

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FUNDING
DECEMBER 20, 2019
1:00 P.M.**

Meeting Location:

| Office | Address | City | Meeting Room |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Department of Education | 2080 E. Flamingo Rd. | Las Vegas | Board Room |
| Department of Education | 700 E Fifth St | Carson City | Board Room |

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE COMMISSION MEETING

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT

In Las Vegas

Dr. David Jensen
Guy Hobbs
Jason A. Goudie
Dr. R. Karlene McCormick-Lee
Paul Johnson
Punam Mathur

In Carson City

Andrew J. Feuling
Dusty Casey
Mark Mathers

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT

In Las Vegas

Heidi Haartz, Deputy Superintendent of Business and Support Services
James Kirkpatrick, Administrative Services Officer III
Jessica Todtman, Chief Strategy Officer

In Carson City

Jhone Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Beau Bennett, Management Analyst IV
Megan Peterson, Management Analyst III

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

Greg Ott, Chief Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

In Las Vegas

Alexander Marks, Nevada State Education Association
Anahi Bravo, Self
Andrew Sierra, Mi Familia Vota
Brad Keating, Clark County School District
Cecia Alvarado, Mi Familia Vota
Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association
Fernando Romero, Hispanics In Politics
Giovanni Cervoni, Student at Valley High School
Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Nevada State Senate
Leonardo Benavides, Clark County School District
Linda Jones, Clark County Education Alliance

Lindsey Dalley, Henderson Community Education Advisory Board
Michael Dang, State Public Charter School Authority
Nicole Rourke, City of Henderson
Rebecca Feiden, State Public Charter School Authority
Richard Santigate, Mater Academy Mountain Vista
Sylvia Lazos, Nevada Immigrant Coalition

In Carson City

Jimmy Lau, Imagine Schools
Jim Penrose, R & R Partners
Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Victor Salcido, Charter School Association of Nevada

1: CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Meeting called to order at 1:01 P.M. by Commission Chair R. Karlene McCormick-Lee. Quorum was established. Chair McCormick-Lee led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2: PUBLIC COMMENT #1

Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association, spoke regarding grandfathering Zoom and Victory Schools in the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Sylvia Lazos, Education Committee of the Immigrant Coalition, spoke regarding grandfathering Zoom and Victory Schools in the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Anahi Bravo spoke regarding English Language Learners/English as a Second Language programs and Zoom Schools. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Andrew Sierra, Mi Familia Vota, spoke regarding grandfathering Zoom and Victory Schools. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Lindsay Dalley, Henderson Community Education Advisory Board, spoke regarding rural schools within the urban Clark County School District. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Fernando Romero, Hispanics In Politics, spoke regarding grandfathering Zoom and Victory Schools in the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Richard Santigate, Mater Academy Mountain Vista, spoke regarding the impact of the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan on charter schools. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Giovanni Cervoni, Student at Valley High School, spoke regarding the impact of Zoom and Victory schools on students. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Linda Jones, Clark County Education Alliance, spoke regarding School Organizational Teams (SOTs) timelines for school budget planning and various Assembly Bill statutes that influence this planning; she specifically requested that the Commission provide a model budget in time for SOTs to reference it in their budget planning for the 2020-21 school year. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Cecia Alvarado, Mi Familia Vota, spoke regarding the impact of Zoom and Victory schools. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

Victor Salcido, Charter School Association of Nevada, spoke regarding the current provisions of Senate Bill 543 that exclude charter schools. *(A complete copy of the statement is available in Appendix A)*

3: APPROVAL OF FLEXIBLE AGENDA

No action was taken; the Commission agenda moved directly from public comment to the approval of meeting minutes.

4: APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 1, NOVEMBER 14, AND NOVEMBER 15, 2019 MEETING MINUTES

Member Punam Mathur moved to approve the November 1, 14, and 15, 2019 minutes. Member Paul Johnson seconded. Motion passed.

5: WORK GROUP REPORTS

Jim McIntosh, Lead, Reporting and Monitoring Work Group, presented an update and report on the progress and work of the Reporting and Monitoring Work Group.

