding for the weights, I think that would be a good reminder for everybody and good for the public to be aware of again as well. The items that we had in agenda item number eight probably repeating agenda item number eight. We could go through that with hopefully some of the updated information that's been requested as a part of the discussion and perhaps that will allow us to dispense with one or more of those at the next meeting. I believe we'll also have an item on, if there's any update, we should probably just have a holding place for this to the values that we received today from applied analysis with respect to the target values and CES, Nevada Current Funding and APA, particularly around the APA question, so we can maybe lock those numbers down as the current values that everyone should be pointing toward and beyond that, I'll have a conversation with Megan and NDE staff about anything else that has to do with status of contracts with subject matter experts, particularly around the next phase of the funding scenarios, because as I think I mentioned earlier, I would like to start before the end of this calendar year on an update of that entire report and at least have that element taken care of. I also believe that the report from the working group will be an ongoing item as well as the updates that we receive on each agenda from NDE.

Nancy Brune asked if the update on the report depends on any of the economic analysis that the economic forum puts out in either December or May, and does it make sense to sort of naturally wait until after December or even after May to have the most current numbers for the report.

Chair Hobbs stated as far as the target values, I don't think it has any effect on the target values that we're dealing with. As far as the funding scenarios, obviously that data changes all the time and when we get around to actually filing that part of the updated report, we'll use the most current data that's available at that time, but particularly on some of the property tax related, and I won't punish anybody by going into the detail, but part of that involves gathering data from all of the county assessors around the state at the parcel level, which we were only partially successful with the last time. We want to begin that part of it as well, because that bears upon a lot of the property tax scenarios that we'll be updating. To your question, yes, when we file the report, we will want it to reflect the most current information that we have but I think there's enough that we could get started on choice.

Joyce Woodhouse stated she has received communication from Todd Butterworth at the Guinn Center and the report that they have been working on for that Punam and I kind of twisted their arms to do for us regarding those national reports that always put us in the bottom of everything. They will have that ready for the November meeting for sure and they also wish to and this is kind of a message to Megan, before they bring it to the commission, and they'll have somebody to present it at that meeting, Mr. Chair, if that's acceptable to you, and they will also like to meet with Superintendent Ebert in advance of the meeting to share that report.

Chair Hobbs asked Megan and Beau to make a note of that for the November agenda.

Megan Peterson stated duly noted regarding the Guinn Center update and I did just want to clarify that in the timing of information that will be available, the economic form revenue projections will not be available before the time that this report is due. They are only available during certain periods.

10. Public Comment #2

[Audio ends abruptly]