

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FUNDING
 MARCH 4, 2021 AT 2:30 P.M.
 CONTINUED: MARCH 5, 2021 AT 9:00 A.M.**

Meeting Location

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Commission on School Funding met via videoconference. In accordance with Governor Sisolak’s State of Emergency Directive 006, Section 1, no physical location was designated for this meeting. The meeting was livestreamed on the Nevada Department of Education’s (NDE) website.

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE COMMISSION MEETING

MARCH 4, 2021	MARCH 5, 2021
<p>COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT Via Videoconference Dusty Casey Andrew J. Feuling Jason Goudie Guy Hobbs Dr. David Jensen Paul Johnson Mark Mathers Punam Mathur Dr. R. Karlene McCormick-Lee Jim McIntosh</p>	<p>COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT Via Videoconference Dusty Casey Andrew J. Feuling Jason Goudie Guy Hobbs Dr. David Jensen Paul Johnson Mark Mathers Punam Mathur Dr. R. Karlene McCormick-Lee Jim McIntosh Dr. Lisa Morris Hibbler</p>
<p>DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT Via Videoconference Heidi Haartz, Deputy Superintendent of Business and Support Services Jessica Todtman, Chief Strategy Officer Will Jensen, Director, Office of Inclusive Education James Kirkpatrick, Administrative Services Officer III Beau Bennett, Management Analyst IV Megan Peterson, Management Analyst III</p>	<p>DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT Via Videoconference Heidi Haartz, Deputy Superintendent of Business and Support Services Jessica Todtman, Chief Strategy Officer James Kirkpatrick, Administrative Services Officer III Beau Bennett, Management Analyst IV Megan Peterson, Management Analyst III</p>
<p>LEGAL STAFF PRESENT Via Videoconference Greg Ott, Chief Deputy Attorney General</p>	<p>LEGAL STAFF PRESENT Via Videoconference Greg Ott, Chief Deputy Attorney General</p>
<p></p>	<p>PRESENTERS Via Videoconference Nathan Trenholm, Data Insight Partners</p>
<p>AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE Via Videoconference</p>	<p>AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE Via Videoconference</p>

MARCH 4, 2021

1: CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL

Meeting called to order at 2:37 P.M. on March 4, 2021 by Commission Chair R. Karlene McCormick-Lee. Quorum was established.

2: PUBLIC COMMENT #1

Ryan Russell and Robert Salyer of Allison MacKenzie Attorneys & Counselors at Law submitted public comment on behalf of certain school districts regarding the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan (PCFP). *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

3: APPROVAL OF COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Vice Chair Guy Hobbs moved to approve the February 4-5, 2021 Commission minutes; Member Dusty Casey seconded. Motion passed.

4: NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION UPDATE

Heidi Haartz, Deputy Superintendent of Business and Support Services provided an [Update](#) to the Commission regarding the work of the Nevada Department of Education (NDE or Department) since the last Commission meeting, including a [one-page comparison](#) of the PCFP and the Nevada Plan.

Member Jim McIntosh asked about the status of legislation related to the PCFP during the 81st Session (2021). Deputy Superintendent Haartz noted that a bill draft request representing the Governor's proposed implementation of the PCFP had been submitted to the Legislature and was under review. Responding to Member McIntosh regarding the use or allocation of federal COVID-19 funds, Deputy Superintendent Haartz responded that education funding was expected to follow the allocation methodology of the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) Fund; 90% of funding allocated to local education agencies and 10% available to the state education agency for investment in activities supporting the return to school buildings and addressing student learning loss.

Member Paul Johnson requested further confirmation of the net proceeds of minerals estimate and the inflation indices. He further asked about the local contributions to charter schools, which Deputy Superintendent Haartz noted was still being developed, but may be based on the projected revenues allocated on a per-pupil basis per county.

Responding to Vice Chair Hobbs, Deputy Superintendent Haartz confirmed that under phased implementation counties would receive the revenues generated in their respective localities, which would be allocated to educational services. Member Mark Mathers confirmed that under phased implementation, nine school districts were fully funded under the PCFP and were out of hold harmless. Member Mathers expressed concern that the calculated rate for inflation growth was not sufficient to fully account for inflation, leading to the weights for certain categories of pupils not reaching full funding by fiscal year (FY) 2027.