[Report]

The Nevada Department of Education (NDE) provided a presentation to the Reporting and Monitoring (R&M) Work Group on the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and its implementation. ESSA created additional reporting requirements and, after study and discussion, the R&M Work Group and NDE assessed that most of those reporting requirements appear to be in alignment with the reporting requirements in Senate Bill 543.

NDE provided a presentation to the R&M Work Group on Assembly Bill (AB) 469 (2017), comparing and reconciling AB 469 and SB 543 and the statutory reporting requirements for each of those bills. The R&M Work Group looked at duplication in reporting, the timing of reports, and related items; they particularly focused on the volume of data that school districts must provide and sought to consider how best to decrease that burden. Member Jason Goudie suggested beginning by removing unnecessary requirements, rather than continuing to add requirements, and evaluating the value of the data being requested.

WestEd provided a presentation to the R&M Work Group comparing current and future reporting requirements. Specifically, what data is currently required by NDE or by statute in reporting, and what will be required under SB 543. Clarification was requested on items in this presentation, such as personnel in the previous year/anticipated changes in the following year, and professional development reporting. For future agenda items, the R&M Work Group would like to know how to align this data so that it provides value to end-users and supports student achievement.

WestEd provided a presentation to the R&M Work Group on other states and state education systems that have implemented pupil-centered funding models. They provided an analysis of these exemplars, specifically referencing states and localities that had revised their formula recently and were similar in demographics to Nevada: Illinois, Rhode Island, and Denver, Colorado.

WestEd provided a presentation to the R&M Work Group on the level of impact and effort anticipated for schools and districts in complying with the requirements of SB543. They focused on current and future reporting requirements and possible redundancies, and who is responsible for collecting and transmitting the data. The R&M Work Group has suggested interviewing a sample of schools across school districts to compare reporting. WestEd also discussed doing a cost analysis. It was also noted that charter schools have additional reporting requirements that must be taken into consideration.

[Key Takeaways]

The R&M Work Group requested clarity surrounding the definition of the base, the sources of revenue in the base, and the accountability standards that will now be applied to base funding.

The R&M Work Group requested a future agenda item regarding the potential for a centralized database and reporting structure for NDE. This would serve as a clearing house for the raw data which comes from schools and school districts and would be easily accessible data associated with SB 543.

The R&M Work Group requested guidance and definitions for terminology from NDE, so that information can be comparable between schools and districts. Chair McCormick-Lee requested that Commission members compile a list of terms they would like defined to provide to NDE.

The R&M Work Group requested guidance from NDE regarding the current process for collecting and compiling data, what statute or legal requirement it is being reported for, and where / to whom it is reported.

The R&M Work Group requested further information regarding the anticipated effect of SB 543 on charter schools and the reporting requirements for charter schools that differ from those of traditional public schools.

Dr. David Jensen, Lead, Formula and Distribution Work Group, presented an update and report on the progress and work of the Formula and Distribution Work Group.

[Report]

NDE provided a presentation to the Formula and Distribution (F&D) Work Group on revenue sources within the proposed State Education Fund and the allocation and distribution of expenditures within the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan (PCFP). The presentation aligned with the R&M Work Group's request for further information about base funding sources. Emphasis was placed on evaluating revenue streams by their legislatively approved budget and recognizing that some funds are not part of the PCFP. Weights and tiered systems were discussed, including Zoom, Victory, and SB 178, which provides funding support for English Learners and At-Risk students. The F&D Work Group wants to address the concerns of members of the public regarding budget timelines and sought clarification on the level of detail required and the flexibility of those requirements as they work to build a model.

The Work Group received presentations on the necessarily small school adjustment included in the PCFP, as well as the attendance area tables utilized in the Equity Allocation Model. APA Consulting described how the model aligns with current district allocations and attendance zone areas. The small school adjustment has been evaluated as more generous than the current attendance zone model; however, the key factor will be teacher allocations. In January, the F&D Work Group will be considering the threshold of 50 students, and whether it should be defined at a different level.

APA Consulting provided a presentation to the F&D Work Group on the small district equity adjustment included in the PCFP. The F&D Work Group would like to evaluate how a density factor would affect the small district equity adjustment.

