

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FUNDING  
OCTOBER 20, 2023  
2:00 PM**

<b>Office</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Meeting</b>
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo	Las Vegas	YouTube
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  
Nancy Brune  
Dusty Casey  
Jason Goudie  
Dr. David Jensen  
Paul Johnson  
Punam Mathur  
Jim McIntosh  
Kyle Rodriguez  
Joyce Woodhouse  
Mark Mathers

**DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT**

Megan Peterson

**LEGAL STAFF PRESENT**

Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE**

Christy McGill  
Justin Silverstein  
Amanda Brown  
Dr. Kelsey Krausan  
Dr. Ashley Greenwald  
Steve Goodman  
Noman Kanani  
Peter Zutz  
Henry Dixon  
Mandy Latham  
Anne-Marie Dixon

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay.

**Unidentified Speaker:** How frustrating this is.

**Chair Hobbs:** Well, good morning, everyone. It's 9:07 on June 27th, and I'd like to call the meeting to order. I'll ask the secretary to please call roll.

**Secretary:** Chair Hobbs.

**Chair Hobbs:** Here.

**Secretary:** Vice Chair Woodhouse.

**Joyce Woodhouse:** Here.

**Secretary:** Member Mather.

**Punam Mathur:** Present.

**Secretary:** Member Brune. Member McIntosh.

**Chair Hobbs:** Just FYI, with regard to Member Brune, she will be joining intermittently. She has other commitments this morning, but indicated that she will be joining as she can. So when she does, please mark her present. Member McIntosh will be joining after some morning commitments. And please mark him present when he --

**Secretary:** 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:** Here.

**Secretary:** Member Mathers.

**Mark Mathers:** Here.

**Secretary:** Chair. We have a quorum chair.

**Chair Hobbs:** Well, fantastic. I'd like to also note for the record that we're joined by Deputy Attorney General Greg Ott. I thought there'd be Greg's name. Thank you for being here, Greg. As we get started with the agenda, just a few housekeeping notes. Participants will be joining this meeting virtually. This is sort of a first for us to have a largely, almost all virtual meeting except Mark and Kyle there. But it's a continuation really, of the meeting that we had last week. The goal today, we have at least three items on the agenda where it's hopeful that we'll get to a point during the course of this meeting to take some form of action on those so we can move those along. That was really the reason this month for having a second meeting. I do want to remind our audience that commission meetings can be viewed by a live stream with closed captioning. I'll remind participants to please turn off your microphone or mute yourself when you're not speaking, and remember to turn on your microphone. I think we're all after about three and a half years or so getting kind of used to this. But I think all of us are in meetings where we see things happen, and we don't want to be those guys. If you'd like to be recognized to make a comment, please feel free to gesture on the screen. We'll certainly try to make sure we, we get to everybody. You know, the folks up in Carson City, just wave. I'll try to be watching that as closely as they possibly can. Members of the public who attend in person and would like to provide public comment must fill out a comment card and provide it to the secretary. I don't believe there's anyone in the Las Vegas boardroom. So if, if there's anyone in person, it would likely be up north. So I'll probably turn to either you, Mark or Kyle to let us know if we have anybody up there that wishes to make public comment. Alternatively, members of the public may submit comments in writing via email to [nbcfsf@doe.nv.gov](mailto:nbcfsf@doe.nv.gov). Public comments submitted via email must indicated in the subject line, whether it's to be read during public comment period. Number one or number two, emails received during the meeting will be read during public comment period number two. Materials have been provided to the commission members electronically, and I would certainly imagine today a lot of us will be pulling those up as we're going through them. And certainly it's not a sign of any disrespect if we're doing that. That brings us to public comment period number one. And we'll first ask if there's any public comment to be provided in person in Carson City.

**Secretary:** Chair, there is no public comment in Carson City at this time.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. And just to be thorough, we'll ask if there's anyone in Las Vegas that wishes to make public comment.

**Punam Mathur:** Chair, there is no public comment in Las Vegas.

**Chair Hobbs:** Thank you very much. Do we have any public comment by way of email?

**Secretary:** Chair, there is no public comment via email at this time.

**Chair Hobbs:** Alright. Thank you very much. And telephonically?

**Punam Mathur:** We have no call-ins.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. Thank you very much. We'll close public comment number one. Item number three on our agenda is approval of a flexible agenda. This is a normal course for us to be able to move items around to facilitate better discussion. Have a motion?

**Paul Johnson:** Mr. Chair, this is Member Johnson. I'll motion to have flexible agenda.

**Chair Hobbs:** Thanks, Paul. Have a second?

**Dr. David Jensen:** Member Jensen Seconds.

**Chair Hobbs:** Thank you very much. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chair Hobbs:** Alright. Motion carries. Item number four on the agenda, Nevada Department of Education update. At this time, we'd like to invite Megan to come forward, Deputy Superintendent of Student Investment Division to provide an update for the Nevada Department of Education since our last meeting just a few days ago. Megan, whenever you're ready.

**Megan Peterson:** Okay. Good morning, deputy Superintendent, Megan Peterson for the record. Seeing as how it's been less than a full week since we've all been together, my update today will be brief. I can share happily. I will say that our Committee on Education meeting that was originally scheduled for July 17th has now been rescheduled for July 24th. So that does actually align a little better with the meeting schedule that we do have the commission. So if there are recommendations that we are not able to get to today, we do now have a little bit more to, to continue to flesh those out during our July 19th meeting. I will quickly plug in and share an update on the status of the deliverables that the commission has. It is relatively the same, although I can say that obviously we were able to make progress on the recommendation regarding open zoning. And so that is one item that we have now moved to complete based on the conversations from the previous meeting. We do still have the state special education to work through and we'll look to bring that back at the July 19th meeting for additional conversation and deliberation. The majority of today's presentations will focus on the remaining deliverables that are still in progress, namely with reference to the AB400 metrics for the quarterly reporting and that framework, as well as items for the metrics to consider. And the frequency and the potential recommendation for a timeframe for when to make those reports due. Also discussed at the last meeting that is still open obviously, are the conversations around the 10-year plan for funding optimal funding within the people-centered funding plan, as well as the review of the alternative revenue sources for funding that. And those are about the only outstanding items that we still have, although robust in nature. And that would conclude the presentation and update for today.

**Chair Hobbs:** Thank you, Megan. And just a point to discuss and remind ourselves, even when we bring closure to some of these items, like those that we're going to talk about today, like some of those that we have been able to address up to this point, there still remains the matter of taking the actions that we took and converting that into a report format. So there still remains a great deal of work to do to take the actions that we're taking and translate them into some type of content for the eventual report. And I think sometimes it may come across that we're pushing on some of these items to try to bring closure to them. Never forsaking our ability to deal with them thoroughly. But largely that's in full recognition of the fact that when we do take actions, there still remains a lot of work to be able to pull all of that together in a report form. So, I just wanted to bring that, that point up. You know, we're almost in July, and we still have some, as Megan referred to the rather robust items to deal with, you know, not the least of which is the, the combination of working groups three, four, and five that will hopefully have an opportunity to focus on a little bit more directly as a full commission as opposed to working groups only because that's really the -- at least in my estimation. Everything that we've been asked to do, everything that all the deliverables that will be responding to are equally important. But certainly some of them are a bit more complex than others. So there is still going to be quite a bit of work to be done to bring all of that into a report format, which, as you all know, you'll have an opportunity to see it again as we move toward the later summer months.

**Megan Peterson:** Chair, Megan Peterson.

**Chair Hobbs:** Yes.

**Megan Peterson:** If I could, yes. And I did want to clarify. The department has been taking the recommendations as they've been made by the commission and has been compiling them into a single document that will be made available in the next few weeks for the commission to review and vet and refine as well. So, to your point, there are still opportunities for refining that language and making sure that it is fully representative of what the commission is looking to communicate. And I would be remiss if I didn't mention and acknowledge we do have a number of department staff in the audience today available to serve as subject matter experts for additional insight and information regarding any of the topics that are addressed through the metrics conversation for the AB400 reporting.

**Chair Hobbs:** And we certainly welcome all of those and appreciate their attendance today. And Megan, just to go a little further with your point, I appreciate the fact that some of those recommendations that have been acted on are, are being formatted. I think one of the things that wakes me up a couple of times a week is the thought of, you know, it, it beginning to be a month that ends with that. It's one of those months that ends with like a EDR at the end, and we still have all of that to write. And, you know, some of that, while I appreciate those efforts, some of it's dependent upon work that some of the rest of us will be producing as well, and we're going to have to make all of that mesh into a single document at the end of the day. But we appreciate all of those efforts that are being made. Agenda item number five, discussion and possible action regarding the multi-tiered system of support. And I'll just remind the commission pursuant to NRS 387.1 2463(1)(b), the commission shall monitor the implementation of the Pupil Centered Funding plan and make any recommendations to the joint Interim Standing Committee on education that the commission determines would within the limits of appropriate funding, improve the implementation of Pupil-Centered funding plan or correcting deficiencies. And this is the language that essentially gives us a little bit of a more open door to make additional recommendations beyond those that are enumerated and the memorandum from the legislature or any of the actual laws that have been passed. And I believe that this item of fits very well into that category. So I'd like to invite Christy McGill, deputy Superintendent of Educator Effectiveness and the family engagement to the podium, please. And Christy, whenever you're ready, we're ready for your presentation.

**Christy McGill:** Thank you, Mr. Hobbs. This is Christy McGill, deputy Superintendent for the Nevada Department of Education. I also have with me three very important partners. I have my partner, Dr. Greenwald from the University of Nevada, Reno. Casey Fleetwood, who is also from the University of Nevada Reno, who spends a lot of times with our districts and district implementation. And then we also have Dr. Goodman from Michigan, who is part of the National Technical Center. So we have lots of people here in case you have questions, we can help you with those questions. So, just to frame this, education as you probably know, I'm preaching to the choir is undergoing some changes. Education has always been a changing profession, but I think we can all agree that right now we are really experiencing some significant changes. Nobody can really predict the future, but if we're looking at some future trends, we're seeing a few that keep sticking around one. Of course, change is kind of a constant. You can see some of those other ones. Some of the ones I'm going to pull out is, we're seeing a blending of academics that is integrating with health, meaning that our young people, not only are showing up in our schools with chronic illnesses like asthma and diabetes, but mental health needs to be addressed alongside of the curriculum. And so we're seeing this, we've been seeing it over the last decade, and since the pandemic, we've seen it increased as well. So there's this real norm, and it's been a slow shift that these kinds of services are best made at the school level, because that's where the kids are growing up. The other one I want to just kind of talk to you about two others, is this competency-based learning trend. And this trend is really looking at, well, since we have a lot of information and the content in our phones and on these supercomputers and in AI, what really do we want kids to know? And that really is focusing on skills. We want our students to be problem solvers, right? We want them to be able to collaborate. So using the content as the feel to really practice some of these skills. So that's competency-based learning. We're seeing that trend as

well. And then our students are really fueling a trend, which we can kind of sum up as relevance. Students will tell us quite plainly that they need a relevant material to really keep them in the classrooms for six hours straight. And also, of course, flexibility. We're seeing students and school choice really becoming trends as well. So when we look at this, we can either allow -- the change is going to happen, so we can allow that change just to happen to us, or we can participate in that change. So, as you can see, what happens a lot in the education system is that we have some plans. We have what we hope to accomplish, and then something happens and we hope for increased achievement, right at the end. What we are saying is that to help illuminate that pathway from investment to achievement is some of these systems competencies. So what MTSS really is just like we're moving towards student learning competencies, MTSS is system competencies. What kind of skills system do we want to be able to address in a positive way, the changes that are coming. So these skills that I'm going to talk about, I know it's kind of weird to be thinking that we want a system that is competent, that is skilled, but these skills are really nothing new. I think most of you have probably heard of these before, either in your own businesses or in education. So some of these skills, as you can see here, is teaming and shared decision making. So really focusing on, it really needs to come down to the students and the teachers working with their districts, working with the state, that there is a structure in place that promotes this teaming. One, so that we can really focus on the assets of the community and the school. Again, one of the trends that we're seeing is differentiation between our schools. So how do we do that? One of the things that we can do is focusing on the assets of our communities, and allowing for that differentiation to occur. And we need to have good teaming structures in place for that to happen. Problem solving, I don't think I have to discuss with you the importance of problem-solving models. I think that we're seeing as society becomes more complex as we get, you know, anything from fires to pandemics to earthquakes, having system that can be flexible and really make sure that we can problem solve as we go along. Also, systemic implementation and progress monitoring. So that's that piece in between how do we monitor, how do we make sure that we know what's going on and how to talk about what's going on between that investment through achievement and looking at all the things that districts are investing in, really getting them what they need, that positive student outcomes. We also really want to look at, schools are doing many things right now, and so are the many things that they're doing actually producing good student outcomes. And so giving them the skills needed to be able to progress, monitor those interventions. And if some of them are out of date, allowing them the flexibility to let those go and so that they're not having too many things on their plate. A tiered continuum of courts. Of course, this is that knowledge that there are interventions earlier than later. So as soon as a teacher, a staff person or a student starts to struggle, there's that team again that helps them with those interventions. And we don't allow those issues to get too far down the road. Having a good tiered continuum of supports reduces our need for tier three, reduces our need for special education, and all those things. And then, of course, regular screening to make sure that we're catching some of our internalizers. And the use is our schools, our districts is the Department of Education utilizing evidence-based interventions and improvements. And of course, one of the most important is high quality instruction. That includes that social emotional development. Again, if our tier one instruction is not successful, we're going to have too many students needing a tier two and tier three sports, and that is in a very expensive model. So really making sure that we have the flexibility we need for the districts, the schools, the communities, to strengthen that tier one score to meet the needs of that school. So one of the things I want to bring out before I try to turn this over to my colleagues who really can go deeply into the implementation is that these competencies stress the how they don't stress the what. There's a lot of research out there that really shows that decisions, teachers make thousands of decisions a day as well as administrators. And when they have what they need to do those decisions well, they're the absolute best person people to be making those decisions. So to keep them close to the students, allowing that decision making at that local level. But what we can do is we can say, we would like a system. We would like NDE, we would like our districts and schools to work together where we know where our funds are being allocated, that we have systems. You can ask the question of the Department of Education. How is your data system going? Is the data that we are collecting from the districts, are we turning it around in a manner that is useful for the districts for them to then turn around and use and make good local decisions? Do we have processes in place that allow for teaming and feedback in our policies and procedures to occur from the districts -- from the schools to the districts to the state

level? And are we progress monitoring? Are we taking a look at how well not only NDE is doing, but how well the districts are doing? And some of these methodologies. Are we supporting and using evidence-based strategies? And are those evidence-based strategies aligned to the needs of their students? And are we looking at implementation? Sometimes we can say, you know what, we have the evidence-based strategy, and we're still not seeing any kind of change. When looking at fidelity, we can take a look at the implementation and say, well, how well is it being implemented? Did we give enough time? Do the teachers have the resources they need? And then, the focus on that implementing with fidelity opens up that communication rather than just be focusing on focusing on the achievement. As you can see, these competencies not only help us with keeping those decisions local, but also help us with lead indicators versus lag indicators. Achievement is all lag indicators. We can take a look at achievement and see that a school is doing well, great, but how and why using some of these lag or these lead indicators, we can really say, yes, they're doing well. And you know what they're really doing well, they use data and the assets of the community to, let's say, bring in a second language. And they chose to focus on dual language between pre-K through third grade for all of their literacy needs. So this gives us the language to talk about the implementation, and I would like to say that that has been the gap of how we look at how we track implementation from investment to achievement. And I'm going to turn it over to my colleague, Dr. Greenwald.

**Dr. Ashley Greenwald:** Good morning, members of the commission. Thank you so much for having me. Dr. Ashley Greenwald, for the record, I am an associate research professor at the University of Nevada Reno's College of Education. And I have had the pleasure of serving as the director of the Technical Assistance Center that has been overseeing multi-tiered systems of support in the state of Nevada for the past 12 years. So allow me to share a little bit more about what this actually looks like, sort of in practice. And Christy did a beautiful job of sort of explaining the theory behind MTSS. And I wanted to give you an opportunity to understand what this actually looks like and feels like in the state for our districts and for our schools. So the first thing to understand is that MTSS is a framework. It's a systems framework, and we like to refer to it as an operating system. So we've got systems that we put in place, the systems support, the evidence-based practices, and then we collect data through progress monitoring, monitoring and fidelity and capacity to ensure that we have adequate student outcomes. And so, what we're looking at is essentially this is a prevention model. We want to prevent a crisis. We want to intervene early. We want to identify students who need additional supports early, and we want to make sure that the entire student body, including the educators, are well supported in their roles. We focus on triaging students to appropriate interventions. And those interventions are evidence-based. One of the reasons that we really focus in on evidence-based interventions, is that we have limited resources, as you all know in education. And we want to make sure that the practices that we put in place are proven to be impactful and effective for students. Interventions are progress monitored for effectiveness at the school level, and then also at the individual student level. And then it's really important to know that the MTSS framework supports adults in the building in doing this work well. So we're talking about both academics and behavior support when we talk about MTSS. Next slide, please. This is done, as Chrissy mentioned, through a process of teaming. That big yellow sort of oval in the middle is what we refer to as our leadership teams. Every school has a leadership team for MTSS that participates with us. And then every district that participates also has a leadership team. The leadership team is responsible for certain functions within the system. If you kind of go up into the blue area, that's the executive function. So we're talking about stakeholder engagement. Who do we need at the table to make decisions? Who do we need to engage with from the community perspective? Who do we need to engage with at the state? Funding and alignment, how are we funding this initiative? How are we aligning all of our different practices? We've got a ton of practices within education, right? How do we align all of those so that way we've got good solid foundation for everybody. Policy, how do we engage in policy development around this work? And then do we have the workforce capacity to carry this out? And what do we need to advance? Beneath the leadership team, when you go down into the green, that is the implementation functions. The leadership team is also responsible for the implementation functions. That means training, coaching, and evaluation. Oftentimes, when we think about new practices or new initiatives within education, what we think about a lot is training, right? And I want you to really realize that training is

one of the seven implementation functions. And so we have a lot more that we focus on within MTSS, and that's what really creates a solid system because we have training with coaching and evaluation for the school sites for the individual students. And then that leadership team is also responsible for all of those different various executive functions. This map, I'll come back to this in a moment, but this is what informs the leadership team's action plans. So the action plans are happening informed at the school level and also at the district level as well as the state. So, next slide please. Thank you. So at the state, we have what we call a cascade of coaching support and our state leadership team. So there's a state MTSS leadership team that is housed at the Nevada Department of Education. That state leadership team is responsible for informing practices, for informing data, for informing systems, and providing supports for that through policy, through funding, through the leadership, and through election of priorities. Those priorities and all of those systems that are recommended get supported down to the level of the district through our technical assistance center. So I've got my dear colleague, Casey Fleetwood on the call today. She is the one that actually goes out and sits with every single district team that works with us across the state. Casey is supporting the districts to understand the policies of the state, to receive the funds, to allocate those funds appropriately, to understand the priorities of the state, but then also to start to select the priorities of the district to align that to MTSS. The district leadership team helps to provide implementation action plans for the district and the schools recommendations. They engage in team meetings and they review data regularly. The district also selects an MTSS coach that supports up to 20 implementing school sites. So that district coach then goes in to help support the school teams, the school MTSS teams. The school MTSS teams engage in school-wide supports. They engage in the development and support classroom systems. They provide group interventions and individual student interventions. The school staff are then supported by that school team. So the school team supports the school staff to be successful in providing academics, in providing safe school environments and practices in providing social behavioral skills and mental health supports. And then ultimately what we see is that the students benefit fit. Next slide, please. In Nevada, you can see our implementation map. This is as of October 23. We have 12 participating local educational agencies, including the State Public School Charter Authority. We are implementing currently in 226 schools. So it's about one third of the schools across the state that are participating in MTSS. And this is reaching over 200,000 students across the state of Nevada. Next slide, please. What I wanted for you to have an opportunity to really see today is how do the district implement this? What does this really look like? And we're going to spend most of our time actually focusing at the district, because the district is a really big unit of implementation. For us, it's the space where we actually provide a lot of intervention is at the level of the district administration. And so here, I've chosen some examples from some of our really exemplary MTSS school districts, participating school districts. So this Carson City, I will share with you, is doing some really great things with MTSS. Here's a copy of their implementation plan. Every district that participates with us has a district implementation plan that includes components of their district leadership team, site selection, coaching, training, and evaluation. Next slide, please. We are going to dig into this implementation plan. So we'll start with the district leadership team, and I hope you can see this. I know this is a little bit small, and if you can't see it well, we'll make sure to send the slide deck out after. So the district leadership team, we have a roster of participants on the district leadership team. Here, again, I'm just sticking with Carson City for a moment. You can see these are the members of the Carson City MGSS leadership team. And it's nice to see a blend. So we've got leadership from cabinet. We've got a trustee, a board trustee on this particular MTSS leadership team, and we've got representation from different departments. So from behavioral expertise, education expertise, special education, student service supports. So we've got a really nice team in Carson, and this is pretty representative of what we see with other districts as well. This district leadership team, again, they oversee the policy, the funding, they review data from their school sites, and then they also engage in their own assessments around fidelity and capacity to be able to support multi-tiered systems support for all students in district. They select their meeting schedule, and then they maintain their action plan. I don't have a copy of the action plans because they are so large and robust, it would be too small to -- we don't have enough time today to dig into the action plan for every district, but what I want you to know is that the action plan is based off of the fidelity assessment. So the areas that they are not strong in are the areas that the team selects to focus on. And that action plan is specific. The action plan categories are



specifically linked to that little diagram of leadership teaming that I showed you earlier. So there are categories on those, every district action plan around stakeholder engagement, alignment of initiatives, policy, workforce capacity training, coaching, and evaluation. So we really are very comprehensive in our action planning. Next slide, please. The district receives coaching support. They receive coaching support through both Casey Fleetwood at the level of the creation of the action plan, the assessments that they're conducting, how to engage in data decision making, but then the school teams and the district coaches also receive coaching through us. So here you can see this is an example of Clark County School District, coaching support plan for the 2324 school year. So, it's just a pretty robust plan. And the districts, one of the things I really want to focus on for you to understand is that the districts select what they focus on. So some of our districts select to focus on trauma interventions. Some of our districts are focusing on substance. Some of our districts are focusing on academics. Some of our districts are focusing on behavior support and bully prevention. And really the reason that they select to focus in certain areas is that when we start to work with the district, we take a look at their district priorities, their district strategic plan, and also their district's data and student outcomes. So we start to identify the need, support the district in selecting the priority areas that they'd like to focus on. And then from there, we build their coaching plan. Next slide, please. We also build, -- Oh, this did not animate well. My apologies. We also build their training plan. And so, you can see, if you look into the background, where you see the smaller diagrams as tier one, tier two, tier three, that was the first one that I wanted to show you. That is actually Lyon County School District's training plan for the 2324 school year. And Lyon County focuses a lot on -- has selected focus on trauma and mental health interventions as of last year. So that was a big, big area of emphasis. So you can see that their tier one training, their tier two training, their tier three training is very infused with the selection and the priorities of their district. They receive the standard training is one workshop and three professional developments throughout the year for every tier of implementation. Schools advance to the next tier when they reach Fidelity criteria at the former tier. Okay. I did stick in a second training plan. This is Nye County School District's training plan. This was the first year actually that Nye County participated with us. So these are all schools that trained in tier one in the 2324 school year. And Nye County chose to focus on behavior and academics. So you can see that their training plan includes a response to intervention and positive behavior intervention and support, less so focusing currently on trauma and mental health intervention. I just wanted you to have an example to see what this looks like. Next slide, please. I should say too, before I go into evaluation, we provide all of the training. So we have employees with expertise, interdisciplinary expertise across multiple areas within education, within mental health, within behavior support. And so, we develop the curriculum, we receive technical assistance from the national TA centers to bring the best evidence-based practices to the state. And then we bring that down to the level of the district. And we also provide that training support to schools. So when we talk about district level evaluation, every district also creates their own evaluation plan based on the priorities of that district. They participate in systems, fidelity inventories, which informs their action plan. And here, [indiscernible] I think we lost the PowerPoint. Thank you. There. It's back now. We can see some examples of fidelity assessments. And so, I grabbed Pershing County School Districts systems fidelity Inventory. Pershing County has actually been participating with us in implementation for about 11 years. And so, you can see that this graph only shows five years' worth of data when we pull them. But Pershing when they started, had a much lower fidelity score. And over the years, they have continued to raise their fidelity score every year through our training and technical assistance. And they are at high fidelity. We consider 80% or above to be very high fidelity for a district. So that is a district that operates at high fidelity. Juxtapose with that, I wanted to share with you, Carson City School District. They are newer with us. They've been implementing with us for three years. And you can see this is actually in 22. That was their first fidelity assessment with us. And they had about 25% capacity and implementation for MTSS. And now they are at about 70%. So they have made really great gains in just a three-year period. So we are very proud of the work that they're doing, and they still have a good amount of work to accomplish. So, systems work, systems development takes time, I think is a really important message. This is not something that happens in a year. We often say, at minimum five years and oftentimes, especially with some of our larger districts up to 10 years to really develop the systems, to get all of the schools participating, trained through the tiers, implementing infidelity, receiving adequate coaching, and also, priorities change. And the beauty of the MTSS framework is

