

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FUNDING
May 31, 2024
9:00 AM**

Office	Address	City	Meeting
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo	Las Vegas	Board Room
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson	Board Room
Department of Education	Virtual	Virtual	YouTube

TRANSCRIPT MINUTES OF THE COMMISSION MEETING

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT

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

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

Megan Peterson

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

Deborah Earl
Jeremy Aguero, Applied Analysis
Sara Doutre, WestED
Dr. Kelsey Krausan, Director, WestED
Justine Silverstein, Augenblick, Palaich and Associates
Amanda Brown, Augenblick, Palaich and Associates
Noman Kanani

Secretary: Starting now. I'll let you know when we're live.

Chair Hobbs: Alright, thank you. Just reshuffling a couple of chairs here. Good morning. It's 9:01 and I'm calling the May 31st, 2024 meeting of the Nevada Commission on School Funding to order. I'd like to welcome our audience who are joining us in person as well as by livestream on the Nevada Department of Education website, which is recorded for public record. Will the secretary please call the roll?

Secretary: Chair Hobbs?

Chair Hobbs: Present.

Secretary: Member Woodhouse.

Joyce Woodhouse: Present

Secretary: Member Mathur.

Punam Mathur: Here.

Secretary: Member Brune.

Chair Hobbs: Now, let me just mention to you Bo, I received a text message from her, and she should be joining us by phone. And when she does join by phone, please mark her present.

Secretary: Will do. Thank you. Member McIntosh. Member Jensen.

Dr. David Jensen: Here.

Secretary: Member Casey.

Dusty Casey: Here.

Secretary: Member Rodriguez.

Kyle Rodriguez: Here.

Secretary: Member Johnson.

Paul Johnson: Here.

Secretary: Member Goudie.

Jason Goudie: Present.

Secretary: Member Mathers.

Mark Mathers: Here.

Secretary: Chair, you have a quorum.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much Bo and thanks for pinch hitting for Joseph today. Thank you very much. As you can see, we have three people up in Carson City, and we have member Casey joining us by video conference. So as we move through any of these topics, I'll do my best to keep my eye on any hands that may go up with questions, and I would also ask the other members to do the same and let me know. So, we have a quorum. I'd like to note for the record that we're joined by Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott. We'll start with the normal housekeeping items. Today, the Commission on School funding is holding a meeting in Las Vegas and Carson City virtually. Both locations will be available for public comment. As always, during the first public comment section, we'll be listening to public comments that only pertain to items on the agenda. The second period of public comment for any item under the commission's jurisdiction will be held at the end of the meeting. Members of the public who attend in person would like to provide public comment, must fill out a comment card and provide it to the secretary. To provide public comment or testimony telephonically dial area code 312-584-2401. When prompted, provide meeting ID 19042398, and then press pound. When prompted for a participant, ID, press pound. Alternatively, members of the public may submit public comments in writing via email to nvcsf@doe.envy.gov. Public comments submitted by email must indicate the subject in the subject line. If the comment is to be read during public comment, period number one or public comment period number two. Emails received during the meeting will be read into the record during the second public comment period. Since materials have been provided to the commission members, electronically, members may be using their computers during the meeting to view materials and take notes. And this is certainly not a sign of disrespect. For our members, please silence your electronic devices. When you're not speaking, please mute your microphone and unmute when you're ready to use and remember to state your name as often as you can remember for the record prior to speaking. So the first item on our agenda today is public comment, period number one. I'll turn it over to, looks like you today, Bo, to facilitate comments from members of the public who have attended in person and have submitted a comment card and are in Carson City first.

Secretary: We have no public comment in Carson City.

Chair Hobbs: Okay, thanks very much. I have not received a -- we do have one card. Alright.

Megan Peterson: We've received one card from Deborah Earl.

Chair Hobbs: And that's for public comment period number one.

Megan Peterson: She's requesting to speak about accountability and funding.

Chair Hobbs: Please come forward. Oh, yeah, you can go ahead and come forward. I don't really see a reason. I mean, that's generally on our agenda because of things that we'll be discussing during our working group presentation. So, welcome.

Deborah Earl: For the record, my name is Deborah Earl, and I'm Vice President of Power of Parent. We're a parental rights organization mostly concerned with quality of education and helping parents find the classroom that works best for them. I appreciate the opportunity to testify this morning and officially address the critical issue of education, funding and accountability in Nevada. Despite significant investments, our state continues to perform at the bottom of the national rankings. This commission has a pivotal role in addressing the challenges by ensuring that the record amount of funding allocated translates into tangible improvements in our education system. Last specimen, the governor called for a major increase in education funding with a budget containing 2 billion in new funding for students representing an increase of over 22% from the previous [indiscernible]. This budget fully funded the targeted weights in the pupil centered funding plan, as far as I understand. However, with the substantial funding, the governor has emphasized the need for results accountability. He has made it clear that the lack of funding can no longer be an excuse for underperformance and has committed to working with the state superintendent to ensure robust systems of accountability. If we

don't see significant improvements, the governor has indicated that he will call for systematic changes in the governance and leadership in K through 12 education. Despite the increased funding after nearly two years, we've seen little improvement, teacher shortages, absenteeism, safety issues, and declining proficiency in several areas as reported in the Nevada report card are still prevalent. The commission must address these issues legislatively and ensure accountability for taxpayers. I would like to bring some solutions to, we have really thought about, we deal with parents every day, and some of them feel so stuck and don't feel like their children have an equal shot of his education and a good education, especially when they're zoned for school that's failing them. We believe that this does contribute to the absenteeism because when the classroom is working for their child, why send them? And they don't have a lot of other options, especially our lower income folks who can't find transportation or don't have the means. And this is really where we step in to try and help them find those wraparound services that will help them find the education classroom that works best for them. Physical safety in the classroom remains a significant concern with 42 guns seized in Clark County School District this year alone. Chronic absenteeism is another issue as I've addressed, and 38% chronic absenteeism in Clark counties up from 21% pre-pandemic faster. Factors contributing to absenteeism include safety concerns, lack of parental involvement, transportation issues, and mental health challenges. I know I'm running short on time and I don't want to be rude, so I'm going to quickly conclude and just say that all of the options should be on the table for holding districts accountable for the funding and of our education of our children. We must also expand to choice for families to ensure that every child can access the education they deserve, and taxpayers receive the value that they're promised. The commission has the opportunity to make a lasting impact by recommending effective accountability measures in supporting legislative actions that address these pressing issues. Thank you so much for your time.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much for your comments. Appreciate it. Any other public comment in Las Vegas?

Megan Peterson: There are no other public comments in Las Vegas.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Are there any written comments to be read into the record, Bo?

Secretary: There are no written comments to be read into the record.

Chair Hobbs: Do we have any callers waiting to provide public comment?

Secretary: No callers waiting to provide public comment.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Thanks very much. That moves us to our next item. Item number three, approval of flexible agenda.

Joyce Woodhouse: Member Woodhouse, I move approval of a flexible agenda.

Unidentified Speaker: I'll second.

Chair Hobbs: We have a motion and a second. All in those in favor saying five by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Hobbs: Any opposed? Thanks very much. Item number four, approval of minutes. The commission should have the minutes before it from the March 22nd and April 26th meetings. Any motion or discussion? Okay. If you want to bifurcate approval of minutes, that's okay as well. If you would wish to trail this item because you haven't had a chance to look at them, we can trail it to the latter part of the meeting. So remind me

to come back to agenda item number four. That brings us to agenda item number five. Commission will receive an update on the progress made by Nevada Department of Education since our last meeting. And for this, Megan Peterson, deputy Superintendent of Student Investment Division.

Secretary: Megan.

Megan Peterson: Good morning, Deputy Superintendent Megan Peterson for the record. I'm going to share my screen. This timeline we've seen a few times, but I wanted to re-share and refresh everyone's memory on the items that we still have before the Commission for recommendation. If you'll recall, we have essentially three main deliverables. One is the standard business identified in NRS. That includes, reviewing optimal funding, the various components of the model to make sure that they're functioning as intended, as well as items that have now been identified, EB400 that will be prescribed in statute going forward. That includes the quarterly report from school districts and charter schools on the metrics. The numerous metrics identified in AB400, those are identified as recommendations that are to be made to the Committee on Education. We have been in contact with the legislature on this topic, and that committee's going to be meeting here in June, July and moving into working group sessions in beginning in August. And so that committee has requested a presentation on an update with the deliverables and potentially final recommendations in this area by July. So that includes areas including, as I mentioned, the implementation of the pupil centered funding plan and any changes that need to be made, progress made by pupils. These are the AB400 metrics recommendations to increase the efficiency, effectiveness, and transparency. I'm not going to read through all these because they are numerous, but those are items that we'll be looking to hopefully wrap up either today or during the June meeting in order to make those available to the Committee on Education in July. We then have the legislative letter of intent, which includes areas such as the reviewing the EL wait and whether it was an acceptable use to provide dual language programs with that funding. A review of the grad score and its effectiveness as identifying students who are at risk of not graduating as well as the Nevada Cost of Education Index. And so these are highlighted in green because they are recommendations that the commission has made. And the two that we currently have pending that we will begin to address today relate to special education. Those topics are identified to have recommendations to the Legislative Council Bureau by August 1st. So we have a few more things to wrap up in order to make that deliverable. And then we have the items that were identified in Senate Bill 98 that includes a study of accountability metrics. This is the work that we are doing with West Ed and Dr. Kelsey. And those are identified to be due by November 15th. And so, the commission does still have quite a few tasks ahead of them. We were able to receive approval from the Board of Examiners on the remaining contracts that were pending. We were happy to announce that applied analysis was awarded the contract in order to do the work for review of the 10-year plan and the various revenues. We'll be hearing a presentation on that later today. We have also been working with WestEd and Sara Doure, who you'll hear a presentation from, as I mentioned later today, about special education and the methodology in comparison to what other states are doing and how we can look to improve that for our state. At this point, that sums up our update for today.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much, Megan. That summary of all of the tasks. I know you didn't really do this anyway, but if you could send that out to each of the commission members, tomorrow. It occurred to me this morning that tomorrow is actually June, right? And we have these dates coming up. We have some in August, and then some as late as November. But I'm thinking that in the months of September, in October, some of us will be deeply engaged in actually putting the entire report together that takes all of these individual items and aggregates them into something that hopefully is a comprehensive document that addresses everything that we've been tasked with, which as your spreadsheet shows as quite a bit. And I think we need to just continue to remind ourselves where we are, which items we've achieved closure on, and hopefully there will be at least a couple more today that we'll be able to shade in green and then be able to redeploy some of our resources that have been involved in some of the other working groups to the remaining working groups. Certainly that's within the context of what we're allowed to do in terms of the number of members you can have on a working group under the open meeting law and that sort of thing. But the notion of redeploying our

resources so we can meet all of these timelines, not just meet the timelines, but meet them in a high quality manner, which is what all of us really want to do. I mean, all of these topics are important, otherwise they wouldn't have been given to us. So, I think at this point we're coming around the far turn and we'll be heading toward the home stretch here shortly. And just a note on that, I think some of you are aware, all of you are aware that we've scheduled two meetings in June. One on the 21st and one on the 27th. One on the 21st, items that we had hoped to bring closure on today that may need any additional discussion or work we would be bringing back on the 21st to actually get that closure. And the 27th would be more of a full regular agenda. And then there's some other things that we're currently working on. And we may end up having to go to multiple meetings in a month to meet all of the different timelines that we have. Though it's going to take a lot of work to bring all of these pieces together in a seamless form. We have bits and pieces right now, and we need to make an effort to have the presentation presented in such a way that it shows the importance of each of the topics. So there's going to be a lot of work to do. So Megan, thank you for that update. Thank you for the reminder. Any other questions for Megan? Seeing none. Item number six, update of target funding values. This is information discussion, possible action item, but we are to receive a presentation from applied analysis. We're grateful to hear actually is on board, uh, officially with us regarding the work and updating the target revenue projections. Actually, what we're updating here are the funding targets that we've used as a basis for identifying what the funding requirements would be to bring us to either parity with the national average or with the subject matter expert recommendations. As all of you know, those values end up driving the optimal funding report and the funding. How we would go about funding it because we have been charged with identifying methods of funding to achieve those levels over the ensuing 10 years. And we'll talk a little bit about that after Jeremy gives his presentation. But Jeremy, I turn it to you.

Jeremy Aguero: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, thank you very much for the opportunity to be here today. I'd also like to express my thanks to superintendent Ebert, as well as her entire team for their support throughout this process. I have my presentation plugged in. It tells me that it's going, but I don't know whether that's actually true or not. So I wanted to just check with you first. Sure. That's it. Okay. Alright.

Chair Hobbs: For the folks up north, we're working through some very complex audio visual issues right now. I'll be with you shortly. Paul Johnson is helping out now, so it may take a little longer. Just come on up and take one of these seats. I wouldn't trust him to click. Megan, it looks like we have a solution here. Just be a moment. Alright, here we go.

Jeremy Aguero: Up and up and running. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I would also like to express my personal thanks to the IT consultant that helped us get it all the way figured out. Mr. Chairman, our job here is relatively simple and straightforward. The initial legislation that created this commission as we understand it as well as the instructions that have been given to us, provide this concept that we are constantly trying to get to this per pupil spending level. That level is obviously moving over time. Inflation, as we've probably read more than we ever hoped to be, to read over the past year or so, has been significant. And that's always a factor in providing that. As chairman Hobbs indicated, this is the first step in a relatively long journey. The longer element of it is determining the strategies by which the gap can be filled. So the purpose of this presentation is really to focus solely on what that gap is and how we measure that. And so from that perspective, when we think about it in 2002, the last time we had this conversation and discussed some of this, the Nevada spending on a per people basis was about \$10,204. I'm sure that everyone here will recall. There are two targets that we're using to ensure that we're mindful of the fact that measuring this is important and there's different methods by which we can measure what the national average or what the target might be for purposes of seeking a level, a higher level of per pupil funding. We use both NC and CES data, the national data provided for all school districts. And then APA back in 2006, updated in 2016, provided an estimate based on subject matter expert recommendations relatively exhausted report that was revisited then. And it is our understanding that that's being revisited against. So we do expect these numbers to be modified somewhat, but we are always encouraged by the fact that they're almost within 1% of each other. And so, what subject matter

experts are saying we ought to have in schools is also consistent with what an average is across school districts across the United States. If we look at that in terms of what is projected now for 2025, and it's an estimate, that's next to that, Nevada's expected to be about 12,579. Again, that's simply taking, adjusted for inflation and those other two in just adjusted notes for inflation. We have used the historical inflation rate as well as the projected inflation rate, going forward, which is obviously more moderate than what we've seen previously. Beyond that, we then have to ask ourselves, where did the legislature leave us last legislative session? Unprecedented, I should say historic probably, increases in education funding were added. And that increase in 2025 should take us to about 13,368 board. Now [indiscernible] that we were working with previously are also adjusted here. That takes us, pardon me, to about 17,500 for both the national average and the subject matter. Again, these have merely been augmented to be able to make that adjustment. Now, from there, we then have the phase in, and that phase in is over 10 years. 2025 is the basic year in the mid 10 subsequent years in which we try to get to that national average. And so we're allowing that grow and we are seeing what it takes to catch up to that amount over a 10-year period. If we look at that in terms of where we would need to go relative to where we expect to go, if we were only to adjust by basic inflation during that period, you get a sense that you would have to take people coming in 2025 from about \$14,400 to about 21,000. Now, obviously that's in 2035. So it paid us some time to get there, but this shows the amount that we need in any individual year in order to get there 10 years from now, allowing us to have incremental bumps as we move forward. If we look at it in terms of what the aggregate level is of the funding that would be needed to get us to that point. This is again, aggregate funding all the way through that 2035 timeframe. It would take us about \$200 million. So 0.2 billion 19, all the way up to about \$2.5 billion a decade from now in order to get there. And again, that is every, essentially taking what is roughly one 10th of the value each year and diminishing that so that in 10 years' time we are at that national average. Now, obviously the last time I came to you, we looked at 10 years, there was a 2034, and the next time we have a conversation or you have a conversation about that, it's going to be 2036. The idea, hopefully that the margin continues to get smaller and smaller and smaller, which thankfully to the legislature and governor lawmakers and stakeholders, that number is smaller than what we looked at previously and as diminished. If we do the exact same thing, but we do it for the APA values is going to come, no surprise to this group. It's going to look very similar overall because the numbers are very close in terms of what that target is. So here's where we are in 2025, and you can get a sense that it's almost the exact same number going out to 2035 in terms of what we have to be to get to the APA aspirational level, which is almost exactly at the national average in terms of funding. Again, if we look at that and just this value, you'll notice in the out years it is slightly higher and that has become effect of compounding and inflation, but it's relatively close overall in terms of what it's going to take us. Smaller increases in the early years, larger increases in the out years. And as we've had some conversations, chairman, I know you've had here, right? When we start thinking about these larger numbers and ways of funding them, the strategies that there are relatively new strategies that have the ability to generate the types of dollars that we looked at here. And I know that's part of your ongoing dialogue, but if we thinking about it in the context of what is provided here, it really sets the stage for that next phase of analytics and deliberation, I suppose, among this group in terms of where you want to go forward. So that is where we are today. Look from an analyst perspective, I think it's worth mentioning State of Nevada has made tremendous progress. I think no small part to the work done by this group. And I'd be remiss if I didn't mention Senator Woodhouse and the work that she did to actually, I think set the stage to even have the conversation about in responding overall. So thank you for all the work over many years and that just being one part of it. So that Mr. Chairman, if there's any questions, I'm more than happy to answer them.

