

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

AUGUST 6, 2019

10:00 A.M.

Meeting Locations:

The meeting was video conferenced from both locations

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Rd	Las, Vegas	Boardroom (1 st Floor)
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St	Carson City	Boardroom

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

KellyLynn Charles
Jennifer Martinez

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Las Vegas:

Wendi Hawk
Brent Husson

Carson City:

Wayne Workman

Phone:

Pam Teel
Nicolette Smith

Deputy Attorney General:

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

Las Vegas:

Marjorie Conner
Jeff Geihs
Chelli Smith
Jerrad Barczynszyn
Sarah Negrete

Carson City:

Sara Cunningham

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

Wendi Hawk; Council Co-Chair
Meeting called to order at 10:20 AM

2. Public Comment #1

No public comment in Las Vegas or Carson City

3. Flexible Agenda Approval (Discussion/For Possible Action)

Wendi Hawk, Council Co-Chair

4. Motion to approve a flexible agenda Wayne

- Member Wayne Workman moved to approve a flexible agenda
- Member Brent Husson 2nd the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion passes at 10:23 AM**

5. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes for January 8, 2019; February 11, 2019; and May 7, 2019

(Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Wendi Hawk; Council Co-Chair

Motion to approve the minutes from the previous meetings

- Member Wayne Workman moved to approve a flexible agenda
- Member Brent Husson 2nd the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion passes at 10:25 AM**

6. Nevada Department of Education Updates (Information/Discussion)

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

- KellyLynn Charles welcomes Jennifer Martinez to the Department. Reminds everybody to state your name for the record when speaking.
- RPDP budgets increased for salary increases.
- Department is hosting a Power By Teach to Lead Summit in October focusing Social Emotional and Academic Development and Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.
- AB276 created an Advisory Task Force on Teacher Retention and Recruitment.

7. FY19 Budget Amendments (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Sara Cunningham, Director, NWRPDP; Chelli Smith, Director, SNRPDP; and Sara Negrete, Director, NNRPDP

Motion to approve the FY20 Budgets

- Member Brent Husson moved to approve a flexible agenda
- Member Nicolette Smith 2nd the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion passes at 10:26 AM**

8. Annual Reports of the Regional Professional Development Training Programs

(Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Sara Cunningham, Director, NWRPDP; Chelli Smith, Director, SNRPDP; and Sara Negrete, Director, NNRPDP

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

Member Workman pointed out how amazing it was as he read through all three of the reports. The surveys that they provide for those receiving the Professional Development and Training, it's on a 5-point scale and on every single item in every single region, it came back as 4.5 or higher. That is unheard of in any scale that you do. He commended our Directors and Training Staff for all of the work that they do. And with that, he motioned to approve the Annual Reports.

Dr. Hawk also commented that she really liked the graphs that indicated what categories that they were getting the professional development. She liked to see it visually in the graphs of how diverse and what peoples need were and how each County was different in what they were looking for and the services that they provided. They were excellent and very well done.

- Member Wayne Workman moved to approve the annual reports
- Member Brent Husson 2nd the motion
- All in favor
- **Motion passes at 10:28 AM**

Quorum was lost

9. Early Learning Professional Development Council Concept (Information/Discussion/Possible Action)

Patti Oya, NDE Director of the Office of Early Learning and Development

Members will hear a presentation on the concept of an Early Learning Professional Development Council through the use of federal funds. Possible action may include providing feedback and suggestions