that once the framework is set for identification of student needs, the teaming is in place, the structures are in place for effective progress monitoring at school levels, at this district levels. You can upload any new practice into that same system, and it will be implemented with greater fidelity than if you implemented the practice in isolation without a system. And there's a lot of research to support that. So we are very proud of our implementing districts. The other thing that I wanted to share, next slide, please, is the initiative audit. Very briefly, one of the things that I really love about NTSS, and I think that we do this particularly well in our state, and just to toot Nevada's horn for a minute, we've actually been asked by some of the national technical assistance centers to write an evaluation paper or a sort of a brief on our practice audit process, because we do it so well in the state of Nevada. So the districts that work with us, we sit down with them, and we go through every single practice and intervention that they recommend as a district. And you can imagine that some districts have a multitude of practices, and some districts may not actually have any practices. They leave it up to the schools to select. So, I'll give you a couple of examples here. In Churchill County, which is one of our implementing partners, they don't have a lot of practices at the district level because they don't have two schools that are the same. They have different grade bands in, in that particular county. And they have a total of six schools in Clark County, which has over 300 schools. You can imagine their list of practices goes on for pages and pages and pages. I mean, I couldn't even fit it on a slide deck for you. So, the districts are very different in their practices. But what is really important to understand is that what we do with the districts is we take a look at the practices that they do have in place at tier one, at tier two, and tier three. When we talk about tier one, that's universal practices for all students. When we talk about tiers two and three, those are advanced interventions for students at risk or students who are really in crisis and have significant pervasive needs. Okay? So, these practices, we take a look to see what are the outcomes? Do we know as a district, are we having effective outcomes based on these practices? We take a look and we audit the full system. We take a look. How do you receive training? How do you receive coaching? What do you do if someone doesn't know how to implement this practice? What do you do to support staff in this practice? Right? We're taking a look at the systems component of the practices. We also take a look at the data. How do you collect fidelity data? How do you progress, monitor these interventions to make sure they're effective for students? And then we ask, how is this funded? And so what I will tell you that having been doing this work for 10 years, and my colleague Casey Fleetwood could attest to this very well. Because she's the one that actually sits with the district administrators and does this. There are a lot of gaps. A lot of gaps. When we first sit down with the districts, oftentimes they know their practices and we say, okay, do you have student outcomes? And they're like, oh, I hope so. Right? And then we say, well, how do you receive your training? Well, we hired an external consultant, right? How do you receive coaching? We don't receive any coaching. What do you do if a teacher doesn't know how to implement this intervention? I have no idea, right? These are -- and I don't say this to make anyone feel bad or embarrassed, but, but this is a reality is that a lot of the money that is spent in the state, and we have proof of this. A lot of the money that is spent in educational practices is spent on vendors, curriculum vendors is spent on external consultants that come in, do a one-time training, and then they're gone. And then the system is not there to support the practice. And in the absence of the system, we cannot expect good student outcomes because then we don't have supports for the educators. We don't have supports for the schools. The district doesn't know how to evaluate it, the district doesn't know if the practice is working, and they're spending a ton of money every single year on a specific practice that we don't even know necessarily how to track the data on. So that's why MTSS, that's where MTSS comes in and says, great, let's identify those gaps and barriers. Let us help you, let us help you create a system for providing support to educators. Let us help you create a system for tracking the progress, monitoring of the student outcomes. Those are really important. The other thing that I want to highlight here is the money column, right? This is sort of right up your alley. Funding ebbs and flows, right? And when funding drops out for a specific initiative, let's say that we got a brand for a few years, or we had funding allocated to state for a few years for specific practice, and then all of a sudden the funding is gone. What do we assume happens to the practice? It's gone, right, it's gone onto the next practice. And so what, what we do in MTSS is we talk about the importance of building a system for sustainability and capacity. So that way there are coaching practices built in so that if funding drops and you can no longer pay a vendor to come in and provide training to your new teachers who have never learned

this practice before. We have this system in place to create those feedback loops, to create those coaching loops so that the practice can live beyond funding or beyond initial funding, seed funding, I should say. Next slide, please. Okay. So let's talk about some results at the level of the state and the district. We're still, again, focusing at the district level. So this is just a sort of a snapshot of the top dimensions in which our state has made the best progress. And you can see from district perspective. And this is from the earliest administration, and they vary based on the district to the current administration. Well, this is actually from 2122 data. So about a year ago. We have had significant training growth, significant funding and alignment growth, and really nice advancement in policy for MTSS at the state capacity level. This is from 2020 to 23. Again, training policy and funding have been our biggest areas of improvement. We still have room to grow. I want you to see that, right? We've improved, but we still have room to grow to reach full capacity for MTSS in the state of Nevada. Next slide please. Here's a quick snapshot of participation show. So I showed you that map of Nevada, of all the districts that are participating, but it's really important to know that even if a district is participating in MTSS, it does not mean that all of their schools are participating, receiving supports, receiving coaching, and evaluating their practices. Okay? So for example, what I want you to have a look at is, Carson, Churchill, line and Pershing, all of their schools are participating. That's fantastic, right? We've got Humboldt, NYC, State Public Charter Authority, Clark County School District. Not all of their schools have been able to access these training supports, right? It takes time to roll these systems. And we have limited resources ourselves as a state technical assistance center. We started in 2014 with 10 schools, we're implementing in about 225 schools. So we've made a lot of progress over the years, but we still have room to grow. Next slide, please. Okay, let's go down towards the school level. I wanted you to have an opportunity to understand a little bit about what the schools receive. So the schools, again, create their team very similar to the districts. They also maintain their own action plan. They receive coaching from their district coach. We provide all of the coaching to the district coach. The district coach then goes through the school. We do as the state TA center, provide all of the training in collaboration with their district coaches or coordinators. The schools attend workshops. And so those teams attend workshops. They attend their tier one systems workshop. They attend a tier one database, decision making, classroom supports and sustainability and addressing disproportionality. That happens all at tier one. At tier two, they're building their tier two systems. They are building out processes for universal screening for all students in academics and in mental health. And they are selecting their interventions for advanced tier support for those students that are at risk or in crisis. They are then progress monitoring. They're building progress monitoring systems, and then they're learning to evaluate their advanced tier interventions. Very similarly, at tier three, they take their tier three systems workshop. They engage in screening for individual students, intervention selection for individual students, progress monitoring and systems evaluation. With that training, they develop what you saw as their coaching plan, and then they have ongoing evaluation throughout the school year. Next slide, please. Okay, so what are the student benefits, right? This is sort of always what we want to know, right? Our big markers for implementation success are increase in fidelity, increase in capacity, right? But we also want to track the student outcomes. We want to know for those school sites that are implementing MTSS with fidelity, big caveat with fidelity, what can we expect? And so, we had an external valuation company come in and evaluate the first five years of implementation of NTSS in the state of Nevada. And these are the outcomes from the first five years of implementation. And this is schools that we're implementing compared to non-implementing schools within the same district. So for those that were implementing NTSS with fidelity, we saw increases in, uh, infidelity, of course, at the site levels, we saw declines in student problem behavior, including possession of weapons, distribution of controlled substances, and bullying. We saw a 31% decrease in dropout rates. We saw gains in the school climate as measured by the Nevada Cecil Survey, which is the school climate survey that students take. And then we also saw improvement in academic performance in both reading and in math. So we are seeing very promising outcomes for implementation with fidelity. We are expecting our next five-year report. These longitudinal reports are really, really valuable, right? We do have a report every year. They're welcome to see any of them. But the longitudinal reports give us the sort of, the big picture kook. Our next longitudinal five-year report is expected in 2025. We've already contracted with our external evaluation company who started to work on another evaluation of the impact from the last five years because this report was published in 2020. So we have new

data to share. Next slide, please. Okay. So how is MTSS funded currently in the state of Nevada? And how do we support training and technical assistance for this work currently? We have often formerly relied on competitive federal dollars exclusively. Within the last year, we have started to receive some state dollars, but I want you to see kind of what this funding formula looks like. So we have still competitive federal dollars, and I've listed the sources up here for you. That makes up about almost about 30% of our current funding for MTSS is competitive. Competitive federal dollars that are only here for a short time. Nevada dollars that have been put forward for these efforts include Department of Health and Human Services has put forward half a million dollars a year from the fund for Resilient Nevada, which is the [indiscernible] settlement dollars. Division of Public and Behavioral Health has put forward children's mental health block grant dollars, about \$400,000 a year. The Nevada Department of Education has provided IDEA dollars at \$420,000. This will be the first year FFY25 that we receive those dollars. Nevada Department of Education is also leveraging some Title 4A dollars. They promise \$200,000. Again, this will be the first time that we receive those funds. So, what I want for you to also pay attention to is that the little asterisk indicate temporary funding. And so, we do not have sustainable funding for this initiative. I think that that is a really important thing for the Commission on School funding to understand is that the districts and the schools and the students in the state of Nevada are benefiting from this work. We've been doing this work, thanks to the significant amount of federal funds that have been poured into the state of Nevada to pilot MTSS. We're having really good outcomes. We've built a lot of good systems, and we need to start thinking about how do we sustain this moving forward, and do we want to sustain this moving forward? So our total expected operating budget for FY25 is just over 2 million and our expected operating budget for FY 26. No, and I think that that's important to know. Next slide, please. And I will now turn it over to my colleague from National Tech Technical Assistance Center, Dr. Steve Goodman to talk about MTSS theory of action and why this is so impactful and effective and what some other states are doing to support these efforts. Dr. Goodman?

**Steve Goodman:** Thank you, Ashley. So, again, my name's Steve Goodman, and it's such an honor to be here. Thank you for the opportunity. I have the wonderful opportunity to work with states across the nation as well as different countries for the implementation of MTSS. And I just want you to say you should be very proud of the excellent work to take place through the Nevada Department of Education. It's very remarkable. So congratulations on that. So, I wanted to point out here with the theory of action for MTSS. We all want students to have successful, demonstrate meaningful outcomes. So you look at the very bottom that that's the foundation of what we want happen, but we do know that it doesn't take place without certain things in order. So if we have states and districts provide implementation supports to involve professional development and policy and allocation resources, and there's research informed practices that are adopted that really matched the student need and educators implement those practices effectively and consistently, which we just fidelity that Ashley was talking about, it's then we will see the outcomes. If we miss out on any of those steps, then we will not have the opportunity to really realize the effects we want. Can you please, uh, go to the next slide. So, wanted to share this with you here. If you look at the cost and return on investment, there's a researcher, Catherine Bradshaw with her colleagues, have been really doing a lot of work in this area. So when you look on the left side, it costs money to implement this, particularly for a multi-tiered assistance support using positive behavior interventions and supports. So on the left side, you can see the cost per student, you can see what it would cost to implement in schools, and these are different research articles that calculates cost and the annual cost for our district to implement. But what I want to draw your attention to is on the right side, if you look at the improvements in standardized test scores, the high stakes test and districts per 100 students, for elementary, it's 138, over 138,000 that is returned per 100 students. And then we, we see we can do reductions for aggressive behavior and the cost savings on that, that would be needed to provide better supports for students. And another study came out that every \$1 invested in a positive behavior intervention supports as a fiscal savings of almost \$105. So, it's a good return on investment. And next slide please. And this is just breaking it down. So Catherine Bradshaw actually does a study with the colleagues looking at the state of Maryland and the return on investment for, for the implementation of a behavior support within a multi-tiered system. And you can see here, it's the high stakes test for reading and math that the return, but they broke it down in other

areas. So the bottom line is for reading and math it's 109,000. But when you look at total savings, it is looking at 60,000 for bullying prevention reduction. We can see total savings of 33,000 for suspensions. And then, so this is elementary school. If you could go to the next slide base, you can see something similar in secondary schools, and you can see for math and reading, the outcomes at 71,000 for 444 per 100 students, that the cost be covered for this. We are suggesting we've seeing some good investments from return. And if you go to the next slide, please. So what we are seeing is that some states are saying, well, how do they address this? How do they get that return investment? And they do not have enough funds to continue to give money out. So they say, what's the existing funding structures that we can utilize? So in Michigan, where I'm from, we actually worked with the finance department and the programming team. We created a fiscal guidance for implementing. And if you look on the, the table, you'll see these are federal funds, title one, title two, title three. So when we look at those federal funds and then the state funds that are allocated, we can say, how can it support those components of implementation? And can you go to the next slide, please? Washington, the state of Washington, done a similar thing of providing guidance so that districts can see how they can use their existing funds to be more successful in moving forward. In next slide, please. Minnesota, what they had done is they surveyed the districts to see how, how are they implementing NTSS and what do they need to move forward. If you can go to the next slide, what they said is -- what they need is a general guidance. If you look at bullet 0.2, for how to coordinate the use of state and federal funds to support implementation of NTSS. So how you can continue this work moving forward, and how do we increase the enhanced support through evaluation, through training, and through coaching, which, actually brought up as well. Next slide, please. And another thing that that has been helpful is, a number of years ago, Oregon Department of Education created a policy alignment document. They said, if we're going to invest in this work, if we are going to allocate resources for it, it should be standard practice that we are investing our resources in to make sure that we are looking at the best of science, the best of education to move forward. But there are emergency emerging practices that we do not have all the evidence yet. And then there are promising practices out there that, yeah, it may sound like a good idea. What I think is fascinating about how Oregon approached this is that they look at how they differentiate allocated funds. So standard practice is where most of the funding went. Additional funding would go for emerging practice. And then very little we go for promising practice because we want to invest in things that we know that will work. So we have been using this in Michigan to work with our district to say, how are you aligning your practices for finding moving forward? And next slide, please. And here, here's what we're finding is, Christy brought this out very eloquently, that we want to look at the impact on students. But to get to the impact of students, we want to make sure that we are implementing good practices with fidelity, meaning that they're done with correctly and consistently as intended by the researchers. So that's the fidelity we need to measure that. And we also know that Fidelity is going to be dependent on the capacity of the district to help support it, well, capacity of the state to help support. So what you see is we can get impact measures, but there are interim measures that we can do assessments to help make sure that we are moving in the right direction. So capacity will influence fidelity, fidelity will influence the impact the student outcomes. And then overall, we need to look at how we are doing this, the reach, the number of schools, number of districts. Next slide, please. And finally, here's the recommendations that, Christy, I believe I'm going to turn this back to you.

**Christy McGill:** Thank you, Dr. Goodman. For the record, Christy McGill. This is our last slide. And these are the humble recommendations around MTSS. As you guys heard, that systems like schools, like students need to be competent and have competencies in order to be able to implement the practices that students need to succeed. So our recommendation is strengthen Nevada Department of Education and local education agencies, our district's system competencies through MTSS to support and manage change and innovation. Again, these competencies allow the districts to look at their data, decide if their interventions are actually yielding positive student outcomes. Our scan recommendation is to add lead indicators to state funds to help monitor our system. This is nothing new. The federal government has been doing this for a while. And creating these lead indicators so that the pathway from investment to achievement is lit so that we know what happens in in between there. Our third is continue the partnership with UNR for MTSS, statewide training and technical

assistance and expand the reach. The fourth goal is alignment goal. One system, multiple practices. We get a lot of feedback. There's a lot of confusion and chaos coming between the department and the districts. But we all agree that looking at data, making sure that we have collaboration systems in place, making sure that we progress monitor for good student outcomes, it can really go a long ways. Fund the system and practices. One of the bummer part about federal dollars is that they focus on practices, right? They want to see for example, opioid dollars. The opioid settlement dollars wants to see a reduction in opioid use. So there's not a lot of funding out there that allows for the districts to use the money for their systems, to use their money to actually build good data systems to allow for time for teaming. So that's one of the oversights I think that we can really discuss and, and figure out how to work through together. And then last but not least, least keep implementations decisions local. By focusing on these competencies, we're not telling the districts what to do, where to do it. We're saying we're going to work together as a team. We're going to use data, and we're going to look at how these interventions are, are making good outcomes for our students. We're also not recommending the interventions because we never know, again, Nevada has a lot of talent in it. I'm really excited about this generation. Many of them are bilingual. We have many different cultures coming in, allowing the schools the flexibility to build on those assets, making those decisions of what they want to do, but then having the data and the progress monitoring to talk to us around those. And then when we have that, we can also say, Hey, you know what? This school is doing amazing things. Let's do a good job of getting out their success to others so it can be replicated. Without this implementation agreement on these competencies, we really don't have any idea when a school or district is doing well, what's going right, or when a district or school is not doing well, we really have a hard time of what's going on without looking at the implementation progress. So thank you so much. And we are available for any questions.

**Chair Hobbs:** Well, first I'd like to thank all of you for a very thorough and fascinating presentation. As I was making notes, as you were going through, along and behold probably 80% of the questions I had, you had a slide that eventually addressed them. So I sincerely appreciate that. I think at this time, what I'll do is turn it back to members of the commission for comments or questions. Anyone? Okay. I had a couple of questions, but I think you did address them. So this is a program that at least at some level has been in place here in Nevada for, I think you said 12 years. And you showed that it had migrated to, I can't remember the exact number, but somewhere in the mid two hundreds in terms of number of schools that the program is operating within. And then you got to the funding part of it, which I was very interested in seeing. The participating schools and districts, are they able to opt in or is that a funding decision for them if they do opt in?

**Dr. Ashley Greenwald:** I can answer that. This is Dr. Greenwood for the record. Previously we had, because we were on almost exclusive federal funding, that was really dictated by the federal grant proposal. So when you write a federal grant proposal, as probably most of you are aware, you have specific high need LEAs that need to be participating in order to receive funding, right? So, the partnerships were sort of predetermined based on the criteria of the grants that were funded federally. So formerly the answer was no. They were not just allowed to opt in. They were essentially invited in based on the parameters of the grants that we received for the state of Nevada. Currently our structure is a little bit different as we've shifted, and this is just within the last one year, so one calendar year. We have shifted towards more state funding than federal competitive dollars. Now we have a little bit more flexibility in which districts we can support, which is fantastic. We ultimately want that. And we do have now some districts coming to us where we had previously had to say, I'm so sorry, we don't have dollars to support you right now. Please cycle back with us in a year. Now we can say to them, absolutely, we'd love to partner with you. Let us come out and explore what that might look like. So, we don't have capacity currently because we don't have enough funding in the infrastructure, but to support every single school across the state. But we have a good amount of capacity to bring on some new districts that are interested. And we have already started doing that. As just example, Elco County last week, Elco County is one of the districts that has expressed interest over the years, and we now are able to support them.

**Chair Hobbs:** [Crosstalk] Go ahead.

**Christy McGill:** Sorry. I was just going to add. The districts too get to add with their -- whether or not they want to hire coaches. So as you can see, there's different levels at the state level, it's the technical assistance center, and then the districts can write in or participate in different grants, either, you know, through people centered funding or through the project AWARE grants. They can then allocate money as they see fit.

**Mark Mathers:** Chair Hobbs.

**Chair Hobbs:** Yes, please. Mark.

**Mark Mathers:** Yeah, Mark Mathers for the record. So Washoe County School District funds eight MTSS positions out of its general fund. So they're not grant funded. So just to clarify, I mean, districts I think, have recognized the value of these programs and have, at least in our case, chosen to fund them out of our own resources versus grants. So I just wanted to kind of clarify the district can fund them with non-grant sources, and has. Was that captured in this report at all when we funded these programs ourselves or was the analysis and report contained to these grant funded MTSS positions?

**Dr. Ashley Greenwald:** This is Dr. Greenwood for the record, the analysis is of the state services. So certain counties, Washoe County in particular, um, has a very robust MTSS department that we participate with very minimally. The REST state is very involved and engaged with our technical assistance center. So I think, in the diagram where I showed you the percent of schools that are receiving training, receiving, coaching, and engaging in evaluation with us. I don't know if you noticed, but there was only one school in Washoe County that actually formerly partners with our TA center. So Washoe County does MTSS a little bit different from the rest of the state, is sort of what I can say about that. So our report was exclusively based on the schools and the districts that partner with us.

**Mark Mathers:** Great. Thanks for the clarification.

**Dr. Ashley Greenwald:** Absolutely.

**Chair Hobbs:** Yeah, that's an interesting point, mark. So, what I got from that is, districts can implement MTSS semi autonomously or directly in coordination with the state program, right? Is that what I was hearing there?

**Mark Mathers:** Yes, we find those eight positions out of our general fund, and so that's something we can do and have done. Yep.

**Chair Hobbs:** Yep. I appreciate that. Okay.

**Punam Mathur:** Mic on, hand down. Thank you. So just on that specific point, thank you, first of all, Christy, for a decade plus of indomitable effort around this topic. And to Dr. Greenwell, Dr. Goodman, thank you as well. So on this relative to Washoe, for example, so the schools, they've got MTSS with energy happening there, do we have a mechanism to ensure system alignment between implementation and Washoe and what's happening on the technical support system, or do we just hope it works?

**Christy McGill:** This is Christy McGill for the record. So, I think we could, because there is overlap between, so the main competencies of MTSS remain the same. It doesn't matter what state you're from, evidence-based practices database decision making. And so, there could be really good overlap. I think part of it is that, again, with the reduced capacity we've had at the university level to kind of lean into some districts that may have needed more support. Not to say we've left Washoe County out, but they are, I mean, they have their data

handbooks, they're really kind of, they've been doing this for a long time. So yes, can we definitely learn from them and continue to work for with them, which we do. And can we look at some shared indicators? Yes. Because that's the beauty of MTSS, those competencies remain the same.

**Punam Mathur:** And in that instance, would the schools that was, was directly implementing MTSS into, would they then be counted in our over 248 or whatever that number was?

**Christy McGill.:** Yeah, I mean, we would have to create some crosswalks. We did something very similar to the school climate data. Again, Washoe County uses their own system, and so we've created crosswalks. Again, we could focus on implementation fidelity. So a lot of these things have similar meaning enough so that if we did look at some shared indicators across the state, I don't think we would have too much trouble or Washoe County wouldn't have too much trouble being able to contribute as well. Great. Two more, Chairman Hobbs, begging your indulgence. Two more questions. I guess you, Dr. Greenwald, 2.1 million for fiscal year 25, what would it take to do this in every school? Every LEA and just some --

**Dr. Ashley Greenwald:** Yeah, Dr. Greenwald for the record. We have estimated that an operating budget of about 3 million would be sufficient for us to be able to provide training, technical assistance and evaluation statewide. But I will say with the caveat, that is 3 million to the training and Technical Assistance Center. That doesn't include the coaches at the local level, but those coaches at the local level, as you heard, can be funded for multiple funding mechanisms per people funding allocations, other dollars of the district has allocated towards them. So, that's what we anticipate needing if we were to implement fully statewide across Nevada. With that said, we also need to make sure that there's buy-in from all the districts and from the schools, right? So, we can't force anybody to engage with us, essentially.

**Punam Mathur:** So going there for a second, I think I heard that we've got 12 districts including charter authority that are on board. Is it a function of there is demand, but we can't meet the supply? Is it that there isn't demand? And if so, why not?

**Dr. Ashley Greenwald:** I would say both. So I think that there is demand. So like I said, Lincoln for example, Lincoln County would like to participate. Washoe County would like to participate. They're in the waiting dump right now. We also have some districts is looking at my map of Nevada right here. We have some districts such as Esmaralda, Eureka, Storey county who have never expressed any interest in participating, but we've also never approached them and explained to them what exactly it is that we have available to offer because we haven't had the capacity to really expand beyond what we currently have. So does that make sense? I think both [indiscernible].

**Punam Mathur:** Thank you. And then one last question, Greenwald, I'm taking up a lot of time. As we talk about, a lot of those are a systemic approach, right? It's not a whack this whole and hope it never comes back, which we do so often. And when I think about the ecosystem that is K-12, the nonprofit sector is a pretty active part. And as a commission, we've had presentation after presentation of great works being done by nonprofits. Is there a way to sort of expand our definition of what K-12 system is to include the nonprofit sector in a way that aligns and maximizes return on all investment, right?

**Dr. Ashley Greenwald:** Yes, Dr. Greenwald for the record, I think that we are already doing that and I love that approach. I'll give you a couple of examples and perhaps I could call my colleague Casey Fleetwood to provide a little bit more. But we have recently expanded in many of our districts from a district leadership team to what we refer to as a district community leadership team. And so, some of our districts are already doing that. We brought the community coalitions on, for example, because they have a lot of resources to provide supports and coaching around specific practices and interventions. We've brought community partners in, we thought some of our communities are engaged with the tribal leadership. So, we do try as best as we can to



engage community resources as well. Casey, do you have anything to add to Punam's question?

**Christy McGill:** Hi, Casey Fleetwood for the record. Yes, I want to echo everything that you said in echo back to that blueprint around the leadership team. When the executive function land, one of the key indicators is stakeholder engagement, right? So as a district identifying which partnerships are the most fruitful and commonsensical based on the scope of your MTSS implementation of wrap in, there are different cultures in different districts that some people are very not as welcoming to external collaboration. And then there are some that are like radically inclusive and it's just wonderful to support and watch the scope expand. As Dr. Greenwald said, we always used to say district leadership team. And now in about half of our districts, we legitimately are using the words district, community leadership team. And something that I kind of learned in the past is I would always work with Cabinet to develop the agenda for these meetings. And then I had this like, aha, about like, why am I not creating shared agendas with these executive directors of the community agencies that are sitting? So now I corrected myself. And when we develop agendas, it's a shared agenda development between oftentimes our nonprofit community partnering agencies and district cabinet.

**Punam Mathur:** Thank you. Thanks, Chairman Hobbs.

**Chair Hobbs:** You're not. You bet. I always like to state the obvious whenever I can, but I think what we are being asked to consider is making a recommendation for continued implementation in support of the MTSS program. I think that's a very generic way of putting it. If you think back to the very last slide from their deck, I don't know if Christy has the ability to put that back up. Some of those recommendations were more specific in nature than generally supporting continued implementation of MTSS, should that be something the commission would want to do. We can either approach it that way or be more specific with respect to the itemized recommendations that were being made to, well, not just us, to whoever it is they would be presenting to, whether that be NDE or the legislature or some other body. Does that make sense? I think that's what we're being asked at this point. And again, this fits under a more generic level of recommendations that we're authorized to make. This isn't a specific deliverable. This would be one that we elected to make a recommendation on that by virtue of the language we are allowed to do. So I throw that back out to the commission to ask what type of direction you would like to take at this point.

**Punam Mathur:** [Indiscernible]

**Chair Hobbs:** Please.

**Punam Mathur:** Chairman Hobbs, thank you. For the record, Member Mathur. I mean, full disclosure, I've been in MTSS proponent since I bumped into Kristen McGill because you can't not be one when you've been McGill fight. Here's, so in very large pieces, a massive investment that the state has made in a formula is all about a mechanism that is bigger than a whim or a political wind. It's a holistic systemic approach. We are also tasked with the accountability system that is going to give us the metrics to know we're getting a return on the investment. The part that has always been really fuzzy and furry to me is what is the operating system that's going to tie those two together? And for me, I think MTSS is that operating system. It isn't prescriptive except for, to say, here's the part you can't do, you can't operate, you can't incorporate practices that are proven not to work. And so, living in corporate land, in a private sector setting, I'm really sensitive to the separation of federation and states. And as a corporate, I never wanted to be the four-letter word is corporate. I'm going to come in and help you. And for big systems, it's important to have certain things be true across. And the key is to come up with those certain things are true that keep decision making still at the local level, which is where those closest to the kids are going to know best. And I love, that's what I've always appreciated about MTSS is it's an operating system. And so as we go from the, here's the methodology to fund, here's the accountability system to measure, to then as a state approach it by saying, and we've got an operating system in the middle to get us from A to B makes a lot of sense. So my inclination would be to say, yes, let's adopt recommendation

number one and put it in all caps and exclamation points. I mean, I recognize that it's been 12 years of building support and building demand, and we've got good demand in us. Some that are in the waiting room trying to get in, but some point we just have to do it because the continuity and consistency becomes really important as a state. And we have a statewide focus. Ours is a statewide mission. And so, yeah, I'm not a lawmaker, but I would be inclined to make a very enthusiastic and strong recommendation to the state because I think it's a wise way to manage and be accountable for the investment.

**Chair Hobbs:** Punam, that sounded like a pre-motion to me.

**Punam Mathur:** Great. Because I was a little concerned it was just verbal diarrhea. So I'm glad [indiscernible].

**Paul Johnson:** Chair Hobbs.

**Chair Hobbs:** Yes.

**Paul Johnson:** Yeah. Waved my hand. I haven't been an effective method, so I figured I just shout out. So, I had questions. I have no problem supporting this. I think it's great. But support requires financial commitment and I'm trying to understand where the financial commitment will come from. For example, we have a recommendation that we as a commission think that we should adequately fund and staff NDE and part of that increase in funding for adequacy is that where the money would come from to support the system of MTSS? Are we talking about creating a categorical funding outside of PCFP and the State education fund to support this or is this simply just a message to NDE that in the state of Nevada that this is a great concept, we want to figure out how to finance this?