APA Consulting provided a presentation to the F&D Work Group on the proposed weights for At-Risk Students, English Learners (ELs), Gifted and Talented Students, and Special Education Students, as well as a comparison to student population weights under the current Nevada Plan. APA Consulting provided an analysis that addressed tiered services for ELs and Special Education. EL services would be tiered according to World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) scores and Special Education services would be tiered based on time in mainstream classrooms. A tiered system and one-weight system are under evaluation, pending what is determined to better serve students.

APA Consulting provided a presentation to the F&D Work Group on updates to the Comparable Wage Index (CWI) and other cost adjustment factors relevant to the implementation of the PCFP. The F&D Work Group requested cost of living indices, as well as Nevada-centric data to further inform the CWI.

[Key Takeaways]

The F&D Work Group suggested that Zoom, Victory, and SB 178 be pulled from the base categories C and D, and allocated to category E, weights.

The F&D Work Group suggested that NDE use the current necessarily small school adjustment model defined by APA Consulting, in order to facilitate the building of a workable model. However, the F&D Work Group has requested a future agenda item on the 50-student small-schools threshold.

The F&D Work Group suggested that NDE use the current small district equity adjustment model defined by APA Consulting, in order to facilitate the building of a workable model. However, the F&D Work Group requested further information regarding density considerations, and had additional concerns regarding the grouping of K-12 as one item, rather than differentiating elementary and secondary schools

in both the small schools and small district models. These matters have been requested as future agenda items.

Member Goudie noted that At-Risk as defined by those eligible for free-or-reduced-price lunch (FRL) is not implementable, as students' FRL status is not released to schools, which prevents the delivery of services funded for those students. He further inquired about the weight for Special Education, and how the requirements for moving funds from districts to schools would be determined. He noted specifically that the weight for Special Education is often irrelevant at the school-level, as funding is provided based on a students' Individualized Education Program (IEP). While the 1.1 weight aligns with funding districts, it does not correlate to school-level funding.

The F&D Work Group suggested that NDE and the Commission use the weights for categories of pupils recommended by APA Consulting of At-Risk, 0.3; English Learners (ELs) 0.5; Special Education, 1.1; and Gifted and Talented, 0.05. Member Jensen emphasized that these items were not the aspirational weights, but rather, would be used to create a workable model for further evaluation. The F&D Work Group requested that the Commission receive additional public comment regarding weights to further inform recommendations. The F&D Work Group requested further information on the definition of "At-Risk" and a discussion on aspirational weights or tiered weights for EL and Special Education as a future agenda item.

The F&D Work Group discussed CWI and cost adjustment factors, and requested a reevaluation be presented in March with Nevada-centric data.

6: RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FORMULA AND DISTRIBUTION WORK GROUP REGARDING COMPONENTS OF THE PUPIL-CENTERED FUNDING PLAN

SB 543 does not clearly define "ending fund balance;" the F&D Work Group suggested that "ending fund balance" be defined as: unrestricted general fund dollars. Member Goudie clarified that this referred to the unrestricted fund balance in the general fund.

Member Jensen made a motion to define "ending fund balance" as: unrestricted general fund dollars. Member Mathur seconded. Motion passed.

In affirming and defining revenue sources, the F&D Work Group recommended to the Commission that Zoom, Victory, and SB 178 be pulled from the base categories C and D, and allocated to category E, weights.

Member Jensen made a motion to transition Zoom, Victory, and SB 178 from the current C and D categories to category E, weights. Member Mathur seconded. Motion Passed.

Chair McCormick-Lee emphasized that the Commission must provide recommendations to NDE so the Department could begin to build a working model; she indicated that these recommendations will not necessarily be the final recommendations, but rather they are numbers with which to test data and from which to build and improve.

Vice Chair Guy Hobbs recommended that for the sake of standing up the formula, the Commission read the current recommendations into the record.

Member Hobbs made a motion to approve the recommendations of the Funding and Distribution Group as they relate to: the current small school adjustment model provided by APA Consulting; the current small district equity adjustment provided by APA Consulting; the recommended weights of APA Consulting of At-Risk, 0.3; English Learners (ELs) 0.5; Special Education, 1.1; and Gifted and Talented, 0.05; and the CWI index of 1.03 for Clark County and 1.0 for Nevada respectively. Member Mathur seconded. Motion Passed.