Patty Oya, Director of Early Learning Childhood Development, gave a little background that their office receives federal childcare and development funds from the welfare division and the primary purpose of those funds is to provide childcare subsidies to low income families. The portion of the funds that they get is a set aside of federal dollars that goes to improve quality of childcare programs and access to quality programs for families. In the past they have done lots of trainings with these funds and professional development. Childcare licensing requires by clock hours, about 21 hours per year for childcare providers to continue to work. They are trying to build on that and have more in depth training for those providers. Their idea was to do similar RPDP's to align with the current K-12 ones that are already established; but will be slightly different. She wants to get feedback on their ideas and concepts. The three operational areas they are thinking of are Clark, Washoe, and the Northeast. They would require a budget, an annual report, a 3-year plan, needs assessment by location aligned with the early childhood Core knowledge system. They would also provide training as determined by their needs assessment and training evaluations. They really want to focus in on children from birth. Funding will be contracted directly to a selected agency or agencies, depending on the RFP Process they would do request for proposal process. They would not require a governing board because there will be standing agencies and they would have their own board. They would have them report to the Nevada Early Childhood Advisory Council. They would track the trainings and they have a separate approval system, which is the Nevada Registry System and they will continue to approve the trainings. They bring in National experts like 0 to 3 to provide train the trainers. It costs them a lot of money, but it is high quality professional development opportunities for trainers in the State. But what they don't know is once they have trained about 15 trainers, are they going out and providing that training and maintaining the quality level of training. or are they leaving the field and now we have run out of trainers? This process is something that they cannot track. The Registry System can track how many trainings in general the State has offered, but not in that kind of detail for the series of trainings. They have been focusing on having series of trainings instead of the 2 hours only trainings. They have been working with TNTF Agency in Nevada to develop an Administrator training for them. They want to promote these higher-level trainings for Directors or Administrators of Early Childhood Programs. They would also expect this group to explore the idea of ECE Credentials or endorsements, and the collaborations would look very different from your RPDP Centers. On their staff they have a new Education Programs Professional that focuses on work force development. They have the Registry that does all of the trainer and training approval and then the Teach Scholarships that work closely with the higher

Education community and Teacher Licensure, and those would be their collaborations that they would expect to see. Their next steps would be to finalize the funding that they would have available. They are looking at about two to two and half million. They will do an Request for Proposal (RFP) Process and they hoping to get it approved before the January Board of Education and do a two and half year contract. So that is their concept and plan and she wanted to present it and get ideas or any thoughts on the plan.

Member Husson brought up that Patty mentioned that they don't have a good way to track in depth the kind of trainings that happen. He asked if there is anything in the proposal that would address that.

Patty Oya responded that she works with a National Organization like 0 to 3 that came in to do a train the trainer. They did one series of training last year, one in the North, and one in the South, with 15 people in each training. That part is easy to track. But of those 15 people, how many trainings did they provide? How does she know that they are maintaining the quality level that they are expected to maintain? Then 0 to 3 wants to know if they should come back and provide more training? And she doesn't know if those trainers are even still out in the field. Those are the kinds of things that she is unable to track.

Dr. Hawk questioned about the Work Force Division and Pre K Work Force. What the difference is between them?

Patty Oya stated that in Early Childhood, when we talk about the system, we refer to the B3 system, which is birth to 3rd grade. Transition between pre-kindergarten to kindergarten is often a place that gets neglected and kindergarten tends to be very separate but kindergarten and up should not really be separated from what's happening in our state pre-kindergarten programs or in our childcare center and it should be a seamless system from birth to 3rd grade. They are finding that the workforce for childcare have different issues such as higher turnover rates and lower pay. State pre-kindergarten programs also have a teacher shortage. That workforce piece is a huge issue for them and the Professional Development that's needed. The alignment of approval processes and requirements is also a part of that. They have hired an EPP (Education Programs Professional) to look at those issues and help align those issues across the agency.

Dr. Hawk mentioned that in summary, the main concerns that Patty Oya has and that she wants support on is internal training tracking, how much infrastructure is already set up and has to be developed and coordination with other agencies.

Patty Oya mentioned that the other key point is the needs assessment piece. To have a handle on what people really need in terms of professional development opportunities. They are not expecting to have them develop a lot of new trainings, but to help coordinate.

Dr. Hawk added that one of the best forms of flattery is to replicate what someone else is doing well. The RPDP's surveying system is already a very good structure. Their information is already publicly posted and it would be a really good place to start. She suggested looking at how they are collecting data and how they are reporting. Narrow down your questions and then be able to go to them for help and support in the regions that you are.

Patty Oya said that she did meet with Kat and KellyLynn and did go through one of the previous reports and saw the way they monitor and evaluate the trainings. Then she said she would line it up with child outcomes. The only piece that she was not sure about is if there is an existing RPDP as a governing body that wanted to apply for their fee process,

if it was allowed or not. She will share and would like to see that alignment for birth to 3rd grade.

10. Presentation and Update on the NASA Leadership Institute (Information/Discussion)

Dr. Marjorie Conner, MMC Consulting, Inc., Nevada; Dr. Jeff Geihs; President, Nevada Association of School Administrators; KellyLynn Charles, NDE Education Programs Professional for Office of Educator Development and Support

Members will hear a final update on the 2019 NASA Leadership Institute. Possible action may include providing feedback and making recommendations regarding plans for the use of the FY20 Administrative Funds.