**Chair Hobbs:** Paul, Megan could certainly -- correct me here, but I believe, I think a couple of your points are probably on point. I think it would probably be additional funding to NDE as a central source to coordinate. Megan could correct me there because during the course of the dialogue, we heard about it potentially being funded through the people centered funding plan, which takes it down to the district level. But I think the most straightforward way it would be for additional funding and at the NDE level to coordinate the program. In any regard, we do know that it does cost more money. And I think that's the genesis of your question. And I suppose it depends on the type of recommendation that comes from this commission on one end, the recommendation could be that the legislature continue to support the implementation of MTSS, being silent to the funding part of it and support the implementation along with additional funding. And I think either one of those sends a message of support for MTSS. It depends on how specific -- you saw that list of recommendations, one or two of those had direct relationship to funding. And when Punam was going through it, she emphasized recommendation number one, which was more generic, support the enhancement and wider spread application of MTSS. So, we can go in either direction.

**Paul Johnson:** Yeah, thanks, Member Hobbs, Chair Hobbs. Member Johnson for the record. So, the cycle of intermittent professional development that was described earlier, I think was a system of inconsistent funding and targeted funding through the federal government that sometimes meets our objectives, sometimes does not. So I certainly agree that more stable source of funding is essential to rolling this out and making it a systemic part of the way that we do business. So, in addition to supporting the concept, I think that has to be tied with some sort of sustainable funds. Identifying this as a separate appropriation is subject to the same reauthorization, and sometimes we may not have a type of thing, so I don't have a solution for that. But just make sure that there's awareness that if we carve this out as a separate pot of money, it's still subject to that reauthorization. And if it's not reauthorized, then what?

**Chair Hobbs:** Paul, I think you hit on some workable words there, right? That the commission recommends

the continuation, and further application of MTSS on a statewide basis for all of the reasons that have been identified during the course of the presentation. And along with that, consider identifying a stable and ongoing source of funding. Now that isn't specific as to where the funding comes from, but it does make note of the fact that it should be consistent and stable. You know, much like Dr. Greenwald correctly mentioned that competitive grant funding is not a forever thing. Appropriations aren't necessarily a forever thing. I have the right. And so, the word stable and ongoing, I think speaks louder than just saying bank funding.

**Megan Peterson:** Chair, Megan Peterson, if I could provide some information. So this, I think would fall within the parameters of the commission in terms of providing guidance to school districts in the department and the implementation of the people centered funding plan. So the commission can make a recommendation, obviously, to school districts in this charter schools to make this part of the standing practice and incorporate it as part of the way that we apply Pupil-Centered Funding plan dollars, i.e. like the adjusted base going to tier one support services, and then the weighted funding's going for tier two and tier three. But then separately in terms of making sure that there is funding aside for the professional development and the training for districts and the department to be able to support and implement this, that would look like a separate appropriation that would be subject to each biennium being funded. we do need to definitely address and acknowledge the fact that the Department of Education is not currently staffed to be able to support this kind of implementation as well. So I would suggest that it would be a recommendation from the commission, not only to the governor, but the legislature in terms of here are the provisions that we needed to see put in place in order to help with the implementation of the Pupil-Centered Funding thing.

**Chair Hobbs:** Other comments or is anyone ready to take a stab at a motion? Dave, is that you?

**Dr. David Jensen:** Yeah, Member Jensen, for the record. I apologize. I am trying to find the document that NAS submitted to the commission. I found the summary sheet that the NAS recommended a component of supporting MTSS when we looked at the overall recommendations under what was our recommendation, number three, improve needed supports for students and families. And MTSS as I'm going through here, was embedded in those conversations. And then, if you recall, we had a price analysis, really a cost analysis of what each of those components we would require in our, and that's the document I can't find, but I'm going to keep digging and finding it. But I guess my point is, NASA is in support of the overall -- anything we can do to support our students and families, MTSS being a component of it, as Member Johnson was talking, it would need to be an additional appropriation for us to support it rather than a reduction of existing revenues. But with that being stated, you would have the support of the mass group in moving forward on this recommendation.

**Christy McGill:** This is Christy McGill [indiscernible] sorry for the interruption. Sorry. We got a heck of a lag going on. So, I want you guys also -- I didn't talk much about it today, but I can come back. One of the things that NTSS does well for the districts, it sets them up with the ability for those tier three supports to build Medicaid. And so, we have been making some slow progress in that. And again, it depends on the district. So clearly Clark County is going to benefit from billing Medicaid more than any other district because of their sheer size and then also for the amount of students they have that qualify for Medicaid. So what that means is that in the case of Clark County, they can stop using their people centered funding funds for tier three. And when the criteria is met, they can start billing for Medicaid in order to support the tier three services. We did just get a grant to help the districts develop their Medicaid system. It was announced yesterday; it was one of the few that were funded in the country. And Nevada Medicaid has just gone out to each one of the districts to help set up that system as well. So, again, that's a little bit of a rabbit hole, but I did want to let you know that MTSS is also that foundation of which then districts can turn around and start billing for their Tier 3 services.

**Chair Hobbs:** I appreciate the additional information.

**Punam Mathur:** I have a question. So if I'm understanding the construct of the formula's waterfall from the

state education fund, a very early layer is NDE. So, we fund and this to me seems so fundamental and critical. The only way to make it completely sustainable and reliable is put it into the waterfall. And so, if Dr. Greenwald says it's 3 million for the technical support that the state would've to come with the properly supportive information, I'm also mindful that for a district to do it well, as Washoe has, they've made their own investments and they've found ways to make those investments. And Medicaid is another pathway that could become a pretty viable one for them. We are putting a bucket of money into education. We that for 3 million at the top of the waterfall to make sure that all of the practices have fidelity and empirical evidence seems like a really small investment to protect the corpus of the whole. So I don't know if there's recommendation you can make to say fund MDE and UNR center norms where the technical [indiscernible].

**Chair Hobbs:** Let me go ahead and try to begin to fashion a motion that you can then modify, pick apart, whatever you want to do. The first part of the motion would be the Commission on Education funding supports the continued implementation of MTSS and wider application of the MTSS process throughout the state education system. Are we good with that part? Okay. And we could either do these separately or together. The second part would be that the state identify stable and ongoing sources of funding to ensure the continued operation of the system. Now, I don't know that we have to go further than that and tell the state how to fund it, but certainly offer encouragement to continue to fund it, whether that's done as appropriation to NDE or in some other manner. I don't know that we have to prescribe that part. That's why I made it more general. Paul?

**Paul Johnson:** Yes, thank you, Chair Hobbs. Member Paul Johnson for the record. Yeah, I had put down something very similar to that. And then the only other pieces that I would add to that would be to address Megan's concern is that the investment include adequate the funding and staffing at the NDE level fully support the MTSS.

**Chair Hobbs:** And in the fashioning of the motion. I'd be happy to add that to the end of that motion.

**Paul Johnson:** So you're completing a member --

**Chair Hobbs:** I guess I motion.

**Paul Johnson:** Or are you making that motion?

**Chair Hobbs:** Well, I guess the first thing I need to check with Greg is whether or not I'm allowed to make a motion. Because I think I kind of just did. I believe I'm able to make a motion, but if somebody would like to restate the motion that was made, that's fine too.

**Paul Johnson:** [Indiscernible] So I think the concept was to support the MTSS including a consistent ongoing or stable financial system of support and adequate system and support staffing for MVPNE to support operationalizing TSF on a statewide basis.

**Chair Hobbs:** That sounds close enough to me.

**Joyce Woodhouse:** This is Member Woodhouse and I would second the motion.

**Chair Hobbs:** Is there additional discussion on that motion? I see Punam and I heard a yes. Or did I hear the yes?

**Punam Mathur:** Let's go to yes first.

**Chair Hobbs:** Mark, was that either you or Kyle?

**Mark Mathers:** Yeah, sorry, Chair Hobbs. It's Mark. I certainly don't have any opposition to the motion, but I guess it feels a little odd in that we're very narrowly making a recommendation on a specific kind of program. And I go back to one of the first slides where we talked about the need for mental health supports. And so, MTSS is part of that, but not all of that, right? And so, we who work in school districts know how critical additional mental health support funding is given what we're seeing at our schools. So I just, I guess I want to make the point that, again, I'm not opposed to the motion at all, but there's a broader, more significant issue here of adequately funding mental health supports for K through 12. And going back to Dr. Jensen's point, I think at NAS and the CFO's quantified the needs of school districts in many, many areas including mental health supports. And so, I just don't want to lose sight of the fact that there's a far greater need here than \$3 million for NDE to continue to get PSS training. I guess I just want to make that point that it's great even when we talk about MTSS to fund NEE, but it takes positions at school districts to implement, right? So in our general fund, last fiscal school year, we fund, our costs were 800,000. But I'm sure that if I asked our MTSS coordinator, they would tell me that that's just a start or that's not nearly enough even for Washoe. So we're talking about millions of dollars of funding for MTSS personnel at school districts on top of the 3 million train and coordinate. And so, there is a bigger price tag doing this effectively, and I just don't want to lose sight of that. And I don't know if that's a -- you can make a friendly agreement into the motion or something to acknowledge that, but again, I'm supportive of the motion, but there's a far bigger issue here. Thanks.

**Chair Hobbs:** Mark, back to your point. When I was suggesting support for continued implementation, I was mindful of the fact that continued implementation does not have specific time context to it. And that would largely be because there are fiscal constraints, whether they be centrally for MTSS at the state level or at the district level. So I don't know if that's enough to assuage your concerns, but I think you raise an important point that those are not all of the costs associated within those decisions would have to be made locally. So if there are no other comments, we have the motion and I would ask for those that are in favor of the motion to signify by saying aye.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chair Hobbs:** Any opposed? Any abstain? That motion passes and we, again, thank all of you, all of the doctors and other experts that have appeared before us today. And for all the good work that you have been doing and continue, good luck with everything that you do. That brings us to -- let me find my place here. Item number six. And this brings us back to a discussion we had last week with regard to pupil centered funding plans, attendance area adjustment. And I'll remind the commission too that pursuant to NRS 387.12463(e), the commission shall review and make recommendations to revise cost adjustment factors and the method for calculating the attendance area adjustments. So this is one that we're dealing with that is a more specific deliverable that was requested of us by the legislature. And we have with us again today and we're happy to have you here. Amanda and Justin, are you here as well?

**Amanda Brown:** We're both here.

**Chair Hobbs:** Awesome. So I'm going to turn it over to you for your presentation and comments.

**Amanda Brown:** Great. Let me just get the screen share working and give one second. Looks like it'll actually be easier if I open it as a Chrome tab instead of a PowerPoint.

**Chair Hobbs:** As long as Paul approves your method of opening, we're good.

**Amanda Brown:** Paul, is that okay? Am I doing it right? Okay, I'm going to share the screen. Okay. Can everyone see this?

**Paul Johnson:** I'm assuming? Yes.

**Amanda Brown:** Okay, good. Alright. Okay. Amanda Brown for the record. So this is a follow up presentation to last week. So it hasn't been very long since we were just touching on this. And I apologize, I can't see your faces when I'm doing the presentation, so if there's any questions just kind of verbally let me know, and that'd be great. So I want to just give a quick recap of the draft criteria that we moved forward with last meeting. Some updates on the district feedback process that we've been doing, and our final recommendations of, I think where we should go from here. So the draft criteria that we talked about last week was to set the definition first being based on attendance areas needing to be separated by more than 20 miles from another attendance area. With the second criteria that if they are less than 20 miles from another attendance area, the attendance area must be more than a 30-minute drive away from a district center central office. This in part to capture, two places may look very close to each other, but because there's no road, the day's much longer to get there. And then the third criteria that we put forward was that if an attendance area was both less than 20 miles away from another attendance area and less than a 30-minute drive, that there needed the extenuating circumstances that necessitated a separate attendance area and have that be kind of subject to approval. So this is where the idea of kind of review process allowing for that feedback from districts to demonstrate why it makes sense that the attendance area is separate. So, our next step coming out of last week's meeting with that draft definition, we identified the list of attendance areas that were under review being based on meeting both those first criteria. So they were both within a 20-mile radius and their attendance area and within a 30-minute drive up their district's main office, to determine if they should be considered separate attendance areas for funding purposes. And I want to just emphasize that we were not saying that they should not be operated or the school shouldn't exist there, but that you would not as a system fund them separately. And then we shared that list with districts to gather feedback and identify any extenuating circumstances. So we have received a good amount of feedback over the last several days with both clarifying questions on the methodology and then feedback on what circumstances are happening in their communities. So I'm just trying to quickly capture the main themes of the feedback we heard. First often came up was road related issues, including areas only connected by a single road, road congestion or traffic extending estimated commute times. Cost pressures faced in certain communities that require their costs to be higher, such as utilities, staffing difficulties in certain more remote settings. Transportation issues, which all a caveat transportation is setting separately. But what was also emphasized is that in having two communities required having a dedicated [indiscernible] so you might have greater centralized costs outside of just the, the actual busing of students and then potential fiscal impact. So concern about the ability to continue to operate individual schools and more remote communities historically had their own schools. So, in some what we heard that there does appear to be extenuating circumstances in a number of tenants areas that likely necessity that being kept separate for funding purposes. So we're seeing that from about half of districts that we've heard back from so far. But what we recommend is to move this forward and so the commission can close this work out is instead of the commission evaluating each individual attendance area, NDE should establish a review appeals process for districts. So they should be talking about that third bucket of, where we think there needs to be some exemption to the kind of first two criteria for extenuating circumstances. And we think those really need to be related to attendance areas being remote or necessarily small. If we go back and think about the district size adjustment that we started with and then applying it to attendance areas, what we were trying to accomplish was both addressing district size and then the higher cost pressures faced by kind of what we call necessarily small schools or settings. So any exemptions really should be in line with that kind of theory of action or purpose behind the adjustment. And then finally, we would just recommend that attendance areas be reviewed probably at least every other biennium, knowing that circumstances can change as we've seen communities that used to be very separate from each other, have developed over time and really became one continuous area where it wouldn't make sense to fund them separately because they're no longer needed. So, we would recommend that you keep that process ongoing. I'm going to stop sharing so I can see your faces. Any questions? Joyce, I saw you raise your hand.

**Chair Hobbs:** So essentially, the criteria that we reviewed this past week, and I think we generally accepted that criteria.

**Amanda Brown:** Correct.

**Chair Hobbs:** What you've added to that is an appeal process every other biennium whereby those that may have some extenuating circumstances can appeal to NDE for different treatment than the criteria would otherwise dictate, right?

**Amanda Brown:** Correct.

**Chair Hobbs:** And that certainly seems to be sensible given the comments that, that you received back, that there be some appeal process. And NDE is probably the most sensible place to have that. And NDE is probably the most sensible body to develop whatever those criteria are. But given the examples of what you brought up, that would certainly give a NDEA basis for those types of things that may qualify for any exemption from the criteria. That's kind of what I got out of it. So with that, I'll see if there are any other questions or comments. Joyce?

**Joyce Woodhouse:** Thank you. Member Woodhouse for the record. [Indiscernible] actually very eloquently stated what I intended to speak to. But I want to thank you both, everyone who worked on this for reaching back out to the school districts regarding the attendance area, because when working group number one did our listening sessions, this was one of the issues that came up. I appreciate all of this work that's been done, and I think it's really important that we honor the spirit of the definition for the attendance areas, but I also know that there are extenuating circumstances at various times. So, the recommendations that you brought forward today, I strongly support. I think it's necessary for us to review these and allow school districts to come forward to the NDE through the waiver process. Let's see. I think in here, we talked about review and appeal to me to be the same thing. So that, would really strongly support the recommendations that are brought forth today because I think it still honors the definition with fidelity and appreciate all the work being done. So no questions. It's just kind of my statement of where I'm at because we started talking about this a long time ago.

**Amanda Brown:** Thank you very much.

**Chair Hobbs:** Thank you very much, Joyce. See how the comments go because it seemed like you might have been also framing out the beginnings of a motion well.

**Mark Mathers:** Chair Hobbs.

**Chair Hobbs:** Yes.

**Mark Mathers:** So thanks Amanda for your work here and I generally am supportive of the recommendation. One of my questions though, maybe it's specific to Marcia, but maybe it's applicable to Clark, is that we have arena sparks area and then, you know, as kind of one of my comments kind of alluded to, there's this sprawl up or down the 3 95 freeway. So we've got kind of the core Reno Sparks area, then we had an attendance zone that was kind of up north 395 freeway. Then there's another attendance zone a little further north on the 395 freeway, right? And it goes and goes and goes. And my question or concern is just that they're each within 20 miles of each other. But if you are, it's a chain of different attendance areas, if you will. And at the end of the chain near the California border, you are really, really far away from Reno Sparks. But if your definition is just 20 miles within an attendance zone, right? You've got these serial attendance zones going north up to 3 95. And so, again, I appreciate the wafer process, but I'd kind of want to put it on the record that okay, you could be within 20 miles of an attendance zone, but by the time you get to the end of the chain, you're so far up north,

right? And as my comments indicated, we have a real challenge finding people to even staff that those schools up there. So I don't know if there's any tweak to the criteria to actually acknowledge that situation or if it's just better served by the waiver process. But I would want to make sure that I state here that you could technically fit the that you're within 20 miles of an attendance zone, but you get what I'm saying. You could still be at the end of the day, 30 miles away from Reno Sparks proper.

**Amanda Brown:** Amanda Brown for the record, mark, I think that's great question. And why we attended to add that second criteria of that distance from your central office. Because we park up worried just to your point of creating chains. So you may be within 20 miles of an under attendance area, but you're both with 50 minutes away from your central office. So, we added that second criteria to avoid that idea. We're just looking at attendance areas. I think if we had only left it at the first criteria, the 20-mile radius, we would end up in that exact situation where we could have remote communities that happen to be near each other, but far away from their central office. So I think by having the 30 minutes that kind of travel time criteria, we're avoiding just linking teams, which I think fits the broader criteria. But then they'll still leave me for that waiver process for those circumstances when that farthest away community is right on that tipping point of the 30-minute drive. And I think that's where the waiver process kind of comes in. But we were hoping to avoid that we had just linked attendance areas and not funded them because they happened to be close to another. We also wanted to make sure they were a reasonable drive away from their central office and we tried to pay a threshold that also felt true to having communities that were larger metro areas that could have that amount of drive time even within their district. So we tried to strike that balance, but Mark, I'm curious to hear more.

**Mark Mathers:** Yeah, no, I appreciate that. You make a great point. And I made a point in my comment that, I mean, you got to set criteria and it's never going to fit all situations, right? And so, I made the point of, it may be even barely inside 30 minutes to the central office in Reno, but that doesn't mean that's where people in Reno actually live, right? They are even further away from the central office area. So when you look at where people live and how to get up to that last area that borders California, right? It is more than 30 minutes. And I just hope that NDE considers factors like that of where actually people live versus just where our admin building is located. But I appreciate it all the considerations and thought you put into it. I really do and I'm supportive, so thank you.

**Chair Hobbs:** Dusty had his hand raised as well.

**Dusty Casey:** Thank you, Chair. Member Casey for the record. Thank you very much for this presentation. Just a technical question, I apologize if I missed this last week, but how are the boundaries of an attendance area determined? And is that 20 miles boundary to boundary or is it like the center? Is it just a radius, formula? How is that determined?

**Amanda Brown:** Amanda Brown for the record, thank you for that question. It's a good question. The attendance varies as far as we could tell, did not have particular boundaries to them. So when you see that first criteria, it tends to be kind of center point to center point because the attendance areas tend to be a town with some exceptions that are individual school. So that one is center point to center point to establish the 20 miles. For the 30-mile radius we did the address of the central office and then what appeared to be the furthest out school within an attendance area. So that is how we determined that travel time was kind of what was the max travel time in an attendance area from a district central office to the farthest school in an attendance area.

**Dusty Casey:** Okay. Thank you.

**Chair Hobbs:** And I'm looking around at my little tiny screen here. So Joyce, back to you. You came close to making a motion. I don't know that we've been all the way through with that.



**Joyce Woodhouse:** Yes. Member Woodhouse for record. I'll try to make this motion. In starting out, I would suggest that the committee, in addition to the recommendations made earlier on the attendance area, that we further address the attendance area with the extenuating circumstances particularly that each individual attendance area that the NDE would establish a review and appeals process for districts. And that particularly would address remote or necessarily small situations. And this could be reviewed or should be reviewed every other by any, to see if any circumstances have changed. I'm kind of pulling from the list. But always that we are honoring the spirit of the definition of attendance areas. So that is my motion.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. We have a motion. Is there a second on that motion?

**Mark Mathers:** I think Dusty might have a question.

**Chair Hobbs:** Oh, I'm sorry, Dusty. Since we're in the process of a motion, let get a second on the motion and then we'll go to discussion. I have a second on the motion from Paul Johnson. So we have a motion and a second now we go to discussion. So, dusty, you're up.

**Dusty Casey:** Thank you, Chair Hobbs, Member Casey for the record, and I apologize. And I'm in support of this in general. I am a little concerned with the idea of a way to appeal, and how NDE might handle that process because every circumstance is extremely different. But Mark, I think made a great point, what sprawl versus what -- all the circumstances could be very different and become a very subjective process. And at the end of the day, if a new attendance zone is created, for example, and an area gets an adjustment, that money has to come from somewhere. So it's going to affect -- it could essentially affect everyone across the state. So I'm a little hesitant as far as having this big gray area because I think everything would eventually fall into it. I mean, I think everybody could say, well, this attendance area should be considered or this, for whatever reason. And it could become -- everything turns into an appeal or for an extenuating circumstance. I'm curious if NDE has any thoughts preliminarily how they might [indiscernible].

**Chair Hobbs:** Well, Dusty, I thought about that a little bit and I didn't want to over complicate by adding to Joyce's motion. But what I would strongly suggest that MDE and I would think that this is something that should be done probably around the same time that we finish our work. If MDE would have an opportunity perhaps with APAs assistance to share with each of the districts the type of criteria that they would recommend for use in adjudicating any requests for waivers or exemptions and workshop, that way in advance so it's not a black hole with anybody that is applying and it doesn't seem to be arbitrary. I think that's the concern. If I was making an appeal, yes, I would want to know what the criteria was going to be because I would also like to know in advance whether or not my appeal fits within that criteria. So, we can make that suggestion. I don't know that we need to add that to the motion to suggest that to MDE unless you all feel otherwise.

**Megan Peterson:** Chair Hobbs, Megan.

**Chair Hobbs:** Is that something you could concur with?

**Megan Peterson:** Megan Peterson for the record. Yes. I would be very much in support of a methodology like that that is well defined and understood so that there is not room for question or arbitrary decisions.

**Chair Hobbs:** Perfect. Thank you. So we have a motion and a second is there additional discussion? If not, signify your support for the motion by saying aye.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chair Hobbs:** Opposed? Abstain? Motion passes. Thank you. Thank you, Amanda and Justin. I really

appreciate your work on that one. We've checked another one off. That's great. Moving to item number seven, discussion, possible action regarding work group reports. And we're focusing now on work in groups three, four, and five. And my understanding, Paul, is that you're the spokesperson for the combined effort. Is that correct? Or was Jensen presented separately?

**Paul Johnson:** I didn't see Jensen on the line [indiscernible].

**Chair Hobbs:** Well, at the very beginning of the meeting when we went through roll call Jason I believe may have been on the phone. There he is.

**Paul Johnson:** Jason, you want to tee off the section?

**Jason Goudie:** Sure. So, for group three, we actually just had a meeting yesterday including Amanda and Kelsey, and I believe Amanda has a few slides that she's going to share just to kind of summarize where we are. So I'm going to turn it over to her.

**Chair Hobbs:** Whenever you're ready, Amanda.

**Amanda Brown:** Okay, we have -- I think slides on each of these work groups in the next agenda item presentation. Would you like to do the slides now or wait till then?

**Chair Hobbs:** Well, I'll tell you what, this is a good example for why it's good to have a flexible agenda. So if most of that is going to be covered under the next agenda item number eight, which let me introduce that one. That's update on reporting requirements and potential categories for new reporting framework. And that is another one that is a specific deliverable that's been assigned to us. So making sure I'm not violating any rules of order, Greg, are we able to take the discussion under agenda item number seven of those working groups? And agenda item number eight, concurrently, currently? There will be no action on agenda item number seven. There may be on number eight. So it would just simply be discussion with regard to agenda item number seven. Is Greg with us? So nobody telling me that that's a crazy time. Let's go ahead and proceed. Yes.

**Mark Mathers:** I think we could probably just wrap up seven quickly. What I can say, you know, I don't really have any additional comments or updates other than what one said later. And Paul could probably do the same thing.

**Chair Hobbs:** That's perfectly fine with the flexible agenda. We'll leave item number seven. We could return to it if there is a reason to, and we'll migrate to agenda item number eight. How's that? So Amanda, it's you.

**Amanda Brown:** Great, thank you Kelsey, I believe you were going to do the share. Back in here.

**Chair Hobbs:** Kelsey, I'm sorry if I misread my notes here. Welcome once again.

**Amanda Brown:** Sorry, technical difficulty to get it started here.

**Paul Johnson:** Chair Hobbs, I can stall for time if you need.

**Chair Hobbs:** Go for it, Paul.

**Paul Johnson:** I would just like to thank the commission and whoever's responsible for this format for the excellent flashback to the pandemic. Great time for me. I really appreciate this. So, thank you.

**Chair Hobbs:** I just hope since we are waiting another minute or two for someone to come up on the screen, that everyone that's participated in probably, I don't know, triple figures of virtual meetings has taken notes on those moments during virtual meetings that should be put on YouTube as a highlight reel. Things that people did not intend to say or did not intend to have seen behind them. I know I have about a dozen that are going to be treasures forever in my memory banks.

**Amanda Brown:** Chair Hobbs, it looks like I'm going to try to share and I am right there with you. I've even had recent examples where I've thoroughly embarrassed myself with technology. So keeping it going. I'm going to try to share now.

**Chair Hobbs:** I think my favorite one while we're stretching is, it was a rather small group. I won't mention the group or the association, but one of the gentlemen was on call. Didn't mute himself and was yelling at his wife to not burn the noodles this time.

**Amanda Brown:** Oh, great.

**Chair Hobbs:** It was a great moment.

**Amanda Brown:** Alright. So can everyone see the slides? Yes, thumbs up perhaps. So Kelsey, I'll let you go ahead and get started and just tell me when to advance.

**Kelsey Krausan:** Okay. And I think it's still showing on your desktop rather than the actual slideshow, but this works for now. But thank you all again. This is Kelsey Krausan from WestEd for the record. Great to see you all again. We are excited to be presenting more detailed information about to inform potential recommendations around existing reporting requirements and some opportunities for streamlining those. And also for operationalizing the metrics that were outlined in AB 400 and SB 98. So, in order to keep you all engaged, we're going to have a mix of different presenters here and hope, of course, Member Johnson and Mathur and Member Goudie and others who have been deeply involved in this work through the work groups and will also contribute to the discussion as well. So with that, I think we'll jump right in. There's our agenda, which I already discussed, and I'm going to kick it over to Amanda for the reporting requirements.