[Discussion]

Chair McCormick-Lee supported further review of the necessarily small school adjustment threshold and requested that exemplars be comparable to Nevada's districts and demographics. Additionally, she supported further review of density and transportation costs in the small district equity adjustment. Furthermore, she supported more work on the definition of At-Risk, as many educators think of At-Risk as "not on track to be proficient or graduate." In some cases, At-Risk may potential homelessness, poverty, or other factors beyond FRL eligibility.

Member Mathur noted that the legislative intent had been to observe poverty as a headwind for every child in Nevada no matter whom or where they were. Chair McCormick-Lee noted that programs such as McKinney-Vento or Homebound could be used to assess At-Risk and that At-Risk could be defined on an index not limited by FRL eligibility.

Member Goudie requested information about Zoom and Victory schools, as a per-pupil funding model applied to a Zoom or Victory school may decrease their resources. He said that understanding the success of Zoom and Victory schools and how to support them under a per-pupil funding model is an important step in the adequacy discussion.

7: FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

The following future agenda items were requested by the Commission:

- Clarity surrounding the definition of the base, the sources of revenue in the base, and the accountability and responsibility for the base as it connects to revenues that were targeted or restricted previously.
- Guidance and definitions of specific terminology from NDE, including a definition of support services.
- Guidance from NDE regarding the current process for collecting and compiling data, what statute or legal requirement it is being reported for, and how/to where it is reported. This includes reporting best practices and streamlining reporting practices at the state level.
- Further information regarding charter schools and their reporting requirements, and how charter schools will be affected by SB 543.
- Report on the performance of Zoom, Victory, and SB 178 schools.
- Further information on the small district equity adjustment, weight allocations, and CWI.
- Testimony on weights from experts and the public.

8: PUBLIC COMMENT #2

No public comment.

9: ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 2:38 P.M.

Appendix A: Statements Given During Public Comment

1. Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association, spoke regarding grandfathering Zoom and Victory Schools in the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan.
2. Sylvia Lazos, Education Committee of the Immigrant Coalition, spoke regarding grandfathering Zoom and Victory Schools in the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan.
3. Anahi Bravo spoke regarding English Language Learners/English as a Second Language programs and Zoom Schools.
4. Andrew Sierra, Mi Familia Vota, spoke regarding grandfathering Zoom and Victory Schools.
5. Lindsay Dalley, Henderson Community Education Advisory Board, spoke regarding rural schools within the urban Clark County School District.
6. Fernando Romero, Hispanics In Politics, spoke regarding grandfathering Zoom and Victory Schools in the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan.
7. Richard Santigate, Mater Academy Mountain Vista, spoke regarding the impact of the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan on charter schools.
8. Giovanni Cervoni, Student at Valley High School, spoke regarding the impact of Zoom and Victory schools on students.
9. Linda Jones, Clark County Education Alliance, spoke regarding School Organizational Teams (SOTs) timelines for school budget planning and various Assembly Bill statutes that influence this planning; she specifically requested that the Commission provide a model budget in time for SOTs to reference it in their budget planning for the 2020-21 school year.
10. Cecia Alvarado, Mi Familia Vota, spoke regarding the impact of Zoom and Victory schools.
11. Victor Salcido, Charter School Association of Nevada, spoke regarding the current provisions of Senate Bill 543 that exclude charter schools.

Item A1, Chris Daly

President McCormick-Lee and Commissioners, my name is Chris Daly, from the Nevada State Education Association, the voice of Nevada educators for over 100 years. I also represent Strong Public Schools Nevada in partnership today with Mi Familia Vota and their campaign to grandfather existing Zoom and Victory schools, Nevada's most successful equity in education programs. So having a student-centered funding plan, where money follows the students, sounds great; until you realize that means diverting precious resources from Nevada's most impacted communities and away from Nevada's most successful programs of education equity, Zoom and Victory schools. This is the irony and one of the major problems of SB 543, whose supporters claimed the new formula would mean greater education equity. In Clark and Washoe, Zoom schools have the highest percentage of students who are English learners, performing at the lowest levels academically. Victory schools are the lowest performing schools in Nevada's 20 poorest zip codes. Simply put, these schools are the highest need schools in the state, and a school-wide transformative approach, delivered by Zoom and Victory school programs, is what is needed to raise student achievement and school performance. A shift to Zoom and Victory "services" waters down this model. So students who are English learners and at-risk not at these schools certainly require greater support, but it doesn't make sense to move backward on our most important and most successful programs of equity in order to find those resources. Pulling resources out of Zoom and Victory schools risks the proven success of the models that are as much about a massive shift in school climate and culture as the individual supports and interventions prescribed in the related Zoom and Victory services deliver. In other words, Zoom and Victory services alone do not make Zoom and Victory schools. Our successful models of equity add one and one to make three. For the students who are English learners or at-risk in other schools, we should follow the model of SB 178, where we find new revenues to program those services to those kids. Earlier this year, the Legislature shut out advocates from the education community and from Zoom and Victory communities; they passed the new funding plan in the dead of the night. This plan is flawed, it is short-sighted, and it moves backward on education equity. We would ask that this Commission recommend to the Legislature in the next session that they consider grandfathering in existing Zoom and Victory schools. Thank you.