Chair Hobbs: I'll go ahead and start out with a couple and maybe they're not questions as much as they're points of emphasis about everything you just went over. And I thank you for doing all that. This is an exceptionally important piece of information for us because again, it sets those target values that you saw in the bar charts, and we get into the funding scenarios. That's essentially what we're trying to attack are those bar charts and those gaps that we're shown in that lighter color of blue. But you said something at the outset. I thought was particularly important for everyone to understand because of the tendency that when we hear a number, we stay married to a number forever. And it's very difficult with numbers like this that change every

year. The Nevada portion is going to change based on the level of appropriation in the state budget. NCES is going to change and always be two years behind where we really are, but it's going to be updated annually. And of course that's influenced by what other states are doing. I want to mention something about APA. The APA values are still inflated values from prior studies. We have shared this slide with APA and asked them to provide some additional input to us as to whether or not we keep using their name relative to that number. And I want to make sure there's a comfort level on APAs part, and they've indicated a willingness to take a look at that number in light of the types of things that they considered back in 2006, reconsidered back in 2016. Is this still a number that they're comfortable with? Like you, when I see how close those numbers, those two numbers are together, I'm comforted because each of the numbers supports the other. We know that we're focused in the right ballpark as far as order of magnitude of gap. Now, that may not equate to optimal in some people's views, but as far as the national average representing something that is agreeable with what the subject matter expert has to say, I think it helps fortify those numbers as being a good order of magnitude value as a target for us. Is that something you'd agree with?

Jeremy Aguero: 100%. And I know sometimes that when we use that term optimal, reasonable minds can differ. And we've often thought about it, I think in going back to the early conversations, thinking about it being aspirational in order to say, Hey, we know we've got to move forward from where we are here. But Mr. Chairman, I think the way that you outlined it is exactly right, right? Getting this information from the subject matter experts and aligning that with what we know to be the best available data from a reputable national source of getting those as close as possible, which I think ultimately will set up at least some dialogue between you and probably ultimately others, the legislature, the department around what is right for the state of Nevada. But it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that you have to start somewhere, and this is a really good somewhere to start.

Chair Hobbs: No, I appreciate that. And I think part of the comments here were to reinforce with everybody that we will continue to update these numbers as information becomes available. So if people see the numbers change, it is not an indictment of any of the prior numbers, it's the nature of what we're dealing with. These numbers will change, and we hope they change over time from what we see today. The change that we may see before we do the final report on optimal funding may come about as a consequence of APA reviewing their value, right? So that's something, and if that happens, we'll bring that back and show you if they've either pushed that number upward or downward based on their review. But I thought it was extremely important for all of you to see that today, because this becomes the basis for other work that we're endeavoring to get moving on as quickly as possible. And that is putting together the funding strategies part of it. You might recall from our report that was filed in November of 22. So in that report, we identified these target values and they're large dollar values, and we also identified primary revenue sources, those being property tax and sales tax, largely because, well, Jeremy already said it, you look at numbers like an average of 250 million a year over 10 years in new revenue each year, right? 250 million doesn't solve it. It solves it for one year. Then you have the same challenge each succeeding year in order to get to that value. You've been around the state's fiscal system for a goodly amount of time, there aren't that many revenue sources out there that produce that type of revenue and certainly don't produce it in that trajectory. And so, both because of that and because the historical methods of funding education have largely leaned on property and sales tax focused on those areas, right? So no mystery when we put the report together, it'll focus on those areas as well. But what we're going to be trying to do and looking for any other comments that you may have too Jeremy. We gave a number of illustrations. If you did this, it could produce this amount, amount of revenue. If you did this with abatements, if you did this with depreciation, if you did this with the [indiscernible] methodology, if you did this with sales tax base, those types of things. And we did it a year ago, November, to provide illustrations of revenue generating potential. We did not provide that as a recommended set of scenarios, if you will, to achieve the full amount of the funding. This report will come closer to making a recommendation that would guide us toward achievement of the revenue targets. And clearly, that's going to be a heavy lift, but that's what the focus will be on, and that's the remaining work product that I know that your folks are already actively engaged in.

Jeremy Aguero: Sure. Mr. Chairman, the only two comments that perhaps are germane to the conversation is one, the department impressed upon us early on in this process last go around, and then again in this go around that it's important to build flexibility into the modeling itself, such that if the numbers need to be updated, we're not reinventing everything, we're not recreating everything. We're putting a new number into a cell that represents the best available information so that the model will flow through. I think we have the benefit of that now and we'll continue to leverage that. The only other thing that I would perhaps offer for purposes of just making sure that the record is complete is that, Mr. Chairman, in our conversations, and I think some that have gone on here before, that there's sort of been a no stone unturned strategy, left unturned strategy that's been here. And so, that's meant not only talking about tax rates, talking about tax bases, and also talking about things like abatements that exist out there that diminish the amount of money that would otherwise ignore to the benefit of schools throughout the state of Nevada. And so, in the analysis that's being done, again, unless you all advice otherwise, the approach will continue to be, look, we know the base has to be big, just like you said. To match that, there's not one way to do that. And looking at whatever's possible so that this committee and then ultimately the department and the folks that need to review it before the legislature, governor, so forth and so on, all have as many options as possible and that this group can provide recommendations around what seems the most logical approach to what needs to be done.

Chair Hobbs: Well, and to that point, and I don't want this to just be a conversation between me and Jeremy. Jeremy and I often have an opportunity to talk, and now you can see how exciting those conversations are when we have an opportunity to talk to each other. But please. To the extent, as I mentioned, we're going to be focusing on property and sales tax. We went through a lot of the advanced evaluation analysis and so forth last time we put the report together to arrive at those conclusions. But this isn't to say that if anybody identifies any other sources of revenue that should be a part of this analysis, they can't bring them forward. Now, in all likelihood, we have previously evaluated those, but again, this is to say that we don't have that ability. It would be my hope that we would be able to have a discussion that maybe as early as the second meeting in June on these funding strategies so we can undertake completing that report, which is no small undertaking. And to that point, I've had a couple of people raise other revenue strategies to me, and I think this fits within the context of this agenda item. And Mark Mathers, not to put you on the spot, but you and I talked the other day about some thoughts that you had with respect to things that should be also considered as part of the overall funding strategy. And if, if you'd like to bring those up at this point, this would be an appropriate time for that.

Mark Mathers: Thank you, Chair Hobbs. Mark Mathers for the record. Yeah, going back to the phrase, leaving no stone unturned, I feel like -- and during our conversations, a really good point was raised that before you consider tax increases, it may be prudent to consider existing resources, right? And ensure that again, we've looked under every stone and considered other options before we present the concept of raising taxes. And so, we had discussed two different concepts. One would be a reallocation of other local government tax revenues. And having worked at the state level at a county, and now at a school district, it's been my observation that there are other levels of government, local government that have seen significantly greater resources over the last decade than school districts or the state for that matter. And that, like other states have done, it may be prudent for the state legislature to consider some resetting or reallocation of sales tax or other revenues between cities, counties, and school districts to level out the resources each of us receives. So that was one concept, or it could apply to government services tax or other local government revenues. And I know how controversial that would be, but it feels to me like over several decades, certain tax revenues increase faster than others. And so, some re-look at the mix of revenue sources that all local governments receive, to me makes sense for the state to do at some point. Because I really do feel like having worked at those other agencies, school districts is at the bottom of the food chain. That we just have not kept base with what city and county governments have received over time, even with the significant increase this last biennium. And then the second concept that I wanted to raise was the fact that, and I think we've covered this in the past, that the share of the state's general fund that went to K through 12 used to be much higher. It used to be 40% of State general

fund revenues went to K through 12, and it has dropped over the last decade or decade and a half to 33%. So before we consider a tax increase, if the governor is opposed to such a thing or others are opposed to that concept, then to me, one of the concepts we should consider as a recommendation is to, again, get back up to that 4% mark, which would generate hundreds of million dollars of revenue to K through 12. So those were in summary, just two concepts I'd like us to look at. Again, for the record saying, okay, if tax increases are off the table for the moment, or perhaps in combination with tax increases, here are some concepts to increase K through 12 funding, if that's truly a priority of the state without raising taxes. So I think, Jeremy's had a long history looking at revenue issues at the state, and so have you, Chair Hobbs, I'm hoping that that analysis is not such a heavy lift and those kind of concepts could be quantified fairly easily, I'm hoping. Those were the ideas I wanted to bring up. And I appreciate Chair Hobbs, you letting me kind of cover those.

Chair Hobbs: Well, thank you very much, Mark. And instead of continuing to have a conversation with Jeremy, which I'll do later. I want open it up to the commission for any questions and comments direction, because one of the next things that, as I mentioned we'll be doing is using these targets and beginning to run the different scenarios of funding that would hopefully move us in this direction, right? And so, in Mark's comments, potentially fit into that as something that can be evaluated as a part of the overall look. As Mark mentioned, those don't come without -- well, none of the concepts that we'll be talking about, whether they involve sales tax, property tax, reallocation of revenue setting a benchmark of funding standard for the state budget. None of those come without some amount of controversy and lack of ease for a variety of reasons. So, they're all equally challenging, but this will be an opportunity to provide comments as we're entering the phase of the analysis for other things that should be considered or not be considered. We're maybe setting some guardrails for the rest of the work that's going to be done by applied. Anyone? Please.

Punam Mathur: For the record, Member Mathur. Part what I've been convinced of in the three years that we've been sitting in this room at this science is that our fiscal policy as a state is in as desperate need of modernization, as was our poor pupil funding formula in 2019 with increase in incentives. Senator Woodhouse took it on. And so, I think there's a massive opportunity for us and to bond, right? I'm convinced based on what you've educated us on through this process relative to the only to social self-funding in the state that met clearly the principles that we set forth as important to me in terms of tax policy back in that November 22 report, sufficiency, stability, predictability, competitive, are the four, I think you promise commitments that we make around insurance. And based on what I've seen between abatements and narrowing base, we think as Nevadans that it's a really solid foundation. I get really concerned about looking at what used to be pump brought up the sales tax now looks very much like a stiletto heel. And so, I know that the terminology, when we get to any conversation about this, please don't raise taxes. I'm convinced it's not an exercise in raising taxes, it can exercise and modernizing the way in which we tax. And so, as bases are getting narrow and narrow in both of our two primary sources, the only place you can chase is the rates. Because there's less of a base. And so, I think there's a huge opportunity for us and I would just encourage us to be brave enough to say that thing out loud and it isn't going to be popular. There is no scenario under which we will earn popularity points. But I think that's maybe the opportunity for us is to say the thing that we truly believe to be the best way forward. I've been completely convinced that this is a journey imperative for us as a state. We also have to education certainly, but relative to a whole bunch of other things as well. I think the imperative for us as this state is to modernize our really antiquated systems of financing everything we do, which also strike me as not really having been significantly evaluated, reevaluated, modernizing over 50 years, which was exactly the same case. And so, as you imagine and dream about a state that has a diverse set of economic drivers and a diverse workforce that rises to really excel and succeed in those jobs, it's the whole thing's about modernization. It began with modernizing funding formula. Now, I think that the time is now to really get serious about modernizing our fiscal policy so that we can modernize our systems to educate a modern workforce to then really be kick-ass. Excuse me, if that's okay to say, but to be kick-ass in a modern economy. I mean, there is a certain amount of prudence and turning every stone, but I don't want us to get so busy turning stones that we miss the energy required to move the boulder.

Chair Hobbs: Well, absolutely, and thank you for always putting it in a way that refocuses why we're going through all of these mathematical steps. There are several of us on this commission that one way or the other. Dr. Brune has been involved in looking at the state's fiscal system as well. Jeremy and I, it goes back over 20 years, having the same types of conversations. It was critical then, and 20 years later it's even more critical, right? And it's one of those things that you look at it as an inevitability because it can't continue that way. The opportunity to join it with something as purposeful and meaningful as education is a remarkable opportunity. Paul, I think you had your hand up earlier, and then I'm going to go to Dave up north.

Paul Johnson: Thanks, Chairman Hobbs. I appreciate all of the comments. I think we have a tendency to identify where we are not really reflect on some of the problems that we've had. And the path has been solved by the state education fund, which is one thing when now there's no more argued about how much money is in education. Now we know how much money is in education. We have no more dispute about the sufficiency that's been triangulated. We have the two that were referenced here, and I would throw in the Nevada Association of School Superintendents, that reached a similar conclusion, independent in a different way than these were provided. So there's no more argument about what adequate funding is. So there's been a lot of questions that have been answered and a lot of debates that are no longer taking place that allow us to take things and move them forward instead of continue to spin our wheels talking about where we are and what we should be doing. So, I think that focus is great and this is a real exciting time for me because having been here for a couple of decades where no progress was being made, now we're at a point where we're actually making some traction. And I do have to give the legislator credit and prior Senator Joyce Woodhouse and Mo Dennis for campaigning the state education. I know Jeremy worked hard on that as well to be the architect of that plan, but the significance of that is powerful. And the next piece though, just put this in perspective, we had a \$2.6 billion into education and it's still not adequate. We have another \$2.6 billion to go. So, I mean, that's a huge lift and I would love to be optimistic and think that we can get there in 10 years. And I'm going to still think that not revolving 10 years, but in 10 years from now. But I think this is an exciting time. And I just really appreciate all the effort and hard work. And I also appreciated the comments about funding study being revisited because in 2006, if you keep in mind, that was a cost-based analysis based on what professionals staffing should be and resources should be in schools at that period of time. And we've gone through a pandemic and we've introduced artificial intelligence and we've learned the significance of social emotional supports for students and how that affects their learning outcomes and a lot of things. So education has changed. So this is something that we constantly need to take a look at to not only identify the changes in funding, but also the changes in practice. So those things are married and that we also focus, which we are currently doing on finding out what matters so that we can invest our resources in those things that matter in order to fix or improve those things for our kids to set them up for success. So this is an exciting time and I just really appreciate the work. Looking forward to working with y'all as we move forward.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much Paul. Dave, I just want to make sure we, uh, go up to you and see if there's any questions or comments from up North.