**Amanda Brown:** Alright, thank you. And Justin is going to be our great navigator. I think we finally landed on being able to share the presentation. So for this first bucket, we'd like to talk about the work we've been doing with Work Group 3 on talking about current reporting and identifying any potential areas where there's duplicative, redundant, or maybe no longer necessary reporting requirements. So we're going to review the reports that have been identified by districts through our feedback process we've gone through. And then our initial, perhaps make some initial recommendations, the commission making initial recommendations on areas to streamline or eliminate. So, next slide please. So, just a little recap of how we got here. Work Group 3 with a lot of support from the wonderful staff at CCSD created an initial master spreadsheet of all the reporting requirements that are out there, um, for districts in the state, and then shared that spreadsheet with districts. And one of the ask of districts was to look at the list of reports, and we did a particular focus on reports that were required by the state and in areas related to the commission's charge. So accountability, student related data, staff data and finance to identify reports that they thought, again, were either no longer necessary, were redundant or duplicative, or potentially had another source for the same data. So what we're going to share today is our initial list. The review is still underway, but this is where we are now. And we'll be identifying reports that at least three districts have considered to be duplicated, redundant, or no longer needed. And then potential recommendations that we're hoping to have a good conversation on today for addressing these reports are to either eliminate redundant or unnecessary reporting requirements. So either this could include suggesting that you leverage other data that's available from another report or another source, or again, just eliminating reports that the data coming out of them is no longer perhaps beneficial or as beneficial it could be. Then

streamlining reports by, you could modify similar reports to collect data in a way that will meet the requirements of both reporting requirements. Consider a database, perhaps like Infinite campus could be leveraged to pull data directly versus district submitting reports or data, and then reducing frequency of reporting. So, some of those will come up as we talk about different reports and we're going to talk about them in blocks. So next slide please or just in fact. The first block is easing accountability reporting. And there's specific reports in here, but it was really broadly around the reporting that's needed to meet that ING accountability requirements. So district feedback that we heard was concerned about the alignment and overlap between accountability framework, the NSPF, the report card, and how to prioritize what they're being asked to do and what's being measured. That these reports are redundant to data collected elsewhere or across reports that rules and guidance are unclear or changing as these requirements are being put in place. Recognizing, again, ING accountability is a new reporting requirement, and that one in particular, the district performance plan is time intensive to complete. So some considerations and potential recommendations in this area is first to note that this accountability reporting is intended to be temporary. It was also intended to collect information that was already collected in the states. That wasn't any new pieces of information, but trying to leverage what was there. Some potential considerations are recommendations [indiscernible] reporting report annually. And considering if other reporting could be leveraged or compiled and complete instead of a new data collection. So while the data elements themselves are reported elsewhere, my understanding is that's still a new report or a new series of reports that districts have to submit to the department to meet these requirements. So that is our first block, and I was thinking we could take pauses along the way to discuss and if there's any recommendations that we do them as these blocks versus individual items.

**Chair Hobbs:** That makes sense, Amanda. Comments, questions? Not knowing the format that you're going to be using to go through these, Amanda, is there a recommendation associated with each one of these?

**Amanda Brown:** Chair Hobbs, yes. Amanda, for the record. There is a recommendation for each one of these. So, the recommendation for that using accountability reporting is twofold, is to reduce the frequency of reporting from quarterly to annually. And this will come up in later presentations. That data is actually really only new once a year. So otherwise you're just reporting the same data. And then the second one is a recommendation to see if there's a way, perhaps at the state level to compile data that's already available from other reports that are already submitted by districts versus it being a new data request. And that may be more [indiscernible] because I imagine it would need working within to determine they have the capacity or ability to.

**Chair Hobbs:** Yeah. Along those lines, Amanda, the first recommendation seems very specific from quarterly to annually. That's very clear. The second one, is that more aspirational or as you say, exploratory?

**Amanda Brown:** Amanda for the record. Yeah, I'd go with exploratory because I think it needs to be run past indeed to confirm that's possible and they have the capacity to do that.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. So as we go through these, I think we should all be bearing in mind that if we're going to take an action, we could either choose to do it on individual items as we go through, or try to remember when we get toward the end, what all of those pieces and parts should be. For example, if, if there is concurrence with making a recommendation that the frequency of reporting be changed from quarterly to annually, perhaps that's something we could talk about and deal with directly here. Although I think there's another element of that. And you all probably know it far better than I do. To the annually part of it, annually when?

**Amanda Brown:** Amanda Brown for the record. Great question. And Kelsey actually has a recommendation in later slides about the timing of when. Data could be collected to meet the 8,400 requirements. So I imagine similar timing would be appropriate for using accountability. Kelsey, could you speak to that?

**Kelsey Krausan:** Yeah, I think that's the case, but since we didn't look at it specifically, I think it would be

important maybe just to adopt the last, whatever the final reporting quarter is as required under Acing Accountability to be the annual reporting date might make sense given the work that's already been done by the governor's office and others to set parameters [indiscernible].

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. So this recommendation is specific to Acing Accountability. That's the way I'm reading it. Now there's a specific recommendation, again, to migrate from quarterly to annually, and I think that has a lot to do with, quarterly is generally infeasible, right? Plus the workload. I mean, I don't know if we've met every quarterly requirement so far. I don't happen to know that. So it's something that -- go ahead, please.

**Dr. David Jensen:** Member Jensen, for the record. And first I want to indicate speaking for a school district, I am an absolute support of this recommendation. I guess my question, maybe this is directed to NDE is understanding that this was a direction from the governor, the Acing Accountability requirement. Do we have a preliminary feel? And again, this should not be the basis for either supporting or not supporting it. Are we going to have any conflict with the governor's office with this recommendation if we move forward with it?

**Chair Hobbs:** Megan, are you able to comment on that?

**Amanda Brown:** Deputy superintendent Megan Peterson, for the record. I have Deputy superintendent Anne-Marie Dixon with me. I'm going to let her speak to it a little bit first, and then I'll add any additional clarifications needed.

**Anne-Marie Dixon:** Perfect. Deputy Superintendent Anne-Marie Dixon the record. A lot of the indicators we do not collect multiple times a year, so we do not foresee an issue with that.

**Megan Peterson:** And Megan Peterson, for the record. Ideally what we're envisioning is that the reporting that's required under AB 400 would not interact or impact with the ability for the acing accountability to be reported on. We do see them as separate and distinct actions. And so, by recommending the report from AB 400, move from quarterly to annual would not interact with that deliverable to the governor's office.

**Chair Hobbs:** Dave, does that satisfy your question?

**Dr. David Jensen:** Yes, I greatly appreciate that.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. To Paul.

**Paul Johnson:** Thanks Chair Hobbs, I appreciate that. And just a question. One of the concerns that has been mentioned, and I brought up several times, is the development of separate and distinct reporting and accountability systems. I don't know if part of the recommendation should be that we avoid that, that we have one system of measurement, not multiple systems of measurement. I think we've talked about that before, but I don't know if that would be part of this recommendation.

**Chair Hobbs:** Yeah. To your point, Paul. Let me go back to Amanda and Kelsey. Is that a point that will be addressed further down the road in this presentation?

**Amanda Brown:** Yes, in the later conversation call.

**Chair Hobbs:** So, I think what we're dealing with here, and again, it's the commission's pleasure. Do we want to take actions on recommendations that we agree with as we see them, or wait until the end and try to recompile all those into the single motion thoughts?

**Dr. David Jensen:** I think that we would do them individually because if we don't agree on one and trying to accumulate all the ones we did agree upon, seems were challenging to me. And since we're here, I would think that we would move forward. So, I'll make a motion to accept the recommendation to reduce the frequency of reporting related to Acing Accountability from quarterly to annually. And additionally to explore if other reporting can be leveraged and compiled to complete the data instead of new data collection.

**Unidentified Speaker:** I'll second that motion.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. We have a motion. Is there a second on that motion?

**Punam Mathur:** Member Mathur, second the motion.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay, we have a motion and a second. Additional questions, comments. Hearing none, signify your support by saying aye.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chair Hobbs:** Opposed? Abstain? Okay, that passes. Thank you, Jason. Amanda, you can --

**Amanda Brown:** Thank you all. Next slide. Justin. Oh, back up. There you go. It's a very sensitive ancient slide. So the next area is class size reporting. So there's a number of reports in this area, and I bucket it under class size, but I apologize. It also includes people ratios, which is slightly different metric than class size, but those reports include the pupil ratios report, NRS, which is the NRS 388.890. So for the work group, I did confirm that this is a separate report than the personnel report, which is the next one, which is the NRS 387, one, two, four, six eight. We like to call this one a two, four, six eight. Who do you appreciate report? Then there is also quarterly class size reduction report and waivers that districts have to submit an annual class size reduction plan of how they're going to get to the required or the recommended class size ratios and or how they're minimizing the impacts that they're not. And then, within the report card submissions is student teacher ratios. So feedback in this area was to note that these report collects similar information, class size or ratio. The quarterly reporting on class size reduction and waiver requests is particularly burdensome, and the class size reduction plan was not meaningful. And so, these are again, the plans where districts have to indicate why they are or not meeting the targeted class size ratio, request a waiver and then have a plan or a reason why they're not able to meet them. And so, within this area, our suggestion is to consider eliminating class size reduction plan and quarterly reporting requirements. So that would be what the suggestion was to what to get rid of is the pieces related to class size reduction. And then, explore streamlining reporting requirements for other reports. So could provide the need of data and class size and ratios annually. So I'd say there's an action to take now and one to continue to explore because it could require modifying the reporting requirements or the format of the reports to be able to have an individual report, like the personnel report, certain multiple functions or the report card submissions to say, take the place of the people reach your vote request. So those are the recommendations and [indiscernible].

**Chair Hobbs:** Thank you very much, Amanda. As I read the recommendation and this is probably something that I just don't know as well as, as many of you when I read the words, consider eliminating class size reduction plan. Joyce, if you could maybe help me out here a little bit, is there a lot of meaning attached to that or sensitivities surrounding, maybe it's optics or something around the class size reduction plan itself?

**Joyce Woodhouse:** Joyce Woodhouse for the record. Yes, my radar started flashing when I saw this slide. I think it's appropriate for class size reporting annually, but I'm afraid of, and I don't really want to -- the language of eliminating class size reduction plan. If you just take those words, I can't support that because we have worked for so long from the 1970s forward on class size reduction plans, trying to get it in statutes so that

across the state of Nevada, we were really looking at the number one thing that teachers were telling us was their class sizes were too large. And if we don't know what those numbers are, it isn't addressed. So eliminating the class size reduction plan is, I think it's in optics with a lot of people out there in particularly K-12, it's going to create a lot of concern. So, I want to bring that to the table, and I might be reading this differently from the work group on this, but the language I see in this recommendation is the way that I understand it, and I'm afraid there's others that will too. And we may not be in concert with you. So it maybe if somebody could explain it a little more. Jason, you've worked on this a long time. If you could relate some of my fears, that would be helpful.

**Jason Goudie:** Great. Jason Goudie for the record. So, you're exactly right, Member Woodhouse. The discussion around class size and the elimination of the plan, it is not elimination of supplying the data as to class sizes because we all believe that the data, however, what happens is we know very well in the state that nobody meets class sizes. So we create this quarterly reporting requirements and a plan to where we have to talk about what we're going to do and there's nothing anybody can do, right? So I think it just becomes a redundant piece that I don't know that anybody reads the plans, but the plans aren't that valid because nobody can achieve them. And that's the piece we're looking at, like eliminating. Not the actual reporting of class sizes, but the redundant plan that essentially probably looks very similar for most districts, that we can't hire enough. There's, there's not enough nationally as well as we don't have enough money to even attract them. And if we increase it, then other states will increase it, etc. And I think Paul had some comments after mine.

**Joyce Woodhouse:** Thank you.

**Chair Hobbs:** Paul, just let me insert a question to Jason here. So would there be a way to eliminate the current quarterly reporting requirements for class size and replace those with an annual class size report? Does that get to the same thing without bumping into the optics that Joyce was expressing concern about?

**Jason Goudie:** I'm going to let Paul, because he will know more details about that piece than I do, so I'll let him respond.

**Amanda Brown:** And Paul, before you go, can I piggyback on that? I believe the personnel report also has class size information within it, so if you could speak at all to, if class size is included in one of these other reports. I thought it was, but you're an expert.

**Paul Johnson:** Well, I think you've overestimated my knowledge and expertise, but anyway, thanks for that. But just a little bit of history. So the class size reduction plan was a separate categorical fund from the state that was outside of the Pupil Centered Funding plan. And so, it made sense to track funding and the ratios at that point when that class size reduction fund rolled into the PCFP, the funding portion that went away, but the reporting never did. So it didn't make sense to have one piece of it go away and still require the other piece. So we're kind of getting rid of the other piece and yes, Amanda, to your question. There are other areas where we do report class sizes and we'll continue to report class sizes, but it's not part of this. And maybe if the piece is giving everybody heartburn is where we're saying eliminating class size reduction plan, we simply say that we consider eliminating class size, quarterly reporting requirements and drop the word plan that might, provide some level of comfort.

**Amanda Brown:** I think -- Chairman Hobbs.

**Chair Hobbs:** I think that's on point Paul, because I think the reaction was probably to the optics of seeming to abandon any concern about class size by eliminating the plan itself when what you're really aimed at is the reporting part. So, I think if that part could be reworded, we may be able to get a little bit more comfort. [indiscernible] got your hand up.

**Punam Mathur:** Yeah, a little history. Apparently, there's been an attempt in the past to try to reduce the number of quarterly reports down to twice a year and that didn't fly. So there's a history around the legislature watching this. And then just from the public's perspective, I think just really matters to people and so to know that we're reporting the class sizes, but then that there's also something that even if the report is a summary of things that are impossible to do, people or buildings, I think to not have anything would be really awkward for the public. I don't know if there's a way, and on the other side of that, it does seem silly to ask districts on a quarterly basis to submit a plan and seek a waiver. Like that just feels like a lot to go through. It's something that still keeps the focus on with the recognition that there's actually not much we can do right now, but we're not giving up.

**Chair Hobbs:** Ultimately what this group was asked to do was to look at, for lack of better term, extraneous reporting or duplicated reporting, redundant reporting, those kinds of things. And this seems to fit into that category. I think we're looking for the right words here to recognize both the sensitivities that exist with respect to the class size. You know, notwithstanding what Jason and Paul have both said. As I've looked at some of those reports over time, they don't really -- all they do is reinforce the fact that we have a target that we can't get to without additional funding. That's all they ever tell me. And the fact that you have to continually go on record to admit that you're not able to do that with the level of funding that you have, it doesn't seem to me like anybody's paid attention to that personally. So I understand the motivation to deal with the reporting side of this, and I guess if we can get, again, the right wording, maybe that will help. Paul, do you want to engage on this?

**Paul Johnson:** Yeah, actually think it could be very simple if we just eliminate the word and after plan. I think it accomplishes what we are, because we don't want to get any rid of any plans to reduce class sizes. That's a goal of adequate funding. But what we want to do is eliminate the redundant reporting that's gone along with that, and to give everybody some logistical things from a school district budgeting and staffing perspective. So in May, a month ago, we've already hired most of the people that we want for the upcoming school year. So in anticipation, whatever our student enrollment is going to be, once the school year starts, it's very difficult to hire anybody else because you're not going to be hiring people after school starts. So, adapting to any changes of staff during the school year probably isn't going to happen. So doing anything on a quarterly basis doesn't make a lot of sense. School districts aren't flexible like many businesses are where they can adopt on a monthly basis. We have an operating cycle of a year, basically. So providing information on a report on a quarterly basis to me doesn't provide any useful information.

**Chair Hobbs:** Then let's think about that as we move maybe toward a motion. I believe I saw a tiny hand go up in Carson City. Is that Kyle or Mark?

**Kyle Rodriguez:** Rodriguez. I just wanted to emphasize that annual plan is much different than the quarterly plan as well. And most districts go into the annual plan knowing we are going to fill out a waiver and nothing else is going to come from that. But we do not have funds to fund at that level, nor do we have the building space to have classrooms at the required class sizes. So I just wanted to emphasize there are two very different reports throughout the year.

**Chair Hobbs:** Let me ask this. Paul made a comment a moment ago, consider eliminating class size reduction plan, quarterly reporting requirements. He dropped the word. And I have a question and a comment. I'll make comment first. So, we're eliminating the quarterly reporting that's associated with that. I don't know the right words, but in favor of annual reporting. So it doesn't look like you're abandoning all reporting. Is that part of what my understanding was?

**Amanda Brown:** Chair Hobbs, Amanda Brown for the record. The reporting requirements are separate in that



there's a quarterly class size reduction reports and planning, and then there's an annual report. So I think you could choose to eliminate the quarterly and leave the annual as it is. But I just want to acknowledge that separate requirement.

**Chair Hobbs:** No, I appreciate that Amanda because I think that's worth adding to this. You're eliminating quarterly reporting and maintaining the annual report, right?

**Amanda Brown:** That's the direction. Our recommendation was to also eliminate the annual plan given district feedback that we heard. But the conversation of the commission sounds like it's landing on maintaining the annual plan.

**Mark Mathers:** Chair Hobbs.

**Chair Hobbs:** That's what I'm trying to determine actually through all of this.

**Mark Mathers:** Mark Mathers for the record. We're mixing two concepts. There's quarterly class size reports. Washoe school by school class sizes, and then we have to ask for a waiver, explain why we can't meet those class, the target class sizes set by the State Board of education. Those are the quarterly reports. Then there's an annual class size plan. It doesn't have school by school class size information. It says, what are you going to do to get to those target class sizes? It's a plan, not a report. So we keep mixing plan versus report. There's quarterly reports, and then there's an annual plan. And the annual plan, we all say as school districts, we're not getting enough funding to meet the target class size ratios. And so, the working group is totally fine with annual reports, class size reports. Totally get how important that information is. Everyone does have an interest in knowing what are actual class sizes. Within that, one of our concerns is that we have to include special education students in the class size count, but we can't include special education teachers. So we do quibble about the accuracy of those numbers. Putting that aside, we're good with an annual class size report where we're not okay, is the annual class size plan, because we all say the same thing. We don't have enough funding. And to Jason's point, even if we had enough funding, we might not be able to fill positions. So I just wanted to make that distinction, which I think Kyle and Amanda have tried to point out too. And what the recommendation is, is not to have to do the annual plan where we just say we don't have enough funding, but to do annual, quarterly or annual recording. I hope that clarifies the recommendation.

**Chair Hobbs:** It does. And I think what we're still searching for is wording that accomplishes that without seeming to ignite a fire.

**Paul Johnson:** So Chairman Hobbs, if I could, so if we consider eliminating class size reduction plan and quarterly reporting requirements while maintaining annual reporting, would that suffice?

**Chair Hobbs:** Let me turn to Joyce and Punam, get a litmus test from them.

**Joyce Woodhouse:** Member Woodhouse, for the record. I understand where you want to go. I'm fully supportive of the class size reporting being done annually. I still have a problem with eliminating the class size reduction plan to have that in the motion is I think a serious problem for the commission going forward with this recommendation. But to report annually, I'm fine, but I don't want to take out class size reduction plan. And I understand [indiscernible].

**Punam Mathur:** Chairman Hobbs, Member Mathur for the record. I have the same kind of dissonance around it. And I think the issue is that, by not asking for any plan, essentially we have no accountability component to ensure that there's an emphasis and a focus in Nevada on driving down assets from the public's perspective. I think that's an important accountability feature to having here somewhere. And for the legislators, I think that

will be a big deal as well. And so the challenge is, if we don't have anything that has some accountability around driving down class sizes, then I fear that our recommendation to do away with all the reporting will just be tossed with the bath water.

**Chair Hobbs:** I think some of this gets accomplished again, with wording. Maybe something that is a preamble to the wording that we're showing here that the commission understands and fully supports the notion of class size reduction. You start out with a positive statement like that. And however, with regard to quarterly reporting, we recommend that the quarterly reports be eliminated in favor of an annual report. So if it's worded something like that, does that take a little bit of the sting out of it, Joyce?

**Joyce Woodhouse:** Yes, it does. Member Woodhouse for the record. That that works for me.

**Chair Hobbs:** And you, Punam?

**Punam Mathur:** It does in terms of just making it less, yes, it does. And I still get curious about, but where is the accountability for driving down class sizes? [Indiscernible] any plan. I think market was instructed to have you delineate between a report and plan. So I think the reporting I'm completely comfortable with, but I think from the public's perspective, completely do away with any planning, even if the plan right now is we're miles from it because of workforce issues, economic issues, or building issues.

**Chair Hobbs:** So to those of you on this commission, I don't mean to leave anybody off, Jason, Mark, Kyle, Paul, Dave, others that actually have to do this reporting. Would a modified motion like that, I know it's not exactly what you want all the way, but does that move us in the right direction? Are you okay with that?

**Mark Mathers:** Can you repeat the wording of the motion then?

**Chair Hobbs:** Well, I seriously doubt it, Mark. It'd be something, the effect of the Commission on school funding recognizes the importance of class size reduction and efforts to reach the stated goals. However, with regard to reporting on class size, we recommend the elimination of the quarterly reporting requirements, and -- I'm looking for the right words here. In favor of an annual report or maintaining an annual report. You corrected me earlier on that, but that's maybe not the right wording, but in favor of an annual report on class size.

**Mark Mathers:** Well, Mark Mathers, again. We're not opposed to an annual report showing class size. I think I just would make the distinction. When we have to prepare an annual class size plan, it infers that districts have the funding to meet target class sizes, and we don't. So it shifts accountability, in my view, or at least the perception of accountability onto school districts. As if we have enough funding to meet target class sizes and we put in our report, we would need 80 million more dollars to create the number of teacher positions to meet target class sizes. And when the state's ready to give us \$80 million to do that, we'll try to do that. So, like I said, to me, the process of the plan is, it puts the onus on school districts to explain why they can't do it. But the onus really needs to be somewhere else on funding those target class sizes or adjusting the target class sizes to meet the reality of our funding situation. I guess I'm okay with the motion. For those who've seen the class size plans, I just don't know what you necessarily get out of it, but, so if we can talk about annual reports, I'm good with that.

**Chair Hobbs:** Mark, I think one of the things we can maybe do in addition to that motion, which I agree with you, doesn't go far enough, and the absurdity of filing reports to tell someone something they already know, or for you guys to report on something that's completely out of your control. I completely get that a hundred percent with you on that. Maybe in the report itself that accompanies the recommendation, some explanation could be included with regard to, there's a reason why we're recommending elimination of quarterly reports

because you're doing something four times that is absurd as opposed to maybe one time is absurd, right? If you're doing it annually, and maybe in the actual wording in the report, we can explain what that rationale really is and include choosing the right words of course. Some commentary about, well, just how meaningless that reporting is without additional help. Would that help?

**Mark Mathers:** Yes. Thank you.

**Chair Hobbs:** So with that, I am not quite sure where we left off. I gave the wording for something that could look like a motion on this. And I suppose it needs to include the second part of what we see on the slide, consider lining requirements for the reports to provide me to date on call ratios handily. Do you accept that as a motion, and please don't ask me to restate it again. If you accept that as a motion, we would be looking for a second.

**Joyce Woodhouse:** Member Woodhouse for the record. I'm happy to second the motion.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. Additional discussion on the motion. Okay. All of those in favor signify by saying aye.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chair Hobbs:** Opposed?

**Unidentified Speaker:** Abstaining.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay, Amanda, back to you.

**Amanda Brown:** Great. Justin, let's go to the next slide. So this one is on staffing and personnel reporting. There's a number of different places the districts report about the staff in their buildings, including within report card submissions. And there's two, so personnel employed by school district and categories of personnel versus staffing more specific to teachers licensed personnel and paraprofessional, so your instructional staff. And then another personnel report that separately collects some of this information. Districts just noted that there was similar data acted across these reports through submission requirements and that there's potential other sources. So this one is not a recommendation at this point to eliminate or change any requirements, but more explore if, say the personnel report could be modified in a way that produces the data that's needed in the other report. That's the one report would [indiscernible].

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay, so I don't know if there's anything actionable here. Consider streamlining reporting requirements. I think everybody generally agrees with that as far as what it is. I think we have to be a bit more specific than just that. I don't know. Thoughts?

**Amanda Brown:** [Indiscernible]

**Jason Goudie:** Yes, Jason got it from record. So, I think part of this that we did talk about in the group and we luckily did have, James and Bowen on the call, and I think part of this really gets into at least part of it, part of it gets into a statewide system database of accounting, right? To where we can provide data. And I think that it'll probably come up in a number of other areas as well, where instead of us at districts levels, just creating separate reports, provide state data that then can be utilized. And this could be one areas where that could be valuable. So, I think that -- I don't if that's just going to be a specific comment later. But we did talk to [indiscernible] and they've been working on it for a while and trying to figure out how to best do that, but that's in process as well.

**Chair Hobbs:** Excellent. I appreciate that. Jason, is that something that we are going to be talking further about later, Amanda?

**Amanda Brown:** Chair Hobbs, Amanda Brown for the record. We do not yet have a specific recommendation on that. Today we just had recommendations about specific reports and then we have a set of seven or eight broader recommendations. I think the workers are still discussing and refining that with the coordinator, but one of those is building that level capacity, perhaps to have that infrastructure in place that would eliminate the need for some of these [indiscernible].

**Chair Hobbs:** As Jason has told us a number of times before. And I think we need to keep this in the back of our mind. This isn't like a single item, one bite of the apple to deal with all of the reporting issues. This will be an ongoing process. So, whatever isn't tackled today, if there's any more specificity over the next month or two, and we can certainly add that back and add that to our recommendations as you continue to work through it. Alright.

**Amanda Brown:** And I see Dusty has raised his hands.

**Chair Hobbs:** I'm sorry. Well, thank you for being able to see him. I can't see him.

**Amanda Brown:** He's one of my tiny squares though.

**Dusty Casey:** Okay, thank you. Member Casey, for the record. The only thing I'd like to make a comment on is this is an area where I think we could drill down into what reporting should be required because it would help the task force in this area, in our working group, working groups. My working group [indiscernible] when it comes to personnel recruiting. If we make sure the right data is in here consistent across all the districts and SPCSA, and includes the staffing groups that we need to include as well as salary information, I think it would help in the task force work that we are ultimately probably going to support. So I just want to make that comment as well.