Member Jason Goudie noted that the funding instabilities due to the effects of COVID-19 and the addition of federal funding made forecast modeling difficult. He further noted that implementation of Infinite Campus to account for at-risk students for weighted funding was crucial and asked if NDE could use federal funding to push the program through prior to the full implementation of the PCFP; Deputy Superintendent Haartz responded that the Department has submitted a work program to fund the at-risk module in Infinite Campus.

5: DISCUSSION REGARDING THE TRACKING OF LOCAL MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION IN THE STATE EDUCATION FUND

Heidi Haartz, Deputy Superintendent of Business and Support Services, and Will Jensen, Director of the Office for Inclusive Education, facilitated a discussion regarding [local maintenance of effort](#) (MOE) funds for special education.

Deputy Superintendent Haartz noted that option one would have local MOE funds carved out before the PCFP allocated funds through the model and would treat local contributions similarly to auxiliary services funding.

Option two would have funding allocated or identified after the calculation of the base per-pupil funding amount for each district.

Option three is similar to option two, but the funds would be reflected on a supporting table showing final per-pupil funding amounts for each district after the hold harmless adjustment has been applied, rather than on the tab which shows the allocation of all resources. The primary difference between options two and three is whether the funds are accounted for in the summary tab or on supporting tables.

Chair McCormick-Lee confirmed with Deputy Superintendent Haartz that funding special education outside of the PCFP would not remove the protection of special education funding from collective bargaining as indicated in Senate Bill 543 (2019). Responding to a question from Member Johnson, Director Will Jensen noted that the Department would need to adjust the timeline for district MOE calculations in order to accommodate any of the proposed shifts in funding allocation.

Member Goudie expressed concern with separating local and State special education funding as it loses sight of the total cost of providing special education services; he indicated he could support option one or two. Member Mathers agreed with Member Goudie, and supported option two. **Member Dave Jensen moved to approve option two, allocating local MOE special education funds after adjusted base per-pupil funding and before weighted funding. Member Johnson seconded. Motion carried. Member Casey dissented.**

6: INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING PUBLIC-FACING SUMMARY DOCUMENTS

Jessica Todtman, Chief Strategy Officer, presented updated public-facing [summary documents](#) regarding the PCFP.

Chair McCormick-Lee noted that further updates would need to be made to the document with some frequency, and further discussion may be necessary regarding what is appropriate to include. Member Mathur agreed and requested that the ongoing discussion on optimal funding be linked with the Department's Statewide Plan for the Improvement of Pupils (STIP) in the future. **Member Mathur moved to approve the use of the public-facing summary document; Member Johnson seconded. Motion passed.**

Greg D. Ott, Chief Deputy Attorney General (DAG), Attorney General's Office, provided a review of [guidance](#) to boards and commissions regarding the Legislative Session. Chief DAG Ott agreed to provide further information to the Commission regarding the delineation between advocacy and lobbying actions while emphasizing that the action item before the Commission was intended to allow the Commission to select delegates to provide testimony to the Legislature as needed.

Member Mathers nominated Member Andrew Feuling as a delegate; Member McIntosh nominated Member Goudie; and Member Mathur volunteered.

Member Johnson moved that Chair McCormick-Lee and Vice Chair Hobbs represent the Committee and call on agreed delegates for subject matter expertise as appropriate and in collaboration with the Department. Member Feuling seconded. Motion passed.

7: PUBLIC COMMENT #2

No public comment.

RECESS

Chair McCormick-Lee requested a recess; the Commission meeting would resume on Friday, March 5th at 9:00 A.M. Meeting recessed at 5:00 P.M.

MARCH 5, 2021

8: CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL

The meeting started late due to technical difficulties with the livestream. Meeting called to order at 9:27 A.M. on March 5, 2021 by Commission Chair R. Karlene McCormick-Lee. Quorum was established.

9: PUBLIC COMMENT #1

The Nevada State Education Association submitted public comment regarding the implementation of the PCFP. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

10: [CONTINUED] INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING PUBLIC-FACING SUMMARY DOCUMENTS

Greg D. Ott, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Attorney General’s Office, facilitated a discussion regarding [guidance](#) to boards and commissions regarding the Legislative Session.