Kyle Rodriguez: Chair Hobbs, Kyle Rodriguez, for the record. If I may, I think we need to be careful when we discuss raising taxes. We are seeing unprecedented inflation and if we're not designing where the funds are going to go, not only will the people send their funding plan, in my opinion, not be successful, but it is counterintuitive just to give raises to then again, increased taxes. So, just my thought. Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: No, thank you very much. Dave, you or Mark have any other comments?

Dr. David Jensen: Member Jensen, for the record. I'll be brief because I think it's been covered. I appreciate the focus on it and that's what excites me about this process is we do have a focus, but we need to be very

cautious because my concern is that if we don't have an intensive focus and a plan to continue to add revenues, the PCFP will ultimately fail. Like the Nevada plan did. The Nevada plan failed because there was not attention put into moving that forward as it needed to. And if the state becomes lax on this, we find ourselves in the same situation. So the conversations today were intriguing to me and I'm glad to see the forward progress that's going and I hope that we can maintain that as a commission in the state.

Chair Hobbs: Thanks much. Mark, you and Dusty.

Dusty Casey: Chair Hobbs, this is member Casey for the record. Quick question Jeremy. Can you go back to the 10-year phase in. I just have a quick math question if you don't mind. I just want to put this in terms of increased funding for the biennium. I just want to make sure my math's correct. So if we're looking at funding in terms of the next legislative cycle biennium for the next one, would that be approximately \$600 million increase for the biennium over the current biennium?

Jeremy Aguero: Alright. For the record, Jeremy. I remember Casey, you have it correct. You would've to add both of those together in order to have the totality of it. So the end of the biennium, you would have to be all the way up to 14,791. We can add both of those together and divide it by two or something along those lines and resubmit it so that it's very clear in terms of what the average have to be because they, as you are well aware, they budget each one of those individual years. But yes, you would have to get all the way to the second year to have sufficient funds that have both years included.

Dusty Casey: Excellent. Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah, you raise a really important point in all of this. It won't become necessarily a part of the analysis, but it could become part of the commentary. This 10-year period is a moving tenure year period by virtue the way it was put into law to the extent that you don't make progress in the -- let's say by any of that you were just talking about, it puts additional upward pressure on all of the other years through year 10. But there's always this ability, if you don't do something for two years, you'll have another next 10-year period that'll continue to inflate forward. So, there's some danger in that part of it. And I think our focus is always on the 10 year period because that's what we were charged with until we're charged with it again the next time. Jeremy, we thank you very much for the update today and all of the effort and past and present.

Jeremy Aguero: Thank you, sir. Appreciate the opportunity to be here.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. With that we will move to agenda item number seven, a review of the current distribution methodology for state special education dollars. We are to receive a presentation from WestEd relating to the current state special education distribution methodology. Sara, from WestEd we're pleased to have you here and whenever you're ready.

Sara Doutre: Good morning. I am pleased to be here and to share with you today. I'm hoping I can successfully share my screen. Let's see.

Chair Hobbs: Don't make us look really bad down here by being able to do that very quickly. Okay.

Sara Doutre: Let's see if this -- I may have to share my entire screen because I can't share PowerPoint, so that means I won't be able to see you well, but I'll be able to hear. Sorry, this is new software for me too, so I'm not just trying to make you look good.

Chair Hobbs: It's no problem.

Sara Doutre: I'm just genuinely figuring this out.

Megan Peterson: Sara, this is Megan. If you'd like, I can try to plug in and run the presentation for you.

Sara Doutre: It's okay. I think I'll just have to share -- For some reason it doesn't want to share certain apps. I won't share a PDF or PowerPoint, but I can share my screen. So I think I can just make it my whole screen and then share. So let's try that before we result to you having to listen to me say next slide.

Chair Hobbs: You just sent Paul Johnson to the airport to catch a flight to help out.

Sara Doutre: Perfect. Okay. Are you seeing my presentation now?

Chair Hobbs: I am not, no.

Sara Doutre: Okay. Megan, we might have to have you share it then. Because it says I'm sharing my -- Here, let me try it one more time. One more time. We'll get this.

Megan Peterson: I just shared, so we should be seeing it momentarily.

Sara Doutre: Great. Okay. Hello, to members of the commission. Thank you for your great work. It's been interesting to follow your work. My name is Sara Dootree. For WestEd, I do work related to special education funding. This is somewhat a passion of mine because I'm also a parent of a child with a disability, but just a field. I have a colleague who calls this a very shallow puddle of researchers who work on this because it's a very complicated subject as we're going to talk about today. Not as straightforward as some others. But Megan, if you'll go to the next slide, we have been contracted by the Nevada Department of Education specifically to help describe how special education is currently funded in Nevada. Explore how Nevada's special education funding formula compares to other states and develop considerations related to and the potential implications of the previously proposed changes as well as any new recommendations for change. And that, we've been working with Megan closely and with Julie Ballmer, the director of special education on this for a little more than a year now, looking at special education funding and are excited to share with you today the first part of two presentations. I'll be back with you again next month to talk more about this and to get more into the numbers. But today we wanted to provide a framework for thinking about how we fund special education and the policy levers we have. So, Megan, if you'll go to the next slide, I want to start with two rounding assumptions that a lot of this work is centered in. And the first is that special education as required by the Federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA is an individual entitlement. And regardless of the fact that IDEA does provide federal funding, which we're going to talk more about, each LEA, which in the Nevada is a school district, must provide a free and appropriate education to each student with a disability. And each state must ensure implementation of the IDEA by its LEA school districts. And this is important to understand because again, while IDEA does provide some funding, the right to receive special education is one of the few individual entitlements in education. We have a lot of entitlement programs to student groups and other things, but this is an individual entitlement for students. And regardless of funding compliance, that's still required. And so sometimes we'll hear like, oh, we're going to decide to turn down the money from the federal government. Well, even without money, we still have this civil rights law, basically of IDEA saying that students with disabilities need to receive a free appropriate education. The next piece that goes along with that is that federal special education funding, while much lower than envisioned, we'll talk about that in a minute, is not, and is not intended to be sufficient to fund all special education costs. And so when we think about the federal share in special education, we need to understand that each state has to provide special education funding. And in most cases, there's also a local share that that federal share is even, or that state share is not even sufficient to cover all of the needs of students with disabilities. So moving on to the next slide, one of the areas that we have been looking into is this idea of federal special education funding and the fact that the

work that you're doing in Nevada right now has not been done at the federal level since federal fiscal year 1999. And so, we're talking about 25 years that the feds have used the same formula and have not moved to what we call fully on special education. And I just want to talk to that a little bit so you understand what that means and what that would look like if it were fully federally funded when we talk about that. IDEA funding was not ever, like I said, intended to cover everything. Federal funds right now nationally cover approximately 13% of the cost of special education, and that's the excess cost of special education. So on top of these base per person amounts that, that we just have been speaking about that you all have been looking at very closely. And that proportion varies based on locality. But again, as a national average, full funding of IDEA as was envisioned in the 1970s when the law was first passed, would cover 40% of the excess cost. Still expecting states and LEAs to contribute about 60% of the excess cost of special education. So federal funding is about a fourth of what it was envisioned to be. And we have heard more in recent years, there was a quite a large increase during COVID that was maintained, but still doesn't move the needle very far on that as far as getting toward full funding. So one of the things, we've looked at recently, this research on the next slide was conducted by myself and a colleague, Tammy Colby, some colleagues, Tammy Colby and Elizabeth Dewey last year, is we looked at what's been the effect of that. What is the effect of not updating the formula? And there's an interesting parallel here to Nevada as well. But based on looking at those 1999 numbers and comparing those to fiscal year 2021 data, special ED funding has increased. And nationally, this is again, those federal funds and we look at the per pupil with a disability grant. When we break that down per student with a disability, it's increased 210% nationally. Again, from that, you'll see 783 to 2489 that's adjusting for inflation. So if you do the math there, that's why it's not perfect. Nevada's amount increased only 137% from 810 to 1924 and was the smallest increase in the country. And this is due to the large increase in the population in Nevada. And so, Nevada is a state that has definitely been impacted by the fact that we're still using a base amount of money and students from 1999 to calculate the federal amount. And so, only two states receive less per child with a disability, but that would be Pennsylvania and Oklahoma. And the highest amounts are not quite double, but again, like a 50% increase over Nevada amount more than \$3,000 per student in Wyoming, Louisiana, and Vermont. So, I provide that to you with context as we think about special education funding to understand not only does Nevada receive less per child than most other states, but also there's an impact of using old numbers to calculate data based on changes in the population. And this has really disproportionately affected the distribution of funds for Nevada federally. And then we see that mirrored in Nevada based on the allocation of funds and maintaining a base based on old numbers. And so, it creates disparities in those amounts across districts in Nevada's case are across states, and some inequity there, especially where we have large changes in populations. So if you think about the growth in Nevada over the last 25 years compared to a state like Vermont or Wyoming, that that population may have even decreased in the last 25 years. So along with that context with federal funding, Megan, if you move to the next slide, in some work that we did for Colorado a couple of years ago, we looked at this idea of who has which share. So we know the feds have promised to take on a 40% share of these excess costs. They have not lived up to that we're again, 13 to 15%. And what does that look like when we look at a state and local share? This is something of interest. This again was a Colorado, special education funding group that was looking at this to look at what should the local share be and what should our state obligation be? And so, this is really interesting to look at. I think, as you know, based on other things understanding this and the costs of special education are very different across states and even within states. We don't have consistent data on especially General ED Funding to provide special education when special education funding isn't sufficient. So I provide that as a caveat that the takeaway from the next two slides, Megan, if we go to the next slide, is that the share really varies and it varies most based on the cost of special education. And with the exception of Wyoming, which is the lowest bar on this chart, which shows that the blue is the federal, I think I lost my key when I zoom this in for the slide, but blue is the federal share. Green is the state share. And then on the far right, the gray is the, the local share. What is the local burden to provide special education. And Wyoming is well known for providing almost a hundred percent. This is FFY 2021. Again, data that the local share in Wyoming was only 2%. The state was able to cover 88% of the costs. And there you'll see their federal money only covers 10% despite being one of the highest amounts because they're spending about \$18,000 per year on a student per student with disability on top of the base amount for

all students. Colorado, has the largest local share and is spending about \$10,000 per year, just over 10,000, almost 11, I guess. Oklahoma also has a large local share. Utah has also a very small local share that 4%, but their costs are very low. And so, if you look at Oklahoma, which is the second line, and Utah, the fourth line, you'll see that with similar costs, even sometimes that state fund, that state portion, what we cover as the state is larger. And then sometimes that portion of what we expect locals to cover. When we talk about local share included in this local share are funds that are provided by the state, but not set aside for the purpose of special education. And so, I'll talk a little bit more around the rules around that, but sometimes it becomes that the local share are really just funds that the local agency has re-designated from somewhere else and made the decision to put towards special education, even though they may be state funds. And if you go to the next slide, this shows, these were states in the same district as Colorado. So some states, these states are states with a similar count of children to Colorado. So a little bit bigger than Nevada. Nevada would fall on the small end of this. But then again, you'll see that there's a very clear correlation here between the amount of funds spent and the local shares. So the smaller amount of funds spent on students with disabilities, the smaller the local share. And so some of this, again, and I just, the data on this aren't clear, maybe the lack of reporting in some states of general funds that are used for students with disabilities. Generally, nobody collects data on that consistently across states and even within states, the data collection on those varies greatly. So moving on from thinking about those three different inputs, I want to talk a little bit about state funding formulas and within that context where Nevada fits in. And so, we at WestEd have have talked about a framework for thinking about that and have identified three policy levers that policy makers have when thinking about a funding formula. The first is the actual allocation, how the amounts are calculated. And from the earlier conversation, I know you all have been thinking about this as well as the broader context that surround this, but then we look at distribution, how the funds are directed to specific entities, and then the rules around expected expenditures. How tight or how loose are the rules around how funds we allocate, how to be used? Those are kind of the three levers we have. So I'm going to talk about other states and Nevada's formula in terms of these pieces. And so moving on to the next slide. When we talk about allocation, we'll start with allocation. And this also includes thinking about what is our unit count? What are we using? Are we using a count of students, all students in a district when we make that allocation are using account of students with disabilities? And how are we adjusting that count? What type of weights are we applying? If that count is of LEAs, are we applying weights to that whole community, like their ability to generate property taxes, actual revenue, they generate cost of living, additional costs, added based on the city or rurality of an area. Characteristics of both the unit as far as the receives the funds is also the student unit. And so looking at disability type, those are weights, right? We'll think about those as weights or adjustments. And of course, the more adjustments we have, the more complex it gets to be and it's difficult to understand the formula. So starting with the most simple on the next slide, we looked at who uses, well, let's look at Nevada. This is Nevada, sorry, I got ahead of myself. But the prior year special education funding in Nevada is used as adjusted for patients to determine a base allocation, right? So this is a really high level 10,000-foot view of what, how Nevada currently allocates the funds. It uses those base, those base allocations are proportionally adjusted based on available funding. And then there are supplement. When there is supplementing available, it's provided to LEAs for students beyond a 13% cap that is set for base funding. And so that base funding is based on a unit count. And I'll have you go to the next slide, Megan. I'm actually going to have to skip a slide and I'm going to come back to this one next because I want to show -- sorry about that. That basic piece of this, the count of students with disabilities, I just want to share. 39 states use account of students with disabilities in some way, and not the count of all students or census count to allocate special education funding. Nevada falls in with those. The states that use a census count are assuming a percentage of students is going to be similar identified with disabilities across the state. And so, they're saying, we're going to allocate our special education funding based on your total population because we assume that there's going to be whatever that average is, 12%, 14% of students are going to have disabilities in every district or LEA. And then some are a hybrid. And again, this is where Nevada does have a hybrid approach where we look at the kind of students with disabilities, but we also use that base amount to allocate. And so that's where the single wait or amount comes in below. And then there are states with multiple weights and others resource and reimbursement models. The resource models that's similar to, I believe what Nevada had

prior to earlier, earlier, much earlier was, which is allocating teacher units based on counts rather than allocating funds. And then a reimbursement model is Wyoming and Kansas among other states where amounts allocated are based on receipt of reimbursement requests and the actual costs, and then allocated based on the actual costs provided by districts. So Megan, if you'll go back now, sorry, I want to talk a little bit about this. Hold harmless was provisioned. And so when I just spoke about the base and the base being carried forward from year to year and adjusted for inflation, this is a measure that was put in place intending to assure that LEAs did not experience a decrease in funds year over year. And so we're using those 2016 counts, they established a base and we have continued that base and it's led to large disparities. This is similar to the federal formula with per student with disability, LEA amounts ranging from approximately \$3,000 to \$12,000. That when we figure out that multiplier, we don't have a single multiplier for the whole state. The multiplier is different for different districts because we've carried forward that base. And I want to spend a little bit of time talking about this because this is often mistakenly referred to as the maintenance of effort provision or MOE, and I'd like us to think of that instead as a hold harmless provision that it is indeed intended to ensure LEAs don't have a decrease in amounts and to hold them harmless if they do have a decrease in a population. So that's a decrease in amounts, but that doesn't align perfectly to the federal maintenance of effort requirements. And so, I want to make sure you as a commissioner are aware of what those requirements are and how that is connected and isn't connected to this. And so, Nevada has two maintenance of effort, federal requirements that apply to special education. One is the state level maintenance of financial support that requires that Nevada as a state make available funds from year to year of at least the same amount. And so, when the legislature cannot decrease the amount made available from one biennium in Nevada's case to the next because the state has to make available the same amount as it made available. It's important to understand there aren't exceptions to this. The state has to continue that. There have been -- I know I've had discussions with Nevada over the last 10 years probably about the impact of this, but this definitely affects funding decisions. In addition to that, each LEA must meet MOE requirements at the local level, local MOE. And this is based on both budgeting and spending. And there are exceptions to that. So for example, if I'm an LEA and last year I spent \$250,000 and then this year I had fewer students with disabilities, three of my students with disabilities moved out. And that meant I'm spending 10,000 per child last year. I could reduce my maintenance of effort based on students leaving. I can reduce that based in changes in costs of staff. If a more expensive staff person leaves and I'm able to replace them with a less expensive staff person, I can reduce my maintenance of effort. And if I have exceptionally costly programs, and so some of those students that require intensive services like nursing services or interpreters or other things like that, that are very costly for one student, when those programs end, I can reduce my maintenance of effort. And so, I think that the biggest takeaways I'd like you to all have from this is that, the current provision of continuing the base from year to year is important to help hold LEAs harmless. And so, they don't lose funds. However, it's not required and the state is not obligated to ensure each LEA meets maintenance of effort by giving them the same amount of funds from year to year. LEAs can meet that requirement by using state and local funds, any type of state funds, not the state special education funds as well as local funds such as those generated through property tax. And LEAs can also reduce that. And so, when we think about the projection, like you were just speaking about over the next 10 years, hold harmless provisions are often used when we make changes to a special education formula to make sure we're not causing disruption to the system. But they're, they're generally intended to be temporary and transition. And so, it might be that we provide 100% of the base in the first year down to more leveling out those amounts across districts over five years, over eight years, over three years, something like that. But generally those are for a period of transition and maintaining them long term can lead to quite large disparities as we see in Nevada. And like I said, as we've seen with the federal formula. Go on, Megan, if you want to skip ahead to the slide on waits, I wanted to provide some waiting examples. And so, I think another reason this is important as I was just listening to the previous presentation is that the recommendations, and the ask of us was not to redo any of the work related to specialization funding, but we did review both the APA reports and their methodology and the AIR report that was done in 2012. So we have the 2016, 2012, and 2018 reports, and all of those recommend await for special education similar to the leads that you have developed in the both centered funding plan for other student groups. And some of those weights are one weight and for multiple. And so I just wanted to provide an