Item A2, Sylvia Lazos

Good afternoon Commission, my name is Sylvia Lazos, I am a professor of law here in Nevada. I am also a member of the Education Committee of the Nevada Immigrant Coalition who represents working families as well as immigrant families. And I am here again to echo the remarks of NSEA, and ask that you consider grandfathering Zoom and Victory. As my colleague said, sometimes one plus one equals three. Sometimes one plus one may even equal four. It is because you have put in place a system that really works. Why do Zoom and Victory [do] better than the per-pupil allocations that are proposed currently under the formula? It's better because what was done, especially in Clark County with Zoom and Victory, was a change of culture, was almost an imposition of research-based educational practices that work particularly well with these populations, and it was a change of identity in these schools. Those three things added to leadership, have been able to turn around these schools at a relatively low weight factor to have great success. And that has been documented in the NDE third-party studies, that I hope you have access to, or we will be glad to submit that to you. These, as Chris has said, are communities that if you added the weights, would get a lot more per-student than they're currently getting. So they're extremely efficient in their use of funds. They are highly accountable, not to the bureaucracy of that district to which they belong, but to the State Board of Education and to the state itself, and the investments are highly visible. Those three additional factors have made it really possible to have a lot of focus on these schools and make them really successful. You know, I think that one of the things that we want to try to do, as the Nevada Immigrant Coalition, is try to translate numbers to you in terms of what happens to kids and the differences in real lives. We're going to have a series of testimonies today of parents of students that go to Victory schools that can speak in a much more personal way, what the difference in culture and the difference in identity that these monies have been able to provide, have mattered, have been able to issue to these kids. Let me just kind of address this issue: well what about the kids that don't go to Zoom or Victory schools, what should we do with them? Well, I mean, I guess my answer to that is two-fold. Number one, don't take something that's already working because you don't have enough monies to really cover the entire obligation of the state. It's really hard to make the magic a one-plus-one equal three happen. And number two, the commission should be thinking about, maybe we need additional investments, and not simply take away from what's working to be able to address that bigger question. Thank you.

Item A3, Anahi Bravo

Hello, my name is Anahi Bravo, I'm here to represent myself, and my daughter who is currently an ESL student at an elementary school, and the funding that you guys give have helped her a lot, have helped her teachers give her more support. I myself, when I came to this country, I was also an ESL student, and my teachers helped me a lot. I am now- sorry, a university graduate, and I don't think you guys should cut it. Maybe find more funding, other places, or other students that need it will benefit from it. And the Zoom program is a great program, my cousins have been in it. And all I can say is that it's a really great program that shouldn't be cut. I feel like a lot of these students need a lot of help, parents, I know a lot of parents couldn't be here, and I'm trying to represent everyone that I know that benefit from these Zoom programs. And even the lunch programs that are free help our parents that are struggling, making ends meet, trying to work full time and trying to help our kids. You know, with homework, that's something we don't understand because we don't understand the language. So please look into other places that we can keep funding these programs and expand them more. Thank you.