Having determined that Chair McCormick-Lee and Vice Chair Hobbs would serve as delegates for legislative testimony in partnership with the Department and invite other Members to serve as subject matter experts as necessary, the Commission transitioned to a discussion regarding the key messages to communicate to the Legislature. Chief DAG Ott clarified that this discussion was to develop points of emphasis to guide responses to questions from the Legislature. Furthermore, he noted that serving on the Commission does not restrict the first amendment of Members; they may advocate on their own behalf or on behalf of their own organizations. Chief DAG Ott emphasized the importance of communicating to Legislators in what capacity they are speaking.

Outlining the items, they believed should guide their discourse, Member McIntosh emphasized the importance of identifying the differences between the Nevada Plan and the PCFP; Member Jensen supported the importance of new revenues and definitions of “adequate” and “optimal” funding, with which Member Mathur agreed. Member Goudie noted continued support of full implementation and a clear understanding of ending fund balances. Member Casey emphasized equity and equitable funding. Member Feuling supported a clear understanding of the hold harmless provision. Member Mathers noted the importance of State obligations to funding. Member Johnson supported highlighting trust, transparency, and improvement. Vice Chair Hobbs stated that the Commission should continue to support full implementation and gain buy-in for funding numbers associated with adequate and optimal to support revenue growth; Member Lisa Morris Hibbler emphasized a sense of urgency; Member Feuling added contextualizing that urgency with the history of the work. The Commission reiterated their support of full implementation of Senate Bill 543 as written.

11: INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING NEVADA CLASS SIZES AND EDUCATION WORKFORCE NEEDS

Jessica Todtman, Chief Strategy Officer, and Nathan Trenholm, Data Insight Partners, conducted a PowerPoint presentation regarding [Nevada Class Sizes and Workforce Needs](#).

Member Jensen emphasized that Nevada’s education system is grossly understaffed and noted his belief that there are mechanisms in place that disincentivize educators from working in at-risk schools, including within the Nevada Educator Performance Framework. Member Jensen stated that some of this was outside of the scope of the Commission, and to address targeted student-teacher ratios, they would need clear figures in order to calculate optimal funding. Member Goudie stated that it was important that funding for staff and the availability of staff remain tied, so that funding is not unable to be spent due to staff shortages; the main issue is with the teacher pipeline. Member Feuling indicated his agreement with Member Goudie.

Member Morris Hibbler emphasized how elements such as class size and highly qualified educators affect equity, and the importance of these factors in accounting for optimal education. Member McIntosh asked for clearer information regarding cost factors to address these needs, as the presentation was targeted more towards hiring. Chair McCormick-Lee noted that the presentation reflected the best conditions for a child to learn, and the role of the Commission is to determine if they should adjust funding goal posts or shape the definition of optimal based on that information.

Noting that solutions to the teacher pipeline and policy reforms to the education system must occur in tandem with funding considerations, Chair McCormick-Lee asked Superintendent Jhone Ebert to address the topic. Superintendent Ebert stated that the Nevada System of Higher Education has recently welcomed Chancellor Melody Rose, who has worked collaboratively with the Department to develop the Blue Ribbon Commission for a Globally Prepared Nevada, the Dual Enrollment Task Force, and a forthcoming task force regarding the teacher pipeline, which will include a pathway to address the issue.

12: DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POTENTIAL REVENUE SOURCES FOR OPTIMAL EDUCATION FUNDING

Vice Chair Guy Hobbs and Member Paul Johnson facilitated a discussion regarding possible revenue sources for optimal education funding.

Vice Chair Hobbs noted that the Commission identified sufficiency, predictability, and equity as their top priorities in revenue sources. Rather than looking at the creation of new revenue sources, the Commission began with revisiting supplemental funding sources; a report was being compiled summarizing their work. Currently, the Commission is focusing on property taxes and sales taxes, with particular attention to abatements under property tax. There are several bills proposed during the 2021 Legislative Session that may impact the revenues of these taxes, and the Commission is tracking the progress of these bills.