**Chair Hobbs:** Got it. Thank you, Casey. Dusty, I mean Justin.

**Amanda Brown:** Justin, if you move to the next slide, I think this one is in a similar place. Okay. So financial reporting, there are a number of different financial reports required of districts. So there's a couple that I think fit with what we've been talking about of still exploring, considering potential ways to streamline perhaps through a state by day system. So what's required of districts is the annual spending report, the 387-303, and apologize. That's the number specifically for districts. Charter schools have their own number. I just don't know that one off the top of my head. There's also quarterly financial reports that require, there is minimum expenditure reporting. So that's suggested, I believe if I've been correct, if I'm wrong in certain areas, suggested spending say on textbooks or instructional materials. And they have to report what they're spending in these areas. And then the summary financial report, which is a financial report that's in a different format that's sent to the Department of Taxation. And then that's required to be published both on websites and in newspapers in hard copy. So district feedback that we heard was for the 387-303 reports that districts indicated that similar more detailed school level financial data is available from other sources, but broken down differently. And this is going to come up when we talk about 8,400 financial metrics as well. So again, there's a little misalignment in sources in that this report is at the LEA level versus school level. So perhaps I need for streamlining and consistency across reporting. There's also a quarterly financial reporting requirement that's burdensome and unhelpful. And again, I'm speaking for districts, these are not my words. Minimum expenditure reporting is unnecessary for the summary financial report. Again, it's submitted in a different kind of less detailed format, so it requires them to produce something else specific for this request. It's costly to publish in newspapers and not all districts have a printed newspaper to meet that requirement. Data is all already available on the website,

and more detailed information is in other financial reports. So for the potential recommendations for discussion, the very specific ones are to consider eliminating requirements for the summary financial report. So again, that's the one that's in its own unique format that has to be published in newspapers, which is redundant to some other information. Eliminate quarterly reporting requirements, which seems to be a direction we're trying to head in broadly for reporting and eliminating the miniature expenditure, minimum expenditure reporting. So that would be the request for today's action of what could be changed or eliminated. And then broadly to consider going forward, how do you streamline financial reports to make sure they're consistent and how data is broken down. How do you potentially leverage a statewide infrastructure data system? So again, probably not a now recommendation for data.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. Looking for comments, questions. I'll make a general one. I think whenever we talk about eliminating reports, it's important for us to provide explanation to support the recommendation. Otherwise it sounds like you're just eliminating reports and there's less information people have reactions to that when in fact there's very good reasons for making this recommendation. So the same comment as before that included in the report to support this recommendation, I think we have to write that very clearly to make the case for it either being, not particularly useful or redundant or too time intensive relative to its value, whatever words we use, right? I think that's incredibly important for us to do. With that being said, is there again, any questions? Anyone wish to make a motion?

**Punam Mathur:** I have a clarification about it. I'm just trying to understand the architecture of our data related to K-12. So as a member of the commission, what I'm curious about is all of the information, but in a way that's useful to know whether the formula is actually the invested properly in yielding returns for kids on the investment. So this financial data, does it all end up in a centralized place? I guess, so inside school economics, sounds like it's a four-wall data capture system over here that the district are reporting into, but at some point is the commissioner, is there ever a day when we can say, gee, this school is really moving quickly. What did they invest in to do that sort of sub tabbing, right? That subgrouping so that we can get real insights about what's working and what may not be. Do we have an architecture that makes that someday possible?

**Amanda Brown:** So, two questions. Not questions. Two follow up comments to that. To answer your question. So Amanda Brown, for the record. Speaking specifically about the insights for the School Nomick, I think is their current name. Districts submit their audited annual reports to that. This third party then breaks that information down into reports to the shares back to the district. And that does include breakdowns by specific categories of type of spending around instruction or school leadership. The slight challenge there is those categories are not well aligned with other reports from Nevada. So they're not aligned with Nevada's charts of accounts or how it categorizes. Expenditures into what we would call function categories. So again, instruction, admin, student support. So there is that information. It then appears in the Nevada report card, if you go into some of the detailed information, you can have access to the figures coming out of insight. So that data lives somewhere. It does exist. It is not in what I would consider a centralized repository that you could then be pulling different reports. It spits out some numbers and you have what it comes out with. So just a slight distinction that information is available, it's not quite as aligned as it could be to other financial reporting, but there is not a centralized financial data warehouse and work group. If I said anything incorrectly, please hop on and tell me where I'm wrong.

**Nancy Brune:** This is Nancy Brune. Sorry, [indiscernible]. Alright, we actually had that asked for group meeting and because I asked about that. I asked a similar question Punam about wanting in theory that level of granularity and this is currently information that's reported in the school improvement plans. And I think we looked at one state which did have some detailed information about what they presented. We would require probably a significant investment in the platform where we deposit data and then turn into something that's actually user-friendly. And so, I think that is a long-term aspirational goal, but probably beyond what we can, what we hope to do in this next, biennium, if that makes sense. So, I think that's where we want to go, but we're

not going to get there in the next two years without additional revenue to support building out the framework or the structure to allow that to happen. If that makes sense.

**Chair Hobbs:** Paul, is your hand up?

**Paul Johnson:** Yeah, thanks, Chair Hobbs. Member Johnson for the record. So, I mean if you think of this in three parts, the first part here is, we're trying to identify an exhausting list of all the stuff that we have and we're trying to peel away the things that are redundant, not useful or confusing and so, that we can get to the bits of information that we really want that are going to create the framework that you're talking about Punam. So this step right here is if you eliminate the summary financial reports that we have to publish in the newspaper, the information on those reports is not usable for anybody. It's simply we are fulfilling a statute requirement to do something. So stripping that away helps strip away some level of effort and information that's really not useful. And if efforts that we have to apply at school district level to meet compliance and we don't meet the compliance, then there's audit violation that says you didn't follow NRS. And the quarterly reporting of minimum expenditure requirement, before we used to have a minimum expenditure requirement that has been reduced to a minimum expenditure recommendation. And that was for school districts to spend a certain amount of money per pupil for instructional materials. So it fenced off money within our general fund and, and took away some flexibility. And I don't know that that is in a positive direction. We certainly can report that in one of the other reporting frameworks, but not on a quarterly basis. It'll be part of the framework that we would have whether we identify in the school nomics reports where they identify face-to-face instruction, which is your labor, and then they have your expenditures which are segregated for that, that are non-labor. And we can continue to do that. But this step is to get rid of all of that, garbage for lack of a better phrase, that is not useful, confusing in order for us to get to something that is more meaningful, holistic and more representative of the things that are important to paint a portrait of a learner and a portrait of a school that we can all basis to inform our decisions. So, I would make a recommendation. If you're ready for a motion, Guy, I would move to consider meeting requirements for the summary financial report and quarter of reporting and miniature minimum expenditure reporting whenever it's convenient.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. We have a motion, is there a second for that motion?

**Unidentified Speaker:** I'll second.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. We have a motion and a second. Any additional discussion?

**Kyle Rodriguez:** Chair Hobbs?

**Chair Hobbs:** I don't see -- Yes, please go ahead.

**Kyle Rodriguez:** Rodriguez. I just want to confirm that the annual fiscal report was NAC 354-561 that we were looking to eliminate?

**Amanda Brown:** I believe so. Give one second to try to find that reference to make sure [indiscernible].

**Kyle Rodriguez:** Yeah, it's certainly not the comprehensive annual financial report or the annual comprehensive financial report. But I think Kyle is correct on the Nevada administrative code reference.

**Amanda Brown:** I am getting there.

**Chair Hobbs:** So Paul, if that's verified --

**Amanda Brown:** It is not 3540.561.

**Chair Hobbs:** Paul, then in your judgment, do we need to be more specific about including that in your motion?

**Paul Johnson:** We certainly can. Having a summary annual financial report other than your comprehensive annual financial report doesn't make sense to me. So, I don't know why we want to publish a separate financial report when members of the public can request information from the school district directly in whatever format that we have readily available. So I don't know, I'd leave that up to the group if they want to have it specifically identified the NAC, that would be fine by me.

**Amanda Brown:** I think it may make sense just given that the title of it summary financial report, if you didn't know that it was just a separate requirement and then it was not your main financial report, that could perhaps be concerning. But maybe perhaps it's in the wording of acknowledging that it is not that it's strict primary comprehensive financial report or something like that.

**Chair Hobbs:** So would that be something that could be included as a parenthetical after summary financial report? That reference?

**Amanda Brown:** Yes. Yeah, we can get the NAC reference and for some reason if you make a motion, I can repeat it if that's helpful.

**Chair Hobbs:** Yeah, Paul, I mean you made the motion, so that's up to you to concur or?

**Paul Johnson:** Yeah, absolutely. And include in parenthetical disclosure, the Nevada Administrative Code reference.

**Amanda Brown:** Which is 354.561 for that.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay, let's include that. And I need to go to the individual who seconded the motion. You concur as well?

**Dr. David Jensen:** Member Jensen, [indiscernible].

**Chair Hobbs:** Alright. Any additional discussion? I don't see any hands. All of those in support signify by saying aye.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chair Hobb:** Opposed? Abstain. Okay, let me ask this. Amanda, before we move on, I realize it's in the middle of the lunch hour. How many more slides do you have?

**Amanda Brown:** I have one more in this section.

**Chair Hobbs:** And then beyond that?

**Amanda Brown:** And then beyond it, I turn it over to Kelsey and [indiscernible] how many slides do we have?

**Chair Hobbs:** So we have ways to go.

**Amanda Brown:** We do, yes.

**Chair Hobbs:** -- the point of this, and I hate to stop you in the middle, but I want to ask the commission if they want to take -- I see video going off here and there. So, I know people may be attending to their needs, but do you want to take a 10-minute break at this point or do you want to power through?

**Unidentified Speaker:** Chair Hobbs, I would suggest we do the next slide, which should take about maybe a minute or two. Because I don't think there's a motion here. It is still in the floor and then it feels like a good natural.

**Chair Hobbs:** Well, I'm asking the commission to Amanda whether or not they want to take a break or continue then I'll move on with Kelsey's part of the presentation.

**Unidentified Speaker:** Got you.

**Chair Hobbs:** Anyone?

**Unidentified Speaker:** I'd be in favor.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay, go ahead Amanda. And then after Amanda completes her section, we'll take a 10-minute break for everybody to stretch their legs.

**Amanda Brown:** Great. Thank you, Chair Hobbs. This is my last slide. And again, this isn't going to be one we have a specific recommendation for today. It's a continue to explore. But one of the reports that came up for districts, as you know, perhaps a little burdensome is the average daily enrollment quarterly reports. So the average daily enrollment is, we want to preface this with very important information. It's what establishes payments for districts. So it's not a question of if the data's important, it's very important. But the feedback was that the quarterly reporting, they believe that data is housed in Infinite Campus and are wondering if there's a way to collect this, again, very important data without requiring each district to separately pull this information and submit reports. So the consideration or the next step here is to explore whether it's possible for in indeed to pull that available data from an existing database. And so this case infinite campus. So it's a -- to see if it's possible. We're not sure if it's possible, but I think it's worth exploring how to --

**Chair Hobbs:** So, that's something that you're still exploring?

**Amanda Brown:** Yes.

**Chair Hobbs:** Which would make total sense if in fact the ability exists.

**Amanda Brown:** Yes. And we just want to make sure that he did not have a chance to talk with NDE about the one, because the work group just met yesterday.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. Comments, questions? Okay, Amanda, as always, we really, really appreciate everything that you do to support the work that we're trying to accomplish. And you guys bring a wealth of expertise and help really move things along. And so we're deeply appreciative of that.

**Amanda Brown:** Thank you. I appreciate that.

**Chair Hobbs:** And with that, it's 12:25. Spots on the group there. So I'm waiting to -- Okay it looks like



people are coming back and we will go ahead and reconvene the meeting of the Commission on School funding. We left off in the midst of agenda item number eight and next to present to us Dr. Kelsey Krausan. And Kelsey, sorry about the little break there. I know you've been there for a while, but I wanted to ask one other thing, see if I heard back yet. Megan, are you back?

**Secretary:** Megan got pulled aside for a minute. She unavailable. She's on the way.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay, Bo, I got a message from Superintendent Ebert that there was a student attending our meeting that was waiting for public comment period number two. And if she is there and present and wants to make comments to us under the flexible agenda, I'll go ahead and move her comments up so she can get on with her day.

**Secretary:** Thanks, Chair Hobbs, she's here and she's setting up to the speaker.

**Chair Hobbs:** Welcome.

**Abigail:** Hello, my name is Abigail [inaudible] and I go to Spring Valley High School. I'm here to talk about Civics Education Funding in Nevada. I've noticed that throughout the past few years, the number of civics programs such as Model United Nation, political clubs and organizations and mock trial teams and CCSD has skyrocketed. Many schools have started to travel for competitions, and these programs have been of increasing interest to high schoolers. However, even with their interest in popularity, I find that many schools are lacking the resources in order to properly accommodate their teams. My school in particular, Spring Valley High School, hosts the oldest and largest MBN program in CCSD. Yet we still struggle to go to out-of-State competitions. Our trips to California alone cost each student \$500, even with the money that we raise from fundraising, and a lot of students can't afford to go. Although we've been invited to participate in two competitions in Arizona, DC and New York, most people in our delegation cannot afford to attend them. And the same issues are reflected in other schools' teams across the county. The development of equitably funded civics programs across the state falls under the access to quality education clause instead. The inequitable access to well-funded programs directly combats the idea that Nevada students have access to the same opportunities regardless of their setting. I know that me, for example, I've moved after my freshman year of high school because my school did not offer a lot of extracurricular opportunities, specifically doing with funding. In 2021, the robotics programs in Nevada received \$4 million to develop and expand K-12 programs throughout the state. And I believe that a similar initiative should be launched for civics programs, giving teachers the opportunity to both improve the quality of existing clubs and initiatives, and create ones that create ones in schools that lack access to them. Civics programs are very important extracurriculars that directly impact the political literacy of many future citizens. Participating in MUN has made a tremendous impact on the way that I perceive the world, and it's caused me to challenge many of my beliefs and has made me more globally aware and empathetic, and it's also increased my public speaking skills. Increasing access to quality education programs should be very important because access to quality civics programs should be given at all schools and not just a perk at select few. Thank you.

**Chair Hobbs:** Well, thank you very much and your public speaking skills are excellent. Thank you for your comments and for joining us today.

**Abigail:** Thank you for allowing me to be here.

**Chair Hobbs:** Absolutely. And just for anybody listening, we'll return to public comment period number two at the close of our agenda today. Thank you again for being here. So I'll turn it back to you, Dr. Krausan for your presentation.

**Kelsey Krausan:** Thank you. Chair Hobbs. Kelsey Krausan from West Ed for the record. So now we're going to dive into operationalizing the new PCFP reporting framework, specifically those metrics that were outlined in AB400 and SB98. So we have six objectives here, and Chair Hobbs will take our queue from you as to how many we get through an ambitious agenda. So we've broken up the decision points for the first around the structure of the PCFP reporting framework, which I previewed last Friday. Then we're going to talk about those metrics that are currently available and already included in other reporting frameworks, metrics that we would recommend additional metrics, as you know, AB400 and SB98 actually explicitly state that the commission may want to recommend some additional metrics that we're bringing some of those forward for consideration. Then there's, some considerations around metrics that may need some adjustments in order to align with available data in existing reporting. And then some metrics that we think really deserve some further discussion among the commission. And we're bringing forth some research for your consideration. And then finally, Paul's going to close this out. I'm talking about some of the secondary and longer-term recommendations related to the framework. So I'm going to start us with the first section on the structure of the new framework. Again, this will be very familiar to all of you. One decision point is around the frequency of reporting. And so, similar to the discussion earlier around aging accountability and some of the other reporting requirements, AB400 and SB98 require districts and charter schools to submit a quarterly report. But almost all of the metrics outlined in the legislation are only collected once per year. So, we think it's important for the commission to consider annual reporting rather than quarterly. And I'm going to just go through these quickly since you've already seen them. And then a lot of time for the commission to discuss. Next, is the timing of reporting by districts and charter schools. In investigating all of existing reporting requirements, most of the metrics are received either late winter, spring, or summer and are available in early fall. And so, we thought the commission may want to consider a November reporting to allow for time for analysis once all of these data had been collected. When it comes to the level of reporting, we found that nearly all of the metrics are available at the school level. And so, we'd like to open it up to commission consideration for requesting data be recorded at the school level to allow for a more detailed view on student and school progress under the new funding formula. Next slide. And then the last two again, this first one should be familiar given our discussion earlier, is that many of the data that are outlined in legislation, in AB400, SB98 are already collected in another report. And so, we think the commission may want to consider having districts and charter schools only report data that is not already reported elsewhere. So rather than creating another duplicative reporting requirement in the state. And then finally in order to measure progress over time for consideration is to look at, including data in the first year of reporting as early as 2020, up to the current year. And then for future years, only one-year of data would need to be collected. But just as a starting point that you'd be able to do that look back and look across years since implementation of the new funding formula and since the new investment. Okay. So those are the five for consideration by the commission. So the next slide shows, these five points and really just want to open it up for discussion here to see if the commission would like to actually make a recommendation.

**Chair Hobbs:** Thank you, Kelsey. I think it's a good idea to take these objective by objective. And maybe if you want to go back a couple slides, so we can see the specifics of each of the recommendations. And is it the commission's preference to deal with them as a group by objective or deal with them individually? Anyone?

**Unidentified Speaker:** I think objective works.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. Let's take them by objective and reading through them, the considerations that are listed, you concur with the wording of those considerations. Are there any that you have questions about or wish to add any more specifics to? Kelsey, if you go to slide 15, I had a question about one. The trend analysis, the reports for future years would only collect data for the current year, but it would display data for -- it would display data in a way that one could discern a trend,

**Kelsey Krausan:** Correct. Yeah. And Member Johnson may want to speak to this as well, but the idea being we don't want to ask for additional data to be reported that has already been reported in past years. But yes, so

maybe that's an important clarification that it would still be displayed and analyzed across and analyzed.

**Chair Hobbs:** And for what period for display? I mean obviously, we'll have it in our records over a period of time, but as far as displaying over, did you guys consider like a five-year period or did you have that level of discussion?

**Dr. David Jensen:** Member Hobbs, this is Dr. David Jensen. Yeah, we absolutely did discuss this. And data points, snapshot in time really doesn't give you an indication of performance. You really have to track performance over time, just like investment performance or anything else. You want to see how it's doing longitudinally. So we were looking at a five-year comparison. And the reason why 2020 is specifically listed in this is because in 2020 we were still under the Nevada plan. And if we want to do any comparison to contrast with the way things used to be funded with the way they currently are funded, you'd kind of want to pick up those last two years in the Nevada plan. And then two years later we started with PCFP. So that'll give us some comparison. And then two years later we had the \$2.6 billion that was injected into that. So I think that gives us three distinct points in time that would be covered over a five-year trend analysis. I don't know that there's a significant need to go longer than five years to capture how school districts are doing or how schools are doing, but was basically the discussion we had with some trend analysis.

**Chair Hobbs:** Right. I appreciate that. So, members of the commission looking at the considerations, do you want to take any action at this point? Paul, is that what you'd advise?

**Paul Johnson:** Yeah, I think the consideration right there have the form of a motion or maybe this is still work in progress that we're doing where you think would be best Chair Hobbs.

**Chair Hobbs:** I think we're okay with the motion because it would certainly frame out the intent and if we have more specific recommendations that are available to be made as we're still deliberating in advance of putting the report together, we could certainly add clarity to those at that time. Does that make sense?

**Paul Johnson:** Yes, it does. So, would you want the form of a motion to be the first one? To avoid duplicative reporting, the CSF would recommend or consider avoiding any case reporting that school districts and charter schools, we give another run at that. CCFs consider having schools, charter schools, we have data that already has access to each year or to avoid duplicative reporting. And with respect to trend analysis, consider including data starting from 2020 funding plan with a new funding plan and additional investment.

**Chair Hobbs:** Paul, I think for the sake of ease of going through these presentations is part of the official record. If we wanted to, as we go through each of these objectives, make a motion to adopt the considerations that are shown therein for each one of those objectives. Unless there's edits that members of the commission wish to make to any of them.

**Dr. David Jensen:** That is way easier than what I did.

**Chair Hobbs:** Unless Greg tells me otherwise. I think that works because this is part of the record.

**Punam Mathur:** I'll second that.

**Paul Johnson:** I'll tell you otherwise.

**Chair Hobbs:** What's that?

**Greg Ott:** I'll tell you otherwise. You're good to go.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. Alright. And I think I heard a second.

**Punam Mathur:** Yeah, that's me. I'll second that motion.

**Chair Hobbs:** So there was actually a motion, right Paul?

**Paul Johnson:** Absolutely. Motion without considerations.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. For objective one. Okay. Alright. Any other discussion? If not signify your support by saying aye.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chair Hobbs:** Opposed, Abstain? Okay, Kelsey.

**Kelsey Krausan:** Wonderful, thanks. Now we're going to go through those metrics that are currently available through existing data collection and include it in other reporting frameworks. And I'm going to turn it over to Justin Silverstein for this,

**Justin Silverstein:** Justin Silverstein for the record. So as Kelsey mentioned, this slide really just lays out all of those metrics in AB. Under that we think the data's already available and including other reporting. So we don't, and this actually is one I'm now thinking about as we've gone through this, where there might not be a consideration. It's effectively these exist. They work in the format that they are. And they include the rate of graduation of pupils from high school by type of diploma, the performance of pupils on standardized examinations, math, reading and science. The number of pupils who earn a passing score on an advanced placement examination. The number of peoples who earn a passing score on an international baccalaureate examination, percentage of pupils in each school who drop out the number of violent acts by pupils and disciplinary actions, their retention rate for teachers. And that includes movers, leavers, and the stay rates. The number of credentials or other certifications in the fields of career and technical education earned by high school graduates who completed SCT program with study. And then the number of pupils who enroll in higher education upon graduation. And that data is only for those in that Nevada state of higher education institutions. So basically here, we're just saying, what's laid out really works. There really isn't anything that needs to happen to these two to make them actionable.

**Kelsey Krausan:** Kelsey Krausan for the record. Just to say that the bolded is additional clarification on the metrics outlined in AB 400 based on what is available in

**Dr. David Jensen:** [Indiscernible] the retention rate for teachers, including mover, are we looking at inter-district transfer and why our staff movement, why would that be important?

**Justin Silverstein:** So I think that just -- I believe it is within district and it's the data that is currently collected. So, it's currently part of the data collection system in one of the current reports. Again, I think how it's used on the kind of importance, again, the retention rates, in part you would start to also be able to see if teachers are moving from one type of school to another, which I do think over time can be important if you're trying to look at dollars kind of flowing to students who might have hired me.

**Chair Hobbs:** Thank you. No other questions on that?

**Justin Silverstein:** Justin Silverstein, for the record. What you'll see is an eCase. We have this final slide that

comes down the commission's recommendation. Again, I think it's just really on me for not thinking this one all the way through. I'm not sure there has to be a necessarily some recommendation made. I mean, it could be yes, we support these different metrics in what they're currently collected or can simply be they exist. They've been written out and we, we don't necessarily have to have a motion for us to do that.

**Chair Hobbs:** Well, Justin, that's what I was going to ask someone to confirm. I mean, these have been specified to us, right? So, we really don't have any discretion in this. You're just simply indicating that data for each of these metrics exists someplace and could be captured and pulled into a reporting framework, right?

**Justin Silverstein:** Chair Hobbs, Justin Silverstein for the record, what we will see on the next slide is areas where what has been given to you, we are bringing information back that says they might be difficult in certain ways, or there might be some different considerations where you might want to make a recommendation back. So this is just a group of metrics we're saying the way we see it, there probably is nothing that needs to be considered based on what's been given to you.

**Chair Hobbs:** Yeah, I think the more germane part of it for us are those metrics that may be difficult or impossible to obtain, and whether or not the commission, which wishes to make a recommendation, that some of those requirements be adjusted. So let's move on to that.

**Justin Silverstein:** Perfect. And I'll kick it over, Kelsey, to your team, but this is the objective three is the additional metrics to understand the use of funds. And actually we're kicking over to Amanda.

**Amanda Brown:** So, apologize that you get to listen to me talk some more. I know you've been hearing from me a lot today, Amanda Brown for the record. So, we want to put forward some metrics that could be considered that they're not specifically spelled out in AB400, but the intent to looking at how are dollars being invested. This is our first set of metrics on just how funds are being used. So, I'm going to tell you just a little bit about each one because some of them are available now, some of them are not. Some of them might make a little requirement. So, per people total expenditures by LE and school, that is information that's currently available. Per people revenues by PCFP fund category. And when I say fund category, I'm using the language that's coming out of the district's comprehensive financial report that has a separate fund for special education at risk EL and gifted. So it would be revenues for each of those sources at the LEA level. Similarly there's expenditure information by each of those fund categories coming out of that district comprehensive report that is not at the school level. Currently there is school level information coming out of those insights or school Nomex reports that we've touched a bit on, but they're currently not set up to track by fund. So that's a limitation of what's currently available. The next indicators are per pupil expenditures and percentage of total expenditures spent by function and function, again, is the idea of instruction, student support, administration, the areas that you're spending money in. And our suggestion is to look at this by total and potentially by those funding categories if available. And so for context, this information is currently only available coming out of those insight in school Nomex reports, the comprehensive financial report does not break down total spending by function. And also highlighting that the insights in the genomics report or school genomics are not genomics is slightly different categories than your chart of accounts and the functions that show up in the comprehensive reports. So that may be an area that's down the line. You want to try to refine and make that data consistent because that data is also only available at the school level from those insider school Nomex reports currently. And again, that data is not collected by PCFP. So you have some limited information in this indicator area available now and could potentially have more in the future. Similarly, the per pupil expenditures and percentage of total expenditures by object. And so, object is the type of thing you're buying. Is it salaries, benefits, purchase services supplies. That information is available out of the 387-303 or the comprehensive report at the LEA level, both in total and by PCFP funding category. It is not available at the school site level out of that report. And again, it's the same limitations out of the insights and school Nomex of what you can have at the school level right now. And then finally, FTE counts and per student ratios by function. We talked

a bit about there is some FTE information available. It tends to be at the district level, in current reporting and not by fund category. So this is an area we think would be new data collection. So again, start with what you have now available for FT out of those, the personnel reports and the other sources, and continue to think about how you could modify those or leverage other sources to get more detailed information as you go. So that was a lot of talking.

**Chair Hobbs:** Amanda, if you could hold for a moment, Megan and Greg, I just want to double check at this point whether or not we still have a quorum. I see Dusty, Paul, David, and Punam.

**Jason Goudie:** Jason.

**Chair Hobbs:** And Jason. Okay. So that still constitutes quorum, right?

**Amanda Brown:** Chair, Megan Peterson for the record. Yes, we also still have Member Rodriguez and Mathers here in the north.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. Alright. I'm just double checking. Sorry about that.

**Amanda Brown:** No, great. So I think Justin, it's advancing to the next slide of just conversation of what is the commission [indiscernible] in this area.

**Paul Johnson:** Chair Hobbs, did you [indiscernible]?

**Chair Hobbs:** We're advancing to another slide or was that just awkward sign?

**Amanda Brown:** Chair Hobbs, we did advance to another slide. It's very tricky because only the title changed, so it doesn't actually feel like you've changed the slide, but it has. And Paul, I think you were going to ask a question, a comment.

**Paul Johnson:** Well, I was going to bring up a point. I think all this information is essential for us to report. We do have some reporting in a similar manner through the school Nomex or insight reports that we've had before. But one of the problems that we have the school districts is it's difficult to tie that information back to our audited financial reports. So, information coming from our -- the best thing to do is for us to be more consistent with the way we allocate and record costs at a district level, including definitions of what goes into at risk and the funds that Amanda was talking about. And with that consistency in practice, we'll have more consistent financial statements and we can operationalize these ratios and expenditures and per people amounts from our financial statements instead of relying on the school Nomex reports.