example of that. In the earlier table, we showed that some states have multiple weights, and that's about 16 states have multiple weights. 21 states that have a weight have a single weight that's applied across the state. So of those multiple weights, sometimes those are allocated there. There's a large range. I think the largest number of weights for special education is 15, but Arizona is an example with 11, and they have divided out by disability category. And even within that, some additional categories. And those additional categories include mild intellectual specific learning disability, speech language. That's their lowest weight of their 11, which is a very small weight. So again, just \$3 on the 1,000 per student if we were looking at a base. We know that base is at least 10,000, right? It went from the earlier conversation. But this is to make it simple. And then going up from a mid-weight of about 3.5 for a preschool severe delay and up to almost a weight of eight times the base amount for multiple disabilities or a severe sensory impairment. And those weight distributions again, and you'll see Georgia's includes some pieces include whether that is provided mostly in a general education setting or outside of general education. Iowa looks at whether special education, what proportion of the educational program is provided by special education, whether that's in general education or not. There are a lot of ways of doing that. I think the big takeaway from this is that in looking at what Nevada has available to it, these waiting systems, these more complex waiting systems all require another element of data collection. Some do it just by disability category, which can be effective in sorting the most mild disabilities from the most severe need. But not always, we have a lot of disability categories including autism, which are not singular in how they're organized. And there are students within the autism disability category, for example, whose educational programs look more like that of a student with a speech language impairment and some who have much more severe needs and are potentially receiving all of their services outside of general education and need one-on-one supports. And just thinking about this that applies to Nevada's current approach of using same base across all students with disabilities is definitely the easiest to transition to. And states that have more complex weights have had to collect additional data about students to implement those reading systems. Moving on to the next item in the three levers that I talked about. The next lever is distribution. And distribution refers to -- we think about as where the money goes, to whom does the state give the funds, whether that's directly to schools, that happens, some states for charter schools. That happens for our federal funds for students who are in need of economic economic assistance under Title One. Those funds go directly to schools, directly to LEAs, that most states, including Nevada flow all special education funds directly to LEAs. Mostly because that aligns to that authority and responsibility under IDEA programmatically that the LEA is responsible for identifying students with disabilities and ensuring they receive their educational programs. It also looks at how the funds flow, whether they are separate categorical allocations. Most states, including Nevada currently do flow them as a separate fund, right? There's a separate calculation. And then seven states. And I would say this is one of the more common changes we've seen in states that have changed their special education funding over the last 10 years is they've made that part of the foundation funding that's become a part of their foundation funding. And I think that matches one of the early recommendations from APA that was continued forward is integrating this weight or whatever way that the state chooses to allocate funding for special education, making that part of the pupil centered funding plan rather than a separate special education allocation. And then the last lever for policy recommendations that we've identified is expected expenditures. Megan, if we go to the next slide, that there's also an opportunity with special education. There are so many required expenditures. Again, those individual mandates, right? That individual entitlement. That makes special education unique, that the lack of funding doesn't mean the program will go away. It means that LEAs have to find funding to provide that summer. And so, it's a nice protection along with maintenance of effort and other fiscal requirements. But also programmatically it's very difficult to stop providing special education services. And so we have those required expenditures. The other way that expected expenditures are communicated are through restricted expenditures or preserved funding. And that's very common in special education that Nevada and most states require all funds to be used for special education. So, if we're going to give you special education funds, those are restricted for special education only. Texas is the only state I'm aware of that has a portion of that, that in Texas they say that 55% of the funds allocated must be used for special education. And then there are seven states that include that funding as part of the base and do not restrict its use. And so it means, for example, in Alaska and in New Hampshire, those are two states that don't restrict districts receive additional funds based on the

allocation we talked about earlier based on account and amount available or await. But those funds are not restricted. They could be used for any purpose understanding that they still have the requirement of makings of effort and the programmatic requirements. And so they aren't generally using those funds for anything else, but the funds themselves are not restricted for special education. So, that I know is a lot, but like I said, special education funding is very complex. And we wanted to make sure before we get into in June, kind of more of the numbers and talking about specific weights and those things and the implications of that, that we gave you some context of thinking about making special education decisions, again, in these three different areas where you can think about recommendations that could impact special education funding. So on just the last key takeaways from this, and then I'll hopefully we have a little bit of time for question, but most states have developed formulas using study studies similar to Nevada's 2006, 2012, and 2018 studies. We've reviewed those studies. We don't have any concerns about the methodology or how those recommendations were made. We didn't redo any of those studies because they were done well and we didn't have the time and data available to us to do that. Limited data makes it very difficult to compare state special education funding formulas. We tried to do that in a few different ways for you all, but over the past decade, the shifts that we have seen in states that have changed their formulas have further differentiated it by moving to multiple weights, incorporated special education into or coordinated their special education funding with their general or foundation funding more. And so, I think that aligns really well to the recommendations that you've been given from the previous studies to incorporate into the people-centered funding plan and also to consider one or multiple weights that are used in coordination with your base amount. And that's what I have today. I don't know if you have -- I think we can move to questions. NDE will share the report with you prior to the June 21st meeting, and then we can discuss this more at that meeting as well.

Chair Hobbs: Sara, thank you very much. When we get reports like this, and I appreciate the background. It was certainly very helpful to me. We always like to remind at least myself, hopefully the rest of us too, what our tasks are in this area. What we've specifically been asked to do. Because again, it's a lot of information. I know it's extremely helpful to me not being one that works with this every day, but Megan, could you -- and maybe that's what you had early in your deck, Sara. I don't know if that's a repetition of what the tasks that have been assigned to the commission are, but I would certainly like to have a reminder so as we go through this, we can maintain some focus on those things that we've been specifically asked to do.

Megan Peterson: Chair Megan Peterson for the record. I'm presenting a copy of the legislative letter of intent that we received regarding the request, which is to review the special education program and develop a recommended targeted weight multiplier, similar to what we have for the English learners, our student's success, support weight, and the gifted and talented pupils, as well as reviewing the study of our current distribution methodology and making any changes to that. And so, I think in short, whether we need to review making changes to our hold harmless provision for maintaining prior year base and allocating funds on a per pupil based on the remainder and moving straight to a strictly per pupil allocation methodology or some other methodology are the two tasks that are at hand.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah, I think your explanation took care of the other question I had, that there's some precognition here of changing the way that we allocate for special education. Is that the case?

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson for the record. The biggest change would be because the intent is to allocate on a per pupil methodology based on the allocations that are provided, but whether or not to maintain essentially the hold harmless because that does prevent full application of a true weight in this situation.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. With that in mind, as we get to the June meeting, will we be receiving some additional recommendations with respect to the setting of the weight multipliers and underlying rationale for that.

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson. As part of the presentation next time, we will identify the ways that were

previously recommended through the studies that have been done, and then we have a fancy tool that will help us model and understand the impacts. It includes some heat mapping functions that show how that will impact each of the districts based on the per pupil amounts and whether or not a hold harmless is utilized for three years, five years, and at what percentage? We'll have those available next time.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. No, that's helpful. And I'm just assuming here, and I'm looking over at Jason and Paul and Kyle and Mark and others. That would be a matter of the impact that that would have on base level funding, right?

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson. It will show comparison to what was funded in fiscal year 24 or 25. So it'll be a comparison of what currently is versus what scenario we would like to model.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Got it. Okay. With that in mind, and knowing that this is coming back to us and hopefully we'll be in a position to act on some or all of the recommendations or at least the deliverables that we've been given responsibility for, is there anything else the commission would like to see before that next meeting? Or does Megan's explanation satisfy? It sounds like we're going to be getting the impact part of it as well, which is the piece I was most concerned about. Dave, anybody up there?

Dr. David Jensen: Yeah, we do have a comment up North. Mark.

Mark Mathers: Thank you Mark Mathers for the record. This is great work done by our consultants, I guess. My very high degree of concern is, if we're looking at just changing the methodology without a significant increase in funding for special Ed, that's again, going to create winners and losers. And I really worry about doing that. And I know we have a directive from the state just to give a sense to folks that aren't CFOs. Our local share of special Ed funding went from 46 million, fiscally 23 compared to 36 million of state funding went from 46 million to 69 million in the fiscal year 25 budget. So our local share went up more than 20 million or more than 50%. So we've kind of banged the table for a while. That state funding a special Ed has to increase. It barely moved at all this biennium. And if you couple that with a new methodology that again, moves the deck chairs, and you're going to have real financial harm to some districts, I fear. So I just wanted to note that, that I hate to propose a change in methodology that'll, again, create winners and losers if the pie doesn't expand, but I know that's a conversation for another day.

Chair Hobbs: I appreciate you saying that, Mark because that's what was in the back of my mind and you worded it much better than I did. But in making any of those recommendations, we have to be cognizant of the impacts elsewhere within the overall funding regime that we have. There's no question about that. And I don't think it would be impossible for us to make recommendations that had triggers or I don't know what you want to call them, attached to it that had to do with, if funding is increased by a certain amount, then you can begin to migrate from one methodology to another. But unless that happens, again, it's the reshuffling of the deck chairs as you always refer to it. I completely get that, and I think that's something that we have to have in the back of our mind because I think that fits within the deliverable we've been tasked with is to make those kinds of observations as a part of the recommendation as well.

Paul Johnson: Well, thanks chairman. Member Johnson for the record. I think it'd be helpful for us to identify why the deck chairs are arranged the way that they are. So kind of an orientation of the existing formula and how it works or does not work. I think would be helpful if we're going to identify where we are to where we want to go.

Chair Hobbs: Makes sense. [Indiscernible]

Megan Peterson: Thank you. I don't want to get out in front of everybody or anyone, but this is a really

complicated topic and so, I know we set up a small working group or a couple of meetings for the NCEI and so, I know our time is limited, but I was wondering whether we could have a small group or just be in the room when the consultants huddle with NDE to talk through some of these issues in a more informal setting so that I would like to feel better prepared when we come back for the formal June 21st meeting. I don't know if that would be possible.

Chair Hobbs: Well, personally, I think that's a great idea. Now we'll get into the logistics of how we do it, right? Greg, again, making sure that we do this the right way, this would be similar to other working groups that we've set up in the past that would be made up of three or so members of this commission enabling them to monitor that process and when it becomes back to us, help the consultants speak on behalf of it and the forming of recommendations on the part of the commission. Again, I think that's a great idea and not having had a lot of time to think about what face to circle. I would ask who is interested in being a part of that. I don't know whether to call you Dr. Brune or Council Brune or Commissioner. I'm just trying to be most respectful. So Nancy, just the raise of hands. I think it's important that the CFO be a part of that process, Paul, so you're jumping in there. And anyone else? I don't see anybody else. That's perfectly fine. So we would go ahead and form that working group that way and you'd be acting more as observers in the process and certainly be able to interact with questions and with what the commission has been charged with in the back of your mind and whether or not the material that we're going to receive will enable us to move forward and act on that. Perfect. If nothing else is on that agenda item. And thank you again very much, Sara. Good stuff.

Unidentified Speaker: Very shallow puddle. She's very deep.

Chair Hobbs: That was a compliment.

Sara Doutre: Thank you. [Indiscernible] I look forward to further conversations leading up to end of the GYM meeting,

Chair Hobbs: Okay, that brings us to agenda item number eight, which sometimes can be a fairly lengthy agenda item. So I'll ask the commission whether or not they wish to take a short convenience break. I don't know what accommodations have been made if we were to go through the lunch hour today. I do not know, but during this break, I suppose that's something that could be addressed as well. So let's take 10 minutes and we'll reconvene no later than 11 o'clock. That's 15 minutes if that works for people. So we'll recess until 11.

Secretary: The Livestream is ready.

Chair Hobbs: Thanks very much. Okay, we're going to go ahead and reconvene the meeting of the Commission on School Funding, May 31st. It's 11 o'clock, and we're moving into agenda item number eight. Before we get into the individual working groups and the reports associated with each of those groups, it's our goal today in at least, perhaps three cases to bring closure to some of these items. So just looking down the list here, but that's our goal today, and we appreciate everyone's efforts and being able to bring these subjects to this point for the commission of the consideration. All of these are information, discussion, and possible action items. So we'll begin with, let's try working group number one.

Joyce Woodhouse: Thank you, Chair Hobbs. Member Woodhouse for the record. We have working Group one, which is the performance of the Pupil Centered Funding Plan. My co-lead on this working group is Dr. Jensen, and our members are, members Johnson and Casey. We have a number of listening sessions. I do have a printed report, well, actually it's on my computer, that I have forwarded to all of the commission members and to staff. And in talking to Megan, it will be posted on the website after this meeting. But what we did, was to take a look at, and really the important part to us was that we had listening sessions with four different groups. The first being the superintendents of the school districts across the state. And we followed that up with a

listening session with CFOs that were available to speak with us. And then we followed that up with a listening session with NDE staff. And then the fourth session was with the staff of the Governor's Finance Office. And so, in the paper that we have prepared, and we've had since our last listening session, the four of us have had a phone call. Or actually, I don't remember it was a phone call or a zoom call. But we made some edits. We made some additions, we deleted some things. So I'm going to briefly go through and then ask if Dr. Jensen, when I finish, if you would add anything I might have missed that you think is important to share. And then certainly Paul and Dusty, if you have anything else to add or questions that you would like to prepare. But we are prepared today to share with you five results from our listening sessions. But just before I do that, the process that we use, as I indicated the four listening groups with the superintendents, we asked them to respond to questions that we had pulled from WestEd in their Nevada LEA focus group summary report from November of 2023. For the other three groups, we asked them to speak to us regarding any mechanics within the PCFP that should be addressed. So you'll see a little bit of difference there. It was interesting that some of the groups had the same issues or the same concerns and some of the same compliments. So, we also upfront told them that the issues of MCEI hold harmless reports, and at risk definition, were going to be addressed via the full commission, which that has been going on. So, we took those things because some of those things raised were raised when we had our listening sessions and we said, the whole commission's going to take a look at those and make a determination. So some of the comments that we had that I'm going to bring to the four before I give you the five focus points for the results. First one was that the previous categorical grants that were in the Nevada plan were problematic. The pupil centered funding plan is easy and easy to understand and explain. One concern was, we still have a difficulty in really feeling that we know for sure that the funding is following the student, which is exactly what are the baseline efforts of the PCIP was. So, we wanted to make sure about that from a couple of the groups concern about handling K-12 funding with the funding that we have if there is a recession, and I think we all understand that concern. We had discussions on the adjusted base and base calculations on special Ed funding, and certainly the West Ed report and the ensuing conversations this morning added to that and attendance zones, which we've also are having a report on today as well. So, the results, based upon all of the conversations that we had, number one is the general consensus is that the pupil centered funding plan is working well, and it is working as designed. The second one, that we are bringing forward as a result, for us to consider is review and update of the attendance area, language and model as needed to ensure that the PCFP is following the prescribed definition in statute. Number three is to consider a ratification in a hold harmless provision regarding weighted subpopulation adjustments. And the fourth one is to evaluate the benefit of weights being calculated on the adjusted base versus the base. And number five is to evaluate updated research to identify how equitable the PCFP funding is being distributed. And we've heard some conversation on that already today. So those are the five results that are being brought forth by your working group number one that we might want to consider for our report. And I would like to ask Dr. Jensen, if there's anything else you'd like to add in then, Paul and dusty following him. Thank you.