Dr. Jeff Geihs thanked Dr. Conner for leading this effort for the Nevada Association of School Administrators and all of the participants throughout the State. It was hectic but they put it together and got it off the ground. There were nearly 65 participants. The reviews from the participants were extraordinarily good. He said that they want to continue this work in the future, and if this would be approved at a later date, they already scheduled the Center for Educational Excellence (CEE) preceding or following the NASA Conferences in the fall and the spring. He then turned it over to Dr. Conner.

Dr. Conner thanked Jhone Ebert and Felicia Gonzales. She was very thankful for the funding and said they were very helpful. KellyLynn was very helpful as well. At the end of each of the 4 sessions of 2 full days each, co facilitators were able to go through Leadership action and procedures. They got back evaluations at the end of each day not at the end of each session. No negative responses from the evaluations. They had 63 people registered and 8 counties were represented. There were also 4 charter schools represented, 3 RPDP Representatives, 6 NASA board members, and 2 higher education representatives. Five Vendors or sponsors were also in attendance, such as NWEA, McGraw Hill, and Achieve 3000. The vendors liked so much what they were doing that they contributed to the receptions after hours. They had 8 people who have already promoted. The 8 people that were promoted said that what was given to them in the conference was incorporated in their interviews and in the plans that they have to incorporate it and put it in place in their new positions. The piece that was missing, that was discussed with KellyLynn, was the social and emotional piece; relationship building. The tentative plan for this next session would be sending out invitations to the participants from last year and invite them to attend that social and emotional relationship building piece that they did not do in last year's conference. Then also the participants from last year can connect with the new participants and that connects more educators in the state. She shared challenges that they faced this year, other than money. She said that RPDP wanted them to provide travel and lodging for all of the participants to stay in Nevada. Lodging was not so much a challenge, as places to stay in Nevada are fairly reasonable. Travel to get to and from Reno was very much higher than expected. One of the challenges they had was holding the line on those extra costs. Her suggestion for that challenge, should they receive funding again this year, would be limit the amount of reimbursement per person to a set amount. Some participants took their generosity and ran with it. Since the participants are getting all of the recertification hours, they should only get some reimbursement to defray some of the costs. The cost of a flight to and from Reno was well over \$600 every time. Another challenge also was venue location. Since they received the funds for this event in the 11th hour, the challenge was where to hold the events. Mostly only hotels were available for the venue, which was very costly. This year, if the event was to be approved, they have researched venues that could possibly be free. For example, PBS, The Public Education Foundation or schools with large enough training rooms, as opposed to the hotels. They would like to do their first event in November, and they already found out that neither Switch nor The Public Education Foundation were available. Both of these venues are already booked for those dates in November. No money was set aside this year for project management. It took Dr. Conner about 3 days a week from October to July from her time to manage. There are participants to consider, their needs to consider, curriculum to put together, timing to work out, registration, multiple

questions from districts and participants to consider. She talked about getting possible clerical help this year. Dr. Geihs was able to hire clerical help last year for \$22 an hour. She worked an extra 10 hours a week and worked only on the CEE. That was a problem. Suggestions for next year would be to set an amount as a reimbursement, venues that are more cost effective, allowing for operational funding within the budget and possibly using some Title II funds for the social and emotional piece. She commented that when Dr. Gorman runs his leadership consortium on his own, he mostly gets people who are looking to be superintendents. That is not what they were looking to do. They were looking for people who were looking for promotional positions or for positions in the central office. This gave them a much richer mix of people with a wide variety of needs. They would like to increase the participants with funding available to 65. They started at 35 and then quickly went to 45 and then finally landed at 63. They would like to increase to at least 65. She worked on a tentative budget. For every 5 people that they add, it is an extra \$8,500. This includes the cost of the speakers, etc. With this, she said it was an amazing experience for everybody. They were very pleased that RPDP participated in this. They were very grateful. She asked that KellyLynn do a brief overview of what they were doing money wise.

KellyLynn Charles stated that they were able to work with their Title IIA coordinator to secure some additional funds and offset the travel costs and the increases. They built in an initial \$21,000 to the \$100,000 for the speakers and room locations. She got approval and is working on getting the last little bit of funds, which is about \$9,000 to cover the last little bit of the travel. It was a good blending of funds to help offset the travel costs.