Item A4, Andrew Sierra

Good afternoon, my name is Andrew Sierra, thank you for the time to speak. Besides working with Mi Familia Vota, I'm a community member here in our beautiful community. But more importantly, besides the positions I've held in this community, the most important that I hold dear and near to my heart is that of being a big brother and an older cousin to a beautiful set of little children who attend Zoom and Victory schools. So my baby brother and my cousin, both attend Twin Lakes Elementary School, where I've seen major improvements as a result of the funding they have received as a result of being classified as a Zoom school. I know that my cousin for example struggles a lot despite the fact that her parents are first generation immigrants here in this country. She struggles with learning the English language as a result of no one being able to fully speak it or understand it at home. Which is why when older cousins such as myself, or older brothers such as myself, are available we often dedicate our time and our resources to be able to help the children at home. But I know for a fact that the resources that they offer as a school as a result of the funding have had dramatic effects on improvements whether it's reading, whether it's math, and every other subject in school. And I just couldn't think of what could possibly happen if that money and those resources were to be removed. I know that it's something that I also hold near and dear to my heart because at one point in time I was also an English language learner, and had it not been for the resources I had at my school, despite the fact that it was in a different state, I at the age of 19 would not be able to speak as coherently or as confidently as I am here today. Thank you.

Item A5, Lindsay Dalley

Hello, I represent, as I've addressed before, rural schools that exist within the large urban CCSD district, and as is common in a rural area, I wear three hats and I serve on the Community Education Advisory Board, which represents all of our schools, our two elementary, middle, and high school. And then I also serve on our Moapa Valley High School organizational team and our Middle School organizational team, which as you know, is legally involved in getting school budgets. That's where I've learned that this school funding issue is going to skim right over the top of us. So I've been to other meetings, and I've had some great conversations with a couple members, and I was asked to outline our unique issues. And as I begin to kind of think about it, and get into it, I realized our issues are really the same as other rural schools. I don't need to go into all that, because there are enough people on the board here that understand that. But there is an added component of a large urban district that does not understand rural issues. And that is way more involved than I can put on a one-page outline. And I think it requires a little bit of interaction to kind of dial-in, so the board understands that, and because of that, I would like to ask, hopefully I'm not being presumptuous, that at some point, maybe we get 10 or 15 minutes on the agenda and I can bring some administrators in, and we can just kind of outline our very small little box that we have trouble with, so that it can help, as these formulas are developed, we can make sure that we're not a donut hole in the back end. We would also be willing, would like to ask, that our schools be included in the test runs when we get the models up and running, our principals have agreed to provide information. Because we don't fit the norm, our utilities all around the board are different than the Las Vegas utilities. And not even the Las Vegas, not even CCSD understands that. That's a whole other discussion. Since this was brought up in public comment, this is my last comment; hopefully I'm not going to run out of time here. I'd like to note that rural schools within CCSD do not have access to Victory or Zoom schools. Yet there are many students within those schools that could benefit from that. And we've already had that fight, and we can't seem to get noticed on that. So as we're looking at this funding formula, I'd just throw out that that's one of those unique issues that just popped up today, that we're that donut hole. So we have to struggle with trying to accommodate those types of students, but we don't get the benefit that comes with Clark County. But you as law-makers see all of this money pouring into Clark County, and it never hits us. So anyway, thank you very much.

Item A6, Fernando Romero

Buenas tardes, good afternoon, it's a long walk from back there to here. I already wasted my two minutes, I know. But, anyways, it's a pleasure to be here, to be able to speak on behalf of Victory and Zoom schools. I have witnessed personally the great things that they have done, and I ask you to grandfather this thing in. My kids, I've been here 53 years in Las Vegas, and I have a daughter who graduated from Valley High School who's an attorney, a son who graduated from Valley High School who is an architect, and my wife is a specialist for the JAG program at Valley. I've seen the progress that the funds from the Victory school has done for our children. We have at Valley, a population of over 250 homeless children that have been identified—there are more—but 250. This program has helped dramatically. We speak of at-risk children, at-risk students, that this program has helped. And we don't like to use that term, but that's what it is. In Southern Nevada, we have 725,000 people who are immigrants of Latino descent, many of whom attend—there are 2900 students at Valley High School that have benefited from this program, at least a third of them are bilingual or monolingual Spanish. There are at least 50-200 people, students, from other countries that have come knowing absolutely no language, no schooling whatsoever, coming from African countries for example, that need the services of the Victory and Zoom schools. We need for you to consider, again, extending that and keeping that going to grandfather this program into the schools that exist now and in fact seek funds where we can expand the programs that have been so successful. There is no reason why a school that has done so great in what they're doing, in having received these funds, having that pulled away. It's like a person who wins a marathon and gets a medal and now they take the medal away because they won. We have to continue this funding, we have to look for our kids that are at-risk, we have to do it for success, and success has been proved at Valley and other Zoom and Victory schools throughout Nevada. Again, I urge you to consider this, and I do thank you for your time and for your interest.

