

**Reporting and Monitoring Work Group
COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FUNDING
Friday, November 15, 2019
9:00 AM**

Meeting Location:

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Rd.	Las Vegas	Suite 210 Conference Room

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE WORK GROUP MEETING

Work Group Members Present:

Dusty Casey
Andrew J. Feuling
Jason A. Goudie
Jim McIntosh
Dr. Lisa Morris Hibbler

Department Staff Present:

Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Megan Peterson, Management Analyst III
Beau Bennett, Management Analyst IV
Jessica Todtman, Chief Strategy Officer
Alberto Quintero, Education Programs Professional
Rose Cota, Administrative Assistant II

Subject Matter Experts Present:

Jason Willis, WestEd

Agenda Item #1 - Call to Order

Work Group Lead Jim McIntosh called the meeting to order at 9:05a.m.

Agenda Item #2 - Public Comment #1

Public comment will be taken during this agenda item regarding any item appearing on the agenda. No action may be taken on a matter discussed under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. A time limit of three minutes will be imposed by the Work Group Lead in order to afford all members of the public who wish to comment with an opportunity to do so within the timeframe available to the Work Group. Public comment #2 will provide an opportunity for public comment on any matter within the Work Group's jurisdiction, control, or advisory power.

No public comment.

Agenda Item #3 – Reporting and Monitoring Project Planning

The Reporting and Monitoring Work Group's charge includes identifying the evidence required to monitor the implementation of the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan (PCFP) and determining the recommendations, within the limits of appropriated funding, to improve or correct any deficiencies of the Department or any school district or public school in carrying out the PCFP (Senate Bill 543 §11.1(b)). The Work Group will discuss the current fiscal and accountability reporting requirements related to SB 543.

[Discussion]

Reporting and Monitoring Work Group Lead McIntosh, Member Morris-Hibbler, Member Feuling, Member Casey, and Member Goudie discussed the Base Funding Reporting Requirements.

Member Goudie asked who would define the requirements for how funding must be spent in the case of programs such as Read by Grade 3 Program (RBG3), which will become part of base funding. Specifically, if RBG3 is partially funded by grants, once RBG3 is incorporated into the new base funding system, how will RBG3 components affect reporting?

Megan Peterson, Management Analyst at the Nevada Department of Education, noted that there are two statutes which are currently in place with reporting requirements which will be repealed: revenues from the State Supplemental Fund, and taxes raised by districts to support school safety and security. Other existing statutes with reporting requirements will remain in place, extending to RBG3. Zoom reporting, in place due to a specific bill, is set to expire and will not remain in place as currently structured. While SB 543 alters the system for funding allocations, the accountability systems in place for much of that funding is still held in statute and does not change.

Member Goudie remarked that while reporting elements are more clearly defined within the scope of the project, spending requirements and limitations require further definition.

Work Group members collaborated to clarify that while base funding reads as non-categorical, with different grants supporting the base funding, those funds will still have specific requirements relating to spending, reporting, and accountability.

Lead McIntosh requested reports for the next meeting regarding the current funding formula's revenue sources and the accountability and reporting requirements for each of those sources. The Department currently has a rough draft of this document which is being reviewed by the Funding and Distribution Work Group during their November 15, 2019 meeting.

Member Morris-Hibbler requested that the Work Group review how districts currently build their budgets, as it may differ between districts. Lead McIntosh agreed, noting that the primary exception would be Clark County School District (CCSD), as they are under the purview of Assembly Bill (AB) 469, which outlines specific requirements for how Clark County budgets; other school districts are likely using the longstanding model of allocating on a per-pupil basis. Since the recommendations of the Commission on School Funding may conflict with AB 469, the Work Group concluded there should be future review and discussion of AB 469 in future.

[Presentation]

Megan Peterson, Management Analyst III, Nevada Department of Education, conducted a PowerPoint presentation on [New and Revised Reporting Requirements](#) in SB 543.

[Questions and Comments]

Member Goudie remarked that the reporting requirement under section 12.5(e), relating to the professional development provided to each teacher requires further clarification. "Teacher" needs to be defined between educators in the classroom and licensed personnel; furthermore, given the number of teachers and licensed personnel, the Work Group needs further clarification on what the reporting

requirement for “professional development” means, to what extent of detail, and how that gets reported.

Member Casey also had questions about how the reporting on professional development would be aggregated, whether by teacher, professional development programs offered, etc.

Mrs. Peterson noted that further definitions would need to be made, and there was potential in refining how reporting was done in the regulations process.

Member Feuling had concerns regarding reporting and tracking expenditures for at-risk students in poverty. He stated that there were clear codes for tracking budget to Special Education, English Language Learners, etc., but there was no such coding for students in at-risk categories due to federal law.

Member Casey clarified that the names of students cannot be recorded, but that schools can report the percentage of their population which is supported by at-risk programs.