Dr. Conner stated that the dates that they are hoping to consider are November 13, 14 and 15, 2019. This would be with the social/emotional piece and would be in conjunction with the Fall Conference for NASA and the same for the dates in June. This way people who have already traveled for the Training, can also participate in the Fall Conference for NASA in November as well as in June. The other dates would be February 6, 7 and 8, 2019 and June 17, 18 and 19, 2019. They would have 2 sessions in Las Vegas (November and February) and the June session will be up North. The reason they are going for 3 sessions this year instead of 4 is to minimize travel and also to cover a larger amount of content in the training.

Member Husson asked to confirm that the total budget for this is \$121,000?

KellyLynn Charles confirmed that yes, \$121,000 was the budget for this training, as well as an additional approximate \$9,500 from Title IIA funds for the last amount of travel expenses.

Member Husson asked if the intent this year was to stay within the \$121,000 and not have to use the extra \$9,000.

Dr. Conner confirmed that she has discussed with KellyLynn on using more Title IIA funds for the consultant fees to free up more of the original funds for the operational costs. This way they would not have to work outside the original budget. To go over the budget this past session was not their intention, it just happened that way due to costs that far exceeded what they had expected.

Member Husson asked for clarity as to some of the members taking advantage of their generosity. Did they book first class? Did they travel to other places? What was going on there?

Dr. Conner stated that they gave them everything. They gave them travel, lodging, a room to hold their work in, they provided them with the curriculum, they provided books for them at their cost and they had receptions for them. Some people became greedy with the generosity that was given to them. Here are some examples of how people took advantage. They had a participant who decided she wanted to leave early to go back home. She took an Uber from Lake Tahoe back to the Reno airport and wanted them to pay for that. They had a married couple that decided that they would each get their own room and separate rental

cars, even though they were coming to the Conference together. They had people that made flight changes and wanted them to pay for those changes. They had people who wanted a rental car upgrade and wanted them to pay for the upgrade fee, the insurance fee, and the gas as well. They did not pay for any of these extra item charges, but it was very disappointing and they had some people very upset at them and took them on because they would not pay it.

Dr. Geihs thanked Dr. Conner for being so diligent in reviewing those records. Those were just some examples, but they were not prevalent. Most of the participants were not attempting to take advantage.

Member Husson mentioned that he travels quite a bit to Reno from Las Vegas and usually the round trip is about \$300-\$340. Where were these participants traveling from, were they coming from out of state? Is that why travel was more expensive?

Dr. Conner stated that yes; people were coming from other places other than Las Vegas. They were coming from Churchill, Nye, White Pine, Elko, Lander, and Washoe. They were not able to get any one-way flights for less than \$250. The minimum was \$500 per person, per time. Some people drove their own cars and at .58 cents a mile, those ran around \$650.00 for them to drive their own cars. It wasn't the hotels. They were able to get pretty decent priced accommodations. It was the travel that "ate them alive" cost wise.

Member Husson asked about the plan for limiting those costs next time.

Dr. Conner mentioned that their plan is \$400 per session. The \$400 per session would defray their cost. It would not cover all of their costs, but it would defray their costs. Not all 65 participants have to travel every time. This is one of the reasons that they will be having 2 sessions in Las Vegas and only 1 up North. It is less costly to travel to Las Vegas than up North. And also, most people come to Las Vegas as a little getaway while also attending the Conference, so they are more willing to absorb any extra costs. In their tentative budget, they have built in some money for travel hotels at kind of the same rate that they had before, 2 professional books, and a survey that they would like to have people take. This was not built in last time and this time it is built in the tentative budget along with printing as well, to keep it under that \$100,000.

Member Husson mentioned that there wouldn't be another meeting until October 1st. \$100,000 is the limit by law, max and that cannot change. He said that he didn't think that anyone on the committee would not want to move forward. But that he couldn't speak for everyone. He said that we have to have a meeting and prove it. He stated that they can't approve anything today right?

Dr. Conner stated that they need to move forward with tentative plans, should they get the money again, they are not wanting to be strapped again like in the past with trying to arrange everything last minute. They have tentatively contacted venues, hotels, etc. to try and get good rates with the understanding that we would limit that cost to \$400 per person and that would simply be to defray costs. They need some ok go ahead and plan but we can't give you any money type feeling so they are not just spinning their wheels.