Item A7, Richard Santigate

Thank you President McCormick-Lee and Commission, thanks for having the, giving me this opportunity to speak on this platform. I'm Richard Santigate, I'm here to represent Mater Academy Mountain Vista Public Charter School, State Public Charter School. I just want to highlight that fact that charter schools are a state public school in every sense of the word, we serve all students from every demographic, and we understand that there's a lot of decisions to be made on your end coming up here, and we trust and hope that you look upon us equally and equitably when it comes to all of our other public school peers. We just do not want to get in the habit, and we want to be cognizant, of not pinning one district against the other. We're all a part of the Nevada Public Education, and we're all here to serve students to the best of our abilities. And that's our main goal, so thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Item A8, Giovanni Cervoni

Yeah, my name's Giovanni Cervoni. I'm a senior at Valley High School, the Zoom and Victory grants have so many benefits towards our school, it's unimaginable. Like, I want to paint a small picture, right? Picture the kid in band, ok? They've been practicing the same song over and over, on an instrument that other schools can't even get, right? However, he gets this piece of musical art, because of a grant like Victory. They go up, they provide us with a performance that was merely a scenario in their head 10 minutes before; then get ready to do it again. Or the girl in dance; Victory has allowed her class to be set up in a room where they can practice, have peace. She goes to class constantly, giving her all, practicing until 6pm, pouring with sweat, doing this routine until its perfect. Then gets on stage and gets ready to do it all over again. Maybe the boy, part of Latino Student Union, using Zoom funds from these grants to get influential Latinos to come to our school and give us advice about our future, our age group never even thinks about. Ten years later, all of these same kids defy it all, go to a high school to tell their story, go home, and get ready to do it again. And then there's me, a student using his aptitudes from my schools Jobs for Nevada's Graduates program. Using my intangibles, it taught me to speak to professional audiences, helping his dreams come true, this moment representing to all of you, and doing everything in my power, to help do what I believe is correct. And what I stand for, because Zoom and Victory grants are paying to give me an opportunity like this, give me a chance to speak to you in confidence, knowing you hear my words, my message, and if I was asked about another opportunity like this, best believe the unnamed students before me, they aren't the only ones who would do it again. My name is Giovanni Antonio Cervoni, I'm a third generation Italian, second generation Cuban, but I'm going to be the first generation in my family to graduate college one day. I could promise you that. Now I know I'm probably over time, but this needs to be said. Victory and Zoom help so many students and plays such a great impact. You have managed to discover a way to make a great impact become a minimum impact, a non-factor. If you spread those funds, instead of increasing them, instead of renewing them, instead of keeping them where they are, these students will suffer, and I promise you, they will not be able to get back up. They definitely won't be able to do it again. Thank you.

Item A9, Linda Jones

That's a tough act to follow. Thank you Madame Chair, Members of the Commission. For the record, my name is Linda Jones, and I'm the school organizational team coordinator for Clark County Education Association. CCSD is unique as it relates to AB 469. There are roughly 334 schools that are responsible for providing input on the strategic budget for their school for the upcoming school year. The teams are comprised of the following stakeholders: parents, educators, support staff, and administrators. They are the folks that are on the front line at the school level and they are tasked with making decisions on the budget according to the funding that's available to them. The SOT will begin to work on the strategic budget for the 20-21 school year beginning January 15, 2020. They must have that budget completed and submitted to the Associate Superintendent by the end of February. Paragraph 76 of SB 543 states that the Commission shall project its budget for the 2019-21 biennium as if the provisions of SB 543 were currently in effect. It also states that each school district shall use the data that the Commission determines to be appropriate to provide a comparison between that budget as well as the actual projected budget. And both budgets should be submitted to the Commission on or before May 15, 2020. We understand that the Commission has a significant charge in its work with SB 543; we know that coming up with the model that shows how budgets would look like under SB 543 is not easy. We also know that your timeline in doing that goes out to May 2020. But that's 2-3 months after SOTs adopt budgets. What we are asking is, if at all possible, for a model to be created while the SOTs are developing their budgets. We think the experience would be invaluable for those SOT members to see how the new funding formula will work. We believe that it is important that this Commission get feedback from the SOTs because they are the people at the point of delivery. Since the statute mandates that there be a budget comparison with the actual budget and the SB 543 budget, we again request if possible that this Commission can provide the data to the district, so that while the SOTs are working on their 20-21 strategic budgets, they can have a real experience with both budgets, and be able to make comparison in real time. CCSD could then be able to provide those to this Commission for review and assessment. Thank you.