**Chair Hobbs:** Paul, to make that adjustment in the way -- I think what I took from that is, you obviously would rather the financial reports match up to the [indiscernible] and I assume the adjustment has to be made on the way the recording -- the way your chart of accounts is constructed, the way that you do your accounting at the local level, so it does match up to the [indiscernible] Is that what I'm getting?

**Paul Johnson:** Yeah, and what the school districts do, the process was explained before on the financial data that we currently have, [indiscernible] used. Certainly we don't use it at our level. We provide a final trial balance to the school omics folks for the insight reports and they have their own proprietary means to try to allocate costs to make the reporting more consistent from school district. To school district and school to school. The problem is that's not really transparent to a third user who doesn't understand that process. So it takes some interpretation, which can be confusing and people might perceive that there's some agenda for having the numbers be different. And it is just less transparent. So being able to have that resident within the

school district system through NDE, I think is, is a better place for that to reside than with an external third party. But that would require some additional investment to work at the NDE level in order for that to happen. However, they could not do that under the current system and staffing that they have at the moment.

**Chair Hobbs:** Hey, so Paul, as we go through these, is there any direction that we need to provide or concurrence that we need to indicate in your opinion? Or this is just ongoing?

**Paul Johnson:** Well, I think it would be ongoing, but I think in [indiscernible] the SB98, maybe 400 data that's specifically required by law, I think the information that's on this slide should also be reported and recorded on a school basis.

**Chair Hobbs:** So if there's anything that you think that this commission needs to clarify by any action that it takes, I'm going to look to you to let me know.

**Paul Johnson:** That sounds good. And I think what we could do is, I mean, we could have an action or recommendation to include these items in this slide as part of the data request or the framework, and I'd be happy to make that motion.

**Chair Hobbs:** Jason and Mark, and others that have worked on this, you're in agreement with that?

**Mark Mathers:** So this is Mark. I haven't worked with this group, but I guess I do have a question. What was the thinking behind requiring expenditures by function and what was the thinking behind requiring expenditures by object code?

**Justin Silverstein:** Justin Silverstein, for the record. We were thinking, again, and this assumes the early recommendation to look at things over a trend period of time, was to try to get an understanding of if there's been shifts in how resources are being allocated within LEAs and schools as the PCFP dollars grow. And so, an example would be, are you seeing more dollars in instruction than needed before? Are you seeing more dollars in salaries and benefits? Just getting folks in the idea of where the dollars are going. Again, it's at an accounting level handful of us that's super comfortable and maybe that won't be as clear to every person who reads it, but it really is about seeing if there shifts in how dollars are allocated or used as the dollars grow in the PCF.

**Paul Johnson:** And mark to add to that, I would perhaps add staffing to this as well because the funding and staffing probably should be together. But the thought is the money that we get has to be at the school level invested in administration, structural staff, the student support, staff support, and those things that support not just instruction, but the social emotional supports for students that we've learned through the pandemic are maybe more valuable than we thought they were previously. So as we're getting that money, it would reflect the categories within each school that we are investing our funds in, applying our human resources. The object code, I think would be to a lesser degree, less significant. But it's another metric that could be used to identify how we've invested our funds by object.

**Mark Mathers:** Thanks. I guess my concern, certainly is that these are going to be huge reports. Maybe an alternative would be category of expense. So showing total expenditures for salaries and the category of benefits. Then the category of the non-personnel categories so that you would have five lines versus a hundred. That's just a huge report in my view.

**Amanda Brown:** Amanda Brown, for the record. Mark, that is a great clarification and something I didn't think about as we were writing this. When I think function or object, I think the big bucket, high level total, like all your salaries at the 100 level versus thinking about it by individual objects, I think that's a really great

clarifier for language that it is in those high-level categories like object categories.

**Chair Hobbs:** So Paul, if you're thinking about making a motion with regard to Mark's comment, I don't know if high level object category is generally accepted accounting term. I think we --

**Amanda Brown:** There's a better one than what I said.

**Chair Hobbs:** But by intent, that's what we're looking to do is provide a little bit more information than just the big buckets that Amanda referred to. But with that in mind, please feel free to make a motion.

**Paul Johnson:** So yeah, I would make the motion. Did I hear somebody want to ask a question first? And I'm just hearing things. So make a recommendation that we adopt the bulleted items on this slide. And with respect to the total expenditures by function, by summary function or summary object, if that would be a better word, so that we are not providing every single detailed object code because there are hundreds, and that we're just getting the summary codes. So if that will work, Mark, if that sounds a little bit better, then I can make that the motion.

**Mark Mathers:** Thanks. I call them categories of expense, but maybe that's not. We're saying the same thing, so I'm good.

**Punam Mathur:** And I will second.

**Secretary:** Chair Hobbs, we have a motion.

**Chair Hobbs:** We have a second on that motion. Any additional discussion? If not signify your support by saying aye.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chair Hobbs:** Opposed? Abstain. Okay, Amanda?

**Amanda Brown:** With that, I will turn it over to someone else. I'm not sure who.

**Kelsey Krausan:** I will pick it up from here. So, these next two sections get into the more complicated metrics for consideration and we prepared a background document that provides the more on the research behind some of the rationale that we've included of what we learned from NDE when we spoke with them. And so, I want to direct you to that document as you have questions. And because there, there's additional information there. But without further ado, I'm going to pass it to my colleague, Noman Kanani to go through the next couple of metrics.

**Noman Kanani:** Kanani for the record. I'll talk through these first three metrics with you all. And again, as Kelsey mentioned, I urge you to reference the document for additional details. The attendance rate for pupils is one of the metrics that's recommended as part of AB 400. Attendance rate is defined as the percentage of pupils who are present in a given school on average throughout the school year. So if 90% of students are present in school on day one, 85% is on day two, the average between the two days would be 88%. And so if you just average it throughout the year and you get the average attendance rate for pupils, it's not taking into account, that some students may be out for multiple days, for longer than other students. And so for these reasons, the attendance rate tends to be a very limited metric on its own. Not many states actually use attendance rate. The Nevada report card uses the attendance rate, but the NSPF actually uses chronic absenteeism, which is more in line with what most states use to measure attendance. So we recommend continuing to use attendance, but



operationalize it using chronic absenteeism, which is the percentage of students who have missed at least 10% or more of the school year. The second metric on the slide here is the percentage of pupils in each school who lack a sufficient number of credits to graduate by the end of their 12th grade year. And similar to the attendance rate, what's used by NSPF is a slightly different metric, which operationalizes the same measure and perhaps in more useful way by looking at ninth grade credit deficiency as opposed to 12th grade credit deficiency. So ninth grade credit deficiency is included under the student engagement indicator for the NSPF as an early indicator of whether students are on track to graduate. So, the CSF may want to consider inclusion of ninth grade credit deficiency in the PCFP framework to align with the NS NSPF. Next slide, please. The literacy rate for pupils in first, third, and fifth grades. So, Nevada, like many, like most states throughout the country, has passed comprehensive reading laws dating back to the last several years in response to, uh, uh, data showing that reading rates provisions rates have declined substantially over the last, uh, decade or so based upon the national test. Uh, so the, uh, currently Nevada students receive, uh, diagnostic assessments three times a year between kindergartens and in grades kindergarten through third grade through the NWEA MAP test. So this is the only measure of literacy that is, uh, universally collected across schools in Nevada, uh, and in grades can through third grade specifically. So, some considerations with that in mind is that firstly we need to define what we mean by the literacy rate over here. Is it specifically proficiency or is it the, is it growth? One should also note that the matrix is better suited to be measuring student growth as opposed to proficiency. Given that it's a diagnostic assessment. Should grades kindergarten and second grade also be included? So we are questioning the reasons the reason behind only first, third and fifth grade. In fifth grade, students take the smarter balance assessment, which is also taken in grades three, four, and sixth through eight, as well as part of the standard state standardized assessment. And so, it makes sense to use different metrics for kindergarten, for K through 3, compared to fifth grade, which would be the smarter balance test. So mapping in grades K through 3 in smart balance in grade five. And one should also consider that the smarter balance assessment does focus more on strictly literacy skills. It focuses on other facets of English language arts as well. The most important thing I think that we should be focusing on as a really important measure to consider before continuing to use this measure is considering whether or not this matrix assessment in grades, kindergarten through third grade is valid for this use in school accountability. As I mentioned, a lot of states have passed laws concerning comprehensive literacy. And so, everyone is using these diagnostic assessments, but I've seen very few examples where states are actually publicly reporting students' proficiency scores. They tend to be used more informatively to inform classroom instruction, inform school level interventions, but in terms of a public measure that can be seen by anyone at school level in the state. That's something that we would need to dig into a little bit more about, maybe even approach the developers of this assessment to see if that would be a valid use of this assessment. Next slide please. And I believe -- I'm passing it on to Kelsey.

**Kelsey Krausan:** So, these next two metrics we put up for consideration because for the first one, the number of classes taught by a substitute teacher for more than 25% of the school year. These data are not currently collected in the state. The state does collect data on the number of short and long-term substitutes. So, there's a decision for the commission to make, whether or not you would like to use the number of short and long-term subs in lieu of this metric that has been identified under 8,400, SB 98, or make a recommendation that data be collected in a way in the state so that you actually can get to this 25% or more of the school year. Uh, the next metric, the rate of vacancies and physicians for teachers, support staff and administrators, the state does collect data on vacancies for teachers and administrators, but it does not collect these data for support staff. Um, and so again, another decision point whether or not to, um, ask for the state to begin collecting these data. When we spoke with NDE, they mentioned that it would be useful to have these data, um, but there's some definitional work around who, who would be included under support staff and how to define the categories of different support staff across schools. I think those are the five metrics for discussion, for the commission in this section. And maybe it helps to just start back with the first slide so the commission can see the considerations there.

**Chair Hobbs:** I think you're right.

**Kelsey Krausan:** There we go.

**Chair Hobbs:** So it appears that the question, I suppose the first question being asked here is which measure of attendance should be used. Attendance rate or chronic absenteeism? And let's see. I imagine I understand the difference between the two. I mean, they're not complimentary, they're completely different statistics. I mean, attendance, if it's 88% attendance, it's not 12% chronic absenteeism, some portion of that 12% would be chronic, right?

**Noman Kanani:** Yeah, perhaps even more.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay.

**Noman Kanani:** I mean, you can have a school on average, 90% attendance throughout the year, but because different students are present or absent on a given day, you can have as much as a significantly large number of students who are chronically absent, even one on a day-to-day basis. Your school is serving 90% of students.

**Chair Hobbs:** Well, that gets to my next question. Just understanding these statistics. So a measure of attendance is at a point in time done periodically, is that correct? And chronic absenteeism is over a lengthier period of time just because of the nature of that statistic, if they miss 10%, it has to be over a period of time. So those are two different statistics in terms of time context.

**Noman Kanani:** Yeah. They're different in terms of time context, but also different in terms of one takes into account specific students, whereas the others focus more on the aggregate.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. And both are valuable metrics.

**Noman Kanani:** To some degree --

**Chair Hobbs:** One more valuable than the other.

**Noman Kanani:** Yes. If you were to ask me whether which ones are valuable than the other, then chronic absenteeism is definitively more valuable than the attendance rate.

**Dr. David Jensen:** This is Member Jensen. Can we just provide a perspective that we're seeing from the school districts and I'm just speaking as a superintendent, the value of chronic absenteeism and attendance rate has dropped since COVID. We have lost, and I'm going to say this in broad strokes, we've lost control of attendance rates and chronic absenteeism since the COVID epidemic. And we we're still struggling with it. I don't know if my comrades in other districts are, and I use an example, a kindergarten chronic absenteeism student is generally not the fault of the kindergarten student is the fault of the parent because it's the parent that is not getting that student to school to attend and therefore they're deemed chronic absentee, as chronic absent. So what the issue is, I can tell you a lot of school districts right now are really struggling with the inclusion of chronic absenteeism in the NSPF. Because of that factor is we are all striving to increase that factor. But I don't know that we found the answer yet. So that doesn't send us any direction. I do worry that we adopt chronic absenteeism as our measure and then in the next year or two years, three years, we change it out of the NSPF and now we've got it as a singleton again.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. I appreciate that, Dave. I was actually going to ask your opinion about that, Paul.

**Paul Johnson:** Yeah, Chair Hobbs. Member Johnson for the record. Yeah, one thing to point out here, Chronic absenteeism is already part of the Nevada school performance. We're already collecting that data and

reporting the information. So I would guess, what is the value of having a different or similar attendance rate metric? Are we telling the same story, similar story? Is it materially different that it's going to tell a different story? So, if we're going to have a different attendance measure, I would want to make sure that it's significantly different or the fact that we -- if we need this to validate the other metric, then it kind of makes sense. I don't understand why we would have two different attendance rate measures. I think the one that we currently have should suffice and it's already baked into the NSPF, so creating a different one outside of the NSPF doesn't make a lot of sense to me. I agree with what David indicated. It's unfair to kind of judge the performance of the school based on the parents' ability to get kids there at the elementary level. But there should be a correlation between attendance and performance. And I think that's the connection we're trying to make.

**Chair Hobbs:** So, Paul, help me out a little bit too because I'm reading here that chronic absenteeism is included in the NSPF as you just said, but we're obviously tracking attendance rate and reporting it on the Nevada report card. I guess I don't understand why we're doing both of those things now. Obviously, we're collecting the data for both. So it just comes down to a decision is which one is a better indicator of a potential problem.

**Paul Johnson:** And maybe guess, which ones were positively, directly correlated with performance? Because the bottom line is we want to come up with metrics that identify feedback loop to make changes the level of, to improve student performance. One of those measures probably would be sufficient. I don't know that both of those are necessary. And if we're going to include a metric in the framework that we're going to use to determine a five-star rating or target improvement or something like that, it seems to me that we already have a metric and we don't need another one. That would --

**Chair Hobbs:** Yeah, I mean, to that point, Paul, are we going to continue to report attendance rate on the Nevada report card while we're using chronic absenteeism elsewhere? I mean, that seems very strange to me.

**Megan Peterson:** Chair Hobbs. Megan Peterson, for the record, we do have director Peter Zutz on the line who could speak to this a little bit more about the differences and why we have them. Peter, if I could ask you to join us.

**Peter Zutz:** Good afternoon, everyone. I'm joining you from Seattle. I'm attending the National Conference on Assessment and Accountability this week. Peter Zutz for the record. I oversee the Office of Assessment Data and Accountability Management. I think the question that was posed was what up to measures a DA average daily attendance and or chronic absenteeism might be of more value? The department, just a brief history as Dave mentioned, the NSPF does include chronic absenteeism. With the passage of ESSA in 2015 states were given criteria to comply with the federal mandate to annually and meaningfully differentiate school performance. And that the output of our engagement at the state level was the Nevada School Performance Framework for the NSPF. And as Dave mentioned at that time, a lot of the data coming out and still today shows the value of addressing absenteeism moreover, chronic absenteeism simply put students who are in.

**Peter Zutz:** Schools have a better chance of improving outcomes. The average daily attendance, as was mentioned in the meeting, is reported on the Nevada report card. If the question was, as we understand it, what might be the better of the two measures in the considerations? The mission on the pool funding is undertaking and required to make, which, if we understand correctly, is to understand any correlation between absenteeism and student performance. Because chronic absenteeism is an annual measure, it's a strong measure. It provides much information, and it's universally applied to all districts and schools. Again, that's outside of the context of the NSPF. And as Dave mentioned with what has happened during the pandemic and post pandemic around attendance, there are conversations going on at a lot of different levels, including here today, the commission on school funding around the value of that measure within the NSPF. We see that as a separate measure.

However, we are required, again, federally mandated each year to report school performance in a framework that is approved by the federal -- by the USED, and that is our NSPF. And the chronic absenteeism rate is a part of our NSPF, the federally approved framework by which we rate schools annually. So we really don't want to get into the value of either one of the measures. Again, we have to comply with both state and federal law. The average daily attendance on the report card complies. So, I'm careful not to weigh in on that. However, chronic absenteeism, the data does show nationally over long period of time that chronic absenteeism has a negative impact on student achievement. Thank you.

**Chair Hobbs:** Thank you very much for your comments. I mean, it's sounding to me, and Dave, I would love your comments on this as a superintendent, but it sounds to me like it's leaning in the direction of chronic absenteeism if one was to make a choice.

**Dr. David Jensen:** Yeah, everything that Peter said is absolutely accurate. Again, I'd rather have consistency in it as it's chronic absenteeism in the NSPF. It would only make sense that we use it in this measure as well. There's issues with it, but it is our measure.

**Chair Hobbs:** Yeah. In that regard, it sounds like if we were to try to change that, we would be attaching a number of other challenges to it, just beyond picking between two measures.

**Paul Johnson:** Member Hobbs, Member Johnson. Average daily attendance is different than the attendance rate. So an attendance rate, we don't have a definition of that. So we would've to define what it is first and then come up with uniform practice in order to do it. We do have the measures, as Peter had indicated, uniformly consistently applied for chronic absenteeism.

**Punam Mathur:** Chairman Hobbs, just to clarify, the Nevada report card inclusion of either the average daily rate, defense rate or the defense rate, is that statutorily described? Who makes us do that? I understand that the NSPF chronic absenteeism is a federal description, but why do we have the other one in the report card? Is that recommended? I guess what I'm asking is, everything I've read, especially coming out of COVID chronic absenteeism seems to be more valuable indicator. So for us, as we're building an accountability system and we're using the NSPF as the foundation on which to build that accountability system, it seems wise to affirm chronic absenteeism within that accountability system. And then does that extend to making a recommendation to the legislature to say, by the way, the average rate is confusing in a report card, and our recommendation would be that you take away either the statutory obligation or a regulatory obligation.

**Peter Zutz:** Peter Zutz for the record. That statutory compliance is 358.240, NRS 385.A.240, thank you. Excuse me. Let me clarify. 385.240 for the average daily attendance, the requirement to include that information on the report card.

**Punam Mathur:** Thank you. Because ultimately determine Chairman Hobbs, the way that I'm thinking about it is that we're going to come up with an accountability of recommendation for an accountability system that then becomes the system that everyone relies on to make all decisions from us as a commission to the legislature, to parents, to the business community. And so in the long game, we want to declare that as the optimal and then work backwards. And one of the things that is clearly confusing is to have one way measured by the commissionable funding in another way measured that is conveyed to parents.

**Chair Hobbs:** No, I absolutely agree with that Punam. And I think we just got part of the answer. The Nevada report card, the use of attendance rate is something that if -- I'm just kind of talking out loud here, but if chronic absenteeism is the more useful measure in terms of predicting performance or lack of performance, it probably belongs on the Nevada report card. I mean, we should probably be consistent in our use of statistics. And so, if we go with chronic absenteeism, it would seem to me that there would be a corresponding

recommendation to make a similar move for the Nevada report card.

**Member Mathur:** What you just said, if you're open to it, I will convert that into a motion.

**Chair Hobbs:** Sure. So there's a motion by way, and I'll check that and we have a second to the motion, additional discussion. If not, I would ask for you to signify your support by saying aye. Opposed? Obtain? Okay. To the next one.

**Punam Mathur:** So this one Chair Hobbs, this one is so compelling. The earlier we know that there's risk, the better we can deal. And so, just to keep the conversation moving, I would make a motion that we turn into a recommendation that ninth grade credit deficiency, which is currently included in the NSPF also, we would recommend that that be included in our framework line with the NSPF. Is that it?

**Chair Hobbs:** We have a motion. Do we have a second?

**Dr. David Jensen:** Member Jensen, [indiscernible].

**Chair Hobbs:** A couple of those. One question, as we go through these, I think we need to have you all the experts comment back to us whether or not this information is available or would need to be newly collected.

**Kelsey Krausan:** That information is currently collected ninth grade credit deficient. It's collected for all of the grades throughout high school based on our discussion with NDE, and I think the only question is if this is an additional metric or if it's in lieu of collecting data on 12th grade, credit deficiency as well.

**Chair Hobbs:** Well, I go back to the maker of the motion for clarification on that. Is this going in addition to also doing 12th grade or to replace 12th grade?

**Punam Mathur:** So, I go back to our experts and say, Kelsey, what would you recommend? I mean, it seems like to learn about it. And the way that we're reporting is we're going to get it a year afterwards. So basically if the babies at the beginning of 12th grade weren't going to be ready, we will know a year later that they weren't ready. So as a useful indicator doesn't feel useful.

**Kelsey Krausan:** Yeah, I think I speak more just -- I think my orientation towards this is also just not to overwhelm the commission and the public and others who are analyzing these data to that having more streamlined list of metrics to measure student and school progress over time. Maybe a useful principle to employees. Well, I see Peter raise his hands as well, so it would be good to hear from you, Peter.

**Peter Zutz:** I appreciate that. Thank you. Thanks everyone. Peter Zutz. Just on that, a sub bullet under the second bullet considerations, a slight edit, it's not ninth grade credit deficiency. Deficiency is the one mentioned for 9, 10, 11, 12 for grade nine in the NSPF. This is ninth grade credit sufficiency. And it's not a small distinction. In other words, what we want to know is how many students after grade nine are position credit-wise to graduate with their cohort in four years? So thank you.

**Chair Hobbs:** Punam back to you with that clarification from Peter, and thank you for that. Changing the word deficiency to sufficiency, is that something that you would agree with in your motion?

**Punam Mathur:** Oh, joyfully, yes.

**Chair Hobbs:** And to any of those that seconded, just make sure you also concur with that. And so, what I was hearing was, I think what I was hearing, Kelsey was having this as -- and Punam said the same thing.

Having this as an early indicator is a greater value than having a late indicator. But it might be good to have the statistics at both ends to be able to gauge whether or not those students who may not have had the sufficient number of credits were able to get to that point.

**Punam Mathur:** Which I think we have that with the kids that don't graduate. And so, maybe this is just singular that we would add this into our PCFP framework.

**Chair Hobbs:** I think you're right though. I don't know that we need to over complicate that point.

**Peter Zutz:** Exactly. So it's ninth grade, but it's sufficiency as a component within.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. Motion cleared everybody. Okay. I would ask you to say aye if you agree.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chair Hobbs:** Opposed or abstain? Next page, which I think was even scarier. There's a few questions on here. Sorry, I'm just reading again. Well, it looks like we probably should tackle these align at a time. So the question being asked in the first is to define the literacy rate. And you have suggested parenthetically proficiency and growth. So could you distinguish those for us please?

**Noman Kanani:** Yes. So proficiency is the level that a student is currently reading at. So that could be such as below proficient, currently proficient or well above proficient. And growth could be that you're still at the same level of proficiency, but you've made progress towards that next benchmark.

**Chair Hobbs:** So growth has more of a time element attached to it?

**Noman Kanani:** Correct. Yeah. Right. Because these assessments are administered usually three times per year. It's from one administration usually to the next administration.

**Chair Hobbs:** I mean, just hearing that, not to oversimplify very complicated thing. I would think growth probably has more meaning because of its time element. Agree or disagree? I am asking the experts.

**Noman Kanani:** Yes. There's certainly value in both, but with diagnostic assessments, you tend to see folks use growth more so than proficiency. And that's really because these younger grades, what we're really looking for is growth in these students where when you're just entering school, you may not be very proficient. There's a number of factors that may impact proficiency outside the school, especially as early as kindergarten and first grade. So, growth tends to be a better metric of what is happening within the schools as opposed to what the students bring to school with.

**Chair Hobbs:** And the same question as before. This is something that we concurrently track?

**Noman Kanani:** I believe so. Yeah.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. I saw Kelsey shaking her head. So as we go through these, just to make sure I'm doing it the right way, procedurally, there seems to be concurrence around growth versus proficiency, and I'm not saying that there is because we haven't talked about it, but if we discussed it that way, I guess I'm looking to Greg, and we discussed the next item as well and there's some concurrence, can we discuss them that way and then take them all in a single motion at the end of that discussion,

**Noman Kanani:** You got the ability as chair to combine items. So I think that's the most efficient way to do it,

and it's going to be better done with one motion. You got the ability to do that.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. Thank you so much. And we'll try to work through them that way if the rest of the members agree. So is there concurrence around growth for bullet point number one?

**Noman Kanani:** Yes. I'm certainly --

**Chair Hobbs:** Is there anybody that has a concern about -- Dave, did you have your hand up or a thumb up?

**Noman Kanani:** No, that was a thumb up. Growth is the only way to go.

**Chair Hobbs:** That's right. Okay. Well, that's pretty strong. Okay, so unless I hear otherwise, growth looks like the answer to that question. Next, including kindergarten and second grades. Also, could you comment on the additional value of that, please?

**Noman Kanani:** It is mostly about third grade being the target by which students should be reading. And so if we're looking at progress with each year, you have more data to understand how the extent to which we're getting to that point. Whereas if you only have one grade, first grade being the only target, then there's less data points. You have to know what the extent to which schools are annually meeting such targets the way that we might be setting for them to make.

**Chair Hobbs:** And that's assessed at the kindergarten and second grade levels currently?

**Noman Kanani:** Yes. The assessment is given to [indiscernible] from kindergarten to third grade. So this wouldn't require any additional data collection.

**Kelsey Krausan:** Kelsey Krausan for the record. This isn't a recommendation to include additional grade. I think we did just have a question around why only first and third grade that we thought it was substantive enough that it was worthy of discussion by the commission.

**Chair Hobbs:** And I think for the commission to have that discussion, the experts would need to tell us what the added value would be for adding second grade in between first and third or adding kindergarten, which I'm astounded. I don't remember reading in kindergarten, but maybe they do now. Is there added value to that or is it first and third sufficient from an expert's view?

**Noman Kanani:** Again, these metrics and accountability frameworks is fairly scarce from what we've seen. The small number of states that are using these diagnostic assessments. They tend to report on kindergarten and all grades from kindergarten to third grade.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. So, that seems to be a movement toward best practices.

**Noman Kanani:** Yeah, there doesn't seem to be anything special as to why first grade should be reported as opposed to kindergarten or second grade. So, there isn't anything in the research. I suggest that first grade is more important. And so, unless we hear, so unless there are specific reasons from a practical standpoint that only one of those three grades can be used, we're wondering why not, why else wouldn't kindergarten second grade be included?

**Megan Peterson:** Chair Hobbs.

**Chair Hobbs:** Dave, is there any -- I'm sorry, go ahead.

**Megan Peterson:** Megan Peterson for the record, we have Mandy Latham available who can speak to some of this with more detail that I would like to turn over to.

**Mandy Latham:** Mandy Latham for the record. I'm an education programs professional for Read by grade three with the Nevada Department of Education, and we have several laws that come into play. AB289, 2019, and AB420, 2023 whereby students are assessed in grades K3 for literacy. So I just want to point out to this commission that literacy development starts in kindergarten with schools and it develops over time. So we're not assessing kinder with the same metrics that we would be assessing a third grade student, but it would help us to understand the literacy development.