Dr. David Jensen: Thank you, Member Woodhouse. Member Jensen, for the record. And I really appreciate the work that Member Woodhouse has done on this as the lead. She's done a phenomenal job as she summarized those five primary areas. There were also a number of comments, observations that each of you'll have an opportunity to review. In fact, there's about 21 of them and it does make me think about the public comment that we received this morning with this historical investment. We're truly only a couple of years into the process, and we know change takes three to five years. As we look for those outcomes, those outcomes will take time. And I know the commission sees that, but we're going to have to help others understand that as well. And then one of the areas that was focused on in the comments and observations is the fact that one of the goals, not only of the commission, our legislature, but also the superintendents group, was in regards to recruitment and retention. And that required us to put a significant infusion of funds into salaries and benefits. And when you consider that, the largest proportion of these funds simply went to pay existing people more revenue, more salary in order to try to entice future teachers to come in, but also to maintain our teachers. So as we start now to look, and there was a conversation yesterday that Dr. Brune led and it made me think, because one of my comments was, is one of the goals that was specified by the superintendent's group was to identify

the number of positions that remain unfilled because we're struggling right now to fill vacancies. I know Clark County and every other district in the state has vacancies in our school district right now, that we just simply can't find the people to fill, let alone the additional areas of focus that need to be brought on in order to support our students across the spectrum. And then the final thing I'll touch on, and this comes from a comment from Dusty, and he was spot on when we had this meeting, is the focus that came from the Commission on auxiliary services, specific to transportation and nutrition. There was a recommendation regarding transportation for our charter, organization that we didn't see much progress on. But those auxiliary services are going to be essential for us to continue to evaluate as we move forward through this process. And with that, I'll open it up to Member Johnson or Member Casey, if they have any comments they'd like to share.

Chair Hobbs: Dusty, Paul doesn't have anything to contribute at this moment. Do you have anything?

Dusty Casey: This is Member Casey. I agree with that. Thank you Dave and Joyce.

Chair Hobbs: Okay, very good. So, with that --

Dusty Casey: Before you jump in, I think we need to put on record that Paul didn't have anything to add. This might be the first time.

Chair Hobbs: We are actually bringing in a photographer to chronicle at this moment. So with that, please.

Joyce Woodhouse: And thank you very much. I really appreciate that. Just in conclusion, I also want to say, we all extend our appreciation to Megan, Bo, and James for attending all of our meetings and helping us through some of the technical parts of things that we were looking at. So they are greatly appreciated for all of their input and their support. Thanks.

Chair Hobbs: So, to move this matter forward, I'm just trying to think of what the appropriate process would be. Part one would be to accept the report from the working group, I believe. And along with accepting the report from the working group, we'd be accepting the observations that the working group has made. If we do that, then the only thing that would be remaining would be the preparation of, you know, any building out of a report around those, those or those observations. And they would, as a result of our action become recommendations within this area. Does that make sense? Okay. So with that in mind, if there's no more discussion, we could take a motion to accept the report and the observations as recommendations.

Paul Johnson: This is Member Johnson and I will make that motion.

Chair Hobbs: We have a motion. Is there a second?

Nancy Brune: Member Brune, we have a second.

Chair Hobbs: We have a motion and a second. Is there any further discussion? A question?

Punam Mathur: Thank you, Chair Hobbs. For the record, Member Mathur. So to the four of you, the original intent was to create a people-centered funding plan where the money would essentially serve as a little backpack for Nevada babies, and it would find its way. Do we have a sense of even a level of confidence that that is what's happening? Do we have a sense that there's work to do that we got to put some more reporting in or transparency into assure that?

Joyce Woodhouse: Well, I'll jump in first. Woodhouse for the record. Yes. Each of the four groups that we had a listening session with indicated that the plan was working and that they felt comfortable with it. But yes,

always we need to be watching and learning from, because there's going to be changes in demographics of student populations, in funding sources and how our state changes over time. We all agree that this is not something that we can adopt in 2019, in SP543 and just say, okay, we're not going to touch it for 50 years. We've learned the mistakes of that. So I think every group then also indicated to us, it's obvious that the admission on school funding or a group like that, like us, needs to stay on top of this, working with the Department of Ed, the Governor's Office on Finance, and all of the stakeholders as to, does it continue to work right now? Yes, it is working. Yes, there's probably some changes that could be made, but we always have to be on top of it, not let it slide away by just setting it on shelf. So, I really felt that the, the response from the four groups was very positive in what we are attempting to do and the efforts that we're doing now, in taking a look at all of these pieces, in addition to the assignments from the legislature and with the two bills as well as the letters of intent, Dave, Paul, any additions to that?

Paul Johnson: At the risk of criticism, Chairman Hobbs, Member Johnson, for the record. I had hard enough time biting my tongue on the last one. So, this is all Dave's fault. No, but I think every school district has an ability to report expenditures down to the school level. It's not an exact one-to-one relationship between the dollar and the PCFP because there are shared expenses. But in the reporting and accountability piece, one of the things that we're trying to do is identify that type of reporting. And there's some challenges because school districts don't all do the cost to allocation the same way. And there's some accounting issues that are unique to each school district. So we have to standardize those types of things in order to make sure that we're all recording things in the same way and reporting things in the same way. As a general rule, each school district can provide how much money is spent, where it went down to the school level.

Chair Hobbs: Another question came to me telephonically, and that has to do with time context of these recommendations. And Joyce, I think you've already addressed that, that the people-centered funding plan was originally put into place in 2019. We need to monitor, and as conditions change in the education environment, be prepared to modify any elements of the people-centered funding plan that aren't working as appropriate. But for example, the review and update of the attendance area language and the model part of it, I would think that we would want to be conducting those reviews. I don't know that this is the right terminology, each interim or each, each period of the existence of this commission between legislative sessions. Is that the thinking?

Joyce Woodhouse: Yes. Chair Hobbs. That is the thinking plus some of these, such as the evaluation of updated research on equity, or whatever that right word is. And looking at the base, looking at hold harmless. Some of these are in attendance area for one, two, and there's others buried in the comment section, that we wanted to put them forth because in moving forward, it will require some funding for the additional studies. And not looking at NDE itself to do those, or the commission itself to do those, but that the commission would have the support to conduct the studies as needed, based upon whatever the changes might need to be.

Chair Hobbs: And that's a theme I think that we're going to see in at least one of the other working groups recommendations that involves ongoing work that needs to be performed. Obviously we're not trying to create homework for NDE, and to the extent that we created for ourselves as this commission, there's a need to point out the fact that resources would be necessary in order to be able to undertake that. And we're recommending that it be done, but without the advent of resources, it might be a bit challenging, right? To do the way that you envision it being done. So with that clarification, we have a motion and a second. Is there any additional discussion?

Punam Mathur: Thanks, Chair Hobbs. Member Mathur for the record. And just watching how legislature just sort of assigned a whole bunch of to do homework assignments to us, I've been wondering what we can do to reduce the incidents or the frequency of that sort of random set of assignments. And so, I just wonder whether there's a recommendation that says a biannual review of the mechanics given changing dynamics contracts is valuable. It would include these kinds of things, and we would make a biannual recommendation to

the education committee, or to the legislature so that the legislature can have confidence that the stuff is being monitored actively with the resources and the expertise required to give it a good thorough review, and somehow change the triggering that from us doing it and making recommendations to them at the end of the session. Just picking the stuff that feels really important.

Chair Hobbs: So try to think about how to mesh that into the motion that's been made. I suppose the simplest way of doing it would be to also recommend that those tasks that have previously been given to the commission with respect to monitoring the performance of the Pupil Centered Funding Plan continue in each subsequent year, or each subsequent. It's not a year, it's every biennium, right? I think that's implicit to our existence, frankly. But to the extent that we want to make it more clear, we could use language like that to be added to this list. So we're saying here that the People Centered Funding Plan is working well as intended, however, it needs to continually be monitored to ensure its performance.

Punam Mathur: Just for clarification, Member Mathur. This working group was as a result of a specific homework assignment given to us. It wasn't because SB 543 had codified that this was an evergreen responsibility. Am I right? So this was an assigned out of this most current legislature. So maybe it's as simple as let's codify this responsibility into the commission's role and reason for being,

Chair Hobbs: Yeah, again, I don't know. At least in my mind, I think that's an essence of our existence, right? The monitoring the People Center Funding Club, but stating it as such, there is absolutely no problem with that. And probably the simplest way to do that would be to amend number one there, that it is working well, and that the commission will undertake a review each biennium to be able to offer the same. Hopeful conclusion. Right? It doesn't have to be those words, but Dr. Brune.

Nancy Brune: I was just going to add, in addition to revising point number one, we could also underscore that point in the final big report that we have to submit because I get your point. It's just trying to educate the stakeholders to be more streamlined so we don't get 30 tasks next time.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah. And thank you for mentioning that, whether it's this item that we're dealing with or subsequent items in this group, what we're approving today is moving forward with the development of the report around those recommendations. The entire report will come back to us as a whole in or around September or October timeframe. And will there be some wordsmithing that needs to be done between now and then? Absolutely. But you get a second shot at approving the content. So with the motion that we have, Dave, any other questions or comments up there? Dusty?

Dr. David Jensen: Nothing from [indiscernible]. Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Dusty, you're good.

Dusty Casey: Good.

Chair Hobbs: All of those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Hobbs: Those opposed? Sustain. Okay. Great job. Thank you so much. Working group number two, I'll make this simple. We cover this under agenda item number six already. So unless there's any other questions about it, we'll move on to working group number three. Jason.

Jason Goudie: Thank you, Jason Goudie for the record. So we've had a number of meetings and I think some

really good progress. First I want to thank Kelsey and Amanda from APA and WestEd that they've been extremely valuable in, in helping to guide us through this. So the initial ask was really to put together a list reports of what's out there. It's somewhat morphed into a couple of different areas. One is trying to identify recommended recommendations for changes due to redundancies or reports that are not as valuable as they maybe once were upon the legislation or whatever reason was there. And additionally, more recently, we've also through the guidance of, again, WestEd with APA, we have bifurcated our full list into a stratified list of just state based reports, because we know we don't really have any influence over the Fed. We want to list it so we understand it, but let's focus on what we think we might have some influence on. And additionally, they helped sort those into assessment based type reports. And so, as CCSD, we're going through and having our experts go through and looking at those and what I'm going to call ranking them as to what we at least believe are the most valuable assessment reports. We are also utilizing the other mark and Kyle, and, and, and Paul was kind enough to jump on as well, and, and as well as the other districts, um, as we sent this out to them. And, and the reason for that is a couple of things. One is just to identify, you know, what, what the districts believe is valuable. And then two, utilization of, of Kelsey and Amanda, because they are going between my group, which is kind of a data gathering, and then they're looking at what ultimately the recommendations for accountability and assessment market moving forward and utilizing that by saying, hey, these are the five reports that are most valuable that has this information and concentrating on those. So I think that's an incredibly a valuable task. So far as the recommendations for changes and based off redundancy, etc. I mentioned to the group that I work with that while CCSE is very large. It was easier for us to put together a comprehensive list because I have 30 people that I can go to to help put together a list. What the challenge is, is we have 30 people putting together reports, which means it's very hard to identify redundancies. When you look at smaller districts, you probably have two or three people putting together all of them, and they see what they do over and over again. So I've reached back out to them. Additionally, NDE is reviewing this because again, they're the keeper of all the data. So again, they have a lot more insight and I think value than CCSD does in that endeavor. And so, we're trying to leverage that. So those are the key pieces. As we look at moving forward, we're looking at having the draft report ready, which will focus on what we've done. It'll focus on trying to identify any of these potential changes to reporting for the group to consider, as well as providing what this group has seen as the most valuable assessment reports. And then, as I mentioned, utilizing that into the other group. Additionally, as Chair Hobbs mentioned, this is certainly one of the groups that we'll continue to do this forever. I don't think we're ever going to get this done, but we'll continue to look at it. And there's a couple of pieces that relates to that. Another recommendation, again, from our great consultants was that part of our recommendation will be to define processes for reviews of future reports that are required, so that there may be a sunset date, there's a review date to ensure that these get reviewed to ensure their ongoing importance or changes. So I think that's great. And then additionally, as the other group defines the new accountability and assessment recommendations, that in of itself will potentially identify other reports that have nothing to do with any of those pieces that should be considered for change moving forward. So we'll work on that. And that's all I had, and I'll open it up again to either Kyle or Mark if they have anything addition that I missed. There is one other piece that Mark did bring up last time is, we focused on reports, but there's a lot of actions that don't necessarily have reports tied to them. We want to incorporate that into our review moving forward as well. What districts are required to do, regardless of whether it's report or not, and ensure that all of those are valuable. So I hope that covered all.

Chair Hobbs: Mark or Kyle, do you have anything to add to the report? Okay, good. Appreciate it. Thanks for all the effort and this is one that I, I, I think all of you that have to deal with all of this reporting. I look very forward to bringing to completion. That brings us to -- go ahead.

Punam Mathur: Thank you, Chair Hobbs. For the record, Member Mathur. Just a quick question. The accountability team, I think one of the things that I've learned but confirmed for me please, is that of the state reports, there's also a diversity of places to submit that report. I just heard you say that most of them go to NBE, do they?

Jason Goudie: Jason Goudie for the record. For the vast majority of reports, regardless of whether we're required to file something with the Nevada Department of Taxation and things like that, ND still gets the vast majority. I am not going to say that they get a copy of everything we do, but I would say the vast majority of reports, regardless of which state agency, and even some federal components, right? They still are copied on a lot of it. I would say they are by far the most broad wealth of database of reports that we have as it relates to this stuff. And that's why we kind of focus there as well.

Punam Mathur: Sorry for the record, Member Mathur. Patrick, just long term, 50 years from now, it would be really amazing if we had some process in place for all of our district system and the stuff that really mattered the data into a centralized place within a whole bunch of options in terms of the ways that we wanted to see that data fit out around achievement, performance measures, innovation, culture. But my sense is that that's very elusive because you haven't centralized and made sort common of denominator so that we can't deal with the fractions left, they're just long term, like 50 years from now. It should be that easy. Those are simple plays. There's some relied upon reports for different stakeholders and we use them to make decisions.

Jason Goudie: Correct. Jason Goudie for record. And we discussed this during the last day when we first engaged the state adopting, one is a standard accounting process and system that would allow the districts to use data and input in this. And then that would provide one set of data. As Member Johnson pointed out, there are some challenges. We don't necessarily account for every single charge the same way. I don't think that's going to be an overly burdensome challenge. And that's always going to be somewhat, but if we can get the big chunks into the places, and again, having one central database for data that can then be utilized to generate different reports is the ultimate goal down the lines.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Moving to the next set of working groups, we will take working group four and five together.