Member Goudie noted in discussion of Section 12.5(g) that there were many students who operated out of multiple categories. He noted that this area will need very specific definition from the Department, as there will frequently be those working in a cross-section of special education, English language learners, and free and reduced lunch, and the intention was likely not to count these students three times. Without being able to assign names, it is difficult to assign funds and services. Member Goudie was concerned that the funding will become diluted for students in multiple programs, as they are calculated only for the single, most heavily weighted, program they are enrolled in.

Lead McIntosh requested that clarification on this matter be made a priority.

Member Casey inquired if audit requirements and deadlines will change since cost components, such as the per-pupil amount for supplies and materials, are due by October 1.

Lead McIntosh seconded concerns with the timeline, as it means that reports will not yet have been audited, so there are potential changes in the prior period.

Mrs. Peterson noted that the legislature created the October 1 deadline, but the deadline is within the purview of the Commission to make a recommendation to alter. The Department will do further research on why the October 1 deadline was selected.

Member Feuling remarked that under section 12.5(h) he would like the age of the facility included so that members of the public, as well as the state, can better contextualize differences in operational per-pupil costs between schools.

Mrs. Peterson clarified for the Work Group that the goal is for the Department to standardize the format for expenditure calculations and reporting, so that data is comparable across each district.

Member Casey asked that clear delineations be made for what public schools needed to report, versus charter schools, school districts, etc.

Lead McIntosh also asked about whether Insight reporting would continue after the implementation of SB 543, as there appears to be a great deal of overlap between SB 543 requirements and Insight reporting requirements.

Mrs. Peterson reported that the Insight contract was maintained through the Legislative Counsel Bureau, and the Department was unsure of Insight's status at this time. She indicated that the Department does not currently use Insight report data.

Member Morris-Hibbler remarked that the reporting required under Section 12.4 to each parent/guardian needs to be easily digestible; she also inquired if this is an additional report to the accountability report that each school produces, or if it can be integrated into the accountability report.

Member Goudie asked that teams evaluating Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) data, which is also per-school, per-pupil reporting, be taking into consideration to ensure that duplications are not being made unnecessarily.

Upon the recommendation of Member Feuling, it was requested that reports from the Department's current data visualization taskforce be evaluated or incorporated. All members emphasized the importance of streamlining and making clear the reporting requirements.

Lead McIntosh asked for clarification on Department reporting requirements, specifically those required by July 1.

Mrs. Peterson clarified that the data is slightly different, as it is a recommendation based upon what an average school would look like. The reports at the school level are what schools have experienced, and are designed to be forward-thinking to help inform decision making, and the Department report is based upon that work. The Commission is meant to provide recommendations on the Department report, and Lead McIntosh inquired when they could expect that report. Mrs. Peterson indicated that the Department is working on the details of that timeline with subject matter experts

Reporting and Monitoring Work Group Lead McIntosh, Member Morris-Hibbler, Member Feuling, Member Casey, and Member Goudie discussed further elements of the Reporting and Monitoring Work Group Draft Project Plan.

[Discussion]

Member Feuling requested clarification on the hold-harmless expectation, Section 15.2. Member Goudie also requested further clarification and what that means for flexibility in spending allocations.

Member Morris-Hibbler emphasized the importance of adequacy, and Lead McIntosh seconded that once the data was organized and well understood, the Commission could move into discussion about optimal funding and adequacy.

While reviewing the business process, the Work Group requested further information on the proposed budgeting process. The Department will adopt the policy as outlined in SB 543, and put together recommendations based on those reports to go to the governor; the governor then makes recommendations for add-ons and adjustments, which is then forwarded to the legislature for the final

decision. The Commission will also make recommendations to legislature for funding weights; final outcomes are determined by revenue projections from the Economic Forum.

Member Casey requested further information on what variables or metrics the Commission may want to see associated with comparable reports. The Work Group agreed that revenue sources are the most important elements to have clear reports on from the districts, especially at this stage, and that the Work Group needed to define what information they would like to see go into the budget comparisons. In the Commission on School Funding Meeting on November 14, 2019, members confirmed that they had flexibility in determining which elements go into the budget.

The Work Group also noted that future work, beyond the Data Crosswalk and the Business Process, include determining which critical elements and guidelines they would like to monitor when the monitoring component goes into place. However, the Work Group determined that the Data Crosswalk needed to be established prior to further work, and that the requested data and reports were needed to continue.

Agenda Item #4 – Future Agenda Items

Member Feuling requested that WestEd’s report on exemplar States be shared as it relates to monitoring metrics.

Agenda Item #5 - Public Comment #2

Public comment will be taken during this agenda item on any matter within the Work Group’s jurisdiction, control, or advisory power. No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. A time limit of three minutes will be imposed by the Work Group Lead in order to afford all members of the public who wish to comment with an opportunity to do so within the timeframe available to the Work Group.

No public comment.

Agenda Item #6 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30a.m.