**Chair Hobbs:** Thank you very much. Two members of the commission, would the leaning be toward including kindergarten and second grade since that data already is being tracked?

**Peter Zutz:** Yes. And, and with the conversation about growth, it becomes a much clearer picture of growth by having measures every year than two years apart when they're changing so quickly at that age.

**Chair Hobbs:** And to be clear, Dave, there's no additional administrative burden here because that testing is already being done. Is that what I heard?

**Peter Zutz:** Member Jensen for the record. Yeah, it's already being collected. It's already being reported. It's just an additional data point, which is not a bad thing as we're talking about student growth.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. That really helps. So are we leaning in that direction as we move down this list? Okay. The next bullet looks like more of a statement than a question. So is there any direction, guidance, action you need from us on that?

**Kelsey Krausan:** Kelsey Krausan for the record. I think we were -- it is in some ways comparing apples to oranges, the inclusion of fifth grade, since it's a different test that is taken in the fifth grade. So, whereas K-3 take the NWEA map test, it's a different test in fifth grade. And reporting on standardized test scores in fifth grade is included in another metric, albeit it's for ELA and not specifically around literacy. So, I think we would put forth for consideration that this metric would be the collection of literacy data for K-3, but not fifth grade.

**Chair Hobbs:** So would that be the elimination? And again, It shows how naive I am about this. I apologize, but so they would not be taking the SBAC in the fifth grade or they would be?

**Kelsey Krausan:** They would be.

**Chair Hobbs:** Then I'm even more confused.

**Punam Mathur:** I think the suggestion here just to make sure I understand it, is that the focus on literacy as a K-3 effort, it is not that relevant to have a standardized test in the fifth grade as part of that dashboard. It's still going to be in the database because they're still taking the test and it'll still show the proficiency rates for all fifth graders. But that this is specifically about what gauge we set up within our performance framework to keep a keen eye on literacy. And that fifth grade would not be a part of that specific gauge.

**Chair Hobbs:** Right. I saw a couple of heads nodding, so, okay, that makes sense.

**Paul Johnson:** Peters hand is raised.



**Chair Hobbs:** I'm sorry?

**Paul Johnson:** I thought I saw Peterson's hand raised .

**Megan Peterson:** Thank you. Peterson for the record.

**Chair Hobbs:** Megan, you have a comment please?

**Megan Peterson:** Thank you so much. I raised my hand prior to the last comment, which I believe provided complete clarity on this. However, there was a comment prior, in other words, that grade five is simply a consideration of being included in the PCFP reporting framework. Prior to that clear statement that we agree with from the assessment point of view was, do students need to take an assessment in fifth grade? I just wanted to provide the commission a clear explanation of what tests are required and why K-3 is required by all students of Nevada to comply with state law. In grades 3-8, all students must take both mathematics and English language arts to comply with federal law. Thank you.

**Chair Hobbs:** Helpful as always. Thank you. To the fourth bullet. We want to consider diagnostic measures whether they're valid for use in school accountability.

**Noman Kanani:** This was a question maybe someone like Peter to answer. The best reporting practices around using these measures, how are they going to be? Are they going to be publicly reported? We think there just needs to be a little more clarity on what exactly will be shown. Is it going to simply be -- is it going to be scores? Is it going to be some sort of a benchmark determination of whether schools are meeting progress? I think we need some more clarification on that. And whether that is supported with the way NWA, that the developer of the assessment permits or recommends.

**Chair Hobbs:** So your question is how that information will be displayed?

**Noman Kanani:** Yeah. And whether that that's displayed.

**Chair Hobbs:** And that's the information from the prior bullet points, right?

**Noman Kanani:** Correct.

**Chair Hobbs:** K-3. Paul, is this something you guys have considered? I mean, this would be part of the reporting framework to show progress for literacy? And if so, how, I guess is the question.

**Paul Johnson:** Yeah. Member Johnson, for the record. This would probably lean on David, maybe appear a little bit more on this, but all the schools do the measure academic progress tests, which are done at different times during the year as opposed to a standardized test, which is once a year. So it does give teachers immediate feedback with respect to student performance and how to help them during the year. So that seems to be a better tool to be used at the school level and the teacher level than other diagnostic measures. And maybe somebody else can help me out with that.

**Peter Zutz:** Peter Zutz for the record. I appreciate that comment. And we would piggyback on that. There's different types of assessments and the different types of assessments are all often referred to as being part of balanced assessment system. In other words, there's formative assessments that are ongoing in the classroom between instructors and students. There's interims, like the NWA map growth that we administer to all K-3 students. And then there's summative assessments, which are designed at the end of the year after a period of

instruction to measure the acquisition skills and knowledge as well as the competencies of acquisition of the state standards as defined in an alignment of our academic content standards to the content assessed in our case in grades 3-8, that's the smarter balanced assessment content. So one of the considerations to take into account is those administrations that are multiple times a year, like the NWEA map, we refer to those as interim assessments. There's different labels. That is what NWEA uses. At what point and at what measure would you use just for your consideration? In other words, if we administer in fall, winter, and spring, what's more important? Is it fall to spring? Is it fall, winter? Is it winter to spring? Well, in acing accountability, that conversation was had and it was quite stimulating. We ended up with spring to spring, in other words, wanting to know at the end of each school year, to what extent did students improve instead of within the school year from fall to spring. And again, another consideration for the commission is that any one of those assessment windows the fall, winter, and spring is a window. It's not a point in time on a single day like our CT examination, for example, for all grade 11 students. And so, there is also a correlation between instruction time and when a student tests, in other words, the more instruction time path data shows, your outcomes on the assessment improve. And so, some schools, some instructors may try to wait until the end of the window for those reasons. Other instructors for other logistical considerations may not have that ability to push or to move their assessing of their students to later in the window. So I'm only offering that for thought for consideration when thinking about which one of the assessments would be used. Fall, winter, or spring. But also what do we really want to look at? And as I said, for acing, we ended up with wanting to know from grade to grade what kind of improvement or growth did students make. And so, we use that spring to spring measure. Thank you.

**Chair Hobbs:** Thank you. Okay. So that last sentence is one that I wanted to ask about as well. Public reporting of literacy rates scarce across the nation. Is there a reason for that or real reason?

**Noman Kanani:** I think there just isn't as much research to show the extent to which -- I think the scenario where you have a school where students are doing really well in literacy. There may be less opportunity for growth when you're at a very high end of the spectrum, whereas when you're compared to someone who's at the lower end of the spectrum. So if you're only presenting growth metrics, might you be potentially misrepresenting a school's contributions to literacy if growth is not as high. And so, I think there's been some of these questions in the literature, and given that we don't have great answers to these questions, there's been some reluctance to using them as measures that that can be displayed publicly that parents can decide on whether that's a good school for literacy or not. So those questions are in the literature and I don't have a good answer for what's the right approach.

**Chair Hobbs:** No, that makes a lot of sense. I mean, it ties back to bullet point number one, when we had the discussion about proficiency or growth. Proficiency, you could, I suppose, see when you're looking at a particular school, hey, they're reading at this level on the average that looks better in some sense, right?

**Noman Kanani:** Right.

**Chair Hobbs:** Then the time context of growth, which is something that we're very interested in measuring as far as performance is concerned. So any direction with respect to the fourth bullet point so we can maybe move on.

**Punam Mathur:** I'm sorry -- Punam. Just to clarify elsewhere in our performance framework or accountability system, we've got the proficiency scores, right? Of those national standardized tests. I think that would also be part of what we're building. So if I'm a parent wondering whether it's a high reading school, I can look at the n results and see a high-rate proficiency, right? Even if there's a low -- if what we're talking about here is a gauge to evaluate literacy based on growth, but in the scenario, that was a really good point you made. If I see a low growth pace in a literacy indicator, but I see high proficiency rate, I can sort of square the two. That makes sense. They're not growing as fast because there's less head room for now. Can I think about that

properly? Okay.

**Noman Kanani:** Chairman Hobbs, with respect to this last bullet, so, I think there is value to use the W MAP data and if the bullet is to, for us as a commission to make a recommendation to use that assessment, then I think that we should be using the information in that assessment tool in our performance framework.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. Let's see if we can fashion some direction out of what we just went through here. So to define the literacy rate growth seems like a better measure to the second bullet point, including K-1, two, and three, that data already exists. Show progression. On the third one, I believe the direction was to focus more on the progression that we see from K-2, 3, is that correct? And in the last one, using NWEA map, if I got that right from you, Paul.

**Paul Johnson:** Yep, that sounds good, Guy.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay, that's a summary of that one.

**Punam Mathur:** Do you want a motion?

**Chair Hobbs:** And I suppose to make it easier, I could make that as a motion.

**Punam Mathur:** Then I will second your motion.

**Chair Hobbs:** Additional discussion. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chair Hobbs:** Opposed or abstain? Okay. Let me ask very quickly too, to the members of the commission, Member Woodhouse had a doctor's appointment and she has been unable to make it. I've heard since from Member McIntosh who thought he would be able to join late and was unable to. And Member Goudie has a 2:30 meeting that he has to attend. Is there anyone else on the commission with a hard stop this afternoon? I have one at four o'clock for a call that I thought I scheduled late enough in the day. So if there's no others, we'll continue on. Back to you Kelsey.

**Kelsey Krausan:** Thank you Kelsey Krausan for the record. The next two considerations are around data that is not currently available. I received an email from NDE staff during the meeting to say that one potential way to address the first metric about 25% of the school year, a substitute teacher is to have districts use a substitute assignment code, an infinite campus on position that are being filled by a long-term substitute teacher. It doesn't address if classes are taught being taught by a series of short-term subs though. So for this one, there's an opportunity to either use existing data on the number of short and long-term subs or to sort of work with NDE and others to build out some data collection for actually collecting data on substitute for more than 25% of the school year. I think these are good to be taken together. They're just not currently data collected on vacancies for support staff. So it's sort of, it's the same question. Does the commission want NDE to put the processes in place to collect these data?

**Chair Hobbs:** I mean, the first question that comes to my mind is probably the same one that came to a lot of folks, it's the relationship of the value of the data versus the level of effort that will be required to produce that data. And NDE probably would have to comment on, what additional workload, doing either of these would create for them or the districts because it's the districts that'll have to report to them. So is there some feeling about that?

**Kelsey Krausan:** From NDA staff, I think yeah.

**Chair Hobbs:** Yes, exactly.

**Peter Zutz:** So, that's a great question and I think it is integral to the larger umbrella. Concept of this conversation is to minimize the burden of collections and reporting on districts while providing sufficient data to both comply to state and federal law and meet all other reporting needs, so to speak. And those needs could be the needs of the commission on school funding as well as other commissions. We do currently collect in bullet one, sub bullet one and or use existing data on the number of short- and long-term subs, either temporarily or in lieu of this. So we do collect existing data on short- and long-term subs to be clear. And if the original question was what is the burden? I think another part of the conversation we have been a part of both in the work groups and with attending the commission on school funding is the burden versus value. To what extent does what we're collecting give us insight into what answer or what question we want answered. To be sure, we also oversee external data requests coming into the department and some of those data requests necessitate us working. We're collecting additional data to fulfill that request in collaboration with our districts. It's simply data we don't have at the state. That being said, if there is value in collecting data, I would appreciate hearing from Dave and some of our other district partners.

**Peter Zutz:** To what extent that is a burden for them because this is the conundrum we find ourselves in the state, both either complying with recent legislation, which requires us to go out and request new data sets for our districts. And then what, once that data is provided to the state by districts, what's the outcome? What's the use of that data? And I think that would be our perspective. We can collect anything with our partners. Again, the state in our office who leads a lot of this data collection and recording work, we rely on our districts. We can't do anything we do without them. And so, if there's value in collecting that, we can certainly collect it. That, however, is not a decision that we would make solely in our office. Thank you.

**Chair Hobbs:** Fair. And well, thank you for that. And that was my concern too. I think the districts need to comment on the burden question that you raised, and I think I raised earlier.

**Mark Mathers:** Chair Hobbs, on both of these points.

**Chair Hobbs:** Yeah,

**Mark Mathers:** So, Mark Mathers for the record. I'll just chime in that yes, this would be very burdensome if you need a confirmation of that, I guess on this measure, I'm confused what we're after. The next measure talks about vacancy rates and then in objective five, their measure for attendance rate of teachers. I think this measure would capture -- when we say the number of classes taught by a substitute, that would be based on two factors. I think one is, how many vacancies do we have of teacher positions? And then of those that are actually filled by teacher positions, what percentage of teachers on any given day call in sick or have professional development need coverage? Those are the two components that would generate a rate of classes taught by a substitute teacher. I'm looking at our APA plus those experts, right? Because if it's just the vacancy rates, that's the second measure. So it's the vacancies. I mean, no.

**Kelsey Krausan:** Kelsey Krausan for the record. I would just amend to say that I think the intention here is to look at classes that have had a substitute for more than a quarter of the school year.

**Mark Mathers:** That's going to be captured in the vacancy rate more or less, right? I mean, if you define vacancies, and we had this discussion in a working group yesterday. If you define vacancy, if you don't include long-term subs as filling a position, in other words, the vacancies mean it has to be filled by a permanent certified teacher, then what's the difference between these two measures? No one. Can anyone answer Paul?

**Paul Johnson:** Yes. Chairman Hobbs, with your permission, Member Johnson for the record. No, I would agree with you, Mark. And when you take a look at, first of all, I agree, we don't want to calculate, figure out what percent of the year we all have definitions of what long-term subs are, and we can track that a little bit better. So what are we going to do with this data? So that we identify that you have a bunch of long-term subs then what? What are we as a school district going to be able to do to change that? And I think it is tied directly into the vacancy rate because that data tells very much the same story. If you have a high vacancy rate, you're going to have a lot of sub. So, what are we going to do with this data? To me it may use one or the other in my opinion.

**Mark Mathers:** I mean, to me the second measure is way more straightforward and understandable. But yeah, they seem like redundant or overlapping measures, especially when you consider the measure and objective five, the attendance rate for teachers. I don't understand the value of the first one. Can this commission recommend not deleting that requirement out of law? If that's the case, then I would recommend deleting that first measure because it's burdensome to collect and it's overlapping with the second measure.

**Peter Zutz:** This is one of the things that AB400 [indiscernible] whatever the number is, this is one of the things that we were assigned to do. Right? Okay. So there's an option to explain why this isn't in the best interest of moving us forward as a state and making a solid case. And I think you've just made the case because the juice is not --

**Chair Hobbs:** That's totally fine for us to provide that input back.

**Peter Zutz:** So this will go under the juice is not worth the squeeze for better responses.

**Chair Hobbs:** And would that be with reference to both of these bullets or more so the substitute teacher? Mark, go ahead.

**Mark Mathers:** I was suggesting delete the first one. I think the second one is easier to calculate and more meaningful and understandable. [Crosstalk] Yeah, please.

**Peter Zutz:** In terms of support staff, I think that too is going to be incredibly burdensome. Unlike teachers and administrators who generally are rotation is in a cycle towards the end of the year, start of the year, support staff is an ongoing influx, outflux of staff members. It's going to be an ever-changing number. I know the intent is when everybody's saying we can't find bus drivers, we can't find food service, whatever that may be, support staff is going to be a moving target that is going to change with me on any given week. And so, I question the validity and what value that brings to us. And if we can avoid inclusion of support staff, they're valuable individuals, valuable employees, however, they don't operate the same as teachers and administrators.

**Punam Mathur:** And just to clarify, where would like social workers and counselors skills not support staff?

**Peter Zutz:** We include them under our certified, which is teachers.

**Punam Mathur:** Okay.

**Mark Mathers:** Chair Hobbs or Dr. Jensen, I guess that raises the question. When we're calculating the rate of vacancies, is that based on points in time or is it an aggregate average vacancy rate of every day of the school year?

**Dr. David Jensen:** Good question.

**Chair Hobbs:** Well, that is a really good question, Mark. And with these two items, I don't think it would be inappropriate for the commission based on this discussion to take a position that both of these may in fact be very useful pieces of information to have however, that data is not currently collected and would be administratively challenging to collect.

**Mark Mathers:** Well, I'm not sure about that. I guess. Again, if it goes back to, goes back to points in time. So if I were to be required to measure the vacancy rate four times a year, in my book, that's not burdensome. If it's every day, if it's an average of the vacancy rate for every day in the school year, it is. Maybe it depends on how we define it. I still think item number one is not necessary. Item number two, I can see the value of it and in my view it's not burdensome to collect it four times a year.

**Kelsey Krausan:** Kelsey Krausan for the record. When we interviewed NDE staff about this metric, we were told that the vacancy rate is based on October 1st, the October 1st vacancy rate. And those are data that are already collected for teachers and administrators.

**Dr. David Jensen:** This is Member Jensen. So knowing it's an October fixed date value for teachers and administrators, what value does that bring on support staff that are not in annual contracts?

**Paul Johnson:** Member Johnson for the record. So there are more than just -- teachers is kind of a -- I don't know if that's the correct phrase, perhaps licensed or certificated individuals because you can have support staff which are licensed, your social workers, counselors, school psychs. They also can be licensed teachers. The folks that we have that are hourly wage and hour folks are your paraprofessionals, which are also called teacher's aides, your bus driver for those. So I think there is a distinction between the type of support staff, but I really think we're talking more about licensed personnel as opposed to unlicensed because as Dave indicated, the licensed personnel they'll sign a contract for a year, so are the school administrators, but the support staff that's not licensed. They are day-to-day hourly. They can come and go. And we have a high volume of turnover in classified physicians, especially with respect to special education aide because you get paid a lot in our school district. They have health insurance and the work is difficult. So there's a lot of turnover there.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. Just to summarize where we are, I think we know where we are with the first consideration relative to the substitute teachers and the 25% of the school year. Right. That has changed through any of this dialogue. On the second one, what I'm hearing now is, it would be reported on a single, or it is reported on a single date, that being in October, which Mark, I don't know if I'm right or wrong, wrong, but that doesn't sound administratively burdensome. So to Dave's point, okay, what does that tell you? And I think that's really important. What does that tell us? Anything useful?

**Mark Mathers:** For support staff or for all categories?

**Chair Hobbs:** The support staff.

**Mark Mathers:** Well, I mean, I'll play devil's advocate. I mean, a couple years ago, many, many districts had many, many best driver vacancies. Is that information not valuable to others?

**Peter Zutz:** But it's just a snapshot. And with our teachers, our certified -- because I could have all of my bus driver positions filled on this October date and come November 15th and goes out on maternity and doesn't return and one retires. It's a snapshot that yes, it, it answers a question for me on that date, but it doesn't mean anything two weeks later.

**Chair Hobbs:** So Mark, back to the point you raised earlier, it would a better direction with this be to, as you

brought up, take that measure four times a year. I don't know what those four magic dates are, but does that add any value to it?

**Mark Mathers:** I mean, it gets past the one day a year sampling problem. Again, I mean, granted support staff aren't on contracts, but you have budgeted positions and you know, which positions are filled or vacant. I guess, yeah, sure, that goes up and down throughout the year, but that's the case for all agencies, I guess. I don't have a problem with measuring vacancy rates as support staff four times a year. I think there could be value to it, but if others disagree, I don't feel super strongly about it.

**Chair Hobbs:** No, I'm just looking actually to try to land our position on this, and it might be that in implementing this, we would recommend that it be provided on certain dates. It might be that the commission doesn't see the value from an overall performance and accountability reporting framework.

**Dr. David Jensen:** Yeah. Chairman Hobbs.

**Chair Hobbs:** Yes.

**Dr. David Jensen:** That's kind of where I was going with that. At a school level, that turnover rate's important because, so we have assessed the turnover rate with respect to our paraprofessionals internally to find out what we could do to keep them here. But I don't know that that information needs to go into a school accountability performance framework. It is, yes, it's important for me to track at a district level because it's something I can do to help maintain some of the consistency and bus drivers and some of those other areas, but I don't know the relevance of that when, when it comes to the school and district performance framework.

**Chair Hobbs:** Any other thoughts? [Crosstalk] Please Dusty. Go ahead.

**Dusty Casey:** Member Casey for record. I would agree with Dr. Jensen as far as the support staff. The other thing is different duties by different staff members change depending on the district, the school. So what information that actually provides the public, I don't know, when it comes to support staff. To Mark's point, that October one, data is already collected. If we wanted a second point in time, to me, the end of the school year would make sense, because October one's the beginning of the school year, see what the vacancy rate looks like, and then the end of the school year, what we fill, I don't know, quarterly, if we already have to collect data for October one, what those other dates would look like, and what information they would really provide. But I would be up for twice a year for the licensed positions and administrators. And I would be in supportive leaving off support staff and definitely leaving off the first point on this slide. Thank you.

**Chair Hobbs:** [Crosstalk] Go ahead.

**Christy McGill:** Sorry. This is Christy McGill, deputy superintendent. You may want to consider, so the point in time counts. We know that they're not everything that we would like, but it gives you a view, and again, it's a short-term kind of banded approach. Teacher vacancies a very important indicator. We all know that. We also would like to, we're trying to move our systems, working with the districts forward in a digital reporting. But until we get there, this is a very -- I agree with Superintendent Jensen. This is a very arduous data set to actually get. I mean, it seems like it should be fairly easy, but when you're looking at schools and it really does take the district some time to do that. But we do know it's important and we are trying to work toward a more systematic way of reporting this indicator.

**Chair Hobbs:** Let me go out on a limb here. I think everybody agrees with the first bullet point, right? Not out on that one, but on the second one. What's that?

**Paul Johnson:** Was agreeing with you.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. So on the second one, the inclusion of support staff, in the bolded language, I assume that comes directly from the metrics that were prescribed to us. And I suppose another course of action that we could take is to remove support staff, recommend that support staff be removed from that line, and provide rationale as to why. Some of that has to do with how often it is collected throughout the year. The more often it's collected, the more burdensome it becomes. And also there's a question as with regard to its relevance from a performance and accountability standpoint. Agree, disagree?

**Dr. David Jensen:** Member Jensen, that's my position on it. And that would be my motion.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. So that we have a motion for the second bullet point. Is there a second?

**Paul Johnson:** I second. Member Johnson.

**Chair Hobbs:** We have a motion in a second. Any additional discussion? And this is on the second bullet point. We'll come back to the first one in a moment. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying, aye.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chair Hobbs:** Opposed or abstain? And then back to the first bullet point. Somebody want to make a motion?

**Dr. David Jensen:** Member Jensen, I have moved to exclude data collection on substitute teachers at this time, or make a recommendation to exclude.

**Unidentified Speaker:** One second.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. Have a motion and a second. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chair Hobbs:** And with both of those, motions, hopefully those were clear enough for the record. With both of those motions, we will want to be including a sufficient amount of explanation supporting the reason for the motion. Okay? Great. Kelsey, back to you. We're moving along.

**Kelsey Krausan:** Well done. Kelsey Krausan for the record. I think we're going to move to objective five here. So do you have the endurance to get through this last, well, there's two, but Okay. So we can keep going. Okay. These are metrics that beyond just having an alternate metric felt really worthy of additional review and discussion by the commission. And let's see. Here, I think I'm turning it over to Noman again.

**Noman Kanani:** Have me forward two more slides. So this one, the attendance rate for teachers is a measure that's currently reported on the Nevada report card. However, there does tend to be very limited variability in attendance rates for teachers across districts. I believe what's reported is a daily attendance rate. So again, this is what proportion of teachers are in attendance, in a given school on any day of the year. It is a measure that is aggregated at the school level. And it doesn't consider that there may be certain teachers who are missing school more often than others. So there is evidence in support of using teacher attendance for school accountability. But it's very scarce. It's not a common measure that's used. So, we put into this section to put into deeper consideration whether it's worth including or not. But there is a relationship between teachers attendance and student achievement. It's just not very strong. And part of the reason is that it's very hard to study. And so, the literature is very limited. Doesn't have as much to say on the connection between the two.



The second metric, the number of pupils in elementary school who were promoted to the next grade after testing below, proficient in reading in the immediately preceding school year, separated by grade level, and by level of performance on the relevant test. This metric is tied to the read by grade three law. When it was initially passed in 2015, I believe, had a clause in there that students who scored below efficient on the state standardized reading test in third grade had to be retained instead of being promoted to fourth grade. This is a very common law across the country. But a few years ago, Nevada voted to remove the retention component of the read by grade three law. And then recently last year it was brought back and it'll be in place in 2028. So what this metric seems to be getting at is how many students would have been -- in de facto, how many students would have been retained if that law was currently in place right now? How many students would likely not be promoted to grade four based upon their performance on the grade three standardized assessment. The question that we have for this one is, given that currently that the retention law is not in place, and there's already data on literacy, on literacy rates that we've talked about in the previous slides, is there additional value to having this measure in here? Does it give us something that we don't already know based upon the literacy rate? Uh, and then I'll also include that not every student, even though the law says students who are not permission will be retained, usually there are many, many exceptions that are made. And so, not every student who's below probation does end up actually getting get retained. So that may be a misleading figure as well. Then I'll pass on to Kelsey for the next slide.

**Kelsey Krausan:** Next to the next one. Great. Thank you. Okay. And the next metric is about whether or not schools are able are employing a licensed teacher designated to serve as a literacy specialist and those, the number of schools that fail to employ such a teacher. So a couple of considerations, just again, to what degree does the commission feel that this is really an important metric beyond those other metrics around assessing student literacy? And there's some questions that were brought up when we met with NDE staff about some -- schools don't necessarily hire someone just to be a literacy specialist. They designate a certain proportion of a teacher's time to serve in this role. So, would it matter how much of a staff, a teacher's time is dedicated to being a literacy specialist or do you want to discern between whether or not someone is employed full-time in this position, or just designated? And it also brings up issues around staffing across the state in general, and the challenges that some schools and school districts face in this area.

**Kelsey Krausan:** Another question about inclusion of this as a metric to really measure student and school progress?

**Chair Hobbs:** Is that all of them under objective five?

**Kelsey Krausan:** We have a couple more.

**Chair Hobbs:** I had a feeling you would.

**Kelsey Krausan:** Alright. New voice, Ryan.

**Ryan:** This is Ryan [indiscernible] from WestEd for the record. The next metric is the number of pupils who enroll in a vocational or technical school or apprenticeship training programs. Student access to these programs can serve as an important metric for evaluating the availability and effectiveness of specialized programs that prepare students for specific careers. This can also be a metric for the degree to which school programming aligns with broader market demands. An important point about this metric is related data might not be reliable according to NDE. No entity in the state collects this information and survey data that might be collected from students or schools might be inaccurate or unreliable in that collection. This can be an important metric, but might need more time to systematize how this data is collected. For example, the state apprenticeship council is working with the GOWINN and NPWR to get their data into the state longitudinal data system.

And then moving to the number of schools and classrooms within each school in which the number of pupils in attendance exceeds the design capacity for the school or classroom, this metric and the conversation around it aligns with the conversation the commission had earlier on class size reporting. This capacity metric is related to if classrooms are over capacity, which can help bring understanding related to school and learning environments. NDE has found that defining capacity across schools and districts is complicated. NDE does collect information regarding quality and issues with school buildings, while this metric can identify schools that may require additional resources or infrastructure improvements, there are other metrics that provide information related to school and learning environments.