Paul Johnson: Thanks, Chairman Hobbs, member Johnson for the record. I think some of this may be covered later, but a working group four, it's the accountability and new reporting system. I put them as the co-lead on that. We have Nancy and Jim, I think are the other members on that committee. We've been having weekly meetings to discuss this. The purpose is to really identify what matters most in education, both on inputs and outputs, and figure out a way to measure that and report it in a comprehensive and understandable way so that all stakeholders, regardless of their station, can understand the pieces that they want to understand, whether it's parents as we talked earlier, or our policy makers or school district leaders who want to figure out how they need to modify their investments in order to move the measures on those things that matter most. So we've had great support from that representatives from APA and from WestEd. They've been awesome. We have our representatives from NDE, which is really the glue to all of this stuff. I can't begin tell you how much I appreciate the work that they've done. And maybe also put my 2 cents in for an increased investment into our own department of education as well. But they've been great. And then we've also been taking a look at all of the information that is required of us to find those things that are redundant or similar, but not the same, match those up with the information that we actually have in our databases so that we can see the things that we want to measure that we have information on. And also see the things that we want to measure that we don't have information on, or may not be reporting it in a consistent similar manner. This is a huge undertaking. We'll have recommendations. What I was hoping to come up with is a model of what could be. I don't know if that's possible, but we certainly can have recommendations that targeted direction where we need to do in order to develop what it is that I think that we would need. As Jason indicated, I was not aware of the enormity of the information the school districts are required to prepare. I knew it was bad. I don't recall the chewing Venn diagram that I had before where there were so many things that overlapped, but nothing that was concentric. It's voluminous. So I'm hoping by going through this process, we're going to be able to streamline reporting and information, make it less confusing, make it more understandable and less onerous to everybody, including

NDE school districts and parents. So I think that's a great worthwhile task. I certainly think we can have at least recommendations available either at the next meeting or meeting after. So you can at least cite the topics that we want to identify and move forward with.

Chair Hobbs: Thanks very much, Paul. That naturally flows over to you Nancy.

Nancy Brune: Yes. Thank you. So, our working group I met for the first time yesterday. I work with members Jensen, others and Woodhouse and Member McIntosh couldn't join us. So I invited Member Johnson since we needed help with the IT. We had help from our consultants from WestEd and APA and NDN. NDE was also in the room. Well, I will say the scope of our working group really is focused on the financial reporting. Since the reporting of academic indicators and outcomes inputs and output is being addressed by working group four. So I think our task was narrow because we're just focused on the reporting of the financial information. We spent a lot of the conversation. Well, I will start by saying that our consultants prepared for models or showed four states that have models for preparing and presenting the financial information. And those states were Iowa, Delaware, Colorado, and Utah. And they all present different indicator in different ways. And so, we spent some time talking about who actually is the audience. It turns out Nevada already collects a lot of financial data. It also turns out that no one really looks at it. And the consensus, I think from the group is parents don't really want to know about the financial data. They're more interested in the star rating or how many full-time licensed teachers our school has. And so, the question became, who is the right audience for the reporting of the financial data. And if it is our CFO and CFOs and their teams, do we want to have a publicly available portal as well as private information that folks can look at. Even though we do collect a lot of data, as Dr. Jensen mentioned, we discuss whether there are indicators that could be useful for the CFOs in their team. We're not currently reporting such as, how many full-time vacancies do we have? How many do we want to, and how many would we be able to hire ideally. And then what's our aspirational number again, to meet what we think we need. Some of the priorities for how we present the data, were there seemed to be interest in whatever data we end up presenting that CFOs or stakeholders be able to compare and get down to the school level and then also compare across district or schools. And then, there's a prioritization to being able to have that longitudinal data so that we can figure out where are we moving the needle over time. We are hoping to meet again in June where we will walk through some of the priorities that we identified yesterday. So we're on schedule to meet early June, and we're looking at a date for that. So, I don't know, I will turn it over to my fellow team members to see if you wanted to add anything. Anyone? Okay. Thank you for those reports and all of the work that's gone into that. This is probably going back to comments that I think have been made earlier and over and over again. All of the tasks that we're undertaking are important, but this is probably the central theme of everything that we're doing. So thank you all very, very much. Working group number six, I'm going to play the role of Jim McIntosh for a moment. This is accessibility within public schools. And what I can report to you is that I've received a report from Jim and had an opportunity to review it. I just sent it to NDE yesterday, so that will be delivered to all of you. But to give you a summary of the report, it evaluates open zoning policies across the US in different states. Well, I should probably back up if I can find what I was looking at again. The main task here was to review and consider strategies to improve the accessibility and ensure the equitability of existing and new programs for pupils within and between schools, including without limitation open zoning. So the key words there were review and consider strategies. The report, and I'll continue paging down through a very lengthy, and very well done report. It also includes discussion of issues around open zoning and transportation.

Chair Hobbs: Recent policy initiatives relative to school choice elsewhere around the country. So it offers a glimpse at what others have been doing, and then the state by state sort of case study analysis of what has been done and what it includes and excludes multiple states, including Nevada. I'm continuing to page down so you can get a sense of the length of this report. What other states? What some of the outcomes have been of school choice programs, charter school impacts, small public high schools of choice, voucher programs and neighborhoods, long term effects and vouchers. Again, it's very, very comprehensive as to what has happened

within this topic. What it does not have is any recommendations. So if you think back to the review and strategies part of this that that I mentioned earlier, it certainly is a review of all of the different strategies that have been used and to some to the extent that they could be commented upon from efficacy standpoint, that's included in the report. So what I would suggest and I know you haven't seen the report, but I would suggest that we take an action to receive that report to the notion that was brought up earlier. If there are recommendations that this group wants to make with respect to this topic, the accessibility, the open zoning topic, we have the opportunity to do that. So at this point, I would suggest we receive the report.

Punam Mathur: Member Mathur, I make a motion that we receive the report.

Unidentified Speaker: I have a second.

Chair Hobbs: Second -- motion and a second. Any question. And we'll get this out to you right away. Like I said, I just received it from Jim, who obviously isn't having as much fun as on his vacation as we would like him to have, and send it to Megan yesterday. So that's available to be distributed to all of you. And I would ask NDE to go ahead and send that out to all of you. So we have a motion and a second to receive the report. If there's no more discussion, signify your support to receive the report by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Hobbs: Any no or abstention? Thank you. That report's received. It's a good piece of work.

Nancy Brune: Chair Hobbs.

Chair Hobbs: Yes.

Nancy Brune: If we read it or when we read it, have some recommendations, can we bring those back on the June 21st meeting?

Chair Hobbs: Absolutely.

Nancy Brune: Is that the deadline? Okay. Thank you.

Chair Hobbs: Absolutely. In fact, that will great call, Nancy. If after reading it, anyone wants to put it back on the agenda for either any edits, if you will, additions, or feels that we need to get into the recommendation side of it, simply let me know and we'll put it back on. We'll do that. And just gives me opportunity to mention something else too. For those of us that still have reports to prepare, the format that we're generally using for those reports is, you saw it with a small school cattle report. There was a statement up at the top, I believe I did it in italics that cited the direction that we received. Did it come from SB98, 8400 legislative memorandum? So it cited what the directive was to us, and then it went into background discussion and recommendations. So that's the format that we're using. And viewing this final report as a book with many chapters, if we can keep them in that same basic format, it'll probably make the final document easier to read. Alright. And the one that we just accepted from Jim is generally in that format already. So we're good there. So working groups eight and nine, teacher pipeline and teacher and support staff compensation. Dusty, I'll turn it to you. And we appreciate you hanging with us. And looks like you're in a nice hotel room.

Dusty Casey: I am in a hotel room. I will leave it at that. Member Casey for the record. So if you guys will recall, working groups eight and nine, which is the pipeline and the compensation work groups, decided to combine efforts, earlier this spring. And so, was the lead on working group nine. Our working groups also include Jason, Mark, and Kyle. So I want to thank them for their work. The commission last meeting received

a presentation from the task force, and that task force, I have a document I'm going to pull up real quick I'm going to read from, but the technical name for that task force is the Nevada State Teacher in Education Support Professional Recruitment and Retention Advisory Task Force. And that was set up in the 2019 session through assembly bill 276. So really what I believe our two working groups have discovered is that number one, Nevada's data desert. Data surrounding recruitment, retention, vacancies, compensation is very much fragmented, if not, non-existent altogether. The other big thing we discover is this task force and the work that they are undertaking to address. And we're more to gather data and address these issues. And so, I did write a report up and we identified a few areas, or we've learned about a few things that I'll report out now. Number one, the task force is very much working on creating surveys. They do have a consultant. They're working with WestEd to aid in their work. They're trying to develop surveys to address everything from compensation to climate and culture, exit surveys of outgoing staff, and they're also trying to develop a survey of existing license holders in the state of Nevada. And so that work is really important to gather data. And so, as they work on all of this, it essentially overlaps with what the commissions was charged with, which was really two things coming out of SE 98. And that's of course identifying the number of teachers graduating from institutions of higher education as well as classification and compensation of teachers and support personnel at public schools in this state. And so, those two areas, we realized that this task force is already working on those things with the consultant that the commission is working with as well. And so, essentially those are the things we've discovered. There may be some opportunities that task force is mostly made up of the current membership is educators and education support professionals. There may be an opportunity to add HR and business professionals to broaden the task force's expertise to tackle things like compensation and everything that they're trying to put together to address these two areas. And so, again, the commission did receive a full presentation on task force per legislation. They're required to present a list of findings and recommendations to interim Ed in June. And so those will be coming out soon. We have not been able to get ahold of any drafts of that as of yet. But, when we do, I think we will obviously forward those to the commission. So with that said, I will turn it over to Punam and the other members to jump in with anything I might have missed.

Punam Mathur: Thank you. For the record Member Mathur. Thank you, Dusty, you did a great job in a reasonably pretty hotel room. Yeah, that was a really succinct and right on summary. The legislature just in 19 established IT then to give it a mission to focus on this so critical area. This was assigned to us in one of those last session. How we do things we're really not equipped or is it really core to our mission it's fundamentally important to education. And so I think the opportunity is this task force right now could probably be judged up a bit and if they knew that they were heavily relied upon by the legislature to solve this really big problem, I think it would up their game as well. Because they're really motivated and they live it, we can then go make some recommendations around beefing them up and giving them more empowerment and more credibility. I think that would help a lot because it's the right people having the right conversations. Yeah, that's it.

Chair Hobbs: So just checking status on these two items and the reference to the task force. Dusty, would it be your recommendation that we continue this item on the agenda for or maybe second meeting in June, after which we would actually be able to see what those recommendations are. I'm gathering what we're doing is concurring and supporting those recommendations as part of our work, yet we don't know what those recommendations are today. And that would give us an opportunity then to do that concurrence with full knowledge of what the recommendations are. Right? Does that make sense or is that where we are?

Dusty Casey: Correct. Member Casey, for the record, yes, that is where we are and I think we definitely want to see what those recommendations are from the task force.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. So, that creates either likelihood or hope that we could bring closure to acting on recommendations on the part of the commission by the end of June.

Dusty Casey: Makes sense.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. That'd be great. Fantastic. Thanks so much Dusty. And thanks for showing us your room and that Jackson poll back there on the wall. It's beautiful. That brings us to agenda item number nine, update on reporting requirements and potential categories for a new reporting framework. And this gives us the opportunity to welcome back Dr. Kelsey Krausen from WestEd.

Kelsey Krausen: Hello to the Commission. This is Kelsey Krausen for the record. Thank you for this opportunity to share a bit of an update with all of you today. I'm going to just provide a little bit of framing and then pass it to my colleague, Dr. Noman Kanani. So, at the last meeting we had a question about one of the AB400 SB98 requirements around the collection of survey data on the satisfaction of staff, of students, graduates, and family members. And so our team, in order to be responsive to that request and to many members questions and focus on ensuring that the new data reporting framework captures data that is most important and valuable from measuring progress in the system. We've done some work to just look at the research base behind tar surveys, both in terms of what it means for the reporting requirements, but also potentially, in terms of measuring progress in the state. So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Noman to share some of our work with you.

Noman Kanani: Thank you, Kelsey, for the introduction. Noman Kanani [ph] for the record. I will share my screen. And please bear with me, this is my first time using this video conferencing application.

Chair Hobbs: Don't, don't worry about it. The bar is very low today on that.

Noman Kanani: Can you all see the slide that says Full Climate and Accountability Systems?

Chair Hobbs: Yes. Great. Thank you.

Noman Kanani: Alright, great. So, as Kelsey described, I'm going to be going through the impetus from a practice and a research standpoint for the inclusion of school climate measures as part of accountability reporting frameworks and requirements. So, to jog everyone's memory, in AB400, there is a stipulation that states that there must be metrics used to measure the extent to which schools meet the needs and expectations of pupils parents, or legal guardians of pupils, teachers and administrators, which include, without limitation, the results of an annual survey of satisfaction of school employees, the results of an annual survey of satisfaction of pupils parents or legal guardians of pupils and graduates, and any other metric prescribed by the commission. So currently, in our review of existing surveys and measures captured by Nevada at the state level and as well as within individual districts, there does not appear to be a systematic and statewide effort to capture elements of satisfaction across people's parents or staff. But there are several school climate surveys, and as I'll describe in the ensuing slides, school climate is not exactly the stating as satisfaction, although it does capture some similar elements. So we'll be discussing basically the ways in which these school climate surveys, existing surveys, can be used in lieu of the satisfaction, metrics that are proposed in AB400. So, I'll be going over the precedent for research and research and practice for using school climate measures successful quality, and then provide relevant information and necessary for making recommendations on the youth school climate and Nevada's accountability framework and as the measure for evaluating the impact of the new funding formula. So some federal context, Every Student Succeeds Act requires that schools collect and publicly report school performance on five domains, broadly speaking, academic achievement, academic progress, graduation rates, progress in achieving English language proficiency for students who are English language learners. And a fifth measure, which is called school quality or Student Success. From the No Child Left Behind Act, NCLB, the School Quality of Student Success Domain, it represents a major shift where NCLB was focused primarily on academic achievement measures, as I introduced school quality of student success to introduce a non-academic achievement measure, to give schools an opportunity to showcase performance in other ways that may or may not be directly related to academic achievement. These five measures or domains are used to identify schools