Member Husson stated that they couldn't give them any assurance. He mentioned that for him, he would vote to do it again. He was very happy how it all worked out. Sixty-three people got very valuable training and the 8 that got promoted and are using the training to help students and that was the idea behind why they did this in the first place. Thinking differently about how to provide professional development and connecting people to the profession. He thanked both Dr. Geihs and Dr. Conner for making it happen. He said that the vision was very blurry when the Committee said "do this" and they left a lot of it up to them, knowing that they were the professionals and knew how to get the job done. He supports it fully and would like for them to have more funding. He does not know where they could

possibly get more money but knowing that there is \$100,000 and it has to go for something like this, they could definitely count on his vote.

Dr. Hawk had a question on the \$400 limit per person. Is it a stipend or limit on the airfare?

Dr. Conner stated that they would still have participants turn in their receipts with a ceiling of \$400. This way they would have a record of how much each person was spending. When they paid for everything last time, it caused people to nitpick and they were upset that they did not get all of their expenses reimbursed. This way, they will know upfront that they have this limit to defray the costs of getting all of these hours. Then they are able to keep inside a budget.

Dr. Hawk stated that she agreed. With this limit, even if they are paying something, there seems to be a little more value to it, and respect in one's time. It's not a bad thing. She is not sure how many people it may deter. Depending on the cost, it shouldn't be much and it gives value to what they are doing, especially if they are getting credits for it.

Dr. Conner stated that until we try something different, we really won't have enough data to have answers to those questions about who it may deter or could it be cost prohibited for people who have to come from somewhere further. People coming from White Pine to Las Vegas it cost a lot more, some of those prices were \$800-\$900. However, those are the people who were very grateful for the training and everything we did for them. And we asked some people, if we hadn't paid for everything, would you still have come to the training and they said knowing what we know now about the training, we definitely would have paid for some of the costs and our own needs.

Dr. Hawk questioned would it be possible to look at the different areas that people will be coming from and maybe do a budget to help lower costs based on the area they are traveling from and level the stipends out based on that?

Dr. Conner stated, yes, they can absolutely do that. They can level out the reimbursement based upon how much more it will cost you and adjust a little bit that way. That is very possible.

Member Husson was curious to know how many participants they could get if they had an unlimited budget. How many people need this training and how many are out there that haven't got it but need it?

Dr. Geihs stated that they did not take everybody. He asked Dr. Conner if she recalls how many people they had to turn down.

Dr. Conner stated that they had 86 people apply and they turned down about 20. Some people wanted to be added on and another 15 people wanted to participate.

Dr. Geihs stated that close to 100 people to answer your question. And that they had put it out about 3 weeks prior to the first session.

Member Husson stated that they had about 100 interested. How many people, based on your understanding of the State, should have been interested? How many people need this training?

Dr. Geihs stated that he would say probably thousands would benefit from this high level of professional development. He mentioned that he had personally gone through Dr. Gorman's Superintendent's Academy in 2016. They had the discussion they wanted to differentiate it because not everyone wants to be a Superintendent, so it's about Leadership. Thousands would benefit from the high level of Professional Development that occurs. It's all in the best interest of kids. It's all about you being the best you can be so in whatever role you are in, you can serve kids and improve achievement best. That's our mission. No other State is able to offer this to this level. Thousands of people would benefit, no matter the level you are in,

not only for the comradery that you are developing there, but also from the content of the training.

Member Husson asked what it would look like to offer it more broadly and develop some sort of budget for that. A suggestion he made would be maybe to do a traveling show where they did it in every County over the course of a couple of years. His goal would be to get everybody who needs it, the training and offer it to a broader audience. If people need this training to make our schools get better, then we need to think bigger. Maybe at the next meeting, have a game plan as to what that might look like and how you might expand this. His idea was maybe to have Industry groups supported by vendors because they pay the majority of the costs for these kinds of events. He wants to see this expand and knows that they will do it right. He mentioned that he knew that he was asking them to do a little more work, but if they could come back with a plan on something like that, that would be very interesting to him.

Dr. Geihs agreed with what Member Husson was suggesting. He stated that what Member Husson was suggesting is outstanding. There is nothing inappropriate about it, for a State Association to solicit that kind of partnership from Vendors. It would be inappropriate for individuals that are working in School Districts to take it, but nothing inappropriate for vendors/partners to work with a State Association. That would be all right to do. As a matter of fact, other Superintendent Academy's and Leadership Academy's all over the nation often have vendors/partners around the table that are there in partnership and are also participants in the work. Dr. Geihs stated that they would definitely do that.

Member Husson stated for them not to necessarily limit it to that either, that was just one idea to help defray costs. There could be other sources of funding as well that can be used. If Title II is appropriate to use; I know many dollars are usually spoken for.