Member Goudie asked if the Commission should consider making an 8-year plan to fund its recommendations, rather than a 10-year plan, in the event there is no ability to make changes this year due to the COVID-19 economy. Vice Chair Hobbs responded that rather than compressing to an 8-year plan, they are working on a 10-year plan that may not see progress in the first two years.

Member McIntosh asked for further information regarding abatement and its associated funds; Member Johnson responded that in 2020, the Department of Taxation performed an abatement of approximately \$242 million for the State. Vice Chair Hobbs noted that next steps would include calculating and inflating the numbers they have and reviewing each revenue component.

[Convenience Break]

13: DISCUSSION REGARDING OPTIMAL FUNDING

Chair R. Karlene McCormick-Lee facilitated a discussion regarding optimal funding.

Deputy Superintendent Haartz noted that by 2028, 15 districts would be funded by the PCFP, with only two districts still funded at the 2019/2020 budget baseline amounts. If funding were to be allocated to have all districts funded by the PCFP and out of hold harmless, an additional \$5.54 billion would be needed and would fund the per-pupil based at \$17,896. Given this information, the Commission discussed adjusting their language to be more precise. Members Goudie and Mathur supported including “all districts fully funded under the PCFP” in the definition for adequate.

Chair McCormick-Lee summarized that she would draft a document for review prior to the next Commission meeting for finalization to be submitted by the Commission to the Legislature and the Governor.

14: DISCUSSION REGARDING THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF FUNDING ALLOCATED TO THE NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN EACH FISCAL YEAR

Jessica Todtman, Chief Strategy Officer, and Nathan Trenholm, Data Insight Partners conducted a PowerPoint presentation regarding [administrative funding](#) allocated to the Department.

Responding to Member Mathur regarding the purview of the Commission and Department funding, Chair McCormick-Lee noted that Department funding to oversee Statewide programs is the first tier in the waterfall, and as administrative caps were developed for districts, this was a similar discussion relative to the Department. The Chair noted that Department funding was part of the larger ecosystem of adequate district and per-pupil

funding. Member McIntosh clarified that the funding supporting the Department is resourced from State funds and would not detract from the local or district funds that support school districts.

Member Mathers emphasized that the relation of Department staff to the number of students is not the only factor to consider, as the number of relationships and districts that the Department must support may not clearly translate to a student ratio. Member Goudie supported an increase in funding to the Department as funding is moved through the waterfall, but that funding to the Department could not happen at an accelerated rate compared to other increases in education funding.

15: FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Chair McCormick-Lee acknowledged a previous request from Member Jensen to review prior recommendations of the Commission for further discussion once recommendations on restoration, adequate, and optimal funding have been confirmed. Additional agenda items include NDE progress reports; optimal funding; potential revenues; PCFP implementation; and cost adjustment.

Member Goudie requested a presentation from the Department and Jeremy Aguero of Applied Analysis regarding components of full implementation of the PCFP; he noted that districts may struggle to implement in fiscal year 2022 given budget deadlines, and recommendations for district flexibility may be necessary. Member Johnson requested further discussion regarding whether weighted categories in optimal funding are cost adjusted.

16: PUBLIC COMMENT #2

The Nevada State Education Association submitted public comment regarding the implementation of the PCFP. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

John Vellardita, Executive Director of the Clark County Education Association, submitted public comment regarding the implementation of the PCFP. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

17: ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 1:22 P.M.

Appendix A: Statements Given During Public Comment

1. Ryan Russell and Robert Salyer of Allison MacKenzie Attorneys & Counselors at Law submitted public comment on behalf of certain school districts regarding the PCFP.
2. The Nevada State Education Association submitted public comment regarding the implementation of the PCFP.
3. The Nevada State Education Association submitted public comment regarding the implementation of the PCFP.
4. John Vellardita, Executive Director of the Clark County Education Association, submitted public comment regarding the implementation of the PCFP.

Item A1, Allison MacKenzie Attorneys & Counselors at Law

Madam Chair and Members of the Commission on School Funding:

We represent the following county school districts and their respective superintendents: Elko, Eureka, Storey, Douglas, Pershing, Lander, Lyon, Lincoln and Carson City.