for comprehensive support and improvement and targeted support and improvement, CSI or TSI, which represent the lower performing schools in a given state. And schools in which there are specific student groups that are performing significantly lower than other students in any given school or across the state. So generally speaking, the school quality student success domain is lower weighted than these other domains, but it does present an opportunity to include other metrics that have traditionally been not been a focus of school accountability systems. The requirements for school quality or student success metrics is that are five, this is specifically coming from legislation. It must meaningfully differentiate school performance. So there must be schools that are high performing on a given metric of school quality student success, and I'll say SQSS for short. So it can't be metrics that in which every school, for example, is performing really, really well on, or every school is performing very poorly on. There needs to be some variation in it. These measures must be valid and reliable, meaning that they represent measures that are consistently captured. They're consistently reporting what we are trying to measure. So, whatever is used to capture that element, that domain, it must be a measure that -- and from a statistical standpoint and from a theoretical standpoint, matches what we want it to be measuring, which is not always the case with different types of measures, instruments. It must be something that's used within each grade span at the elementary, middle, and high school level. And it must be comparable across school statewide. So every school must be using the same type of instrument or measure. So in the case of school climate, for example, everyone must be administering the same survey. You can't have one group that's using one type of survey and one set of schools or districts are using another type of survey, and it must be measured as captured annually. Report Improve in CSI or TSI, which represent the lower performing schools in a given state and schools in which there are specific student groups that are performing significantly lower than other students in a given school or across the state. So generally speaking, the school quality student success domain is lower weighted than these other domains, but it does present an opportunity to include other metrics that have traditionally been not been a focus of school accountability systems. The requirements for school quality student success metrics is that are five, this is specifically coming from the US legislation. They must meaningfully differentiate school performance. So there must be schools that are high performing on a given metric of school quality or student success, and I'll say SQSS for short. So it can't be metrics that in which every school, for example, is performing really, really well on, or every school is perform very poorly on. There needs to be some variation in it. These measures are be valid and reliable, meaning that they represent measures that are consistently captured. They're consistently reporting what we are trying to measure. So, whatever is used to capture that element, that domain, it must be a measure that from a statistical standpoint and from a theoretical standpoint, matches what we want it to be measuring, which is not always the case with different types of measures and instruments. It must be something that's used within each grade span at the elementary, middle, and high school level. And it must be comparable across school statewide. So every school must be using the same type of instrument or measure. So in the case of school climate, for example, everyone must be administering the same survey. You can't have one group that's using one type of survey and one set of schools or districts are using another type of survey. And it must be measured as captured annually, reported annually for all students and student groups. Examples of metrics that are used for the SQSS domain includes attendance and chronic entities, and this is by far the most common metric used in this domain. Also, college career, and sometimes military readiness, usually at least college readiness is included in there in more recent years, career military readiness has been accounted for by states, such as Texas and Kentucky. School discipline. So, for example, the proportion of students who have been suspended or expelled from school. Student perceptions of school safety, and then school climate, which is of course the focus of this presentation, which is something that is captured by Nevada, but not currently accounted for in the school performance framework. So what it is, school climate, it's defined in the research space as qualities of the school environment that are experienced by students, teachers, and administrators, and generally includes three broad buckets, safety, physical and emotional safety, engagement, which includes themes of connectedness, cross per respect, diversity and the quality of the academic environment. As an example in California, which is the state that's probably been collecting school climate information longer than any other state out there through their core district survey, they include domains under school climate, such as support for academic learning, sense of belongingness and effectiveness, student safety and physical and emotional and knowledge, and pursue fairness

of discipline rules and norms. Nevada currently has a statewide school climate and SEL survey that's administered by AIR. And that survey, which is, again, it's administered all across all districts. It captures engagement and safety. Engagement includes cultural and linguistic competence such as empathy and respect for diversity, relationships between students and staff and the school district environment, and as well as students', physical and emotional safety. There are also districts that capture school climate using their own measures. And these includes both school climate and other dimensions of what we would call social emotional learning or school culture. So in Clark County, for example, there is survey that's administered to students, teachers and parents, which captures elements such as parental involvement in school, learning attitudes, social learning, safety, bullying, physical environment, respect for diversity, and perceptions of school performance. And many of these overlap with measures of school climate. But there are some additional facets in here that would not be traditionally part of definition of school climate. That would include things like, perceptions of school performance or parental involvement. These would be seen as their own separate domains. Washoe County also has a set of school climate surveys that are administered to students, teachers, and parents. And they use the Panorama School Climate Survey. Panorama's an organization that space out of Massachusetts that has partnered with many school districts across the country to administer different types of surveys that include social emotional learning, school climate, student and parental engagement among other among other constructs. And so, the intervention of student school climate includes respect, support, substance abuse, building, SEL skills, safety and engagement among other constructs. The teacher and staff climate survey includes, perceptions of leadership, expectations, fairness and respect, communication, perceptions of parental involvement, relationships with students, relationships with parents, relationships with other staff members, student behavior, SEL work, stress and safety. And then there's a parental climate survey, which includes communication, family efficacy, learning behavior, safety, perceptions of the quality of education, relationships with staff, sense of fit and the sense of that the school is a supportive place. So school climate is used by currently 10 states as part of their accountability system. And these surveys, again, are similar to what are being used by Nevada is being used by California. These surveys generally account for about five to 10% of the of the overall school performance. When you come to rating schools on a scale of zero to 100, trying to figure which schools are going to be legible for comprehensive support and improvement, which are going to be eligible for target support and improvement. Each of these five domains, academic achievement, progress, graduation rates, and so on and so forth, each these domains has a weight associated with them. And how they are used to account for an overall measure of school quality. And as I said earlier, school climate, school quality and student success tends to be a weighted the least amount. And that's also by legislation that it should have a lower level of weighting relative to academic achievement. So, generally speaking, we see about five to 10% of school's overall performance coming from the school quality in student success domain. And in some of these states, these 10 states that use school climate surveys, school climate is the only school quality or student success measure. So in some cases, the five 10% represents all school climate. In other cases, school climate is a small percentage of that five to 10%. North Dakota is one exception which counts for about 20% of their overall school ratings coming from school climate. The surveys tend to range from 20 to 80 questions. Nevada's current school climate, survey, the one that's administered statewide as well as the Clark County, Washington County ones tend to be somewhere in the middle, 50 to 60 questions. Surveys have high reliability. And again, that simply means that students are reporting similar responses, responses are consistent with one another. So in other words, when you administer a survey, if there is a specific subcontract within that survey, if they respond one way to a specific question, they're going to be expected to respond a similar way to similar types of questions. So if every question, if there's several questions are asking about parental involvement and the students assess for several questions, they respond in ways that suggest high parental involvement. Other questions that have to do with parental involvement, a student should be answering in similar ways, not exactly because then of course, the survey questions would be redundant, but in ways that represent a certain pattern that suggests that the question that the survey is measuring a consistent measure of whatever that construct is. So surveys that tend to have high number of questions usually have high reliability. I was unable to find the measure the reliability and validity statistics associated with Nevada's current surveys that AR administers in statewide and then the Washington and Clark County. Once again, the statistics for those measures are not

publicly available from what I saw. Generally speaking, school climate, as a measure is associated with higher academic achievement, higher student attendance, higher graduation, and lower rates of student discipline. But one of the critiques of these measures of academic achievement tends graduation is that they tend to be highly correlated with school demographic characteristics. So, a school that may not be a school that is really improving student achievement, but has students from very highly affluent backgrounds, those types of schools tend to have higher levels of school of perceived measures of school quality. And even if a school's not doing a great job, just because those students come from highly affluent backgrounds, they can still have high scores when it comes to a school's overall measure of quality. And so, that can be problematic because it becomes hard to disentangle whether a school is a good school, a highly performing school, simply because it serves highly affluent students or because the school's actually doing a good job of educating these students. So with these measures, nutritional measures, academic achievement, attend the graduation, sometimes it's hard to entangle that. But school climate offers a different dimension that is not always associated with school demographic characteristics, at least relative to academic achievement measures. So you can be a school that has really high academic achievement, a highly affluent school with high graduation rates, but still have poor climate, two factors such as high amounts of bullying. So school climate does allow us a different measure that is traditionally captured by these other measures that are more correlated with another, but still a dimension of school quality that is important. And another problem of school climate is that it has a greater association of student growth on academic achievement as opposed to proficiency. So student growth is something that many researchers would say is a better measure of academic achievement than student proficiency, because a school that is doing a good job of educating students, would also be able to move students from a certain level of proficiency to a higher level of proficiency, even if they are a more highly affluent, high socioeconomic status background. So the fact that there's a higher correlation with growth compared to who represents this, the school climate is able to capture a better dimension of school's contributions to students achievement as opposed to the school's existing levels of achievement due to the demographics they serve. There is, however very little evidence that supports the use of climate surveys in high stakes settings. And many instruments have not been validated for use in these contexts. So what I mean by this is that school climate instruments, assuming they have high reliability, high statistical reliability, they can do a good job of communicating at an aggregate level, how well student's perceptions of their belonging in school, perceptions of their engagement, these other sub-domains of climate, these measures can do a good job of informing us about that with the extent to which we can say that this is a measure that we should be using to benchmark whether a certain intervention or certain type of program, a school, school funding formula is impacting this measure is something that is a bit of a different question to be asking. It's not just that you have to have a measure that tells you what, it tells you. What it says it's measuring, but that it has to have a theoretical connection and a single measure as well with the types of arguments that we're intending to use it for. So what I mean by this is that, for a measure to be used in school accountability as used as a benchmark for whether a certain program or policies working, it needs to have at least these five components to it, which goes beyond simply saying that this measure is valid, this measure is reliable, except the measure has sensitivity to change over time, meaning it's a measure that you can actually move the needle on. So, if you were to measure school climate for every school in Nevada, and you have the data for this, is it reasonable that a school can move from being a school with low school climate to being a school with higher levels of perceived school climate? Is that type of progress possible for a measure like school climate? And that's important because it related to the second point on the effect of schools improving climate outcomes. Meaning that if school climates are simply an artifact of what's going on in the community and not what's going on within schools, then efforts to try to improve school climate may not actually be successful. So although we collect this information, it's part of our accountability system, we can grade schools on it, can we actually do anything about, can we actually make schools better when it comes to their climate? And it's like all these points, all as you see related to one another is that we need to have evidence that there are impacts of interventions, programs, and policies on improving school climate. Can these measures actually change over time by intervening on them using evidence-based strategies. And this is something that we don't have much evidence on currently. Fourth, and this one is, I would say less important because every measure can be gained, but a measure should have less susceptibility to being a game through the

system in the way that, for example, a note left behind, there was, there were anecdotal stories that teachers were focusing on students only on the margins and not so focusing on students who are very low, have had very, very low proficiency with students who had very high proficiency. So is this a measure that we could gain on where teachers or students or teachers or administrators were to focus on certain dimensions to improve school climate in ways that may not actually reflect the entirety of school climate at the school level. But again, this is something that every measure can be gained, but the susceptibility of it being gained is something that needs to be evaluated more in practice. And then finally, extent to which inclusion of metrics may meaningfully impact the accountability designation. So if we were to include school climate as a measure that, that matters when it comes to the school funding formula. It's a benchmark that we're going to be using to assess whether this funding formula is working or not. Can changing school climate, is affecting school climate. Can it be impactful enough that it matters in the long term about what this formula is trying to do? If this formula is depending what its overall goals are, can moving school climate get us there? Can it get us to a place where a school is from a low performing school to be perceived as a higher performing school overall? And that's something, again, that there's some research on. And it doesn't paint a story where school climate can play enough of a role that it can change an overall, a school's overall measure of quality across achievement, attendance, and graduation. Currently, the way that data is used in school, this is my last slide. Currently, the way that that climate data is used in school agreement is generally schools that states that vision classroom climate survey, which is a little different than the school climate, that type of data is used to provide formative feedback, instructional practice, it's not being aggregated, it's not being reported out as to measure school that has overall climate. It's being used as a way to improve practice and on ground level. There are some efforts at districts to examine the effective program interventions designed to improve the learning environments have certain space to program number three over here about whether or not to use school climate data and having usable thing to do. There are states that are including school time that are measuring it systematically are including it sometimes as a way to be success, the impact of programs that they would hope to improve school time. But again, there isn't necessarily an evidence just would, it would not. And so, that research is still in a infancy. And currently I have not found much research that shows that this program competence training are actually improving school funding. And part of the reason is, it's not because the research has shown negative or null impacts. It's that it just hasn't been done yet because the collection measures is still fairly. And then also school funding can used to find resources and [indiscernible] student and teacher personal relationships. So I'll stop there. All that is to say basically that it seems like it is an important thing to collect the school climate. It has to do with something that provides more information about school quality, but the extent to where you can used as an accountability [indiscernible] success or lack of success policy is something that still [indiscernible].

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much. Kelsey, anything else to add? Okay, that's probably the most redundant of questions, but going back to, and I don't know if this is for you, Megan, but going back to the original directives given to this commission, is it a matter of choice or mandate with regard to the climate elements of the survey? And if so, depending on the answer to that one, what are our next steps and when might we able to take those?

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson for the record. So this is a portion that was identified under AB400 as one of the metrics to contemplate. And I say contemplate in the context of when reviewing all of the items identified in AB400 within the overarching concept of the commission, we can make recommendations on surveys to include or to revise, and amend that are reflected within those metrics. The intent was to give an overview of how surveys are being used elsewhere, and how the commission may want to review and make any changes to the metrics that were identified in AB400 as they currently exist.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. So, based on a lot of the information that we received today, and thank you for that, it was extraordinarily helpful. We have a decision point, not today, but a decision point as to whether or not to expand the surveys to include additional metrics that deal with climate. Is that correct?

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson for the record. Yes. I think in comparison to the surveys that we currently collect, which we are still working to solidify and bring to the commission in terms of what is existing, these are options that we can include to build out or simplify.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. And then part two of that would be, if we do add other elements of measurement to the surveys, what should that include? And we heard a lot of information about the types of metrics and how useful they may or may not be. So that's the charge to us, correct? Both parts.

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson for the record. That is correct.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. And so the next step would be at one of the June meetings, we would receive some more detail and maybe be in a position of making one or both of those decisions.

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson, for the record. That would be the intent of the June 27th meeting, was to go into more depth along with the other working groups that focus on the reporting as it ties to AB400 to make some progress and recommendations that we may or may not want to move forward with.

Chair Hobbs: Great. That's very helpful. Punam.

Punam Mathur: Yeah. Thank you Chair Hobbs. For the record, Member Mathur. I think this is one of the examples you heard. And Noman, thank you so much for that council, for making it all happen. This is an example, and I think we heard is a AIR is the one who conducts the statewide survey. Panorama is the instruments and the platform that is used by Washoe, and I'm not sure how Clark's doing it, but those data sets go to those proprietary places and then are not being useful for our accountability. The larger conversation that we're having around accountability because we can't get the raw data to tie it to the school. And so, this sounds good, but at the end of the day, it's not that useful in the way that it's currently constructed, right? Which is a larger conversation.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah, that's one of the things that crossed my mind too is, this type of information is most useful when you can direct it back to point of origin, right? And because it could vary dramatically within a district, right? So that's something that hopefully can be addressed.

Punam Mathur: Sorry, never mind. Otherwise it's just more exertion. It's like an unfunded mandate that actually produces more information to make decisions about. So I know that my neighbor likes me or the encampment area or the catchment area of the school loves their school. I think we've seen those kinds of trends over time. People love their school, they hate the district, they don't care. So it will just keep bearing that out. But there's nothing that's useful in terms of, as we then look at the accountability work and try to get some clarity around what is the performance, what is the ROI on this investment that we're making here, Pupil Centered Funding Formula. There's the school of thought that says, culture eats strategy for much. And so, if you've got a vibrant culture in an enterprise, the result, you're going to reveal it. But the way that we're currently asking for it and capturing it, it never ties back to a single data place where we can then turn the data in ways that makes it useful.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah, I think just to maybe sum this part of it up, this is one of those real and ideal kinds of things, right? And the placement or usefulness of this survey data is something that within the context of trying to create accountability and reporting for all of the stakeholders is something that I hope the professionals can also comment on what type of value it adds. Right? Well.

Paul Johnson: Thanks, Chairman Hobbs. Member Johnson for the record. Yeah, I think the fourth metrics or

focus in maybe 98 or 400 was to include surveys for employee, annual school, employee satisfaction surveys, annual satisfaction survey of pupils, guardians, parents, so on and so forth. And I think what we get stuck with is the why, why doing this and why is it relevant? There's a whole bunch of why's in there that we could ask. So we need to ground our future discussions about that to what you said. We got to tie this back to something I thought that interesting concept on here that I hadn't thought about until Noman had brought this up, is the culture of the school may simply be reflective of the larger culture within the community, the school community exists, and we may not have control over that, or does the school community culture influence the broader culture?

Punam Mathur: I don't know the answer to that, but take a look at that. That might be easier to measure in a small community where you have the one school in community, but as far as other areas, that could be a little bit more complicated. So, yeah, it's interesting. We're required to do it, so we should either make a recommendation of some sort, either to include or exclude, but as long as we're required to do it, we at least need to make sure that what we're doing is relevant and as significant as it can be.