**Kelsey Krausan:** Okay. And the last one, Noman.

**Noman Kanani:** So this last one we presented on last month during the commissioning. And so, I won't go into any detail here, but this relates to survey data on school satisfaction. As we discussed in more detail last time, there isn't an existing statewide survey on satisfaction. There are surveys on school climate, which there are some intersections between the two, but not exactly. School climate includes many other assets to it as well. There isn't a subcomponent of the school climate survey that specifically deals with the way researchers tend to define satisfaction. So if we were going to go ahead and use the school climate survey, some short considerations is that one, every district must use the same survey. Last time we talked about that Washoe and Clark County have their own surveys. I don't know if they also do the Nevada school climate survey as well. We have to think more deeply about the Civil properties of those surveys, which are currently not reported publicly, and the response rates of those existing surveys from past years to ensure that there is a good enough representation of who is taking these surveys from both student and parent. Both student parent, and the staff population. So I'll stop there for that.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. If we can, let's stay with this one for a second, because this one to me seems topically very different from the others included in this objective. Okay. And I could see that a properly administered survey with respect to student and parent satisfaction being something meaningful that I suppose could be part of a reporting framework. I mean, that's just me. I could certainly see that as part of its ranking or perception that those that are the customers of the school or the district are satisfied or not with the services they're receiving. I do wonder about all districts using exactly the same survey because I could certainly see characteristic differences between some of the urban areas and the rural areas. I know that you want to make them comparable across all district boundaries. So I would think in large part, some of the questions would be the same, but there may be peculiar differences in some of the rural areas that wouldn't exist in the urban areas. And I may be wrong about that, but I would think that we would want to be supportive of a survey that is administered correctly, analyzed correctly and thus reported correctly. That part I think is very clear. Paul, do you have any comments on whether or not one standardized survey would fit all?

**Paul Johnson:** Thanks, Chair Hobbs. Member Johnson for the record. That's a great question and this is kind of the needs to be developed further type of bullet, I think. I don't know that it's a one size fits all approach. I think there are much vary levels of, I guess, climate measures from a larger place than a smaller place. And there's things that larger places have to deal with at smaller places do not. So, I think there are inherent differences that would almost be like a standardized test. It won't take into consideration cultural differences. So I'm in agreement with you on that. And as far as the way this has in a framework that would've to be determined as well, but I do see that there would be some value to measure the sense of security, safety and belonging that parents and students have to identify those kind of base level needs that make them more inclined to, be creative and innovative and perform better at the school level. So I think there's value in having that but it would have to be a very similar and require some variances based on the nuances of the environment. But again, this is going to be --

**Chair Hobbs:** Well, I suppose you can get at that a couple of different ways. You can have a standardized

survey that has questions that if these conditions apply to you, continue you answering questions 21 to 25, right? And where my head immediately jumped was to things that related to transportation and age of facilities and things like that, that might come through differently. And in parts of the same or the -- and I'm thinking about what you and I have talked about a number of times relative to your facilities out there and in some of the other parts of the state compared to those that have had ongoing capital programs and that kind of thing. But maybe it could be designed that way.

**Dr. David Jensen:** We have a survey that I think is optional to fill out at this point, doesn't carry any point value in the performance framework. So there is something that exists, and there's probably somebody at NDE that would've more information on that.

**Chair Hobbs:** But again, this is something that has been designated for inclusion, right? Because it's one of the identified metrics. So I don't know that we would really take issue with the survey being, sorry, I had a couple of messages pop across. I don't think we would be taking issues with the fact that there should be a survey. I think those that I've been involved with, everything lies in the design of the survey. So I don't know that -- do we need an action on this?

**Punam Mathur:** Sorry, Member Mathur. This for me is one of those things where it's probably a really good idea, just not now. We've got some really basic questions that legislature and all of us want answers to. And that is, is the investment working? Is the formula working? Is it moving achievement? And so, if there's a short term, midterm, long term, it is a really good idea at some point, figure out a valid way to see customer input across the entire state. It just feels like that is nuts energy that is appropriately spent now. And so, we've got a few districts that are doing it. That's not the ideal way to do it, but we've still got districts that are doing it.

**Chair Hobbs:** To that same point, it strikes me that this is one of the things that there's risk in this too. This is one of the things that you could do next year, right? And the year after and the year after, and get more immediate input from your customers while you're waiting for other lag indicators to develop. That's the other side of it. But again, it's been identified for us. So we'll have to take some kind of action in the direction or to provide direction or comments back with respect to this. It may be that, as you say, time and effort is better spent on other things at the moment. But anyway.

**Punam Mathur:** Is there an option for us to say thank you legislature for this directive and just given other priorities, we're going to come back to you in two years with a recommendation or four years.

**Chair Hobbs:** And I think we can maybe do that and maybe provide a little bit more information. Like the commission also feels that wherever possible, the survey should be standardized between and among the different districts and should be administered in a proper fashion and statistically analyzed correctly. I mean, we could probably say something like that as well. Anybody feel differently? Okay. Kelsey, if we back up to the other four, I think there were four or five before this one, and maybe we're getting to the sixth hour of our meeting that I say this. Some of these struck me a little bit differently. I keep thinking about these metrics from the standpoint of usefulness in a performance framework. Performance and accountability framework. And as I read some of these, the way they strike me is, yeah, it's pretty good information. It probably would be a lot more interesting to Dave, as a school superintendent than it would be for an overall performance framework. So, it seems like we're almost creating now a couple of different buckets, one of which is a series of metrics that go to the issue of a performance framework and a bucket of other things that are statistically interesting to know, particularly if you're managing a district or a school.

**Dr. David Jensen:** Chair Hobbs, Member Jensen, for the record. I appreciate you priming that, because that was exactly my thoughts. These are interesting metrics and they're data points that I think most schools are collecting and taking a look at. However, the issue for me is what would it mean to compare Humboldt County

to Washoe County or Clark County or Eureka County, when each of these are going to be impacted by different indicators or situations or schools. And so, does it provide any real value in the long run outside of Humboldt County in isolation? So I really struggled. The only one that I was toying with was attendance rate for teachers because that is interesting. If teachers aren't in the classroom, kids aren't learning. And I think that's why there was a preliminary discussion around subs. But again, there's factors on why that's not happening as well. So, my thought is these are great individual district measures. I don't think they should be included in the framework.

**Paul Johnson:** You're on mute, Guy.

**Chair Hobbs:** I think there are a couple on the next page, Kelsey, that were even, I don't know, more striking to me as being less about performance. And I look at this one and I understand what the importance of a literacy specialist is. I also understand why some of the schools don't have them. It's practical reality that they're hard to find in some areas. But is this something that ties directly to performance too, or is this more of a staffing related issue, or am I not connecting the dots?

**Dr. David Jensen:** So this is Member Jensen, I just chime in. I think it could tie to performance, but only if each of the specialists were operating in the same capacity, and they're not going to be across districts and school sites. So we're going to be comparing different data points on what these specialists are doing in the classrooms. That's why I was opposed to it.

**Paul Johnson:** Yeah. Chairman Hobbs, Member Johnson, for the record. This is like, this is a budgetary issue and a local control on how you want to move the performance of students with respect to literacy. One school district may want to have a literacy specialist, but another school may want to invest in professional development, and not have a literacy specialist. So the school, and the performances may be the same. So, I don't see the value in forcing school districts to purchase literacy specialists. First of all, they're hard to come by and there may be a bunch of constraints that limit their ability to do so.

**Henry Dixon:** Chair Hobbs, this is Deputy Superintendent Henry Dixon. We would like to have Mandy speak to that, if you wouldn't mind.

**Chair Hobbs:** Please.

**Mandy Latham:** Good afternoon, Mandy Latham, for the record. I just want to say that AB 289 2019, specifically says that schools, every school in Nevada must designate a licensed teacher to be a literacy specialist. Now, there is some leeway, you're right, where it could be a full-time classroom teacher who might be paid a stipend, or it might be a school district that has much more capacity that could have a literacy specialist employed full time. But what we're finding is that while some of these districts are compliant and they designate someone, their time is being taken away. They're not actually able to fulfill the role for which they are supposed to. And we know from research, the literacy specialists are important. They're supposed to, by law, we have regulations on the trainings that they are supposed to provide teachers. They are supposed to be a valuable resource for teachers and for students. And so, in my opinion, this is an important metric that we would want to capture on how are these literacy specialists being used? Because it is part of the poor people funding that they are supposed to be a part of that staff.

**Chair Hobbs:** I hope the earlier comments didn't suggest that we believe it's an unimportant metric. I was just trying to, at least in my own mind, separate those that are specifically related to developing a reporting system on performance from those that are certainly important, but maybe not part of that reporting framework that's all.

**Punam Mathur:** Chairman Hobbs, this is Member Mathur. Yeah, it's murky because it's so easy to say that's important, let's add it. That's important, let's add it. And then we end up with something that's so overwhelming that isn't cutting through and giving us any clarity in the journey, right? And so, for me, there's alienation, it's a very slight one, and it gets gray real quickly between what is the thing that we're trying to accomplish and the how are we going to accomplish it? And I think too often we get busy around the metrics of the how and thereby reduce our focus on where we need to get to. And so, I thought the rich conversation that we had about literacy, focusing on growth paid through third annual snapshot of how we're progressing on a parallel track, we've made a policy decision to empower schools and leave local control. And so, I want to do that. And we've structured the formula in such a way that the money theoretically follows that kid goes to the school. And so if the school picks this, how good for them? And I don't know that we need to come up with a way to measure the how they're doing. What we need to see is you've achieved growth that is outpacing your peers, or you're struggling. And so, for me, this one as important as it is, feels more like a how than the destination itself, which is for me, literacy. Right? And there may be other, there may be other things that schools could imagine to have about wraparound services. I don't know, or load up on literacy specialists.

**Paul Johnson:** It's more of an input than [indiscernible].

**Punam Mathur:** Yeah, so much more succinctly than after six hours I did. But yes, that's it.

**Chair Hobbs:** Let me suggest this for the time being. It's been a long day for everybody. Both the members of the commission and everyone here that's providing support and help to us. I want to be mindful of that. Let's hold on objective five for a moment and maybe move to objective six. So at least we are able to absorb everything that you brought to us, Kelsey.

**Kelsey Krausan:** Okay, great. And I would really -- I'm going to ask member Johnson to share on objective six. These are just some longer-term recommendations around alignment between different reporting frameworks in the state. So, Member Johnson, I'll turn it over to you.

**Secretary:** Thanks, Kelsey, I appreciate that. And I think, Johnson, you're working on the slide deck, right?

**Paul Johnson:** I am. So on objective six, we've already taken a look at, if you think of this, we have a bunch of different puzzles currently with a bunch of pieces all dumped into one puzzle box. So the first part, Jason's group is trying to get rid of all of the pieces that don't belong to the puzzle. And now we're trying to identify how to get the right pieces in order to get the right picture. And then the last piece of that is going forward afterward, how do we operationalize this and move forward? So some things to consider and, Guy, I don't know how you want to do this since it's late in the day. We can go through these and maybe do recommendations next time. But introduce it here as a concept for us to think about for the next, for the next meeting. But one of the things we talked about on the bulleted item right there in blue is the difficulties that everyone's going to have with having multiple frameworks, which we talked about earlier in this conversation. We have the acing accountability, which has some similarities, but differences to the Nevada School Performance Framework. We have the AB400 and SB98, which one's more important? Which one we're supposed to use? Which one are school districts supposed to align their resources with? So with that, there's a lot of confusion and dilution as to the significance of each one of those. So I think what I've heard from talking to my colleagues that it's best to have really one performance framework, whether it's the NSPF in its current form or some modified form, instead of having multiple frameworks. And so, the list flow that is some considerations that we can take a look at. The first one there to sunset, the acing accountability or incorporate those similar metric measures into a school performance framework rolling in the AB400, SB98, and the Nevada School Performance Framework, so that we have a comprehensive measure. The things that might be lacking in the NSPF, maybe we can gain from the other systems. Creating a statewide data portal and reporting system to not only minimize, you heard Peter Zutz earlier mentioned the burden on school districts, but there's

also a burden on NDE to do all this stuff too. So we want to maximize the efficiency of airtime as well. So if we're able to create a data portal that we can upload our information similar to what a manner that we do with school nomics, the data could be extracted from that database, that would create some efficiencies, reduce, and that would reduce the burden for collecting data and reporting data. It would require that we invest in human resources and systems of both probably capital and operational, that aren't their Department of Education currently. And then we would want to make sure that whatever data that we are collecting with respect to the performance of the PCFP, is also aligned with whatever performance framework that we come up with, that we think. So those bits and pieces of data that tell the story that we want to tell about the portrait of a student, but also the portrait of a school as well. And so, I'll pause right there and see if anybody wants to add to that or if there's any questions.

**Chair Hobbs:** Paul, I think everything that you've summarized here is dead on.

**Paul Johnson:** Okay. Thanks, Guy. I appreciate the feedback. So, the next piece there is, well, now that we've identified that, so, now what. So what we can consider is having our Nevada Department of Education evaluate and revise the NSPF to include more meaningful indicator and measures, whatever those may be. They can take from the existing data sets that we currently have, the volumes of data and report that we have that is currently gathered. Find out what bits and pieces are most significant out of that and put them into one improved performance framework. Now, I can tell you that the NSPF, I mean, that's a huge undertaking. It has to be federally approved, and it's no small feat to modify. So we want to make sure that that is something that NDE is comfortable with, because they're probably going to be doing a lot of the heavy lifting on that, and their input is valuable. We're partners, they're partners with us, and we're partners with them. And then, I keep hearing Putin's voice in this to find the key performance indicators, those harbinger and success that most align with the practices and services that we provide as educator that are most meaningful to the influence of development of our students. And then the final piece is, once we go through this, if we are able to come up with a different modified and better school performance framework, it has to be rolled out in some fashion. So there would have to be some piloting and student engagement, or public engagement platform as well, that we have to go through to make sure that whatever we come up with is understood well from all levels of stakeholders. And the purpose would be to gain such a great understanding that this tool that we come up with is the tool that's used by parents and policy holders, executive branch, and whoever else needs to make decisions with respect to better bettering our education system and being the catalyst for improvement. And I think I'll stop there for comments.

**Chair Hobbs:** Anyone have any comments so far? Okay, Paul.

**Paul Johnson:** And I think we'll want a commission to come up with recommendations with respect to objective six. I don't know if that's something we want to work through at this point. But the considerations for recommendation would be creating a single on there in front of me, you can read as well as I can, creating a single integrated reporting framework to measure progress in Nevada that incorporates all of the things we think are important. Second bullet is commission on school funding mails. Also wanting to consider having any evaluate, revise the NSPF to include more meaningful holistic indicators and measures. And that's something that I can hear our superintendent here is named Adam Young. Those are his words, meaningful and holistic that he has been repeating over and over and over again. And I think they would probably agree with that as well. And then also the last one there, to work with NDE to ensure public engagement, because whatever we come up with, unless it's well known and commonly understood, it's not going to be worth all of the effort and paper that we've put into it.

**Chair Hobbs:** Paul, just a couple of comments from me to get this going. Your third bullet, I absolutely agree that that is something that needs to be done, and it's obviously going to take a good amount of time and effort to have the type of public engagement that we need to have to get the appropriate buy-in and recognition of this as

the reporting system. I couldn't agree more. I do think it's important to hear from NDE with respect to the recommendations that you're making because as I picked up from your comments, they'll be shouldering a lot of the burden to make these changes. So I'd be very interested in Megan's comments as well.

**Megan Peterson:** Megan Peterson, deputy superintendent for the record. This is an activity that we are currently undertaking from a variety of fronts to streamline, to revise a number of these obviously will do include engagement and conversations with outside parties. And so, we will engage in those and do what we can in alignment with the governor's missions and goals for the state. So I'll leave it there for the time being. We are looking for those opportunities to improve and standardize and find efficiencies, and we're looking forward to working with everyone as we can.

**Chair Hobbs:** Got it. And Paul, I think from the standpoint of the three bullets that you have here, the direction I think the commission could give you at this point, I don't know if this is a motion or not, help me think through this, but I think me as a member of this commission concur with all three of these points. I think they're incredibly important. And I don't know if anybody else on the commission feels any differently about that. I would certainly invite comments, but I think the direction from the commission would be, yes, let's continue on this route. Anyone?

**Punam Mathur:** For me, these three bullets sort of really depict the what could be possible or call it optimal, right? And so as a commission, we've been tasked with come up with optimal funding, and maybe we can extend that to include optimal accountability. So this is the where we got to get to. It's going to take a while. And so, in the narrative, as we keep doing the work underneath us, this for me is the destination someday.

**Chair Hobbs:** Well, it clearly is, and that's why I wasn't sure that emotion was required at this point, because you take bullet point number one, and yeah, building a statewide data portal and reporting system, that's a whole lot of stuff to do. And there'll be a lot of detailed decisions that'll have to be made along the way with respect to what data over what period of time and what order, how frequently? I mean, there's going to be a million questions like that, that I know Paul and his working group have already started to wrestle with. Everything that we've done up to this point and everything that we will do is important. But I think this is the core mission for this commission. During this interim. And I think there's a recognition here too, that in order to get from point A to point B, which is the ultimate or optimal reporting and system of reporting and accountability isn't something that's necessarily going to be finished by January 25th of next year. It's going to be a long, evolving process that's going to require a lot of buy-in, because as I read, NSPF acing accountability and everything, I think there's one other report out there too. We have to be adept politically, to ease into a reporting framework that anyone who has a stake in any other reporting framework will equally embrace. I think that's going to be a hugely important part of it. So, Paul, again, I think all of the points that you've raised in this are dead on. And hopefully the rest of the commission will be in a position to work with you as a larger working group, not get in your way, but work with you and support and help wherever we can from this point through the time that we file our final report. So thank you for all of those efforts and all of those that have provided support and helped you walk away.

**Dr. David Jensen:** Thanks, Guy. I just want to express my thank you to our WestEd folks and our APA folks. Their value is tremendous in this process. And also the engagement they have done with our Nevada Department of Education to make sure that their input is solicited because their important input, we're all in this together. We want to make sure that nobody feels excluded. So I appreciate the work of everybody that's got into this.

**Chair Hobbs:** Does anybody on the commission feel that we need to take any specific or direct action on these bullet points that we see here, other than to say, yes, let's keep this moving. I'm hearing none. Is it the appetite of the commission at this point to go back to objective five and talk through those and see what we can do with

those? Don't be afraid.

**Punam Mathur:** We've already eaten the elephant. Let's digest the tail.

**Chair Hobbs:** Alright, let's give that a shot. So if you can take us back to the beginning of objective five, and let's see what we can do. Let's keep in the back of our mind that again, these are things that were prescribed to us. We need to take an action that well, frankly, does something with each one of these. And I think we've had a lot of discussion around each of these individually, so hopefully now that we're coming back, we look back to these, it'll be a little bit of a fresher look. So attendance rate for teachers is this data that we currently, currently have?

**Punam Mathur:** Yes.

**Chair Hobbs:** And is it daily, is it tested periodically? How is it collected?

**Dr. David Jensen:** So, Chair Hobbs, member Jensen for the record. This is being collected at the individual district level through our attendance software and could be run on a daily basis. The data is available.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. So it's available. There's no additional burden to collect the data every, every district's doing that, I'm guessing. And so, what do we do with the data? Where does it fit? Is it part of the performance and accountability framework, or is it reported elsewhere?

**Megan Peterson:** Peterson for the record. It's currently collected in report card to comply. And the measure itself as of the first hundred days of instruction. Thank you.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. So you have any --

**Paul Johnson:** Chair Hobbs.

**Chair Hobbs:** Yes.

**Paul Johnson:** Just for a point of clarification, so there's really two pieces of this. So you have the metrics that's in the performance framework, which is mostly output based. And then you have a lot of important information inputs, things we're spending for district improvement plans, so on and so forth. And that information is resident in Nevada report card. So all of the information that we think is. So all of the information that we think is important should be in the Nevada report card, but there are only certain metrics that are going to be part of the performance framework. Does that make sense? So information like attendance rate for teachers that would maybe not be in the performance framework, it would be in the Nevada report card, or other inputs may not be part of the performance framework, but we would have information that would be in that other website.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. So, we collect it, we have it, it's available, it's where to record it. Right? I mean, you're saying it's in the Nevada report card now, but everything with the framework that you guys are working through would be pointing toward a single report that would become a report everyone uses, correct?

**Punam Mathur:** Correct. And Chair Hobbs, earlier today, we had the discussion around was a good measure, and we thought we sort of affirmed vacancy rates as a better measure than attendance of teachers. So for the performance framework, we've already set vacancy rates to things that we're going to march there. And so this is legislative be required. It shows up on the Nevada report card. I agree with you. Someday we ought not to have different report card. There's reporting different stuff than what's in the accountability framework. But I



don't know what to do with this in the meantime, because the lawmaker. I guess that must be a legislator wondering whether we would incorporate attendance rate for teachers into the performance framework. And I think our consensus is no vacancies a better measure.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay.

**Punam Mathur:** And maybe it's recognized. Is there a suggestion [indiscernible] we want to take the statute around that requires the Nevada report card out, that over time the legislation needs to slip back off that report code and let the performance framework depict in user-friendly and understandable ways a singular set of results for the state?

**Chair Hobbs:** Well, let me take a little bit of additional thought. I want to think about it within the context of the way the bill was written, which I don't recall off the top of my head right now when we listed all of these metrics. Whether it had language like, shall consider the following or shall use the following, I don't recall how that was framed. And I would like to go back and look at that to understand what kind of discretion we do have. Now, earlier in this day, we've taken some discretion with respect to some other metrics. But I'd like to go back and better understand that part of it to maybe be able to recommend an action that we could take relative to this metric by our next meeting. And that may be the same case for two or three of these bullet points. The next one, and again, Dave, not to lean on you too much, but I look at this one and it seems like that is an important or could be considered an important indicator of performance or change in performance over time. But I don't know,

**Dr. David Jensen:** Member Jensen, for the record. It does have value, but I think, again, the value comes more at the individual district level and school level because there's going to be so many variables on why decisions are made at the individual student level. And as we all know, the bill has a lot of exclusionary language that gives the districts and schools the opportunity to move forward, students forward, even if they didn't meet the requirement. It would be so hard to make a correlation between districts on this data point,

**Chair Hobbs:** To save everybody a little bit of time and anguish, given where we are in the day, and I appreciate everybody hanging in there.

**Joyce Woodhouse:** Chair Hobbs?

**Chair Hobbs:** Yes.

**Joyce Woodhouse:** This is Member Woodhouse. I apologize I had to step out for a while. On this one, and maybe this is a question for Megan. I know that the State Board of Education was very interested in read by grade three. Are they looking at anything or have they done anything that addresses this issue?

**Megan Peterson:** Megan Peterson for the record. Could you clarify a little bit more in terms of what action you're looking to confirm the state board is working on?

**Joyce Woodhouse:** Sure. Member Woodhouse for the record. I know that the state board of Ed was very interested in read by grade three. I believe they had a special board meeting with all board members there to work on read by grade three, which basically is the issue in the middle of this one. This one is across the board. But I was just wondering, out of that meeting, did they come up with a policy or a recommendation to the legislature that we should know about that might be helpful?

**Anne Marie Dixon:** Hi, Anne Marie Dixon for the record. That work group is still continuing. They have asked for our experts to bring information. We can update this group once they have recommendations, but at

this point we are just providing information and they have not made any determinations.

**Joyce Woodhouse:** I just would not want us to go down two separate paths on this topic.

**Chair Hobbs:** Let me suggest a possible course here. With respect to the bullet points under objective number five, I'd like to have a further conversation with Megan and whoever else she suggests to try to take these, better understand them relative to the direction given to us in the bill, and bring them back with a recommendation for each one that we could then talk through. When they're open-ended like this, it's very difficult to convert them into a specific recommendation. And I'm happy to take the time to do that. And anybody that would like to join me on that is certainly welcome. But I'm looking for a way to bring each of these to a conclusion in as efficient a manner as possible.

**Paul Johnson:** Member Johnson. I think that's a great idea. One of the frustrations in working in the working groups is we can't make recommendations. So it was really hard to put these together in a manner where we were not recommending something. So with you having the ability to do that with NDE, that would be great.

**Chair Hobbs:** Well, and I would say this too, and Megan can correct me if I'm wrong because she enjoys that. Where it's difficult for the working groups to make a recommendation. It shouldn't be a recommendation, rather, it shouldn't be difficult for and APA to take information from the working groups and on their own make recommendations to us.

**Megan Peterson:** Megan Peterson.

**Chair Hobbs:** Go ahead, Megan.

**Megan Peterson:** I was just going to say you're spot on, Chair.

**Chair Hobbs:** Yeah, hopefully we'll get a little bit more input from the experts and allow us to focus in on some kind of action that we can take with respect to these. And in saying that any that we've gone through today that in their judgment we should revisit for one reason or another, take the same course with those. And right now we're only expecting to have a single meeting in July. Today, was very arduous but very productive. The meeting that we had last week, was also fairly well focused on some items that needed some of their own attention. Hopefully having moved some of these off of our agenda, we won't need to double up on the meetings like we had to this month, but that always remains an option for us down the road. That brings us to agenda item number nine, future agenda items. This one certainly will be coming back to us. I'm hoping that we have something more specific with respect to the guidance that you've all provided last week on the funding side, we're beginning to work through some of that modeling right now. That'll take a little bit of time, but hopefully we'll be able to report back on our progress at that point. Remembering that we have working groups eight and nine still, I think we need to bring closure to working groups eight and nine. And I think there, Dusty, you can correct me if I'm wrong. We're waiting for the working groups to be able to go through the recommendations that were made by the task force and be able to more specifically identify those that the commission may wish to reinforce by way of recommendation from the technician. And I think that's where we were. Okay. Thumbs up. That's a good sign. Middle finger is a really bad sign, so, got it. So those would be the agenda items. I'm sure there'll be others, the normal ones that we see the report from NDE flexible agenda and so forth. But I again expressed to you my admiration and respect for hanging in there today. Again, I think we ticked a lot of metrics that were very important ones. So thank you for all of that. That does bring us to public comment period number two. So I would first ask if there's anyone in person that wishes to make comments in Las Vegas. And I don't see anybody coming forward. I would ask the same question about Carson City. Kyle, you spot anybody?

**Kyle Rodriguez:** No sir.

**Chair Hobbs:** Okay. Do we have any comments that have been provided by way of email?

**Secretary:** There are no written submissions at this time.

**Chair Hobbs:** Do we have anybody on the phone?

**Secretary:** We have no calling comment.

**Chair Hobbs:** And I'm thinking back to a couple of hours ago, we had the young lady from Spring Valley High School, that's very interested in civics. And I'm thinking that we probably did a good thing by letting her go earlier because she may have lost her interest in civics if she would've had to stay until 3:30. So bless her heart for hanging in there this morning. Again, thank you all very, very much and Megan, I'll give you a call to follow up on a couple of things. And with that, we're adjourned. Have a good weekend.

**Megan Peterson:** Thanks everybody.