As you know, Governor Sisolak is recommending a phased implementation of the Pupil Centered Funding Plan ("PCFP") in his proposed budget that was submitted to the Legislature. The Governor's proposal generally indicates that only state revenues will be distributed through the PCFP for the 2021-2023 biennium. Thus, under the Governor's proposal, local revenues will stay at the local level until the following biennium. Summarily, full implementation of the PCFP would be delayed until 2023-2025 biennium under the Governor's proposed budget.

While we believe the Governor's proposed delay in implementation of the PCFP acknowledges and addresses the significant impact caused by the Covid-19 pandemic and the harm of full implementation, the Governor's phased implementation proposal would financially impair every school district in the State. The phased-in approach would lock districts into hold harmless numbers from the disastrous 2019-2021 biennium. This would be catastrophic for some districts.

Moreover, under the suggested implementation schedule, many school districts could potentially lose funding if their local revenues do not meet the actual need of the school district. Additionally, it will be very difficult for school districts to properly budget and forecast staffing and service levels using revenue projections that have been adversely affected by Covid. Finally, given the inconsistent messaging surrounding the PCFP, it is apparent that the Commission needs more time to properly consider and assess the PCFP. A full delay of implementation, and maintenance of the status quo over the next biennium, will give the Commission that ability.

The Legislature has yet to address phased implementation of the PCFP during the session. Thus, we would request this Commission retract its recommendation to the Legislative Committees on Education and the Governor's Budget Office to fully implement the PCFP for the upcoming 2021-2023 biennium. Instead, the recommendation should be to maintain the status quo through the 2023-2025 biennium. This would ensure that school districts are properly funded and maintain their ability to receive statewide guarantees in the event that local revenues fall short. This will protect districts from additional financial harm. A full delay would provide the time necessary to ensure the PCFP is properly vetted.

Sincerely,

Ryan D. Russell, Esq.
Robert M. Salyer, Esq.

Item A2, Nevada State Education Association – March 5, Public Comment #1

The Nevada State Education Association has been the voice of Nevada educators for over 120 years.

Two weeks ago, hundreds of educators in red scarves and face coverings were back in Carson City, lining both sides of the street from the Legislative building to the Capitol to bring attention to education funding. After sustaining difficult cuts last summer, K12 public education is threatened with more devastating hits. Early literacy supports are proposed for a \$33 million cut in the next biennium, and \$156 million in cuts to class size reduction means more overcrowded classrooms even with the largest class sizes in the nation now. The success you will hear about today from Data Insight Partners from Nevada's investment in public education is real, but sadly our gains could be lost.

Additionally, a reduction in per pupil funding moves education in Nevada the wrong way. Federal emergency relief funds will address the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic to safely open and operate school buildings over the next two years. However, we know these funds will only serve as a temporary patch. Uses of funds are restricted, so they cannot be used to backfill proposed cuts. Before the pandemic, Nevada ranked near the bottom of states in most education metrics. Federal emergency relief does nothing to address this structural deficit.

Since the introduction of SB543, NSEA has expressed policy concerns about the new school funding plan—the lack of educator voice; no new revenue for our chronically underfunded schools; watering down of Zoom and Victory schools; freezing and squeezing most school district budgets for a period of years; a giveaway to charter schools without increased accountability, and rewriting the rules of collective bargaining to make it nearly impossible for education unions to win a raise at the bargaining table.

For the last year and a half, NSEA has appeared at nearly every meeting of this Funding Commission to point out that no new funding formula will work without new revenue. While there are significant issues with the Governor's proposed phased implementation of SB543, it's clear that his departure from the recommendations of this Commission calls into question the work that has happened here and the wisdom of moving forward with the new plan at all.

Backers of SB543 claim that the new funding formula is all about equity. If that were true, we wouldn't already be hearing the cries of help from leaders in Zoom and Victory schools. Zoom and Victory schools are located in Nevada's poorest communities, serve the highest percentage of at-risk students, and are proven models of education equity. Unfortunately, they are also the schools facing the largest budget cuts. This is called inequity.

NSEA maintains it is completely irresponsible to effectuate a radical shift in the state's education funding formula amidst a global pandemic, especially as further general fund cuts are proposed for our schools. This is even more true with the late hour changes proposed by the Governor. Given all these challenges, we believe the only responsible course of action is to delay SB543 until after the pandemic, while we are able to work together on optimal funding and the revenue plan to get us there.