Chair Hobbs: And one other thing for next time, the method of administration of the surveys and the response rates would also be interesting to see. I saw the one slide and it said, you know, 20 to 80 questions. I thought, well, 20, you're probably going to get a reasonable response rate 80, I don't know. There's a lot of time investment in a lot of these surveys and you know, it's an important thing. Survey response rates have been going down over the years dramatically, right? So I think that's another thing to weave into the discussion. So, any comments up north?

Secretary: No comments at this time?

Chair Hobbs: Any from the Four Seasons Hotel in California? Dusty?

Dusty Casey: Just a quick question. Thanks, Chair Hobbs member Casey for the record. Is there a portion of this work? Because I noticed it talks about staff climate as well, climate culture that overlaps with the work WestEd is doing with the task force. And that question is really for WestEd and for NDE I apologize.

Joyce Woodhouse: So, this was a question I had after last month's presentation as well, because I'm not sure the exact items that they're including on their surveys, but I think it's a really important one because in an effort to reduce the layers of survey and any of reporting and any kind of duplication in efforts, we do want to make sure that if there is an existing survey that's being administered to teachers and other staff, that we leverage those existing surveys rather than creating anything new. We can coordinate with the WestEd team or others to find out more information about the, the questions that are being used on their survey.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you.

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson, for the record, that is part of the compilation that we're working on is not only the surveys that are currently administered, but what types of questions are addressed in those. And to what extent can they be used for the requirements of AB400. And if not, what modifications can we make to use the tools that are already in place? That way we're not, again, adding and creating more burden. So that work is currently in progress as well. And we do hope to bring that to the next commission meeting.

Chair Hobbs: And this was just a discussion and information item. It's not an action item. So we thank you for all the information you brought forth and look forward to a follow up in June. Thank you all again for a great effort. Brings us to agenda item number 10, review of the attendance area, utilized for the attendance area adjustment in the pupil centered funding plan. And with us today, I believe are Justin Silverstein and Amanda Brown from a APA.

Megan Peterson: We're just figuring out technology. We're not making the bar any higher today.

Chair Hobbs: No way to go with the theme.

Amanda Brown: Alright, Amanda Brown for the record. So today we're going to provide first presentation on the attendance area size adjustments with a plans presentation at the next meeting for follow up. So Jess and I will be presenting next slide. So for today's presentation, we really want to reground us in, in the working conversations that we had before in this area. So I want to revisit just what is an attendance area, how is the attendance area size adjustment developed? How is it applied? Then talk about potential considerations for attendance area definition for funding purposes, including some initial attendance area mapping work that we've done. And then talk about next steps for the next meeting. So what is an attendance area? First off, Nevada school districts are pretty unique in that they're countywide and often and cover large geographic areas. If you look at the nationally, how many districts are in states, it turns out Nevada has the fewest number of districts other than DC and Hawaii that only have one.

Megan Peterson: So most places tend to have hundreds of different, um, school districts. So attendance areas really reflect the idea of districts within districts. And another state and attendance area might be its own district. The attendance areas were identified in the prior Nevada plan. So these were not new to the funding system. We believe they were developed based on city centers or towns that were relatively geographically isolated. However, it's important to note that there doesn't appear to be currently a formal definition or criteria. So it's something that should be revisited. And I know we've talked about that before. And just again, to give everyone a bit of the lay of the land, there's, I believe 74 different attendance areas in Nevada. This is just showing the number of attendance areas by district and then give you a little sense of how bigger district, how many square miles do they cover. So what this is really just showing you is that there's a real range in the number of attendance areas from one to 11 that are in any individual districts. Larger geographic districts tend to have more attendance areas, but there's variation even within similar size districts and how many attendance areas they have. Next slide. And then this first map is pretty simple in that the little orange dots represent all the different attendance areas that are across the state. So you see mostly they tend to be spread out across the state with, some areas where they're a little more concentrated. And we'll touch on that in a minute. Next slide. So how is the attendance area size adjustment developed? So coming out of that 2018 study, there are really two adjustments that are related to district and school size. The first one being a district size adjustment which, if you all recall, JK shape, to account for the differences associated with different economies of scale based on setting and size. And that the curve from that came out of the professional judgment work where we had looked at the resources needed a different hypothetical size categories, created that curve. Then the other piece was a necessarily small schools adjustment, and that one was developed after looking at similar adjustments across the country and other states that accounted for the resources needed in really small isolated school settings. And the one we had modeled and used was after how Wyoming did that work. But at the commission's recommendation, we explored further how this adjustment compared to what was in the prior Nevada plans, that basic support ratio and the AAR study and then expenditures in a sample of districts. I think it was about four different districts that we had looked at at a time. So we did that to see how the size adjustment and the necessary small schools compared to those. And then there was also a recommendation by the commission to model applying the size adjustment at the attendance area level to again adjust this idea of districts within districts and all the differences in costs faced by the different settings. So we applied that at the attendance area. We used the same curve or formula that J curve, if you recall, as the size adjustment. But we then adjusted the tail. So, the resources that you would get less than 20 students to reflect the resources you would've gotten under the necessarily small schools adjustment to create a single curve. And so, the rationale of doing both these things was really the applying attendance area was closer to what the prior funding model had differentiated funding in those settings and actual district expenditures. And that having a single formula was both more easy to apply and more transparent. So that's where we landed taking the two adjustments into one

and applying it to the attendance area. And just again, a refresher of what does that mean for how it's applied. So if you had a hypothetical district of 4,000 students that had four attendance areas, if you had applied that same size adjustment just at the district level, you would've had a factor of 1.08. If you instead applied that same size adjustment to each of the individual attendance areas within it, each would generate more funding and you result in a 1.4. So, it sends out more dollars related to size based on attendance area setting. And I'll turn it over to Justin.

Justin Silverstein: Okay. So really what we want to start thinking about is, what should be considered when defining how you would identify an attendance area? So everything that was applied and it's currently applied was using attendance areas that have been in place for quite a while. So there hasn't been a re-look on our current attendance areas that they meet a certain set of criteria that would make sense. So that really, there's kind of equity in the system. There's a common application of a set of parameters about a why. And so, the potential considerations that we're looking at is really district from another or distance from another attendance area. We've looked at a handful of states and how they determine remote. Because really what we're thinking about here is remoteness and that ability to have resources when remote and it's often related to transportation or to what they call necessarily small school or district adjustment. And the distance range from about eight miles to 30 miles. And so, what we've done is some initial mapping on attendance areas that are within a 10-mile radius of each other or a 20-mile radius of each other. You're going to see some maps, there's a lot on the maps, and keep in mind that circles when we look at those radiuses include, in a couple cases attendance areas that are across district border, which we know is a completely different governance conversation. And then we have a last map that tries to take that out. And then of course, other thing you're going to have to consider is even if you set something by distance, you have geographic barriers, right? You could have a mountain. And so, you have to think about that piece also. So this first map is taking a look at all the attendance areas across the state, and then identifying any attendance area that has either one or two, because that's all you would find additional attendance areas within that 10-mile radius. And those were bigger circles. And so Mark, you asked earlier today when we saw you're here in the north. I think it's just so that everyone can take a look at the fact that in this little box on the left, only attendance areas that you find having this overlap within the 10-mile radius all occur in this area. And again, there's some geographic features in this area that would explain some of that. When you push this out to a 20-mile radius, you actually start to get attendance areas across the state. And so, I think one thing to point out, and if the commander mentioned it, but saying it again where we have these little orange circles, which are our marker for the attendance area, that's just a town really. So, if we have an attendance area that's called a certain town, that's what we put in for our mapping, it doesn't necessarily mean that's what the schools are. And so that's an important piece to consider and that we'd have to take a look at. But you start to see, when you go to that 20-mile radius, you have some attendance areas that are within 20 miles of seven other attendance areas. So there's eight attendance areas. And again, there're across borders and there's a host of reasons, but you start to get some real concentrations. And again, most of that is happening in this north, in this area around, uh, Reno and Carson City. And then when we take out the ability to map to include attendance areas in another district, you start to see, of course this, you have less of this overlap. You still get a lot of the circles and you still have up to three other attendance areas within the 20 mile or the 20-mile radius of a single attendance area. But there's less going on there. So what are our next steps? We want to start mapping the schools, as I mentioned within the attendance area, radiuses because again, if you have where our dots are, if you start that school's actually on the outside or on the edge of those radius, like you actually create more distance. And so, that's one of the reasons to start thinking about the distances. And then we need to identify any potential geographic barriers. The ultimate goal here is to develop a definition for attendance areas and start to think through looking at what's currently the attendance area and make sure they still make sense today because there's just been growth and change and communities that we think probably have started to overlap each other that used to be further apart. And so, that was our last slide. We'd love to know if there's any other information the commissioner would like us to bring forward, any other additional data analysis. And if y'all have any other questions.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you both very much. Questions, comments? Member Punam.

Punam Mathur: Thank you, Member Mathur. Thank you both of you for that. You're in a northern attendance zone right now. Apparently we miss you in our little orange blob down here. Was the contemplation of charters in this state, and if so, is there a way to ate charters in this state?

Amanda Brown: Amanda Brown, for the record. This is only looking at districts because charters do not receive the attendance, right? No, they do. Oh, I said that wrong. Thanks, mark. I was like, Mark's making a face at me. I'm saying the wrong thing. Okay.

Justin Silverstein: Justin Silverstein for the record. We'll take that piece into account as we look at additional data.

Dr. David Jensen: Thank you. This is member Jensen. I'm sorry, Punam were you? Done?

Punam Mathur: I'm done. Thanks for checking Dave.

Chair Hobbs: Good to go, Dave.

Dr. David Jensen: Okay. I was hoping that we could -- it doesn't matter if we put that up. I was just going to give some perspective and I really appreciate that both Justin and Amanda talked about some of the geographical barriers when you get to the map of Humboldt County, which I think was three slides towards the end, and you'll look it shows that if we went to a 20-mile radius, then I've got two schools that geographically are within proximity. What that doesn't take into consideration is the mountain range. And so, if we had district helicopters, it would work. Otherwise, Orvada would drop 20 miles on 95 to the junction and then 18 miles across to Paradise Valley. So it's almost 40 miles one way when you start looking at transportation issues. And so, I think Elco is when I looked at Elco and White Pine and we're going to find that same scenario that just geographically it makes sense until you take a look at what our barriers are. But this was great information. I, I liked seeing it this way, it really pointed out.

Chair Hobbs: Other comments, questions on this item also. Go ahead, please.

Mark Mathers: Mark Mathers for the record. A couple questions or comments. I guess I feel like density, population density needs to be a factor when you consider attendance area. So I can think of one attendance area in our county that used to be remote, but because of sprawl, right? It's just part of Reno now. And so, somehow I would ask you to consider that. And conversely I can think of a school district just to the south of us or maybe more than one. I just have a problem with the concept of attendance zone in that they're a small county and fairly dense, right? I mean, they're not. When I think of attendance zones, I think of remote areas and they're not. So I guess I question why at least some counties are an entire attendance zone. Are they not getting the other adjustments that reflect kind of the size of the entire district. And so, that would be a question I have and I would rely on your expertise to address that, but I just go back to attendance zones in my eyes and I haven't been here as long as others, but I feel like you should be compensated for very remote, unpopulated, underserved areas, right? That need an extra adjustment. And it feels like the way we've done it doesn't entirely match that.

Chair Hobbs: Justin, if you or Amanda want to comment, please feel free.

Justin Silverstein: Justin, Silverstein for the record. I think we can absolutely take a look at that density piece and start to see the relationships between -- I think to your point Mark, some of what we've seen is districts who look at the 30,000-foot level, at least pretty similar, having different numbers of attendance areas and that brings

up that equity and consistency issue.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. Paul?

Paul Johnson: Yeah. Thanks Chairman. Member Johnson, for the record. I'm having deja vu all over again. What was that? [Indiscernible] so in the old DS Nevada plan model where the attendance areas came from, I think the genesis of that was prior to 1955, every community was at school district. There were 200 school districts in Nevada. So that's kind of how the origin of this tennis area became into existence. There were also groupings based on demographics. So we had small rural centralized and then larger school districts. So there, I think there's still merit in that. And the purpose for that was to identify those school districts that have common characteristics, meeting one of the measures of equity treating similar school districts similarly. And there were definitions of what that meant. So that might be able to lend some credibility to further exploring that attendance hearing model. Thanks.

Chair Hobbs: Alright. Again, thank you very much. We'll look forward to having this back on the next agenda that moves us into agenda item 11 of -- That's right, we do. Have you had an opportunity to review the minutes during our break or during the course of the meeting? And if so, does someone want to make a motion to accept the -- approve the minutes? March 22nd and April 26th.

Dr. David Jensen: Member Jensen, I move to approve.

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson for the record, I move approval of the minutes for March 22nd and April 26th.

Chair Hobbs: We have dueling motions from Dr. Jensen. Would yours become second? Dr. Jensen?

Dr. David Jensen: It'll become a second.

Chair Hobbs: Alright. Thank you very much. We have a motion and a second. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Hobbs: Opposed?

Unidentified Speaker: Aye.

Chair Hobbs: Okay, thank you. One other cleanup item. We had discussion earlier about a working group to monitor the work that's being done in support of the special education topic. Nancy and Paul were in that group and I was handed a note or otherwise told that Dusty also wished to be a part of that. So Megan, I would make note of that, that Dusty is a part of that turning it from a pair into a group, right? So wanted to take care of that future agenda items. We do have several of the items from today coming back. The working group reports, we were able to collapse that by at least two working groups, which is a giant step forward. So, a more abbreviated group. The special Ed item, we'll be coming back hopefully for action at either the June 21st or the June 27th agenda. And I would mention to the commission, we would ask for some discretion about apportion of the items between the 21st and the 27th. The 21st. Correct me if I'm wrong, Megan. That's intended to be more of a virtual meeting. And the 27th more of this type of meeting.

Megan Peterson: Megan Peterson for the record, actually it's the reverse. The 21st was originally identified and that was going to be the one in person in Las Vegas. And then the 27th is the virtual.

Chair Hobbs: Yeah. Point remains the same I think. Thank you for the clarification that when we put the agendas together, we'll try to balance it such that we're taking up the items that require a little bit more time and the presence of the members on the meeting on the 27th. So we'll work that through with MDE and try to balance that agenda. We have the agenda item number nine and 10. We'll be bringing those back in. The hope is that we can bring closure to as many of those as possible by June. We'll have an item on probably the second meeting in June. Maybe the first, I have to go back and check on a discussion of the funding scenarios so we could get some additional direction from the commission with respect to the funding scenarios. That would then be included in the actual report because that report's going to take a while to write that up. But we want to have that discussion about what everybody feels more comfortable about including in that report. Hopefully we'll be ready by then and anything else that may come up in the meantime, for example, Nancy, you mentioned that upon reading the report that was submitted by Jim's working group, if there was a desire to amend, modify, add to, discuss recommendations, whatever it may be, just simply notify me and we'll make sure that we put that on as well. Next item on the agenda is public comment, period. Number two. So come on up.

Megan Peterson: No comment.

Chair Hobbs: Well, we'll take that as a comment. So I'll turn it over to the secretary, to Bo to see if there are any members of the public that wish to make public comment during this comment period.

Secretary: There are no members in Carson at this time.

Chair Hobbs: And we likewise have no members of the public wishing to make public comment down here. Do we have any that have been provided in writing during the course of the meeting?

Secretary: We do not have any.

Chair Hobbs: Okay. And lastly, do we have any callers?

Secretary: No callers at this time.

Chair Hobbs: Thank you very much, Bo. So with that, that brings us to adjournment and I'd like to thank everybody. And once again, gratefully acknowledge everyone at NDE, Megan, Bo, James, certainly the superintendent as well, for all of the support that they provide us. We're obviously now seeing a little bit of momentum with some of these items moving forward, and that doesn't come without a lot of effort and coordination. And also to our consultants supplied analysis, WestEd and APA and anyone else that may be pitching into help.