Member Workman stated that he was conflicted. He had heard the feedback that this training was absolutely outstanding. But he heard the point being made that it impacted 63 individuals and that we have thousands that need to benefit from this training. If we continue with this delivery model of bringing the participants to the training, it will take years and years for everyone who needs the training, trained. His concern continues to be the limited number of participants who are able to do this. In today's day and age and with our technology today and with the ability to video cast, it is strange to him that they are not able to have hundreds of participants in each session. Perhaps staff is divided up and they are facilitating in 3 or 4 separate areas across the State, but live sessions are still being run. He stated that perhaps they can bring the training and reduce all those costs, get a few more facilitators and do the training across the State. Where he says he is conflicted is because he believes that this training is essential for all of administrators. He states that if we are not spending the \$100,000 on ALL the administrators in Nevada, in his mind, to have only 63 people per year benefit from this money that is designated for all Administrators, just doesn't seem like the right way that we should be appropriating this money. So in full transparency he stated that if this same model is proposed, he will again be a descending vote for it, simply for the fact that they are not reaching enough administrators. The old model that was used where the money was divided up among the Districts, as a Superintendent, he knew exactly what his Administrators needed and the money that came to him from this \$100,000, he was able to tailor to the training for his Administrators and his School District. So he knew that they were being reached with the training that they needed because he was there as the needs assessment. Unless they can find a way to impact many more Administrators, he has a hard time spending this \$100,000 this way. He just wanted to be upfront about that, so that they knew where he was coming from. He stated that he might be way off base from everybody else on this council, but that is still his big concern. He also believes that there may be a discrepancy or a question in the application process. He said he knew that he personally signed at least 2 applications and it was mentioned that there was somebody selected from every County that had an application, so there may be some trouble with the application process as well. So again, he just wanted to be upfront and transparent with that.

Dr. Hawk agreed that they need to reach more. She mentioned that if they do distance as being suggested, it is not as equitable as it should be. That is the issue with the distance part of that. If they did reach more, if there was a way they did have unlimited funds, what kind of capacity would we have within your organization to be able to manage having more trainings and then with that, she believes that the Public Education Foundation and the Chambers of Commerce's hold their own Leadership Programs and they actually charge participants to participate. Perhaps their company is having them do it. Perhaps there is a way for schools to participate in paying for these trainings. And they can fund for trainings, they can use Title II funds to fund for those trainings. We can say instead of doing the stipend, if you want to participate, you have to pay upfront. She said that she knew that's not the intent, that they want to get more people reached with the \$100,000 but it is limiting to what they can do and she agrees that if there was a way to be able to maximize what the \$100,000 was used for and then have people pay maybe to supplement the cost. To have people pay for that participation now adds value. She asked the question, what would you do if I wanted to send my team to you and I am willing to pay for it, could you even handle the capacity to do that? And then how do you choose who is free and who is not free. People are willing to pay for training. The word is out and you might get people who are willing to pay, especially if it's good, the word is out. We just need to create a budget for that. Looking at multiple options might be good.

Dr. Geihs stated that if NASA had advance notice with that number of participants, they would find a way to manage it. He stated that he was very sensitive to Member Workman's comments. He did not disagree with him whatsoever. He stated that they have had this dialog with participants and had an informal poll of their participants as they concluded the NASA Center in Tahoe on their last session about ways around that. The overwhelming sentiment from the participants was that they said there was a lot of meaning to being together. As Dr. Hawk mentioned earlier, the remote nature of some of these satellite processes is just not the same as being together. However, going back to Member Workman's point, he does believe he can explore how to have a broader footprint across the State and he has had that conversation with Dr. Gorman and Dr. Hager as well. There are ways we can do that. When we come back in October, we will bring those options as well.

11. Future Agenda Items (Information/Discussion)

- Use of the \$100,000 Administrative Funds, specific to how the funds would be spent and have it as an agenda item to be voted on. Our vote would include where that money was going from Workman comment.
- Dr. Hawk brought up that there is upcoming in 2 years the half a credit of economics requirement. She doesn't know how this is going to be rolled out or even what the curriculum is. How are people going to be trained on that? She asked if they could get an NDE update and or what RPDP is doing for training to getting teachers up to par on that, would be very helpful. There is also the computer curriculum coming out.

12. Public Comment #2

No public comment in Las Vegas or Carson City

13. Adjournment

Member Hawk adjourned the meeting at 11:33 AM