Item A3, Nevada State Education Association – March 5, Public Comment #2

The Nevada State Education Association has been the voice of Nevada educators for over 120 years.

In the final hours of the 2019 Legislative Session, Senate Bill 543 was passed with only a single public hearing. NSEA has consistently advocated moving towards greater equity in education, ensuring all school districts have the resources necessary to provide a high-quality education for every Nevada student. NSEA opposed Senate Bill 543 for a host of policy concerns, one of which was an anti-union end fund balance provision buried in the bill. With limited time spent discussing such a complex bill, the issue of ending fund balance received very little attention in the overall SB543 discussion.

However, previously in the same session, significant thought was put into how to treat ending fund balance not subject to collective bargaining. The Nevada Administrative Code (NAC 354.660) already states a school district ending fund balance of up to 8.3% of its annual budget is not subject to employee negotiations. Senate Bill 26 proposed putting this language in the Nevada Revised Statutes. After a full hearing on the subject, the bill failed to clear the committee. Another bill, Senate Bill 111 addressed the issue of ending fund balances and clarified that any monies from the state intended for salary or benefits for employees of school districts would be subject to negotiations with an employee organization.

Language in Senate Bill 543 doubling the amount of ending fund balance walled off from collective bargaining was a gross departure from current practice, policy, and previous direction of the legislature. This provision is anti-union and anti-collective bargaining and could tie up as much as \$740 million in ending fund balances while Nevada school districts continue to suffer from an educator shortage. This provision will make it nearly impossible for education unions to win much-needed raises at the bargaining table.

Senate Bill 142 was introduced on February 23, 2021, by Senator Roberta Lange. If SB142 is passed, the rules for negotiations between school districts and education unions will continue the way they have been conducted for years. With the ending fund balance provision contained in 2019's Senate Bill 543 repealed, the collective bargaining rules on school district ending fund balance would continue with 8.3% based upon the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC 354.660).

Collective bargaining, a mutual exchange of positions followed by an agreement, enables a group of employees with a "community of interest" to negotiate a binding, written contract with an employer. It gives workers a voice in their workplace and has become a respected approach. Collective bargaining is the most proven system for improving standards and quality of life for working people, including delivering higher wages. When labor and management can come to an agreement on salary and benefits, everyone benefits. If this provision were to remain at 16.6%, it will make it nearly impossible for any education union to ever win a raise at the bargaining table, further harming educator recruitment and retention. Creating an incentive for Nevada school districts to sit on up to \$740 million is clearly bad policy for educators but will also harm students.

Item A4, Clark County Education Association

SB 543 Commission Members:

The Clark County Education Association has supported the passage of SB543 in 2019 and its full implementation in July 2021. We believe that the work of this Commission has been invaluable and needs to be shared directly with Legislators. Your work over the past year and half has been very policy centric. Currently the discussion around SB543 as presented by the Governor's office has been fiscal centric. And if it remains a fiscal discussion then SB543 as written will not be implemented.

Accordingly, we have had many conversations with Legislators and Leadership in both houses and both parties about the work of the SB543 Commission. We suggested that legislators receive a presentation from the Commission about your work as well as the recommendations you have made. We have been informed that there will be an effort to schedule such a discussion. We hope that comes to fruition. We would suggest that it would be helpful if the following could be conveyed to legislators:

1. Legislators need to understand that the discussion around funding Nevada's k-12 education system didn't start with SB543 but has been ongoing for several years. The work of the Commission has been an extension of that discussion but this time with real legislation enacted that substantively changes funding k-12 in Nevada.
2. Legislators need to know why the Commission has recommended full implementation of the Pupil Centered Funding Plan (PCFP); the difference between the PCFP plan and the Nevada Plan; and finally, why the phase in proposal from the Governor is not being supported by the Commission.
3. It would also be very important to legislators to learn of recommendations from the Commission regarding the **amount of funding** needed and the **sources of revenue** to fund k-12 system.

As the Governor and Legislators act on economic recovery it is important to understand what investing in our education delivery system means to that recovery. Your recommendations must be incorporated into any discussion that legislators have regarding implementing SB543 so that sound policy decisions are made.

John Vellardita, Executive Director
Clark County Education Association (CCEA)