Item A10, Cecilia Alvarado

Good afternoon, thank you for the opportunity to be here again today. I am Cecilia Alvarado, the State Director for Mi Familia Vota. We are a non-profit organization, a national organization, that represents the Latino communities, and I'm here today not only representing my organization, but I'm also representing my community, and also representing myself. My community because Mi Familia Vota, we get calls from the community when they encounter issues at schools, we are their advocates. They come to us when their children are suffering at school, they come to us when they hear something in the news and they want validation, or they want an explanation of what's going on. And one of the issues that has been brought to our attention, is the potential jeopardy of the Zoom and Victory programs. Why it's so important to my community—I'll share some of the stories. One, I wish that I could bring more parents to share their personal stories, just like Giovanni's and Anahi's, the stories on how Zoom and Victory has made a huge impact on their lives and their children's lives. It's part of our American dream. Every parent wants their kid to have a chance at higher education. And for these parents and for my community, they have a chance of achieving that American dream thanks to Zoom and Victory programs. What we're asking is for the funding formula to grandfather something that's already working. It's working in our communities, I see it every day. I'm a product of our public schools. I moved to the United States when I was 16 years old, we didn't have those programs in place. CSN had to figure out a way on how to help me get through college. And it took me—I still haven't graduated. It has taken me almost 10 years. Because it's not as easy for you to process information that you get. When you're writing an essay, it takes you 3-4 times longer, because you have to adapt, not only in every class that you're learning in, you're learning new information, it's a new language for you as well. So to have that opportunity to be part of a Zoom program, or a Victory program, when I was in school, I can assure you that I didn't have to turn down my scholarships because I wasn't ready to go to San Diego University when I wasn't ready to attend college. So it's your chance, it's your chance to make it from being always labeled as the immigrant kid that struggles to learn English, into becoming someone that can have an impact in their communities. So I'm here today, advocating for all of our parents. Today my daughter goes to a school that doesn't need those benefits. And if she needs help, and if she needs tutoring, thank god I can pay for private tutors. But that's not the case for most of Zoom and Victory schools. So I'm not here with the numbers, but I can tell you I'm here testifying for real people that are concerned about this, because this is their only chance their kids will get to achieve higher education. So please reconsider not cutting the program or expanding it to other kids, but adding more money to it, if that's the case. But we can't do it at the cost of our kids in our poorest neighborhoods. Thank you.

Item A11, Victor Salcido

Good afternoon Members of the Commission, my name is Victor Salcido, and I'm here on behalf of the Charter School Association of Nevada. I wanted to first thank you for serving on this commission, I don't envy your position or responsibilities, but I do deeply appreciate it, so thank you for serving. I know there are many moving parts that you have to try to balance as you go through your deliberations, and I just wanted to draw your attention to one of those moving parts, which is that right now under the new formula, public charter schools are not eligible for some of the same adjustments that some of our peers are. Namely, the necessarily small school adjustment, and the necessarily small district equity adjustments, we're specifically excluded from, all public charter schools. If this remains in place, it would have a devastating effect on many of our public charters, particularly those in the rural areas. Right now I would simply request that before recommendations are made, you understand the consequences of not receiving those adjustments and what that would mean to some of our rural members. This is especially urgent considering that public charter schools are also excluded from the hold harmless provision. So at a minimum I would request that public charter schools be covered by that same hold harmless provision, and also to draw your attention to those adjustments that we're currently ineligible for. Thank you again.